

## Faculty of Land and Food Systems - Classroom Teaching Workload Policy and Calculator

(May 24, 2022)

In accordance with the factors noted in Article 13.03 (section e) of the Collective Agreement (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022), the Faculty of Land and Food Systems will determine classroom teaching workload using a points system as laid out in this policy document. An associated Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator will be used to calculate the points associated with individual courses and each faculty member's teaching assignment. Normal classroom teaching workload assignment is 15 points per year for faculty members in the Educational Leadership stream and 7.5 points per year for faculty members in the traditional professoriate. As in the past, every faculty member's course load must be developed in consultation with the Program Director and with consideration of the teaching needs of the Faculty's teaching programs.

**Scope:** As outlined in the Faculty's Workload Strategy (<https://my.landfood.ubc.ca/human-resources/policies/>), classroom teaching accounts for 60% of full-time equivalent (FTE) for faculty members in the Educational Leadership stream (i.e., Assistant Professors of Teaching, Associate Professors of Teaching, Professors of Teaching) and 30% of FTE for faculty members in the traditional professoriate (i.e., Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors). For faculty members in the traditional professoriate, a further 10% of their FTE appointment is allocated for teaching via graduate student supervision and mentoring. *The LFS Classroom Teaching Workload Policy will be used to inform classroom teaching assignments only.*

**Development:** The Classroom Teaching Workload Policy and associated Calculator were developed by the Classroom Teaching Workload Committee (2020-2022), based on approaches used in other units at UBC and in consultation with Program Directors, the Dean and Associate Deans, and faculty members.

**Using points to estimate classroom teaching workload:** The Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator uses points to estimate workloads associated with different courses. The point value calculated for each course reflects course credit value, as well as impact of factors identified in Article 13.03 (section e) of the Collective Agreement.

The calculation of points for each course is based on the following considerations:

- Each credit-hour of instruction (lecture, PBL, CBEL, field) earns 1 point.  
(Credit-hours of instruction for each course reflect the number of hours scheduled each week to lectures or other primary activity as listed in the course calendar; typically there is a 1:1 ratio between the primary activity and credit value. E.g., a MWF lecture of 1 hour duration = 3 credit-hours.)
- Seminars (in which students or visiting speakers develop/deliver the majority of the content) receive 0.5 points per credit-hour.

- When an instructor teaches x% of a course, the instructor receives x% of the points available for that course. E.g., if a 3-credit lecture-based course is co-taught by two instructors (each at 50%), then each receives 1.5 points.
- When co-taught courses are Co-led<sup>1</sup>, points are magnified by a third. E.g., if a 3-credit lecture or PBL-based course is co-led by two instructors, then each receives  $3*50%*[1+1/3]=2$  points.
- Points for combined undergraduate/graduate courses (in which an undergraduate and graduate course are taught simultaneously but where assessment activities differ for graduate and undergraduate participants) points are magnified by a third.
- The instructor of a course with TA-led labs, TA-led tutorials, and/or TA-led PBL/CBEL activities receive 0.25 additional points per credit-hour<sup>2</sup>.
- Instructor-led labs and tutorials (i.e., secondary activities as defined by UBC Senate<sup>3</sup>) receive 0.5 points per credit-hour.
- Courses with enrolments greater than 50 students are assigned an additional 1/350 points (i.e., 0.002857 points) per student above 50; adjustments for high-enrollments apply both to points/credit hour of primary activities (e.g. lecture) and TA-led activities (e.g. TA-led labs).
- Courses with low enrollments (<12 for undergraduate courses and <5 for graduate courses) are flagged. Courses that have low enrollment for two years running should be discussed with Program Directors to determine whether ongoing annual offerings are warranted; offering low enrolment courses in alternate years could be considered.
- Each 1 credit-hour of Directed Studies earns 0.25 points with a maximum of 0.75 points per year per full-time instructor. E.g. a 2-credit directed studies earns 0.5 points; one 3 credit directed studies earns 0.75 points (the maximum per year).

