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Introduction

Brief History of CHSS Workload Guidelines

In AY20-21, the Faculty Assembly Senior Leadership Committee (SLC) and the Resources and Long-Term Planning Committee (RLTP) reviewed proposals by the CHSS Faculty Assembly’s Term Faculty Affairs Committee (TFAC) and by previous members of the RLTP Committee that addressed uncompensated work for CHSS faculty. SLC and the current RLTP Committees presented a memo to the Faculty Assembly during the spring of 2021. After consultation with Faculty Assembly and other College constituents, the Dean’s Office announced (April 2021 all-College meeting; September 2021 Faculty Assembly meeting) the need to develop new CHSS workload guidelines that:

1. pertain to instructional term faculty, tenure-track and tenured faculty;
2. include the nuances of workload assignments recognized in the AY20-21 CHSS Term Faculty Affairs Committee draft workload guidelines;
3. address visible, as well as less-visible, aspects of faculty workload; and,
4. provide an opportunity for local academic units (LAUs) to engage their faculty in crafting LAU-specific workload guidelines leading to proposals for specific solutions to faculty workload issues that are appropriately informed by their national professional organizations’ recommendations and incorporate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusions (DEI) objectives.

Dean’s Office personnel, in the summer of 2021, reviewed national/international professional guidelines, researched other faculty workload policies, and created a workload guidelines draft document that was intended to serve as a starting point for the newly formed Faculty Assembly’s “Faculty Workload Working Group.” The Faculty Workload Working Group consisted of two members from standing Faculty Assembly Committees including the Senior Leadership Committee, Resources and Long-Term Planning Committee, Term Faculty Affairs Committee, and Chairs and Directors, and one member of the Dean’s Office, equally representing the interests of term faculty, tenure-track and tenured faculty. The following CHSS Workload Guidelines are a product of the work of the “Faculty Workload Working Group” and were created during the fall of 2021 and spring of 2022.

In creating these workload guidelines, the Faculty Workload Working Group were acutely aware of factors outside of the control of individual faculty members that impact the scope and pace of changes to faculty workload. The revision of workload policies should be a continual process involving frank, good-faith, conversations between faculty and administration and it is the goal of this document to provide the framework through which individual LAUs and the Dean’s Office can collectively and continually ensure faculty workload equity and accountability.
CHSS Faculty Workload Guidelines

Faculty have a legitimate claim to be considered the most important and consequential resource of any university. As the University supports all faculty throughout their careers at Mason and sustains Carnegie classification as a Research 1 doctoral university, it is essential that the University, College, and each of Mason’s local academic units (LAUs) ensure faculty workloads remain within contractual boundaries and guarantee faculty workload equity while also maximizing the efficient use of teaching, research, and service resources.

The workload guidelines below apply to all faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS) on full-time instructional term and tenure-line appointment types and are designed for use in managing both curriculum delivery and coordination of annual and periodic faculty evaluation processes (e.g., review for promotion, review for promotion and tenure, annual salary increases, and/or review for contract renewal/extension). These guidelines are consistent with relevant State and Federal policies in referencing the following University and College policies:

- The University’s Faculty Handbook
- The Office of the Provost Teaching Load Policy
- Office of Sponsored Programs Guidelines for Charging Faculty Salary to Sponsored Projects
- University Policy 4012 – Roles and Responsibilities of a Principal Investigator
- Mason’s Supplemental Pay Procedures
- CHSS Faculty Effort On Grants Policy

These guidelines do not apply to full-time research faculty, whose workloads are typically governed by external grant expectations regarding percent of effort and funding, or to administrative/professional faculty, whose performance expectations are articulated in position descriptions.

