January 2021

SCIS Differential Assignment Policy

Preamble

On January 17, 2019, the UFF-FIU and FIU Administration directed "that units create a differentiated assignment policy" in alignment with the 2018-2021 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The policy should maintain the "spirit of the CBA" and allow for "faculty [to be] given an assignment that enables them to meet promotion guidelines that require certain teaching and advising experiences."[1] Subsequently, on February 28, 2019, the administration released the University Differential Assignment Procedures[2] (referred to in this document as the FIU-UDAP), which outlined (1) guiding principles, (2) definitions and expectations, (3) differential assignments per track, and (4) model assignments.

The *SCIS Differential Research Assignment Policy Ad-hoc Committee* was convened to draft a differential assignment policy for SCIS. The committee took as input the draft of the *SCIS Differential Teaching Assignment*[3], which was generated by the *SCIS Differential Teaching Assignments Ad-hoc Committee* in late 2018. The faculty approved an initial version of the policy on April 22, 2019 and sent it to the Dean for approval. The faculty received feedback on that policy in the Fall 2019 term, and in the Spring, Summer, and Fall of 2020 the committee continued to adjust the policy over several revisions in response to more feedback from the Dean and the Provost.

The policy outlined here is a fair and balanced policy that respects the prior practice of SCIS, the standards in the field of computer science, and the needs of the school, college, and university.

Approvals

In accordance with the CBA, this policy was approved by the SCIS faculty on January 15, 2021 by a vote of 35 to 3 (with 0 abstentions), as well as by the following parties:

DocuSigned by:
E7ACCF3Z85744F7...
Mark A. Finlayson
Chair, SCIS DAP Committee
Interim Associate Director, SCIS
On behalf of the faculty
January 15, 2021

DocuSigned by:
Jason Liu
DBFC0E573B80446...
Jason X. Liu
Interim Director, SCIS
December 11, 2020

DocuSigned by:
22A49CA5D02F424...
John Volakis
Dean, CEC
December 11, 2020

DocuSigned by:
Kenneth Furton
51248F8B1E12468...
Kenneth Furton
Provost, FIU
December 11, 2020

[1] UFF-FIU Report of January 16, 2019, sent via email to the faculty on January 17, 2019 with subject "UFF Report - Happy New Year"

[2] FIU University Different Assignment Procedures, Effective February 28, 2019, 3pp.

[3] SCIS Differential Teaching Assignment Policy Proposal, Dated February 1, 2019, 2pp.

Part I: Definitions

A. There will be two nominal categories of faculty in SCIS, as listed below. Note that the boundary between these categories is porous, and faculty can move between them depending on their assignment. In particular, membership in a particular category is not directly a result of a faculty member's title.

(1) **Teaching-Oriented Faculty**, whose primary responsibility is teaching. Their typical course load is 8 courses a year (a "4/4" load), where each course is 3 credits. This category normally includes non-tenure-track teaching professors. The teaching load may be decreased on the basis of other activities as outlined later in this policy.

(2) **Research-Oriented Faculty**, whose primary responsibility is research. The typical course load for a research-active research faculty member is 3 courses per year (a "2/1" load), where each course is normally 3 credits. The 3-course-per-year load is commensurate with FIU's status as an RU/VH university, as demonstrated by the data presented in Appendix A. The category of research-oriented faculty will normally include professors who are tenured or on the tenure track. All new faculty who are hired on the tenure track or are hired with tenure as a condition of employment (TACOE) are expected to be research-oriented faculty. The teaching load of a research-faculty member may be decreased or increased on the basis of other activities as outlined later in the policy.

B. SCIS courses are categorized into three types:

(1) **Service courses** are taught by SCIS faculty and are mainly taken by non-majors. The current service courses are CGS 1540, 1920, 2060, 2100, 2260, 2518, 3416, and 3559; COP 3835; and IDC 1000. This category may include both undergraduate and graduate courses, and courses that fall into this category will be determined by the SCIS undergraduate or graduate curriculum committees, to be reviewed yearly.

(2) **Degree courses** are taught by SCIS faculty, are mainly taken by SCIS majors, and are used, either as a required or elective course, for at least one SCIS degree. This category includes both undergraduate and graduate courses.

