

College of Health Professions Executive Committee – Meeting Record

DATE	June 16, 2016	FACILITATOR	Douglas Murphy	LOCATION	Winters Conference Room, Administration West Building
TIME	8:30-9:30 am	RECORDER	Deborah Taylor	GUESTS	

ATTENDEES (✓ INDICATES ATTENDANCE)

✓ Tony Baker	✓ Mitzi Efurd	✓ Karen Hunter	✓ Douglas Murphy	✓ Mark Wallenmeyer
Danny Bercher	✓ Phyllis Fields	✓ John Jefferson	✓ Nannette Nicholson	✓ Bill Woodell
Erna Boone	✓ Reza Hakkak	✓ Trish Kelly	✓ Cindy Saylor	✓ Dennis Mitchell
Lori Williamson Dean	✓ Suzanne Hansen	Susan Long	✓ Kathy Trawick	✓ Heather Neal-Rice

AGENDA

MEETING RECORD

Time	Item	Presenter	Main Points / Discussion
8:30	I. Announcements	Varies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment brochure progress – pending the dean’s approval, most brochures should go to programs for final review by May 18; will go to print by June 15 and printing should be completed by mid-July Save the date for the CHP Faculty Showcase on Wednesday, July 13, tentatively 9:00 am to 4:00 pm. Additional details to come. Contact Mary Ellen Nevins or Susan Long with any questions. Deadline for Faculty Excellence Awards nominations is June 24 Department chairs are requested to assign new faculty members to participate in the UAMS Educators Academy sessions during 2016-2017
8:35	II. Proposal: Policy on Policies	Douglas Murphy	Handouts A CHP webpage is under construction with links to all CHP forms and policies. A motion was made and seconded to approve the policy; approval was unanimous.
8:40	III. Academic Appeal Policy Final Review and Approval	Douglas Murphy	Handouts (previously distributed for the June 9 meeting) Several changes were suggested—these will be incorporated and the policy then voted on.
9:10	IV. Faculty Workload Plan Final Review and Approval	Douglas Murphy	Handouts (previously distributed for the June 9 meeting) A motion was made and seconded to approve the policy; approval was unanimous.
9:25	Adjourn		

ACTION PLAN

Action Item	Owner	Target Date
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – Incorporate suggestions into revised guidelines for presentation to faculty	Douglas Murphy	
College Planning Process – Set future “workshop” dates during EC and retreat in summer	Douglas Murphy / Deborah Taylor	
Fall Enrollment Process – Review of updated enrollment procedures	Clinton Everhart	June 23
Recruitment brochure progress	Douglas Murphy	Mid-July
Introduction of the OSPAN (Office of Sponsored Programs Administrative Network) Team 1	Renee Rains	After July 1
Collect information on CHP’s diverse and unique needs for the new UAMS Faculty Service Center	Jan Shorey	TBD

Policy: College Policy on Policies

Number: 04.16.01

Approval Date:

Revision Dates:

Section: Business Affairs

Area: Policies

Subject: Writing, Approving, and Maintaining College Policies

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that College of Health Professions policies are well-developed and understandable; approved by individuals or bodies with authority to do so; are accessible for faculty, staff, students; and:

1. Support the mission of the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and the University of Arkansas System.
2. Comply with policies, requirements, and regulations of the university and university system.
3. Promote accountability by identifying the individuals or offices responsible for policies.
4. Provide faculty, staff, and students with clear, concise guidance.
5. Document how the college conducts business.

SCOPE

This policy addresses the process for developing, disseminating, and maintaining all College of Health Professions policies and applies to all college departments, programs, faculty, staff, and students. College of Health Professions policies will be:

1. Provided in a common format.
2. Formally approved by the College of Health Professions Executive Committee.
3. Maintained centrally and accessible to all interested parties.
4. Linked electronically to procedures for implementing the policy.
5. Kept current within the framework of an organized system for change accountability.

Policies will be clearly distinguished from related procedures according to the definitions in "Definitions," below. Individuals who are responsible for writing, updating, and disseminating college-wide policies must comply with this policy.

Policies and procedures developed by departments and programs within the college may not conflict with college-wide policies. They may, however, be more restrictive.

