

The Edwin L. Cox School of Business

Workload Policy and Guidelines

Revised May 2021

1.0 University Policy

Section 3 of Southern Methodist University Policy 2.7 on Faculty Workloads and Compensation provides the baseline concerning faculty workloads: all faculty members are expected to have a normal, full-time teaching assignment of 12 class hours per week, or the equivalent, in each regular academic term. A regular academic term is defined as a fall or spring or summer academic semester. This translates to a 24-credit hour teaching assignment or a faculty workload of 8 units per academic year.

2.0 Background and Introduction

This document provides workload policies for each of the six academic departments at the Cox School of Business: Accounting, Finance, Information Technology and Operations Management, Management and Organizations, Marketing, and Strategy and Entrepreneurship. The activities of faculty in contributing to the research, teaching, and service missions of the Cox School do not vary by department.

The Cox School workload policy described herein is intended to ensure that faculty teaching, research and service activities are annually monitored so that the burden of department and college and university responsibilities is distributed across faculty members equitably, and so that everyone makes a full contribution to the success of the university and its students.

The workload policy detailed herein is the product of a consultative process involving the Senior Associate Dean, Department Chairs and members of the Cox Promotion and Tenure Committee. It was reviewed and approved by Matt Myers, Dean of the Cox School of Business.

3.0 Who is subject to this policy?

All tenured/tenure track faculty and full-time non-tenure track faculty are subject to the standard 8-unit workload policy. In cases of newly hired assistant or associate professors and endowed chairs, their contractual arrangement regarding teaching workloads (if any) takes precedence in determining what constitutes their teaching/workload responsibility. Any subsequent changes to their contractual workload are determined by the Dean of the Cox School.

Department Chairs and administrators are also subject to the 8-unit workload policy. Determination of the units of work associated with administrative duties is determined by the Dean of the Cox School or by existing contractual agreements.

Visiting professors are subject to the 8-unit workload policy; however, not all visiting positions share the same responsibilities. Visiting faculty members may have their teaching loads reduced depending on the nature of their teaching and research assignment; e.g., new PhD's whose full-time teaching and research loads approximate those of new tenure track hires, more senior faculty on sabbatical who may teach less but require less financial support, and visiting professors not on the research track who will be expected to teach more to fulfill their 8-unit workload. Reductions to faculty teaching loads will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Department Chair in consultation with the Dean's office.

As a basis for comparison, the allocation of the 8 workload units across Teaching, Research and Service for a "research-active" (defined below) tenure track or tenured faculty member is 40% (up to 4-units) associated with research-related activities, 40% (up to 4-units) for teaching-related activities, and 20% (up to 2-units) associated with service-related activities. For some faculty, it may happen that their research, teaching and service workload units exceed the 8-unit workload requirement. In such cases, the Department Chair will work with the faculty member to reduce their level of activity going forward.

3.0 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

The "university" is the sum of its individual schools and departments and not all parts are the same. In particular, business and other professional schools operate under a number of unique constraints and competitive pressures. The Cox School of Business competes for faculty, staff, and students primarily against aspirant schools such as Emory, Vanderbilt, USC, Notre Dame, Rochester and Tulane.

An individual faculty member's workload requirement of 8-units can be satisfied in a number of ways. And it is not realistic to enumerate all of the possibilities that would satisfy the workload requirement. For this reason, the Department Chairs are responsible for assessing whether a faculty member's workload has been met, along with oversight from the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean. This is desirable since the Department Chairs are in the best position to assess the contribution of their faculty to the research, teaching and service missions of the Cox School.

Our criteria for evaluating faculty performance is consistent with the Cox School's Faculty Activity Report (FAR) assessment process. In evaluating faculty research, teaching and service we use the criteria for *outstanding*, *commendable*, *satisfactory*, *marginal* and *unsatisfactory* performance. These criteria are defined in general terms below with additional specificity provided in the discussion of research, teaching and service workloads in later sections.

- *Outstanding*—an *especially high* level of performance that significantly exceeds departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.
- *Commendable*—*high* level of performance that exceeds departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.
- *Satisfactory*—performance that *meets* departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.
- *Marginal*—performance that *falls below* departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance falls *well below* departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.