See Appendix A for a summary of key parameters.

---

<sup>1</sup> A teaching activity is considered co-led when all instructors are in the room and actively engaged simultaneously. Courses with multiple instructors who teach sequentially in a pass-the-baton style are not considered co-led and not given additional points.

<sup>2</sup> The instructor receives 0.25 points per hour of TA-led tutorial, independent of the number of tutorials being offered. (e.g. a course with 6 tutorial sections, but each student is scheduled to attend only 1 hour of tutorial per week, then the instructor earns a total of 0.25 points for this activity (and not,  $6*0.25=1.5$  points).

<sup>3</sup>As per the UBC Senate curriculum guide (<https://senate.ubc.ca/vancouver/curriculum-submission-guide/cat1-curriculum/guidelines-new-course-proposals>) the distribution of contact hours through learning activities can be described by the number of hours assigned each week to lectures or primary activity, and to secondary activities such as laboratories and tutorials.

Points in excess of 7.5 for faculty members in the traditional professoriate or 15 for faculty members in the Educational Leadership stream can be “banked” and “cashed in” at a later date; “borrowing” is not allowed.<sup>4</sup> Use of banked points must be discussed and agreed upon with the Program Director prior to course scheduling. See Appendix B for examples of how the Classroom Teaching Workload Policy would be applied in terms of banking and borrowing points.

Regardless of points banked, all 100%FTE faculty members are expected to teach at least 3 credits of UG coursework each year. This includes faculty members with teaching release as Research Chairs, Program Directors, and Associate Deans. There are circumstances in which regular teaching assignments may not be made for particular faculty members for defined periods of time (e.g., new hires who are granted temporary teaching release as part of their contract).

**Application of the calculator:** The Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator is a tool designed to support Program Directors in assigning Classroom Teaching for both individual faculty members and their program as whole.

Any faculty member who accumulates a deficit or surplus in classroom teaching points over a period of 3 years will be required to make up this deficit/be compensated within 2 years. Compensation for surplus points may take the form of a financial payout or course-release (in consultation with the Dean and Program Director). Debt repayment must be in the form of additional teaching.

Faculty members have the opportunity to discuss their assigned teaching load with their Program Director in cases where there is disagreement in the points allocated.<sup>5</sup>

The Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator is hosted on the LFS Intranet, together with a how-to-video, a how-to-pdf, and FAQs. Classroom Teaching Workload data (i.e., points accrued per faculty member, per course) will be available to all LFS faculty members on an annual basis.

The Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator is subject to periodic review and revision (with a suggested review after one year of use and every two years thereafter).

---

<sup>4</sup> In some cases---e.g. where a research faculty member typically teaches 3 courses one year and 2 courses the next---borrowing may be necessary in the year following adoption of the points system.

<sup>5</sup> In cases where no resolution is reached, the Associate Deans Academic and Graduate & Post Doctoral Studies (for undergraduate and graduate teaching, respectively) will make the decision.

**Appendix A: LFS Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator – Key Parameters**

<b>Policy Parameters Table 1 – Modifiers by activity type</b>	
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led lecture	<b>1</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led PBL	<b>1</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led CBL	<b>1</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led Field Course	<b>1</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led seminars	<b>0.5</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led labs	<b>0.5</b>
Points per credit-hour of instructor-led tutorial	<b>0.5</b>
<b>Policy Parameters Table 2 – Supplemental Points</b>	
Supplement (per modified credit-hour <sup>6</sup> ) for each student over 50	<b>1/350</b>
Points per hour of Directed Study credit	<b>1/4</b>
Annual cap on Directed Study points that can be accrued by instructor	<b>3/4</b>
Supplement for co-led courses (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/3</b>
Supplement for combined G+UG courses (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/3</b>
Instructor points per hour of weekly scheduled TA-led lab (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/4</b>
Instructor points per hour of weekly scheduled TA-led tutorial (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/4</b>
Instructor points per hour of weekly scheduled TA-led PBL (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/4</b>
Instructor points per hour of weekly scheduled TA-led CBL (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/4</b>
Instructor points per hour of weekly scheduled TA-led Field Course (per modified credit-hour)	<b>1/4</b>

<sup>6</sup> E.g., for a 3-credit lecture, the modified credit hours would be 3. For a 3-credit seminar, the modified credit hours would be  $3 \times .5 = 1.5$ . Thus, a 3 credit seminar course with an enrollment of 125 students would accrue  $(3 \times 0.5) \times [1+(125-50) \times (1/350)] \approx 1.82$  points.

