CLA 2-2 Initiative: Final Proposal
November 14, 2012

The Concept:

- To move all tenure-track and tenured faculty in CLA onto a standard 2-2 teaching schedule as of Spring 2013
- To render this change revenue-neutral by:
  - Tasking departments with compensating for the sections lost in the move to 2-2 by reducing the number of sections offered and increasing enrollments in those remaining, rather than by creating new sections taught by NTTs
    - The primary method for achieving this goal will be through creation of large-enrollment sections
    - Departments will be required to assure that the number of *seats* they make available to students after the move to a 2-2 remains stable or increases

How It Works: We give *n* fewer sections through TT lines. Enrollments from the eliminated sections are absorbed by an increase in other sections' size.

Benefit:
- Instructional workload is brought in line with our aspirations to become a Carnegie Research-Intensive High institution
- Faculty productivity in scholarship, research and creative activity increases
- Efficiency in mounting curriculum is increased; such efficiency is desirable in and of itself, but is especially desirable, given the national move to curb educational costs

Academic "Cost":
The College will have to guard carefully against negative impacts on academic programmatic integrity

Implementation Principles:

- ***Although we loosely refer to this as a proposal for a 2-2 workload, it is important to make the distinction that technically the College maintains a 3-3 teaching load, with one research CLR being awarded to each tenure-stream faculty member per semester by the Dean.*** This distinction will be useful in
  - Conceptualizing the workload change within the all-University context
  - Presenting it to publics beyond the walls of the University
  - Clarifying this proposal's interface with the research CLRs that have been granted for the past several years to junior faculty upon hire

- o Implementing accountability mechanisms to help assure that the reduction in load will be used for its stated purpose of facilitating faculty research, scholarship, and creative or professional activity
- ***General Contextualization: It is a strategic goal of the University of Massachusetts Boston as a whole to convert formally to a 2-2 workload. Such a conversion will have significant resource implications. As an intermediate step toward that goal, the Provost has tasked individual colleges with figuring out ways to move toward a 2-2 scheduling pattern within their own units – on condition that they do so while remaining resource-neutral. The plan proposed here is CLA's response to this challenge: it will allow the College Dean, working within the general framework of the University's 3-3 load, to award research-related CLRs in a systematic way that gives faculty an effective 2-2 load. Resource neutrality will be maintained by raising class size to offset the lost number of sections. The College and the FSU/MTA agree to conduct a joint review of this initiative during the Spring 2015 semester. The FSU/MTA reserves its right to negotiate over the specifics of this initiative prior to further implementation planned for Fall 2015.***
- Each department will be responsible for planning and implementing scheduling practices that will allow them to mount their programs while remaining within 2-2 target section numbers, guaranteeing no loss in seats for students, and preserving pedagogical quality. These practices will differ by department.

For Pre-Tenure Faculty:

- All pre-tenure faculty will be given one research CLR per semester; the accountability measure for pre-tenure faculty will be the tenure review process
- Pre-tenure faculty will be offered the opportunity to create one research-intensive, teaching-free semester for themselves, in consultation with their Chair, by teaching a 3-course load in two semesters and banking the unused CLRs to be used together in a subsequent semester; with the approval of the Dean, a pre-tenure faculty member may be allowed to 'borrow' CLRs for this purpose, to be paid back in a later pre-tenure semester
- *The opportunity to bank or borrow CLRs is available to pre-tenure faculty for this purpose only; it is not available to tenured faculty.*

For Tenured Faculty:

- All tenured faculty will be given one research CLR per semester
- Implementation guidelines:
  - o Beginning in Spring 2013, the Dean will make an initial award to each tenured faculty member of one research CLR per semester for six academic semesters

- Prior to this initial award being expended, the College shall reach agreement with the FSU/MTA on the specifics, inclusive of accountability, of research CLR allocations planned for Fall 2015. College administration and FSU/MTA representatives shall meet during the Spring 2015 semester to reach such an agreement.
- Although the specifics of the accountability mechanism for tenured faculty will not be determined until Spring 2015, we anticipate that, as recommended by the Accountability Taskforce, it will be built into an existing personnel review vehicle such as AFR, PMYR and will accordingly take the form of a recommendation by the Department Personnel Committee to the Dean. Departments will establish benchmarks for scholarly productivity appropriate to their disciplines.