DEFINITIONS

Policy: A policy is a statement of management philosophy and direction, established to provide guidance and assistance to the college and its departments, programs, faculty, staff, and students in the conduct of college affairs. A college policy:

- is a governing policy that mandates or constrains actions;
- has college-wide implications;
- changes infrequently and sets a course for the foreseeable future;
- helps insure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies;

- reduces institutional risk; and
- is approved by the College of Health Professions Executive Committee and, when applicable, by senior university officials (provost, chancellor, or president), or University of Arkansas Board of Trustees.

Academic Policies: Policies that directly affect the teaching and research missions of the college

Student Policies: Policies that directly affect student life and status within the college

Business Policies: Policies that define and govern how business is conducted within the college, e.g., budget, program review and evaluation, etc.

Personnel Policies: Policies that define and govern how operations that relate to faculty and staff are conducted within the college

Procedure: A guideline or series of related steps taken to help implement the policy. College procedures:

- should identify and link to the applicable college, university, or system policy;
- should be written in a format this is easy to understand, using numbers or bullets to describe steps to be followed;
- should be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure that they are in agreement with the most recent revisions to policies; and
- generally do not require formal approval by the Executive Committee or senior university officials.

Policy Initiator: Any faculty, staff member, or student who identifies a college-level issue and develops a policy proposal to address the issue

Policy Owner: The appropriate college officer (dean, associate or assistant dean, department chair, etc.) who jurisdiction covers the subject matter of the policy

Stakeholder: Individuals or groups of individuals who are affected by the college policy being developed

POLICY

Policy Development – The Policy Initiator may identify a college- wide policy issue and develop it into a policy proposal. The Policy Initiator will submit the policy proposal for review and endorsement of the Executive Committee. If the policy is endorsed, a draft policy is written following the format outlined in the “Policy Format” section, below.

The Policy Owner will review the draft policy and consult with various stakeholders regarding the policy’s likely impact on them or operations of the college, departments, and programs. After review and input, the policy will be formally proposed to the Executive Committee and, if acceptable, will be formally approved.

The dean will maintain approved copies of policies and disseminate them by appropriate means, e.g., college’s website, memoranda, etc. The dean will also notify responsible parties when particular policies are scheduled for review or revision and will be available to work with the responsible parties during any phase of policy development process, including, if applicable, implementation of a training schedule.

As identified in the particular policy, the responsible individual or office will monitor compliance and facilitate remedies for noncompliance as directed by the policy.

Policy Review and Revision – At least once every five years, the dean will initiate a review of each college policy to ascertain whether the policy is necessary, current, understandable, in agreement with other policies and regulations, and effective for achieving its original purposes. If indicated, revisions will

be made to the policy and will be submitted to the same review and approval process as the original policy.

Policy Format – A standard format for policies ensures clarity and consistency. Although not all policies will contain all the format elements, college policies should be written and maintained following the format described below.

1. **Header Information** (required element):
 - a. Policy name
 - b. Policy number (see description below)
 - c. Policy category (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business Affairs, or Personnel)
 - d. Subject
 - e. Related college, university, or university system policies, if applicable
2. **Scope** (required element): Identification of parties or activities governed by the policy
3. **Policy Rationale and Background** (required element): Purpose of the policy – may include statement of philosophy, position, rule, regulation, or direction; or explanation of origin or impetus for the development of the policy
4. **Definitions** (optional element): Meaning and interpretation of terms used in the policy
5. **Policy** (required element): Description of the actual policy covering topics which include: duties assigned to responsible parties and other parties as necessary; other information specific to a particular policy subject as needed; and a description of the compliance review process and specific authority to impose penalties or other remedies when noncompliance occurs, if applicable
6. **Effective Date(s)** (required element): Initial effective date of policy, and latest revision date, if applicable
7. **Approval** (required element): Statement of the date the policy was originally approved by the Executive Committee, e.g., “*This policy was approved by the College of Health Professions Executive Committee on [DATE].*”

Policy Number – Each policy will be assigned a 6-digit number (e.g., 02.13.04) for identification and retrieval using the following format:

Digits 1 and 2: The policy’s general category

- 01 – Academic Affairs
- 02 – Student Affairs
- 03 – Business Affairs
- 04 – Personnel

Digits 3 and 4: The calendar year during which the policy was originally approved, e.g., 15 for 2015, 16 for 2016, etc. Note: For some older college policies, information about their original approval is not available and the year designation has been arbitrarily assigned as “00.”

