

**University of Connecticut  
School of Nursing  
Workload and Performance Review Policy  
December 23, 2022**

**I. Introduction**

The performance review procedure within the School of Nursing (SON) does not replace or inform the established re-appointment and promotion processes under the University and School by-laws. The procedure is intended only to provide School and University administration an opportunity to identify faculty members whose performance egregiously fails to meet minimum expectations of in all three realms of teaching effectiveness, scholarly productivity, and academic professionalism (administration, service, and clinical/professional practice).

Under the University by-laws, “*it is the duty*” of the Dean “*to conduct a continuing appraisal of the work and potentialities*” of faculty members in the SON. When deficiencies in faculty performance are identified, they should be raised immediately with the specific faculty member and a plan should be formulated to resolve the issue as soon as possible. Only when faculty members fail to implement such plans should the possibility of a formal remediation process under this policy or, subsequently, a designation of “unsatisfactory” performance be considered.

In conformance with this perspective, the annual meeting for performance review between a faculty member and the Dean, as required by the current collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the University and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), should not be a setting in which faculty members either (1) need to prove that their performance is “satisfactory” or (2) are surprised to be informed that it is the Dean’s intention to refer the individual for “review/remediation” or to designate them as “unsatisfactory.” Instead, a faculty member’s performance should be assumed as “satisfactory” unless the Dean has gathered unambiguous evidence that the individual either (1) has both failed egregiously as a teacher, scholar, and academic professional and has not made reasonable attempts to redress such issues when asked or (2) has not cooperated with remediation process under this policy. In formulating responses to specific performance issues, the Dean can seek guidance from the SON Workload and Performance Review Committee (WPRC, a standing committee under SON by-laws to be established in conjunction with this policy). Additionally, as explained, below, the Dean’s decision to “request a review” for a faculty member or to designate a faculty member’s performance as “unsatisfactory” must involve “advice” from the WPRC.

The CBA performance review procedure is based on the Dean’s annual assignment of faculty member duties under the “workload” component of this policy. The CBA stipulates that the workload component consist of faculty-developed guidelines that facilitate functioning of educational programs, promote faculty career advancement, and result in equitable distribution of work and responsibilities within the SON. This document will present components of the annual performance review procedure, first, and then provide details of the workload guidelines.

**II. Annual Performance Review and Duties Assignment Procedure**

This is the procedure that will be followed to conduct review of faculty performance within the SON at the close of each academic year and to assign faculty duties for the next year:

- Between January 1<sup>st</sup> and January 15<sup>th</sup>, each faculty member completes the “anticipated annual percentage effort” section (for the next academic year) of the Workload/Performance Review Form and submits it to the Dean’s Office. (This form is included in Appendix A and, in what follows, is referred to simply as “the form”. A different but comparable timeline can be followed for CEIN faculty. Allocation of anticipated effort needs to be consistent with the workload guidelines presented later in this policy.)
- On or before February 15<sup>th</sup>, the Dean’s Office notifies each faculty member of his/her/their teaching assignments for the next academic year by completing the “teaching assignment” section of the form and returning it to the faculty member. (The Dean’s Office *shall* make every effort to develop teaching assignments consistent with each faculty member’s anticipated division of effort as stated on the form.)
- Between February 15<sup>th</sup> and March 31<sup>st</sup>, faculty members can meet with the Dean or designated Associate Deans to discuss their teaching assignments and to propose changes.
- On or before April 1<sup>st</sup>, each faculty member posts an updated, current version of his/her/their curriculum vitae (CV) on the SON Q: drive, OneDrive, or comparable location established by the Dean.
- Between April 1<sup>st</sup> and June 21<sup>st</sup>, faculty members are scheduled (by Dean’s Office staff) for a 30-minute, individual meeting with the Dean to discuss (1) performance during the current academic year and (2) workload assignments for the next academic year.
- In preparation for the meeting with the Dean:
  - faculty members have NO obligation to prepare or to bring any documentation related to performance of their duties during the current academic year; their CVs should already be available to the Dean via a shared computer drive.
  - faculty members do complete the “other” teaching, scholarship/research, and academic professionalism (service, clinical/professional practice, and administration) sections of the form that summarize proposed activities for the next academic year and bring the form to the meeting.
- During the meeting:
  - the Dean provides “*formative feedback*” regarding the faculty member’s performance during the current academic year and reaches one of three conclusions: (1) deems performance to “satisfactory”, (2) “requests review” of the faculty member’s performance by the WPRC and potential development of a remediation plan to improve performance in the next academic year, or (3) deems a faculty member’s completion of a remediation plan during the current academic year, if implemented, to have been “unsatisfactory”. (Remediation periods will be at least one academic year in length. “Requests review” and “Unsatisfactory” designations must be based on documented, unambiguous evidence that a faculty member has egregiously neglected assigned duties in all of the teaching, scholarship/research, and academic professionalism domains in one year for “Requests review” and in two consecutive years for “Unsatisfactory”.)
  - the Dean and faculty member discuss the “anticipated annual percentage effort” levels of assigned duties in the standard domains for the next academic year. (As stated above, the division of assigned duties must be consistent with the workload guidelines of this policy.)
  - the Dean and faculty member either (1) reach agreement on the assigned duties and sign the form or (2) fail to reach agreement and do not sign the form.
- A request for review of current year performance, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation following remediation, or a failure to agree on assigned duties for the next year must be documented in writing and are all subject to review by the WPRC. The WPRC advises the Dean on these matters. Under the CBA, any of these circumstances can be the basis for formal grievances to be filed with AAUP, potentially with support of the WPRC. Additionally, AAUP representation can be requested at any meetings related to these circumstances.

