

# SSE Faculty Workload Policy

Version 2.0

Responsible University Officials: SSE Dean

Effective Date: March 2026

**Provost approval Date: 6/16/26 pending stage II  
(research buyout and production policies being  
approved)**

## 1.0 Introduction

This policy outlines the Saint Louis University (SLU) School of Science and Engineering's (SSE) approach to assigning and managing faculty workload. Faculty responsibilities are assigned by department chairs in consultation with the Faculty and reviewed by the Dean, based on contracts, the Faculty Manual, and academic unit policies.

This SSE policy is subservient to the University Faculty Workload Policy (February 2025) and is built on the foundation created by that document. The University policy details several required elements of school-level policies; these are incorporated into the sections below.

Together, the SLU and SSE workload policies bring the School into alignment with our fellow research-intensive institutions by balancing teaching expectations with benchmarks for externally funded research, scholarly productivity, and student/trainee mentoring. The structure described herein ensures that the work of faculty who sustain high levels of research activity is supported with corresponding workload assignment, while also reinforcing the central role of high-quality instruction. As per the University Faculty Workload Policy (§1), "the broader needs/priorities of the academic unit(s) to which each faculty member is assigned (as determined by the department chair and/or Dean), as well as those of the University as a whole (as determined by the Provost), shall take precedence."

## 2.0 Governing Principles

The University Faculty Workload Policy is grounded in five "Governing Principles". The SSE Faculty Workload Policy builds on those five principles and the three additional principles enumerated below:

1. **Respect for Commonality and Diversity of Practices.** This policy has been designed to capture the most general commonalities across the School. This design recognizes and respects differences of practice across the various disciplines in science, engineering, and aviation.

2. **Reliance on Department-Level Policies.** The University Workload policy (Appendix A.1.4.e) requires that unit-level policies be consistent with unit's promotion and tenure standards. Within SSE, department-level promotion and tenure criteria address discipline-specific standards for research productivity, teaching, and service. Therefore, this SSE workload policy is designed with the expectation that department-level policies subservient to the School-level policy will provide further refinement (as described in Appendix A of this document).
  
3. **Agency of Department Chairs.** Department chairs are best positioned to make judgments about the assignment of workload units to faculty in their departments. The specific details provided in this document are meant to serve as guidelines; chairs have agency to make adjustments that best serve the School.

### 3.0 Scope

This policy applies to all faculty in the School of Science and Engineering who are overseen by the Dean of the School of Science and Engineering.

### 4.0 Faculty Profiles

The University Workload Policy (§4.0) defines three broad categories of faculty: "Teaching-intensive faculty", "Teaching and scholarship/research faculty" and "Scholarship/research-intensive faculty." Within SSE, every faculty member will be assigned to one of six specific categories, based upon their expected research activities for the upcoming year. The University Workload Policy (§5.4b) directs that "all annual faculty evaluations must be based on each faculty member's formally-assigned workload, in accordance with each faculty contract and the Faculty Manual." The *typical* workload ranges for these categories are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Summary of the six lettered classifications to which all SSE Faculty are assigned based on their expected proportion of research, teaching, and service effort.

Category	Research / Scholarship Expectations	Teaching Workload Range	Research / Scholarship Workload Range	Service Workload Range
<b>Category A</b>	none	21–24	0	0–3
<b>Category B</b>	Sustained record of research activity (unfunded)	18–21	1–4	1–4
<b>Category C</b>	Funded research less productive than Category D	15–18	4–7	1–4

<b>Category D</b>	Research productivity that sustains the trajectory of a positive tenure case	12–15	7–10	1–4
<b>Category E</b>	Higher research productivity than Category D	9–12	10–13	1–4
<b>Category F</b>	Exceptional research productivity	6–9	13–16	1–4

