I. Introduction

The Faculty Workload Committee has a two-fold mandate: (1) to review the overall parameters governing what constitutes full-time work for an Arts and Sciences faculty member; and (2) to consider whether a new or modified process for review of each faculty member’s contributions would be desirable. Initially, we had hoped to implement a new review process in conjunction with the annual merit review now underway, and for this reason undertook task (2) before task (1). We produced in February an initial report proposing a new process. After consultation with the faculty senate and the department chairs, it was decided not to try to implement the new process this year, but rather to experiment first with modifications of the existing system. That experiment is underway with this year’s merit review. For completeness, we have incorporated (as an appendix) our initial report, with its proposal for a new system, into this report. We expect that the review process will be discussed further by the faculty next year in the context of the overall analysis of the current report.

With the possibility of a new process put on hold, we turned to the task of reviewing the existing, though only implicitly defined, dimensions of the contribution of faculty members in the School of Arts and Sciences to various missions of the university. Established criteria used in the tenure and promotion system and those used in the annual merit review define this contribution in terms of research/creative activity, teaching, and service (including advising). The present trajectories of larger undergraduate student body and a decrease in the overall size of the faculty in Arts and Sciences make the suggested policies, which aim to create fairness among faculty members’ overall contribution, particularly important.

We have divided this review by considering three areas: first, establishing the activities that need to be taken into account in considering a faculty member’s total contribution; second, making explicit the existing patterns of teaching-load assignments in the various departments and schools within Arts and Sciences; and third, providing a systematic framework for considering reductions to the assigned teaching loads of faculty members who are making significant administrative contributions. Each of these three subtasks is addressed below.
Our second mandate was to consider a range of new mechanisms that would provide the Dean of Arts and Sciences with accurate, timely, and comprehensive information that would inform not only the merit review process but, just as important, the discussions among the Dean, department chairs, and individual faculty members to ensure that our collective missions are accomplished. In this second mandate the committee saw its work as complementary to the task of the Dean’s Curriculum Committee, which is now looking at a similar set of issues from the perspective of programs, departments, and schools. Implementation of a once-in-five-years reporting mechanism for tenured faculty that we recommended in our earlier memorandum has been suspended in favor of expanding the existing annual faculty activity's report. Although additional information-gathering mechanisms may be needed to assure that the increased demands that will inevitably be placed on everyone in Arts and Sciences will be shared equitably.

The overall issue of determining what contributions constitute a full-time workload applies to all faculty in Arts and Sciences, including tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and faculty outside the tenure structure. The initially proposed once-in-five-years report, if implemented, would apply only to tenured faculty. The discussion in the next section—of a complete workload comprised of contributions to scholarship/creation, teaching and service—applies in that form to tenured and tenure-track faculty, with faculty outside the tenure structure bearing responsibilities in those areas that are determined individually and specified in their appointment. In general, this document should be viewed as applying to all faculty, except where noted otherwise.

In addition to the material in our Initial Report, attached as an appendix, this report contains three main parts: The Definition of a Complete Workload; Base Teaching Loads by Departments; and Guidelines for Course Relief for Administrative Duties in A&S.

II. Definition of a Complete Workload

The Dean of Arts and Sciences assesses every faculty member annually, informed by Activities Reports and the reviews of Department Chairs. These reviews consider both the extent and the quality of the faculty-member's performance and forms the basis for the determination of the appropriate merit raise. When the review finds that a faculty member’s contributions are below expectations, a small or zero merit raise is awarded.

It is our recommendation that in the future this review should go beyond the current practice, and the Dean, in consultation with department chairs, would work with individual faculty to ensure that all faculty make appropriate and equitable contributions. We recognize that such judgments are somewhat subjective, and that excellence in small quantity may be more desirable than mediocrity in large quantity. These recommended guidelines are intended to provide a framework for making these subjective judgments as systematic as possible.

A. Teaching
For teaching to be judged to meet university expectations, the following conditions should be met:

1. The number of courses taught should not be less than the standard teaching load for the department or program, as adjusted by any specific “course release” arrangements in effect.

2. The faculty member’s preparation, responsiveness to students, availability for office hours, and attention to course logistics (syllabus, class meetings, timely grading) should meet appropriate departmental and university standards.