### **III. Additional Aspects of Performance Review and Workload Assignment**

#### **A. Workload/Performance Review Committee**

SON By-Laws shall be amended to create an elected, standing Workload/Performance Review Committee (WPRC). Details of committee membership and operations will be specified within the by-laws amendment.

#### **B. Timelines for CEIN Program Faculty**

For faculty who teach in the CEIN program, the performance review/workload assignment meetings can be scheduled between November 1<sup>st</sup> and December 15<sup>th</sup> of each calendar year. If so, the Dean's review of faculty performance will address the current calendar year; the assignment of duties will pertain to the next calendar year. If a faculty member teaches in the CEIN program and within any other SON academic program, scheduling of the annual meeting will occur either in the April 1<sup>st</sup> to June 21<sup>st</sup> time frame or in the November 1<sup>st</sup> to December 15<sup>th</sup> period, depending solely on the faculty member's preference.

#### **C. Reduction in Assigned Scholarship Effort**

The workload guidelines provide for a reduction in faculty time assigned to scholarship/research when a faculty member's productivity is lower than expected. Such a reduction does not, in and of itself, constitute the basis for a "review recommendation" or an "unsatisfactory" performance designation. If the Dean suspects, at any point in an academic year, that a faculty member's productivity in scholarship/research is insufficient relative to the annual percentage effort allocated to that individual, a request should be made for the WPRC to review his/her/their accomplishments and, if warranted, to recommend steps for improvement and/or a future reduction in allocated effort. Guidelines for reductions in annual effort devoted to scholarship/research are included, below, in the workload section of this policy.

Consistent with academic freedom, a faculty member shall alone determine the focus of his/her/their scholarship/research, provided they are conducting scholarship/research within the general realm of their expertise. Furthermore, the school shall not judge the merits of scholarship/research efforts based solely on grant funding. Faculty are not required to secure grant funding if they are able to pursue their scholarship/research without it.

#### **D. Lack of Agreement on Assigned Duties**

Unresolved disagreements between a faculty member and the Dean or Associate Deans regarding proposed teaching assignments or the percent effort value can be "appealed" in writing to the WPRC for review and advice. When an appeal is filed, the WPRC will meet within 10 business days of receipt, will request a response from the Dean or Associate Deans, will assess consistency of the proposed teaching duties with the SON workload policy, and will make a recommendation for resolution of the disagreement. Proposed teaching assignments that deviate from the workload policy are grievable through AAUP if a faculty member and the Dean cannot reach agreement following the WPRC recommendation.

#### **E. Criteria for "Request WPRC Review" Performance Designation**

Within the annual performance review, the Dean can request that the WPRC review a faculty member's fulfillment of assigned duties for the current academic year. Such review should only be requested when the Dean has gathered and documented unambiguous evidence that a faculty

member has not completed assigned duties in all three realms of teaching, scholarship/research, and academic professionalism (service, clinical/professional practice, and administration) within the current academic year and has not responded to counseling provided at the time such shortcomings were identified.

#### F. WPRC Review following a Dean's Request

When an annual meeting results in the Dean requesting review of a faculty member's performance, the Dean shall notify the WPRC of the decision and provide written explanation and evidence of the basis for the request. Those documents must be submitted to the WPRC within 5 business days of the annual meeting. The WPRC will provide copies of these documents to the faculty member within 3 business days of receipt and will request that the faculty member provide a written response within an additional 5 business day period. Upon receipt of the faculty member's response, the WPRC will schedule a committee meeting within 10 business days. The Dean and faculty member will be invited to attend that committee meeting but are not required to participate. The faculty member can be accompanied at the meeting by a representative from AAUP.

During the committee meeting, WPRC members will review the submitted documents and will meet separately with the Dean and, then, with the faculty member (if they choose to attend). In their meetings with the committee, WPRC members can pose questions to the Dean or faculty member, the Dean and faculty member can make statements to support their views regarding potential non-fulfillment of assigned duties, and the faculty member can pose questions to be addressed by the Dean. Following the initial round of interaction with the Dean or faculty member, the WPRC can choose to have the Dean or faculty member rejoin the meeting to pose additional questions or to request clarification. Before the close of the meeting, the WPRC members will discuss, among themselves, all information provided by the Dean and the faculty member and will reach one of two recommendations: Concur with the Dean's Decision or Dissent from the Dean's Decision. The Dean and the faculty member will be notified of the committee's recommendation within 1 business day of the meeting. When the recommendation is "concur," the WPRC will work with the faculty member to develop a remediation plan for the next academic year, following the guidelines presented below. When the recommendation is "dissent," the Dean can change the faculty member's performance review to "satisfactory" or can request that the WPRC work with the faculty member on a remediation plan. If the Dean chooses to proceed with implementation of a remediation plan despite the committee's dissent, the faculty member can file a grievance with AAUP.

