



Chaifetz School of Business Faculty Workload Policy

Date Approved by Subcommittee: February 6 (unanimous)

Date Approved by Faculty Assembly:

Policy Effective Date/Provost approval: 6/5/26 pending stage II
(research buyout and production policies being approved)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This policy outlines Chaifetz School of Business' (CSB) approach to assigning and managing faculty workload. Faculty responsibilities are assigned by Department Chairs and reviewed by the CSB Dean, based on contracts, the [University Faculty Workload Policy](#) and [Faculty Manual](#), and CSB policies. The policy emphasizes equitable distributions aiming to avoid biases in workload assignments related to gender, race, and other aspects of identity.

1.2 The professional goals of faculty members are diverse, which the University embraces, values, and encourages as fundamental drivers of faculty hiring and professional well-being. The diversity of faculty members' professional goals shall inform the distribution of work for individual faculty, as determined by Department Chairs in consultation with each faculty member but shall not guarantee that faculty professional goals or input on workload will be manifested in all workload assignments. The broader needs/priorities of CSB to which each faculty member is assigned (as determined by the Department Chair and/or CSB Dean), as well as those of the University as a whole (as determined by the Provost), shall take precedence. This policy recognizes SLU's organizational complexities and financial constraints and prioritizes SLU's commitment to serving students.

1.3 Saint Louis University is a research university in the Jesuit tradition. Accordingly, SLU is committed to faculty excellence in faculty activities defined in section 5.1 of the University Workload Policy, which are repeated here:

- **Teaching:** Includes course design (except in cases where faculty freely choose to design courses outside their 24 units), instruction, grading, student advising and mentoring, and collaborative effort.
- **Research/Scholarship:** Includes research, publications, creative works, grants, and community-based scholarship.
- **Service:** Includes contributions and collaborative effort to the profession and/or community service, as well as contributions to the faculty member's Department, College/School, and/or the University.

NOTE: This definition of “Service to the University” explicitly excludes basic faculty obligations such as regular participation in faculty meetings (at multiple levels) and academic ceremonies/convocations (unit- and University-level) that are often casually referred to as “service.” These are general expectations of employment for all faculty.

- **Administration:** Includes central administrative and leadership roles (e.g., program director/coordinator, department chair, etc.).
- **Clinical Work:** Includes engagement in work that draws on research and can generate scholarly impact through activities like the writing of case studies and translation of fundamental knowledge to applied situations like within university-operated clinics (e.g., healthcare, legal clinics, etc.) and interviews with media that holistically address complex challenges.
- **Librarianship:** Includes all aspects of responsibilities in operation of libraries on north, south and downtown campuses.

1.4 The strategic direction of the CSB Faculty Workload Policy is intentionally designed to:

- cover all individual contracts, unit policies, and workload assignments.
- promote a diverse distribution of workloads while maintaining fairness, helping to prevent faculty from becoming overburdened.
- be non-prescriptive about the amount of work but provides guidelines for the fair distribution of work.
- help ensure a culture of dignity and belonging to support a thriving academic community

2.0 Governing Principles

This policy is grounded in several principles:

- **Commitment to Excellence:** The University is committed to excellence in teaching, research, service, and, when applicable, administration and clinical work.
- **Flexible Distribution:** Workload assignments vary based on faculty category, qualifications, level of expected contribution in different workload areas, and departmental needs. This flexibility allows academic unit leaders to develop procedures that create transparent and adaptable expectations around which they assign faculty workload.
- **Equity and Fairness:** Workload distribution should be equitable, ensuring fair evaluation and opportunities for merit increases and promotions.
- **Support for Diversity of Roles and Contributions:** The academic unit recognizes faculty who are disproportionately involved in service roles and aims to balance this while valuing their contributions.

3.0 Scope

This faculty workload policy applies to non-tenure track and tenure track (which includes tenured) faculty of the CSB and draw upon and is consistent with the University Faculty Workload Policy (February 1, 2025). Faculty work and workload at CSB are distinctive. The level of workload contribution allocated to teaching, research, and service should be determined by academic unit leaders as part of the workload allocation process.