3. The variety and rotational frequency of courses, and the specific subjects taught, should be responsive to expressed departmental and university needs.

4. The total annual enrollment (including regularly scheduled courses plus independent studies) should average at least 40 (for those faculty with a four-course/year load). For faculty who repeatedly teach fewer students than this number, the dean, department chair and faculty member will consult as to whether the specific nature of the faculty member’s expertise and the needs of the department and university call for the particular teaching assignments in question and thereby justify the low total enrollment.

B. Service

For service to be judged to meet university expectations, the following conditions should be met:

1. Faculty members should engage in major/minor and first-year advising upon request, and at a level that represents his/her appropriate share of the overall departmental advising burden.

2. Faculty members should undertake significant departmental service obligations as requested.

3. Faculty members should be willing and available to serve as affiliated faculty to programs related to their expertise and interests.

4. Faculty members should be available and willing to undertake significant university service obligations as requested.

C. Scholarship/research or creative work

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in scholarship/research or creative work. The rate of production with respect to the relevant indicator that is judged to be adequate will vary by discipline. In judging adequacy, quality, judged primarily by impact on the field, is as important as quantity. A small number of high-impact publications or productions is superior to a larger number of low-impact ones. Expectations with respect to scholarship/research or creative work will vary by discipline.
1. For the sciences, primary indicators of research activity include grant activity (both proposals and awards) and articles (historically published in peer-reviewed journals, but now including electronic publication if still peer-reviewed). Participation in conferences, and invitations to make scholarly presentations outside of Brandeis are supplementary indications of research activity, but are not substitutes for grant activity or publications.\(^1\)

2. For the social sciences and humanities, the primary indicator of scholarly activity is publication in either books published by appropriate academic publishers or peer-reviewed articles (including electronic publications). Participation in conferences and invitations to make scholarly presentations outside of Brandeis are supplementary indications of research activity, but are not substitutes for publications. For those disciplines in which scholarly communication is largely through books and monographs, the indicator of scholarly activity is demonstrable progress on one or more books or monographs. Demonstrable activity includes book contracts, draft chapters and collection of archival material.

3. For the creative arts, the indicator of creative activity is public display of the work outside Brandeis in the formats and venues judged appropriate for the art form.

D. Balancing the three areas of service, teaching and research/creative work

1. Below-expectations contributions in one area may sometimes be compensated by above-expectations contributions in other areas.

   a. Faculty members who teach particularly large or demanding courses may be relieved of some service obligations (including advising).

   b. Faculty members who are at a specific stage of a scholarly or creative project where unusual effort is needed may be temporarily relieved of service obligations (including advising).

   c. Tenured faculty members who are not active as scholars/creative artists may teach an additional course or courses to replace their obligation regarding scholarship or creative activity.

2. Because teaching and service are needed to run the institution, there are limits to the extent to which above-expectations performance in those activities can make up for below-expectations teaching and service.

\(^1\) In computer science, conference proceedings serve the function performed in other fields by peer-reviewed journals.
a. Relief from service and advising obligations based on above-expectations contributions to scholarship or creative activity must be temporary.

b. Averaged over a four-year period, all members of the faculty, no matter how outstanding their research contributions, must make adequate contributions in the areas of teaching and of service (including advising).

E. Overall assessment of contributions

1. A tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose contributions meet expectations in each of the three areas is meeting workload expectations overall. A faculty member outside the tenure structure whose contributions meet the expectations of his/her appointment is meeting workload expectations overall.

2. A faculty member may be judged to be meeting workload expectations overall despite contributions in one area that are below expectations, if this deficiency is compensated by above-expectations contributions in another area. Such balancing of above- and below-expectations contributions is subject to the limitations described in the previous section.

3. Some variation in contributions over time is expected. Faculty are offered an opportunity in their activity reports to explain variations in contribution in each area. Faculty who suffer a temporary reduction in contributions in any given area may receive an annual merit raise that is lower than average, but will not be judged to be failing to carry an adequate workload (see the next section).

D. Mandatory workload adjustments

1. Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, faculty who, on a long-term basis, consistently fail to make adequate contributions as defined above will be subject to adjustment in their assignments to restore an adequate overall workload.