(3) **Support-intensive courses** are core sequence degree courses that need additional support in the form of graders or TA's. The current support-intensive courses are COP 2210/2250, 3337/3804, 3530, 4338, and 4610, which are Programming I and II, Systems Programming, Data Structures, and Operating Systems. These courses are absolutely critical for progression in the SCIS degrees and present major challenges to students for retention, progression, and graduation. Currently, this category only contains undergraduate courses; courses that fall into this category will be determined by the SCIS undergraduate curriculum committee, to be reviewed yearly. It is expected that only a small number of courses will fall into this category.

C. **Support** for SCIS courses can be in the form of graders or TA's. LAs are not funded by the college or the school and are relevant only to course format (e.g., active learning), and are not considered support for the purposes of this document. For classes larger than "normal-sized" (as defined below) that do benefit from support, the amount of effort

required to teach the course will be considered to remain constant if appropriate support personnel are provided. The levels of appropriate support are outlined in Part IV.

D. A research-oriented faculty member must be included in the **Research Active** category for the duration of an academic year if either (i) they are a pre-tenure tenure-track faculty member, or (ii) they have been responsible for at least $100K in external research expenditures, on average per year, for the past 3 years, i.e., the three years ending on June 30th immediately prior to the beginning of said academic year. Faculty will be considered "responsible for" research expenditures in accordance with policies set by the FIU Faculty Tenure & Promotion (T&P) manual[4]. Expenditure responsibility includes the management of auxiliary and FIU Foundation accounts. The amount spent on salary, fringe, tuition, or overhead for PhD students will be valued in this calculation at 4/3 the actual dollar amount and will include FIU-external scholarship support for student stipends and tuition. This extra valuation recognizes the importance of PhD students for national research rankings. In certain circumstances, the SCIS Director may place a faculty member in the research active category even if they do not meet these criteria. This acknowledges the fact that there are certain valuable research activities (e.g., writing a book, publications with major impact, building a new field, etc.) that may not immediately translate into research expenditures or student support. In such cases the Director shall place an explanation for this decision in the faculty's file and this explanation shall be made available upon request to any faculty member in the school.

[4] The FIU T&P CV guidelines state: "when there are co-PIs on an award, give the portion of the total award coming to the candidate." Since this is the criterion used for T&P, and assignments are critical in evaluation of T&P, we use the same guidance here for evaluation of faculty assignments. The committee acknowledges that this is a complex topic, requiring consideration, at a minimum, of factors such as (a) PI, co-PI, co-Investigator, or senior personnel status; (b) fraction of the resources of specific external funds (regardless of PI status on those funds) that are devoted to specific faculty's research; and (c) how much F&A return is accorded to each named PI or co-PI, among other factors. Funds shall not be double-counted across faculty within the college; In cases where these factors conflict (such as when a GA supervised by one faculty member is supported by funds for which that faculty member is not PI or co-PI), the faculty members involved will agree to the apportionment of credit.

Part II: Differential Assignment Structure

Teaching

Each (3-credit) course will count 11.25% toward the teaching assignment, with overall percentages rounded to the nearest whole number. The policy for course overloads, extra compensation for large class sizes, and course support is covered in *Part IV: Teaching Assignment Guidelines*.

As appropriate, faculty may count **other instructional effort** as service, which includes, in rough order of importance:

1. Curriculum development
2. New course preparation and design
3. Conducting independent study courses by teaching faculty
4. Other teaching effort as deemed relevant by the Director, such as participation in activities run by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) and attending appropriate teaching-related conferences.

Note that independent study courses will not be counted as Course Equivalents for the purposes of teaching load assignments.

Service

In SCIS, the minimum service load is 10%. Service includes the following activities:

(a) **University, College, School, or Internal Service** includes, but is not limited to:

- Serving as a school, college, or university committee chair
- Serving as a school, college, or university committee member
- Serving as a mentor to another faculty member
- Serving as a faculty advisor to student organizations
- Serving as a school or college commencement representative
- Serving as a center director
- Attending faculty meetings
- Participating in prospective faculty recruitment and interviewing
- Participating in potential student recruitment and interviewing
- Organizing student activities
- Performing peer teaching evaluations
- Conducting accreditation activities (SACS, ABET, etc.)
- Participation in PhD qualifying exams
- Supervising capstone or senior projects
- Undergraduate curriculum advising
- For a teaching faculty, serving as a PhD thesis committee member
- For a teaching faculty, serving as an MSc thesis committee member
- Other Instructional Effort, as described in the section on Teaching
- Other miscellaneous internal service (e.g., strategic planning) as deemed relevant by the Director