3.1 From a teaching perspective, most courses are three academic units. Nonetheless, faculty also are occasionally asked to engage in specialized teaching assignments ranging from credit-bearing internships to faculty guided individual courses of study, which support experiential learning and facilitate on-time graduation. Faculty teaching the specialized teaching assignments will receive 0.20 to 0.25 a workload unit for each student taught, with final determination made by the Dean.

3.2 From a research perspective, the faculty of CSB strive to provide scholarly impact through a wide variety of activities like those outlined in Sections 1.3 above. The full range of scholarly impact categories are enumerated in Table 1.

3.3 From a service perspective and consistent with the University Faculty Workload Policy, faculty are expected to fulfill basic faculty obligations such as regular participation in faculty and department meetings and academic ceremonies/convocations. Beyond these basic obligations, CSB has a shared governance model comprised of department chairs, associate and assistant deans, and a substantial number of standing and ad hoc committees. Faculty who serve in administrative roles (often referred to as “administration”) and on committees (often referred to as “service”) are expected to dedicate substantial amounts of time fulfilling their roles and responsibilities of shared governance.

4.0 Definitions and Workload Requirements

4.1 As stated in the University Faculty Workload Policy, Faculty workload is measured in **workload units**, with a standard of 24 units per academic year for a 9-month contract, which is consistent with the employment status of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. A single workload unit represents the amount of work required for the successful conduct of one credit hour of teaching in a given discipline. Contracts longer than 9 months have proportional requirements. Any assignment exceeding the required workload units is considered an **overload**, requiring Provost approval and compensated either through additional pay or current or future workload reduction.

4.2 University Faculty Workload Policy workloads are characterized as “scholarship/research-intensive,” “teaching and scholarship/research,” and “teaching-intensive.” These definitions, copied from section 4.0 of the University Faculty Workload Policy, are:

Scholarship/Research-intensive: Faculty workload assignments that fairly equally distribute responsibilities for teaching and scholarship/research/creative endeavor; however, this designation contemplates a level of sustained, peer-reviewed scholarship/research/creative endeavor (including associated outcomes/impact) consistent with professional- or discipline-specific R1 standards. Faculty under this designation *typically* are assigned workloads featuring:

- 10-14 workload units of teaching
- 10-13 workload units of research/scholarship/creative endeavor
- 0-3 workload units of service/clinical/administrative activities

Teaching and scholarship/research: Teaching and scholarship/research faculty workload designations are those comprised primarily of teaching but affording substantive work time for an active pattern of engaged scholarship/research/creative endeavor. Faculty under this designation *typically* are assigned workloads featuring:

- 15-20 workload units of teaching
- 4-7 workload units of research/scholarship/creative endeavor

- 0-3 workload units of service/clinical/administrative activities

Teaching-intensive: Teaching-intensive faculty workloads are those comprised either exclusively or nearly exclusively of responsibility for teaching. This category has no expectations of research or scholarship. Faculty under this designation *typically* are assigned workloads featuring:

- 21-24 workload units of teaching
- 0 workload units of research/scholarship
- 0-3 workload units of service/clinical/administrative activities

For a discussion of faculty service expectations with respect to shared governance, see the [Faculty Manual](#), sections G 5 and H 4 & 5. Successful fulfillment of these faculty workloads keep faculty “on pace” with promotion and/or tenure requirements, although provide no guarantee of promotion or tenure. The CSB’s promotion and tenure requirements can be found at <http://XXXX>. All annual faculty evaluations will be based on each faculty member’s formally assigned workload.

5.0 Process and Requirements for Determining Workload

5.1 This section describes a ***discernment and governance process*** for assessing the scholarly, service, and teaching impact of each faculty member. The discernment process proceeds in three phases.