2. Faculty whose teaching and/or advising/service contributions are below-expectations for a period in excess of two years will be assigned additional teaching and/or advising/service assignments to achieve an acceptable workload.

3. Faculty whose scholarly/research or creative contributions are below-expectations for a period of two years will be asked to meet with their Chair and/or the Dean to develop a plan designed to restore these contributions over time. Faculty who are unwilling to commit to such a plan will be treated the same as faculty covered by the next paragraph.

2 Note that for “book” disciplines, adequate contribution is defined above in terms of intermediate products toward book publication.
4. Faculty whose scholarly/research or creative contributions are consistently below-expectations for a period of four years will be assigned additional teaching or other responsibilities.
   
a. Faculty in this category in the sciences, social sciences and humanities will normally be expected to teach 5 courses each academic year.

b. Faculty in this category from the creative arts will normally teach one course more than the standard course load in their department or program.

c. Alternatively, a combination of teaching and other responsibilities judged equivalent to the increased teaching load may be devised. In such an alternative, the gap between the actual teaching assignment and the benchmark number should be made up by service, advising or other responsibilities, over and above the responsibilities normally considered adequate.

F. Workload and salary

1. Faculty who are engaged in above-expectations contributions in one area, intended as compensation for below-expectations contributions in another area, should not be penalized in salary awards for the below-expectations contribution. Thus, faculty who deliver appropriate and satisfactory extra teaching, advising or service will be evaluated for salary purposes on the basis of these contributions, and will not be penalized for a lack of scholarly or creative contributions.

2. Faculty who have received below-average raises because of below-expectations contributions in one area, but who have not yet triggered the conditions for mandatory adjustment of workload, may voluntarily arrange a workload adjustment. In this case they will be entitled to salary determination based on that adjusted workload, and not be penalized for a lack of contributions in another area.

3. Faculty who refuse to take on additional responsibilities mandated under this policy will be subject to salary reduction. The salary reduction will be proportionate to the assignment refused, e.g. the salary of someone asked to teach 5 courses who insists on teaching only 4 will be reduced by 20%.

(III. Base Teaching Loads by Department)

The base teaching load in Arts and Sciences varies by department, and is different for tenured/tenure-track faculty and faculty outside the tenure structure. For faculty inside the tenure structure, teaching loads reflect the expectation that faculty are, as part of their Brandeis responsibilities, engaged in scholarship/research or creative activities in addition to their teaching and service. In addition, teaching loads reflect norms that exist externally by discipline, with which we must remain consistent if we are to attract the faculty we want. Teaching loads for faculty outside the tenure structure are generally higher, reflecting different expectations regarding scholarship/research or creative
activity within the faculty’s job descriptions. (Many faculty outside the tenure structure whose job descriptions do not include scholarship/research or creative activities nonetheless engage in these activities. These activities add to their professional stature and reflect positively on Brandeis, but they are not considered relevant for the faculty member’s Brandeis workload.)

Tenured/tenure-track faculty in Arts and Sciences have a base teaching load of 4 semester courses per year, and faculty outside the tenure structure have a base teaching load of 5 courses per year, except as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Studio arts faculty teach 6 courses -- 3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>The full-time teaching load for music performance faculty is 5 courses/year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Teaching loads are not standardized. Many courses have just a few students enrolled; correspondingly faculty who teach these small enrollment courses teach significantly more than 4 courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Research active faculty within the tenure structure teach 3 courses per year (2/1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>Foreign language instructors teach 22-24 semester hours per year. In most cases, this works out to 3 courses each term, but is less for faculty who teach 6-hour courses. When these faculty teach two literature courses in a given year that have prerequisite language requirements at the 106 level or higher, their load is reduced to five courses for that academic year. (This reduction does not apply to advanced language skills courses utilizing literary works.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Research active tenured faculty teach 3 semester courses per year (2/1), unless they use grant money to pay a portion of their academic year salaries; with such grant coverage teaching can be reduced to two or one course per year, depending on the level of grant coverage. Tenure-track faculty teach two courses per year (1/1) unless they use grant funding to pay a portion of their academic year salary, in which case the teaching can be reduced to one course per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Research active faculty within the tenure structure teach 3 courses per year (2/1). Postdocs teach 4 courses per year (2/2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life sciences
Tenured faculty with active labs teach 2 courses per year, unless they pay a portion of their academic salary through grants, in which case they may teach only one course per year. Tenure-track faculty teach one course per year, except their first year, in which they are not asked to teach.