- Category A aligns with the University's "Teaching intensive faculty" definition. Categories B and C are variants of the University's "Teaching and research/scholarship faculty." Categories D, E, and F are variants of the University's "Scholarship/research-intensive faculty".
- As per University workload policy (§4.0), "all faculty (a) on the tenure track and (b) maintaining satisfactory progress toward the earning of tenure must be assigned a workload consistent with the Scholarship/Research-intensive designation above until tenure status has been finalized." Within SSE, such an assignment will be to Category D, E, or F.
- While the above categories are defined relative to the notion of the continued trajectory of a successful tenure case, non-tenure-track faculty may be assigned to any of these categories if their research activity meets the corresponding productivity expectations.
- Department-level workload policies should articulate the expected productivity for Category D, based upon the department's tenure and promotion criteria and the University policy's expectation that this be "consistent with professional- or discipline-specific R1 standards."
- Department-level workload policies should also articulate what constitutes significant enough productivity that warrants reclassification from Category D to Category E, or exceptional research that warrants reclassification to Category F.
- Given the peaks and valleys of funded research and scholarly productivity, a faculty member with a drop in funding would normally be assigned one letter earlier in the alphabet than their prior year's assignment, but in extraordinary cases—such as faculty who through a one-time event are now in a category more than two above their three-year average—could be assigned two letters earlier (but no more). For example, a faculty member who was assigned Category D in one year, could be assigned Category C or B in the subsequent year, but not Category A.

- While sustained research productivity is evidenced in the output over several recent years (typically three), workload assignments should be forward facing. In particular, faculty with newly funded projects should be assigned workloads that allow them to meet those funded obligations in the year ahead, even if this necessitates an assignment to a category more than one letter later in the alphabet than the subsequent year.
- The above table applies to faculty on nine-month contracts, and thus with 24 workload units. TT and NTT faculty members with non-administrative appointments longer than 9 months (>24 workload units) may have their workload unit contributions proportionately adjusted. Workloads for faculty with administrative roles must be apportioned to reflect those roles. (See also §5.4 of this document.)

## **5.0 Workload Equivalencies**

The University Faculty Workload Policy (§7.0) holds that workload assignments represent an “equitable distribution of work” where “workloads should 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 University standards while accommodating specific academic unit needs. While institutional needs take precedence, faculty professional goals are considered.”

As per the University Workload Policy (§4.0), “A single workload unit represents the amount of work required for the successful conduct of one credit hour of teaching in a given discipline.” This section addresses the assignment of workload units to the most typical faculty activities within SSE.

### **5.1. Teaching**

The University Workload Policy (§5.1) notes that teaching includes course design, instruction, grading, and student advising and mentoring. The time required for the “successful conduct” of such activities depends on many factors. For most courses, considerations include (but are not limited to) the number of student credit hours of a course, the number of required contact hours for instruction (if different from the student credit hours), preparation time, student enrollment, and other forms of institutional support such as teaching assistants and graders

To establish a baseline assignment within SSE, one workload unit shall represent the delivery of one credit hour of teaching a traditional undergraduate lecture-based course, in a subject that a faculty member teaches with regularity, and having a course enrollment of 25 students. (This ideal is henceforth referred to as the “benchmark” course.) By default, a 1.0 baseline is multiplied by the number of credit hours delivered. When adapting this baseline for individual faculty assignments, primary considerations should include:

- Hours of primary instruction
- Estimated time for course design and preparation

- Estimated time for student-related activity (e.g., grading, answering questions, managing course accessibility with CADR, handling integrity concerns)

While time spent within these categories varies among offerings, the guidelines in this section are based on approximating that 0.3 workload units go toward primary instruction, 0.4 workload units toward course design and preparation, and 0.3 workload units toward student-related activities (for the benchmark 25-student course). For illustrative purposes, if a traditional 3-credit-hour offering equates to 10 hours/week of effort, the above approximation suggests 3 hours/week for primary instruction, 4 hours/week for course design and preparation, and 3 hours/week for student-related activity.

### **5.1.1. Common adjustments**

Given this framework, common considerations for adjustments to the baseline of 1.0 workload units are as follows.

#### **5.1.1.1. Primary instruction**

One credit hour of instruction generally equates to one hour per week of primary instruction (technically 50 minutes of instruction, though rounded to one hour when including travel/setup).

Student credit hours are generally a reflection of student effort; however, this effort might not align with the amount of primary instruction delivered by a faculty member (e.g., a 1-credit-hour lab that meets for 2 or 3 hours per week, or a 0-credit-hour recitation section that meets regularly). Department-level workload policies should address any regular discrepancies between student credit hours and primary instruction time for a faculty member.