- a. *Phase 1:* Each Department Chair will review and assess the scholarly impact for and with each faculty member. The assessment is performed by comparing scholarly impact to three alternative archetypes: *High Scholarly Impact*, *Moderate Scholarly Impact*, and *Modest Scholarly Impact* (for an illustration of these archetypes—also known as exemplars—see Appendices A, B, and C). As no faculty member’s scholarly output will perfectly match any specific archetype, the Department Chair shall employ discernment to assess the “marginal rates of substitution” of scholarly impact across various subcategories in Table 1. The discernment process will lead to an evaluation of each faculty member’s scholarly impact as High, Moderate, or Modest.

Importantly, outcomes are not expected in all categories for any archetype. But for a minimum of research publications, the presence of scholarly output in some output categories or subcategories may “substitute” for the absence of scholarly output in other categories or subcategories. The Department Chair, referring to Appendices A, B and C as archetypes, will determine if the scholarly impact of an individual faculty member will be classified as High, Moderate, or Modest.

The committee anticipates that no matter the subjective marginal rates of substitution across subcategories, lacunas are likely to exist among the three levels of scholarly impact, which simplifies that task of discernment.

- b. *Phase 2:* Each Department Chair will develop a point system¹ that represents how they estimated the subjective marginal rates of substitution across the various categories of scholarly impact. Their point system shall be based on the set of assessments for the faculty in their department and with the norms of their respective field. Hence, each category of Table 1 will have points assigned to it by the Department Chair.
- c. *Phase 3:* Department Chairs will share their individual point systems (not individual faculty information) with each other in a meeting facilitated by the Dean. Point systems will be compared. Employing the point system to explain and compare the discernment results protects faculty privacy concerns. While the point systems need not be the same for each Department Chair, the Dean can recommend modifications to specific point systems based on the discussion. Department Chairs then can revise their classifications, and the Dean will approve all classifications.

5.2 Department Chairs will determine workload for a specific faculty member by matching categories of scholarly activity to university workload categories. As described in Section 5.1, Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty, assess faculty performance and characterize it in terms of *High Scholarly Impact*, *Moderate Scholarly Impact*, and *Modest Scholarly Impact*. Then, these categories of scholarly impact are then matched with workload alternatives as defined by the University Faculty Workload Policy (see Section 4.2) as *Scholarship/Research-intensive* workload, *Teaching and scholarship/research* workload, and *Teaching-intensive* workload.

Hence, a faculty member assessed as *High Scholarly Impact* will be assigned a *Scholarship/Research-intensive* workload. A faculty member assessed as *Moderate Scholarly Impact* will be assigned a *Teaching and scholarship/research* workload. A faculty member assessed as *Modest Scholarly Impact* will be assigned a *Teaching-intensive* workload. The CSB Dean must approve the assignments and matching to finalize them.

5.3 Equitable workload assignment for teaching, service, and research:

- a. Workload assignment for teaching is specified in section 4.2. Workload assignment is predicated on the average number of students per course over a faculty member's annual on-load course assignment. Nonetheless, workload assignment can vary for purposes of equity depending on the number of students enrolled in CSB courses. The guidance for CSB is that three workload units typically are applied to a three-credit hour course, which is expected to have between 15 and 50 students.

Courses with fewer than 15 students can be canceled by the Dean's office. Nonetheless, the Dean and relevant Chair in concert can choose to sustain courses below a 15-student enrollment and have discretion on the work unit allocation. The guidance for a faculty member teaching a three credit-hour course with between 8 and 14 students is two workload

¹ The point system envisioned asks Department Chairs to create a point allocation for each of the categories of scholarly impact in Table 1. Then, they will compare the accumulated points attributed to each faculty member's scholarly performance to the classification by discernment to validate their decision. When point systems by each Department Chair are shared with each other and the Dean, these systems are likely to be refined and somewhat converge. Hence, while the first time through the process will present challenges, future classification will likely proceed efficiently and smoothly.

units. Similarly, the guidance for a faculty member teaching a three credit-hour course with between 1 and 7 students is one workload unit.

For a large class of students, the guidance for a faculty member teaching a three credit-hour course with between 51 and 65 students is four workload units.

