

CALS Faculty Effort Distribution Guidelines
(Adopted October 1 2003 by the CALS Faculty Senate)

I. PREAMBLE

A periodical review and restatement of the accepted activities and responsibilities of a professorial faculty member in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences is crucial to the faculty's maintaining an active and contemporary role in its self-government. This set of Guidelines is not a set of fixed rules, but rather a set of mutually agreed-upon guidelines, from which deviations may be expected. This document offers direction and guidance to meeting our contractual responsibilities while preserving our independence and flexibility as modern day scholars.

II. GENERAL EXPECTATIONS AND PRINCIPLES

CALS' vision is to be the preeminent college for research, teaching and extension in agriculture and the life sciences, and to develop leaders to address the global challenges of the 21st century. As a college uniquely situated in a land grant, Ivy League university, we are committed to research, teaching and extension that makes an important difference in the lives of our stakeholders in New York State, the nation and the world. To accomplish this mission, the following are accepted as basic principles:

1. Any academic appointment encompasses a set of baseline responsibilities and expectations that contribute to basic college citizenship, collegiality and the accomplishment of CALS' mission. These responsibilities include baseline levels of: advising of undergraduate and graduate students, scholarly research, education (achievable through classroom instruction, extension programs, or other forms), public service, and service to the department, college and university – such as service on committees (see *Addendum 1*). If one or more of these responsibilities is initially above, or subsequently rises beyond, the baseline level, faculty effort allocations should be adjusted accordingly (*Addendum 2*).
2. Faculty effort allocations should be adaptable and flexible in order to respond to changing needs. Effort allocations should be reviewed periodically, taking into account the interests of the Department and the College, as well those of the individual faculty member, and should be adjusted as circumstances warrant (see *Addendum 3*).
3. Research is an important and necessary basis for, and beneficial link to, instructional and extension activities, and hence should be a component of all appointments (30% minimum level for initial assistant professor appointments).
4. Having faculty with different types of appointments is essential to meeting the college's diverse responsibilities. Effort allocations are useful for program planning and in conveying performance expectations.
5. The college will adhere to the general practice of limiting the effort allocation of junior faculty members to two functional areas (research and teaching or extension) . As the need exists and as faculty members gain additional experience, selective three-way effort allocations may be appropriate.
6. Consistent with Cornell University's basic performance criteria [1) excellence in carrying out position responsibilities and 2) unusual promise for continued achievement], excellence in program quality and high positive impact should continue to be the major expectations and criteria for advancement. Performance assessments may make use of both quantitative and qualitative indicators and criteria.

7. Faculty are expected to remain current in their areas of expertise. This may include attending workshops and professional meetings, being active in professional societies, reading scientific journals, and other self-enhancing activities.

III. TEACHING APPOINTMENTS: Faculty appointments reflect a wide range of specific activities and commitment percentages in this area. These activities, and the factors that may affect effort allocations, productivity and performance can be summarized as follows:

Classroom Teaching: This is at the center of the teaching commitment. Variables that affect the time commitment associated with teaching a course, *and that may influence the suggested effort allocations described below*, include: 1) first-time course preparation and development, or whether the course is undergoing major revision; 2) level and type of student-faculty interaction (lecture, laboratory, discussion sections, small group or one-on-one meetings); 3) class size; 4) availability of teaching assistants or staff to help with course preparation and instruction; 5) number of course credit hours, 6) whether the course is introductory or advanced; 7) whether it is singly or team taught, 8) whether the course is a course for a major or a service course, 9) number of discussion sections or lab sections, and 10) whether the course is offered in a distance learning format.

Advising: This comprises the academic advising of individual students as well as service as advisers to, or involvement with, clubs, campus organizations and student groups. Advising effort allocation will be heavily dependent on the number of students advised (undergraduate and graduate), as well as the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate student research (see *Addendum 4*).