Other sciences
Tenured and tenure-track faculty with active labs teach 2 courses per year, unless they pay a portion of their academic salary through grants, in which case they may teach only one course per year. Tenure-track faculty teach one course in their first year.

Note that these teaching loads apply before the granting of course relief for administrative or other non-classroom-teaching responsibilities. Guidelines for the granting of course relief are discussed in the next section.

IV. Guidelines for Course Relief for Administrative Duties in A&S

Faculty who perform certain administrative duties may be compensated in a variety of ways; this document addresses only course relief.

A. Department Chairs

Considerations in determination of level of course relief:

1. Number of faculty
2. Number of majors, minors and graduate students enrolled
3. Base teaching load—no faculty should teach zero courses for extended period.

General practices:

1. Chairs of large departments (generally > 15 faculty) and departments with graduate programs receive 2 courses off, if the base teaching load is 3 or more courses.

2. Chairs of very small departments (generally < 5 faculty) do not receive course relief.

3. Chairs who do not fall under either (1) or (2) above, who normally teach 3 or more courses, receive one course off.
4. Chairs of departments with a base teaching load of 2 receive one course off.

5. Chairs who would otherwise teach 1 course per year do not receive repeated course relief. Course relief may be granted for a startup year or for a specific year of unusually large demands.

6. Chairs who serve effectively for 1 three-year term, and agree to renew for a second three-year term (or longer), may, at the dean’s discretion, receive a full-year sabbatical at full pay when they finally step down.

B. Interdepartmental Program Chairs

Considerations in determination of course relief:

1. Number of majors, minors and graduate students

2. Number of affiliated faculty

3. Number of faculty hired and supervised by Program Chair, and whether the program is main home to tenured or tenure-track faculty.

4. Fundraising activities undertaken by Chair

5. Significance of Program activities to the university, beyond benefits to majors/minors/grad students

General Practices:

1. ID program chairs receive either zero or one course off. Two courses off would be granted only in exceptional cases, and if a portion of the Chair’s salary is charged to a gift or other dedicated source of program funding.

2. If the Chair does not hire and supervise faculty, course relief of 1 course is granted only to the very largest undergraduate programs (approximately one of top 10 undergrad majors), and significant revenue-generating Master’s programs.

3. Chairs of smaller programs may be given 1 course off if the Chair hires and supervises a significant number of faculty, or engages in significant fundraising activities.

4. Chairs of programs otherwise not eligible for course relief may be given 1 course off for a start-up year or for a specific year of unusually large demands.

C. Coordinators of faculty units within departments (e.g. Language Coordinators)

The possibility of 0, 1 or 2 courses off for language coordinators should be considered in relation to the guidelines given above for course relief for department chairs.

D. Directors of Graduate Study
The Committee recommends against a general practice of granting course relief for Directors of Graduate Study, because we believe that the curriculum cannot afford to lose the courses. Especially with the increase of MA programs, we recognize, however, that DGS is an increasingly important and time-consuming job, and recommend that compensation for the position of DGS be awarded in some form, based on these criteria:

1. The number of graduate students
2. The magnitude of revenue generated by the graduate program through Master’s/Certificate programs
3. Other factors that may affect the amount of time and effort required of the DGS, particularly the extent to which related duties such as admissions, readmissions, fellowship assignments, etc., are handled by the DGS or assigned to other faculty.

E. Other Administrative Positions

1. Other administrative positions (e.g., Director of a Center or Institute) may receive course relief if the position requires at least 10 hours per week (average over the academic year) for administrative activities that are distinct from normal scholarship, teaching and service.
2. Course relief will be limited to one course, unless a portion of the faculty member’s salary is charged to a gift or other dedicated source of funding.