#### G. Remediation Plan Development and Monitoring

When recommended by the WPRC via concurrence with the Dean or when imposed by the Dean despite dissent by the WPRC, the committee will work with the Dean and a faculty member to develop a remediation plan that, if fulfilled, will result in a "satisfactory" performance review at the end of the next academic year. All remediation plans will be at least 1 academic year in length.

Development of remediation plans will occur within a 30-day period following WPRC concurrence with the Dean's request or following imposition of remediation by the Dean following WPRC dissent. Components of the final remediation plan shall be stated in writing.

The plan shall explicitly list criteria that will form the basis for a satisfactory performance review at the end of the next academic year. It will be approved by a majority vote of the committee. Once approved by the committee, it cannot be rejected by the Dean. The document that summarizes remediation plan components will be signed by the faculty member, the Dean, and the WPRC chair. A faculty member can choose not to sign the plan, but will be expected to follow the plan unless a successful grievance is filed with AAUP.

When a remediation plan is implemented in the next academic year, the Dean and the faculty member shall each document fulfillment of the plan within 10 business days of the following time points: Fall mid-semester (end of 7<sup>th</sup> week), end of Fall semester, end of Winter session (if applicable), Spring mid-semester (end of 7<sup>th</sup> week), end of Spring semester, and end of Summer session (if applicable). This documentation will be submitted to the WPRC chair who shall organize a committee meeting to review it. The committee meeting will be scheduled within 10 business days of receipt of the documentation from the Dean and faculty member. The committee can request additional information, if warranted, and will, within 5 business days of meeting, inform the Dean and the faculty member regarding progress in satisfying the remediation plan.

#### H. WPRC Review following an “Unsatisfactory” Designation

When a faculty member has been under a remediation plan within the current academic year and the Dean chooses to deem that individual’s performance to be “unsatisfactory” at the end of the current academic year, a review of the Dean’s decision will be conducted by the WPRC. In preparation for the review, the Dean shall notify the WPRC of the decision and provide written explanation and evidence of the basis for the designation. Those documents must be submitted to the WPRC within 5 business days of the annual meeting. The WPRC will provide copies of these documents to the faculty member within 3 business days of receipt and will request that the faculty member provide a written response within an additional 5 business day period. Upon receipt of the faculty member’s response, the WPRC will schedule a committee meeting within 10 business days. The Dean and faculty member will be invited to attend that committee meeting but are not required to participate. The faculty member can be accompanied at the meeting by a representative from AAUP.

During the committee meeting, WPRC members will review the submitted documents and will meet separately with the Dean and, then, with the faculty member (if they choose to attend). In their meetings with the committee, WPRC members can pose questions to the Dean or faculty member, the Dean and faculty member can make statements to support their views regarding potential non-fulfillment of assigned duties (particularly, components of the remediation plan that was in effect for the current year), and the faculty member can pose questions to be addressed by the Dean. Following the initial round of interaction with the Dean or faculty member, the WPRC can choose to have the Dean or faculty member rejoin the meeting to pose additional questions or to request clarification. Before the close of the meeting, the WPRC members will discuss, among themselves, all information provided by the Dean and the faculty member and will reach one of two recommendations: Concur with the Dean’s Decision or Dissent from the Dean’s Decision. The Dean and the faculty member will be notified of the committee’s recommendation within 1 business day of the meeting. If the Dean chooses to

maintain the “unsatisfactory” designation despite the committee’s dissent, the faculty member can file a grievance with AAUP and cite the WPRC’s support for a different designation.

#### I. Letters of Appointment

The workload policy provides guidance regarding appropriate allocation, on an annual basis, of faculty responsibilities. When there are differences between a faculty member’s letter of appointment and the workload policy, the letter of appointment takes priority. If a faculty member’s letter of appointment does not explicitly state a division of effort, the SON workload policy provides the basis for allocation.

In general, letters of appointment for clinical/in-residence faculty members with multi-year contracts should stand for the entire multi-year period. Similarly, letters of appointment for tenure-track faculty members should stand for the entire probationary period –i.e. seven years. If the Dean or a faculty member proposes changes to the letter of appointment of a clinical/in-residence faculty member with a multi-year contract prior to the time of contract expiration, of a tenure-track faculty member during the probationary period, or of a tenured faculty member at any time, the negotiation procedure will be as follows:

The Dean and the faculty member will hold a minimum of two meetings –an initial meeting in which the Dean or faculty member outlines proposed changes and a later meeting where both individuals reach agreement and sign a memorandum of agreement (MOA) that specifies revisions to the appointment letter. If the Dean and the faculty member cannot reach agreement on the details of revisions, then summaries of viewpoints, preferences, and objections (with supporting rationales) shall be provided to the WPRC by both the Dean and the faculty member. The committee will then meet with the Dean and the faculty member, separately, to discuss areas of disagreement and suggest potential resolutions and/or compromises. If the Dean and faculty member still cannot agree on provisions of the revisions, the faculty member can file a grievance with AAUP and request arbitration. The existing letter of appointment will remain in effect until the arbitration process is complete. Until arbitration has occurred, faculty members have no obligation to sign a MOA that they deem to be unacceptable.