Workload Guideline Assumptions and Expectations of Accountability

CHSS faculty workload guidelines, and LAU-level workload guidelines, should be based on the following assumptions and expectations of accountability:

1. Term and tenure-line instructional faculty may contribute differently to the College’s teaching, research, and service mission. The success of the University depends on our collective strengths in all three areas of faculty activity, which constitute one integrated mission, not three separate missions. In an academic setting, teaching, research, service, and administration are often inextricably intermingled.
2. In any given year, faculty members on the same kind of contract or appointment type and at the same rank may have different assignments in terms of teaching, sponsored research/scholarship/creative activity, administration, and/or service. These differences in workload assignments, expectations, and responsibilities shall be recognized, valued, and respected at all levels during the review of faculty performance. They also need to be managed equitably by all LAUs and monitored carefully by the College.

3. Faculty workload assignments may change year-to-year and over longer periods of time, either to accommodate a faculty member’s career development interests and opportunities or to address an LAUs teaching, research, and service needs. Such workload assignment changes need to be managed equitably by the LAU; recognized, valued, and respected at all levels during the annual review of faculty performance; and monitored carefully by the college.

4. The maximum teaching load at Mason for instructional term and tenure-line faculty on a 9-month academic year contract or appointment type is 12 credit hours/semester or 24 credit hours/academic year. For 12-month faculty, the maximum teaching load is 12 credit hours/semester and 6 credit hours in the summer. The teaching of summer courses, outside of contractual obligations, is governed by the Supplemental Pay Policy.

5. Effective shared faculty governance at a Research 1 doctoral university depends on robust faculty engagement and leadership in a broad spectrum of service activities for the LAU, the College, the University, and the profession. All these arenas of service effort should be recognized in faculty workload assignments as well as in annual evaluation practices and promotion review processes.

6. Expectations for faculty engagement in service, and especially in leadership roles related to service, will differ over the course of a faculty member’s career as well as in relation to teaching and research workload expectations. As such, individual LAUs are in the best position to understand, and respond to, service-related changes over the course of a faculty member’s career.

7. Faculty should be able to perform their jobs at a level that leads to satisfactory annual reviews and allows them to qualify for retention and/or promotion by working only within the bounds of their contracts (whether nine-month or twelve-month). Workload guidelines should be set with this goal, and with the need for faculty work-
life balance during on-contract periods, in mind. At the same time, review procedures should acknowledge the value of any work accomplished during off-contract periods, with or without compensation.

8. Faculty often have administrative duties in addition to duties associated with other tasks. “Administrative duties” are defined as tasks that are compensated (via stipend, course release, salary increase, and/or other form of compensation) and should be clearly outlined in faculty contracts/agreements with respect to the scope of the administrative tasks, compensation for these tasks, and a reasonable approximation of the time associated with these tasks.

**Values of CHSS Workload Guidelines**

The CHSS workload guidelines, and LAU-level workload guidelines, are also informed by four key values articulated in current scholarship on faculty work and agency:

**Equity** – Faculty work needs to be distributed equitably within and across LAUs and at all levels of the University to ensure that certain groups of faculty (e.g., women, faculty of color, term faculty, etc.) are not inequitably or unfairly assigned to more, more time-consuming, and/or less career-advancing, duties. LAU leadership has a responsibility to administer faculty workloads equitably and College/University-level leadership has a responsibility to monitor and ensure the equitability of faculty workloads within LAUs. Research shows that faculty with equitable service assignments that are transparent, clear, and include rotations among faculty in holding intense service roles are more satisfied with workload distribution (O’Meara, 2019).

**Agency** – Faculty Workloads need to allow for individual faculty agency and success in individual professional goals that also serve the mission of the institution. Many studies have found that creating service opportunities that support faculty career development and the pursuit of individual interests leads to high levels of satisfaction, career advancement, and decreased ambiguity in performance criteria (Gonzales, 2015; Hart, 2016).