Guidelines for Teaching Appointments: The appointment should reflect the degree of responsibility and commitment of an individual's time spent on teaching and instruction. The following effort allocation guidelines should be interpreted flexibly, and will depend on the qualifying factors mentioned above:

- **5-10%: Baseline responsibilities**, which apply to a teaching appointment at any level include: advising undergraduate students (around 10-15 students per year for tenure-track faculty; graduate advising (1-2 students per year); service on department teaching committees; occasional classroom teaching such as contribution to team-taught courses, guest lecturing, or running a single-credit course; and continuing education to support teaching enhancement.
- **11-25%:** This includes the baseline responsibilities defined above and having annual classroom teaching responsibilities generally defined as *servicing as the instructor in charge of at least one course* (subject to the factors above). A teaching appointment at this level may also be associated with assuming substantial baseline-type responsibilities including undergraduate or graduate student advising, committee service, etc.
- **26-50%:** This includes taking on substantial baseline responsibilities as described above (typically commensurate with the number of students taught or advised) and/or having annual classroom teaching responsibilities generally defined as *servicing as the instructor in charge of at least two courses*, or, in selected cases, one large introductory-type course.
- **>50%:** For appointments of >50% , faculty are expected to have a major commitment to teaching. They will typically be heavily involved in classroom teaching, generally including several classes, which may include a large introductory-type course. They will also be expected to have a continuing commitment to service components such as advising a large number of students or serving as director of undergraduate studies, undergraduate advising coordinator, or director of graduate studies.

Evaluation of Teaching Performance: This includes a diverse set of performance measures including, but not limited to: student course evaluations; faculty evaluations of teaching performance; evaluative letters from past and current students and colleagues both inside and outside Cornell University; outstanding student performance tied to teaching or advising; teaching awards; writing textbooks; and developing and implementing innovative teaching methods.

Service: Service on teaching-related committees should be considered within the teaching contribution. Similarly, administrative roles supporting teaching and instruction or student extra-curricular activities may figure significantly in teaching effort allocations; these roles include serving as the department's undergraduate advising coordinator, director of graduate studies, or curriculum committee chair.

IV. RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS: The College endeavors to have a mix of basic and applied research. Basic research is driven by a quest to generate new knowledge and contribute to theory, whereas applied research addresses explicit societal needs with a focus on problem-solving as new knowledge is generated and theory developed. Department programs will be most effective if they are allowed to generate a mixture of both basic and applied research programs.

Initial Research Appointments: All initial assistant professor faculty appointments should be at a minimum 30% research level in order to support excellence in the associated teaching or extension assignment. More typically, initial research appointments will be in the 40-50% range. An increase or decrease in the level of the research appointment may be justified based on research commitment relative to scholarly activity in teaching, extension or administration.

Guidelines for Research Appointments: The research appointment should reflect the degree of responsibility and commitment of an individual's time spent on research activities. Examples of performance expectations for varying percentage appointments are indicated below, although these guidelines should be interpreted flexibly. (Although the minimum initial research appointment will normally be 30%, the effort guidelines are given for a broader range.)

- **15-40%: Contributing responsibility or significant effort**: The researcher is expected to maintain an individual effort of sustained research either independently or in collaboration with other programs and scientists. Research contributions should be documented, including peer-reviewed publications and other performance indicators outlined above, commensurate with the level of the appointment and typical of college and department norms.
- **>40%: Leading responsibility or major effort**: At this appointment level, the researcher is expected to conduct and coordinate an in-depth research program. Typically this program will have multifaceted projects showing depth and/or breadth of field. Evidence of research excellence should be documented by peer-reviewed publications, where the individual shows a significant role in authorship, and other performance measures indicated above. Productivity should be at a level commensurate with the level of the appointment.

Productivity and Evaluation: Faculty members are expected to sustain scholarly excellence and productivity, the latter at a level approximately proportional to the percent research commitment. Research productivity can be evaluated in many ways, including: evidence of significant contributions to the scientific knowledge base, especially peer-reviewed publications, as well as other publication outlets; evidence of significant application or development of scientific knowledge to societal needs and associated research problems; a presence or reputation in a discipline as demonstrated by multiple publications in a particular line of research and a consistent publication record; recognition of the importance or excellence of a faculty member's research findings or ideas by colleagues within and outside the university; and participation in professional society activities. Among the indicators of excellence and promise for continued achievement are national-level accomplishment at time of tenure.

