

Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads

What We Can and Should Do Now



Cover photo courtesy of ACE member institution Case Western Reserve University.



ACE and the American Council on Education are registered marks of the American Council on Education and may not be used or reproduced without the express written permission of ACE.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036

© 2022. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

**EQUITY-MINDED FACULTY WORKLOADS:
WHAT WE CAN AND SHOULD DO NOW**

KERRYANN O'MEARA

DAWN CULPEPPER

JOYA MISRA

AUDREY JAEGER

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Executive Summary.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Opening the Can of Worms: Why Faculty Workload Equity Matters.....	3
Why and How Faculty Workload Becomes Inequitable	5
The Faculty Workload and Rewards Project.....	7
How to Promote Equitable Faculty Workloads	10
Conclusion.....	16
References	17
Appendix A: Exercises That Illustrate How Workloads Become Inequitable.....	21
Appendix B: Equity-Minded Faculty Workload Audit.....	25
Appendix C: Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads Worksheets	28

Acknowledgments

The Faculty Workload and Rewards Project work is funded by the National Science Foundation, ADVANCE-IHE [1463898]. We thank Elizabeth Beise, associate provost for academic planning and programs at the University of Maryland, and research associates Courtney Lennartz, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Gudrun Nyunt, Sarah Kilmer, and Lindsey Templeton for their critical contributions to this work.

Executive Summary

Recent social movements have revealed the systemic ways that racism and sexism remain entrenched in academic cultures. Faculty workload is taken up, assigned, and rewarded in patterns, and these patterns show important yet overlooked areas where inequity manifests in academe. Faculty from historically minoritized groups are disproportionately called upon to do diversity work and mentoring, while women faculty do more teaching and service. These activities are vital to the functioning of the university, yet are often invisible and unrewarded, leading to lower productivity and decreased retention. The COVID-19 pandemic, which has disproportionately affected the lives and careers of women and faculty from historically minoritized groups, makes calls for equity-minded workload reform critical.

This report summarizes the authors' findings and insights learned from the **Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (FWRP)**, a National Science Foundation ADVANCE-funded action research project. The FWRP worked with 51 departments and academic units to promote equity in how faculty work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded, drawing from theories of behavioral economics and the principles of equity-mindedness. Using a randomized experiment with treatment and control groups, we found that there are actions that academic units can take to promote workload equity. The treatment groups participated in a four-part workload intervention that included training on workload inequity, creating a faculty work activity dashboard, developing an equity action plan, and individual faculty professional development on managing time-use.

Based on this research, this report then makes recommendations for how academic units can promote workload equity. We identify six conditions linked to equitable workloads:

- **Transparency:** Departments have widely visible information about faculty work activities available for department members to see.
- **Clarity:** Departments have clearly identified and well-understood benchmarks for faculty work activities.
- **Credit:** Departments recognize and reward faculty members who are expending more effort in certain areas.
- **Norms:** Departments have a commitment to ensuring faculty workload is fair and have put systems in place that reinforce these norms.
- **Context:** Departments acknowledge that different faculty members have different strengths, interests, and demands that shape their workloads and offer workload flexibility to recognize this context.
- **Accountability:** Departments have mechanisms in place to ensure that faculty members fulfill their work obligations and receive credit for their labor.

We provide examples of policies and practices that promote these conditions. We summarize these recommendations and provide tools, such as the Equity-Minded Faculty Workload Audit, for academic leaders, department chairs, faculty workload commissions, and individual faculty members who want to reform faculty workloads with equity in mind.



Introduction

Recent calls for racial justice have brought a spotlight to the sustained marginalization of faculty from historically minoritized groups, while social movements like #MeToo reveal entrenched gender inequities, all of which undermine a diverse and inclusive professoriate. The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent financial fallout in higher education have exacerbated these issues (Amano-Patiño et al. 2020; Gonzales and Griffin 2020; Malisch et al. 2020), making calls for equity-minded reform all the more critical.

One of the most important, but often overlooked, areas in which inequity can arise is within the distribution of faculty labor. Faculty from historically minoritized groups are disproportionately called upon to do diversity work and mentoring (Griffin and Reddick 2011; Turner, González, and Wong (Lau) 2011; Wood, Hilton, and Nevarez 2015), while women faculty do more teaching and service (O’Meara et al. 2017; Winslow 2010). These activities are vital to the functioning of the university, yet they are often invisible and unrewarded (Hanasono et al. 2019; Griffin et al. 2011; O’Meara 2011). Faculty workload systems are also not strategically designed. There are few benchmarks or standards to acknowledge exemplary performance or to hold faculty members accountable when they do not perform. Academic leaders and individual faculty members often do not have the tools or systems in place to make data-driven workload decisions. Said another way, the context that surrounds faculty workload reinforces and perpetuates workload inequities, and these inequities have the potential to undermine productivity, satisfaction, and retention (Eagan and Garvey 2015; Griffin et al. 2011; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; O’Meara, Bennett, and Neihaus 2016).

It may seem challenging to address the realities of the existing faculty work environment, but academic leaders, departments, and faculty members *can* take action to create better, fairer, equity-minded workloads. New policies and practices can be put in place to “script,” or guide, faculty and their institutions toward more equitable outcomes, especially for women faculty members and faculty members from historically minoritized identity groups. Academic leaders and departments can be more accountable for fair divisions of labor.

In our National Science Foundation ADVANCE-funded Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (FWRP), we took on this problem, working with academic units to consider ways that they could reform faculty workload with equity in mind. Through a randomized experiment with treatment and control groups, we collected evidence that showed that following these steps led to greater workload equity and faculty satisfaction. Specifically, we worked with academic units to:

1. Improve workload transparency and clarity for all faculty members, which is especially helpful to women and faculty from historically minoritized groups.
2. Make visible the core department and university work that is often invisible (e.g., faculty members who mentored more, served on more search committees, or chaired more dissertations).
3. Recognize differences in contexts (e.g., only woman of color in a department asked to be mentor for many students of color) and effort and performance (e.g., faculty members who lead committees versus serving as members).
4. Encourage departments or institutions to examine data on faculty workload and disaggregate by categories like appointment type, rank, race, and gender, as relevant.
5. Help departments or institutions to identify any workload imbalances through this data, and incorporate policy and practice reforms aimed at equalizing their faculty workload.

Our work was guided by the concept of equity-mindedness (Bensimon 2007; Bensimon, Dowd, and Witham 2016), which refers to a mode of thinking and action practitioners use to enhance educational outcomes for individuals from different groups. Equity-mindedness focuses our attention on the socio-historical context of exclusionary practices in higher education, and in this case within faculty careers and academe more generally. Equity-mindedness asks all of us to take ownership and responsibility for equity in workload process and outcomes. In this report, we draw from our experiences with the FWRP to discuss how academic units can use equity-minded practices to enhance faculty workload.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

We begin this report with a summary of why faculty workload inequity matters and why departments and institutions should take action. We then discuss how and why faculty workloads become unfair and synthesize the latest social science research on disparities between women and men, and between white faculty and faculty from historically minoritized groups, in campus service and mentoring work. We then present the conditions that we have found support equitable workloads, citing our own experimental work, as well as other research and practice. We pair discussion of the conditions that facilitate equitable workloads with policy and practice reforms (see Appendix C) that can be put in place to enact these conditions, including measures we used in our randomized experiment. We synthesize our recommendations in an audit tool that we have created (see Appendix B). We encourage department chairs, faculty leaders, workload commissions, and provosts to use this audit tool to evaluate whether they have the policy and practice scaffolding necessary to support equitable workloads.



Opening the Can of Worms: Why Faculty Workload Equity Matters

As a result of the pandemic, higher education faces an existential crisis wherein enrollment, financial viability, and the future of in-person education are threatened. These issues are critical, with relatively more importance to considering whether full-time faculty members experience their workloads as equitable. Even before the pandemic, we, as researchers, sometimes encountered skepticism when we broached the topic of workload reform with academic leaders and faculty. There were colleagues who advised us not to “open that can of worms” (O’Meara 2018b). Some argued that reform was not needed—they suggested that workload differences between individual faculty members were small and department members were productive and generally happy with their workloads. In contrast, others argued that even the most well-intentioned efforts at reforming faculty workloads would create more conflict or magnify existing tensions within departments.

In response to these critiques of faculty workload conversations, we offer three main reasons why academic leaders and departments need to open the can of worms associated with faculty workload:

- **As a result of the pandemic, faculty workloads are growing, and growing more inequitable.** Reductions in faculty capacity mean that many faculty members are being asked to “pick up” additional work (e.g., teaching extra classes, serving on return to work committees, establishing laboratory staffing plans). Most faculty workload systems are not designed to recognize or reward this “extra” effort, even though this work is more critical than ever. It is also reasonable to expect that faculty members who were already seen as “good citizens” on their campus because of their service work—who are more likely to be women and faculty from historically minoritized racial groups—will be asked more often to participate in these kinds of assignments. Thus, the pandemic is exacerbating existing workload inequities that already undermine diversity and equity goals. As institutions re-prioritize strategic goals and re-allocate faculty work, there is a need to balance equity with the basic functioning of the academic

enterprise. The workload strategies contained in this report offer flexible, creative ways to foster workload equity, even in times of resource constraint.

- **Workload inequities lower productivity, increase burnout, and decrease retention.** Faculty workload satisfaction is one of the key factors in both faculty productivity (Eagan and Garvey 2015; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012) and faculty retention (Daly and Dee 2006; Gardner 2013; Griffin et al. 2011; O’Meara, Bennett, and Neihaus 2016). Faculty members who are retained, but feel unrecognized and unrewarded for their many years of “above level” service will inevitably experience disengagement and burn out. In higher education, our goals and missions are accomplished by people, not machines. We count on faculty engagement and energy, and thus cannot have sizable portions of that resource diminished. The workload reform efforts we used in the FWRP help promote workload satisfaction in ways that contribute to the achievement of institutional and departmental goals.
- **Workload inequities accrue over time.** Past studies of faculty workload have found relatively small yet meaningful differences in the ways faculty members spend their time. For example, studies show women faculty spend 0.6 hours more per week on service activities (Guarino and Borden 2017). Other studies show that on average, women faculty spend about 3 percent less time on research and 5 percent more time on teaching compared to men (Carrigan, Quinn, and Riskin 2011). While it may be tempting to assume that so-called small differences should not impact an individual’s career over time, such differences, when measured over weeks and years, accrue and have real consequences for advancement and promotion (Valian 2005). Misra, Lundquist, and Templer (2012) found that the extra time spent by women associate professors in service roles (e.g., undergraduate director) resulted in important delays in promotion to full professor for women faculty. We are also aware of lecturers and research scientists frustrated by non-tenure track workloads that require extensive service while their reward systems emphasize teaching and research. As such, many languish for years without promotion. As Virginia Valian (2005) argues that “in the long run, a molehill of bias creates a mountain of disadvantage” (Valian 2005, 204), in ways that significantly contribute to a less diverse and excellent professoriate. This report contains practices and policies for ensuring better alignment of workloads and rewards in ways that promote equity.