Digits 5 and 6: The order of approval in the calendar year, i.e., the first policy approved during the year is numbered “01,” the second approved is number “02,” etc.

LOCATION OF POLICIES

To ensure ready access to college policies, the Office of the Dean will maintain an official webpage with the most current, approved version of college policies with links to applicable procedures, forms, or

supplemental guidance. This webpage constitutes the official electronic repository for college-wide policies.

To maintain an organized system of change accountability and to ensure consistency throughout the college, individual department or program web sites should not contain separate copies or versions of college policies or applicable procedures, forms, or supplemental guidance. Instead, department or program web sites that refer to college (or university or system) policies must use hyperlinks to the documents on the official webpages of the college, university, or university system. This does not preclude departments or programs from maintaining their own internal policies and procedures on their web sites, provided that the internal department policies and procedures are not identified as official college-wide policies and procedures and do not conflict with college, university, or university system policies.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This policy will be effective immediately on approval by the College of Health Professions Executive Committee

APPROVAL

This policy was approved by the College of Health Professions Executive Committee on [DATE].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This policy was copied or adapted from American University's Policy on Policies. Location: <http://www.american.edu/policies/upload/Policy-on-Policies.pdf>. Permission granted May 18, 2016 by Kathleen Murray, Office of Finance and Treasurer, American University, Washington, DC.

Revised:

Academic Appeal Procedures

The purpose of academic appeals is to provide students with an objective hearing of a wide range of issues related to the students' professional education. The appeal procedures below provide opportunities for students to request a review of recommendations and decisions made by the department faculty, submit information not previously available to the faculty, or suggest alternative remedies.

These procedures apply to circumstances and events related to the students' education programs, including academic issues and professional conduct or judgment. Policies and procedures for scholastic dishonesty or other non-academic disciplinary matters differ from these procedures and are addressed in procedures and regulations in the section entitled "Student Conduct and Discipline" in this catalog.

Established ~~school~~ college or program policies themselves cannot be appealed.

Appeal of Grades or Evaluations

The procedures below are followed in the College of Health Professions for appeal of academic matters including grades or other evaluations awarded for a course, assignment, project, examination, clinical procedure, clinical rotations, or other program-related performance including professional conduct and clinical judgment.

Meeting with the Course Instructor – Before initiating an appeal, the student must contact the course instructor to discuss the academic matter or grade within 3 business days of the occurrence. "Occurrence" is the notification of a student's grade or performance evaluation.

Step 1: Appeal to the Department Chair – If the matter is not resolved with the course instructor, the student may appeal in writing to the department chair within ~~3-2~~ business days following the meeting with the course instructor. If the instructor is the department chair, the student may appeal directly to the dean (Step 3, below). The written appeal should include:

1. Student's name
2. Nature of the occurrence
3. Date of the occurrence
4. Name of the course instructor(s) involved
5. Summary of the student's meeting with the course instructor, including date, time, and outcomes
6. Student's rationale for the appeal

~~Simultaneously with the submission of the appeal, the student is~~ Within 3 business days after submitting the written appeal to the Department Chair, the student is responsible for setting an appointment with the department chair to discuss the appeal. This meeting should occur as soon as feasible.

Step 2: Meet with the Department Chair¹ - ~~Within 3 business days after submitting the written appeal to the Department Chair, the student is responsible for setting an appointment with the department chair to discuss the appeal. This meeting should occur as soon as feasible.~~ In preparation for meeting with the student, the department chair's responsibilities include:

1. Investigating the facts and examining the evidence
2. Meeting with the course instructor(s) and student to clarify areas of dispute
3. Mediating a mutually-acceptable resolution, if possible
4. Documenting, in writing, actions taken to seek resolution

¹ "Chair" may refer to the department chair another person designated by the chair.

The department chair will notify the student and course instructor in writing of her/his decision within 32 business days following the final meeting with concerned parties.

Step 3: Appeal to the Dean² – If a mutually acceptable resolution is not achieved, or if the student wishes to appeal the department chair’s decision, the student may submit a written request to the dean to review the merits of the student’s appeal. The request must be submitted within 5-2 business days of the department chair’s notification. The dean will review the student’s appeal and the information and may solicit other information deemed appropriate for resolving the matter. The Dean will inform the student and the Department Chair in writing of the Dean’s decision within 5-2 business days following the final meeting with concerned parties. The decision of the dean will be final and may not be appealed.

