Workload Document

Adopted by the School of Business

22 April 2003

Queen's School of Business Workload Committee

Marc Busch
Bill Cooper (Chair)
John Pliniussen
Dan Thornton
Mike Welker

(changes suggested by Joint Committee for the Administration of the Collective Agreement (JCAA), August 2003)

Business

Preamble

Individual faculty members in the Queen's School of Business have historically enjoyed considerable flexibility in meeting their obligations to the School, Queen's, the community and their professions. The mix of research, teaching and service has varied considerably, both across individual faculty members and for the same faculty member over the course of his or her career. While the formula of 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service is oft quoted as the normal time allocation for tenure-track, tenured, and continuing adjunct faculty, and may well be 'normal' in the sense of being a reasonable approximation to the mean for the faculty as a whole, the 40/40/20 mix does vary considerably across individuals and stage of career. Similar variability exist in the workload allocations for adjunct faculty, with some adjuncts carrying teaching loads of six or more courses plus service contributions but no research, while other adjuncts may teach one course and contribute neither service nor research.

Nothing in this Workload Document is meant to preclude the kind of flexible arrangements that have allowed the School to flourish. Rather, this Workload Document is an attempt to provide greater transparency and equity in the ways in which faculty can meet their obligations to the School, Queen's, the community and their professions, while ensuring that the School meets its requirements and provides for individual flexibility.

This Workload Document addresses Article 37 of the Collective Agreement. We will first identify the goals of this Workload Document before turning to the issues of procedures, workload standards, supporting evidence regarding workload standards, and implementation. Throughout we are cognizant of the need to recognize historical practice within the School of Business.

The Goal

This Workload Document is designed to help ensure that each member of the faculty of the Queen's School of Business has the opportunity and information required to establish an equitable and transparent workload;

Business

Procedures

This Workload Document describes two procedures to support the establishment of equitable faculty workloads: the Annual Request regarding Teaching Preferences, and the Annual Report to the Dean.

Annual Request regarding Teaching Preferences. The Associate Dean (Administration) assigns teaching loads to individual faculty. The Annual Request regarding Teaching Preferences provides a mechanism for each member of the faculty to identify the courses that he or she would like to teach in the coming academic year. This procedure can provide an opportunity for each faculty member to talk with the Associate Dean (Administration) about preferred courses, number of preparations, preferences among required and elective courses, larger and smaller classes, public and private programs, undergraduate and graduate programs, regular course loads and overloads, as well as the scheduling of courses and any special arrangements regarding the timing of courses. The procedure can also serve as a vehicle for discussing ideas for new courses. It is understood that how courses are taught is at the prerogative of the individual faculty member.

We propose two expansions of this process. The first is to address information asymmetries that have resulted from the expansion of programs. Individual faculty may not know all the courses that are to be staffed. To address this information asymmetry the Annual Request should be accompanied by a list of the courses that are expected to be taught in the coming academic year, including their timing. While the Associate Dean (Administration) will not know these with certainty, individual faculty may be able to make more informed requests regarding their preferred teaching assignments if the choices are more clearly identified.

Second, we propose a similar procedure regarding service preferences, and for a similar reason. Service opportunities within the School have expanded in conjunction with the expansion of programs. Unfortunately, some faculty are not aware of the full range of choices regarding how they may contribute service within the School.

To address this information asymmetry the Annual Request should be expanded to include both service and teaching preferences. Accordingly, the Annual Request regarding Teaching and Service Preferences should be accompanied by a list of the service opportunities that are expected to be available in the coming academic year. Those that require election will be clearly identified, as well as those for which compensation is offered. Again, while these service opportunities will not be known with certainty, individual faculty may be able to make more informed requests regarding their preferred service assignments if the choices are more clearly identified.

It is understood that every effort will be made by the Associate Dean (Administration) to accommodate individual requests regarding teaching and service preferences, subject to the School meeting its program requirements.

Business

Annual Report to the Dean. The Annual Report to the Dean contains an account of how the faculty member has spent the preceding calendar year, including efforts devoted to research, teaching and service. In addition, the Annual Report to the Dean contains a section for a detailed proposal regarding how each faculty member plans to spend the coming calendar year. This includes research projects of the individual's choosing to be begun and ended (including where research proposals are to be submitted), courses to be developed and taught, and service to be rendered to the School, the university, the community and the profession. Departures from the normal mix of 40/40/20 are to be justified by the individual faculty member and reviewed with the Associate Dean (Administration). This Annual Report forms the basis for the Dean's assessment of how well the faculty member is meeting his or her workload obligations and the resultant level of merit pay.