We concede that opening the can of worms related to faculty workload may cause short-term discomfort as patterns of inequity emerge. Yet, addressing workload inequities now offers the long-term potential to creatively address some pandemic-related workload demands, mitigate losses of faculty productivity, increase retention, and overall promote a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive academy.



Why and How Faculty Workload Becomes Inequitable

The research on faculty workloads is voluminous and consistently finds that:

Gendered and Racialized Distribution of Faculty Labor	Studies
Women spend more time on teaching and service than men.	Eagan and Garvey 2015; Griffin and Reddick 2011; Guarino and Borden 2017; Hanasano et al. 2019; Link, Swann, and Bozeman 2008; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; O’Meara 2016; O’Meara, Kuvaeva, and Nyunt 2017; O’Meara et al. 2017; Winslow 2010
Women spend less time on research than men.	Bozeman and Gaughan 2011; Link, Swann, and Bozeman 2008; O’Meara et al. 2017; Winslow 2010
Faculty from historically minoritized racial groups spend more time on mentoring and diversity-related work than faculty who are white.	Antonio 2002; Griffin and Reddick 2011; Jimenez et al. 2019; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011; Turner, González, and Wong (Lau) 2011; Wood, Hilton, and Nevarez 2015
Women are asked more often to engage in less promotable or career-advancing tasks.	Acker and Armenti 2004; Babcock et al. 2017; El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, and Ceynar 2018; Hanasano et al. 2019; Hurtado et al. 2012; Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; Mitchell and Hesli 2013; O’Meara et al. 2017

ASKED MORE OFTEN: PATTERNS IN FACULTY WORKLOAD AND EQUITY ISSUES THAT EMERGE

Our analysis of the workload literature and experience working with academic departments suggests that faculty workloads often become unfair as a result of the following patterns in how work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded:

- Some faculty members are more likely to be asked.
- Some faculty members are asked to do certain kinds of work activities.
- Some faculty members are more likely to volunteer.
- Some faculty members are more likely to say yes when they are asked.
- Some faculty members are more likely to negotiate for other resources when they are asked.
- Some faculty members engage in social loafing—signing up for a commitment, but not carrying it out.

Underlying each of these issues is the fact that members of the department are more likely to notice when some colleagues do more and when others do less—there are differing levels of surveillance and “noticing” for faculty members from different groups (Griffin and Reddick 2011).

As a result of these patterns, faculty workloads become inequitable, and the structures, cultures, and design of faculty work reproduce and normalize the inequity. Specific kinds of equity issues emerge:

- **Faculty members engage in different amounts of teaching, research, and service.** Different faculty members participate in different numbers of work activities with different time demands (e.g., individual faculty members serve on different numbers of committees, and each committee requires a different amount of effort). Moreover, although some faculty work is assigned, it is often done so haphazardly, without data or understanding of the workload demands of individual faculty members relative to the workload needs of the entire department. There is a lack of *transparency*.
- **Faculty members do not know how much work is expected, in what areas, and what happens if the work is not completed.** Faculty members are not sure how much is required of them or what the consequences will be if they do not meet certain expectations (e.g., it is not clear how many committees they should serve on as assistant professors versus associate professors). They do not know how to benchmark their performance against others. There is a lack of *clarity*.
- **Faculty members are not rewarded for the work that they do.** Faculty members participate in work activities (e.g., diversity and inclusion or mentoring) that are important but not recognized within unit rewards systems. There is a lack of *credit*.
- **Faculty members are expected to regulate and manage their own workloads.** Much faculty work is discretionary and unregulated, and rests upon the assumption that each faculty member will make decisions in their own self-interest (O’Meara 2016). This discretion makes it seem as though workload inequities occur naturally or are the fault of individual faculty members. There are a lack of *equity norms* guiding workload decisions.
- **Faculty members have workloads that do not account for context.** Often, workload systems assume that “one size fits all” and fail to recognize that different faculty members have different preferences and values when it comes to the kinds of roles and tasks they enjoy or find painful. There is a lack of *context* considered in workload decisions and rewards structures.
- **Faculty members engage in social loafing and slacking.** Not all faculty members within the unit complete the tasks they are asked to do or do not complete their tasks at a quality level, and other faculty members pick up their slack for the good of the unit. There is a lack of *accountability* for fulfilling or not fulfilling work demands.

With these issues in mind, it is clear that for faculty workloads to be equitable, they must be created with intent and by deliberate design.



The Faculty Workload and Rewards Project

How do we redesign faculty workloads to be more equitable? First, we foster certain conditions known to be associated with perceived and real equity in workload. Then, we put policies and practices in place as default settings, to ensure that these conditions prime interactions and behaviors to result in equitable outcomes. In the Faculty Workloads and Rewards Project (FWRP), a National Science Foundation–ADVANCE-funded, action research project, we, the authors of this report, worked with 51 academic units to establish equity-minded workload reform. From 2015 to 2020, we (in addition to colleagues Courtney Lennartz, Elisabeth Beise, and Alexandra Kuveava) considered strategies for improving how faculty workload is taken up, assigned, and/or rewarded.

We began our project with a synthesis of the social science and practice research to diagnose the different ways in which workload becomes unfair. We drew on work from behavioral economics to try to understand the choice architecture around how work was taken up, assigned, and rewarded.

We next recruited departments to participate in the project and the interventions associated with it. In total, we worked with 51 departments or academic units located within 20 public universities. The majority of participating departments represented STEM and social science fields or disciplines, while a handful of departments were in the humanities and professional fields. Based upon Carnegie Classifications, institutions represented both doctoral universities and master's colleges and universities, including some Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

ABOUT THE PROJECT

The website for the project is:

<https://facultyworkloadandrewardsproject.umd.edu/>.

A short video was created to help increase awareness about how this happens which can be found [here](#).

The initial round was set up as an experiment; half the departments that applied to participate in the experiment were provided with the interventions, while the other half were not; we conducted both pre-test and post-test surveys with faculty members in both treatment and control departments, to determine whether the interventions were effective. We asked treatment departments to assemble teams of three to five faculty members who would participate in the intervention over the course of 12–18 months. Members of our FWRP team also provided ongoing resources and support for department teams as they worked toward workload reform.

GUIDING FRAMEWORKS

The work of Thaler and Sunstein (2008) and Kahneman (2011) in behavioral economics and nudges were influential in the design of our interventions. Behavioral economists study why individuals make irrational decisions and suggest that often, our poor decision-making is driven by cognitive and social bias (Kahneman 2011). Certain conditions, including many of those present in the faculty work environment, exacerbate our bias. For example, in most faculty workload systems, work is taken up and assigned (a) without unit priorities in mind, (b) without data on what faculty members within the unit are doing, and (c) by decision-makers who are rushed or stressed. Moreover, there are few decision rubrics, or ways to differentiate effort, and much of the work critical to departments is invisible. To sum, the context that surrounds decisions in faculty workload—what behavioral economists refer to as the “choice architecture”—is primed for bias to undermine effective decision-making (Kahneman 2011; Thaler and Sunstein 2008). Nudges, or changes to the decision-making context, can promote better outcomes (Thaler and Sunstein 2008). Thus, an important part of designing equity-minded workloads is using nudges (e.g., slowing the process down, being intentional, and using data and tools) to reshape the choice architecture surrounding workload decisions.

CREATING EQUITY-MINDED FACULTY WORKLOAD

The FWRP was composed of four interventions (Figure 1), intended to help departments and other units improve equity in their workload policies and practices.

Figure 1. FWRP Interventions



Workload Equity Workshop

- Departments discussed social science research on how, where, and why faculty workload becomes unfair and the implications of workload inequities for faculty outcomes.



Work Activity Dashboards

- Departments collected faculty workload data using existing data sources.
- Departments analyzed data to bring visibility to areas of faculty work usually rendered invisible or typically not counted.



Equity Action Plans

- Using the dashboard, departments diagnosed areas of faculty workload that needed the greatest attention.
- Departments identified policies/practices that would address the area(s) identified and created plans for implementing policies/practices.



Individual Faculty Professional Development

- Departments members (voluntarily) participated in a four-week, online workshop on aligning time with work priorities, saying yes and no strategically, and time-use strategies.

First, we designed a workshop to share the social science research on workload inequities and strategies to mitigate them with departments. This lasted two to three hours and included several exercises and resources. Some of the exercises shared in this workshop are summarized in Appendix A.

Second, departments developed work activity dashboards, or simple, easy-to-read displays of different faculty work activities (e.g., service, teaching, and research). Departments developed these dashboards based upon existing faculty work activity data and analyzed data to understand potential equity issues in their units (e.g., women associate professors taking on more high-effort service or faculty from historically minoritized groups having more advisees). Examples of work activity dashboards are described in [Handout #1](#).

Third, we helped departments develop department equity action plans to address equity issues they discovered based on their work activity dashboards, and identified relevant policies and practices they would put in place to address them. We collected equitable workload policies into a workbook, which we shared with departments, and we helped them think through relevant options given their local contexts. This was critical, since top-down approaches to workload equity issues are not effective. Policy and practice reforms need to be connected to the actual workload equity issues, and the specific local context at the departmental level.

These first three efforts were systemic approaches to the problem of structural inequity, intended to make meaningful change in the mechanisms by which the work was taken up. This way, no matter who was department chair, or how equity-minded faculty already were, the new system would help guide workload equity moving forward. However, we also realized that there was an individual, professional development aspect to how work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded. That is, some faculty members, particularly women and those from historically minoritized groups, would be asked to do more in teaching, mentoring, and service areas and need to take strategic action to better align their time and priorities (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, and Ceynar 2018; O'Meara, Kuvaveva, and Nyunt 2017). As such, the fourth intervention was a four-week professional development workshop (The Terrapin Time Initiative) for individual faculty members on aligning time and priorities (Culpepper et al. 2020). The workshop included modules on keeping track of where one was spending time, avoiding time saboteurs, saying yes and no strategically to new requests, and time-use strategies.

Through this project we were able to create empirical evidence as well as practical significance for the position that certain conditions, policies, and practices support equitable faculty workloads. These are system solutions—ways of revising the choice architecture of how faculty work is assigned, taken up, and rewarded.

FWRP FINDINGS

We have published the results from the FWRP in peer-reviewed articles, scholarly magazines, and op-eds. We describe the results presented in these articles below.

- Exploration of the conditions most important to equity workload (O'Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019).
- Results from the randomized control trial that examine the efficacy of the four workload interventions (O'Meara et al. 2018).
- Guidance on how to create faculty work activity dashboards (O'Meara et al. 2020).
- Advice for academic leaders and faculty members on how and why to facilitate workload reform (O'Meara 2018a; O'Meara 2018b; O'Meara, Misra, et al. 2019).
- Results from the faculty development workshop on aligning time and priorities (Culpepper et al. 2020).



How to Promote Equitable Faculty Workloads

We have found in our own empirical and practical work with faculty (O’Meara et al. 2018; O’Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019), as well as synthesizing the work of others in this and related areas, that the following conditions support equitable workloads:

- Transparency
- Clarity
- Credit
- Norms
- Context
- Accountability

In particular, we found that the more faculty members agreed that these six equitable conditions were present in their department, the more likely they were to be satisfied with their teaching and service loads and the more likely they were to agree that their workload was fair (O’Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019).