Note: Timeframes in the appeal procedures are recommended intervals and may be modified as a result of weekends, holidays, vacation periods, and other circumstances.

Appeal of Program-Related Penalties

At times, the faculty may judge that it is in the best interest of the student, patients, education program, or public to recommend that penalties be assessed against a student. Such penalties may include probation, suspension, dismissal, repetition of course(s), or other penalties deemed appropriate under the circumstances. Reasons for penalties may include a variety of factors, e.g., poor academic performance, violations of professional standards of conduct, poor professional judgment, failure to demonstrate ethical behavior, etc. Established college or program policies themselves cannot be appealed. The following procedures are followed for appeal of program-related penalties:

Step 1: Initial Decision and Notification – The student will have been identified as performing below expectations in the education program, and the course instructor and/or the department’s student progress committee (SPC)³ may assess one or more penalties. It is recommended that the student be allowed to provide information related to the matter before the decision is made about penalties. If the proposed penalty is dismissal, the faculty must provide the student an opportunity for a personal hearing before the decision is reached. Minutes of the meeting in which the decision was made will summarize the allegations, facts, and rationale for the faculty’s decision.

The department chair will notify the student in writing of the faculty and/or the SPC decision and the rationale, and inform the student about appeal procedures. Copies of the faculty/SPC meeting minutes and the notification to the student will be sent to the associate dean for academic affairs. If the student does not appeal the decision, the penalty becomes effective 5-2-business days after receipt of the department chair’s notification. If the decision is dismissal, the student should complete the clearance process for the university unless he or she decides to appeal the decision. Completion of the clearance process is an indication that the student waives his or her right to appeal.

Step 2: Appeal to the Dean¹ – The student may appeal the penalty assessed by the faculty/SPC’s decision by submitting a written request to the dean within 2-5 business days of receipt of the department chair’s notification. The written appeal should include:

1. Date
2. Student’s name
3. Specific reasons that the penalty assessed is deemed inappropriate, e.g., extenuating circumstances affecting the student’s performance or behavior that the faculty/SPC was unaware of at the time of the decision, misapplication of department policy or procedure, etc.
4. Any documentation relative to the points of the appeal

² “Dean” may refer to the Dean or another person designated by the Dean, e.g., the Associate Dean.

³ Names of department committees that deal with student progression may vary.

Note: Documentation provided by the student or faculty/SPC after submission of the initial appeal is subject to review by the hearing officer (see Step 3, below). The hearing officer may disallow such documentation at the appeal hearing if he or she deems the documentation to be unrelated to the initial points of the appeal letter.

Step 2: Preliminary Review of the Appeal - Within 2 business days of receipt of the student's appeal, the associate dean for academic affairs will submit a written recommendation to the dean on the suitability of the appeal for review by the Appeal and Grievance Committee. The recommendation should provide specific reasons the appeal is either suitable or not suitable for review by the Committee. The dean will make the final determination to convene the Appeal and Grievance Committee.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Step 3: Hearing Before the Appeal and Grievance Committee - Students in the College of Health Professions ~~are~~ may be afforded the opportunity to appeal penalties assessed for both academic and disciplinary reasons to the Appeal and Grievance Committee. The Appeal and Grievance Committee is appointed annually by the Dean and consists of at least one faculty representative from each department.

When the Dean ~~receives an appeal from a student~~ determines that the student's appeal is suitable for review by the Appeal and Grievance Committee, the Dean will convene the College of Health Professions Appeal and Grievance Committee and appoint a hearing officer and hearing panel of at least 3 members of the committee to hear the student's appeal. The hearing officer and members of the hearing panel may not be faculty members in the student's department.