Workload units assigned to courses with fewer than 15 students or more than 50 students (sometimes referred to as multipliers) requires agreement among Department Chairs, Dean, and Provost.

- b. Workload assignment for service depends on administrative positions and committees assigned. One workload unit is assigned for committees requiring approximately 65 hours of time. Hence, two committees that require “light” duty may equate to one committee that requires heavy duty. Six workload units are assigned as service for Department Chairs (who work on 11-month contracts in the CSB) and three workload units are assigned for Program Directors. Workload units for Assistant and Associate Deans will be commensurate with duties assigned.
- c. Workload assignment for research must be consistent with the University Faculty Workload Policy and account for teaching and service assignments as described in sections 5.2.a and 5.2.b.

5.4 Workloads shall be assigned based on faculty expertise, departmental needs and goals, available resources, promotion and tenure guidelines, career development plans, and institutional priorities. Distribution of tasks must align with Saint Louis University standards while accommodating specific academic unit needs. While institutional needs take precedence, faculty professional goals are considered. Ultimately, these assignments are submitted to the Dean for approval.

5.5 Once approved, each assignment is recorded in a document that contains a web link to the University Faculty Workload Policy and a web link to the CSB Faculty Workload Policy. The document includes a signature line and date for faculty to acknowledge the workload assignment. The University Faculty Workload Policy requires that “individual faculty workload assignments must be made available to all faculty within the academic unit.” Faculty, for their personal use only, can access the secure online file of workload assignments on **XXX**.

5.6 Internal Appeal Process: An individual faculty member can provide a written appeal about the workload assignment to the CSB Dean. The appeal must be based on the parameters of the CSB Faculty Workload Policy, University Faculty Workload Policy and the SLU Faculty Manual. A faculty member filing an appeal may choose an advocate to join them in presenting and discussing the appeal to the CSB Dean. Final determinations of the appeal are made by the CSB Dean.

6.0 Annual Timeline for Determining Workload

Timeline:

- **September 1:** Complete Phase 1. Department Chairs assess scholarly impact of prior five years ending June 30 of current calendar year (i.e., prior fiscal year).

- **October 1:** Complete Phases 2 and 3. Department Chairs develop and compare point systems and make any needed modifications.
- **November 1:** Complete Phase 4. Submit to Dean's office signed workload assignments. Any appeals by an individual faculty member must be submitted to the Dean by November 15 and will be resolved within one week of the faculty member's discussion of the appeal.

Table 1: Categories of Scholarly Impact

I. Scholarly impact in the academy

1. Publish research articles in peer-reviewed journals to have high impact on future research
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. Count of the number of acceptances in ABDC (A* and A), ABS (4*, 4, and 3), AJG (4*, 4, and 3), and FT-50 journals and/or the CSB journal list (*the CSB journal list will no longer be used to assess high scholarly impact after 2029*) over the past 5 years.
 - ii. Provide citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar for papers published over the past 5 years.
 - iii. The count of downloads such as ResearchGate, and altmetrics such as social media, blogs, Wikimedia, policy documents, news outlets, newsletters, research center curations for research papers.
2. Develop research software that impacts the conducting of research
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of published research software and the number of licenses/users over the past 5 years.
3. Reviewing for high-impact journals
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of refereeing assignments as an AE or as an ad-hoc reviewer per journal and the rounds of reviewing for each article in ABDC (A* and A), ABS (4*, 4, and 3), AJG (4*, 4, and 3), and FT-50 and/or the CSB journal list (*the CSB journal list will no longer be used to assess high scholarly impact after 2029*) journals over the past 5 years.
4. Administrative roles for high-impact editorial boards and societies including organizing high-profile conferences
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of the number of administrative roles for editorial boards (e.g., editor, associate editor, or editorial board member) and societies including organizing high-profile conferences as identified by Department Chairs over the past 5 years.
5. Academic speaking (invited paper presentations, keynote speeches, selective conference presentations.)
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of invited paper presentations, keynote speeches, and selective conference presentations and (approximate) number of attendees over the past 5 years.
6. Publish field-specific scholarly books that impact research (e.g., monographs)
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. A count of the number of contracts, books and monographs in process, and scholarly books and monographs published that impact research over the past 5 years.