***Appendix B: Examples of how the Classroom Teaching Workload Policy would be applied in terms of banking and borrowing points.***

Faculty member X is in the Educational Leadership stream and is expected to contribute 15 points of teaching each year. X has an accumulated balance of 3.5 points in their bank. X proposes to apply 3 of those points towards the upcoming year's teaching load, thereby reducing the number of points needed in the coming year from 15 to 12. This reduction allows X to reduce their course-load in the coming year by one 3-credit course. The remaining 0.5 points remain in X's bank for future use. X's proposal is consistent with the Classroom Teaching Workload Policy provided X's remaining classroom teaching workload earns at least 12 points in the coming year.

Faculty member Y is in the traditional professoriate and is expected to contribute 7.5 points of teaching each year. Y ordinarily sole-teaches two 3-credit undergraduate courses (each with less than 50 students and no secondary activities) and a 1.5-credit graduate course. Y has 1.4 points in their bank. Y would like to redeem their banked 1.4 points in the coming year in lieu of teaching the graduate course. As the proposed load would only generate 7.4 points (6 points earned + 1.4 points withdrawn from the bank), Y's proposal is NOT consistent with the Classroom Teaching Workload Policy as it would require borrowing 0.1 units. Y's proposal to redeem banked points in order to forgo teaching the graduate course could be considered in a future year, when their point balance exceeds 1.5 points.

**Appendix C – Questions and feedback from town hall on Classroom Teaching Workload Policy (responses indicated in bold)**

Will undergraduate thesis students be handled the same way as directed studies students, in terms of credit towards teaching load?

**Yes, 0.25 points per student, maximum 3 per year = 0.75 credits total**

Who is responsible for calculating and accounting for teaching loads using this formula? How will the results of the calculation/analysis be reported and communicated?

**Individual faculty themselves and confirmation with their Program Director. Reported in Annual Review to Dean and the Merit Committee.**

Will the proposed workload policy also apply to sessional instructors?

**No, they are on a separate contract and often only teach 1 or 2 courses**

TA support is used to justify why similar credit would be assigned to courses of different structure. This incorrectly assumes that TA allocations in LFS are done in a transparent, equitable fashion. We need a transparent, equitable process for TA allocation in order for the proposed system to work.

**There is a new TA Assignment Equitability Committee just been formed in LFS that will be reviewing this and presenting feedback. Our Classroom Teaching Workload policy does not need this to be complete before instigating the policy.**

What about new tenure-track faculty members (both EL and Research streams)? Will they be assigned course load according to the calculator stipulations in their first year, or will there be room for an "easing into it" approach?

**New faculty members already receive reduced teaching loads in the first two years of appointment, this is stipulated in their offer of employment letter. No teaching in year one and half teaching load in year two.**

Does taking number of TAs into account happen under the "TA-led tutorial" column of the calculator? (for LFS 250: 1.5hrs tutorial X 10 TAs = 15 TA hours/week). Doing this for LFS 250 gives a point total of ~10.5 points/year (incorporating co-instruction).

**No, TA-led tutorials (and other weekly items) should not be multiplied by the number of TAs, they should only reflect the contact hours for students. So, in this case, it would be "1.5" not "1.5 X 10 = 15".**

What about the evaluation mode? Critical thinking questions are harder to form and mark compared to multiple choice. Or having only one exam vs a midterm and a final exam.

**The instructor has the choice of how the course is taught and the students evaluated, so mode of evaluation is not considered in the calculator tool.**

If the enrollment capacity is 250 and 200 students register which point will be used or does it really matter?