Hearing Officer and Hearing Panel - The hearing officer is the spokesperson for the hearing panel and is responsible for:

- Informing the student, hearing panel, dean, and other interested parties of the date and location of the appeal hearing at least 5 business days before the hearing. The student may request that the appeal hearing be scheduled with less than 5 business days' notice.
- Reviewing, in advance of the appeal hearing, any documentation submitted by the student relevant to the appeal. The hearing officer may request written documentation from other parties as deemed appropriate.
- Conducting the hearing in a fair, unbiased manner.
- Recording the testimony at the hearing in audio or video format in accord with university policy. The hearing panel's deliberation following testimony is not recorded.
- Providing the dean with a written summary of the student's appeal, the hearing, and the hearing panel's recommendations.
- Providing the dean with a file of all evidence accumulated in the appeal process and all materials related to the appeal following the final disposition of the appeal.

The hearing panel is responsible for:

- Providing a fair, unbiased hearing of the student's appeal.
- Maintaining confidentiality of all documentation and deliberations related to the appeal and hearing.
- Making recommendations to the dean about the appeal and the penalty assessed by the faculty. The hearing panel may recommend that the dean support, reject, or modify the penalty.

Appeal Hearing Participants – The appeal hearing provides for an objective hearing of all facts related to the appeal and should include at a minimum the student and a spokesperson for the faculty. The hearing will be "closed" and confidential. Only individuals personally involved in the hearing will be permitted to attend and participate, including hearing panel members, the student, faculty representative, witnesses, and counsel, if desired. A representative of the dean's office or UAMS legal counsel may be available to provide advice on procedural and policy matters.

Witnesses – If called, witnesses will give only their testimony; witnesses may not be present in the hearing before or after their testimony is given. If the student and/or the faculty representative wish to call witnesses, they must inform the Hearing Officer of the names of the witnesses and a brief written

summary of their relevant testimony at least 3 business days before the hearing. The hearing officer must inform each party of the witnesses that the other party plans to call at least 2 days before the hearing.

Procedures during the Hearing

- The hearing officer will review the purposes of the hearing and procedures to be followed, and clarify the data-gathering and decision-making functions of the hearing panel. The hearing officer will orally read the student's appeal submitted to the dean. Only the concerns of the student presented in the written appeal will be discussed during the hearing.
- The student will present the issues and rationale for the appeal. The hearing panel may question the student. The student and faculty representative may question each other, at the discretion of the hearing officer.
- The hearing officer will call witnesses as desired by the student and the faculty representative, and the hearing panel may question the witnesses. The student and the faculty representative may question the witnesses at the discretion of the hearing officer. At all times, it is the prerogative of the hearing officer to monitor and control the extent and degree of questioning and terminate it as her/his judgment dictates.
- Counsel of choice, if requested by the student, may be present to advise and support the student. The student must inform the hearing officer of the name of the counsel of choice, if one is desired, at least 3 business days before the hearing. The hearing is not intended to be adversarial in the sense of a court trial and, therefore, witnesses will not be "cross examined" as in a legal context. Counsel of choice may only confer with the student and will not be allowed to question witnesses or otherwise engage in discussion with the hearing officer, hearing panel, or other participants in the hearing.
- If the student's counsel of choice is an attorney, university counsel must also attend. The university's counsel will observe the proceedings and will not be allowed to question witnesses or otherwise engage in discussion with the hearing officer, hearing panel, or other participants in the hearing.
- When all testimony has been provided, all individuals except the hearing officer and hearing panel will leave the hearing room. The hearing panel will discuss the matters and may request additional information as deemed appropriate and necessary. Although it is desirable to conclude appeals expeditiously, the hearing panel may use as much time as necessary and reasonable to assess thoroughly and evaluate the appeal and related facts. If the hearing panel's decision is delayed more than 5 days after the hearing, the hearing officer will notify the dean, student, and faculty of the delay. Following careful review of all information, the hearing panel will make a recommendation to the dean about the student's appeal.
- The hearing officer will notify the dean of the hearing panel's recommendation(s) within 5 business days of its final meeting on the appeal.
- The dean may concur with, modify, or reject the hearing panel's recommendations. The dean will notify the student, department chair, hearing officer, and hearing panel in writing of his or her decision within 3 business days.
- The decision of the [Dean](#) is final and may not be appealed.

Policy: Faculty Workload Plan

Number:

Approval Date:

Revision Dates:

Section:

Area:

Subject: Faculty Workload

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Full-time service as a faculty member in the College of Health Professions presumes participation in various duties and responsibilities including teaching, service, scholarship, and administration. While each faculty member might not be actively involved in all of these areas, the collective participation of the faculty in all areas is necessary to achieve the college's goals and fulfill our mission to improve health and health care by educating health care professionals; contributing to the intellectual and clinical capital of our professions; and serving our students, university, professions, and communities.