**Transparency** – Faculty work needs to be made visible through clear and concise performance review processes that are integrated into annual reviews, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. Without more transparent workload guidelines, faculty often feel overburdened with increasing or changing expectations (Griffin, 2020). Lack of transparency and ambiguity in workload also accounts for lower levels of satisfaction and productivity among faculty (Bozeman, 2011; COACHE, 2008).
**Flexibility** – Faculty workloads require flexibility over time to ensure agency across careers and contexts. Faculty workload and commitments change over the course of careers and are situated in highly contextual structural, social, and cultural contexts influenced by disciplinary norms, institutional changes, and faculty composition (Bensimon, 2016; O’Meara, 2019).

*Implementation of CHSS Workload Guidelines at the LAU Level*

This workload guidelines document is intended to serve as a template for each LAU to develop localized and more specific workload guidelines. Importantly, this document does not address workload guidelines related to research, as research-activity expectations are currently a factor in promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure-line faculty and do not pertain, at this time, to instructional term faculty.

Local Academic Unit workload guidelines developed by CHSS departments and programs need to be consistent with College guidelines and the University, State, and Federal guidelines. They should also be appropriately informed by course-type definitions and enrollment limit recommendations, as well as staff/student ratio recommendations offered by relevant, discipline-specific, national professional organizations.

More detailed information on the creation and implementation of LAU-level workload guidelines can be found in the “Implementation Process for LAU-Level Workload Guidelines” section at the end of these guidelines.
Teaching

Teaching load should be managed equitably by the LAU, recognized in annual workload assignments, and assessed in annual faculty evaluations as well as in reviews for contract renewal, promotion, and/or promotion and tenure review.

Typical Teaching Load

Workload for teaching is based on faculty appointment but generally represents two 3-credit courses each semester for research-active tenure-track faculty and four 3-credit courses each semester for instructional term faculty. Faculty on 12-month contracts (or appointment type) generally teach two 3-credit courses in the summer in addition to the typical AY teaching load.

“Teaching” a single course includes, but is not limited to, virtual, face-to-face, or hybrid-model participation in:

- Teaching of class sessions
- Preparing for class sessions
- Responding to student work (providing formative and/or summative feedback, assigning grades or other credit, etc.)
- Office hours and/or all required meetings with students
- All communication with students (email, phone, etc.)
- Writing letters of recommendation
- As needed, making referrals to and collaborating in ongoing student support measures with campus resources (CAPS, Disability Services, CHSS Dean’s Office, Academic Integrity, SSAC, Learning Services, etc.)
- Tracking, and reporting on, student progress (including reporting to the Athletic Department, Mason LIFE, MASI, etc.)
- Updating, or creating new, course material from a previously assigned course (including creating or adapting Open Educational Resource material)
- Updating online course materials (and overall learning management system organization and/or training related to new/updated instructional technologies)
- Other tasks associated with teaching an assigned course not otherwise listed

The individual aspects of what constitutes a “single” course and the assumed effort associated with teaching a particular course under standard conditions shall remain the same for faculty of all appointment types and at all ranks.

Managing Course Effort

This model is predicated on each course within the typical teaching load equaling 3-credits. The time necessary to teach a 3-credit course varies considerably and factors influencing the effort
required for a 3-credit hour course can be unique to each faculty member. Factors that may decrease the amount of time required for a 3-credit course are outlined below in the “Compensating Scenarios Outside the Typical Teaching Load” section of these guidelines. However, it should be noted that some strategies for decreasing the effort involved in teaching a 3-credit course may not be applicable to all 3-credit courses.