In this section we discuss each one of these conditions and why they are important for workload equity, and list resources for implementing specific policies and practices that can be used to foster these conditions within faculty workload.

The policies and practices, and their corresponding worksheets, are available in Appendix C.

TRANSPARENCY

Transparency increases trust between members and leaders, increases sense of accountability, facilitates perceptions of procedural and distributive justice, and leads to greater organizational commitment (Bilimoria, Joy, and Liang 2008; Daly and Dee 2006; Leibbrandt and List 2015; Neyland 2007; Norman, Avolio, and Luthans 2010).

We identified two key ways to enhance transparency in faculty workload. First, departments can create **faculty work activity dashboards**, so that faculty members have a sense of the range of effort in teaching, mentoring, and service by relevant appointment or career stage. When academic units present data showing inequities in workload, awareness of those inequities can sensitize faculty members to the reality that some faculty members are called upon more than others to do certain tasks.

Evidence from the FWRP and previous studies shows that creating faculty work activity dashboards helps departments enhance transparency, promote greater clarity, and increase accountability—all necessary conditions for workload equity (Athena Forum 2018; O’Meara et al. 2020; O’Meara et al. 2018; O’Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019). Faculty work activity dashboards, described in [Handout #1](#), add greater transparency by providing faculty members with department data on aggregate work accomplishments in teaching and service. Dashboards provide context and benchmarks for current faculty members to see their effort, allow members to review data to identify equity concerns, and show the relationship between individual faculty effort and department collective effort. Faculty work activity dashboards can show inequities, but also dispel myths or narratives that surround faculty workload.

Second, departments can create transparent, published policies and practices for service, advising, and teaching assignments. For example, chairs create transparency by conducting a **service audit**, which asks faculty members what they want to do over the next three years in areas like teaching and/or service roles. [Handout #2](#) offers a template of a service audit.

EQUITY-MINDED FACULTY WORKLOAD AUDIT

Based upon the research on equity-minded work practices and our experiences with academic units in the Faculty Workloads and Rewards Project, we created a tool, the Equity-Minded Faculty Workload Audit, located in Appendix B. The audit is intended for academic leaders, department chairs, workload commissions, and faculty members who are interested in promoting equitable faculty workloads. The audit asks users to consider the kinds of workload goals they hope to achieve (e.g., promote transparency, enhance clarity). Based upon those goals, the audit then asks questions about existing workload data, processes, and procedures. Users then assess the extent to which these data, processes, or procedures are present within their institution or department, and guides users toward specific policies and practice handouts (see Appendix C) that would help users achieve their goal.

Practices and Policies That Promote Transparency

- Faculty Work Activity Dashboard Examples ([Handout #1](#))
 - Faculty Service Audit ([Handout #2](#))
-

CLARITY

Clarity is also critical to equitable workloads. Clearly understood benchmarks or expectations, rather than subjective guessing, mitigate the operation of prejudices (Fox et al. 2007; Heilman 2001). Research shows that when policies are “foggy”—vague, unclear, or ambiguous—they disproportionately disadvantage women and faculty from historically minoritized groups (Banerjee and Pawley 2013; Beddoes, Schimpf, and Pawley 2014). For example, research indicates that department and campus guidelines often do not explicitly indicate how much service is expected for faculty members at different ranks (Banerjee and Pawley 2013; Beddoes, Schimpf, and Pawley 2014). Thus, individual faculty members often do not know if they should say yes or no to certain service asks, because they do not know if their current service loads are higher or lower than what is expected.

As such, an important strategy that departments or colleges might enact to increase clarity is to create **faculty expectations guidelines**, described in [Handout #3](#). Faculty expectations guidelines identify the amount of teaching, research, and service expected for faculty members at different ranks (e.g., assistant, associate, full) and in different employment categories (e.g., tenure eligible versus instructional or clinical faculty). Such guidelines should be created collaboratively, balancing university and department needs with faculty needs and recognizing different appointment types and career stages. Our results indicated that faculty members within departments that had clearly identified benchmarks for service and advising were more likely to be satisfied with their workloads (O'Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019).

Another example of the benefits of clarity are related to compensation negotiation. Foggy climates can make it unclear when faculty members should negotiate (Beddoes, Schimpf, and Pawley 2014), and research shows that in ambiguous negotiation contexts, women negotiate less often than men (Crothers et al. 2010; Babcock and Laschever 2003; Leibbrandt and List 2015). For instance, many faculty serve in administrative roles like undergraduate or graduate program director (Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012). Within departments, it may be unclear whether there is compensation associated with taking this role and/or what the compensation range could or should be. Individual faculty members who serve in these roles may therefore be paid different amounts or not receive compensation at all.

Departments can enhance clarity in negotiation by creating policies that clarify which roles are compensated, which are not, and how faculty members can indicate their interest in compensated roles. Often, these policies are incorporated into department plans of organizations. Results from the FWRP indicated faculty who said their departments had clear information on compensation for key roles were more satisfied with their workloads (O'Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019). In [Handout #4](#), we provide an example of a process a department might use to give clarity around **compensation for key roles**.

Practices and Policies that Promote Clarity

- Faculty Expectations Guidelines ([Handout #3](#))
 - Compensation for Key Roles ([Handout #4](#))
-

CREDIT

We have placed transparency and clarity before credit because it is very hard to give faculty members credit for doing more work in one area, if the department has not first accounted for what faculty members are *actually* doing (e.g., dashboards) and provided clarity on what faculty members *should* be doing (e.g., faculty expectations policies). Once these are in place, it is possible for departments to provide differential credit for work of higher or lower effort.

Research shows faculty members become dissatisfied when they experience a significant mismatch between the amount of time they want to spend on a certain work activity and the time they actually spend on that work activity (Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; Winslow 2010). A faculty member may feel that their dissatisfaction is magnified if they see others experience less of a mismatch between desired and required work activities. Faculty members may feel additionally dissatisfied if their own mismatch impacts their advancement (Misra, Lundquist, and Templer 2012; Winslow 2010). Thus, finding even small ways to give credit to faculty members such that they can spend time on their preferred work activities makes faculty members feel as though their contributions are valued.

For example, departments might create a credit system that grants a faculty member who chairs a dissertation more credit than a faculty member who serves on a dissertation committee or more teaching credits for teaching a large, writing-intensive class compared to a small graduate elective course. If a faculty member teaches the only service-learning course in the department and supervises 200 students in placements in the community, this may arguably take more time than teaching a lecture course with two teaching assistants grading papers. If a faculty member is supervising three very large grants with five full-time employees, they most likely spend more time in administrative and mentoring work than colleagues without such grants.

There are several strategies to provide credit for performance that is considered above expected effort. One way is to allow the faculty member to “bank” their work in one area in order to do less in another. In [Handout #5](#), we describe a **credit systems**

policy that illustrates this practice. Likewise, departments may create **teaching credit swap systems** that define the teaching workload expectations for all faculty, and offer different pathways for faculty to meet their instructional workloads, which is another variation of giving credit for doing work in different areas. We describe a teaching credit swap system in [Handout #6](#).

Policies and Practices That Give Credit

- Credit Systems ([Handout #5](#))
 - Teaching Credit Swaps ([Handout #6](#))
-

NORMS

One of the key challenges in how faculty work is taken up and assigned is that it is often haphazard. The same faculty members are asked, or volunteer, to do work that is important, but less desirable or not career enhancing. At the same time, some faculty members take advantage of haphazard workload decision-making to ensure that they hold onto more desirable service or teaching assignments (e.g., teaching at 11:00 a.m. versus teaching at 8:00 a.m.). This “opt-in” system for assigning work causes burnout and resentment. Over time, the system can create an underclass of workers who support a small number of privileged faculty members who are not asked to share the burden of maintaining their “academic home.”

Everyone doing their fair share and having access to the same opportunities within a group’s collective work facilitates equity norms, social responsibility norms, and norms of reciprocity (Erez, Lepine, and Elms 2002). For instance, our results from the FWRP showed that faculty members who agreed that there was a strong commitment to the workload being fair in their department experienced greater satisfaction with their workload (O’Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019).

Ideally, the system for assigning work that is less career-enhancing or less desirable shifts from an “opt-in” system to an “opt-out” system. In an opt-out system, it is assumed that all department members will at some point participate in various administrative and service tasks. Opt-out systems reduce the burden of people in vulnerable positions with colleagues (Williams 1999) and are consistent with social psychology research showing we can be steered into better behaviors by changing “default settings” surrounding decision-making processes (Vedantam 2010). Opt-out systems can change the conversation from “why would I agree to do that” to “what is my argument for why I alone should *not* have to do this.”

One way to enact an opt-out system is by putting in place planned rotations, wherein there is an agreed upon plan for how service or teaching assignments will be rotated among department members. Planned rotations avoid the same people being asked repeatedly to do the same tasks and having to turn them down, while others are never asked (Mitchell and Hesli 2013). Planned rotations send the message everyone has to chip in. They can help avoid “social loafing” and “free-riding,” wherein certain group members fail to do their fair share of the work and others overcompensate to complete the task (Curcio and Lynch 2016; Maiden and Perry 2011). Even so, opt-out systems can be designed to recognize that individuals within a department have different strengths (e.g., some faculty are good at administrative and management tasks while others excel at teaching). Thus, planned rotation systems should be designed with some degree of flexibility. In [Handout #7](#), we describe a **planned service rotation** system, and in [Handout #8](#), we describe a policy that establishes the **planned rotation of preferred teaching times**.

Policies and Practices That Promote Equity Norms

- Planned Service Rotations ([Handout #7](#))
 - Planned Teaching Time Rotations ([Handout #8](#))
-

CONTEXT

Equitable systems acknowledge differences in the context of individual faculty work (Bensimon, Dowd, and Witham 2016). While uniformity in evaluation can add to perceptions of fairness (Mallard, Lamont, and Guetzkow 2009), there are structural, social, and cultural contexts that make an individual faculty member's workload distinct from the workload of another member of their department.

The goal here is to recognize that different faculty members have different strengths and interests, while also assuring that every faculty member puts in a similar amount of effort toward shared departmental goals. Reward systems can be set up to recognize differences or to make some work invisible (O'Meara 2011). Our results indicated that faculty members are more likely to be retained, productive, and satisfied when they feel their work, and the context around it, is recognized by colleagues (O'Meara, Lennartz, et al. 2019).

Some small context differences can be balanced through strategies like the credit systems mentioned in the Credit section above—for example, a single-semester difference between teaching a large class and a small elective. However, there are also larger differences in context that can shape workload. These include differences like career stage and appointment type, which can be addressed through strategies like the faculty expectations guidelines mentioned in the Clarity section above.

