

Differentiated Teaching Load Policy Proposal
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
(Adopted April, 2011)

I. Goals and Principles

- Align faculty responsibilities as outlined in the statement of mutual expectations (SME) with the faculty member's contributions
- Differentiate teaching loads according to research productivity
- Differentiate teaching loads according to contributions to graduate education and graduate mentoring
- Differentiate between Ph.D. and Masters level graduate education and mentoring
- Make possible an increase in the number of 200-level courses taught by tenured faculty
- Exempt untenured assistant professors and other new faculty members from increased teaching loads

II. Summary of Criteria for Differentiated Teaching Loads

Please note: These criteria are consistent with and reinforce the general standards of faculty productivity and the standards for each faculty rank as outlined in our Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure policies (<http://www.ncsu.edu/policies/rpt/RUL05.67.410.php>).

The terms “outstanding,” “satisfactory,” and “weak” in this section are defined in section III.

A 2-2 teaching load reflects outstanding or satisfactory performance with regard to **both** research and engagement with graduate training. (Outstanding research productivity may compensate for weak engagement with graduate training, and outstanding engagement with graduate training may compensate for weak research productivity. The former compensatory possibility allows faculty members whose opportunities for engagement with graduate training are minimal to qualify for a 2-2 teaching load.). Service and effective teaching in an undergraduate program are required. Untenured assistant professors and other faculty with fewer than five years employment in the department will have a 2-2 teaching load.

A 2-3 teaching load reflects satisfactory performance in research **or** engagement with graduate training and weak performance in the other. Service and effective teaching in an undergraduate program are required.

A 3-3 teaching load reflects an emphasis on teaching at the undergraduate level. A 3-3 load may be chosen by faculty who wish to make strong contributions to undergraduate education and allows an alternative means by which faculty can be meaningfully involved in meeting the department's missions. A 3-3 teaching load may also reflect weak performance in **both** research and engagement with graduate training. Service is required.

Outstanding performance in either research or engagement with graduate training may qualify a faculty member for a reduced teaching assignment to less than a 2-2 load. Reductions in teaching load may also be granted for activities such as: administrative assignments, course buy-

outs from external grants or other administrative units within the university, or other special assignments as negotiated with the department head.

Faculty members who disagree with decisions about their teaching loads are fully entitled to explain their disagreement in writing for their personnel files.

III. Criteria for Evaluating Research Productivity and Engagement with Graduate Training

Please note: In deciding on teaching assignments, the most recent five years are the period to be assessed. Faculty should not receive increased teaching loads due solely to weak productivity/engagement during years in which they have received family/medical leave or served in an administrative capacity.

A. Evaluating Research Productivity

The following provides a profile of the kinds of research activities that constitute three levels of research productivity. Individuals who fall into these categories do not need to meet all of the specific criteria, but should at least fit the general profile.

Outstanding Research Productivity

The individual displays a robust research agenda. Refereed articles and/or book chapters are published at the rate of two or more a year with publications in quality, peer-reviewed outlets. At least once every two years, a journal article appears in the top generalist or specialist journals in the discipline. Book publication in highly respected scholarly presses at an equivalent rate can also establish this level of research productivity. Research is presented in professional conferences on a regular basis. The individual may also have received national awards or externally funded grants or has made significant efforts to secure external funding.

Satisfactory Research Productivity

The individual displays an active research agenda. Refereed articles and book chapters are regularly published at the rate of about one per year (or the equivalent rate for book publication). Articles appear mostly in middle-tier publication outlets, such as journals attached to regional professional associations or secondary specialty journals. Books are published by recognized academic publishers. Research is presented in professional conferences at least once every few years. The individual has made some effort to secure external funding.

Weak Research Productivity

The individual displays a weak research agenda. Refereed articles and book chapters are published at the rate of less than one per year (or the equivalent for book publication). The works that are published are not well placed. Research is rarely presented in professional conferences. Almost no attempt has been made to secure external funding.

Below is a more complete list of the activities to consider when assessing research productivity. These are rank ordered from most to least important:

- Theory/Research monographs
- Peer-reviewed journal articles (in print or forthcoming)

- Externally funded grant
- Regional, national or international awards for distinguished scholarship
- Edited book—peer reviewed
- Edited book—not peer reviewed
- Original article in edited volume
- University and college grant awards
- Invited presentations at international or national conferences
- Presentation of research papers at international, national, or regional professional meeting
- Participation in a seminar series for university or funding agency
- Reprint of scholarly article
- Published research report or bulletin
- Book review, published scholarly comment, published scholarly editorial

B. Evaluating Engagement with Graduate Students

The following provides a profile of the kinds of activities that constitute three levels of engagement in graduate student training. Individuals who fall into these categories do not need to meet all of the specific criteria, but should at least fit the general profile.

Outstanding Engagement in Graduate Training

The individual frequently chairs graduate student committees to completion.

(“Frequently” here means approximately three dissertation committees in five years or approximately nine master’s committees in five years (or some combination of the two), or the equivalents of these levels in other contributions to graduate training.) The person serves on numerous graduate student committees. The person regularly mentors graduate students informally by including them on research projects, presenting research with them at conferences, and publishing with them. The individual contributes to prelim evaluations, has served as a teaching mentor, and may have also been recognized as making strong contributions to graduate education and mentoring.

Satisfactory Engagement in Graduate Training

The individual serves as a member of several graduate student committees, sometimes chairing these committees to completion. The person occasionally works with graduate students by including them on research projects, presenting with them at conferences, or publishing with them. The individual also contributes to graduate training in some other way, such as evaluating prelims, serving as a teaching mentor, or participating in student discussion or engagement groups.

Weak Engagement in Graduate Training

The individual serves on few graduate student committees, or any students whose committees she/he chairs rarely complete the degree. The person has only rarely included graduate students in their own research activities. The individual offers little additional evidence of training or mentoring graduate students.

Below is a more complete list of the activities to consider when assessing productivity in graduate education. These are rank ordered from most to least important. Note that by far the most important criterion is chairing graduate student committees to completion:

- Chair doctoral committee to completion

- Chair master's committee to completion
- Publish an article/book chapter with a graduate student
- Employ a graduate student as a research assistant as part of a grant
- Serve on doctoral committee to completion
- Serve on master's committee to completion
- Chair doctoral/master's committee
- Serve on doctoral/master's committee
- Receive awards for graduate education or mentoring
- Serve as a teaching mentor for a graduate student
- Present a paper at a conference with a graduate student
- Participate in research collaboration that involves graduate student(s)
- Supervise a graduate student teaching mentorship
- Evaluate preliminary examinations
- Teach readings or other course for graduate students as overload
- Organize/participate in graduate student discussion or engagement group

IV. Implementation

For a faculty member with an SME indicating substantial expectations for research, weak research productivity and/or weak engagement in graduate training ("weak" is defined above) should lead to consideration of changing the faculty member's SME in order to align the faculty member's responsibilities and contribution. Consideration of changing the SME can be initiated in several ways, including:

- By the faculty member in conversation with the department head.
- By the department head in conversation with the faculty member.
- By the peer review committee as part of its assessment of the faculty member. This committee would have information on the five year window specified above. The faculty member and department head would follow up on the peer review committee's suggestion by considering changing the faculty member's SME.
- By the annual review committee as part of its assessment of the faculty member. This committee would not have information on the five year window specified above. On its request, the faculty member would supply annual activity reports from the most recent five years to the annual review committee. The committee might then decide to recommend to the faculty member and the department head that they consider changing the faculty member's SME.