**CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES**

1. **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**12. FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY**

Faculty are essential to creating a higher education system in Kansas characterized by access, excellence, accountability, research, and service. Their influence on the quality and value of a university education is clear, in such areas as curriculum development, pedagogy, program development, and nurturing an engaging learning environment. Additionally, faculty shape this experience through their research, scholarship, creative work, service to the university, community, and profession, as well as their interactions with students both inside and outside the classroom, including advising. The Kansas Board of Regents' workload policy seeks to account for all these factors and acknowledge faculty contributions in each area.

The intent of this policy is to ensure that each campus’s workload policies and procedures fairly treat faculty across the institution, reduce conflicts over workload expectations, and promote consistency in performance evaluations. Additionally, the policy aims to enhance accountability and transparency, enabling the Board and legislature to understand staffing needs and budget implications better.

1. Each institution shall develop and implement a workload standard policy for all faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty.
   1. The institution’s chief academic officer, in consultation with the faculty through regular shared governance processes, is responsible for developing and implementing the workload policy.
   2. The institution’s workload policy must establish fair and equitable guidelines that allow each department chair (or head of a comparable academic unit), under the supervision of the dean (or an appropriate supervisor), to manage faculty workload within the department effectively to support student success and align with both the department’s and the university’s missions.
   3. Institution-specific faculty workload policies, at a minimum, shall include:
      1. the types of assignments and how effort is allocated for each faculty member across teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service;
      2. clear statements of expectations and accountability that both recognizes merit and holds accountable faculty who do not meet expectations;
      3. a process for assessing faculty performance relative to workload expectations and presenting the outcomes of these evaluations to the faculty member and the appropriate dean;
      4. assurances that faculty members meet their workload obligations properly and within acceptable performance standards;
      5. provisions for variations across departments and schools, as well as for individual faculty;
      6. the assignment of a teaching load to all faculty, unless they have a significant administrative or special assignment role.
   4. The table below shows the percentage ranges of workload by institution type for standard expectations in teaching, research, and service. It is acceptable for there to be differences across departments, schools, or colleges within an institution, as approved by its provost.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution Type** | **Teaching** | **Research** | **Service** | **Typical Teaching Load Per Semester** |
| **Doctoral Universities, Very High Research** | 40-55 | 35-45 | 5-20 | 6 credit hours |
| **% of Total Effort** |
| **Doctoral Universities, High Research** | 40-55 | 35-45 | 5-20 | 9 credit hours |
| **% of Total Effort** |
| **Master’s Colleges and Universities** | 60-75 | 15-30 | 5-20 | 12 credit hours |
| **% of Total Effort** |

* 1. Instruction at the University of Kansas Medical Center and the Kansas State University College of Veterinary Medicine differs notably from that at other schools and colleges within the system. These institutions are allowed to establish workload standards for their faculty based on different criteria than those specified in this policy.

1. Essential elements of the workload policy
   1. Instructional Activity
      1. Teaching and instruction are essential parts of faculty workload expectations. Faculty teach undergraduate and graduate courses, but have additional instructional duties that may include creating new courses and developing material for them; updating existing course content; developing courseware or other resources for technology-based teaching; supervising one-to-one courses such as a directed readings; supervising undergraduate research, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations; guiding students in co-curricular activities like plays, exhibits, and preparing and setting up new laboratories; managing teaching assistants; overseeing internships; and providing academic advising, mentoring, and other activities that support student success.
   2. Research
      1. Institutional policies should clearly define how research, scholarship, and creative activities contribute to a faculty member’s total workload and specify the extent of their impact. These expectations may be higher at institutions where research is a primary mission.
      2. Measures of research productivity differ by discipline and subdiscipline within the same academic units and across colleges and schools. Therefore, institutional workload policies in all cases must clearly define the research activities expected of faculty, such as writing and securing grants; applying for and receiving fellowships; supervising graduate students or postdoctoral associates, or both; and dissemination of scholarship through peer-reviewed journal articles, book reviews, monographs, book chapters, textbooks, conference papers and presentations, and other educational material.
   3. Service
      1. Faculty members engage in service that advances the institution's goals and supports its role in serving Kansas and beyond.
      2. Faculty service activities may include efforts that strengthen the university or discipline's scholarly community, enhance the quality of life or society, or support the overall well-being of the institution, professional and academic societies, the community, the state, the nation, or the international community.
      3. Faculty members may also have administrative duties, such as serving as department chair or head, program director, or center director. Institutional policies should specify how and to what extent these responsibilities are included in a faculty member’s overall workload.
   4. Institutions may assign different weights to each activity and other activities it considers essential parts of faculty workloads based on department, discipline or subdiscipline, and other considerations.
   5. Institutions must create a process for reviewing and evaluating workload assignments.
2. Annual Evaluation
   1. Each faculty member shall have an annual review with their department chair or division head. Each faculty member should have an annual work plan.
      1. As part of the annual review, the department chair or head shall evaluate the faculty member's work against their approved work plan.
      2. The work plan should clearly outline the expected outputs and efforts a faculty member needs to accomplish in the upcoming academic year, noting that these items may be part of longer-term or multi-year projects. Its objectives should support and align with the criteria for the upcoming summative or comprehensive review, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The plan must detail expectations for teaching, research or creative activities, and service, including percentage time allocations that match the faculty member’s FTE status.
      3. A faculty member who does not adequately meet their workload expectations for the review period shall be subject to a faculty improvement plan.
      4. The improvement plan must include specific steps aimed at addressing deficiencies, a timeline for expected progress, and a statement of consequences if improvement does not happen within that period.
   2. Institutions are responsible for making sure supervisors have training and the necessary skills to perform their responsibilities effectively.
3. Annual Reporting
   1. Beginning with the 2025-2026 Academic year and continuing every other year thereafter, each campus provost will submit a faculty workload report to the Board’s vice president for academic affairs. The report shall cover the two prior academic years. The annual report has two primary purposes:
      1. To illustrate the breadth and variety of faculty activities and how these activities contribute to students, the university’s mission, the state, and society at large.
      2. To establish a systemwide level of transparency and accountability for how faculty allocate their work time.
      3. The vice president for academic affairs, in consultation with the provosts, will create the report format. The report should explain the institution’s workload policy and its administration; how the institution evaluates individual faculty workloads against the standards set in the workload policy; and specific data on how faculty members allocate their work time. This will include, at a minimum, the following data:
         1. TBD
         2. TBD
         3. TBD
         4. TBD
         5. TBD
   2. The annual report shall include a narrative that highlights faculty responsibilities, the quality of their work, and how their work benefits students, the university, the state, and the greater good.