#### J. Development of Annual Teaching Schedules

In formulating annual teaching assignments in the SON, the Dean and Associate Deans should follow existing guidelines in the University by-laws, specifically:

*Assignment of duties will be made by the appropriate deans and department heads consistent with University policy. Insofar as it is possible, these assignments should take into account the aptitudes and wishes of individual staff members and their opportunities for long-run professional development. . . . (T)he teaching duties of each department shall generally be regarded as a joint responsibility of all its members to be divided as far as possible by mutual agreement, with proper attention to the interests and activities of all. It shall be the responsibility of the department head to make decisions when agreement is lacking and to submit the complete schedule of teaching engagements to the appropriate dean.*

#### K. Flexibility in Notification of Teaching Assignments

Whenever possible, in instances in which the Dean or Associate Deans are unsure of enrollment expectations for the next academic year and the need to offer certain courses or multiple sections

of those courses, notification of faculty members regarding anticipated teaching assignments should acknowledge the possibility of modification. In some instances, such circumstances will be impossible to predict in advance. If the Dean or Associate Deans unexpectedly inform a faculty member of changes to teaching assignments that were announced on February 15<sup>th</sup>, the faculty member can request a review of the modifications by the WPRC in order to ensure that the changes conform with the workload guidelines and that they equitably disperse any burdens associated with those changes among pertinent faculty members.

#### L. Disclosure of Assigned Duties

On August 1<sup>st</sup> of each calendar year, the Dean shall post the assigned levels of effort in each domain (teaching, scholarship/research, service, clinical/professional practice, and administration) for the upcoming academic year for every faculty member in a location (Q: drive, OneDrive, or other shared drive) that can be accessed by all SON faculty members. The objective of such disclosure is to provide faculty members an opportunity to compare their assigned duties to those with the same rank on the same track and to assess the equity of workload assignments.

#### M. Performance Review Policy Implementation Date

Following approval by the full faculty of the SON, an initial, complete version of this policy will be submitted to the Dean and the AAUP by January 1, 2023. The policy will take effect on January 1, 2023. However, the SON faculty, as a whole, may amend provisions of the policy at regularly scheduled full faculty meetings between January 1, 2023 and March 31, 2023. The Dean and Associate Deans will follow the policy's expectations related to notification and revisions of teaching assignments for the 2023-24 academic year –i.e. written notification of proposed teaching assignments will be delivered to faculty members by February 15, 2023 and faculty members will have an opportunity to request changes to the proposed teaching assignments between February 15, 2023, and April 1, 2023. Initial annual meetings between the Dean and SON faculty members (except those who teach in the CEIN program) will occur between April 1, 2023 and June 21, 2023. During those meetings, only workload assignments for the 2023-24 academic year will be considered. There will be no performance review related to the 2022-23 academic year.

### **IV. Workload Guidelines**

The following tables provide standard faculty workloads in each domain of faculty effort for each combination of track and rank. Workloads are expressed in terms of “annual percent effort” (APE). Minimum and maximum APE values specify levels of effort that should apply to all faculty members in order to promote equity in sharing burdens associated with routine School operations. “Allocable effort” represents a component of faculty time that can be flexibly assigned to the different domains of faculty activity. As explained below, all faculty members are provided a minimum of 10% APE for “administration”. Additionally, all faculty members are provided a minimum of 2.5% APE for “scholarship/research”.

**Tenure-Track Assistant Professor (Years 1-3, assuming limited funding of salary from grants)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	0	38
Scholarship/Research	40	87.5
Administration	10	10
Service	2.5	5
Clinical/Professional	0	0
Allocable Effort	N/A	47.5

**Tenure-Track Assistant Professor (Years 4-7, assuming limited funding of salary from grants)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	38	45
Scholarship/Research	40	47
Administration	10	10
Service	5	5
Clinical/Professional	0	7
Allocable Effort	N/A	7

**Tenure-Track Associate Professor (assuming typical scholarship/research productivity)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	28.5	45
Scholarship/Research	40	47
Administration	10	26.5
Service	5	21.5
Clinical/Professional	0	16.5
Allocable Effort	N/A	16.5

**Tenure-Track Professor (assuming typical scholarship/research productivity)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	19	45
Scholarship/Research	40	N/A
Administration	10	36
Service	5	31
Clinical/Professional	0	26
Allocable Effort	N/A	26

**Clinical/In-Residence Instructor (assuming limited clinical/professional duties)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	76	82.5
Scholarship/Research/Continuing Education	5	11.5
Administration	10	16.5
Service	2.5	9
Clinical/Professional	0	13.5
Allocable Effort	N/A	6.5



**Clinical/In-Residence Assistant Professor (assuming typical scholarship/research productivity and limited clinical/professional duties)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	66.5	75
Scholarship/Research/Continuing Educations	10	18.5
Administration	10	18.5
Service	5	13.5
Clinical/Professional	0	8.5
Allocable Effort	N/A	8.5

**Clinical/In-Residence Associate Professor (assuming typical scholarship/research productivity and limited clinical/professional duties)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	57	75
Scholarship/Research/Continuing Educations	10	28
Administration	10	28
Service	5	23
Clinical/Professional	0	18
Allocable Effort	N/A	18

**Clinical/In-Residence Professor (assuming typical scholarship/research productivity and limited clinical/professional duties)**

Domain	Minimum APE (%)	Maximum APE (%)
Teaching	47.5	75
Scholarship/Research/Continuing Educations	10	37.5
Administration	10	37.5
Service	5	32.5
Clinical/Professional	0	27.5
Allocable Effort	N/A	27.5

**V. Additional Aspects of Workload Standards and Assignment**

**A. Explanation of Approach to Workload Quantification**

As stated, above, quantification of workload under this policy is based on an annual percent effort (APE) approach. This approach assumes a 40-hour work week but this assumption should not be interpreted as a mandate; it is, simply, a standard to use in annual effort calculations. Additionally, the approach assumes a 36-week work period for faculty with 9-month appointments, a 40-week period for faculty with 10-month appointments, and a 44-week period for faculty with 11-month appointment.