The purposes of this workload plan are to:

- Encourage coherence between the needs of the academic department, requirements for promotion and tenure, annual performance evaluations, and individual career development plans
- Maximize the contributions of faculty throughout the college
- Assure workload equity within and between departments in the College of Health Professions

POLICY

Department chairs and program directors have primary responsibility for faculty workload assignments, in consultation with the dean. The unique requirements of the College of Health Professions necessitate a flexible system for determining individual faculty member work assignments. Therefore, individual workload assignments are established by the chair or director and the faculty member in a collaborative effort that takes into account (a) the goals and needs of the department; (b) available financial and faculty resources; (c) promotion and tenure requirements; and (d) the faculty member's talents, abilities, and career development plans

PROCEDURE

- On an annual basis and in conjunction with the annual performance evaluation, department chairs and faculty members should plan annual workload assignments for each semester in the year.
- The Faculty Evaluation Form, which applies a weight factor to each category of one's workload, should reflect the faculty member's workload assignment as detailed on the workload assignment form.
- The workload assignment and Faculty Evaluation Forms for all faculty members, full-time and part-time, are posted to the department's Sharepoint faculty workload site by August 1 of each year for review and approval by the dean.
- If assignments must be adjusted during the course of the academic year due to changed or unpredicted circumstances, the adjustments should be documented on the workload assignment form.

APPROVAL

FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

Workload Units – Each full-time faculty member is expected to maintain a **total workload of 5-7 units** each semester (fall, spring, and summer). The number of units is determined by the following values:

Work Assignment ¹	Measure	Units
Administrative Responsibilities	Variable	Up to 2.5
Clinical Practice ²	8-10 hours per week	Up to 1.0
Scholarly Activity ³	8-10 hours per week	1.0
Service	Based on time commitment and responsibilities	Up to 0.5
Teaching – Lecture	3-4 credit hour course; 0.33 per credit hour	0.33 per credit
Teaching – Lab	3-4 contact hours per week	0.5
Teaching – Clinic	3-4 contact hours per week	0.5
Teaching – Thesis, Dissertation Chair	6-12 credit hours	0.5
Teaching – Independent Study	1 student = 0.1	Up to 1.0
Teaching – Continuing Education	1 CEU = 0.02	Up to 0.5
Teaching – Peer Mentoring ⁴	1-2 contact hours per week = 0.10	Up to 0.25

Special Provisions – At times, other responsibilities and conditions may impact on workload assignments, and adjustments to workload units may be required:

- Workload Variances: There may be times when a faculty member’s workload exceeds or falls short of the expectation for a given semester. The difference may be made up in a smaller or larger workload in subsequent semesters. Likewise, when variances occur among faculty within a department or division efforts should be made to achieve equity among faculty over a period of a year or two.
- Workload Units: Workload unit limits under “Units” in the table above may be adjusted in unusual circumstances and with adequate justification. For example, if a faculty member engages in mission-critical service activities that require substantial time on a regular basis, the department chair may assign workload units greater than 0.5
- Grants and Contracts: Faculty with funded grants and/or contracts that exceed 20% effort may have other units adjusted accordingly. For example, a grant or contract requiring 40% effort may account for 2 workload units: 1 unit for scholarly activity and 1 additional unit in excess of 8-10 hours per week.
- Administrative Responsibilities: Faculty with substantial administrative responsibilities assigned by the department chair or dean may have other workload units adjusted accordingly. Examples of such administrative responsibilities include leading an academic department or degree program, coordinating clinical rotations, managing the department’s admissions process, planning and managing the department’s continuing education offerings, etc. Caution should be exercised by department chairs and faculty members when assigning administrative responsibilities because they may interfere with the faculty member’s ability to fulfill requirements for promotion and tenure.
- New Course Development: A department chair may choose to assign workload units for the task of creating a new course or major re-designing of an existing course, e.g., for on-line delivery. In general, the number of units will correspond to the units assigned to course delivery. That is, 1 unit would be given for the creation or re-design of a 3-4 credit hour lecture course. Routine updating of a course is considered part of regular teaching activity and no additional units are assigned.