**Teaching Duties Outside the Typical Teaching Load**

There are common scenarios in which faculty may require some form of modification to workload dedicated to teaching. The instances outlined below are examples of duties that may require effort outside the typical teaching load:

- Feedback-intensive courses, including but not limited to writing intensive courses
- Synthesis, Capstone, and Research-Scholarship Intensive (RS) courses
- Courses with large enrollment (in any course delivery format, as determined on a course, by course basis, at the LAU level)
- Courses that require significant administrative responsibilities including TA management duties, lab coordination, program coordination, community-based learning supervision, etc.
- Teaching courses that have not been taught before by that faculty member,
- Creating new courses (or substantially revising all or part of the curricular materials for courses the faculty member has previously taught)
- Accepting a significant number of students beyond the stated “course cap” (thresholds to be determined at the LAU-level) at the request of the LAU, College, or University

**Other Possible Teaching Scenarios Outside the Typical Teaching Load**

**Chairing Undergraduate or Graduate Student Thesis or Dissertation**

Serving as the chair of an undergraduate or graduate student thesis or dissertation committee may be classified as “teaching” in LAU-specific workload guidelines or may be classified as “research.” The classification of chairing student theses or dissertations is an LAU-level decision and shall be included in LAU-level workload guidelines.

**Courses Worth More than 3-Credit Hours**

LAUs should consider the number of credits per course (for example, in the case of 4-credit hour courses) when assigning courses to faculty. 4-credit hour courses, absent a method of compensation outlined in this document, represent more effort than that associated with 3-credit hour courses.
Courses Worth Fewer than 3-Credit Hours

Each LAU, in accordance with their bylaws and the Dean’s Office, should create a system through which courses worth less than 3-credit hours should be addressed. Any mechanism for addressing a course worth less than 3-credit hours should take effect after a teaching load limit has been breached (or is scheduled to be breached), but not beforehand.

Courses With Significant Student Monitoring/Mentoring

Some courses, particularly courses involving student internships and/or community service/engagement requirements, may require more effort than a typical course. LAUs should identify these courses, when applicable, and create equitable systems through which the extra effort is compensated.

Compensating Scenarios Outside the Typical Teaching Load

Faculty teaching loads that fall outside the typical teaching load require adjustments. Any adjustment made to the typical teaching load shall involve a discussion between the Chair/Director of the LAU and the individual faculty member.

LAUs must create and clearly outline their own practices for compensating duties outside the typical teaching load that are understandable and transparent. Thus, appropriate adjustments to teaching load will vary by LAU and may involve, but are not limited to, the following (Note: some of the proposed adjustments may not apply to every LAU or every situation):

- The assignment of a graduate teaching assistant to one or more courses (Note: the assignment of a GTA may not, in all cases, provide the faculty member with the appropriate “adjustment” especially in cases in which the GTA requires more guidance and/or the faculty member has more of a “mentoring” relationship with the GTA)
- The inclusion of courses, as determined by the LAU, that “require less effort than the typical teaching load” (defined below) in the course load for a given semester
- A course release (course releases must be approved by the Dean’s Office beforehand)
- The scheduling of two or more sections of the same course per semester
- Other adjustments not otherwise listed here, but deemed adequate by the faculty and the LAU

Teaching Duties Requiring Less Effort Than the Typical Teaching Load

There are some scenarios in which faculty may be assigned teaching responsibilities that require less effort than would be expected in the typical teaching load. Courses that fall in this category, if applicable, should be considered when determining faculty teaching load. The determination of
which courses, if any, fit into this category is a decision made at the LAU level following faculty discussion. The following examples may not be applicable to every LAU but should be considered when possible.

Examples of situations that may be included in the category include, but are not limited to:

- Online course “shells” in which adequate and completed course materials (including syllabus, lecture videos, assignments, rubrics, and assessments) are provided to the faculty.
- Historically (or currently) low enrolled courses - The college, in conversation with the LAUs, reserves the right to define what constitutes “low enrollment” on a course-by-course basis, and may recommend a low enrolled section be cancelled when it does not severely impact student progression.
- Attempting to lower the overall number of students taught by a single faculty in a given semester. This is similar to the “historically low enrolled courses” option above, but takes into consideration the total number of students taught by a single faculty, in all scheduled courses, in each semester.
- Courses that are fewer than 3-credit hours

Teaching Load Review for Faculty

Tenure-Line Faculty: Every LAU is required to submit and follow a schedule for tenured faculty teaching load review. Each individual faculty member should be reviewed at least every three years as part of the annual performance review process and each annual performance review should include information about when the next teaching load review will be conducted and should also outline how the individual is doing regarding maintaining research productivity to justify the current teaching load and whether a teaching load increase may be warranted.