**The number of students that actually take the course.**

Is there a standard classroom teaching relief for administrators?

**Program Directors receive a 3-credit teaching relief per year; the same for Associate Deans and Directors of Centres. These are stipulated in the letters of appointment for the various senior management positions. The Dean receives a 6-credit teaching release per year. Similarly, CRC and research chairs receive a 3-credit teaching release per year.**

How will you ensure the calculator remains a fair and equitable model and not individually convertible, or a matter of negotiation and bargaining.

**The policy can be re-visited every few years to ensure the calculator remains fair.**

How is this calculation and special considerations applied to new hires?

**New faculty members already receive reduced teaching loads in the first two years of appointment, this is stipulated in their offer of employment letter. No teaching in year one and half teaching load in year two.**

I am concerned that with allowances for seminars, and directed studies, the overall amount of classroom teaching we can expect from our faculty will fall (given the point system).

**We compared teaching loads from 11 units across UBC and LFS is in line at 7.5 points/credits, equivalent of 2 undergraduate courses per year and a graduate course every other year. We looked at teaching across the whole faculty and with the points system most faculty will remain the same, but some faculty were under teaching – which should be rectified. The number of faculty over-teaching was small, and the over-teaching largely due to large class sizes. This may result in a reduced teaching requirement for a very small number of faculty every 2 – 3years, which could be met by those currently under-teaching, or the employment of a sessional lecturer.**

While I like incentivizing directed studies, and seminars, I am worried that this may create incentives to replace formal classroom teaching with these possibilities.

**Under the points system we do have a cap of maximum 0.75 points (3 students x 0.25 points each) per year for faculty that can come from directed studies.**

We strongly encourage the committee to include metrics for graduate student supervision in the teaching calculator.

**The mandate of our committee was to address inequities in teaching workload for “classroom teaching”. The 2017 LFS' workload policy divides teaching into two parts: classroom teaching and graduate student supervision. The existing 7.5 credit rule only applies to the "classroom**

teaching" component, which is 30% FTE for someone in the Research Stream. A separate 10% of their FTE is for supervising graduate students.

We agree that research-stream faculty should be evaluated on whether they are supervising graduate students. But this is not part of this classroom teaching workload policy.

Adding metrics for graduate student supervision in the teaching calculator would be complex as only research stream faculty are involved and this will take substantial time and discussion in the various programs around how exactly to measure and reward graduate supervision and to get agreement, not least because there is a lot of variation across disciplines in terms of the costs and benefits of supervising students. The mandate of the existing committee is to address inequities in "classroom teaching" and recommend a model that is turned into policy. Faculty could then decide who should be on a subsequent committee to create a policy regarding the 10% FTE that concerns graduate supervision.

We also urge you to recommend that the refined calculator be implemented in combination with similar tools for evaluating research and service.

**The committee recognizes the importance of research, educational leadership and service, as well as teaching, in a total workload policy, but it was decided that separate committees be convened to address these other faculty requirements, it was felt each area was a huge task in itself. There is currently a review of the evaluation of service on going.**

I think it would be smart to add some points for new course creation.

**This is why new hires are given reduced teaching load for the first two years of appointment, to develop their courses. For established faculty this may be something to consider.**

If the intent of the meeting was to explain how the model works and how the different model parameters were chosen, then I think in this regard it was not successful. My suggestion would be to hold another meeting that focuses more on explaining how the model works and explain the logic behind and implications of the parameters that will be used in the calculations.

**We are hosting the revised Classroom Teaching Workload Calculator on the LFS Intranet, together with a how-to-video, a how-to-pdf, and FAQs, which will hopefully allay fears with using the calculator.**

Are there any considerations build-in in the teaching point calculator regarding the design of a new course from scratch compared to teaching an existing course, especially for newer faculty.

**This is taken into account for new hires and is why new faculty are given reduced teaching load for the first two years of appointment, to develop their courses. No teaching in year one and half teaching load in year two.**