Each year all full-time faculty complete the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The Department Chair, Senior Associate Dean and the Dean independently review and evaluate each faculty member's research, teaching and service activity. Teaching and service activity are evaluated annually, while research performance is evaluated based on a 3-year window. Two meetings take place: the first meeting is to triangulate on the performance ratings and to provide feedback to each faculty member. If the faculty member is untenured or tenured associate professor the Department Chair provides feedback on the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion or promotion to full professor. If any faculty member takes exception to their performance ratings she/he can prepare a memo outlining the areas of disagreement. At the second meeting the Department Chair shares this feedback with the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean and a response to the faculty member is framed.

4.0 Teaching Performance and Workloads

The assignment of teaching workloads is determined by a composite of factors including faculty rank, contractual agreement, and research and service performance. Among the factors that influence teaching/workload requirements are the following:

- Class enrollments.
- Number of sections.
- Number of course preparations.
- New course preparations.
- Degree program.
- Core vs. elective course.
- Course modality.

Teaching performance is based on the evaluative criteria and factors described above and codified below:

- *Outstanding/Commendable*—is awarded based on a combination of: 1) excellent student feedback (e.g., course evaluation scores significantly greater than the department average), 2) excellent student feedback as evinced in the student open-end responses, 3) course development- new preps, 4) teaching large sections, and 5) teaching in especially demanding degree programs (e.g., 2-year full time MBA program or EMBA program).
- *Satisfactory*—is awarded based on a combination of: 1) satisfactory student feedback (e.g., course evaluation scores that are not significantly lower than the department average), 2) satisfactory student feedback as evinced in the student open-end responses, 3) course development- new preps, 4) teaching large sections, and 5) teaching in especially demanding degree programs (e.g., 2-year full time MBA program or EMBA program).
- *Marginal*— student feedback that falls below departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.
- *Unsatisfactory*—student feedback that falls *well* below departmental norms and expectations based on specific relevant benchmarks reflective of substantive indicators of performance.

Department Chairs will work with faculty receiving *marginal* and *unsatisfactory* teaching ratings to “course correct.” This may involve any of a number of steps- e.g., working with the faculty member to revise course-related material, classroom observation, or soliciting assistance from the CTE. All junior faculty (untenured assistant professors) are observed in the classroom in their first, third and fifth year of employment. The classroom observation is coordinated by the Department Chair.

The standard course-load for tenure track faculty who are research-active (*satisfactory* performance on research-see below) is three 3-credit hour courses per year (9 credit hours). For faculty teaching exclusively in the Graduate program, which offers 2 credit courses, the expectation is that their average (two year) course load will average 9 credit hours (4/5 course loads). The Department Chair can assign to a faculty member an unbalanced teaching load to block time for research and other professional activities. For example, an individual with a three-course load may teach the three courses in either a fall or a spring semester, allowing that individual to concentrate on research projects during the non-teaching semester. Since graduate courses are offered on a 7-week calendar (“Modules”), unbalanced teaching loads are common. And during a non-teaching semester, a faculty member must maintain an active presence in the department and continue fulfilling her or his service commitments.

Faculty members making *less than satisfactory* contributions to the scholarship of their fields are expected to contribute substantially more toward the school’s teaching mission. Accordingly, their teaching loads will be gradually increased over time, assuming no change in research productivity. These faculty members will be generally assigned a teaching load from twelve (12) and to eighteen (18) credit hours per academic year, depending on their

research performance rating and/or their administrative responsibilities, as determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Dean's office.

The following policies and guidelines inform teaching loads for Cox School of Business tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as non-tenured faculty without administrative appointments.

Three Courses per Year or the Equivalent

An annual load of three course per year or the equivalent (9 hours) applies in the following instances:

- Untenured assistant and associate professors whose contracts provide for a three-course load, and for whom this load is a market necessity, who also have an active on-going research and publication program directed toward satisfying tenure requirements.
- Faculty whose research performance rating is deemed *satisfactory or above*.
- Endowed chair professors who are under contractual arrangements.