Term Faculty: Term faculty teaching loads are reviewed prior to each contractual period. Changes in term faculty teaching load during a contractual period can be made by the LAU with Dean’s Office approval.

Other Teaching-Related Guidelines to Consider

Faculty may not be relieved of minimum service duties to adjust for teaching load outside the typical teaching load.

Any faculty member with an uneven teaching load (for example: 3:2 or 2:1) who is on leave status during one semester of an academic year will take the leave in the semester with the lower teaching load unless taking leave during the semester with higher teaching load will not negatively impact the functioning of the LAU and is approved by the LAU Chair/Director.

The LAU should allow all term and tenure-track faculty to be engaged appropriately in curriculum development over the course of their careers, since such efforts can contribute to a
faculty member’s professional development, including readiness for promotion, as well as being key components of an LAU's ongoing and iterative curriculum refreshment/enhancement efforts. Wherever possible, faculty who teach a course under average conditions (in terms of teaching load and/or appointment type) should be actively involved in curricular development and revision efforts associated with that course.
Service

Introduction

Service-related responsibilities are the backbone of faculty governance and shall be extended to all faculty regardless of status. When possible, without imposing undue burdens on either individuals or a group of faculty holding a particular appointment type, Term and Tenure-line faculty should be proportionately represented in LAU, College, and University bodies. Service is demonstrated by faculty participation in governance and operational or development activities in the LAU, the College, the University, or the profession. University Policy states that a minimum of 5% of faculty time be allocated to service.

Service for the institution and the profession should be managed equitably by the LAU, recognized in annual workload assignments, and assessed in annual faculty evaluations as well as in reviews for contract renewal, promotion, and/or promotion and tenure review.

Defining Service

Service

Faculty service can be separated into four categories: Service to the LAU, the College, the University, and the profession. The following examples are meant as models, but units may find that particular items better fit under teaching or research and should make that apparent in unit level service and workload documents.

- Service to the LAU/Department – Required service in the LAU includes, but is not limited to, such activity as attendance at faculty meetings and LAU standing committee or sub-committee participation. Other examples include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Participation in faculty personnel matters
  - New program development
  - Student advising (not compensated as part of a contracted administrative role)
  - Developing or supporting co-curricular experiences for students, and mentoring colleagues.
  - Faculty/post-doctoral mentoring (research, teaching, career planning, DEI, etc.)
  - Leadership of, and membership in, ad hoc committees and initiatives
  - Engagement in community outreach activities that assist in meeting the stated goals of the LAU and/or student recruitment activities
  - Serving as a 2nd or 3rd member of an undergraduate or graduate student thesis or dissertation committee (Serving as the chair of an undergraduate or graduate student thesis or dissertation committee should be classified as either “teaching” or “research” in LAU-specific workload guidelines. Serving on dissertations or theses outside of the faculty member’s LAU should be consideration in workload
and the LAU needs to have guidelines on how to count that in annual evaluation, 
tenure, and promotion.)

- Moderating, coordinating, or participating in talks, lectures, panels, workshops, 
  reading groups, learning communities, etc. at the department/program level.
- For faculty with joint appointments, LAUs are encouraged to count service to 
  other LAUs (for example, faculty working with the Interdisciplinary Studies 
  program) along with service to their own LAU.
- Other service-related tasks on which the department or program and the faculty 
  member agree

- **Service to the College** – Service to the College may include participation in Faculty 
  Assembly as a Chair of a committee or a member of a committee. Other examples 
  include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Faculty/post-doc mentoring (research, teaching, career planning, etc.)
  - Leadership or membership of initiatives and ad-hoc committees
  - Engagement in community outreach activities that assist in meeting College-level 
    goals and/or student recruitment activities
  - Moderating, coordinating, or participation in non-compensated College-level 
    talks, lectures, panels, workshops, reading groups, learning communities, etc.
  - Mentoring, advising, program development, and related service to other LAUs in 
    the college outside of one’s home LAU (interdisciplinary programs, etc.)