(b) **Professional or External Service** includes serving as a:

- Conference or workshop chair or co-chair
- Editor, Associate Editor, or co-editor of a Journal
- Technical program committee member
- Ad-hoc reviewer
- Proposal panelist
- Tenure or promotion file reviewer
- Board member of a professional society
- Community board member
- Community outreach organizer
- Other miscellaneous external service that is relevant to a specific subfield
- Other miscellaneous external service as deemed relevant by the Director

Research

Research-oriented faculty are expected to remain active in research and supervision of doctoral students. Research activities include, in rough order of importance:

1. Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator status on grants
2. Publications and patents
3. Supervising and graduating PhD students as major advisor
4. Supporting graduate students via external sources (to include, but not to be limited to, grants, fellowships, etc.)
5. Buying out courses to carry out funded research
6. Submitting proposals for external funding
7. Achieving research awards or fellowships (e.g., best paper awards, university or college research awards, professional awards, etc.)
8. Serving as a keynote or invited speaker
9. Serving as the major advisor for an MSc student
10. Serving as a PhD thesis committee member
11. Serving as an MSc thesis committee member
12. Advising students funded by REU or RET grants or supplements
13. Conducting independent study courses by research-oriented faculty

Tenure-track and tenured faculty will be accorded the option of maintaining a minimum of 34% research assignment unless they receive three evaluations in a row of Unsatisfactory in their annual evaluation of the research component of their yearly evaluation.

The teaching load and minimum service are combined in Table 1. As discussed above, these two categories of faculty are nominal and not rigid: faculty can move between these categories depending on their activity.

Table 1 - Assignment Types

Assignment Category	CEs	Teaching	Research	Service
Teaching-Oriented Faculty				
Teaching	8	90%	-	10%
Teaching and Research	7	79%	11%	10%
Teaching and Service	7	79%	-	21%
Teaching and Enhanced Research	6	67%	23%	10%
Teaching and Enhanced Service	6	67%	-	33%
Research-Oriented Faculty				
Enhanced Teaching	5	56%	34%	10%
Enhanced Service	4	45%	34%	21%
Research Active	3	34%	56%	10%
New Tenure-Track Hire, first two years	2	23%	67%	10%

Part III: Changing the Teaching Assignment

Situations that justify a decrease in teaching or service load include:

- In accordance with the university differential assignment policy, a half course release for graduating one PhD student, as major advisor. Co-advisors are eligible for half of this benefit.
- Other situations as deemed relevant by the Director, in consultation with the faculty member.

Regardless of any situation, the service load shall not be decreased below the minimum of 10%. Situations that justify an increase in teaching or service load include:

- Consistently failing to engage in normal research activities for 3 or more years in a row, as reflected by the average rating of less than “Satisfactory”, weighted by assignment percentage, and reflective of approved leaves, in the Research section of the annual evaluation.
- Other comparable situations in the reasonably and fairly exercised discretion of the Director
- Research-oriented faculty may also voluntarily request a temporary increase of 1 course for 1 term “in load” (i.e., in the Fall or Spring term) in exchange for 1 term of GA support.

Part IV: Teaching Assignment Guidelines

As the number of students in SCIS majors increases, the pressure for larger class sizes will increase. Furthermore, in the past, a faculty member's assignment may have already been set for a semester without knowing the ultimate potential enrollment. Therefore, this policy outlines mechanisms that allow faculty members to assess the potential amount of work entailed by a particular assignment, as well as accumulate fractional course equivalents (CEs, shown in Table 4) that represent extra effort for teaching courses larger than normal enrollment without appropriate support.

First, a faculty member's **teaching assignment** shall comprise both the assigned courses and the ultimate enrollment cap. This allows faculty members to decide up front whether they will be able to shoulder potential extra work beyond their standard assignment of CEs. This is consistent with the principle that faculty cannot be forced to take on assignments in excess of a normal assignment.

Second, accumulated CEs that exceed a faculty member's standard assignment (as laid out in Table 1) must be compensated within two (2) calendar years (i.e., if a faculty member accumulates extra CEs in the Spring of 2021, the faculty member must be compensated by the end of the Spring of 2023), unless the faculty member elects to carry a portion or all of the accumulated CEs into future years. If programmatic needs preclude a faculty member from receiving a reduced teaching load, the teaching activity must be compensated in the form of an overload allocation with the faculty member's consent. Fractional teaching activity will be compensated as a corresponding fraction of overload allocation.