Calculation of percentages for annual effort involve numerators and denominators. Between these components, the denominators are typically constant. Relative to annual appointment periods, the denominators are:

<u>Annual Appointment Period</u>	<u>Percentage Denominator</u>
9 months	1440 hours
10 months	1600 hours
11 months	1760 hours

These denominator values exclude time during the week of Thanksgiving break, during the period between the due date for submission of Fall semester grades and January 1st, and during Spring break.

The percentage of effort allocated to any faculty activity will be determined by estimation and/or documentation (when available) of the “typical” total number of hours required for successful engagement in the activity within a particular academic year –i.e. the “numerator”, divided by the appropriate percentage denominator. In such calculations, the resulting percentages will be rounded up to the nearest 0.1%. For example, 10.21% gets rounded to 10.3% and 10.95% also gets rounded to 10.3% (N.B. The 10.95% value is a typographical error. It should be “10.29%”. The error was included in the policy, as approved, but will be amended in a later update.). Additionally, “typical” total number of hours should reflect the median time required for successful performance and neither a “minimum” nor an outlying “maximum.” The work sheets in Appendix B of this policy incorporate the formulas by which APE in each domain or sub-category of a domain of faculty activities/duties will be calculated. The objective of the work sheets is to achieve uniform quantification of activities and assigned duties. Formulas in the work sheets can only be modified through proposal of motions at a full meeting of SON faculty and by formal votes at such meetings.

If the Dean requests or a faculty member proposes assigned duties or proposed activities that are not clearly addressed by this policy’s work sheets, a request should be made to the WPRC for a determination of appropriate quantification of those duties/activities prior to completion of the Workload/Performance Review Form for an academic year. Similarly, if the Dean requests or a faculty member proposes changes to assigned duties when an academic year is underway, the WPRC should be notified and should review the proposed changes prior to any agreement on revision between the Dean and the faculty member.

## B. Allocation of Effort within Workload Domains

The most important domain of faculty activity is “teaching.” However, current operations within the SON necessitate initial allocation of time for routine, required faculty involvement in administration (because it is unavoidable) and for scholarship/research (because it is commonly encroached upon due to educational and administrative contingencies).

### 1. Administration

Faculty activities related solely to effective procedural operation of SON programs are considered to be “administrative” tasks. They include faculty leadership of programs, tracks, and multi-faculty courses but also consist of curriculum development and evaluation (excluding development of materials for a specific course), preparation of materials for SON accreditation, recruitment and admission of students to SON programs, recruitment of new faculty or hiring of new administrative staff, required attendance at routine meetings for all faculty members (e.g. monthly “full” faculty meetings, BS curriculum meetings, MS curriculum meetings), time spent preparing reappointment/promotion applications, merit applications, and HuskyDM summaries, as well as time involved responding to e-mail inquiries from University and SON administrators. In performance reviews, the administration domain is one component of “academic professionalism.”

Every faculty member in the SON will be allocated a minimum of 10% APE in the administration domain.

For some SON faculty members, APE the administration domain will reflect leadership roles in the School's educational programs. Formulas for determining such APEs are included in the work sheets in Appendix B.

## 2. Scholarship, Research, and Continuing Education

a. General Approach. "Using Boyer's model as a framework, scholarship includes the scholarship of discovery (research), teaching, application, and integration. Scholarship in nursing can be defined as those activities that systematically advance the teaching, research, and practice of nursing through rigorous inquiry that 1) is significant to the profession, 2) is creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed through various methods." (Modified from Edwards, J., Alichnie, C., Easley, C. E., Edwardson, S., Keating, S. B., & Stanley, J. (1999). Defining scholarship for the discipline of nursing. AACN White Paper, as cited in the University of Nebraska School of Nursing Workload Policy.)

In general, every effort should be made to maximize the APE devoted to scholarship/research for tenure-track faculty members. This can be accomplished, in part, by maintaining their percentages for administration and service as close to the minimum levels as possible. For tenure-track faculty members within the first three years of hire, this objective can also be supported by reducing their APE in teaching to minimum levels provided in the tables above. Tenure-track faculty members who do not meet productivity goals in scholarship/research should not be subject to reductions in percentage effort within this area. If such a shortcoming is persistent or extreme, the issue should be dealt with through the annual reappointment process –e.g. the post third-year review, and/or through the promotion process –i.e. at the end of the probationary period.

The minimum APE for scholarship/research is 20% for tenured faculty and 10% for clinical/in-residence faculty members who are full, associate, or assistant professors. However, evidence of satisfactory scholarship/research productivity shall be the basis for higher percentages –typically, 40% for tenured faculty and at least 18.5% for clinical/in-residence faculty who are not instructors. Levels of APE for scholarship/research can be set at values intermediate to the typical and minimum guidelines under circumstances explained below. Levels can be set at values in excess of the typical guidelines in order to accommodate a faculty member with substantial grant funding that covers a higher percentage of his/her/their salary/benefits.