Workload Standards

Faculty members differ in many ways, including talents, interests, energies and priorities. Nevertheless, each is expected to make maximum use of his or her talents and to work equally hard to earn their base salary. Some faculty may contribute primarily by their research, others through their teaching, and some through service to the School, Queen's, the community and their professions. While the mix of research, teaching and service may vary, contributions of all full-time faculty are expected to sum to 100%. Differences in the quality of performance should be reflected in merit awards that result from the Annual Report to the Dean. Below are workload expectations for faculty in a variety of circumstances.

Many mixes are both possible and desirable in a faculty as diverse as that of the Queen's School of Business:

> The 40/40/20 mix means the faculty member has an active research program, teaches four courses (with normally fewer than four preparations), and provides service to the School, Queen's, the community and his or her profession at, or near, the median for his or her rank.
>
> Departures from the 40/40/20 mix on research, or teaching, or service activity are expected to be reflected in the other two components of workload:
>
> - A faculty member who has an outstanding research record would be expected to do less teaching and/or provide less service.
>
> - A faculty member who teaches more than the usual four courses (as part of their normal teaching load) would be expected to do less research and/or provide less service.

Business

- A faculty member who provides an unusually high level of service would be expected to do less research and/or less teaching.

More specifically, tenured and continuing adjunct faculty who do not have an active program of research and/or do not contribute service to the School, Queen's, the community and their profession at, or near, the median for their rank, are normally expected to carry a teaching load of five or six courses, with fewer than five or six preparations.

Newly hired untenured faculty who have not had a previous university appointment will be given every opportunity to develop their program of research while being provided with opportunities to demonstrate their teaching and service contributions. This provides such faculty members with ample opportunity to meet the criteria for promotion and tenure. In practice this means institutionalizing the lower teaching and service loads that have become common in the first years of a faculty member's appointment (as required by Article 37.2.7 of the Collective Agreement), with minimized preparations, access to research and teaching assistants, to teaching graduate seminars (if desired), unbalanced loads (if preferred), and minimal service requirements.

The following is the normal workload standard for untenured faculty who have not had a previous university appointment:

	Research	Teaching	Service
Year 1	70%	30%	0%
Year 2	60%	30%	10%
Year 3	60%	30%	10%
Year 4	40%	40%	20%
Year 5	40%	40%	20%
Year 6	40%	40%	20%

The workload for tenured and continuing adjunct faculty is 40% Research, 40% Teaching and 20% Service.

The workload of term adjunct faculty will match the terms of their contracts.

Supporting Evidence regarding Workload Standards

Most activity can be unambiguously categorized as research or teaching or service. A faculty member who is collecting data is doing research, someone who is conducting a class is teaching and a member of the faculty who is attending a meeting of Senate is doing service. But some valued activities are difficult to categorize as unequivocally research or teaching or service. Three seem particularly difficult to categorize and have been the subject of prolonged debate: student supervision, case writing, and writing textbooks and trade books.

Some may see the supervision of students (independent research courses, graduate projects, dissertations) as a service since it is expected that faculty supervise students, much as chairing dissertation defences and taking an active part in faculty governance are part of the role of a faculty member. Supervision could also be seen as teaching since guidance and instruction are often involved in supervising graduate work. And supervision could also be seen as research since some student projects and most dissertations are expected to result in peer-reviewed articles, often with the faculty member as co-author.

Case writing could be seen as research when the case offers a rich account of some understudied phenomenon and is subject to peer-review. Some may see case writing as supportive of teaching, particularly when the case will only be used in the writer's classes, or as service, particularly when the case is to be used in a setting such as an inter-collegiate case competition.

Writing monographs may be seen by most as research, while some may see writing textbooks and trade books as a commercial activity that is done outside a faculty member's workload. Others may see writing a textbook or a trade book as research when the book is peer-reviewed, while some may see it as activity in support of teaching when the book is not peer- reviewed and only used in the writer's classroom.

Supervising students and the writing of cases, textbooks and trade books are three activities that may be difficult to categorize with unanimity. We take the following positions in the interest of clarity: (1) that supervision is teaching; below we elaborate a mechanism for recognizing supervision as teaching; (2) that case writing is research if the case is peer-reviewed; otherwise it is activity in support of the case writer's teaching; (3) that writing textbooks and trade books is research if the book is peer-reviewed, otherwise it is an activity in support of the writer's teaching.