- ii. Provide citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar for scholarly books and monographs published over the past 5 years.
 - iii. The count of the number of books and monographs sold.
- 7. Publish field specific edited volumes that impact research
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. A count of the number of edited volumes that impact research along with the number of copies sold over the past 5 years.
 - ii. Provide citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar for scholarly books and monographs published over the past 5 years.
 - iii. The count of the number edited volumes sold.

II. Scholarly impact in the home-institution (SLU CSB)

1. Ph.D. program involvement
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of dissertation committees as a non-chair, student placement, the number and nature of Ph.D. students informally supervised and mentored over the past 5 years.
2. Engage cross-discipline and cross-school research collaborations
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of cross-discipline and cross-school research collaborations over the past 5 years.
3. Engage with and support student research
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of independent student research projects directed over the past 5 years.
4. Receive external grant funding
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the total amount of external grant funding over the past 5 years.
5. Receive internal grant funding
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the total amount of internal grant funding over the past 5 years.
6. Receive recognitions (e.g., awards, appointments, etc.)
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of recognitions (e.g., best paper awards, research awards, fellowships, visiting appointments) over the past 5 years.
7. Case studies for exclusive use by the home institution
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of case studies for exclusive use by the home institution over the past 5 years. Case studies for courses include both description narratives (e.g., a typical HBS case) and substantial quantitative cases that include data developed and structure for students to undertake empirical analysis.

8. Preparing students for case study and other competitions
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* The number of hours spent (not on load) preparing student teams and the result of competitions over the past 5 years.

III. Scholarly impact in the public sphere

1. Publish research articles in peer-reviewed practitioners' journals
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. A count of the number of acceptances in peer-reviewed practitioners' journals (e.g., HBR, MIT SMR) over the past 5 years.
 - ii. Citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar (for papers published over the past 5 years).
2. Publish articles in high-impact and widely acknowledged business newspapers or magazines (e.g. WSJ, CNBC, Bloomberg Businessweek, Financial Times, Forbes, Economist, Fortune, Barrons)
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of articles published in high-impact newspapers or magazines over the past 5 years.
3. Conduct research workshops to educate policymakers
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of workshops to educate policy members over the past 5 years and a list of the specific policy members and their ability to change policy.
4. Participate in media interviews, podcasting, etc.
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of media interviews and podcasts and corresponding (approximate) size of audiences over the past 5 years.
5. Publish popular press books, monographs, white papers, and technical manuals
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. A count of the number of popular press books, monographs, white papers, technical manuals over the past 5 years.
 - ii. Provide citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar (for publications over the past 5 years).
6. Presentations to the public, especially to policymakers, regulators, and executives
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of presentations to the public over the past 5 years and list specific policymakers, regulators, and executives.
7. Create impact on policy decisions
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of policy decisions over the past 5 years that trace back to the faculty member's scholarship.
8. Participate in government advisory panels, think tanks, advocacy groups

- *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of government advisory panel, think tank, and advocacy group participation over the past 5 years.
9. Volunteer work which leverages research expertise like expert testimony
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of volunteer work and number of hours spent over the past 5 years that leverages expertise.
 10. Reviewing for government and foundation funding agencies
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A list of reviews for government and foundation funding agencies over the past 5 years.