- **Service to the University** – Service to the University may include participation in Faculty 
  Senate. Other examples include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Participation on University-level standing committees, University-level ad-hoc 
    committees, and/or University-wide initiatives
  - Leadership or membership of initiatives and/or ad hoc committees
  - Participation in other faculty committee work outside of CHSS (when not 
    accounted for by dual appointment)
  - Moderating, coordinating, or participating in non-compensated University-level 
    talks, lectures, panels, workshops, reading groups, learning communities, etc.
  - University Life committees (e.g., Faculty Fellows, Honor Committee, strategic 
    planning, and/or University-level search committees)
  - OSCAR review or other similar committee work (as with serving on a thesis or 
    dissertation within a faculty’s primary LAU, the classification of this work as 
    service, research, or teaching is an LAU-level decision)
  - Engagement in community outreach activities that assist in meeting the stated 
    goals of the University and/or student recruitment activities
• Service to the Profession – Service to the profession may include the leadership of professional organizations and may also include, but is not limited to, the following:
  o Scholarly editing leadership roles with presses and journals
  o Service on national advisory boards and foundations and/or Federal review panels
  o Leadership of professional organizations’ standing committees
  o Membership on editorial boards and advisory boards
  o Participation in professional peer-review processes (e.g., RPT, professional organization conference planning, grant proposal review, manuscript, journal article, and book review for presses and journals)

Other service-related duties identified by LAUs that are not clearly expressed in the above guidelines may be included in any of the categories above following majority faculty consensus on the task’s placement.

Duties related to administration that are compensated as part of a formal contract as outlined below, do not count as service.

---

**Faculty with Joint Appointments**

In CHSS, a joint appointment is a formal agreement across at least two or more departments and programs where faculty engage in teaching, research, and service in differing percentages across units. Joint appointments are equal to single appointments, except split between representative LAUs. A joint appointment usually requires the same amount of effort in each unit each year rather than occasional teaching or service in other units.

For faculty in joint appointments, the proportion of service, research, and teaching dedicated to each LAU should be codified in a memorandum of understanding (MOU). If the faculty member or any LAU party to the agreement want to renegotiate the terms of the joint appointment or the fraction of service, teaching, or research assigned to an LAU, all of the parties will have to be in agreement, and a written amendment to this MOU should be signed.

Annual evaluations will be reviewed by all represented LAUs.

---

**Administration**

Administrative duties that are compensated (via stipend, salary increase, and/or other form of compensation) are not considered “service” but shall be recognized, valued, and respected at all levels during the review of faculty performance. If administrative duties are not compensated in some form, or if administrative duties are carried out beyond that which is reflected in the faculty’s employment contract, the administrative duties may be counted as service when agreed upon by the LAU Chair or Director and the faculty member. Administrative duties should be
evaluated during annual performance reviews to ensure that the expected duties have not increased without commensurate change in compensation.

Equitable Distribution of Faculty Service Duties

Faculty workload assignments related to service need to be equitably distributed. In addressing equitable distribution of service duties, three points should be considered: Balancing faculty member career development with LAU service-related needs, the faculty member’s appointment type (tenure-track or term) and the nature of the service task.

Balancing Faculty Member Career Development with LAU Service Needs

As previously stated, faculty workload assignments may change year-to-year and over longer periods of time, either to accommodate a faculty member’s career development and interests or to address an LAUs teaching, research, and service needs. At times, faculty career development and LAU needs may align. Other times, LAU service-related needs may not align with faculty career development and interests. Alignment is not always possible. However, when alignment is not possible, Chairs and Directors should work with faculty to ensure that over time individual needs and interests are addressed fairly.