Another important strategy is **differentiated workload** policies. Differentiated workload policies might be thought of as personalized employment arrangements negotiated between individual workers and employers intended to benefit them both (Rousseau 2005). Research shows these arrangements can be an important part of equity and acknowledging difference. Furthermore, studies show employees accept personalized employment arrangements when they believe they will have access to the same accommodations under reasonable circumstances in the future (if needed) (Lai, Rousseau, and Chang 2009). In [Handout #9](#), we describe a differentiated workload policy that lays out several different kinds of legitimate pathways for faculty to meet their work expectations (e.g., teaching focused, research focused). The policy includes *negotiated deviations* from the traditional percentages of effort (in teaching, research, and service), such that an individual faculty member will engage in a new, negotiated percentage of effort and be evaluated against those expectations at the end of the year.

Another way departments can recognize differences in context is by creating individualized appointment, promotion, and tenure agreements for faculty members who are hired to do different kinds of faculty work (e.g., administratively focused) or whose scholarship is interdisciplinary or community-engaged and thus more difficult to evaluate by traditional standards like counting peer-reviewed journal articles. Such agreements outline the specific ways and metrics by which faculty members in these roles will be evaluated and can be approved by the unit head and provost. In [Handout #10](#), we describe three kinds of **modified promotion and tenure criteria**, including criteria for administratively-focused faculty members and faculty members who do engaged scholarship.

Policy and Practices That Recognize Differences in Context

- Differentiated Workload Policy ([Handout #9](#))
 - Modified Criteria for Promotion and Tenure ([Handout #10](#))
-

ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is also important to improving workload equity, in that it ensures all faculty members are taking responsibility for the work that needs to be done. Accountability is enhanced when work is visible, as noted in the above sections on Transparency and Clarity. However, accountability is also a matter of changing the structures around the work. For example, research suggests when we reduce the size of committees to a few members (e.g., three members) “social loafing” is reduced and the committee members become more accountable for completing their part of the work (Curcio and Lynch 2016).

As such, an important strategy to improve accountability is **restructuring and reducing committees** so that it is clear who will do what on which committees. For instance, departments might perform an audit of all the departmental committees,

reviewing the number of members each committee has and the roles of the members, each committee's purpose, and how many times the committee meets. The department can then determine which committees are redundant, have too few or too many members, and outline the specific expectations of each committee member (e.g., on a promotion and tenure committee, one member will focus on service, one on research, etc.) Likewise, committees can be required to make presentations back to departments with what they accomplished so that it is harder to "slack" or hide. In [Handout #11](#), we describe the process a department could use to evaluate and restructure their committees to promote greater accountability.

Greater accountability also serves a normative function, as individuals who care about their colleagues' opinion will want to perform better if they understand their performance is being observed and/or evaluated (Curcio and Lynch 2016; Dominick, Reilly, and McGourty 1997; Stewart, Houghton, and Rodgers 2012). Thus, another strategy for increasing accountability is creating **statements of mutual expectations**, which are described in [Handout #12](#). Statement of mutual expectations outline the obligations faculty members have to one another and to the department. Such statements can hold faculty accountable to the agreed upon behaviors (e.g., answering emails in a timely manner, attending committee meetings) that foster the completion of departmental work. Upon hire, new faculty members will sign the statement, and department chairs can refer to the statement during annual reviews if faculty members are not meeting one of the expectations.

Policies and Practices That Promote Accountability

- Restructuring and Reducing Committees ([Handout #11](#))
 - Statement of Mutual Expectations ([Handout #12](#))
-

DEVELOPING AN EQUITY ACTION PLAN

A final step in promoting equitable faculty workloads is creating a plan for action, which we describe in [Handout #13](#). Department Equity Action Plans use data from the faculty work activity dashboard to diagnose and identify the most pressing equity issue or issues a department faces. Depending on the equity issue present, departments can then assess the policy or practice that is best suited to meet their needs. They identify concrete actions they will use to implement the policy or practice, including gaining consensus and support from department members and timeline for implementation. Departments also identify concrete outcomes by which they will evaluate their progress toward their equity goals.



Conclusion

Over the last five years we have done a “deep dive” into the social science literature informing faculty workloads, careers, and reward systems. We conducted a randomized control trial and worked with over 50 departments and colleges on enacting equity-minded workload reform. We have provided an audit tool to help faculty leaders and academic administrators work together to engender conditions of transparency, clarity, credit, awareness of context, equity norms and the sharing of work, and accountability. We have also offered concrete policies and practices such as the creation of faculty work activity dashboards, faculty expectation guidelines, planned rotations, and credit systems. We hope that you find the handouts that accompany this report as useful as our departments did in illustrating concretely how these policies might be adopted by departments, colleges and universities to support equity-minded workloads.

One of the strengths of the policies and practices we propose is that they are adaptable. The strategies we consider go beyond traditional workload modifications (e.g., course releases), and many can be offered at relatively low cost, which is increasingly important in today’s fiscal landscape. Likewise, some departments and institutions may determine that revising rewards structures to better recognize the critical diversity-related work of faculty from historically minoritized groups should be prioritized over efforts to improve equity in how work is assigned. The tools, practices, and policies we discuss allows actors to assess needs and take action where equity-minded reform is most critical.

In all, there are many compelling reasons why institutions, departments, and academic leaders should act to enhance faculty workload equity, including increasing satisfaction, productivity, and retention. We hope the suggestions offered in this report illuminate a path for equity-minded workload reform might be realized.

References

- Acker, Sandra, and Carmen Armenti. 2004. "Sleepless in Academia." *Gender and Education* 16 (1): 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0954025032000170309>.
- Amano-Patiño, Noriko, Elisa Faraglia, Chryssi Giannitsarou, and Zeina Hasna. 2020. "The Unequal Effects of Covid-19 on Economists' Research Productivity." Cambridge Working Papers in Economics No. 2038. Cambridge, UK: Faculty of Economics, University of Cambridge. <http://www.econ.cam.ac.uk/research-files/repec/cam/pdf/cwpe2038.pdf>.
- Antonio, Anthony Lising. 2002. "Faculty of Color Reconsidered: Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship." *The Journal of Higher Education* 73 (5): 582–602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777169>.
- Athena Forum. 2018. *Work Allocation Models: A Report by the Athena Forum*. London: Athena Forum. <https://athenaforum.org.uk/media/1144/athena-forum-wam-reportjanuary2018.pdf>.
- Babcock, Linda, and Sara Laschever. 2003. *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Babcock, Linda, Maria P. Recalde, Lise Vesterlund, and Laurie Weingart. 2017. "Gender Differences in Accepting and Receiving Requests for Tasks with Low Promotability." *The American Economic Review* 107, no. 3 (March): 714–747. doi:10.1257/aer.20141734.
- Banerjee, Dina, and Alice L. Pawley. 2013. "Gender and Promotion: How Do Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Faculty Members Survive a Foggy Climate?" *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering* 19 (4): 329–347. DOI: 10.1615/JWomenMinorScienEng.2013004654.
- Beddoes, Kacey, Corey Schimpf, and Alice L. Pawley. 2014. "New Metaphors for New Understandings: Ontological Questions about Developing Grounded Theories in Engineering Education." Presented at the American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN. June 15, 2014. <https://peer.asee.org/22867>.
- Bensimon, Estela Mara. 2007. "The Underestimated Significance of Practitioner Knowledge in the Scholarship on Student Success." *The Review of Higher Education* 30, no. 4 (Summer): 441–469. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2007.0032>.
- Bensimon, Estela Mara, Alicia C. Dowd, and Keith Witham. 2016. "Five Principles for Enacting Equity by Design." *AACU Diversity and Democracy* 19, no. 1 (Winter). <https://aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2016/winter/bensimon>.
- Bilimoria, Diana, Simy Joy, and Xiangfen Liang. 2008. "Breaking Barriers and Creating Inclusiveness: Lessons of Organizational Transformation to Advance Women Faculty in Academic Science and Engineering." *Human Resource Management* 47, no. 3 (Autumn): 423–441. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20225>.
- Bozeman, Barry, and Monica Gaughan. 2011. "Job Satisfaction Among University Faculty: Individual, Work, and Institutional Determinants." *The Journal of Higher Education* 82 (2): 154–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2011.11779090>.
- Carrigan, Coleen, Kate Quinn, and Eve A. Riskin. 2011. "The Gendered Division of Labor Among STEM Faculty and the Effects of Critical Mass." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4, no. 3 (September): 131–146. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0021831>.
- Crothers, Laura M., Tammy L. Hughes, Ara J. Schmitt, Lea A. Theodore, John Lipinski, Angela J. Bloomquist, and Cindy L. Altman. 2010. "Has Equity Been Achieved? Salary and Promotion Negotiation Practices of a National Sample of School Psychology University Faculty." *The Psychologist-Manager Journal* 13 (1): 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10887150903553790>.
- Culpepper, Dawn, Sarah Kilmer, KerryAnn O'Meara, Joya Misra, and Audrey J. Jaeger. 2020. "The Terrapin Time Initiative: A Workshop to Enhance Alignment between Faculty Work Priorities and Time-Use." *Innovative Higher Education* 45, no. 2 (April): 165–179.