#### **5.1.1.2. Course design and preparation**

The benchmark course in the opening of Section 5.1 presumes a subject that the faculty member teaches with regularity. Adjustments to workload upward or downward might include the following:

- If a faculty member is assigned two or more sections of the identical subject in a given semester, the second and subsequent offerings have a baseline reduction of 0.3. For example, teaching two identical 3-credit "benchmark" courses in a semester would result in only 5.1 workload units (not 6.0 workload units). This reduction is justified because much (but not all) of the design and preparation can be shared across the offerings, even though the delivery and student-related activities are separate for each section.
- If a faculty member is assigned to teach a course that they have not taught in the preceding two academic years, or a course which needs significant curricular redesign, a chair may assign additional workload units commensurate with the expected effort

relative to a benchmark course. Advanced undergraduate-level and graduate-level courses can require continual updates to maintain pace with advancements in the field.

When additional preparation effort is required, a typical adjustment range might be an increase from a baseline of 1.0 to an assignment of 1.2 to 1.5 workload units.

- Some courses with many sections might have coordinators or other staff who are responsible for the design and preparation, rather than the instructor of record for each section. The design component of workload for those offerings might be reassigned as such.

### 5.1.1.3. Student enrollment

While the course design, preparation, and delivery generally require a fixed amount of time regardless of the number of students, some aspects of successful conduct of a course do increase with the number of students enrolled. As a first approximation, the increase in workload scales linearly with the number of students (though some reasonable efficiencies may come with significantly large enrollments). Using the enrollment of 25 undergraduate students as the benchmark, and the estimate of 0.3 workload units of a 1.0-unit baseline dedicated to student-related activities, approximate multipliers based solely on student enrollment would include:

**Table 2.** Example workload unit multipliers per lecture course based solely on undergraduate student enrollment. A lecture class of 25 students is the benchmark—assigned a multiplier of 1.

Enrollment	Approximate Multiplier
5 students	0.76
15 students	0.88
25 students (benchmark)	1.00
40 students	1.18
75 students	1.60
150 students	2.50

The above numbers are meant as examples (not thresholds); workload units for other totals should be interpolated. For example, an undergraduate course with 60 students would equate to a multiplier of 1.42. Chairs are expected to make their best estimates of future enrollments when assigning individual workloads for the coming year.

The department chair has discretion to increase multipliers of less than 1 for courses that must be taught for completion of a degree program.

For graduate courses, including courses that are cross-listed, dual-listed or co-located (such as a 4xxx/5xxx offering), department chairs should carefully consider how graduate courses impact the overall workload. Typically, the total (aggregate) workload units assigned for all faculty involved in a co-teaching situation will not exceed the total credit hours of the co-taught course.

#### **5.1.1.4. Institutional support**

The workload estimates above presume that an instructor has sole responsibility for all aspects of the successful conduct of a course. When the University, School, or Department commits other support structures to assist instructors (e.g., graduate teaching assistants, undergraduate graders or assistants), the presumption is that many of those resources reduce the amount of time the faculty member must spend in conducting the course. However, there is not a one-to-one reduction in time; that is, a graduate teaching assistant spending 10 hours per week supporting a course does not equate to a reduction of 10 hours per week of work for a faculty member. Each department-level policy should consider the development of an appropriate framework that meets the needs of the department. For instance, the following approximations could be used:

- Every 10 hours/week of graduate-student support equates to an absolute (not multiplicative) reduction of 0.75 workload units.
- Every 10 hours/week of undergraduate-student support equates to an absolute reduction of 0.6 workload units.

Given that additional support is often associated with courses of higher enrollment, these adjustments should be used in conjunction with other multipliers. As an example, a faculty member teaching a 3-credit lecture course with 150 students would have a 2.50 multiplier as per Section 5.1.1.3, thus 7.50 workload units assigned for that one course. However, if the faculty member were also provided with 10 hours of graduate student support per week and 20 hours of undergraduate student support per week, then the actual workload for that offering would be  $7.50 - 0.75 - 2 \times 0.6 = 5.55$  workload units.