Funding: Faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their research activities. The research funding secured shall be commensurate with the faculty member's research assignment percentage and disciplinary norms and expectations.

Service: As part of being a professional member of Cornell University, faculty members with research appointments are expected to serve on committees that support the research function. These may be at department, college, university and professional society levels.

V. EXTENSION APPOINTMENTS: Extension is the dissemination of knowledge beyond the classroom to enable individual and society actions to produce solutions to identified problems. In determining guidelines for extension appointments, reference may be made to extension programs, projects and activities (these are defined in *Addendum 5*).

Guidelines for Extension Appointments: Extension appointments can be differentiated into three categories reflecting the degree of responsibility and effort. Faculty appointments should have expectations and impact commensurate with designated effort allocations.

<15%: Supporting responsibility and effort: This is typical of faculty involved in extension activities who provide resources to a program or project. This can range from incidental support to significant contributions depending on the time allocated, but should indicate a *commitment* to supporting an extension program(s), and not cover miscellaneous public service activities expected of all CALS faculty. Expectations do not include program leadership, but may include serving as an “expert source,” making workshop presentations, and preparing publications.

15-40%: Contributing responsibility or significant effort: This entails a substantial commitment to extension program development, typically as a project leader or principal participant in a specified project, by making a substantial contribution to one or more programs, or demonstrating broad program leadership.

>40%: Leading responsibility or major effort: This is typical of a program leader who has a major extension programming responsibility, commonly involving coordination and conducting a multi-disciplinary or multi-project program, or management of contributions and/or extension field staff. Faculty in this category are expected to lead one or more major, highly visible projects in a program area, may make contributions to other projects, and should have a high level of involvement in program leadership and/or departmental extension planning and leadership. Leadership includes ensuring that current research is being integrated into the program.

Evaluation of Extension Efforts: Similar to teaching and research, fundamental expectations for scholarship, excellence and productivity are applicable to the evaluation of extension effort. Extension performance can be assessed by the indicators given below, at a degree commensurate with the assigned effort levels. Both quantitative and qualitative indicators may be used (see *Addendum 6*). For faculty with extension efforts at the “supporting” effort level, evaluation should be based primarily on the quality of the contributions made rather than on educational impact.

- ***Demonstrated leadership in program development***, as evidenced through leading program planning and evaluation; innovation in program delivery; seeking, securing and maintaining outside program support; building campus support staff for program delivery; and building commitment of and maintaining liaison with outside collaborators.
- ***Ensuring that impact of extension programs occurs***, or at least identifying how impact is occurring and designing strategies to improve impact to address identified problems. Performance needs to be evaluated not just by the effort expended in program planning and implementation, but by evidence of demonstrated impact. (See *Addendum 7* for further discussion of impact indicators).
- ***Demonstrated scholarly approach to extension programming development*** through professional presentations and publications (including peer-reviewed) concerning extension program development, extension program evaluation (program model, implementation strategy, and impact), and extension education in general.

Funding: Faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their extension activities. The funding secured shall be commensurate with the faculty member’s extension assignment percentage and program needs.

Service: Faculty with extension appointments are expected to serve on committees that support the extension function at the department, college and university level.

CALS Effort Distribution Guidelines: Addenda

Addendum 1: Cornell University Faculty Responsibilities

These guidelines supplement those regarding faculty appointments and the general responsibilities of all Cornell University faculty members, as spelled out in the *Faculty Handbook* (2002 Edition), pp. 28-29. The relevant language includes the following:

Professors [of all ranks] are responsible for teaching, research, advising students, and providing public, departmental, college and university service. Not all professors are assigned all these duties; the determination of responsibilities is made by the dean and the department chairperson or the director of a center, institute or program in consultation with the faculty member. But the responsibilities must include significant effort in research and either teaching or extension/outreach.

