NEELEY WORKLOAD POLICY - 2020

Overview - For the past 25 years or so, the Neeley School has had a workload policy based on (1) research, (2) teaching and (3) service (see attached table 1). The percentages that faculty have dedicated to the three dimensions have changed over time as the level of faculty increased in national prominence. Around 2000, as the Neeley School started rising in the rankings, the quality of the faculty also increased as the quality and amount of research grew in importance. The Neeley School began attracting high quality senior faculty who had prominent research records. At the same time we began competing against some of the top Universities for junior faculty and winning many of these recruiting battles, resulting in even more premier research publications. Lastly, in the early 2000s the Neeley School began hiring Professors of Professional Practice (PPP) who would teach more sections as high level research faculty were teaching less sections.

In early spring semester 2020, the Neeley School began the process of reexamining the workload of the faculty. It had been a number of years since the Neeley School had reevaluated workload policies. The Senior Associate Dean, in conjunction with Dean Pullin, provided a draft of new workload percentages to the Department Chair Council. The process was discussed in depth and eventually new percentages were agreed to by the Department Chair Council and Dean. The Department Chairs took the new percentages and discussed them with individual faculty members in their department to determine if the new percentages accurately represented their workload balance. The process was then discussed with members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and three elected faculty) who provide feedback to the Dean on the annual faculty review. A consensus was reached on the new weights and the weights were communicated to the entire faculty.

Teaching Loads

Teaching loads for tenured and tenured track faculty in the Neeley School are consistent with the TCU teacher/scholar model and with market factors for peer and aspirant business schools. In most cases, the teaching load for research active faculty should be four courses per year. The Neeley School's ability to offer an individual a reduced teaching load is dependent on the quality and quantity of published research articles (see Table 2). In addition, a professor's teaching load can increase as his or her productive research decreases. Specifically:

> Newly Hired Faculty:
> All new assistant professors (defined as those being appointed to their first academic position after a doctoral program) will be initially hired on a three course per year schedule for a period of three years. The teaching load for subsequent years as an assistant professor will be determined by review of the department chair and dean and be partially determined on their progress toward tenure.
>
> Teaching loads for other newly hired more senior faculty will be determined by the chair and dean dependent on the level of nationally prominent research for the newly hired faculty member.
>
> Reduced Teaching Loads for Existing Faculty:
> The number of faculty on reduced teaching schedules will be determined by the dean. The criteria for selection for teaching reductions requires the highest standards of research quality

and productivity. Reduced teaching loads should be given only to those faculty who have clearly established themselves as research leaders within their disciplines (or, in the case of untenured faculty, have demonstrated the potential to become discipline research leaders).

Selection Criteria:
Minimum criteria for selection include each of the following, with the greatest weight on accepted publications and work in process:

- Publications of sufficient quality and quantity within the previous five years to demonstrate an established research program. Publications in leading academic journals are required.
- Work in process of sufficient quality, quantity, and currency to demonstrate an active research program.
- Other research activities such as journal editorship, presentations at other prominent research institutions, membership on editorial boards, presentations at national meetings, and work with junior faculty in the Neeley School.

Increased Teaching Loads for Faculty:
Each year, all faculty are evaluated by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and placed in categories ranging from not meeting expectations to greatly exceeding expectations. All tenure track faculty are expected to participate in research and should strive to meet the criteria to be classified as being SA (Scholarly Academic). However, those with higher teaching loads are not expected to be as productive as faculty with lighter teaching loads. A faculty member will be considered to be "not research active" if they are rated as not meeting expectations for research for two consecutive years. These individuals will be given an increased teaching load to be determined by the chair in consultation with the dean.

The research expectations for a faculty member with a 2/2 teaching load or above will depend on the exact teaching load. Compared to faculty on a reduced teaching load, these faculty will be expected to produce a lower quantity of publications that may be directed at a broader range of audiences. While high quality academic research will always be the most valued form of scholarship, others activities will also be recognized. For example:

- A faculty member on a 3/3 load might meet expectations by publishing practice-based particles, cases or pedagogical articles.
- A senior faculty member on a 2/2 load might meet expectations by publishing articles applying new research results to solve applied business problems.

The determination of whether a faculty member is meeting expectations is inherently subjective and must be made based on the best professional judgment of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Committee must consider both the career stage of the faculty member and the actual teaching load that the individual carried, as well as the expectations agreed upon by the chair and the faculty member.

Workload Balance

As can be seen in the table 1 at the end of this document, workload for a faculty member is divided into research, teaching and service. Department Chairs and Associate Deans add a fourth category referred to as administration.

Workload percentages differ depending on rank and whether a professor is considered to be a research professor, a teaching professor, or in a balanced track.

Assistant Professors. All Assistant Professors are consistent with 60% of workload being research, 30% being teaching (10% workload per course taught), and 10% service. In Neeley, the expectation is that assistant professors be focused on their research and classroom activities and thus their service load is reduced from more senior faculty.