- Curcio, Andrea A., and Mary A. Lynch. 2016. "Incentivizing and Assessing Faculty Committee Work Contributions: Why Now?" Albany Law School Working Papers Series No. 22 for 2015–2016.
- Daly, Cheryl J., and Jay R. Dec. 2006. "Greener Pastures: Faculty Turnover Intent in Urban Public Universities." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77 (5): 776–803. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2006.11778944>.
- Dominick, Peter G., Richard R. Reilly, and Jack W. McGourty. 1997. "The Effects of Peer Feedback on Team Member Behavior." *Group & Organization Management* 22, no. 4 (December): 508–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02F1059601197224006>.
- Eagan, M. Kevin, Jr., and Jason C. Garvey. 2015. "Stressing Out: Connecting Race, Gender, and Stress with Faculty Productivity." *The Journal of Higher Education* 86 (6): 923–954. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777389>.
- El-Alayli, Amani, Ashley A. Hansen-Brown, and Michelle Ceynar. 2018. "Dancing Backwards in High Heels: Female Professors Experience More Work Demands and Special Favor Requests, Particularly from Academically Entitled Students." *Sex Roles* 79, no. 3–4 (August): 136–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6>.
- Erez, Amir, Jeffrey A. Lepine, and Heather Elms. 2002. "Effects of Rotated Leadership and Peer Evaluation on the Functioning and Effectiveness of Self-Managed Teams: A Quasi-Experiment." *Personnel Psychology* 55, no. 4 (December): 929–948. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00135.x>.
- Fox, Mary Frank, Carol Colatrella, David McDowell, and Mary Lynn Realff. 2007. "Equity in Tenure and Promotion: An Integrated Institutional Approach." In *Transforming Science and Engineering: Advancing Academic Women*, edited by Abigail Stewart, Janet E. Malley, and Danielle LaVaque-Manty, 170–186. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gardner, Susan K. 2013. "Women Faculty Departures from a Striving Institution: Between a Rock and a Hard Place." *The Review of Higher Education* 36, no. 3 (Spring): 349–370.
- Gonzales, Leslie D., and Kimberly A. Griffin. 2020. *Supporting Faculty During and After COVID-19: Don't Let Go of Equity*. Washington, DC: Aspire Alliance. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WQrIG6LsR04jGASff6Z8WVxl4RIRpsMj/view>.
- Griffin, Kimberly A., Meghan J. Pifer, Jordan R. Humphrey, and Ashley M. Hazelwood. 2011. "(Re)Defining Departure: Exploring Black Professors' Experiences with and Responses to Racism and Racial Climate." *American Journal of Education* 117, no. 4 (August): 495–526.
- Griffin, Kimberly A., and Richard J. Reddick. 2011. "Surveillance and Sacrifice: Gender Differences in the Mentoring Patterns of Black Professors at Predominantly White Research Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 48, no. 5 (October): 1032–1057. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0002831211405025>.
- Guarino, Cassandra M., and Victor M.H. Borden. 2017. "Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?" *Research in Higher Education* 58, no. 6 (September): 672–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>.
- Hanasono, Lisa K., Ellen M. Broido, Margaret M. Yacobucci, Karen V. Root, Susana Peña, and Deborah A. O'Neil. 2019. "Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 12, no. 1 (March): 85–98. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/dhe0000081>.
- Heilman, Madeline E. 2001. "Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder." *Journal of Social Issues* 57, no. 4 (Winter): 657–674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234>.
- Hurtado, Sylvia, Kevin Eagan, John H. Pryor, Hannah Whang, and Serge Tran. 2012. *Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The 2010–2011 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. <https://www.heri.ucla.edu/monographs/HERI-FAC2011-Monograph.pdf>.
- Jimenez, Miguel F., Theresa M. Laverty, Sara P. Bombaci, Kate Wilkins, Drew E. Bennett, and Liba Pejchar. 2019. "Underrepresented Faculty Play a Disproportionate Role in Advancing Diversity and Inclusion." *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 3, no. 7 (July): 1030–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0911-5>.
- Joseph, Tiffany D., and Laura E. Hirshfield. 2011. "'Why Don't You Get Somebody New to Do It?' Race and Cultural Taxation in the Academy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34 (1): 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2010.496489>.
- Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Lai, Lei, Denise M. Rousseau, and Klarissa Ting Ting Chang. 2009. "Idiosyncratic Deals: Coworkers as Interested Third Parties." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94, no. 2 (March): 547–556. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0013506>.
- Leibbrandt, Andreas, and John A. List. 2015. "Do Women Avoid Salary Negotiations? Evidence from a Large-Scale Natural Field Experiment." *Management Science* 61, no. 9 (September): 2016–2024. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1994>.
- Link, Albert N., Christopher A. Swann, and Barry Bozeman. 2008. "A Time Allocation Study of University Faculty." *Economics of Education Review* 27, no. 4 (August): 363–374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.04.002>.
- Maiden, Barbara, and Bob Perry. 2011. "Dealing with Free-Riders in Assessed Group Work: Results from a Study at a UK University." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 36 (4): 451–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903429302>.
- Malisch, Jessica L., Breanna N. Harris, Shanen M. Sherrer, Kristy A. Lewis, Stephanie L. Shepherd, Pumtiwitt C. McCarthy, Jessica L. Spott, Elizabeth P. Karam, Naima Moustaid-Moussa, Jessica McCrory Calarco, Latha Ramalingam, Amelia E. Talley, Jaclyn E. Cañas-Carrell, Karin Ardon-Dryer, Dana A. Weiser, Ximena E. Bernal, and Jennifer Deitloff. 2020. "Opinion: In the Wake of COVID-19, Academia Needs New Solutions to Ensure Gender Equity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117, no. 27 (July 7): 15378–15381. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010636117>.
- Mallard, Grégoire, Michèle Lamont, and Joshua Guetzkow. 2009. "Fairness as Appropriateness: Negotiating Epistemological Differences in Peer Review." *Science, Technology and Human Values* 34, no. 5 (September): 573–606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243908329381>.
- Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, and Abby Templer. 2012. "Gender, Work Time, and Care Responsibilities Among Faculty." *Sociological Forum* 27, no. 2 (June): 300–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01319.x>.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and Vicki L. Hesli. 2013. "Women Don't Ask? Women Don't Say No? Bargaining and Service in the Political Science Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46, no. 2 (April): 355–369. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513000073>.
- Neyland, Daniel. 2007. "Achieving Transparency: The Visible, Invisible and Divisible in Academic Accountability Networks." *Organization* 14, no. 4 (July): 499–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243908329381>.
- Norman, Steven M., Bruce J. Avolio, and Fred Luthans. 2010. "The Impact of Positivity and Transparency on Trust in Leaders and Their Perceived Effectiveness." *The Leadership Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (June): 350–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.002>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2011. "Inside the Panopticon: Studying Academic Reward Systems." In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 26*, edited by John C. Smart and Michael B. Paulsen, 161–220. New York: Springer.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2016. "Whose Problem Is It? Gender Differences in Faculty Thinking about Campus Service." *Teachers College Record* 118 (8): 1–38.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2018a. "The Hallway Ask." *Inside Higher Education*. May 10, 2018. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/05/10/ensuring-equity-service-work-opinion>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2018b. "Undoing the Can of Worms." *Inside Higher Education*. June 27, 2018. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/06/27/how-make-faculty-service-demands-more-equitable-opinion>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Elizabeth Beise, Dawn Culpepper, Joya Misra, and Audrey Jaeger. 2020. "Faculty Work Activity Dashboards: A Strategy to Increase Transparency." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 52 (3): 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2020.1745579>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Jessica Chalk Bennett, and Elizabeth Neihaus. 2016. "Left Unsaid: The Role of Work Expectations and Psychological Contracts in Faculty Careers and Departure." *The Review of Higher Education* 39, no. 2 (Winter): 269–297.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Audrey Jaeger, Joya Misra, Courtney Lennartz, and Alexandra Kuvaeva. 2018. "Undoing Disparities in Faculty Workloads: A Randomized Trial Experiment." *PLoS ONE* 13 (12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207316>.

- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Alexandra Kuvaeva, and Gudrun Nyunt. 2017. "Constrained Choices: A View of Campus Service Inequality from Annual Faculty Reports." *The Journal of Higher Education* 88 (5): 672–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Gudrun Nyunt, Chelsea Waugaman, and Rose Jackson. 2017. "Asked More Often: Gender Differences in Faculty Workload in Research Universities and the Work Interactions That Shape Them." *American Educational Research Journal* 54, no. 6 (December): 1154–1186. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0002831217716767>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Courtney Jo Lennartz, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Audrey Jaeger, and Joya Misra. 2019. "Department Conditions and Practices Associated with Faculty Workload Satisfaction and Perceptions of Equity." *The Journal of Higher Education* 90 (5): 744–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025>.
- O'Meara, KerryAnn, Joya Misra, Audrey J. Jaeger, and Dawn Culpepper. 2019. "Needed: Allies for Equitable Faculty Workloads." *Inside Higher Education*. July 24, 2019. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/07/24/five-things-faculty-members-should-do-now-help-create-more-equitable-workplace>.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L., and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender and Society* 18, no. 4 (August): 510–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243204265269>.
- Rousseau, Denise M. 2005. *I-deals: Idiosyncratic Deals Employees Bargain for Themselves*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Stewart, Alice C., Susan M. Houghton, and Patrick R. Rodgers. 2012. "Instructional Design, Active Learning and Student Performance: Using a Trading Room to Teach Strategy." *Journal of Management Education* 36 no. 6 (December): 753–776. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1052562912456295>.
- Thaler, Richard H., and Cass R. Sunstein. 2008. *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Turner, Caroline Sotello Viernes, Juan Carlos González, and Kathleen Wong (Lau). 2011. "Faculty Women of Color: The Critical Nexus of Race and Gender." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4, no. 4 (December): 199–211. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0024630>.
- Valian, Virginia. 2005. "Beyond Gender Schemas: Improving the Advancement of Women in Academia." *Hypatia* 20, no. 3 (August): 198–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2005.tb00495.x>.
- Vedantam, Shankar. 2010. *The Hidden Brain: How Our Unconscious Minds Elect Presidents, Control Markets, Wage Wars, and Save Our Lives*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Williams, Joan. 1999. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Winslow, Sarah. 2010. "Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty." *Gender & Society* 24, no. 6 (December): 769–793. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243210386728>.
- Wood, J. Luke, Adriel A. Hilton, and Carlos Nevarez. 2015. "Faculty of Color and White Faculty: An Analysis of Service in Colleges of Education in the Arizona Public University System." *Journal of the Professoriate* 8 (1): 85–109.

Appendix A: Exercises That Illustrate How Workloads Become Inequitable

To help academic leaders and faculty members consider how and why workload gets taken up, assigned, and rewarded in inequitable ways, even in departments with equity-minded intentions, we provide two thought experiments. We used both of these thought experiments during the FWRP workshops to illustrate the subtle yet important ways that workload inequities emerge within an academic unit. In each exercise, the user is asked to imagine they are a faculty member tasked with making certain kinds of workload decisions. In this Appendix, we describe each exercise and the insights the FWRP participants gained from completing it, based on the discussion that followed each exercise.

EXERCISE 1: TUESDAY'S INBOX

Imagine you are a faculty member, checking your email on a Tuesday morning. In your inbox, you have emails from students, department, campus, and disciplinary colleagues, your department chair, campus leaders, and government agencies. Each contains a request that will add to your workload. The requests are:

- Review an article for a top journal at the request of an influential colleague. You have done this before.
- Serve on a review panel for an agency that funds many grants in your discipline.
- Write a recommendation letter for a promotion case. A colleague on campus is trying to move up the ranks from assistant to associate clinical (non-tenure track) professor.
- Provide feedback on a paper for a junior colleague who has done this for you.
- Act as faculty advisor for a newly formed student group affiliated with and serving the Black Lives Matter movement.
- Serve as chair of a committee revising merit pay policies for non-tenure track faculty.
- Write two letters of recommendation for a student with whom you have worked closely.
- Chair the promotion and tenure subcommittee for a junior colleague who has been your mentee.
- Chair an undergraduate research project for a student.
- Join the Senate Executive Committee of the University Senate. This is the steering committee of the university and thus provides a voice on key issues facing the campus. A senior leader of the university has asked you to serve in this role.
- Meet with an administrator, who has been an advocate for you, and now is facing a challenging climate in her department. She needs strategies to deal with colleagues creating a negative work environment.
- Serve on a thesis committee for a student at another institution where they do not have her research topic, which you study, represented.
- Participate in a living learning community luncheon. The living learning community is geared toward undergraduate women students in your field.

You determine that you can realistically complete **three activities from this list**. Which three activities would you choose?

