



Clarifying Faculty Workload, RSCA Expectations, and Service Responsibilities

RES 252633

FAC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms that the professional workload of tenure-line faculty includes engagement in teaching; research, scholarship, creative activity; and professional service, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and campus policy; and
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms that indirect instructional activity, as described in EPR 76-36, is intended to encompass both professionally related service and meaningful engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activities as integral components of tenure-line faculty work; and
- RESOLVED:** That probationary faculty are expected to demonstrate sustained engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) and appropriate participation in professional service, including clear progress toward scholarly or creative outputs consistent with applicable retention, tenure, and promotion criteria; and
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate reaffirms that “candidates for tenure and promotion shall demonstrate these contributions via works that have received favorable peer review from individuals outside of CSUB” (section 305.4.2.8 of the University Handbook); and
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms that tenure signifies continued professional responsibility. Professional expectations extend beyond the granting of tenure and promotion. Contractual compliance and engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity and professional service remains expected regardless of whether a faculty member intends to seek promotion to a higher rank; and
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms that tenure does not eliminate the expectation that faculty remain professionally engaged in research, scholarship, and creative activity; however, such engagement should be understood as participation in the ongoing scholarly or creative process rather than as a requirement to produce

specific outputs within a fixed period of time, recognizing that the pace and forms of scholarly activity vary across disciplines and career stages; and

RESOLVED: That tenured faculty are expected to maintain meaningful engagement in RSCA and professional service appropriate to rank and discipline, recognizing that professional activity may vary across different stages of the academic career; and

RESOLVED: That meaningful engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity may be demonstrated through a range of documented professional activities appropriate to the discipline and stage of scholarly or creative development (e.g., development of scholarly or creative projects; preparation or revision of manuscripts, books, or creative works; submission or preparation of grant or fellowship proposals; presentation of research or creative work at professional conferences; mentorship of undergraduate or graduate student research or creative projects; development of research collaborations; participation in scholarly workshops or institutes; editorial or peer-review activities; or other documented activities contributing to the advancement of knowledge, creative practice, or scholarly or creative infrastructure); and

RESOLVED: That research, scholarship, and creative activity typically occur across extended project timelines that may include periods of idea development, data collection, analysis, writing, revision, dissemination, and mentorship; therefore, evaluation of scholarly engagement should consider the full scholarly and creative process rather than focusing exclusively on completed outputs within a single review period; and

RESOLVED: That meaningful engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity remains an ongoing professional responsibility of tenured faculty; however, advancement in rank typically depends upon the production and impact of scholarly or creative *outputs* as defined in applicable RTP criteria (e.g., publications, presentations, exhibitions). Accordingly, reduced scholarly *output* (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, presentations, and exhibitions) following tenure may reasonably limit opportunities for promotion or advancement in rank, but such outcomes are distinct from disciplinary action, rank reduction, or termination and should instead be addressed through collegial encouragement, professional development, and constructive engagement consistent with the developmental purpose of Post-Tenure Review.

- RESOLVED:** That faculty members who are not actively engaged in RSCA remain responsible for meaningful participation in professional service and may be expected to assume proportionate university-related service responsibilities (e.g., university-level, college-level, department-level, etc.) in order to maintain equitable workload distribution across the faculty; and
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recognizes that faculty who are under-engaged in service adversely impact colleagues by creating inequitable service burdens, which may diminish others' ability to flourish in research, scholarship, and creative activities; and
- RESOLVED:** That substantial engagement in RSCA does not eliminate the professional obligation to participate in service, and balanced engagement across teaching, RSCA, and service remains a shared responsibility of the faculty; and
- RESOLVED:** That when institutional resources intended to support RSCA (e.g., such as internal funding opportunities, reassigned time, or similar support mechanisms) are limited, allocation of such resources should prioritize faculty demonstrating active engagement in research, scholarship, or creative activity; and
- RESOLVED:** That academic administrators and academic units should monitor patterns of RSCA engagement, RSCA outputs (e.g., publications, presentations, exhibitions), and service distribution and take steps, when necessary, to ensure equitable workload assignments consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, applicable policy, and the effective functioning of shared governance; and
- RESOLVED:** That in order to maintain equitable workload distribution and ensure that faculty fulfill their expected contributions to indirect instructional activities, academic administrators, including Deans, in consultation with department chairs, may assign appropriate professional service responsibilities when necessary to faculty members who are under-engaged in research, scholarship, creative activity, or professional service, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, applicable policy, and EP&R 76-36.
- RESOLVED:** That a copy of this resolution shall be included on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate affirms the importance of continued institutional efforts to support RSCA excellence through equitable workload practices, transparent resource allocation, and administrative support for scholarly and creative activity.