Total course equivalents will be computed as follows. As shown in Table 2, each 3-credit course with an enrollment less than or equal to the normal size (cutoffs are listed in Table 4) will have a base course equivalent of 1. The value of courses other than 3 credits will be increased or decreased using the multipliers in Table 3. For each student above that normal-sized cutoff *without appropriate support*, the faculty member will accumulate the course equivalents listed in Table 4, again increased or decreased by the multipliers in Table 3. The enrollment of the course used in this calculation will be the enrollment as recorded when the add/drop period ends.

Other activities that accumulate course equivalents are listed in Table 2.

Appropriate Course Support

It is difficult to exactly quantify appropriate course support across the whole curriculum, and even courses within a specific category (support-intensive, degree, service) may have different support needs. Graders and TAs also have different capabilities and expertise that make them more or less appropriate for a specific course. Therefore, whether or not "appropriate course support" has been provided is, to some degree, a discussion between an individual faculty member and the Director. However, nominal guidelines are established as follows.

For all courses (both undergraduate and graduate), appropriate course support will be equivalent to 1 TA per Y students above the cutoff X, rounded up, or 1 grader per each Y/2 students above the cutoff, rounded up to the next half or whole. Typically, 1 TA will be considered equivalent to 2 graders. In other words, if a normal course size is less than

or equal to X students, appropriate support will be roughly 1 TA per 0 to Y students above X, or 1 grader per 0 to Y/2 students above X. The values of X and Y for each course type is given in Table 4, and examples of these calculations are given in Table 5. Note that while TAs or graders are not needed to offset the accumulation of additional course equivalents for normal-sized degree and service courses, they are not precluded. Indeed, the faculty notes that additional support will both increase faculty well-being and productivity as well as likely improve student outcomes and should be provided as budgets allow.

The faculty also notes that for course enrollments above roughly 150% of normal it is more cost-effective to hire graders or assign TAs than to pay faculty overloads.

Table 2 – Teaching Activity Course Equivalents

Activity	**Course Equivalent (CE)**
Normal sized course	1
Course coordinator (per class above 2)	0.5
New course developed outside area of expertise by teaching faculty	0.2
Major curriculum development	0.2
Supervise academic support group for student success	0.2
Graduate 1 PhD student	0.5*

*Co-Chairs would be eligible for half of this benefit. Students on DYF's who graduate late will not be counted, as the College and School are penalized for these students.

Table 3 – CE Credit Multipliers

	1 credit or Lab	2 credits	3 credits	4 credits
Multiplier	1/3	2/3	1	4/3

Table 4 – Course Definitions by Type and Level

Type	Level	Normal Size Cutoff (X)	Additional CE per student above cutoff (1/Y)
Intensive	Undergrad	≤ 25	1/25
Degree	Undergrad	≤ 40	1/75
Service	Undergrad	≤ 75	1/150
Degree	Graduate	≤ 25	1/50
Service	Graduate	≤ 75	1/150

Table 5 – Example Course Equivalent (CE) Calculations

Assignment	Accumulated Fractional Overload	Total CE
One section of CDA 3103 (Undergrad Degree, 3 credits) with 40 students. The faculty member is assigned no teaching support.	None, normal sized class	1 CE
One section of CDA 3103 (Undergrad Degree, 3credits) with 41 students. The faculty member is assigned no teaching support.	1/75 CE for the extra 1 student	1 1/75 CE
One section of CDA 3103 (Undergrad Degree, 3 credits) with 55 students. The faculty member is assigned 1 grader.	None, appropriate support provided	1 CE
One section of COP 2210 (Undergrad Grading-Intensive, 4 credits) with 25 students with no teaching support	None, normal sized class	1⅓ CE
One section of COP 2210 (Undergrad Grading-Intensive, 4 credits) with 50 students with no teaching support	1⅓ CE = 1 CE for no support for second set of 25 students x 4/3 for 4 credits	2⅔ CE
Three sections of COP 2210 (Undergrad Grading-Intensive, 4 credits) with 25 students each with no teaching support	None, normal sized classes	4 CE
One section of COP 2210 (Undergrad Grading-Intensive, 4 credits) with 70 students with 1 TA (or 2 graders) assigned.	16/15 = 20/25 CE for the last 20 students with no support x 4/3 for 4 credits	2 2/5 CE
One section of COP 2210 (Undergrad Grading-Intensive, 4 credits) with 70 students with 2 TAs (or 4 graders) assigned.	None, appropriate support provided	1⅓ CE
One section of CGS 2518 (Undergrad Service) with 225 students and no teaching support.	1 CE for the last 150 students	2 CE