Research. Evidence of an active program of research normally would be provided by developing, submitting and publishing peer-reviewed research (journal articles, scholarly books and monographs, chapters in scholarly books, cases (when the case is peer-reviewed), textbooks and trade books (when the book is peer-reviewed), developing, submitting and presenting research at peer-reviewed conferences, developing and submitting peer-reviewed grants, or other scholarly activities. Each of these would normally be supported by a manuscript and the peer reviews.

Teaching. Teaching refers to term-length courses taught in the degree granting programs of the Queen's School of Business: Commerce, AMBA, MBAST, EMBA, NEMBA, MSc. and PhD. Evidence of meeting teaching load standards normally would be provided by teaching four courses, (unless a teaching load of other than four courses has been stipulated as the faculty member's normal workload) with normally fewer than four preparations, initiating and developing courses, writing course material, meeting classes, meeting with students, holding office hours, evaluating students' work, and submission of grades.

Service. Evidence of providing service to the School, Queen's, the community and the faculty member's profession normally would be provided by attending and taking an active part in faculty governance (Faculty Forums and Faculty Boards, Senate, attraction and selection of new faculty), attending and taking an active part in committees of the School, Queen's, the community and professional bodies, acting as an editor or reviewer for peer-reviewed journals, conferences and funding agencies, serving as chair of programs of the School, member of a dissertation committee, second reader on student projects, or external examiner for dissertations. Unlike research and teaching, it is expected that service will increase with rank, with Assistant Professors carrying less of a service load, and Professors carrying more of a service load. Providing compensated service (with the exception of a stipend for managerial/administrative service that is requested by the Dean) does not constitute contributions towards the service portion of the workload.

The introduction of the two Executive MBA programs has raised a variety of concerns about equity for some faculty. One area of concern is the treatment of student supervision. Pre-EMBA, student supervision (including supervising dissertations) was regarded as part of the service portion of faculty workload. More recently, MSc. supervision has been dealt with in the same way. Supervision of EMBA projects is dealt with differently, with the supervising faculty member receiving compensation for each completed project. Many would argue that supervising a PhD. dissertation involves substantially more work than does an MSc. project, which in turn involves more work than supervising an EMBA project or an undergraduate independent research project.

In the interest of equity and transparency, completed supervision of dissertations in Management, graduate research projects in Management and the School of Business, and independent research courses in the School of Business will be treated in the following way, where a unit refers to one course credit:

> Supervision of each completed PhD. dissertation = 1/2 unit
> Supervision of each completed MSc. project = 1/5 unit
> Supervision of each completed B.Com. independent research course = 1/10 unit
> Supervision of each completed EMBA project = 1/10 unit

Individual faculty can accumulate credits over time. Each individual faculty member will inform the Dean's office on how he or she wishes to convert units into research funds or course credits. For example, two successfully defended PhD. dissertations could be converted into a one-course credit or the equivalent to the price of a one-course overload. Similarly, ten completed B.Com. term-length independent research courses could be converted into a one-course credit or the equivalent to the price of a one-course overload. Faculty who wish to continue to treat supervision as service may do so by informing the Dean's office on the completion of the supervision and by listing it as service on their Annual Report to the Dean.

While this may help redress inequities in how the supervision of students is treated, some inequities may remain. These include the failure to credit supervision of graduate work in other units of the university and the often-extensive work involved in being a member of a dissertation committee, both within the School and in other units. At this point these will continue to be regarded as service.

Reporting. This Workload Document attempts to ensure that each member of the faculty of the Queen's School of Business has the information required to establish an equitable and transparent workload with the assurance that all of his or her colleagues are working equally hard to earn their base salary. A barrier to this assurance is a lack of information regarding how his or her workload compares with that of his or her colleagues.

All faculty currently have access to the listing of teaching assignments (distributed annually), committee assignments (distributed annually) and the Research News regularly lists new publications by faculty. Each of these is incomplete (e.g., faculty provide service well beyond the School of Business and the Research News only identifies successful research activity, not the activity itself). An annual listing of each faculty member's activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service may do a great deal to reduce information asymmetries and to clarify how each of us makes our contributions. We urge the Dean's office to create a vehicle whereby all members of faculty can have complete information on the workload of all members of the faculty.

Implementation

These workload standards become operative on being ratified by a vote of members of the Queen's School of Business bargaining unit, pending review by the Dean to ensure that the School can meet its academic obligations.