RATIONALE:

Referral 2025-2026 43 instructed the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider recommendations from the Scholarship and Creative Activity Task Force and FAC-4-RSCA Report. This resolution seeks to address some of these issues, although it does not fully resolve the referral and continued work is expected in this area.

In simple terms, this resolution is designed to establish or reinforce several institutional norms and expectations.

1. Engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) is expected after tenure.
2. RSCA outputs are required for tenure and promotion of probationary faculty, and promotion of tenured faculty, but not continued employment of tenured faculty.
3. Workload equity and service engagement must protect RSCA capacity.
4. Engagement in service is expected of tenure-track and tenured faculty.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), particularly Article 20, defines faculty workload as encompassing instructional responsibilities as well as other professional duties, including research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. Faculty workload therefore extends beyond classroom contact hours and includes activities necessary for the academic mission of the University. EP&R 76-36 further recognizes that faculty workload includes “indirect instructional activities” and assigns three WTUs to these activities. EP&R 76-36 also grants the President authority to ensure the proper assignment of individual faculty workloads, recognizing the need for administrative oversight to maintain appropriate workload balance across faculty responsibilities. Because EP&R 76-36 grants the President authority to ensure the proper assignment of individual faculty workloads, academic administrators may appropriately adjust service assignments in order to maintain equitable workload distribution and ensure that faculty fulfill their professional responsibilities in indirect instructional activities, including research, scholarship, creative activity, and service.

Within this framework, academic administrators have long been responsible for ensuring that faculty workloads remain balanced across teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. In practice, this responsibility requires attention to the distribution of professional service and other indirect instructional activities so that responsibilities are shared equitably among faculty members. When imbalances arise, administrative adjustments to service assignments—typically made in consultation

with department chairs—may be necessary to maintain equitable workload distribution while preserving faculty capacity to engage meaningfully in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

Balanced engagement in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service is also reflected in faculty evaluation processes. Probationary faculty are evaluated for retention, tenure, and promotion across these domains, while tenured faculty continue to hold professional responsibilities consistent with rank and institutional standards. Post-Tenure Review (PTR), as established through the CBA and campus policy, reinforces the expectation that tenured faculty demonstrate continuing effectiveness and ongoing professional engagement following tenure. PTR is intended as a developmental and improvement-oriented process designed to support continued professional contribution rather than to function as a punitive mechanism.

Tenure represents recognition of sustained achievement and the granting of academic freedom and professional security; however, it does not signal the completion of professional expectations. Faculty responsibilities in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service continue throughout the academic career regardless of whether a faculty member intends to pursue promotion to higher rank. Ongoing engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity may take many forms, including project development, collaboration, student mentorship, data collection, analysis, writing, and dissemination, and these activities may occur across extended timelines depending on disciplinary norms. Advancement in rank, however, typically depends upon the production and impact of scholarly or creative *outputs* as defined in applicable RTP criteria. As a result, reduced scholarly output following tenure may limit opportunities for promotion or advancement in rank under established evaluation processes, but such outcomes are distinct from disciplinary action, rank reduction, or termination. Post-Tenure Review exists to encourage continued professional development and engagement rather than to impose punitive consequences.

