**REPORT OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION / ACADEMIC SENATE
WORKING GROUP ON INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY**

On November 15, 2002, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Paul R. Gray convened a joint administration/Academic Senate working group to develop a set of recommendations related to faculty teaching workload activity (Attachment 1). He noted that the legislature recently commissioned the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) to review the partnership agreement between the Governor and the University of California. Included in this audit was a review of the University's teaching workload activity.

Based on Bureau of State Audit's findings and recommendations, President Atkinson called for greater monitoring of policies and practices related to faculty instructional activities at the campus level (Attachment 2) and for improved instructional workload guidelines. A systemwide Taskforce on Instructional Activities was convened to review and compare teaching workload policies and practices on each of the UC campuses and with peer institutions and to "develop effective and transparent ways to express and measure faculty instructional efforts that will be understandable to constituencies outside the University."

I. CHARGE:

EVCP Gray asked the working group to provide a set of recommendations for the following areas:

- Guidelines for developing departmental faculty teaching workload policies.
- Guidelines for the types of classes to be counted towards departmental workload policies.
- Desired relationships between course numbers and the instructional formats (lecture, seminars, independent study, etc) of the course.
- How courses with small enrollments should be counted towards teaching workload policies.
- How cross-listed and room-share courses should be counted towards teaching workload policies.
- How team-taught courses should be counted towards teaching workload policies.
- Suggested infrastructure and reports to monitor and report faculty teaching activity as outlined in President Atkinson's letter.

Having reviewed relevant Academic Senate regulations, departmental teaching workload policies, systemwide reporting policies, and current reporting practices, the working group offers the following findings and recommendations.

II. POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Current systemwide policy requires departments to have formal faculty instructional workload policies on file and campuses to apprise the Office of the President (OP) annually of any changes. Berkeley has not systematically reviewed its departmental policies since 1993. OP is now requesting that instructional workloads be kept within the ranges pertaining at comparable research universities, that the policies which govern those workloads be maintained by the chancellor's office, and that the executive vice chancellor and provost (EVCP) approve all additions or amendments thereto. Most departmental workload policies are expressed in terms of the number of primary courses taught annually, but eleven departments/schools use instead various kinds of point systems based on other measures, e.g. units of instructional efforts.

The Office of the President is also asking that the EVCPs annually compare departmental practices with policies in order to determine the appropriateness of any discrepancy between them. In addition, OP is asking each campus to develop or review campus policy with regard to instructional release time and to submit it to the Provost and Senior Vice President—Academic Affairs for review before implementation.

For campus-level reporting OP has developed guidelines (Attachment 3) for the annual legislative report which includes the following distinction between primary and independent study courses:

Primary - "regularly scheduled unit-bearing offerings usually known as lectures and seminars. . . If there is any question about whether a specific activity should be categorized as a 'primary course' or an 'independent study,' use the following guidelines: (a) Academic Senate actions are binding; if the Senate says it is a class, it is a class; (b) look carefully to see if it meets the definition of 'regularly scheduled'--meaning it has an assigned classroom at an assigned time, and meets a minimum of once a week; (c) able to reconcile out survey numbers with the published schedule of classes."

Independent Study – "all other instructional activities for which students receive credit towards their degree, but which are not regularly scheduled in the schedule of classes."

Systemwide and divisional Senate regulations and administrative policies govern the offering of courses and the appointment of instructors. The regulations and policies relevant to the reporting of faculty teaching activity are:

Courses
- Regulations of the Academic Senate, Title III.

Special Studies and Independent Study Courses
- Regulations of the Berkeley Division, Part I, Title II. A230 (Independent or Group Study)

Instructors
- Persons in Charge of Courses—Regulations of the Academic Senate, Part III, Title III, Chapter III, 750
- Assignment of Officers of Instruction --Regulations of the Berkeley Division, Part I, Title IV, A250
- Teaching of Pass/No Pass or Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Courses --Regulations of the Berkeley Division, Part I, Title II A205

Cross-listed Courses
- Committee on Courses of Instruction Handbook, Policies for Cross-Listed Courses.

Minimal Class Size
- 1973 Systemwide administrative memo

III. FINDINGS (what is recognized)

In reviewing the various materials, the Working Group identified two major issues: 1) the need for some uniform means of instructional activity comparisons and 2) the need for adherence to campus and systemwide policies. The uniformity of reports and the adherence to policy will serve to strengthen the university's position with the external community and its ability to secure appropriate resources.

Instructional Workload Policies for Individual Faculty

The campus respects the disciplinary diversity of departmental variations in faculty teaching workload policies and in crediting individual faculty teaching workload, and subsequently, reporting at both the departmental and campus level. Different departments have different cultures with respect to how they conceptualize faculty workload.