INSIGHTS GAINED FROM COMPLETING TUESDAY'S INBOX

After FWRP participants completed this exercise, we asked them to reflect upon their choices and consider the principles that guided their selections. There were four main themes that came out of these discussions:

- **Individual values influence choices:** Inevitably, when we asked participants which activities they would choose, and why, the participants recognized their choices reflect their values. Faculty members reported that they said “yes” to certain activities because they were committed to their students or junior colleagues, valued shared governance to the institution, believed that scholarship should be connected to community engagement and social justice, or wanted to be a good departmental citizen.
- **Requests and responses reflect individual identities:** A faculty member’s identities, career stage, prior experience, and perceptions of greatest need also contributed to their choices. Faculty from historically minoritized groups often selected issues related to supporting minority student groups. Women faculty often indicated a strong commitment to fulfilling asks related to their students. Moreover, responses often depended on who the request came from, with faculty members more hesitant to say no to asks from close colleagues or mentees, or those with much more relative power/influence on their careers. On the other hand, individual faculty members indicated that it was more or less realistic that they would receive certain kinds of asks in the first place. Senior faculty were more likely to be asked to serve as chair of the promotion and tenure committee, on a research panel, or serve on the faculty senate. A Black faculty member would be more likely asked to serve as the advisor for the Black Lives Matter Movement. A woman in science would be more likely than a man to receive a speaking request from the living learning community that is focused on women in the field.
- **Responses to one request influence future requests:** Participants also indicated that there is sometimes a cumulative effect to their responses. The more certain faculty members are asked to engage in certain activities, and then succeed in those activities, the more they will be asked to do in that area again. For example, faculty members were sometimes hesitant to write letters of recommendation because they knew they would be asked to do so again but were eager to say yes to serving on a review panel because they wanted to be asked again in the future.
- **Certain asks are more or less career-enhancing:** Finally, participants sometimes considered the extent to which saying yes to certain activities would help further their career goals. Faculty members of color and women in some STEM fields indicated that they are often asked to do activities that are less career-enhancing though critical (e.g., speaking at the living learning community luncheon, serving as the advisor to the Black Lives Matter undergraduate group). Still, other tasks provide more career visibility or networking opportunities and may thus be more coveted, even if the benefits are not immediate (e.g., serving on Faculty Senate).

Overall, the Tuesday’s Inbox exercise was designed to show that workload inequities are not only the result of individual discretion and choices, but patterns in who gets asked to do what and why (El Alayli, Hansen-Brown, and Ceynar 2018; Mitchell and Hesli 2013; O’Meara, Kuvava, and Nyunt 2017). Rather than assuming that all faculty will have the same list of priorities and activities, we need faculty activities to be distributed across the larger faculty to accomplish the many missions of most higher education institutions.

EXERCISE 2: THE HALLWAY ASK

Imagine you are a department head who has just found out that you need to identify a new chair of undergraduate studies. The position needs to be filled immediately. You walk down the hallway of your department, and you see the office doors of six faculty members.

The doors of the first three offices are open. These offices belong to the following faculty members with the associated characteristics:

- Dan is an associate professor who does good research but tends to say “no” to protect his time for research when he is asked to take on additional teaching or service tasks.
- Amanda is a full professor who has a strong research agenda. She is known as an abrasive teacher and committee member but is also detailed and good at getting things done.
- Elizabeth is an associate professor with strong research who everyone likes. She will likely say yes and complete the work well.

The other three doors, which belong to faculty members Marian, Damian, and Josh, are closed. You do not know if these faculty members are in their offices or not.

As a department head, who of these six faculty members would you ask to be the new chair of undergraduate studies?

INSIGHTS GAINED FROM COMPLETING THE HALLWAY ASK

After FWRP participants completed this exercise, we asked them to indicate who they chose to be the chair of undergraduate studies. Knowing it was not fair, almost all FWRP participants reluctantly indicated that they would ask Elizabeth. They explained that choosing Elizabeth makes the decision easy: she was present in her office, likely to say yes, and would complete the job at a high-quality level.

We then asked the group to consider the operating principles for this decision (e.g., would they describe the system as strategic? Are some faculty benefiting more than others, and if so, why and how?). The themes from this discussion were as follows:

- **Workload Decisions Occur in “Foggy” Contexts:** We discussed the fact that the “hallway ask” described here¹ occurs in a situation that is “unscripted” (Ridgeway and Correll 2004) and “foggy” (Banerjee and Pawley 2013; Beddoes, Schimpf, and Pawley 2014). That is, participants chose Elizabeth in this case (and will probably choose Elizabeth for other work activities in the future) because they are rushed in deciding, want the decision to be simple and easy, and they lack information on what the other members of the department are doing. In other words, this is both a common occurrence and a perfect storm situation in which bias shapes our decisions.
- **Lack of Tools Needed to Make Workload Decisions:** We also discussed with participants the tools that a department head could use to ensure that a chair was selected in a fair and equitable manner. For example, the department head lacked data. They did not know how much service Elizabeth or the other faculty members were already doing. The department head also did not have a process or guidelines to rely upon in making the decision. Perhaps some of the faculty members with their door closed would be interested in the position but had never been given the opportunity to indicate their interest. Finally, there was a lack of consensus and commitment to equity in the distribution of work. The department head did not pause to consider if Elizabeth was being asked over and over again.

In summary, the goal of The Hallway Ask exercise was to reveal the ways workload inequity emerges because there is a lack of strategy underlying workload decisions. Yet, the goal of the exercise is also to illustrate that there are equity-minded policies and practices that can help administrators and faculty be more strategic in their workload systems.

1 Also described in O’Meara 2018a.

By participating in these exercises, faculty began to consider how they, as individuals, made decisions about their own workload, but also how the overall system of workload decisions within their department or unit lacked strategy or structure. Thus, these two exercises illustrated the complexity and nuances of how inequities occur in how faculty work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded in unintentional, unscripted ways that often go unseen.

Appendix B: Equity-Minded Faculty Workload Audit

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

This audit was created based on the research on equity-minded work practices and lessons learned from the Faculty Workload and Rewards Project. To use this tool, users should first consider what some of the main issues or goals your unit has for enhancing workload equity listed in **Column 1 (Orange)**. For example, units may want to be more transparent in who is doing what within the department or encourage faculty members to be more accountable to completing the work they have been asked to do. Once users determine their workload goals(s), they should pose the questions listed in the **Column 2 (Green)**, regarding their unit’s existing workload data, processes, and procedures. If users answer “no” to the questions in Column 2, **Column 3 (Blue)** guides users toward the relevant FWRP Policy & Practice Handouts that may help them achieve their workload goals. All handouts are available in Appendix C.

Our Unit Would Like To	Questions to Consider	Relevant Policies and Practices to Consider if Answer Is No, or Not Enough
<p>Promote Transparency</p> <p>Let faculty members see the range of effort in teaching, mentoring, and service by relevant appointment type or career stage and show the relationship between individual faculty effort and overall department effort.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are data on faculty workload published and transparent (e.g. teaching and advising loads, committee service, advising) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are they presented in ways that faculty can benchmark their teaching, research, and service against department averages by relevant career stages and apt. types? b. Are there way to make the often invisible work of historically minoritized faculty and women visible in the representation and credit of workload? 2. Are the processes through which routine service assignments, advising assignments, and teaching assignments are made fair and transparent? Do faculty have voice and agency within them? 	<p>#1 Faculty Work Activity Dashboard Examples</p> <p>#2 Faculty Service Audit</p>

Our Unit Would Like To	Questions to Consider	Relevant Policies and Practices to Consider if Answer Is No, or Not Enough
<p>Enhance Clarity</p> <p>Ensure faculty members clearly understand what is expected of them.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are expectations for faculty labor in teaching, advising and service clear? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are the clear benchmarks for performance, relevant to faculty in different ranks and apt. types? 	<p>#3 Faculty Expectations Guidelines</p> <p>#4 Compensation for Key Roles</p>
<p>Provide Credit</p> <p>Recognize that some faculty members do more work in certain areas than others and that certain tasks require more effort than others.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do policy and practice differentiate the amount of work completed in such a way to allow differential credit and reward? (e.g., chairing versus serving, 500-person class with no TA vs. five-person class) 2. Can faculty members bank, or otherwise do more of one work activity, and get credit to do less of another? 	<p>#5 Credit Systems</p> <p>#6 Teaching Credit Swaps</p>
<p>Promote Equity Norms</p> <p>Make sure that all departments are doing their fair share and that less desirable and/or less career-enhancing tasks are not disproportionately being assigned to the same faculty members.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are there planned rotations for time-intensive administrative, service, or teaching assignments, as possible? 	<p>#7 Planned Service Rotations</p> <p>#8 Planning Teaching Time Rotations</p>
<p>Give Context</p> <p>Acknowledge that faculty members have different strengths and interests.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do policies and practices appropriately acknowledge differences in work contexts and effort levels? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. (e.g., apt. type, career stage, administrative role, differential role in supporting under-represented students) b. Are there ways to formally recognize faculty whose workload differs from the norm within the department? 	<p>#9 Differentiated Workload Policy</p> <p>#10 Modified Criteria for Promotion and Tenure</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Our Unit Would Like To</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Questions to Consider</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Relevant Policies and Practices to Consider if Answer Is No, or Not Enough</p>
<p>Encourage Accountability</p> <p>Encourage faculty members to complete the work they have been assigned to do and reduce the extent to which faculty members “free-ride” off the work of others.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there accountability built into the system such that when a faculty member does not complete minimal expectations for work, or completes more than their share, there is a consequence? 2. Are committee sizes and roles sufficiently defined as to reduce social loafing and free riding? 3. Is there alignment between workload policies and practices and the evaluation system? (e.g., annual review or merit, post-tenure review, promotion and tenure, contract renewal) 	<p>#11 Restructuring and Reducing Committees</p> <p>#12 Statement of Mutual Expectations</p>

Appendix C: Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads Worksheets

Transparency

1. Faculty Work Activity Dashboard Examples
2. Faculty Service Audit

Clarity

3. Faculty Expectation Guidelines
4. Compensation for Key Roles

Credit

5. Credit Systems
6. Teaching Credit Swaps

Norms

7. Planned Service Rotations
8. Planned Teaching Time Rotations

Context

9. Differentiated Workloads
10. Modified Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Accountability

11. Restructuring and Reducing Committee Size
12. Statement of Mutual Expectations

Developing a Plan for Action

13. Developing a Department Equity Action Plan (Template and Example)

Faculty Work Activity Dashboard Examples – Handout #1

Handout #1 includes examples of different faculty work activity dashboards meant to track the teaching, research, and service commitments of faculty within a department. A faculty work activity dashboard is an easy-to-read and simple data visual aimed at increasing transparency in how faculty workload is distributed across members of a department (O’Meara et al. 2020). Departments can create dashboards using pre-existing data sources (e.g., faculty annual reports, instructional reports, annual merit review data). In this handout, we provide an examples of teaching credit dashboards and service credit dashboards. Although departments can create dashboards that also track research-related work activities, we focus on teaching and service, as they are the activities that are often not measured in traditional faculty workload systems. We describe in greater detail how departments and institutions can develop faculty work activity dashboards in [this article](#).

In Example 1, we present two teaching credit dashboards. In each teaching dashboard, a total course load is calculated for each department member, taking into account the kind of course (100-level versus graduate seminar; large enrollment versus writing intensive), new course preps, and/or course releases. The actual course load is then compared to the standard course load expected for faculty at different ranks (e.g., assistant, associate, full) and in different kinds of faculty positions (tenure and tenure-track versus instructional lecturers). These dashboards help individual faculty members and departments assess if certain faculty members have teaching loads that are larger or smaller than what is expected based on the standard load. The dashboards also give credit to faculty members teaching courses that require extra effort.