The University Handbook states that “A faculty awarded tenure has the right to continued permanent employment as a faculty, except when such employment is voluntarily terminated or is terminated by the University pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement or legal statutes” (Section 305.2.7). The emphasis on research, scholarship, and creative activities in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the University Handbook, together with the protections afforded by tenure, clarifies an important principle: Faculty are expected to remain professionally engaged in research, scholarship, and creative activity following tenure, but scholarly engagement should not be reduced to productivity quotas or rigid expectations for specific outputs within fixed time periods.

A growing body of scholarship on research evaluation has cautioned against excessive reliance on simple publication counts or other narrow productivity metrics. Research on scientific incentive systems suggests that when publication counts become primary measures of performance, researchers may be incentivized to prioritize quantity over quality, fragment research into smaller publications, or pursue projects optimized for rapid publication rather than long-term scholarly contribution (e.g., Ding et al.,

2020; Edwards & Roy, 2017; Smaldino & McElreath, 2016). These concerns have also been recognized in research policy discussions, including the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)¹, which calls for more holistic approaches to evaluating scholarly contributions. Emphasizing sustained scholarly engagement rather than rigid productivity quotas therefore helps preserve disciplinary diversity, encourages responsible research practices, and supports the development of substantial scholarly contributions that often unfold over the extended timelines afforded by tenure.

At the same time, if a tenured faculty member is not sufficiently engaged in RSCA, then they may not be taking full advantage of the opportunity that tenure affords. Tenure provides academic freedom, professional security, and long-term horizon necessary for faculty to pursue ambitious research questions, creative work, and scholarly initiatives that may take many years to develop. Accordingly, continued engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity represents an important professional responsibility of tenured faculty.

Clarifying the distinction between scholarly engagement and scholarly outputs helps ensure that expectations for ongoing professional activity remain visible while preserving the developmental and supportive intent of faculty evaluation systems.

Furthermore, professional service plays a critical role in sustaining the University's academic mission. Faculty service supports shared governance, curriculum oversight, accreditation processes, faculty evaluation systems, various committees and initiatives, community engagement, numerous institutional decision-making functions, and more.

The University Handbook recognizes that faculty members shall prioritize their activities so that professionally related service does not interfere significantly with teaching or scholarly or creative activity.

When service obligations are unevenly distributed among faculty members, the resulting inequities may limit some faculty members' ability to maintain active engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity. Ensuring a reasonable distribution of service responsibilities therefore protects both shared governance *and* faculty capacity for scholarly work.

Institutional stewardship of limited RSCA resources is also important. Internal grants, reassigned time opportunities, and other forms of institutional support are finite resources intended to strengthen the University's scholarly and creative output. Allocating these resources in ways that prioritize active scholarly engagement helps ensure that institutional investments most effectively advance research, scholarship, and creative activity.

¹ <https://sfdora.org/read/>

In addition, prior institutional efforts—including the work of the Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force and the FAC-4-RSCA initiative—have emphasized the need for stronger institutional support for RSCA, clearer expectations regarding faculty workload, protection and prioritization of RSCA efforts, and improved structures for promoting scholarly and creative excellence. These efforts recognized that fostering a culture of excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activity requires both individual engagement and institutional practices that support equitable workload distribution and strategic resource allocation.

This resolution therefore clarifies existing professional expectations while reaffirming the importance of equitable workload implementation, continued engagement across professional domains, and institutional support for research, scholarship, and creative excellence.

References:

Ding, D., Nguyen, B., Gebel, K., Bauman, A., & Bero, L. (2020). Duplicate and salami publication: a prevalence study of journal policies. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 49(1), 281–288. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyz187>

Edwards, M. A., & Roy, S. (2017). Academic research in the 21st century: Maintaining scientific integrity in a climate of perverse incentives and hypercompetition. *Environmental Engineering Science*, 34(1), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ees.2016.0223>

Smaldino, P. E., & McElreath, R. (2016). The natural selection of bad science. *Royal Society Open Science*, 3(9) 160384. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160384>

Distribution List:

President

Provost and VP for Academic Affairs

AVP for Faculty Affairs

AVP for GRaSP

College Deans

Dean of the Library

College Associate Deans

General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate: March 26, 2026

Sent to the President: April 10, 2026

President Approved: June 16, 2026