Large-Enrollment Classes:

Large-enrollment classes will be a key option (though not the only one) available to departments to meet the requirements of the 2-2
- Scheduling for Spring 2013 reveals that present physical infrastructure is sufficient to cover the large-enrollment classes needed to accommodate the move to 2-2, as long as they can be scheduled (and will fill) across the spectrum of standard daytime class times
- Scheduling limitations will decrease dramatically with the opening of GAB 1 projected for Summer, 2015
- In accordance with the recommendations of the Large-Enrollment Taskforce, a large-enrollment class will be defined as a class of 70 or more students at the end of the add/drop period; this bar will be strictly maintained
- A section taught by a tenure-stream faculty member that reaches the 70+ bar will normally count toward workload as 1.5 sections
- Tenure-stream faculty may normally not take a CLR earned from large-enrollment classes until the semester *after* they have earned its 2nd half. In exceptional cases, with the prior approval of the Dean, and only in courses that have a proven track record of meeting the 70+ bar, a faculty member may take a CLR in the semester in which he/she will earn its second half. In such cases, the Chair must build an additional section into the department schedule for the faculty member to assume by bumping, in case the 70+ mark is not reached three days before classes start. In such cases, all affected parties (the tenure-stream faculty member and any NTTs who stand to be bumped) should be informed by the Chair of this possibility at the time the schedule is set.
- A non-tenure-track faculty member teaching a section that reaches the 70+ bar will be compensated in line with departmental past practice; as a norm, that will mean receiving double compensation, but in cases where alternative departmental arrangements have been made they may be maintained
- It is important, as the Large-Enrollment Taskforce stresses, for faculty teaching large-enrollment sections to receive TA support. For Spring 2013, the College advocated for additional TA resources to support large-

enrollment classes and was granted a special continuing allocation of 5.0 FTE assistantships. The College is in the process of requesting a further increased allocation for AY 2013-14. The College goal is to provide a 0.5 FTE TA (= 9 hours per week) to every large-enrollment class (including especially those offered by departments without their own graduate programs), and an additional 0.5 FTE TA for every 70 students added above the original 70 (70-139 students yield 0.5 FTE, 140-209 students yield 1.0 FTE, 210-279 students yield 1.5 FTE, etc.)

- The Dean's Office, in collaboration with GPDs and the Office of Graduate Studies, will work to develop training opportunities both for TAs and for the faculty who supervise them
- The L-E Taskforce recommends that the University establish "university-wide instructor learning communities" and provide rich opportunities for professional development on L-E pedagogies. Their Appendix A is itself a major step toward the latter objective. This is a goal that all in the College (faculty, chairs, CLA Dean's Office) and the Office of Faculty Development should embrace
- For more detail see the Large-Enrollment Taskforce Report (online at www. http://cdn.umb.edu/images/cla_revised_ LE_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf)

Graduate Instruction:

The Graduate Workload Taskforce was charged with making recommendations for crediting graduate workload. In accordance with their recommendations:

- Undergraduate and graduate courses will be deemed equivalent with regard to workload (1:1)
- The College will adopt as a general principle the taskforce recommendation that a faculty member will earn a CLR upon successfully advising to completion 8-12 master's projects/theses or 4-6 doctoral dissertations
- Within this general framework, again as recommended by the taskforce, departments will be given a measure of leeway, in consultation with the Dean, to tailor the general principle to fit their particular program needs and constraints

Administrative CLRs:

Three guiding principles enunciated by the Taskforce on Administrative CLRs will inform the award of administrative CLRs within the College:

- The Equivalent Reduction in Teaching principle will be the central principle, by which CLRs given under the 3-3 load will generally be counted as 2/3 of a CLR under the 2-2 load, and fractional CLRs will be banked till a whole CLR has been earned
- The No Worse Off principle provides that adjustments to administrative CLRs should not result in a person's teaching more under the 2-2 than he/she did under the 3-3