Four Courses per Year or the Equivalent

An annual load of four courses or the equivalent (12 credit hours) is modal for

- Tenured faculty whose performance in research is deemed *marginal* in combination with on-going *satisfactory* ratings in service, or
- Clinical professors or professors of practice who contribute (*satisfactory or above*) to the research mission of the department or *outstanding/commendable* service performance rating.

Five Courses per Year or the Equivalent

An annual load of five courses or the equivalent (15 credit hours) is modal for

- Tenured faculty whose performance in research and publication is deemed *unsatisfactory* along with *satisfactory* ratings on service, or
- Clinical professors or professors of practice who contribute to the research mission of the department or receive an *outstanding/commendable* service performance rating.

Six Courses per Year or the Equivalent

This is the standard load (18 credit hours) for clinical professors and professors of practice.

5.0 Research Performance and Workloads

Research workloads are based on an expectation of research-active productivity from tenured and tenure track faculty and specific non-tenure track faculty. Research-active faculty are expected to allocate significant time to scholarship activities and research projects having the potential to make significant contributions to knowledge creation in their fields of study.

The eventual publication of papers in top-tier journals is the ultimate objective, which is consistent with the research posture of any top business school. The research focus of faculty should be on top tier publications. Exhibit A provides a list of the relevant journals in each of the functional areas/departments¹. The gestation period (submission, revise & resubmit, acceptance) is, in most disciplines, 24 to 36 months, if all goes well. This coupled with the fact that empirical research is time consuming (e.g., collecting or securing data, combining disparate data sources, etc.) means that research performance should not be evaluated independently each year. Accordingly, the research performance of a faculty member will be primarily evaluated by the Department Chairs in consultation with the Dean's office, and established based on a three (3) year moving window.

The Cox School supplements the FAR document with a Research Review Form (RRF) which captures the history (evolution and status) of each faculty member's research activity. This enables the Department Chair and the Senior Associate Dean to track the status (e.g., working paper, first submission, second round, etc.) of each research project over the three (3) year window. This ensures that productive research activities and long lead times for publication are considered in determining the research performance of a faculty member. In addition, knowledge of research productivity in the faculty member's field of study using comparative data from peer and aspirational business schools as well as the faculty member's research history will also be considered in making this determination. While publications in top-tier journals is the ultimate goal, the Cox School also recognizes that simply counting publications is not enough. Tenure affords faculty an opportunity to undertake riskier projects that have potential for high impact. The Cox School encourages such a research agenda and our evaluation of research takes this into consideration. Such an evaluation is best handled by Department Chair, Senior Associate Dean and the Dean.

The current RRF includes the following categories:

- Referred Journal Articles (published or forthcoming).
- Manuscripts under Review/Revision (journal and status).
- Working papers (status).
- Book Chapters.
- Books.

¹ The list of journals appearing in Exhibit A is relevant for workload decisions. A more limited set of journals may be used in the assessment of and progress toward tenure and promotion.

- Other Publications.
- Referred Conference Proceedings.
- Referred Conference Proceedings.
- Invited Presentations (school/conference).
- Editor/Associate Editor/Editorial Boards.
- Research Awards.

Research performance is based on the evaluative criteria described above and codified below:

- *Outstanding/Commendable*—is awarded based on a combination of: 1) A-level publication(s), 2) manuscripts under review (R&R), 3) research awards, 4) participating in policy-setting bodies of government, 5) editorial leadership, and 6) scholarly reputation.
- *Satisfactory*—is awarded based on a combination of: 1) working papers, 2) evidence of on-going research projects, 3) publications in other high-quality journals, and 4) editorial responsibilities.
- *Marginal*— little evidence that research projects and/or working papers have progressed since the last performance evaluation (3-year window).
- *Unsatisfactory*—no visible sign of research activity.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *outstanding/commendable* or *satisfactory* receive up to 4-workload unit credits for research toward the 8-unit workload requirement.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *marginal* receive up to 3-workload unit credits for research toward the 8-unit workload requirement.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *unsatisfactory* receive 0-workload unit credits for research toward the 8-unit workload requirement.