Example 1. Teaching Credit Dashboard

Rank	Faculty ID	100-Level	200-Level	300-Level	400-Level	Grad Seminar	New Course Preps	Course Release	Total Course Load	Standard Load
Assoc	F-1	1		1		1		1	3	4
Asst	F-2		1	1					2	2
Assoc	F-3	1		1	1			1	3	4
Asst	F-4	2				1	1	2	2	4
Senior Lecturer	F-5	2	2						4	6
Full	F-12					3		2	1	4
Full	F-13			1		1		2	0	4
Assoc	F-14			1		2	1	1	3	4
Lecturer	F-15	3	2	4					9	4

Rank	Faculty ID	100-Level	200-Level	Large Enrollment	Writing Intensive	Service Learning	Course Release	Total Course Load	Standard Load
Lecturer	F-1	1	3			1		5	6
Asst	F-2		1	1				2	2
Assoc	F-3	1		1	1		1	2	4
Full	F-4	2				1		3	4
Asst	F-5	2		1				3	2
Full	F-12		1	1			2	0	4
Assoc	F-13	2	1	1			2	2	4
Assoc	F-14	1	2	1			1	3	4
Senior Lecturer	F-15	3	2	4				9	6

Units may wish to count in their teaching dashboards whether faculty members had teaching assistants (TA), especially for large enrollment courses. A TA might be considered a resource and be counted against a faculty member's total course load (similar to a course release). On the other hand, supervision of TAs might be considered a wash and thus not counted.

In Example 2, we present a service credit dashboard. In the committee service matrix, each departmental, college, and institutional service committee is assigned an intensity category (low, medium, or high) based on the amount of effort associated with serving on the committee. The two subsequent dashboards present different ways the committee service matrix could be used to display and analyze department members' service commitments. In the bar chart, the average number of committees on which faculty members serve is calculated by rank (assistant, associate, and full). This dashboard allows individual faculty members and departments to benchmark faculty service, assessing whether faculty are doing more or less service compared to other faculty members at a similar rank. In the table, a points system is developed (low intensity committees = 1 point; medium intensity committees = 2 points; high intensity committees = 3 points + 1 point for chair). Based on this point system, each faculty member's total service load is calculated. This dashboard helps departments understand the total service contribution of each faculty member while taking into account the differences in effort required for different kinds of service work.


Example 2. Service Credit Dashboard

Example: Committee Service Matrix

Expected Time Commitment	Department	College	University
High	Merit/ Salary Review	Director or Assoc. Dean Search/ Review	Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee
	Graduate Admissions	Accreditation Review	Search Committee for Provost or Dean
	Faculty Search	Scholarship/Fellowship Selection	Provost/Senate Task Force or temporary ad-hoc task force
	Chair Search/Chair Review	College Committee Chair	Review of Executive-level Administrator
Medium	Undergraduate Recruitment	College Promotion and Tenure Committee	Chair of a Senate Committee
	Staff Search	Facilities Committee	Standing Campus Committee (Research Council, Sustainability Council, Living-Learning Review, etc.)
	Priorities/Strategic Planning	Awards Selection Committee	Faculty Board for General Education
Low	Technology Committee	College Administrative Council	Campus Senate
	IRB Committee	Diversity Committee	Senate Committee or Council
	Graduate Colloquium	College Senate	Graduate Council

Example: Committee Service

Average Number of Committees Served for Academic Year 2015–16



Example: Calculating service based on hours spent per week for different service commitment

Faculty	LOW (1 POINT)					MEDIUM (2 POINTS)				HIGH (3 POINTS + 1 for CHAIR*)						Total Comms	Total Service Load	
	Faculty Sponsor	Seminar Series	Curriculum, Enrollment & Distance Education Committee	Events committee	Handbook revisions	Promotion Tenure Review	Budget committee	Faculty Senate	Newsletter	Assessment Committee	Faculty Workload	MA Admissions	Search	Student Club	Undergrad Supervision			Grad Supervision
Number needed	1	1	4	2	2	3	3	3	2	6	6	7	4	1	1	1	47	
F-1			1							1					1		3	7
F-2																	0	0
F-3			1		1							1					3	6
F-4						1		1		1							3	8
F-5											1	1	1				3	9
F-6										1			1	1			3	9
F-7						1	1				1						3	7
F-8	1											1	1				3	7
F-9			1				1						1				3	6
F-10					1							1					2	4
F-11				1							1	1					3	7
F-12							1		1	1							3	8

*chair indicated by yellow highlight.

Faculty Service Audit – Handout #2

THE PROBLEM

The Tuscan Department had a problem. As they conducted a departmental service audit, they found that some department service roles are more preferred than others, because they are more interesting or provide more campus-wide visibility to faculty members. Other service roles are seen as beneficial for helping faculty to establish better connections to campus leadership and gain “inside information” from connections within the university. There is not much transparency related to these desired service roles, leaving many faculty members feeling confused on how they can be nominated or sign up to serve. Additionally, senior faculty members tend to hold onto these service commitments. Many faculty members suspect the desired roles go to those who are considered favorites of the department chair.

A SOLUTION

The Tuscan Department decided to enact a new practice of sending out a Service Audit to be completed every spring when annual reviews were submitted. The Service Audit was brief but included a list of different service responsibilities, both those that faculty fulfill at the department level, and those that the department sends representatives to at the college and university level. Faculty were reminded of service expectations at the top of the form (e.g., how many committees faculty were expected to serve on based on career stage and appointment type). They were also asked to indicate which service roles they were currently playing that would continue into the following academic year. Then they were asked to check boxes of any service roles they would prefer to play in the future. Faculty were all asked to check at least some boxes. Department chairs and advisory groups then used these forms to assign roles for the following year.

FACULTY SERVICE AUDIT

Faculty Service Expectations

Assistant Professors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on 2 college/university or department committees
Tenured Associate/Full Professors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair 1 department committee • Serve on 2 other college/university or department committees
Instructional Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair 1 department committee • Serve on 3 or more other college/university or department committees

Please identify which service roles you are playing this year that continue into the following academic year.

Please check boxes of any service roles you would prefer to play in the future. We encourage all faculty to check at least some boxes.

Merit Review	Curriculum Review	Budget & Planning
Admissions and Fellowships	Workload Committee	Rep to University Senate
Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee	Research & Grants	IRB Representative
Representative to College Senate	Professional Track Faculty Committee	Faculty Development Committee

Are you interested in chairing any committees? If so, which ones?

Faculty Expectations Guidelines – Handout #3

THE PROBLEM

The Lake Wobegon Department had a problem. When they collected data on workload and faculty experiences with it, they learned that faculty felt research expectations were clear, but teaching and service expectations were not. As annual review and merit committees sat down to review faculty, there was great variability in merit ratings of the same CV. Assistant professors noted to their mentors that they did not know what was considered “enough” in the areas of teaching and service. The department chair likewise felt it was difficult to explain merit rankings to faculty without clearer guidance related to minimal expectations.

A SOLUTION

The department workload team developed a workload policy that included a more concrete description of expectations. They sought feedback on it from department faculty before finalizing. The rubric varied for three groups of faculty: assistant professors, associate/full professors, and instructional/lecturers. It identified effort in teaching, research, and service that was considered below, meeting, above, and exceeding department expectations. The rubric was distributed to all faculty, and given to the merit committee. All mentors reviewed it with junior faculty, and the department chair used it to consistently guide performance evaluation. Note: The rubrics below are a sample for what faculty expectation guidelines might look like. The rubrics are not intended to be a specific recommendation on what the expectations for faculty in different roles/at different ranks should be.

Associate/Full Professor Rubric

	Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
Below Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>less</i> than 5.5 courses per year teaching evaluations below college average advise less than 10 undergrads; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students <p><i>(if 2 of these 3 bullets are met)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-1 peer reviewed publications per year 0 conference presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 0 department and/or other committees serve on 0-1 university/ college/ other committees
Meets Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 5.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>consistent</i> with or <i>above</i> college average advise 10 undergraduate; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 peer reviewed publications per year 1 conference presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 1 department committee serve on 2 other college/university or department committees
Above Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 5.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>above</i> college average advise <i>more</i> than 10 undergraduates; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 or more peer reviewed publications per year 2 or more conference presentations grant/award proposals submitted and/or accepted <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 2 department and/or other committees serve on 3 or more university/ college/ other committees <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>
Far Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 6.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>significantly above</i> college average advise <i>more</i> than 12 undergraduates; 4 MA; 5 doctoral students teaching or mentoring awards <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 or more peer reviewed publications per year in top tier journals 3 or more conference presentations grants received research awards <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 3 department and/or other committees serve on 4 or more university/ college/ other committees recognition for service played key leadership role in major effort (accreditation, chair of university senate, etc.) <p><i>(meet 1 of these)</i></p>

Assistant Professor Rubric

	Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
Below Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>less</i> than 4.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>below</i> college average advise <i>less</i> than 5 undergraduates; 1 MA; 2 doctoral students <i>(if 2 of these 3 bullets are met)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-1 peer reviewed publications per year 0 conference presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 0 university/ college/ other committees
Meets Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 4.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>consistent with or above</i> college average advise 5 undergraduates; 1 MA; 2 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 peer reviewed publications per year 1 conference presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 1 college/university or department committees
Above Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 4.5 courses per year teaching evaluations above college average advise more than 5 undergraduates; 2 MA; 3 doctoral students <i>(meet 1 of these)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than 2 peer reviewed publications per year 2 or more conference presentations grant/award proposals submitted and/or accepted <i>(meet 1 of these)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 2 or more university/ college/ other committees
Far Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 5.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>above</i> college average advise <i>more</i> than 7 undergraduates; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students teaching or mentoring awards <i>(meet 1 of these)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than 2 peer reviewed publications per year in top tier journals 3 or more conference presentations grants received research awards <i>(meet 1 of these)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 3 or more university/ college/ other committees recognition for service <i>(meet 1 of these)</i>

Instructional Faculty Rubric

	Teaching/Mentoring	Research	Service
Below Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>less</i> than 7.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>below</i> college average advise <i>less</i> than 10 undergraduates; 0 MA or doctoral students <p>(if 2 of these 3 bullets are met)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 publications per year 0 conference presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 0-1 department and/or other committees serve on 0-2 university/college/ other committees
Meets Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 7.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>consistent with or above</i> college average advise 15 undergraduates; 1-2 MA; 0 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 publications per year 1 conference presentation <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 1 department committee serve on 3 or more other college/university or department committees
Above Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 7.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>above</i> college average advise <i>more</i> than 15 undergraduates; 3 MA; 0-1 doctoral students <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 or more publications per year 2 or more conference presentations <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 2 department and/or other committees serve on 4 or more university/ college/ other committees <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>
Far Exceeds Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach <i>more</i> than 8.5 courses per year teaching evaluations <i>above</i> college average advise <i>more</i> than 20 undergraduates; 4 MA; 1 doctoral students teaching or mentoring awards <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than 2 publications per year, majority of them peer reviewed 3 or more conference presentations grant/award proposals submitted and/or accepted <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 3 department and/or other committees serve on 5 or more university/ college/ other committees recognition for service played key leadership role in major effort (accreditation, chair of university senate, etc.) <p>(meet 1 of these)</p>

Compensation for Key Roles – Handout #4

THE PROBLEM

The Show Me the Money Department had a problem. As they reviewed their faculty workload data, they found that some time-intensive faculty roles (e.g., graduate program director) are more coveted by faculty members, because they come with a summer salary or a course release. Because of a lack of clear guidelines and unexplained policies, no one in the department knows how faculty are assigned to these roles, or how faculty can sign up for them. Furthermore, the senior faculty members within the department tend to hold onto the roles, and some faculty members have expressed the belief that these roles go to those who are favored by the department chair. The lack of transparency in this process also creates confusion around which roles are compensated and which are not. Some important service roles are considered critical to shared governance but there is no additional compensation for them.