Addendum 2: Baseline Responsibilities

Consistent with general Cornell University faculty responsibilities (see *Addendum 1*), specific “baseline responsibilities” may differ from one faculty member to another in light of one’s expertise and experience, and the needs of the department and college. However, all faculty members are expected to be capable of contributing to all components of these responsibilities at least at a minimal level. If a faculty member’s responsibilities are initially above, or rise beyond, the baseline level in one or more areas, the effort allocation should be adjusted accordingly. In the discussions of effort distribution in this document, percentages are on an annual or appointment basis.

Addendum 3: Revisions of Effort Allocations

The effort distribution of an individual faculty member is established at the time of his/her initial appointment. The distribution should be reviewed from time to time by the Chair in concert with the faculty member, taking into account the interests of the Department, the College, and those of the individual faculty member. The Department Chair should notify the Senior Associate Dean of a major adjustment in effort allocation (in excess of 10%) and provide a justification. Such changes are not official until approved by the Dean’s Office. Minor changes in effort distribution (less than or equal to 10%) should be noted annually in the faculty member’s annual report and discussed. The Dean and the Senior Associate Dean will review departmental faculty effort distribution in relationship to overall departmental productivity annually in their discussions with Department Chairs.

Addendum 4: Graduate Advising

Graduate student advising may include service as Special Committee Chair or minor member. Whether or not graduate advising is included in research or teaching faculty effort allocations will often depend upon the specific discipline. For example, in the biological and physical sciences, graduate student research and advising is typically indistinguishable from the faculty member’s research program, and thus graduate student advising will commonly be included in the research effort allocation. In the social sciences, on the other hand, relatively independent graduate student research is common, and graduate student advising is often included in the teaching effort allocation.

Addendum 5: Extension Programs, Projects and Activities

An extension **program** is a planned sequence of learning experiences (e.g., a curriculum) addressing a well-defined need, often directed toward a specific target audience and typically representing a significant time commitment over an extended period. Needs may be defined at local, state, regional, national or international levels. Audiences may be decision-makers at these same levels, other educators, extension field staff or other such persons who are able to multiply the effort of the primary extension educator. An extension **project** can be part of a larger program or a standalone project. It typically has narrower objectives and requires less time commitment. The scope of its audience and expectations for achieving changes in performance or decisions are similar to expectations for an extension program.

An extension **activity** is a specific, discrete element of a project or program. It typically involves a single one-time event, which may be repeated at different times and locations.

Addendum 6: Extension Performance Indicators

Recognizing that qualitative and quantitative performance indicators are often indistinguishable and may often overlap, the following are illustrative of each:

- *Qualitative elements* include: 1) peer-review letters of evaluation from colleagues within and outside Cornell; 2) letters of evaluation from program/project audience(s), cooperators and field staff; 3) tabulations of surveys of audience responses to specified program/project outcomes; 4) new instructional approaches/materials developed; and 5) personal summary assessments of performance and goals.
- *Quantitative elements* include: 1) measures of program/project commitment (personnel managed, resources acquired, facilities obtained, legislation influenced, etc.); 2) grants/contracts submitted and funded; 3) workshops presented, training schools conducted, and associated audience numbers; 4) publications and writings, including: manuscripts, bulletins, papers presented at professional meetings, newsletters, news articles and fact sheets, editorial contributions, and computer software developed; 5) presentations, including audiovisual presentations, made to extension audiences at all levels; and 6) other relevant measurable attributes, including correspondence, field visits and telephone/email communications.

Addendum 7: Indicators of Extension Impact

The impact indicators listed below are excerpted from the CALS "Report of the Applied Research and Extension Task Force" of CALS (draft issued February 1, 2003), and provide additional examples of widely recognized indicators of high impact, outcome-based extension programming:

- Addressing important stakeholder-identified needs;
- Achieving outcomes that are well-defined and specific to priority audiences;
- Success in developing programs for new or nontraditional audiences;
- Targeting niches where CCE can make a unique contribution to problem solving;
- Achieving high levels of accountability to important extension stakeholders;
- Development of new educational materials and techniques;
- Documented changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspirations and/or behavior of targeted audiences;
- Demonstration of leadership (state, regional and/or national) for program development and delivery;
- Building effective teams with collaborators on and off-campus; and
- Demonstrating scholarly approach to program development through professional presentations and peer-reviewed publications.