- The Minimum Teaching Load principle establishes that no one's instructional load should be reduced on the basis of administrative CLRs to below one course per year
- For the detailed "Conversion Table" embodying and illustrating these principles, see page 5 of the taskforce's report: http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/info_for_faculty
- The Dean will assign CLRs directly to Chairs and GPDs (the taskforce's Pool 1), guided by the three principles above and following the Equivalent Reduction in Teaching Principle to as great an extent as possible
- Some departures from the ERT Principle and even from the NWO principle, however, may result from a concurrent attempt to rationalize existing anomalies in the number of CLRs awarded to different departments for similar work
- The Dean may, in consideration of unit size and/or complexity, assign a second pool of administrative CLRs (or bankable fractions of CLRs) to a department, to be assigned by the Chair to faculty taking on other significant administrative responsibilities (e.g., Associate Chair)
- In exceptional circumstances, departments may petition the Dean to assign them a CLR on a one-term, non-continuing basis, to cover especially onerous temporary administrative duties
- Administrative CLRs awarded *outside* the departmental structure will be recalibrated by the Dean in the context of the three guiding principles listed above and in consultation with the entity that awards them.

Implications for NTT Faculty:

The Taskforce on Implications for Non-Tenure-Stream Faculty was charged with examining the Pilot 2-2 Plan to determine implications and ramifications for NTT faculty.

- The taskforce asks for confirmation that no department has chosen the Option B cited in the original draft of the Pilot 2-2 Proposal (see Appendix B). This confirmation need not be sought from individual departments, as the Dean's Office can confirm unequivocally that no department chose this option, resulting in its being omitted from the final proposal. It should be clarified, however, that – though the removal of Option B from the plan means that no benchmark will be established for average enrollments in NTT sections – it is always within the purview of a department to modify enrollment caps in its courses (whether taught by NTTs or TTs) provided the average workload of the department is not increased.
- The Dean's Office agrees with the taskforce that NTTs will at times teach large-enrollment sections and should be appropriately compensated. A plan to compensate NTTs in accordance with past departmental practice for such teaching is enunciated above, in the section on Large-Enrollment Classes. The plan suggested by the taskforce is built on a wholly new model and does not fit within the 2-2 planning requirement to remain revenue-neutral while developing a College-specific workload plan. The more appropriate venue for

discussion of the taskforce's model – as suggested by the taskforce's proper notation that they do not have status as a negotiating body – is at the bargaining table for the University as a whole.

In response to the taskforce's request concerning 'available work': the restriction that the conversion to 2-2 must be done without creating *new* NTT sections has been laid on the plan precisely because the natural tendency of converting to 2-2 would be to create *more* NTT sections, rather than *fewer*. The Dean's Office will be happy to meet with the taskforce to provide general information concerning the stability of the number of NTT sections for the conversion term but notes that the taskforce has not been charged with monitoring the implementation. We therefore do not think it appropriate for them, as suggested, to seek data from each department and call for alterations in a particular department's implementation plan.

Appendix A

Taskforce Charges

- The **Taskforce on Administrative CLR's** will recommend policies concerning post-2-2 assignment of course load reductions in return for administrative work. Its work should be informed by three starting premises:
  a) that over the recent decades, from a general sense that a 3-3 load was in and of itself overly onerous, there has been a proliferation of administrative CLR's, in order to encourage faculty to take on administrative tasks without feeling that doing so will detract from their scholarly agenda; the move to a 2-2 teaching load will obviate the need for many of these CLR's, returning us to a point where many administrative tasks can be taken on as service, without further adjustment to teaching load;
  b) that Chairs and Graduate Program Directors are scholars too, with the result that their service in these administrative roles should be recognized through adjustments to teaching load (e.g., through a 1:1 load for chairs and a 2:1 for GPD's?) – but, conversely, they should be held accountable to productivity in scholarship by the same mechanisms as other faculty, if they are to qualify to keep the pre-CLR 'starting-point' of a 2-2 load;
  c) that there should be a general *minimum* teaching expectation (e.g., a 1-1?), below which a faculty member may not have his/her teaching load reduced for administrative purposes
- The **Taskforce on Graduate Workload** will recommend policies concerning the counting of graduate instructional activities toward teaching workload. Its work should begin from two provisional starting premises:
  a) that the work involved in teaching a graduate course is not intrinsically greater than the work involved in teaching an undergraduate course; but
  b) that thesis and dissertation advising should be factored into teaching load by some consistent College-wide formula
- The **Taskforce on Large-Enrollment Classes** is charged with
  a) consulting with the Registrar and other relevant administrative offices and making recommendations concerning possible changes in scheduling practices for large-enrollment classes; and
  b) making recommendations on ways (including incorporation of non-traditional pedagogical methodologies) to preserve the academic integrity of the College curriculum while at the same time increasing the number of large-enrollment classes
  c) inventorying current departmental workload adjustment/compensation practices regarding large-enrollment classes and making recommendations concerning possible changes to develop a comprehensive College policy