Appointment Type: Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty and term faculty have different baseline expectations for service and thus, service-related duties must consider appointment type. CHSS promotion and tenure guidelines place emphasis on service and leadership for tenure-track faculty going up for promotion to full professor (approved June 2020 and available at: https://chss.gmu.edu/faculty/faculty-governance/college-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines). As such, tenure-track faculty should be provided adequate opportunities to participate in service without adverse impact on other aspects of workload such as research or teaching.

Tenure-track faculty service participation should, at all times, meet minimum service requirements. However, LAUs should create specific guidance for service requirements for tenure-track faculty at Assistant, Associate, and Professor levels.

Provost guidelines for tenure-track promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor specifically warn against extraordinary supervisory or programmatic responsibilities since this level of service may negatively impact scholarship. “High competence” in service at the Assistant rank will generally involve productive committee service within the LAU.

Provost guidelines for tenure-track promotion from Associate Professor to Professor state that faculty members beyond their probationary period are expected to take on substantial service responsibilities in the College or University while continuing their commitment to departmental service.
Each LAU is expected to clearly outline expectations for tenure-track quality and quantity of service by faculty rank. Once LAU expectations are clearly outlined, service workloads can be distributed more equitably and/or other adjustments can be made to individual workload in order for individual faculty to participate in higher levels of service when necessary.

Tenure-track faculty dedicating more time to service activities than is expected in LAU-level workload guidelines should be relieved of other duties, have service duties reassigned to faculty contributing less in the area of service, and/or receive some other form of workload adjustment which may include course releases (on a limited basis, with approval from the Dean’s Office and Provost’s Office). In instances in which a faculty member has contractually outlined administrative duties compensated via course release, adjustments to workload should be made in a way that respects LAU need and individual faculty development without these decisions penalizing faculty in the tenure, promotion, and/or annual review processes.

Faculty dedicating less time to service activities than is expected in LAU-level workload guidelines should be given more service-related duties and/or contribute to the LAU mission in another way (e.g., teaching an extra course to relieve the burden on faculty performing excess service).

Appointment Type: Term Faculty

Term faculty within CHSS must, per policy, devote the minimum amount of time to service (5%). This allotment of dedication to service must be considered adequate in all discussions involving performance evaluation, promotion, and contract renewal at the Assistant Professor (or Instructor) rank.

The Provost’s guidelines for term faculty promotion do not explicitly require term faculty to spend more time on service in order to be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor (or Senior Instructor to Master Instructor). However, these same guidelines do require term faculty to exhibit “leadership for teaching and learning whether within Mason or in the context of their professional organizations or communities” when pursuing promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor (or Senior Instructor to Master Instructor). This service can be done at the LAU, College, University, or professional level.

In order to have equitable representation in faculty governance, especially on College and University-level committees, term faculty must be provided the opportunity, if desired, to participate in service beyond the minimum outlined in the Faculty Handbook with minimal adverse impact on teaching duties or performance. In order for this to occur, accommodations in teaching should be made in accordance with guidelines in the “teaching” section of this document and the Provost’s Office Teaching Load Policy (August 25, 2021), which may include course releases (on a limited basis, with approval from the Dean’s Office and Provost’s Office).
Nature of the Service

Service, whether to the LAU, College, University, or profession, can involve many disparate
tasks that can have differing effects on a faculty member’s time and level of responsibility.
Additionally, some service-related tasks may be valued more highly by the LAU, College,
University, or Profession. All these factors should be considered in the distribution and
acknowledgment of service.

- Time – There are service-related tasks that clearly involve more time than others.
  However, even seemingly similar tasks may vary greatly in the amount of faculty
time that is involved. Also, the time commitment of different service tasks may not be
clear until after the work has begun (or been completed). When equitably distributing
faculty service obligations, consideration must be given to the expected amount of
time related to the task and to the actual time related to the task.