Appendix A: Teaching Loads and Buyout Policies at Top-50 R1 CS Departments

Purpose

As described elsewhere, FIU has requested all departments to define a "differential assignment policy" capturing in writing departmental expectations about equitable assignments. In the course of formulating this policy changes it has been suggested that the current FIU SCIS teaching load and buyout policies are not in accordance with national standards. Therefore, we endeavored to collect data from computer science departments across the nation to understand the common practice in computer science at research universities.

Method

FIU's stated goal is to be a "Top 50" university, potentially measured along different metrics such as overall university ranking or individual department rankings. Accordingly, we assembled a list of universities in the United States that were either (a) ranked a "Top 50" university overall, (b) had a "Top 50" ranked computer science department, or (c) were a research university in Florida. One university that did not have a computer science department was eliminated (Caltech). This resulted in a list of 99 universities, listed in Table A1. We identified either a faculty member we personally knew or the department lead (chair, head, director, etc.) and emailed them the following questions (verbatim text of the questions, omitting greeting text):

(1) What is the default teaching load for a research active faculty in your department? For example: 3 courses per year if you are bringing in research funding and supervised PhD students.
(2) Are you allowed to buyout of course commitments (and how much does it cost)? and,
(3) If you are allowed to buyout, is there any dependency between summer support and course buyouts, e.g., are you required to fully fund your summer before taking course buyouts (or perhaps vice versa?)

After a follow-up query to non-responsive persons, we received a total of 77 responses (~77% response rate).

Table A1 lists the universities queried, and those that responded. All universities that responded are classified by the Carnegie Institution as "Research University / Very High Research Activity (RU/VH)," except for 4, noted below. The five universities in Florida are underlined; of those, four are classified "Research University / High Research Activity."

Table A1 – Universities queried for this report

Universities Responding to the Query (R1 except as noted)

1. Arizona State University
2. Auburn University
3. Boston University
4. Carnegie Mellon University
5. Clemson University
6. Colorado School Mines (class **SOET**)
7. Colorado State University
8. Columbia University
9. Duke University
10. Florida Atlantic University (class **RU/H**)
11. Florida State University
12. Georgia Institute of Technology
13. Georgia State University
14. Harvard University
15. Iowa state University
16. Johns Hopkins University
17. Louisiana State University
18. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
19. Michigan State University
20. North Carolina State University
21. Northwestern University
22. Ohio State University
23. Oklahoma State University
24. Oregon State University
25. Princeton University
26. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
27. Rice University
28. Rutgers - State University of New Jersey - New Brunswick
29. Stanford University
30. State University of New York - Binghamton
31. State University of New York - Buffalo (class **MCU1**)
32. State University of New York - Stony Brook
33. Texas A&M University
34. Texas Tech
35. University of Alabama - Birmingham
36. University of Arizona
37. University of Arkansas - Little Rock (class **RU/H**)
38. University of California - Berkeley
39. University of California - Davis
40. University of California – Riverside
41. University of California - San Diego
42. University of California - Santa Barbara
43. University of California - Santa Cruz
44. University of Central Florida
45. University of Colorado - Boulder
46. University of Connecticut
47. University of Delaware
48. University of Georgia
49. University of Florida
50. University of Houston
51. University of Illinois - Chicago
52. University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign
53. University of Iowa
54. University of Kentucky
55. University of Maryland - College Park
56. University of Massachusetts - Amherst
57. University of Michigan
58. University of Minnesota - Twin Cities
59. University of Missouri
60. University of Nebraska
61. University of New Mexico
62. University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
63. University of Notre Dame
64. University of Pennsylvania
65. University of Pittsburgh
66. University of Rochester
67. University of South Carolina
68. University of South Florida
69. University of Southern California
70. University of Tennessee - Knoxville
71. University of Utah
72. University of Washington
73. University of West Virginia
74. University of Wisconsin - Madison
75. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
76. Washington State University
77. Washington University - St. Louis