Conclusion

For the foreseeable future, the increase in enrollments and limitations on faculty hiring will inevitably increase the overall burdens borne by the faculty in terms of teaching and service, especially advising. Given the potential tension between external and internal demands, it is crucial that this increase in workload be—and be perceived to be—distributed as equitably as possible, taking into account the skill-set of each faculty member. We see the creation of guidelines, and a process to ensure that faculty operate within those guidelines, as necessary to that objective. We urge the faculty and the Faculty Senate to consider these recommendations carefully, and to give the dean appropriate feedback. After receipt of such feedback we urge the dean to publish and implement final guidelines so that all faculty know what policy and practice will be going forward.
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Tenured and tenure-track faculty make contributions to the university’s missions in the areas of scholarship or creative work, teaching and service. Different combinations of contributions in these three areas constitute full-time work. It is impossible to set a quantitative or formulaic target for these contributions, but it is possible to assess qualitatively whether a given combination of contributions is reasonable, and is contributing appropriately to the needs of the university.

The vast majority of faculty contribute to the institution in all three areas. But there is an inherent tension between time devoted to scholarship/creation versus teaching and service, since the former contributes to external reputation and rewards in ways that the latter does not. For the foreseeable future, the increase in enrollments and limitations on faculty hiring will inevitably increase the overall burdens borne by the faculty in terms of teaching and advising. Given the potential tension between external and internal demands, it is crucial that this increase in workload be—and be perceived to be—distributed as equitably as possible, taking into account the skill-set of each faculty member.

In addition, some faculty whose contributions in one or more of these areas have declined in some way may want to contribute in other ways, but may not know how to do that. As an institution, we should be committed to investing in faculty who would like to reshape their activities to contribute more. Finally, some faculty are interested in or willing to perform specific kinds of service, but have not been asked to do so. It would be desirable to have an explicit process by which faculty indicate in what ways each faculty member wishes to serve the university, so that such willingness can be utilized.

We therefore recommend the institution of a formal procedure by which all tenured faculty members in Arts and Sciences will report on their recent contributions to the university and their plans for the near future, which is updated and reviewed every 5
years. Eventually, these reports would occur on a staggered basis, so that each year approximately one-fifth of the tenured faculty would update/revise their reports and have those reports reviewed. Under a process described in more detail below, the faculty member would describe and assess his/her contributions over the previous three years, and also describe expected and desired contributions over the coming three years in each of the areas. The proposed report would then be reviewed by the department chair, the dean, and a faculty committee. These reviews will ensure that specific needs of the department and the university are being adequately addressed while all faculty are held to similar standards.

The Faculty Handbook (III.C.2.g.i) states that “Proposals for changes in university policy with respect to the work load of faculty must be submitted to the Faculty Senate, the School Councils and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committees for prior review….” We believe that implementation of the proposed new procedure constitutes such a “change in university policy,” and accordingly hereby submit it to the stated bodies for their review. After such review we believe that the procedure could be implemented by the dean under the authority granted in the Handbook for “management of academic resources, and oversight of academic departments, interdepartmental programs, and other academic activities in the Arts and Sciences” (IV.B.1). It is possible that maximally effective implementation of this procedure might require changes in the Handbook, to formalize it and integrate it with other Handbook-governed processes. On the other hand, this may be too detailed for the Handbook, and may be canonized as an official policy that does not become integrated into the Handbook. We suggest that we begin with implementation on a trial basis this spring, and then use the experience gained in this trial to determine what, if any, changes in the Handbook should be considered by the faculty for the long term.

**Implementation—Long Run**

We begin by describing how this process would work several years from now, in the long run or steady state, when each year one-fifth of the tenured faculty would update their individual report. We will then propose how the system would get started.

**Construction of a proposed report:** The update of the five-year report would occur in conjunction with the annual activity report and merit review process, and would follow a discussion between a faculty member and chair concerning contributions to departmental and university needs. Every fifth year, each tenured faculty member would submit, along with her/his annual activities report, an updated 5-year report. In order to capture the trajectory of the faculty member’s activities, this three to five page report would cover a period that is partly retrospective and partly forward-looking. It would summarize the faculty member’s activities over the previous three years, and outline proposed and

---

3 Faculty outside the tenure structure are subject to an analogous process when they are considered for reappointment. Tenure-track faculty are reviewed after three years and again when considered for tenure and promotion.
desired activities over the coming three years, covering in detail scholarship/creative work, teaching, and service.