For clinical or in-residence instructors, the typical APE for scholarship/research is 2.5%. Insofar as many instructors lack doctoral credentials, allocated effort within this domain should generally be used for continuing education related to their particular professions.

b. Inadequate Productivity. If the Dean requests the WPRC to review a faculty member's productivity in scholarship/research, the committee will meet with that individual and request documentation of their activities and accomplishments in this domain. If warranted, the faculty member and the committee will develop a plan for a

return to full productivity in the next academic year. Failure to achieve full productivity in a second academic year can, at the Dean's discretion, lead to reduced effort allocated to scholarship/research in the third academic year at a level midway between the typical and minimum levels stated above. Continued failure to meet the reduced productivity levels in a fourth year can, at the Dean's discretion, result in further reduction of scholarship/research effort to the minimum level in a fifth year.

A faculty member with reduced effort for scholarship/research due to lack of productivity in an earlier academic year can, at any time, request a review by the WPRC of current accomplishments. If, after such a review, the WPRC determines that productivity has sufficiently improved, it will communicate to the Dean its recommendation that annual effort for the scholarship/research domain be returned to "typical" levels under the workload policy or, if appropriate, to levels midway between the "typical" and minimum levels.

c. Salary on Grants. If a faculty member receives external grant funding that covers a percentage of his/her/their salary supported by the grant(s), then their annual effort at scholarship/research will be determined using the following guidelines:

- If the percentage for scholarship/research would be at the minimum for the next academic year in the absence of external grant funding, the percentage will, instead, be the minimum percentage plus the percentage covered by the grant(s).
- If the anticipated percentage for scholarship/research would be above the minimum for the next academic year in the absence of external grant funding and the percentage of salary covered by external grants is less than or equal to the difference between the anticipated level and the minimum, the percentage will be left at the anticipated level.
- If the anticipated percentage for scholarship/research would be above the minimum for the next academic year in the absence of external grant funding and the percentage of salary covered by external grants exceeds the difference between the anticipated level and the minimum level, the percentage will, instead, be the anticipated level plus the amount by which the percentage of salary support exceeds the difference between the anticipated level and the minimum level.

### 3. Teaching

All faculty activities directly related to instruction of students or, in some cases, other faculty, fall within the "teaching" category. Most obvious among these is traditional classroom instruction but, increasingly, instruction occurs "online" or in combined "hybrid" formats. Teaching also includes time spent planning, evaluating, and revising instructional activities, creating and grading student assignments, and meeting with students to provide support within their courses. Efforts devoted to general student advising fall into the "teaching" category, as well as advising related to PhD dissertation development/preparation and to DNP profession practice projects. Similarly, faculty time provided to formal independent study, to undergraduate research/innovation, and to honors program advising also constitute teaching.

Accordingly, the teaching domain includes a number of categories related to the “form” of instruction: classroom teaching, on-line teaching, hybrid teaching, simulation teaching, clinical/laboratory teaching, doctoral student advising, independent study/research, course development, and new course assignments. Under this policy, all of these forms of instruction should be formally acknowledged as “duties” on an annual basis and faculty time directed to them should be quantified. Calculation of faculty effort within the categories will be guided by the work sheets in Appendix B. The work sheet formulas account for different burdens associated with the various categories as well as the numbers of students enrolled in official courses or requiring faculty guidance.

#### 4. Service

The service domain covers faculty activities, apart from those directly related to administration, scholarship/research, teaching, or clinical/professional practice that support various constituencies of the SON. This includes faculty support to students (e.g. servicing as class advisor), to the SON (e.g. participating in an open house for prospective students), to the University (e.g. membership on the UConn IRB), to SON alumni, to various geographical communities (local, regional, national, international), to one’s profession, and to one’s community of scholars (e.g. those with related interests). (<https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/08/03/how-use-service-bolster-your-academic-career-opinion>)

5. Clinical/Professional Practice – Clinical (or, more broadly, “professional”) practice includes faculty activities related to the direct exercise of nursing (or other vocational) skills in a setting other than the classroom or beyond typical scholarship/research projects.

*(Appendices are attached, starting on next page.)*

# VI. Appendices

## Appendix A. Workload/Performance Review Form

### Faculty Workload/Performance Review Form UConn School of Nursing

version: 12/2022

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract months: \_\_\_\_\_

**Performance Review at Close of Current Academic Year**

This faculty member's performance is judged:  to be satisfactory.  
 to require committee review (see Workload/Performance Review Policy criteria).<sup>\*</sup>  
 to be unsatisfactory (see Workload/Performance Review Policy criteria).<sup>†</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Workload and Performance Review Committee will review documentation and schedule meetings to advise Dean and to develop a remediation plan, if warranted.  
<sup>†</sup>Option only possible following prescribed remediation period. Requires documentation referral to Workload and Performance Review Committee for advice.

Dean's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Workload Assignment for Next Academic Year**

Anticipated percentages (APEs) for next academic year:<sup>‡</sup>

Teaching % \_\_\_\_\_ Scholarship % \_\_\_\_\_ Service % \_\_\_\_\_ Clinical Practice % \_\_\_\_\_ Administration % \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>‡</sup>Complete this section, and, if applicable, the two sections below by January 15<sup>th</sup>. Percentages should be consistent with SON workload policies.

