Workload and Annual Review Policy
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Approved by the Department on 11/8/2019

1 Introduction

This department workload and annual review policy is written to conform with the workload policies of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) as per the college document (section IV) College Governance-Workload Policy. This policy was approved by the department unanimously on 11/8/2019. The department chair is charged with ensuring that this policy is reviewed and updated on a regular basis, normally every five years, as well as in response to any changes that may arise in the College policy.

The department recognizes that a faculty member's workload will include contributions in teaching, research, and service. Specifically, the workload policy is based on the following factors and considerations with a goal of creating an equitable workload among the faculty that would allow the department to meet its teaching, research and service obligations: 1. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to be actively doing research; 2. The standard teaching load, per College policy, for a tenure-track faculty member who is actively doing research is five courses per academic year; 3. The Department needs to maintain a high level of research in order to support its large and successful graduate programs, and to support the university's research mission; 4. Faculty members are all expected to provide service to the Department, the University and to their research fields professionally; 5. The annual merit evaluations need to take into consideration each faculty member's designated workload in order to properly acknowledge his/her effort and achievement.

A faculty member's overall workload must incorporate appropriate recognition of his/her research success and effort. For this purpose, three workload tracks named "research-intensive", "research-active", and "teaching-intensive" are created and each tenure-track faculty member will be assigned to one of them. The department chair has the responsibility for making these designations, in consultation with the DRC, following the guidelines

provided in this document. The workload of department members with significant administrative responsibilities (*e.g.* the chair, the associate chair, and the undergraduate and graduate coordinators) is determined jointly by this workload policy together with their course reductions defined in the Department Bylaws, and in special occasions may be approved by the department chair or the dean of the college. Course buy-outs from external funding will not normally exceed two courses per year; an exception would be a faculty member who is awarded a college-approved Fellowship that has no teaching expectations.

2 Definition of Journal Publication Equivalent Count

Since overall workload is based in part on success and effort in research, it is important for the department to describe how such success/effort is measured. The department recognizes that a precise measurement is difficult and we can only provide guidelines based on a **journal publication equivalent count**. For this purpose, the department will split mathematics, statistics, and mathematics education journals into two groups: reputable and acceptable, based on journal reputation, impact factor, and expert evaluations. One (journal) publication means a paper published in a "reputable" journal. As a rough approximation, the journals in groups A and B of the Australian Mathematical Society Ranking (`https://www.austms.org.au/Rankings/AustMS_final_ranked.html`), in groups Q1, Q2 and Q3 of the Scientific Journal Ranking list (SJR, `https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php`) and those listed in the *2008 Venue Study Report* done by the Department of Mathematics Education at Brigham Young University may serve as a comparison base for the "reputable" journals, while book chapters and refereed papers are usually considered as publications in "acceptable" journals. 2 publications in the "acceptable" list or Conference Proceedings may count as a single publication equivalent. The submission of a serious and substantial research grant proposal (documented by reasonable reviews) by a faculty member as the PI will count as one publication, a successful and significant external grant (NSF, NIH etc, multiple year, usually in the $50k plus range) may count as 2 additional publications in the year the grant is received, while a faculty member who plays a significant role in

the submission of a major external grant proposal either as a co-PI or as a senior personal may receive a partial publication count. The department recognizes the importance of interdisciplinary collaborations and shall treat papers published in reputable journals of other disciplines equally. Faculty members are encouraged to inform the chair and DRC when they believe their work may not be adequately evaluated using these guidelines and may petition to have their publications to be counted differently. The chair, with consultation with DRC and external experts when necessary, is responsible for making the final determination of the publication count for each faculty member.

3 Definition of Workload Tracks

Research-intensive workload track

Criteria: Non-tenured tenure-track faculty members are automatically placed in the research-intensive workload track, and tenured faculty members who have six or more publications, with at least 3 papers in reputable journals, over the previous 5 year period are also assigned to this workload track.

Faculty members in the research-intensive workload track normally carry a 2–2 teaching load.

Research-active workload track

Criteria: Tenured faculty members who are not in the research-intensive workload track and have at least 2 publications over the previous 5 year period are assigned to this workload track.

Faculty members in the research-active workload track carry a 3–2 teaching load.

Teaching-intensive workload track

Criteria: Tenured faculty members who do not meet the criteria for the research-active workload track are assigned to the teaching-intensive workload track.