IV. Scholarly impact in education, pedagogy, and andragogy

1. Publish teaching case studies in peer or editorially reviewed journals
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of teaching case studies in peer or editorially reviewed journals/outlets (e.g., HBSP, Ivey, MIT Sloan, INSEAD, Stanford, UBS, Yale) over the past 5 years.
2. Give invited presentations of case studies or win case study competitions
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count the number of invited presentations of case studies and the number of case study competition wins over the past 5 years.
3. Publish innovative teaching methods or techniques in peer-reviewed journals
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:*
 - i. A count of the number of peer-reviewed journal publications of innovative teaching methods and techniques over the past 5 years.
 - ii. Provide citation counts, h-index, and i10-index measured by Web of Science and Google Scholar (for publications over the past 5 years).
4. Publish textbooks
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of textbook or major textbook revisions and the (approximate) number of adoptions and circulation over the past 5 years.
5. Develop teaching software that impacts innovative teaching
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of published research software and the number of schools and licenses/users using the software over the past 5 years.
6. Conduct teaching methodology workshops for faculty at conferences and universities
 - *Measures include but are not limited to:* A count of the number of textbook or major textbook revisions over the past 5 years.

Appendix A: Illustrative Archetype for High Scholarly Impact

Faculty are neither expected nor required to have contributions in each of the four categories except for the minimums for journal publications listed below in Section I. Nevertheless, faculty should have contributions over several categories. The archetypes below are examples of exemplary scholars in each designation contributing in some of the categories.

I. Scholarly impact in the academy

- Three to five journal acceptances over the past five years in journals rated ABDC A (or equivalent) or higher or 1-2 journal articles rated ABDC A* or equivalent.
- 35 or more Google Scholar citations from these journal publications; Google Scholar H-index of 10 or more from last five years
- Three reviews in the past two years for high-quality or higher journals
- On one editorial board of top high-quality journals
- Received one best paper award or recipient of significant attention in high impact over the past five years and widely acknowledged business newspapers or magazines
- One invited talk at a top 50 university, and one invited talk at a specialty conference over the past 3 years
- Maintaining AACSB SA status.

II. Scholarly impact in the home-institution (SLU CSB)

- Taught one Ph.D. Seminar over the past year
- Advised one Ph.D. Student over the past year
- Spent four hours preparing a team for a case competition over the past year

III. Scholarly impact in the public sphere

- Interviewed for two Post Dispatch Newspaper articles, one interview on KMOX over the past five years.
- Made a public presentation to policymakers

IV. Scholarly impact in education, pedagogy, and andragogy

- Published one case study with Ivey

Appendix B: Illustrative Archetype for Moderate Scholarly Impact

Faculty are neither expected nor required to have contributions in each of the four categories except for the minimums for journal publications listed below in Section I. Nevertheless, faculty should have contributions over several categories. The archetypes below are examples of exemplary scholars in each designation contributing in some of the categories.

I. Scholarly impact in the academy,

- One ABDC A or 2 ABDC B journal publications over the past five years
- 10 Google Scholar citations from these three journal publications; Google Scholar H-index of 5 or more over last five years

- One review in the past two years for top tier journals
 - On one editorial board of top tier field journal
 - One talk at a general conference
 - Maintain SA Status
- II. Scholarly impact in the home-institution (SLU CSB)**
- Advised one Ph.D. Student
 - Wrote two case studies for exclusive use in the home institution
 - Spent four hours preparing a student team for a case competition over the past year
- III. Scholarly impact in the public sphere**
- Interviewed for one Post Dispatch Newspaper article, interviewed three times on KMOX over the past five years
- IV. Scholarly impact in education, pedagogy, and andragogy**
- Published a teaching case study with Ivey

Appendix C: Illustrative Archetype for Modest Scholarly Impact

Please note that faculty are not expected nor required to have contributions in each of the four categories. Nevertheless, faculty should have contributions over several categories. The archetypes below are examples of exemplary scholars in each designation contributing in some of the categories.

- I. Scholarly impact in the academy,**
- One lower tier journal publication over the past five years.
 - One talk at a general conference
- II. Scholarly impact in the home-institution (SLU CSB)**
- Wrote a case study for exclusive use in the home institution
 - Spent 10 hours preparing a team for a case competition
- III. Scholarly impact in the public sphere**
- Interviewed five times on KMOX over the past five years.
- IV. Scholarly impact in education, pedagogy, and andragogy**
- Published a teaching case study with Ivey