As mentioned, faculty members not making significant contributions to the scholarship of their fields are expected to contribute more toward the college's teaching mission. This decision will be made on a case-by-case basis by the Department Chair in consultation with the Dean's office and will take affect at the beginning of the next 3-year evaluation window.

Cox research summer support is conditional on being evaluated as research active. Faculty receiving a research performance rating of *outstanding/commendable* or *satisfactory* are classified as research active and eligible for summer research support. Consequently, the removal of summer research support is evidence that the faculty member is no longer research active.

Cox summer research support, consistent with the window of research performance evaluation, is normally granted on a three (3) year rolling window. At the time (end of a three

(3) window) when a faculty members' research performance falls below satisfactory summer support will be decreased to 1/9ths for the next year. If the faculty member's research activity does not improve then summer research support of 1/9ths will be ended; on the other hand, if the faculty member's research activity improves then support will return to 2/9th level.

For example, assume that in year 2 for a faculty member on a three (3) cycle, the Department Chair, Senior Associate Dean and Dean observe a noticeable drop below acceptable levels of research productivity and impact. This observation would be brought to the attention of the faculty in the course of the FAR performance evaluation feedback loop. The faculty member would continue to receive 2/9ths summer research support in year 2. Next year, year 3 of the research cycle, if the decline was sustained the faculty member would receive 2/9ths for the following summer (year 3, previously agreed to) but only 1/9th the next year, year 4. If at time of the year 4 FAR evaluation the faculty member's research program had improved, the 2/9th funding level may be reinstated and possibly extended to years 5 and 6- in essence establishing a new three (3) summer research cycle. If it did not improve, they could be informed that their summer research support in year 4, as agreed upon, would be at 1/9th, but that in year 5 summer research support would be eliminated if there was no evidence of meaningful research activity. That would typically lead to an increase in teaching load in year 5 as the faculty member was deemed non-research active. The teaching load could increase each year until it reached a maximum of five 3-credit hour courses.

6.0 Service Workloads

Most full-time faculty have service responsibilities as part of their standard workload. Accordingly, all fulltime faculty receive 1 workload unit to reflect the standard service-related activities (e.g., school and department meetings, attending graduation, etc.) Except for appointed administrators, the Cox School has not awarded reduced teaching loads based on service.

Among the myriad ways to meet the service component of the overall faculty workload are the following:

- Leadership roles within the department, school or university.
- Active membership on department, school or university committees.
- Student organization service.
- Assisting with student case competitions.
- Mentoring students.
- Mentoring junior faculty (e.g., providing feedback on manuscripts).
- Ad hoc journal reviewing.
- Attending graduation ceremony.
- Chairing a conference.

The quantity and quality of service varies by rank. For example, we expect untenured assistant professors to fulfil only the standard service requirements (e.g., attending school

and department meetings, attending department research seminars). Service performance is based on the evaluative criteria and factors described above and codified below:

- *Outstanding/Commendable*—is awarded in cases where the faculty member has a high level of activity based on a combination of: 1) department committee assignments (e.g., recruiting committee), 2) school committee assignments (e.g., Graduate Policy Committee, BBA Policy Committee, School P&T Committee), 3) university committee assignments (e.g., Educational Policy Committee, University P&T), 4) junior faculty mentoring, and 5) student advising (e.g., case competitions, student clubs).
- *Satisfactory*—is awarded in cases where the faculty member has an average level activity based on a combination of: 1) department committee assignments (e.g., recruiting committee), 2) school committee assignments (e.g., Graduate Policy Committee, BBA Policy Committee, School P&T Committee), 3) university committee assignments (e.g., Educational Policy Committee), 4) junior faculty mentoring, and 5) student advising (e.g., case competitions, student clubs).
- *Marginal*— is awarded in cases where the faculty member has a low level of activity based on a combination of: 1) department committee assignments (e.g., recruiting committee), 2) school committee assignments (e.g., Graduate Policy Committee, BBA Policy Committee), 3) university committee assignments (e.g., Educational Policy Committee), 4) junior faculty mentoring, and 5) student advising (e.g., case competitions, student clubs).
- *Unsatisfactory*—is awarded in cases where the faculty member has not fulfilled his/her standard service responsibilities nor participated in any of the service-related activities described above.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *outstanding/commendable* or *satisfactory* receive a total of up to 2-workload unit credits for service toward the 8-unit workload requirement.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *marginal* receive a total of up to 1-workload unit credits for service toward the 8-unit workload requirement.