**Review with department chair:** The report would be reviewed by the department chair at the time of submission of the activity report, and then discussed between the chair and the faculty member. This discussion provides an opportunity for departmental needs to be addressed, as appropriate, by adding needed elements to the teaching and service sections. The parallel nature of the three year forward-looking part of the individual’s report and the departments’ three-year curricular plans is intended to make the link between the individual reports and the department plan explicit. The dean asks the departments to present a three-year plan showing how the department will meet its curricular obligations; the new planning and review process creates an explicit mechanism for the chair to call on the members of the department to do what is necessary to make that plan a reality.

When the chair and faculty member agree that the report represents a reasonable overall workload, and appropriately addresses the needs of the department, the report will be submitted to the dean with the approval and comments of the chair. If the chair believes that the proposed report does not represent a reasonable overall workload, or does not adequately serve the needs of the department, the chair will ask the faculty member to revise the report to meet these concerns. If the chair is unable to resolve these issues jointly with the faculty member, s/he will make a written recommendation to the dean (shared with the faculty member) regarding suggested modifications/additions to the report; the faculty member is welcome to submit comments to the chair’s recommendation.

**Review by Committee on Faculty Workloads:** We propose creation of a new committee, consisting of the dean of A&S and tenured faculty selected by some mechanism still to be decided. The committee will review each of the proposed reports. If the committee concludes that the report is not acceptable, it will meet with the faculty member to try to develop a mutually acceptable report. If agreement still cannot be reached, the committee would recommend alternative responsibilities to those in the report, as necessary to achieve a reasonable overall workload and address the needs of the department and the university.

Based on the deliberations of the committee, the dean, acting on his/her authority in the Handbook, may impose alternative responsibilities for teaching, advising, and service as appropriate. If the faculty member believes that the alternative responsibilities are unreasonable, s/he would have the right to file a grievance with the Faculty Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, which would hear the grievance and make a recommendation to the Provost as provided in the Handbook.

**Monitoring of report elements and milestones:** Once a report is in place, each year’s activities report should make reference to the 5-year report, and indicate accomplishments and progress relative to it. The department chair and the dean will consider each year’s activities report relative to the 5-year report in the context of the
annual merit review, and take action as necessary and feasible to assist the faculty member in achieving the objectives set out in the report.

**Initial Implementation**

To initiate this process, we recommend that all full professors whose most recent promotion was 5 years ago or longer prepare a report in conjunction with the spring 2010 activities report. These reports would be reviewed as above. By reviewing many of the tenured faculty at once in this initial round, the committee should be able to achieve an understanding of different ways in which faculty time contributes to the university. This experience and understanding can then inform any actions that it takes to impose additional responsibilities. This extensive first-year implementation might also suggest ways in which the long-term process discussed above might be changed before it is implemented on a regular basis.

The committee’s experience with initial implementation of the procedure, including reports concerning FCRR grievances (if any), will provide experience that can inform the long-run implementation of the procedure. If it seems to work well, it could then be continued in the same form. If problems arise, they could be rectified. If it seems necessary to modify the Handbook to make things work as desired, such modifications could be considered next year.

Once this initial group prepares their plans, a schedule will be developed to review the remaining tenured faculty, and to spread the reports out over time so that approximately one-fifth of all faculty provide reports each year. We recommend that the committee develop an equitable plan after the initial review is complete. Newly tenured faculty members would prepare a new report 5 years after the award of tenure.

**Standards for Workloads**

This document intentionally side-steps the important issue of the standard teaching load of tenured faculty; this varies, and will continue to vary, based on department and research and administrative responsibilities. Subsequent recommendations from this committee will include an analysis of expected normal loads by department. It will also offer a structure by which activities (e.g. chairing a dept of a particular size, certain extremely time-consuming administrative activities [e.g. chairing the faculty senate]), or specific teaching activities that do not comprise “a course” are treated within the workload.

---

4 Approximately 100 faculty would be subject to this initial review.