There are a number of activities that constitute faculty teaching workload, of which teaching a primary class is only one. Others -- e.g., supervising independent studies, thesis, and dissertations, being in charge but not teaching a class, developing new classes, etc. -- should also be recognized and credited.

In many disciplines, the pedagogy is changing particularly in the area of instructional technology. Most departmental workload policies have not been modified to incorporate the changing pedagogy. Pedagogical flexibility must be retained for effective delivery of the curriculum.

Most departmental workload policies are expressed in terms of the number of courses taught annually, but eleven departments/schools have developed their own point systems, some of which factor in release time. The working group acknowledges this evolved complexity but has no particular recommendation with regard to the pros or cons of such systems. It was noted that point systems seem to work better for large departments. Generic examples of workload policies using the point system and number of courses can be found in (Attachment 4).

Separately, the working group noted several instances where there was less than full compliance with Senate policies and regulations (see above). Examples include inconsistent numbering of independent courses or a failure to observe restrictions on the offerings of special studies courses. Such inconsistencies can impact the accuracy of instructional activity reports which, in turn, has resource implications for both the campus and for individual departments.

Reporting of Instructional Activity at the Campus/Departmental Level

CSIR, the reporting system that combines data on classes, enrollment, classrooms and instructors, is an old system that cannot be easily modified to adequately reflect recent pedagogical innovations, e.g. cross-listed courses, use of appropriate academic title codes. It is, therefore, being rewritten, but major enhancements are not anticipated until 2004-5 at the earliest.

In recent years, the campus has reported offering approximately 700 primary classes annually with enrollments of one or two students. Some of these courses are taught as overloads and do not count towards departmental workload policy. Others are legitimate examples of small classes that do not meet the minimum class size policy. Still others are reported as "primary", but in fact are taught in an independent study format. The campus wants to preserve and protect small classes where they contribute to the quality of instruction, while still being able to stand up to a state audit which questions the use of small unit courses with low enrollments.

The data on teaching activity are relatively accurate, given the largely decentralized nature of and lack of sufficient validation in CSIR's data entry processes. Unfortunately, the errors they do contain tend to be glaring. Examples include incredibly large numbers of primary classes credited to individual ladder faculty members, in one case 17 students initiated or facilitated courses numbered 98 or 198 (i.e., DECAL affiliated courses), in another 45 elementary language instruction classes. Although in the context of nearly 7,500 annual class offerings some error is unavoidable and these specific errors have little effect on the aggregate statistics, they are of the sort that would be viewed by external constituents as calling into question the integrity of the entire enterprise.

An additional challenge is that academic title information is not universally provided either on time or accurately for reporting purposes. (Approximately 10% of course offerings have missing or non-academic title codes by end of term, though Senate regulation requires all instructors of record and officers of instruction to have academic title codes.)

It is important that any changes introduced to our reporting systems not yield spurious changes in the workload statistics.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The working group recommends making a distinction between the crediting of individual faculty workload at the departmental level and the reporting of departmental teaching workload to campus and systemwide agencies.

The working group recommends the crediting and reporting of faculty teaching workload at three levels
- Individual faculty workload credit (e.g., internal departmental reports; faculty bio-bibs, program reviews).

- Departmental reporting (e.g., historical internal campus reports, new OP mandated departmental policy vs. practice report)
- Campus reporting (i.e., annual report to OP and to the legislature)

<u>Individual Faculty Workload Credit</u>

The campus should not seek to micro-manage individual faculty workload at the departmental level. Departments should be allowed to establish individual faculty workload policies and practices that recognize disciplinary differences. Individual faculty workload statistics would be used for individual and departmental purposes (e.g., merit and promotion review). Deans/chairs would be responsible for determining how individual faculty conform to departmental workload policies.

The campus anticipates receiving the final report from the Systemwide Task Force on Instructional Activities during the Summer or Fall of 2003. This report will include several recommendations related to the review and development of individual faculty teaching workload policies, articulation as to what types of courses and release time should be incorporated into teaching workload policies, as well as new reporting requirements. The working group recommends that departments review their individual faculty teaching workload policies and practices, but that such requests to review their policies be incorporated into the anticipated systemwide request.

Departments should establish faculty workload policies and practices that are consistent with campus and systemwide teaching workload guidelines to facilitate the crediting and reporting of teaching workload. Deans/chairs are expected to report any anomalous practices as they occur to the EVCP as well as correctives steps or strategies for resolving them. It is recognized that in any given year chairs may allow individual exceptions while still upholding overall departmental policy.

Departments should adhere to campus and systemwide regulations and policies when reporting teaching workload to campus and systemwide agencies. The comparison of teaching workload practice and policy should be at the level of departments, not individual faculty.

Colleges, schools, and departments should be continually informed of Academic Senate regulations, administrative policies, and OP reporting specifications, as well as reminded of the impact that inconsistent or inaccurate reporting may have on budget and the allocation of resources. Training of departmental staff in the reporting of faculty instructional activities is essential for optimizing as well as creating greater university in reporting practices.