#### **5.1.1.5. Combining adjustments to multipliers**

The framework of §5.1.1 considers possible adjustments to faculty workload due to factors related to primary instruction, preparation and course design, student enrollment, and other institutional supports. When multiple adjustments are warranted, the adjustments due to §5.1.1.1 through §5.1.1.3 should each be viewed as an additive adjustment to the multiplier prior to multiplying by the number of credit hours, while the adjustment from §5.1.1.4 is an absolute adjustment to the workload after all other calculations. As an example, consider a 3-credit hour undergraduate lecture course. If a chair deems that a new or advanced course requires twice as much preparation time as a routine course, that increases the multiplier by 0.4, and if that course also has 75 students, that results in an increase of the multiplier by 0.6 as per

the table of §5.1.1.3. That combined multiplier is then 2.0 ( $1.0 + 0.4 + 0.6$ ) and so the 3-credit course would require 6.0 workload units to deliver; note that the multiplier is not calculated as  $1.4 \times 1.6 = 2.24$ . Similarly, if a chair or department designates a graduate class as requiring 50% more prep and thus an additional 0.2 toward the multiplier and the class has estimated enrollment of 10 students and thus a  $-0.18$  impact on the multiplier due to enrollment, the overall multiplier for that course becomes 1.02.

### **5.1.2. Non-classroom teaching responsibilities**

The subsections above address lecture courses taught in classrooms. While these courses generate the most student credit-hours taught in our School, faculty teach a variety of other courses with various modes of instruction. Given the variety of practices found across the disciplines within SSE, developing a universal system for workload unit assignment in these courses would likely introduce inaccuracies and inequities. This subsection identifies non-lecture courses with the intention that department-level workload policies will address the equitable assignment of workload units to the faculty teaching these courses. Assignments should be consistent in the equitability of the assignment of teaching loads to lecture courses within these departments. In this manner—through comparison to an SSE-standard lecture course as a benchmark—the department-level policies will tie the assignment of workload for these courses into what amounts to a single framework.

Example teaching activities that are not delivering lectures:

- Teaching laboratory courses and studio-style experiential-learning courses
- Performing flight instruction & flight stage checks
- Mentoring undergraduate- and graduate-student research
- Mentoring capstone projects
- Organizing department-wide seminar series (not delivering seminars or serving as a weekly host of a speaker)
- Coordinating internships
- Advising students

Most of the teaching work listed above is associated with catalogued courses (i.e., those that have a proper course number within the department), although the number of credit hours for these courses does not always match the number of contact hours per week. Department-level policies should reflect the work expected to successfully deliver the course rather than the number of credit-hours for the course. Workload will generally be assigned to the instructor(s) of record. In some cases, workload can be assigned to faculty who are not the instructors of record but contribute to delivery of the course. One notable example is assignment of workload to flight instructors, who are not always the instructor(s) of record. A further complication is that teaching

workload is not always associated with a catalogued course (e.g., faculty flight instructors who conduct flight stage checks for students). When these circumstances arise, they should be addressed equitably by department-level workload policies and the best judgment of department chairs.

In cases where a department chair recognizes that work contributed by a member of the Faculty in a hybrid area (e.g., project oversight of students that is part-research and part-teaching) does not cleanly fall into categorization by the guidance provided in this Policy, the chair has agency to make a reasonable assignment of workload units to avoid this work going uncredited.

### **5.1.3. Student advising and mentoring**

The University Faculty Workload Policy (§5.1) notes that “student advising and mentoring” should be assigned as teaching workload. For the purpose of assigning workload within SSE, “advising” shall be defined as student support associated with program progress and professional/career advice that is provided directly from faculty to students assigned to them by their departments (e.g., in the official role of “Faculty Mentor” in Banner). For the purpose of assigning workload within SSE, “mentoring” shall be defined as oversight and mentorship of students associated with research projects and capstone projects, including related guidance provided to students regarding funding applications (e.g., student fellowships), exams (e.g., oral defenses) and deliverables (e.g., final reports, theses, dissertations, student presentations)

associated with these projects. Department-level policies should both assign a reasonable number of workload units to these efforts and detail the responsibilities of faculty assigned to these roles.

## **5.2. Service**

At its heart, a workload unit is an approximation of faculty time, and so over a 9-month contract period (approximately 38 weeks), one workload unit equates to approximately 65 hours of effort over the academic year (or 100 minutes per week, if averaged across the entire contract period). Therefore, service workload units should be assigned based upon this measure of estimated time commitments.