- The **Taskforce on Implications for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty** will consider, in consultation with the FSU, implications and ramifications of the program for non-tenure-track faculty
- The **Accountability Taskforce** will consider and make recommendations concerning accountability mechanisms intended to
    - Assure departments' compliance with the prescriptions of the plan regarding scheduling/class size
    - Hold tenured faculty accountable to the plan's expectations for scholarly productivity

All taskforces reports are available at
http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/info_for_faculty

Appendix B

The so-called Option B, by which departments might add NTT sections as long as they meet a benchmark of 38 average enrollment in sections taught by NTTs, has been removed from the proposal. Here, for comparison purposes to this document, is the original proposal containing the Option B language.

Potential CLA 2-2 Initiative
April 19, 2012
FSU/MTA Proposed Changes May 1, 2012

DRAFT 2nd concept   **DRAFT**   **DRAFT**   **DRAFT**

The Concept:

- To move all tenure-track and tenured faculty in CLA onto a standard 2-2 teaching schedule as of Spring 2013
- To render this change revenue-neutral by:
  - Monitoring average class size in sections taught by tenure-stream faculty, to assure that individual department averages do not decrease with the switch to a 2-2
  - Tasking departments with compensating for the sections lost in the move to 2-2 by reducing the number of sections offered and increasing enrollments in those remaining, rather than by creating new sections taught by NTT's
    - The primary method for achieving this goal will be through creation of large-enrollment sections
    - Departments will be required to assure that the number of *seats* they make available to students after the move to a 2-2 remains stable or increases
  - In cases where departments demonstrably cannot decrease teaching loads without adding new NTT sections above and beyond their target section numbers for Fall 2011 or Spring 2012, requiring that the department reach an NTT class-average-size benchmark of 38 (the present 'break-even' point for hybrid sections, as determined by A&F) for *all* their NTT sections

    How It Works: We give *n* fewer sections through TT lines. With rare exceptions, these go away, with enrollments absorbed by increase in average class size.
    In truly exceptional cases, some of these sections may move to NTT's, but without additional cost – because we keep average hybrid class size above the break-even point.

    Benefit:

- Instructional workload is brought in line with our aspirations to become a Carnegie Research-Intensive High institution
- Efficiency in mounting curriculum is increased; such efficiency is desirable in and of itself, but is especially desirable, given the national move to curb educational costs

Academic Effect:
The College will have to guard carefully against negative impacts on academic programmatic integrity

The Benchmark (Spring 2013):

- The general premise is that no new sections taught by NTT's will be created as a result of the move to 2-2 .
- Departments that demonstrably *must* create new NTT sections to mount their programs as a direct result of the move to 2-2 will be required to meet the benchmark of 38 for *all* NTT sections given by the department
  - The Fall, 2011 CLA average hybrid section size was 27.2, with a range of 21.4-35.5 (source CLA Hybrid lists, with cross-listings counted just once)
  - The Spring, 2012 CLA average hybrid section size was 25.2, with a range of 18.2 – 37.2 (source CLA Hybrid lists, with cross-listings counted just once)
- The increase in NTT average section size may *not* result in a concomitant decrease in TT average section size
  - The Fall 2010 CLA average TT section size was 27, with a range of 18–36 (source "Average Class Size," IR)
  - The Spring 2011 CLA average TT section size was 26, with a range of 16-37 (source "Average Class Size," IR)

Implementation Principles:

- All **pre-tenure** faculty will be given one research CLR per semester; the accountability measure for pre-tenure faculty will be the tenure review process
- Pre-tenure faculty will be offered the opportunity to create one research-intensive, teaching-free semester for themselves, in consultation with their Chair, by teaching a 3-course load in two semesters and banking the unused CLR's to be used together in a subsequent semester; the opportunity to bank CLR's is not available to tenured faculty
- All **tenured** faculty will be given one research CLR per semester; accountability measures for tenured faculty will be recommended to the Dean by the Accountability Taskforce; an opt-out possibility may be built into the program, upon recommendation by the Accountability Taskforce