Associate and Full Professors. All Associate and Full professors are on either a teaching track, a research track, or a balanced track.

A Professor that is on a teaching track has 50% of their workload on teaching, 30% on research and 20% on service. More senior faculty are expected to do more service, both to the University and within their discipline.

A Professor that is on a Research track has 30% of their efforts going to teaching, 50% of efforts to research and 20% to service.

A Professor that is on a Balanced track has 40% of their efforts going to teaching, 40% of their efforts to research and 20% to service.

Faculty in Administration (Department Chairs and Associate Deans)

The expectation for administrators is that 35% of their efforts will be administratively oriented. In addition, 20% of efforts will go to teaching (two sections a year), 35% of their efforts to research, and 10% of their efforts to service.

Professors of Professional Practice

In general, a PPP is 80% teaching and 20% service. However, a number of PPPs are on a significant administration role such as a Director of a Center, Head of a program, or other significant administrative duties designed to advance the reputation of the Neeley School. The workload of administrative PPPs is variable dependent on the administrative duty assigned.

Table 1
Percentage Evaluation Worksheet 2020

	Assistant Professor		Associate Professor				Full Professor				Administration Chairs & Assoc. Deans		Professor of Professional Practice & Instructors
			B	R	T		B	R	T				
Teaching	30		40	30	50		40	30	50		20		80
Research	60		40	50	30		40	50	30		35		0
Service	10		20	20	20		20	20	20		10		20
Admin.	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		35		0

Table 2
2020 Research Evaluation Rubric Sufficient Criteria

Dimension	Below Target (0-1) Eligible for Dean's Summer Funding	Acceptable (2-3)	Very Good (4-5)	Exceptional (6-7)
Publications:[1] Focuses primarily on the impact of publications as indicated by journal quality.[2] *Principal Indicator:* Articles in highly respected academic journals. *Other Evidence of an Active Research Program:* Citations in total and over the last five years, especially in top journals. *Additional Consideration Factor:* Exceptional academic activities (Section 1C), e.g., editorships, etc. **(Weight: 50%)**	• No or only one article in highly respected academic journals in the past five years. *Additional research program evidence:* • Citations. • Beginning research projects.	• An appropriate number of academic articles published in academic journals included or not included on the Neeley Reading list. *Other evidence of a productive research program:* • Citations of previous work in academic journals, with emphasis placed on citations during the last five years and in Premier Journals.	• At least one article over the past five years in a Premier Journal. or At least one article over the past five years published in a Reading Journal and judged to be of premier quality. *Additional evidence of a highly productive research program:* • Citations of previous work in academic journals, with emphasis placed on citations during the last five years and in Premier Journals. • A consistent stream of research in high quality journals.	• At least two articles in some combination of Premier Journals or judged to be premier and appearing in Reading Journals over the past five years. *Additional evidence of a highly successful research program:* • Citations of previous work in academic journals, with emphasis placed on citations during the last five years and in Premier Journals. • A consistent stream of research in high quality journals.
Pipeline: Focuses on a consistent stream of high quality work as an indicator of future publication success. *Indicators:* The number of projects under development as appropriate for one's discipline and career stage. The number of projects under review and with a revise and resubmit decision. The quality of projects as indicated by target journal, with emphasis placed on those under review or with a revise and resubmit decision. Progress in moving projects through the pipeline based on when projects were started and movement over the past year. **(Weight: 50%)**	• Few projects in the pipeline. • No projects in or near the advanced stages of the pipeline. • Limited progress on projects already begun. • Targeted journals, especially those in more advanced stages, are not included on either of the Neeley journal lists nor considered premier in other areas.	• A pipeline of sufficient quality (as indicated by the target journal). • Projects in some of the pipeline stages. • Projects are generally making progress. • Some projects receiving support in the past have been published or are under review at targeted journals.	• A pipeline of sufficient quality (as indicated by the target journal) with at least one project in the advanced stages of the pipeline. • Several projects in the early stages of the pipeline. • Demonstrated progress towards completion as indicated by movement within the pipeline. • Most projects receiving support in the past have been published, are under review or being revised for targeted journals.	• A pipeline of sufficient quality (as indicated by the target journal) with at least one project in the advanced stages of the pipeline. • Projects in the early stages of the pipeline, if this is appropriate for the discipline. • Demonstrated progress towards completion as indicated by movement within the pipeline • Most projects receiving support in the past have been published, are under review or being revised for targeted journals.

[1] All indicators associated with evidence of an active research program are to be evaluated as appropriate for the standards of individual disciplines.

[2] Articles may be judged to be premier though appearing in journals not included on the Premier or Reading Journal lists. Recommendations for articles in these additional journals should be made by the applicant's department chair, so the applicant should first send supporting material to their department chair who will then make a recommendation to the Research Committee.