Faculty members in the teaching-intensive workload track will be assigned 6 to 8 courses per academic year depending on the service load of the faculty

member (such as course coordinator, time consuming committee assignments, *etc.*).

Non tenure-track faculty workload track

Criteria: All non tenure-track faculty members are in this workload track.

Non tenure-track faculty members have a 4–4 teaching load.

4 Effort, Performance and Evaluation

4.1 Tenure-track faculty members

Since tenure-track faculty members may be assigned different workloads, their effort and performance needs to be evaluated accordingly. The annual performance of a faculty member in each of the three areas teaching, research and service will be based on a 100 point total scale, with 100 representing the best performance. A weighting factor for each area is used to take the different workload track into consideration.

More specifically, the effort and performance of a tenure-track faculty is reflected by a vector of the form (T, R, S) where T, R and S stand for the teaching score, research score and service score respectively. Each score is obtained by the raw performance score (on a 100 point scale as defined in the above) multiplied by an effort weighting factor according to the workload track of the faculty member. The effort weighting factors for the three workload tracks are given below.

For the research intensive workload track: $(0.4, 0.4, 0.2)$.

For the research active workload track: $(0.5, 0.3, 0.2)$.

For the teaching intensive workload track: $(0.65, 0.1, 0.25)$.

Finally, a chair discretion factor C (used by the chair to recognize faculty members with extraordinary achievements and contributions) with a maximum value of 10 points is added as the fourth entry. Thus the evaluation vector is a 4 entry vector of the form (T, R, S, C) where the maximum values of T, R and S sum to 100 for all workload tracks.

4.2 Non tenure-track faculty members

Non tenure-track faculty members are evaluated in the areas of teaching, professional development and service and their performances are assigned one of the following five ratings: not meeting expectations, meeting expectations, good, very good and excellent.

5 Factors Impacting Performance Evaluations

This section outlines some typical factors (expectations) that are used for evaluation purposes in each area; it is not meant to be an exhaustive list.

Teaching expectations and factors impacting teaching evaluations

Other than the assigned teaching loads, faculty members are also expected to perform other teaching-related duties such as directing senior projects/independent studies, supervising masters and doctoral students, writing and proofreading common final exams, writing, proofreading and grading qualifying exams, developing new courses *etc.* These activities will be considered in the annual merit evaluation in the category of teaching. The quality of teaching is gauged by a combination of factors such as student evaluations/comments, peer evaluations, student performance on common final exams, student praise/complaints, recognition in teaching (such as a teaching award), and DFW rates.

Service expectations

All faculty members, tenure-track or non tenure-track, are expected to undertake departmental service responsibilities (that are appropriate with respect to their rank, expertise and experiences) such as participation in departmental meetings, committee service, mentoring junior colleagues or postdoctoral scholars, advising PhD students, undergraduate course coordination, and participation in student and faculty recruitment. In addition they are expected to become involved in the university's governance process and to serve the profession through paper and proposal review. Senior faculty members are expected to exercise leadership in the profession at a national or international level (examples: editorial boards for scholarly journals, leadership in scholarly organizations, organizing conferences or summer schools.)

In the case of significant professional service, faculty members should document such service.

The department recognizes that service comes in different forms and can be difficult to measure in many cases. The general guideline is that the evaluation should be based on the impact, quality and effort of the service provided by a faculty member.

6 Other factors that may affect teaching load

1. To compensate the tremendous time/effort a faculty member spent in supervising a doctoral student, a faculty member will earn a 1/2 course reduction credit for a completed Ph.D. thesis under his/her direct supervision.

2. Significant new course development and new course preparation outside a faculty member's immediate expertise (at the request of the department due to its need) will be taken into consideration for possible (entire or fractional) course reduction to compensate the faculty member's time and effort.

3. Large classes in general increase the workload and need to be considered. In general, classes at the 3000 level with more than 30 enrolled students are considered larger than a normal size, while lower level courses with more than 50 enrolled students are considered larger than a normal size. The increased workload due to larger class enrollment is to be offset by grading support, and in the case that grading support is not available, such a class should be counted as more than one regular sized class, on a scale from 1 to 1.5, depending on the actual class size and level of the class. The fractional points from teaching such large classes can accumulate toward a class reduction in the future.

4. A faculty member who supervises and supports a multi-person research team (that includes research assistants and/or post doctoral fellows) with his/her funding may receive up to a course reduction per year during the duration of the project. Faculty members who receive a substantial research grant may also receive up to a course reduction in the year the grant is awarded.