- With the single exception of English 101-102 sections, the initiative will work on an every-tub-on-its-own-bottom principle: each department must meet the requirements of the plan each semester
- English 101-102 sections will be exempted, on the grounds that, as a necessary component of the University-wide Gen Ed program, they are appropriately considered a College and University cost, rather than a departmental cost
- Each department will be responsible for planning and implementing scheduling practices that will allow them to mount their programs while either remaining within present target section numbers or reaching the NTT section-size benchmark, without sacrificing academic quality. These practices will differ by department.
- A system will be designed to hold departments that add NTT sections above and beyond their present targets accountable to the benchmark; this system will work on the principle that departmental failures to reach the benchmark (in cases where sections have been added over target) will be offset by loss of research CLR's in subsequent semesters.
- A system will be designed to hold post-tenure faculty accountable for the research productivity that is sought through the reduction in load

Appendix C

Approval Process

At the beginning of this process, the Dean enunciated the principle that the College would proceed with this initiative *only* if there was agreement with the FSU/MTA regarding the process; if CLA faculty approved the concept, participated in planning and shaping its implementation, and formally voted to endorse the final proposal. It was also agreed that final approval to implement would be contingent on agreement with the FSU/MTA.

Chronology to date:

- April, 2012: Dean presents faculty with basic outlines and premises upon which a move to 2-2 is feasible
- April, 2012: Dean forwards the draft proposal to FSU for consultation and feedback
- May, 2012: two 'go-ahead-and-plan votes' taken, one among Chairs, one at the CLA Senate; Chairs by majority vote endorse the plan but recommend deferring implementation till Fall 2013
- May, 2012: FSU endorses the 'go-ahead-and-plan' mode
- May, 2012: Senate Executive Committee, Dean, and FSU jointly appoint a set of taskforces to study and make recommendation to the Dean by October 1, 2012, on particular aspects of the initiative:
  - A taskforce on administrative CLR's
  - A taskforce on implications for graduate workload
  - A taskforce on large-enrollment classes (scheduling and pedagogy)
  - A taskforce on implications for NTT faculty
  - An accountability taskforce
- May, 2012: departments examine their scheduling needs and consult with faculty; several chairs that previously voted to defer implementation to fall change their positions, leading to an 11-7 majority in favor of implementing in Spring 2013
- June, 2012: the Dean circulates for consideration a set of provisional terms on which a Spring 2013 pilot might be undertaken by interested departments; these terms are accepted (with minor modifications/clarifications) by the Chairs, the Senate and the FSU, and the decision is made to implement on a pilot basis in Spring 2012
- June, 2012: departments individually establish working principles for how they will meet the terms of the 2-2 proposal
- June-August, 2012: Chairs, working from the department's approved principles and in close consultation with the CLA Dean's Office staff, draft a Spring 2013 schedule that will meet the terms of the program; schedules are loaded into Wiser once approved by both Chair and Dean
- August-September, 2012: no departments choose to pursue Option B (by which they may add NTT sections as long as they achieve an average

enrollment of 36 in NTT-taught sections); that option is accordingly dropped from the proposal

- October, 2012: the taskforces submit their reports; the Dean posts them on the CLA website and seeks feedback from faculty, chairs, Senate, and FSU
- October, 2012: the Dean prepares a single proposal, in draft form (=this document), to be posted on the CLA website, with invitations to the faculty at large, the Chairs, the CLA Senate, and the FSU/MTA to give feedback
- November, 2012: A finalized final proposal will be presented to the FSU/MTA for approval, then to Chairs and the CLA Senate for final ratification at their respective November 2012 meetings.

Anticipated Outcome:
- Go-live (Spring, 2013): during the pilot semester, the plan is implemented, continuously evaluated, and revised as necessary
  - January, 2013: Fall, 2013 schedule designed on similar principles
  - Accountability measures applied after Add/Drop in Spring, 2013 – perhaps occasioning changes in Fall 2013 schedule