Typical contributions to the SLU and SSE missions that are properly classified as service include:

- University, School, and department committees
- University and School offices in Shared Governance (Faculty Senate, SSE Council)
- Professional service (scientific organizations, journal editorship, peer review)
- Community service (outreach, prison programs, directing visiting student researchers)
- Student support (student club advising, letters of recommendation)

- Student recruitment (graduate and undergraduate efforts)

**Table 3.** Suggested service workload units assigned to certain faculty roles in Shared Governance.

<b>Role</b>	<b>Suggested Service Workload Units</b>
Council President	3
Council Vice President	1
Council Secretary	1.5
Council Representative	0.5
Chair, Curriculum Committee	1.5
Chair, TPSDL Committee	1.5
TPSDL Committee Member	0.5
Faculty Senator	0.5

### **5.3. Research**

Research and scholarship includes faculty activities delineated in the SLU Workload Policy along with other commonly recognized research and scholarship activities:

- Experimentation / R&D (where expenditures can be used as one metric of effort)
- Publication of scientific papers in peer-reviewed journals
- Dissemination of results (conference presentations, invited talks, book authorship)
- Intellectual property and technology transfer (patents, etc.)
- Grant writing and submission of proposals

The above list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive. Given the differences in metrics of productivity across the various disciplines within SSE, department-level policies shall consider what specific metrics should be used in the assignment of research workload to faculty. Department chairs should have agency in making adjustments to accurately capture faculty workload in cases that are not directly addressed by University, School-, or department-level workload policies.

### **5.4. Administrative**

Those faculty with administrative roles (e.g., department chairs, associate chairs, program coordinators, and program directors) should be assigned workload units commensurate with their responsibilities.

## 6.0 Individual Faculty Workload Assignments

This section addresses required elements in the University Workload Policy related to the assignment of work to individual members of the Faculty. The University policy (§A.1.4.f) requires each unit policy to have a detailed description of the process (including associated timelines) by which workloads for individual faculty are established annually." The University policy (§A.1.5) further requires that each "unit shall develop a written, internal appeals process to address disagreements between individual faculty and the person responsible for formally determining their annual workload assignments."

### 6.1. Timeline of Tasks and Responsible Parties

For the upcoming academic year, the Department Chair will assign each faculty member to a category as defined in §4.0. This categorization will take into consideration department needs, institutional goals, and the strengths and goals of the faculty member, and must objectively evaluate the recent and upcoming research activity of the individual in accordance with the University, School, and Department policies. The Chair will have a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the workload assignment for the coming year. Faculty members who disagree with their workload assignment can submit a written appeal to the Dean's Office.

**Table 5.** Timeline of tasks related to the assignment of faculty workload profiles, with the parties responsible and expected deadlines.

Task	Responsible Party	Expected Deadline
Preliminary assignments communicated in writing to individual faculty and discussed.	Department Chair	January 15
Discussion and potential adjustments to assignments.	Department Chair Individual Faculty	January 31
Workload assignments submitted to Dean	Department Chair	February 1
Final approval of workload assignments	Dean	February 21
Approved workload assignments communicated in writing to individual faculty	Office of the Dean & Department Chairs	March 1
Submission of appeals	Individual Faculty	March 15
Resolution of appeals	Dean, Provost	April 15
Workload assignments become effective	Individual Faculty	July 1

## 6.2. Appeals Process

Faculty who feel their workload assignment is inaccurate, inequitable, or unreasonable may appeal the assignment of their supervisor. Workload assignments made by a department chair are appealed to the Dean. All appeals must be made in writing by the deadline noted in §6.1. All rulings must be returned to the member of the faculty, in writing, by the deadline noted in §6.1. Rulings to appeals must substantively address arguments raised in the written appeal—a simple notice of denial with no associated explanation is insufficient.

## 7.0 References

The documents cited and linked throughout the Policy are:

- The Saint Louis University Faculty Manual ([www.slu.edu/provost/policies/faculty-manual.php](http://www.slu.edu/provost/policies/faculty-manual.php))
- The Saint Louis University Faculty Workload Policy ([www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-workload-policies/index.php](http://www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-workload-policies/index.php))
- The *SSE Tenure, Promotion, Sabbatical, and Developmental Leave (TPSDL) Guidelines* and SSE Departments' Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, available on the Provost's website (pending approval by the Provost). ([www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure-resources/rank-and-tenure-criteria.php](http://www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure-resources/rank-and-tenure-criteria.php))

## 8.0 Approvals

Once approved, this policy will be reviewed every three years.

Version 1.0 was approved in May 2022.

