Policy on Faculty Workload for Computer Science

December 7, 2022

In accordance with the university-wide Policy Workload Policy (effective June 1, 2021) as well as the SLU School of Science and Engineering (SSE) Faculty Workload Policy, this document articulates the principles, policies, and procedures that govern the faculty workload and evaluation within the Department of Computer Science.

1 Workload Distributions

The university-wide Policy on Faculty Workload assigns 24 workload units for all faculty under a 9 month contract; any workload beyond this constitutes an overload, which must be approved by the provost and compensated accordingly. Within the Department of Computer Science, faculty members select the workload distribution that reflects their desired activity level in each area of

Supervision of capstone projects

Curriculum development/revision

Program assessment

Student recruitment

Faculty recruitment

Mentorship of junior faculty (by senior faculty)

As a general rule, these collective responsibilities must be shared amongst the faculty. As is the case with other aspects of workload, it is recognized that different faculty members may have different roles and responsibilities in service, that these roles naturally vary over a multiyear period, and that departmental service must be balanced with efforts to support related programs (e.g., mathematics, data science, or bioinformatics), the college, the university, the profession at large, and the community through professional outreach.

In general, one workload of service (out of 24) equates to about 1.6 hours per week over the 9 month appointment. Thus, a typical 3 unit allocation allows for the faculty to be spending almost 5 hours a week on regular service activities. As an example of this workload, a faculty member would gather course-level assessment for courses taught, serve on at least one significant department committee, serve as a faculty mentor to a typical share of majors/minors, and perform some professional service, on occasion, outside the department (either at the university or professional level).

Higher levels of service contribution (or displacement of some of the typical departmental service) might be achieved through participation in college- and university-level committees, or through service to the profession (e.g, as an organizer, program committee member, or steering committee member for professional meetings, as a reviewer or editor for publication, as a task force or advisory board member). In general, higher service workload levels such as these should be addressed on the annual review document as well as with the chair, so additional workload is approved and included in the faculty member's allocation of units. If changes occur during the course of the year, the faculty member should consult with the chair, although it may not always be possible to change the workload allocation on short notice for the coming year.

5 Representative Workload Distributions

To better illustrate a range of possible workload distributions, this section describes some typical faculty pro les. The ranges given are fairly typical for workload assignments in the CS department, but will be set for each individual faculty in a given year based on planned activities and recent performance, and hence may vary in individual cases.

Pro le	Teaching	Research/Scholarship	Service
A	18{23 units	0 units	1{6 units
This is a pro le of a faculty member with little to no research activity over the past 3 years, or who was primarily hired into a teaching-oriented position; while primary contributions are in teaching and service, continued professional development is expected, i.e. through participation in teaching development workshops or conferences.			
B	15{20 units	2{4 units	2{6 units
This is a pro le of a faculty member with minimal research and scholarship, perhaps having			

two students, and some buyout, this would approximately equate

Rating	Teaching	Research[1]	Service[2]
1	not meeting basic teaching obligations	no recognizable research program	absence from department meetings, refusal to accept service assignments
2	weak evaluations and syllabi; little variety; no attempt to improve	ongoing program, but little or no output; no publications, grants, or submissions	minimal participation; unwillingness to work on department activities
3	mediocre evaluations and syllabi; minimal contribution to departmental e orts; some attempt to improve	lower than average output or quality; some evidence of submission of publications and/or grants	minimal service to U.D. and the profession, or some tradeo between these
4	moderate evaluations, syllabi, and contributions, or a similar balance; some capstone supervision	about one-half publication of good quality per year; some e ort for funding; some external recognition	basic service to both U.D. and the profession, or medium to one and minimal to the other
5	good evaluations, syllabi, and contributions, on bal- ance; capstone supervision	about one publication of good quality per year; good funding e orts; moderate visibility of work	medium service to both U.D. and profession, or good to one and basic to the other
6	strong evaluations, syllabi, and contributions; capstone supervision	about one and a half publi- cations of good quality per year; internal funding and/or good e ort for external funds	good service to both U.D. and profession, or very good to one and medium to the other
7	excellent evaluations/syllabi; capstone supervision; one of curriculum devel, innovative practices, indiv. supervision	two or more good publica- tions per year; moderate funding; good visibility of work	very strong commitment to both U.D. and profession, or exceptional to one and medium to the other
8	excellent evaluations/syllabi; capstone supervision; two of curriculum devel, innovative practices, indiv. supervision	proli c publication (more than two per year) with demonstratable impact; signi cant external funding	outstanding to both, or exceptional to one and good to the other
9	outstanding evaluations and contribution plus external recognition outside the department	clear international reputa- tion; outstanding productiv- ity; strong external funding	leadership positions at university, department, or profession, and very good service to others

[1]Given typical timeframe for research projects and for external evaluations of publications and proposals, annual evaluation of research should be based on a sliding window of the recent three years of activity.

[2]Use of phrase \U.D." in descriptions shorthand for University/Department