

From: The Professional Right and Responsibilities committee
Susan Jaworowski, Chair

To: Faculty Senate
Susan Dik, President

Re: Report on Teaching Equivalencies for Department Chairs

Date: November 3, 2013

The Professional Right and Responsibilities (PR&R) committee has been told by the Faculty Senate President that an Action Request had been submitted to the Faculty Senate on Teaching Equivalency (TEs) for Department Chairs and would be directed to the PR&R committee. The Committee has not to date received the action request, but due to the short timeline for this topic, the committee placed it on its agenda, analyzed the guide and charts, and submits the following report to the Faculty Senate.

Your Committee understands that the TE policy under discussion is the one contained in UH CC 9.237. Pages 6 - 9 of that document relate to the duties of department chairs and include two charts under the heading "Guide to Determine Minimum Teaching Load For Division/Department Chairs." One chart provides a grid of factors to be considered in awarding points to persons who served as department chairs. The second grid then ties the points into TEs. After analysis of this section of the document, your Committee finds the guide to be unreliable as it currently related to department chairs who are also teaching faculty, and wholly inapplicable to department chairs who are counselors. Your Committee recommends that its concerns as to sections A and B be transmitted to the appropriate administrators, and that the CAAC be consulted about the best way to handle the issue raised in section C as to counselors who are department chairs, and then have appropriate recommendations as supported by the CAAC be transmitted by the Faculty Senate to the appropriate administrators.

A. Unreliability of chart 1

Overall, the committee expressed serious concerns with the quality and effectiveness of the first chart. See table 1 below. Specifically, the committee noted that the first four line items, labeled (a) through (d), contained short, undefined phrases. These seemed clear until committee reviewed subsection (e), additional complexity. The first two items under subsection (e), scheduling and assessment, seem as though they should be part of subsection (a), "number of course sections." Under (a), more points are awarded the more course sections a chair has, but there is no statement about how the number of course sections affects the chair's duties. Two of the most time-consuming duties in regard to course section are scheduling and assessment, and the committee assumes that (a) therefore already includes scheduling and assessment. Your committee finds that there is a certain amount of

“double-dipping” in giving a chair more points for more sections under subsection (a) and also giving them more weight under additional complexity under (e).

There is a similar issue with subsection (b), number of programs, as the department chairs receive more points the more programs they have, but that term is not tied to a specific set of duties. Under subsection (e) there is the phrase "multi-disciplines," and the committee was concerned that this also was "double dipping" by including this factor in both (b) and (e).

Similarly, subsection (d) merely reads “budget,” while “budget preparation” is included as additional complexity below in subsection E. Your committee thinks that the term “budget” necessarily includes budget preparation.

Table 1.

Appears to be double-counting; number of sections in (a) includes scheduling and assessment, number of programs appears to also cover multi-disciplines, and budget includes budget preparation.

Criteria	Levels			
	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
a) Number of course sections (annual)	400+	200-399	125-200	<125
b) Number of programs	6+	4-5	2-3	1
c) Total number of employees	75	50-74	20-49	<20
d) Budget	\$75K+	\$50-74K	\$20-49K	<\$20K
e) Additional complexity (weighted double): scheduling, assessment, budget preparation, multi-disciplines, accreditation, multiple sites, clinical, commercial enterprise, grants, campus operations, advisory committees, fundraising, facilities, select admissions	Complex	Moderately Complex	Moderately Low	Low

Your committee agrees that issues of additional complexity, such as accreditation, multiple sites, and commercial enterprise, do exist, and so that an additional complexity component should continue to be included. However, your committee recommends that, similar to the way criteria (a) through (d) are broken out into objective criteria, the additional complexity factors also be tied to a more objective set of criteria than “complex,” “moderately complex,” “moderately low,” and “low,” which your committee finds to be subjective.

Your committee would also like to suggest that an "other" category be added to cover special projects, which are not currently covered by the criteria.

To sum up, the committee finds that subsection (e) contains elements already weighed in (a) through (d), and recommends that the double-counted items in subsection (e) be removed. Your committee suggests that the other elements that remain in subsection (e) be broken out into a grid similar to subsection (a) through (d). Your committee finds that that will help with the subjectivity that seems unavoidable otherwise.

B. Inadequacy of chart 2

In regard to the second chart labeled "benchmarks," the committee notes that the maximum amount of TEs is 21, and that, aside from the initial lowest level, all of the TEs are odd numbers. Your committee notes that the work of department chairs is usually consistent from one semester to the next. There are no usual changes in the workflow that would make one semester significantly higher or lower in work. The committee also notes that the former TE policy for department chairs provided for a maximum of 24 credits per academic year. The former maximum has been dropped to 21 credits. As most courses on the campus are three credits, this means the department chair has an uneven TE equivalency between fall and spring semesters. The committee sees no reason for the discrepancy, and recommends that the maximum number of TEs be restored to 24, and that consideration be made for changing the nine and 15 levels of TEs to be the next highest even number multiple of three, 12 and 18, to provide a fair and equitable amount of teaching equivalency for the department chairs on an academic year basis. Your committee notes the difficulty experienced by some departments in finding a department chair, in part due to low TE allotments. Your committee notes that the role of department chair it is a very important one, and recommends a thorough consideration of factors that would affect willingness to serve as a department chair.

C. Inequity of lack of policy for department chairs who are counselors.

Last, but certainly not least, your committee notes that the formula discussed above does not apply to someone who is not a teaching faculty member serves as chair, such as when a counselor is serving as department chair. There have been counseling faculty who have served as DCs at least since 2005, when Prof. Rosie Harrington served as DC for the BLT department, and currently Prof. Sharoh Moore, also a counselor, serves as DC of KLM. Your committee recommends that some specific mention be made of how TEs will be calculated for counselors, such as hiring a fill-behind to handle their relief and setting out equitable standards for their workload.