¹ Definitions for work assignments may be found in the Appendix.

² Used only by departments with an established faculty practice plan.

³ At least 1 workload unit is required for tenure-track and tenured faculty.

⁴ Requires a formalized and approved mentoring plan that comprises specific goals, measurable objectives, and a defined time frame for achievement of the goals.

- Lab Sections of Didactic Courses: The credit hours for the lab portion of a course should be calculated separately from the didactic teaching portion. For example, a 4 credit hour course with 3 credits= hours of lecture and 1 credit hour of lab = 1.5 units [lecture (3 credit hours x .33 = 1.0) plus 0.5 units per 3-4 contact hours per week lab].
- Online Teaching: Generally, workload units for teaching on-line courses are the same as for face-to-face courses, assuming that the on-line course includes substantial time for (a) interaction between the faculty member and students, (b) regular assignments that are graded by the faculty member, and (c) regular, weekly monitoring of students' performance by the faculty member. If the on-line course does not include these elements, workload units are decreased.
- Team Teaching: Workload units may be adjusted for team teaching, based on the relative effort of members of the teaching team. For example, a faculty member who has half-responsibility for a 3 credit hour course may be assigned 0.5 units for that teaching responsibility. The total units assigned among all faculty involved in teaching a single course should typically not exceed the course credits. For example, if two faculty members co- teach a 3 credit course and faculty member were responsible for 50% of the course, each faculty member would be assigned 0.5 units for the course.
- Scholarly Activity for Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure Track Appointments: All faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activities, in addition to teaching and service. In general, expectations for scholarly activity are greater for tenure-track and tenured faculty members than for non-tenure track faculty members. When workload units are assigned for scholarly activity, the department chair and faculty member must establish annual goals for scholarship with measurable outcomes. (See the appendix for examples of measurable outcomes.)
- Promotion and Tenure Considerations: Department chairs and faculty members should be cognizant of the impact of workload assignments on the faculty member's ability to meet requirements for promotion and tenure. For example, it is advisable to assign a lighter teaching workload for new tenure-track faculty so that they can establish their scholarly activity agenda. On the other hand, heavier teaching workloads may be assigned to non-tenure track faculty for whom expectations for scholarly activity are lower.
- Clinical Practice: Faculty may be assigned to practice in a clinical setting as part of the department's or college's faculty practice plan. Faculty practice plans do not allow for "moonlighting" or other forms of clinical practice outside the auspices of the plan. Under unusual circumstances and with special permission from the department chair and dean, a faculty member may be allowed to practice clinically when the department has no faculty practice plan, i.e., moonlighting. However, moonlighting may not be included in workload unit calculations.
- Special Assignments: Faculty members may be assigned a special project as part of their workload. Such projects should be well defined to include expectations for outcomes and completion within a finite time period.

APPENDIX

Definitions – The following definitions apply to work assignments:

- Administrative Responsibilities: See above
- Clinical Practice: See above
- Scholarly Activity: “Scholarship/scholarly activity entails contribution to knowledge available to [one’s] discipline. . . To be recognized as scholarship, contributions must be: shared with peers; and subject to peer review.”⁵ Congruent with Boyer’s (1990) framework, scholarship addresses four concerns of contemporary academic work: (1) scholarship of discovery, (2) scholarship of integration, (3) scholarship of application, and (4) scholarship of teaching.⁶ While basic and translational research are valued activities in the College of Health Professions, other forms of scholarship may and should be pursued by faculty as essential components of the college’s and university’s mission to contribute to the intellectual and clinical capital of our respective disciplines.
- Service: “Service applies a faculty member’s knowledge, skills, and expertise as an educator, a member of a discipline or profession, or a participant in an institution to benefit students, the institution, the discipline or profession, and the community in a manner consistent with the missions of the university and the campus.”⁷ Service activities can range from sponsoring a student organization, to serving and/or leading a committee, serving as an officer of a professional organization, to leading a service group in the community that benefits from the faculty member’s professional knowledge and expertise.
- Teaching – Clinic: Clinic teaching is the direct supervision of students in a real-world clinical setting in which the student is working directly with patients and families or in a medical laboratory performing real clinical tasks. Typically, faculty preparation time outside of the clinical setting is minimal.
- Teaching – Independent Study:⁸ Sometimes termed “directed study,” independent study is a learning activity undertaken by a student with little or no supervision by the faculty member. Typically, the student and faculty member agree on a topic, the end product, and the number of credits for the activity. Guiding students in independent study courses can range from minimal to substantial contact time and effort, depending on the interests, abilities, and sophistication of students’ independent study topics. To qualify as a workload assignment, independent study teaching activities must occur as part of an official course in which students enroll.
- Teaching – Lab: Laboratory teaching usually involves instruction on and demonstration of clinical or laboratory procedures. Typically, student assignments are completed within the time allotted for the laboratory, and faculty preparation time is usually considerably less than for lecture courses.
- Teaching – Lecture: Traditionally termed “didactic” teaching, lecture courses most often involve the presentation or new information, in-class learning activities, and in-person assessment of students’ learning. Usually, lecture courses meet for a set number of hours on a regular basis. Students are expected to spend substantial time on their own completing requirements for lecture courses. Faculty members are expected to evaluate students’ performance and provide individual feedback to facilitate learning. Workload units are based on the assumption that a lecture course requires the faculty member to devote substantial time and effort outside the classroom to course-related responsibilities, perhaps a total of 6-12 hours per week.