Universities Queried but not Responding

1. Brown University
2. Cornell University
3. Dartmouth College
4. George Mason University
5. Indiana University
6. New York University
7. Penn State University
8. Purdue University
9. State University of New York - Albany
10. Temple University
11. University of California – Irvine
12. University of California - Los Angeles
13. University of Chicago
14. University of Kansas
15. University of Mississippi
16. University of Oklahoma
17. University of Oregon
18. University of Texas - Austin
19. University of Texas - Austin
20. University of Texas - Dallas
21. University of Vermont
22. University of Virginia
23. Yale University

Analysis

As asked in the first question, respondents provided the default for a "research active" faculty. Definitions of what constituted a "research active" faculty varied and are discussed below. The average course load was 2.6 courses per year, distributed among the following categories. This included universities on quarter systems. More than half of all respondents have a 3 course/year teaching load, with over a third having 2 courses per year. The average course load across the respondents was 2.6 courses per year for "research active" faculty. Table A2 shows the breakdown.

Table A2 – Counts of default course loads for "research active" faculty

Category	# Dept.	%
2 courses / year	28	37%
2.5 courses on average (e.g., 3 courses one year, 2 courses the next)	6	8%
3 courses / year (a "2+1" load)	39	51%
4 courses / year (2 courses per term)	3*	4%
Average Course Load	2.6	

*Two of three departments reporting 4 courses per year were RU/H ranked universities.

Definition of "Research Active"

The label of "research active" was variously defined. Most departments did not specify a definition in their response (although none was specifically asked for). Others volunteered the following definitions, where research activity was defined as:

- Maintaining an average dollar-amount research expenditure of averaged over a certain number of years. The three specific cutoffs mentioned were: $50k/year over 3 years (WV), $80k/year (UF), $75k/year (Iowa), and $200k/year over three years (SUNY SB).
- Supervising a certain number of PhD students (e.g., 1-2 GAs at UF)
- Achieving certain numbers of publications, e.g., 9 journal articles over 3 years, or 6 major conference papers over 3 years.

Automatic Scaling of Teaching Load with Research Activity

24 respondents reported that teaching loads scaled automatically with research activity, with teaching loads increasing with less research activity (up to 3, 4, or even 5 classes a year). A much smaller number reported that significant research activity further reduced teaching load (down to 2 or even 1 class per year). No university explicitly reported an automatic research activity reduction to 0, though only a handful of respondents reported that this was explicitly disallowed.

Course Buyout Policy Analysis

68 respondents reported their department allowed buyouts. Only 3 departments (CMU, UMich, and GATech, all in the top 10) reported that buyouts were expected of faculty to help balance the departmental budget. All 3 of these universities had a default teaching load of 2 classes per year for research active faculty. CMU has departmental funds available to cover the salary of faculty who were unable to buy out.

Buyout Cost

Where buyouts were allowed, their cost varied widely. The most common number reported was 12.5% of the academic year faculty. Several departments reported buyouts were as inexpensive as the cost of a replacement instructor, while other departments (often those with already low teaching loads) made buyouts significantly expensive or dramatically increased the cost of second buyouts, to discourage their use.

Relationship Between Course Buyouts and Summer Support

No respondent reported a relationship between the funding of the summer and course buyouts. That is, faculty were not required to buyout first before funding their summer, or vice versa. Comments received on this point included:

- “Faculty do what is best for their research group.”
- “It would be about what is best for a specific faculty member.”
- “I usually advise faculty to fund their summer first.”
- “The academic year salary is something that directly benefits the college/university because they would be paying it if you did not buy out; the summer support goes directly to the faculty member and so is significantly less of a benefit to the university.”
- “I like the idea of compelling summer coverage before buyout.”
- “The expectation is that the faculty cover summer salary first and then buyout.”

Conclusion

The standard of the field can be described, roughly as:

- Default course load is between 2 and 3 courses per year for “research active” faculty
- “Research active” is defined, where it is defined precisely, by either level of research expenditure, PhD student support, or publication activity.
- It is common for teaching loads to increase for non-“research active” faculty; conversely, it is common for teaching loads to decrease with increasing research activity without the need for buyouts.
- Buyouts are generally allowed, but there is no dependence between buyouts and summer support.
- In this sample, higher teaching loads of 4 classes per year are associated with universities outside the “RU/VH” category