- Responsibility – The amount of “responsibility” associated with some service tasks is
  often correlated to the time the task requires. However, the task’s level of
  responsibility and/or intensity can be considered separately. Some faculty governance
duties involve heated debate, coordinating with groups that have distinct positions on
the issue (and often intense emotions related to those positions), or require the faculty
member to be the “public face” of a contentious issue. As such, the level of
  responsibility associated with the service task should be considered when appropriate.
  All faculty members engaging in service-related tasks high in “responsibility”
  (including term faculty without the protection of tenure) shall not be penalized or
discriminated against in any way because of their work related to these service tasks.

- LAU Priorities, Goals, and Values - LAUs within CHSS each have their own
  priorities, goals and values. Though all service-related tasks are required for effective
  faculty governance, LAUs can consider their own priorities, goals, and values when
determining the amount of time and effort that should be dedicated to a service-
related task. For example, serving as the editor of a journal or serving on a specific
University or College-level committee may be considered crucial for an LAU and
thus, the LAU decides that task should be recognized in LAU’s workload guidelines
as well as RPT guidelines.

Prioritization of Faculty Service for Individual Faculty

First priority should be given to preparation for and attendance at department or program, CHSS,
and/or University meetings relevant to the faculty member’s duties (as determined by the LAU)
and/or that the faculty member deems necessary to informed exercise of their departmental,
CHSS, and/or University voting rights. Additionally, priority should be given to reading and responding to communications from the department or program, College, and University as well as to preparing required materials for annual review or contract renewal, or similar activities.

Subsequent prioritization of faculty duties should be a topic discussed between the LAU Chair/Director and the individual faculty member and should consider the impacts of service on teaching and research responsibilities.
Implementation Process for LAU-Level Workload Guidelines

LAU-Level Workload Guidelines

Each LAU shall create unit-specific guidelines that define and clarify expectations for faculty workload. These guidelines should be created and approved within 12 months of the adoption of the CHSS Workload Guidelines by the Faculty Assembly.

The final LAU-level Workload Guidelines:

- Must comply with all CHSS, University, State, and Federal policies and guidelines
- Should be appropriately informed by national peers, disciplinary societies and associations, and other professional organizations
- Require majority approval and must be voted upon by all full-time faculty, regardless of appointment type and/or rank
- Shall follow the definitions and process outlined in the document above and provide more specificity, when possible

LAU-Level Workload Guidelines for Teaching

Each LAU shall create unit-specific guidelines informed by national peers, disciplinary societies and associations, and other professional organizations that define and clarify expectations for teaching effort.

All administrative positions receiving any sort of teaching load reduction or compensation must be approved by the Dean’s Office in advance. Course reductions for administrative positions within an LAU must be scaled appropriately to the size and complexity of the unit and should involve a discussion between the Dean’s Office, the Chair or Program Director, and the individual faculty. Each LAU will formalize administrative course reductions and stipends that are handled within the LAU.

LAU-Level Workload Guidelines for Service

Each LAU shall create unit-specific guidelines that define and clarify expectations for service. LAU-level service guidelines should outline a method of accounting for faculty time spent on service in accordance with these guidelines. (Note: this is not an “hourly log” of time, Service activities may be divided into “low,” “medium,” and “high” time commitments following faculty discussion.)

It is recommended that each LAU create a service “dashboard,” available only to the Chair or Director of the LAU, that tracks all faculty service-related duties on a yearly basis. This information should be used by the Chair or Director, in conjunction with the LAU standard for service participation for a given appointment type and rank, when evaluating service loads
during annual reviews, in assigning new service-related tasks, and in addressing disparities in faculty service when they occur.

Faculty Grievances Regarding Workload

Faculty grievances regarding workload should follow the policies and procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section 2.11.2.1) “Policies Concerning Grievances.”
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