Percentages stated in appointment letter or subsequent memorandum of understanding (MOU):<sup>#</sup>

Teaching % \_\_\_\_\_ Scholarship % \_\_\_\_\_ Service % \_\_\_\_\_ Clinical Practice % \_\_\_\_\_ Administration % \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>#</sup>Leave blank if unavailable.

If anticipated percentages differ from appointment letter/MOU, state reason for temporary adjustment:

**Specific Duties for Next Academic Year**

**Teaching** (To be completed by the Dean's Office on or before February 15<sup>th</sup> and subject to revision, in consultation with the faculty member, by March 31<sup>st</sup>.)

	Course No.	Credit Hours	Enrollment	% Effort	Comments (if needed)
Fall Semester	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Spring Semester	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Winter/Summer	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

**Other Teaching** –e.g. advising, independent studies, etc. (for next academic year)

**Scholarship/Research/Continuing Education Activities** (for next academic year)

**Service Activities** (for next academic year)

**Clinical/Professional Practice Activities** (for next academic year)

**Administration Activities** (for next academic year)

**Approval of next academic year's workload assignments:**

Faculty Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dean's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B. Workload Estimation Work Sheets

### University of Connecticut, School of Nursing Workload Policy Computation Guide

#### Tally of Annual Percentage Effort (APE) by Domain and Category

Domain	Category	Annual Percent Effort (APE)
<b>Teaching</b>		
	Classroom (Page 2)	+
	On-Line (Page 3)	+
	Hybrid (Page 4)	+
	Simulation (Page 5)	+
	Clinical/Laboratory (Page 6)	+
	Other Teaching - Doctoral Advising (Page 7)	+
	Other Teaching - Independent Study, etc. (Page 8)	+
	New Course Adjustments (Page 9)	+
	<b>Teaching Total† =</b>	
<b>Administration†</b>	All (Pages 10-11)	+
<b>Service†</b>	All (Pages 12-13)	+
<b>Clinical/Professional Practice†</b>	All (Page 14)	+
	Sum*	=
	Remainder (a) <span style="float: right;">100% - Sum</span>	=
	Scholarship Minimum for Faculty Track/Rank (b)	
	<b>Allocated Scholarship</b> (Greater of Remainder (a) and Minimum (b))	

†Must be consistent with domain minimum and maximum limits in workload policy

\*Sum of Teaching category totals and Administration, Service, and Clinical/Professional Practice domain totals must be adjusted to accommodate minimum scholarship allocation for faculty track and rank.

**Classroom Teaching**

List courses individually	<u>Anticipated</u> Number of Students	A. Number of Credits*  *Add 0.5 credits to the "official" number of credits associated with any GEOC approved "W" course.	x	B. Adjustment Factor for Preparation and Class Size (2.67)  Increase by 0.33 for every additional 10 <u>anticipated</u> students over 30	x	C. Allotted Number of Weeks  Typically 17 weeks for a 1 semester course. Can also be used for Winter and Summer Session courses.	=	D. Product of Columns A, B, & C	÷	E. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months 1600 for 10 months 1760 for 11 months	=	F. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <u>Round-up</u> to 1 decimal place
Example NURS 5020	25	3	x	2.67	x	17	=	136.17	÷	1440	=	0.0946	x 100	=	9.5%
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Classroom Teaching Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column G, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_



**On-Line Teaching**

List courses individually	<u>Anticipated</u> Number of Students	A. Number of Credits*  *Add 0.5 credits to the "official" number of credits associated with any GEOC approved "W" course.	x	B. Adjustment Factor for Preparation and Class Size (2.67)  Increase by 0.33 for every additional <u>anticipated</u> 5 students over 15	x	C. Allotted Number of Weeks Typically 17 weeks for a 1 semester course  Can also be used for Winter and Summer Session courses.	=	D. Product of Columns A, B, & C	÷	E. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months 1600 for 10 months 1760 for 11 months)	=	F. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <u>Round-up</u> to 1 decimal place
Example NURS 5020	20	3	x	3.0	x	17	=	153	÷	1440	=	0.1063	x 100	=	10.7%
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

On-Line Teaching Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column G, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**Hybrid Teaching**

List courses individually	<u>Anticipated</u> Number of Students	A. Number of Credits*  *Add 0.5 credits to the "official" number of credits associated with any GEOC approved "W" course.	x	B. Adjustment Factor for Preparation and Class Size (2.67)  Increase by 0.33 for every additional 7 <u>anticipated</u> students over 22	x	C. Allotted Number of Weeks Typically 17 weeks for a 1 semester course  Can also be used for Winter and Summer Session courses.	=	D. Product of Columns A, B, & C	÷	E. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months 1600 for 10 months 1760 for 11 months	=	F. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <u>Round-up</u> to 1 decimal place
Example NURS 5020	36	3	x	3.33	x	17	=	169.83	÷	1440	=	0.1179	x 100	=	11.8%
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Hybrid Teaching Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column G, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**Simulation Teaching**

Course Number	A. Number of contact hours per week	x	B. Adjustment Factor for Preparation (1.5)	x	C. Allotted Number of Weeks	=	D. Product of Columns A, B, & C	÷	E. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	F. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example NURS 3334	8	x	1.5	x	12	=	144	÷	1600	=	0.0900	x 100	=	9.0%
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Simulation Teaching Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column G, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**Clinical/Laboratory Teaching**