Departments should review existing courses for consistency in number and instructional format (e.g., independent study, group study, and field study) and modify them as necessary with COCI approval.

<u>Reporting of Campus/Departmental Instructional Activity</u>

Reporting of departmental teaching workload data should be based on the number of primary classes taught by ladder-rank faculty in a given time period using the following definitions and criteria:

A <u>primary class</u> is any credit-bearing course that is not listed as an independent study class.

An <u>independent study class</u> is any class with a course number of x99, 601, or 602. Secondary sections that are credit-bearing will be considered a primary class. Non-independent courses identified as having schedules TBA will be considered as a primary class. Independent study classes that are scheduled (same room and time) will still be considered as independent study.

<u>Cross-listed</u> courses will be pro-rated and counted once.

Team-teaching courses will be pro-rated and counted once.

Small-unit primary classes will still be counted as primary classes. No adjustment (partial credit) will be made for classes with one or two units and such classes will be given full credit.

Low-enrollment primary classes will be counted as primary classes. No adjustment (partial credit) will be made for classes with enrollments below the minimum policy---low enrollment classes will be given full credit. Systemwide policy sets minimum enrollment limits of 12 students for lower division classes, 8 students for upper division classes, and 4 students for graduate classes. In the event that enrollment in a class falls below this specified norm in two successive offerings, the class should not be conducted again with enrollments below the norm without the approval of the dean. Low enrollment classes should be minimized and chairs need to regularly evaluate and guide this process.

Overload or primary classes listed in the department's workload policy as not being credited to the individual faculty workload, will still be given full credit in the teaching workload report made by the department to the campus.

P.E. classes will be listed as primary classes if they meet the above criteria.

Instructor Function[1]: Faculty will be credited / reported for teaching a primary class if they are recorded as either 1) teaching and in-charge of the class or 2) teaching and not in-charge of the class. Instructors who are in charge but not teaching will not be reported as teaching the class for departmental and campus reports.

Special Studies Courses that have a x97 or x98 course number will be counted as a primary class, if the course meets the criteria for a primary course.

Student-initiated and facilitated classes (e.g., DECAL affiliated courses) will report both the student facilitator who is teaching the class but not in charge and the instructor who is in charge of the class but not teaching. Similar to the above criteria, ladder faculty who are in charge of a student-initiated class but are not teaching the class will not be credited with teaching the class for departmental-level teaching activity reports.

As outlined in President Atkinson's letter to the Chancellors of September 9, 2002, the EVCs are asked to "annually review, by department, the instructional workload reported in the Legislative report and determine the appropriateness of any discrepancy between the effort reported and the workload policy that pertains to that department." In the past, the Office of Planning and Analysis has produced an annual report (FAIAR Report) that displays by department the number of classes, student credit hours (SCH), enrollment, and contact hours per faculty FTE across various instructor ranks. It is recommended that the FAIR report be modified to include departmental workload activity based upon the above criteria.

The Office of Planning and Analysis in conjunction with other offices should provide more education and training to departments and units on the reporting of departmental faculty teaching activity to ensure data integrity and quality.

The campus should continue to support the development of an enhanced Student Information System (SIS) and CSIR systems that will accommodate the recommendations of the Working Group. Such enhancements would a) reduce or eliminate data entry errors; b) simplify data entry by

---

[1] For purposes of internal individual faculty teaching workload credit, departments should be guided by their own workload policy. This may allow crediting for internal purposes (of courses where the instructor is teaching but not in-charge, or in-charge but not teaching) that is not allowed for external reporting of departmental workload. For departmental reporting and campus reporting to OP, primary courses will only be counted once and reflect the instructor actually teaching the class. For those instances where a faculty member is the "instructor of record" for a large multi-section course where teaching is done by GSIs (as is often the case for example in English R-1A), it is suggested that a 300 level course be defined for which that faculty member would get credit for teaching a primary class, in this instance, the coordination and mentoring of the GSIs.

departments; c) streamline the reporting process; and d) enhance the reporting process for departments, colleges, and the provost's office. For example, the system would provide better screens for data entry and provide departments with the capability of producing web-enabled reports on their faculty. In addition, the system could provide department chairs the ability to produce individual faculty teaching workload reports for internal department purposes. Such reports would be limited and would not be able to encompass all aspects necessary for the reporting of individual faculty teaching workload.

Members of the Joint Administration/Academic Senate Working Group on Instructional Activity

Vice Provost Jan de Vries, Chair
Vice Provost William Webster
Chair Catherine Koshland
Dean Mark Richards
Professor Ralph Catalano
Professor Margaret Conkey
Associate Professor Michael Mascuch
Executive Director Dennis Hengstler
Executive Director Maureen Morley
Registrar Susanna Castillo-Robson