⁵ Adapted from Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (2012). *Scholarly activity guidelines*, Review Committee for Family Medicine. https://www.acgme.org/acgmeweb/Portals/0/PFAssets/ProgramResources/120_Family_Medicine_Scholarship_Guidelines.pdf.

⁶ Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN 0-9a31050-43-X.

⁷ *Service at Indiana University: Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating* (1999). Indianapolis, IN: Center for Public Service and Leadership.

⁸ Adapted from Wikipedia “*Independent Study*.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independent_study.

- Teaching – Thesis, Dissertation Chair: Chairing a thesis or dissertation committee is labor- and time-intensive and involves regular meetings with individual students, providing individualized feedback on proposals and manuscripts, motivating students, and advising students.
- Teaching – Continuing Education: As leaders in their respective professions, College of Health Professions faculty members have a special role in promoting their professions and educating practicing professionals about current scientific and clinical developments in their fields. Continuing education “consists of educational activities which serve to maintain, develop, or increase the knowledge, skills, and professional performance and relationships” that health professionals “use to provide services for patients, the public, or the profession. The content of [continuing education] is that body of knowledge and skills generally recognized and accepted by the profession as within the basic medical sciences, [the professional’s discipline], and the provision of health care to the public.”⁹ To qualify as a workload assignment, continuing education activities should be approved by the profession’s agency that accredits continuing education.
- Teaching – Peer Mentoring: Mentoring of junior faculty members by those who are more experienced is a valued activity in the College of Health Professions. Faculty members who are assigned workload units for peer mentoring must participate in mentorship training. As noted above, workload assignments for peer mentoring require a formalized and approved mentoring plan that comprises specific goals, measurable objectives, and a defined time frame for achievement of the goals.

Examples of Measurable Outcomes for Scholarly Activity

All full-time faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activity, regardless of track (tenure-track and non-tenure track). As noted above, expectations for scholarly activity are greater for tenure-track faculty than for non-tenure track faculty. Such expectations are reflected in more workload units for scholarly activity. When workload units are assigned for scholarly activity, the department chair and faculty member must establish annual goals with measurable outcomes. Examples of such outcomes include:

- peer-reviewed presentation at a national or international conference
- manuscript in a peer-reviewed journal
- book or book chapter(s)
- manuscript on clinical practice in a trade journal
- policy analysis disseminated to the public or other audiences of interest
- application for research grant
- creation and dissemination of innovative teaching materials or methods
- consultation with professional or community organizations on health and healthcare topics
- development and publication of new clinical methods or procedures
- creation and distribution of computer applications or software
- grant proposal for service or service-learning program
- critical review article or presentation on a “hot” topic
- synthesis and interpretation of scientific findings for public audiences
- participation in the process of shaping public policy as it pertains to health care or education
- creation of data sets, data bases to be used for secondary data analyses
- service as a peer reviewer for grant applications
- creation of new evidence-based teaching modules, courses, or curricula

⁹ Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education. *CME content: Definition and examples*. <http://www.accme.org/requirements/accreditation-requirements-cme-providers/policies-and-definitions/cme-content-definition-and-examples>.