Version 2.0 was approved in February 2026. Early drafts were developed by a committee of the SSE department chairs and one representative from the SSE Council Executive Committee. Draft 1.3 was distributed to the SSE Council Executive Committee for feedback. Draft 1.4 was distributed to the entire SSE Faculty Assembly for feedback. Draft 1.5 was developed by an ad hoc committee of six members of the SSE Faculty—three scientists, two engineers, and one aviator—with a charge endorsed by vote of the SSE Council. Two members of the ad hoc committee were also department chairs, and the SSE Council President served as an *ex-officio* member of the committee. Draft 1.6 was a revision from the same ad hoc committee following a round of feedback from the SSE Faculty. Draft 1.7 was the result of amendments approved by majority votes in the SSE Council regular meeting of 28 October 2025. Draft 1.8 was prepared by the ad hoc committee on remand of Draft 1.7 with feedback from the Dean. Draft 1.9 was the result of amendments approved by majority votes in the SSE Council special meeting of 11 November 2025. Draft 1.9 was approved by the full SSE Faculty Assembly by a vote that closed 13 November 2025. The Dean of SSE approved Draft 1.9 on 13 November 2025. Draft 1.10 addresses feedback to Draft 1.9 provided by the Office of the Provost.

Approved by SSE Faculty Council:	11 November 2025
Approved by SSE Faculty Assembly:	13 November 2025
Approved by the SSE Dean:	13 November 2025
Approved by the Provost:	13 February 2026

## Appendix A

### Development and Approval of Department-Level Workload Policies

The Governing Principles of the SSE Faculty Workload Policy (§2, above) recognize the inherent differences in practices across the various disciplines in science, engineering, and aviation. These disparate considerations cannot all be addressed accurately in one concise, School-level workload policy. Consequently, each department in SSE is expected to develop and implement its own workload policy. This appendix describes the required components of department-level policies and the process for their design and approval.

#### A.1. Development of Department-Level Policies

Department workload policies must be consistent with the University and SSE workload policies, and with the promotion and tenure standards adopted by the department. Departmental workload policies must meet the requirements for unit-level policies described in Appendix A of the University Workload Policy. Department-level policies will be developed according to Table 1 of Appendix B in the University Policy.

##### Required Elements of Department-Level Policies

- Specific and measurable attributes of research productivity that would warrant assignment to each of Categories B, C, D, E, and F, consistent with definitions in §4, and with alignment of Category D as "research productivity that sustains the trajectory of a positive tenure case" and which is "consistent with professional- or discipline-specific R1 standards" as per the University's categorization of a "Scholarship/research-intensive faculty."
- An enumeration of any regular teaching assignments within the department that require refinement to the general principles of workload equivalencies given in §5.1.
- A web link to the promotion and tenure guidelines of the department.
- A definition of "overload" that is consistent with the University Faculty Workload Policy (§5.2).
- Language referencing how successful fulfillment of faculty workload assignment will keep each faculty member "on pace" with approved promotion and/or tenure requirements (University Faculty Workload Policy, §5.4a).
- Language reiterating that all annual faculty evaluations are based on each faculty member's formally assigned workload (University Faculty Workload Policy, §5.4b).

#### A.2. Approval Process for Department-Level Policies

- The chair of the department will determine how a draft policy will be generated (e.g., by committee, by individual, etc.).

- The draft policy must be distributed to the department faculty at least one week prior to a non-binding, advisory vote on its approval. There must be an accessible forum for relevant discussion (e.g., a faculty meeting, a thread on an online discussion board, an e-mail chain) open for substantive deliberation about revision of the draft prior to the vote.
- Each department-level workload policy requires the following succession of approvals: (i) recommendation from the department chair, (ii) approval of the Dean of SSE, and (iii) approval of the Provost.
- Any member of the department who feels the procedural requirements of this section were not adequately followed may appeal to the SSE Dean, who will review the case and determine whether the department must revisit any steps of the process.
- Departmental workload policies shall be reviewed every three years.

### **A.3. Accessibility of Workload Policies**

- In accordance with the principles of transparency, equity, mutual accountability, and Shared Governance, the Faculty is entitled access to all policies that govern workload assignment within the School of Science and Engineering.
- The SSE Office of the Dean will be responsible for posting the approved School-level and department-level workload policies such that they are readily accessible to the Faculty in the same manner that the Office of the Provost has made unit-level policies available to the University community.