Course Number	A. Number of contact hours per week	x	B. Adjustment Factor for Preparation (1.125)	x	C. Allotted Number of Weeks	=	D. Product of Columns A, B, & C	÷	E. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	F. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example NURS 3334	8	x	1.125	x	12	=	108	÷	1440	=	0.0750	x 100	=	7.5%
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Clinical/Laboratory Teaching Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column H, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**Other Teaching**

**Graduate Student PhD Dissertation/DNP Project Advising**

Student	A. Anticipated Contact Hours per Week  0.5 for Pre-Exam Semesters 1.0 for "Between" Semesters 2.0 for Final Semester	x	B. Number of Weeks per Semester  Typically, 15 weeks	=	C. Product of Columns A & B	x	D. Number of Semesters Advising will be Performed	=	E. Product of Columns C & D	÷	F. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	G. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	H. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
<b>Pre-General Examination</b>																
Example John Smith	0.5	x	15	=	7.5	x	2	=	15	÷	1440	=	0.0104	x 100	=	1.1%
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
<b>Between General Examination and Final Dissertation/Project Semester</b>																
Example Jane Doe	1.0	x	15	=	15	x	2	=	30	÷	1440	=	0.0208	x 100	=	2.1%
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
<b>Final Dissertation/Project Semester</b>																
Example Sue Jones	2.0	x	15	=	30	x	1	=	30	÷	1440	=	0.0208	x 100	=	2.1%
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
		x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Other Teaching, Doctoral Advising Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column H, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**Other Teaching**

**Independent Study, Undergraduate Innovation/Research, Honors Advising, Statistical Consultation**

Student	Type	A. Anticipated Contact Hours per Week	x	B. Number of Weeks per Semester	=	C. Product of Columns A & B	x	D. Number of Semesters Advising will be Performed	=	E. Product of Columns C & D	÷	F. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	G. Quotient of Columns D & E  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	H. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round- up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example John Smith	Independent Study	1	x	15	=	15	x	2	=	30	÷	1440	=	0.0208	x 100	=	2.1%
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	
			x		=		x		=		÷		=		x 100	=	

Other Teaching, Independent Study (etc.) Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column H, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

**New Course Adjustments**

**Development of a New Course (worth 3 or more credits)**

Course Title	A. Hours Allocated (72 per course)	÷	B. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months 1600 for 10 months 1760 for 11 months	=	C. Quotient of Columns A & B  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	D. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example: Adventures in Nursing	72	÷	1440	=	0.0500	x 100	=	5.0%

**Teaching a Course for the First Time**

Course Number & Modality	E. Percent Effort for Course as Calculated Above	x	F. Adjustment Factor (0.5)	=	G. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example: NURS 5020 Classroom	9.5%	x	0.5	=	4.8%

New Course Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Columns D and G, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_

### Administration

Type of Administration							C. Annual Percent Effort	
Curriculum Evaluation and Development (All Faculty)							5.0%	
Bureaucratic Documentation (All Faculty)							5.0%	
CETL-Developed On-Line Course Lead								
Course	A. 15 Hours Allotted	÷	B. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	Quotient of Columns A & B  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	=	C. Percent Annual Effort  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place
Example: NURS 5020	15	÷	1760	=	0.0085	x 100	=	0.9%
Undergraduate Clinical Leader / Track Director								
Course	A. Base Allotment 10% per Semester	x	B. Number of Semesters	=				C. Percent Annual Effort
NURS 3444	10%	x	2	=				20%
		x		=				
		x		=				



<b>Directors of Graduate Tracks and Certificate Programs</b>						
Track/Program	Number of Students Based on enrollment cap if course is expected to be full or on expected enrollment given a realistic estimate.	A. Base 2.5% Annual Effort	x	B. Enrollment Adjustment  1 for 1-8 Students  2 for 9-16 Students  3 for 17-24 students  etc. per extra 8 enrollees	=	C. Annual Percent Effort (APE)
Example: NNP Track	35	2.5%	x	4	=	10%
<b>Other Leadership Positions (Pre-Licensure, DNP, or PhD Program Director, as appointed by the Dean and documented in Letter of Appointment or MOU)</b>						
Role						C. Assigned Percent Annual Effort

Administration Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column C Entries, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Will be at least 10% for All Faculty)

## Service

Type of Service							
School and University Committees							
Committee, Role	A. Base Allotment 2% per Committee per Year	x	B. Adjustment for Committee Leadership 1 for Regular Member 2 for Chair	=	C. Annual Percent Effort (APE)		
Example Merit, Chair	2%	x	2	=	4%		
		x		=			
		x		=			
		x		=			
		x		=			
		x		=			
		x		=			
Community Service							
Setting	A. Total Estimated Hours during Academic Year	÷	B. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	Quotient of Columns A & B  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	C. Percent Annual Effort  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place



**Clinical/Professional Practice**

Setting	A. Total Estimated Hours during Academic Year	÷	B. Adjustment for Appointment Period  1440 for 9 months, 1600 for 10 months, 1760 for 11 months	=	Quotient of Columns A & B  Report to 4 decimal places	x 100	C. Annual Percent Effort (APE)  <i>Round-up</i> to 1 decimal place

Clinical/Professional Practice Annual Percent Effort (Sum of Column C Entries, Enter on Page 1): \_\_\_\_\_