Faculty receiving a performance rating of *unsatisfactory* receive 0-workload unit credits for service toward the 8-unit workload requirement. In this case the faculty member has not fulfilled his/her standard service responsibilities.

7.0 Workload Variance

In order to meet the needs of the school and AACSB accreditation standards, workloads may vary across departments depending on such factors as the proportion of terminally qualified faculty, clinical professors, and professors of practice, as well as the proportion of research-active faculty and the administrative load of faculty members.

Exhibit A

Workload Journals

Accounting	Finance	Information & Operations Management
The Accounting Review	JFE – Journal of Financial Economics	Management Science
Journal of Accounting Research	JF – Journal of Finance	Information Systems Research
Journal of Accounting and Economics	RFS – Review of Financial Studies	MIS Quarterly
Management Science	JAЕ – Journal of Accounting and Economics	Management Science
Review of Accounting Studies	JAR – Journal of Accounting Research	Manufacturing and Service Operations Management
Contemporary Accounting Research	TAR – The Accounting Review	Production and Operations Management
Accounting Organization and Society	JPE – Journal of Political Economy	Operations Research
Journal of Finance	AER – American Economic Review	Management Science
Journal of Financial Economics	QJE – Quarterly Journal of Economics	INFORMS Journal on Computing
Review of Financial Studies	Econometrica, Review of Economic Studies	IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	JFQA - Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	Marketing Science
American Economic Review	Management Science (MS)	Math of OR
Journal of Political Economy	RoF – Review of Finance	IIE - Institute of Industrial Engineering Transactions
Quarterly Journal of Economics	JME – Journal of Monetary Economics	ECRA - Electronic Commerce Research and Applications
	JFI – Journal of Financial Intermediation	ITM - Information Technology and Management
	JCF – Journal of Corporate Finance	JIT – Journal of Information Technology
	JFM – Journal of Financial Markets	JSIS – Journal of Strategic Information Systems
	RCFS – Review of Corporate Finance Studies	ISJ – Information Systems Journal
	RAPS – Review of Asset Pricing Studies	EJIS – European Journal of Information Systems
	FM – Financial Management	I&O – Information and Organizations
	JMCB – Journal of Money Credit and Banking	CACM – Communications of the ACM
	CFR – Critical Finance Review	JAIS – Journal of the Association of Information Systems
	JBF -- Journal of Banking and Finance	CAIS – Communications of the Association of Info. Systems
	JIBS -- Journal of International Business Studies	OGEC – Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce
	JIMF – Journal o International Money and Finance	
	Journal of Empirical Finance	

Management & Organizations	Marketing	Strategy & Entrepreneurship
Academy of Management Journal	Marketing Science	Strategic Management Journal
Academy of Management Review	Journal of Marketing Research	Academy of Management Journal
Administrative Science Quarterly	Journal of Consumer Research	Academy of Management Review
Journal of Applied Psychology	Journal of Consumer Psychology	Organization Science
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	Journal of Marketing	Administrative Science Quarterly
Organization Science	Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	Management Science
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	Management Science	Journal of Marketing Research
Psychological Bulletin	Harvard Business Review	Marketing Science.
Personnel Psychology	Sloan Management Review	Journal of Marketing
Psychological Science	Operations Research	
Journal of Management	Journal of Retailing	
Psychological Methods	Marketing Letters	
Journal of International Business Studies	International Journal of Research in Marketing	
Journal of Business Venturing	Journal of Interactive Marketing	
Organization Research Methods	Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	
	Cognitive Science	
	Cognition	
	Memory	
	Psychological Science	
	Psychological Bulletin	
	Psychological Review	
	Journal of Experimental Psychology: General	
	Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied	
	Social Psychological and Personality Science	
	Psychometrika	
	Structural Equation Modeling	
	Multivariate Behavioral Research	
	Journal of the American Statistical Association	
	Judgment and Decision Making	