A SOLUTION

The Show Me the Money Department decided to write a policy that was incorporated into the department’s organization plan. The policy was two-fold. They began by restating standard performance expectations in teaching and service for three faculty groups (associate/full professors, assistant professors, and instructional faculty). Second, the policy clarified which roles are compensated and which are not. Third, the policy specified how faculty who want to take on more time intensive roles can express their interest, which made the process more transparent.

Table I. Standard Performance

Associate/Full Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructional Faculty	
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 5.5 courses/yr 	Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 4.5 courses/yr 	Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teach 7.5 courses/yr
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise 10 undergraduates Advise 3 MA Advise 4 doctoral students 	Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise 5 undergraduates Advise 1 MA Advise 2 doctoral students 	Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise 15 undergraduates Advise 1-2 MA Advise 0 doctoral students
Chair of Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair 1 department committee 	Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve on 1 college/university/ department committee 	Chair of Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair 1 department committee
Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve on 1 search committee/yr 	Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve on 1 search committee/yr 	Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serve on 1 search committee/yr

Table II. Standard vs. Compensated Roles

Standard Performance	Extra Effort Compensated Roles
Chair or member of Merit Review	Director of Graduate Studies
Chair or member of Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee	Director of Undergraduate Studies
Chair or member of Admissions & Fellowships	Associate Chair
Chair or member of Curriculum Review	Chair of Online MA Program
Chair or member of Workload Committee	Chair of Accreditation Team
Chair or member of Research & Grants	Chair of College Senate
Chair or member of Budget & Planning	
Chair or member of Rep to University Senate	
Chair or member of IRB Representative	

POLICY ON EXTRA EFFORT ASSIGNMENTS

Faculty members who are interested in taking on more time-intensive roles that require “extra effort” must submit a letter of interest, along with their CV, to their department chair by July 1 of the calendar year. Faculty who apply for more time-intensive roles will be required to attend an informational meeting, where specific policies around compensation for key roles will be reviewed in full, along with a review of how faculty members will be selected for these key roles, in order to create more transparency around the process. In some cases faculty will be asked to “shadow” the person currently in the role in the spring before they assume office. All faculty will be given an opportunity to serve in one compensated role over a five-year period.

Credit Systems – Handout #5

THE PROBLEM

The Getting Even Department had a problem. As they reviewed their faculty workload data, they found that some faculty members carried standard research workloads, but participated in many more teaching, advising, and service activities than what was expected for standard performance. Several faculty members in this category wanted to continue “overperforming” or producing greater effort in one or more of these areas. They just wanted to exchange that extra effort for credit in another area where they would provide less effort. In addition, there was recognition among the faculty that some service roles were especially taxing and not compensated appropriately for the time they took away from scholarship and grant work. For these few but important roles, department faculty wanted to provide service releases (either to be taken during the appointment or right after the person left the role).

A SOLUTION

The Getting Even Department wrote a credit system policy. They began by re-stating standard performance expectations in teaching and service for three groups (associate/full professors, assistant professors, instructional faculty). Then they considered what would represent “extra effort” that could be credited against standard performance in other areas.

Associate/Full Professor

	Standard Performance	Extra Effort	Policy
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 5.5 courses per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> taught 1/3 more course size twice faculty average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in teaching for 2 years can receive a course release for the third year.
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 10 undergraduates advise 3 MA advise 4 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 15 or more undergraduates advise 6 MA or more advise 8 doctoral students or more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in advising can exchange for 1 course release every other year as long as the average graduation rate of advisees was consistent or better than the department average.
Chair of Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 1 department committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 3 department/college/ university committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who chair 3 or more committees can be exempted from committee service the following year.
Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 1 search committee per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 3 search committees per year or 6 over 2 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who serve on 3 search committees per year or 6 over 2 years receive a course release the third year or complete no service for 1 year.

Assistant Professor

	Standard Performance	Extra Effort	Policy
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 4.5 courses per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> taught 1/3 more course size twice faculty average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in teaching for 2 years can receive a course release for the third year.
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 5 undergraduates advise 1 MA advise 2 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 10 or more undergraduates advise 3 MA or more advise 4 doctoral students or more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in advising can exchange for 1 course release every other year as long as students are graduating at or above department average.
Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 1 college/ university/ department committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 2 department/ college/ university committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who serve on 2 or more committees can be exempted from committee service the following year.
Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 1 search committee per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 2 search committees per year or 4 over 2 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who serve on 2 search committees per year or 4 over 2 years receive a course release the third year or no department service for 1 year.

Instructional Faculty

	Standard Performance	Extra Effort	Policy
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teach 7.5 courses per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> taught 1/3 more course size twice faculty average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in teaching for 2 years can receive a course release for the third year.
Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 15 undergraduates advise 1-2 MA advise 0 doctoral students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> advise 20 or more undergraduates advise 4 MA or more advise 1 doctoral students or more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who provide extra effort in advising can be exempted from committee service the following year.
Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 1 department committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chair 3 department/ college/ university committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who chair 3 or more committees can be exempted from committee service the following year.
Search Committee Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 1 search committee per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> serve on 3 search committees per year or 6 over 2 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty who serve on 3 search committees per year or 6 over 2 years receive a course release the third year or no department service for 1 year.

In addition to having a policy addressing extra effort, the department workload committee felt there was a need to address the additional work for full-year, high-effort roles. The committee thus created a policy for service releases. These would be assigned sparingly, though transparently and reliably, for full-year, high-effort roles. A faculty member could choose to take their service release while they served in the appointed role, or in the year following their appointment.

The following activities were considered worthy of service release:

Activity	Nature of Release
Department Chair (term of 5 years or more)	2 course release during year serving; 1 semester sabbatical once term completed
Graduate Program Director (3-year term)	1 course release a year
Undergraduate Program Director (3-year term)	1 course release a year
Chair of Accreditation Review	1 course release in last year of external visit

Teaching Credit Swaps – Handout #6

THE PROBLEM

The Equalizer Department had a problem. As the department chair reviewed their instructional productivity data and met with faculty for one-on-ones, they found that some faculty carried more of the instructional workload than others, which was hurting other aspects of their work, such as research. In many cases, these were high performers across the three faculty roles of research, teaching, and service. These faculty were way above the instructional workload requirement of 5.5 course units required by their state system for their institution. In most cases this was because they were carrying the normal course load of 4 courses (units), engaging in course units in dissertation advising, *and* engaged in supervising internships, independent study credits, and seminar papers that brought them closer to 7 or 8 units. Yet the department had just lost a large federal training grant and it was important that some of these high performers spend more time grant writing. The department chair and advisory group wanted to see if there was a way to have faculty (a) continue teaching the courses students needed to graduate and advance in their academic programs; (b) still meet instructional workload requirements as a department; and (c) allow some faculty to teach fewer traditional courses per year.

A SOLUTION

The department wrote a new instructional workload policy. They began by restating instructional workload expectations of 5.5 course units per faculty member. They then wrote out all of the other teaching/ mentoring credits that counted toward that 5.5 in addition to traditional 3-credit courses.

3-credit courses	1 course = 1 unit 4 courses = 4 units
Pre-dissertation credits	3 students registered = 1 course unit
Dissertation writing credits	2 students = 1 unit
A BA or MA internship credit	4 students = 1 unit
MA seminar paper credits	2 students = .5 units

They then showed two pathways in which faculty might meet instructional workload. The first pathway was considered standard. The other three had to have approval from the department chair in advance of course scheduling and were understood to be approved only if they did not require hiring an adjunct to teach a course for the faculty member, and the program was still delivering required and elective courses for students to advance for graduation.

	Standard Pathway A	Pathway B - Option 1	Pathway B - Option 2	Pathway B - Option 3
Teaching	4 courses per year (4 units)	3 courses per year (3 units)	3 courses per year (3 units)	3 courses per year (3 units)
Advising & Mentoring	1.5 unit in dissertation/ MA credits	2 students writing dissertations (1 unit), 4 BA/MA internship students (1 unit), 2 students for MA seminar papers (.5 units)	3 pre-dissertation students (1 unit), 2 students writing dissertations (1 unit), 2 BA/MA internship students (.5 units)	1 student writing dissertation (.5 units), 4 BA/MA internship students (1 unit), 4 students for MA seminar papers (1 unit)
Total Units	5.5 units	5.5 units	5.5 units	5.5 units

**Pathway B must be approved by the department chair.*

Assumption: First, all faculty members are expected to accumulate 5.5 units each semester, unless one of the following exceptions applies: (a) the faculty member is externally funded to engage in research at a higher time-base requirement than expected by the department; (b) the faculty member has taken on a time-intensive service responsibility such as serving as a division chair or program directors; or (c) the faculty member is granted sabbatical leave or an approved leave without pay. Second, courses have to be offered to meet students' needs. All faculty are expected to contribute to covering the required courses for the department.

Planned Service Rotations – Handout #7

THE PROBLEM

The Fellowship Department examined their faculty workload data over the last five years and learned that many of their most time-intensive faculty service roles tended to be rotated among only four faculty members. Three of the four faculty were associate professors who needed to spend more time on research. One of the four had been serving as Promotion and Tenure Chair for so long, no one else in the department knew what had to be done in that role or appreciated how much work was involved. Also, the person in this role had indicated they would retire in three years. In order to share the burden of work more fairly across the 12 faculty in the department, protect faculty who have held time-intensive service roles from burnout, make sure multiple faculty in the department could play each role, and increase appreciation for those roles come merit time, the department decided to gain support for and implement a rotation system for time-intensive service roles.

A SOLUTION

The Department came together to develop a new rotation policy for six consistent service roles they needed to fill each year. In developing the schedule they made the following decisions:

- All faculty would rotate through all roles, but assistant professors would not serve as Undergraduate Program Director (UPD) or Graduate Program Director (GPD) until after receiving tenure; associates would not serve as *both* UPD and GPD before going up for full professor.
- The schedule would try to take into account sabbaticals but would need to be adjusted when faculty took parental leave and other unknown leave. The rotation schedule would be reviewed by faculty, adjusted if needed, and confirmed each April by department leadership.
- Faculty would be assumed to play the role noted in the schedule unless on sick or parental leave, or acting as department chair.
- Faculty would be assigned to serve as a member of a committee during the year prior to serving as that committee's chair.

Six-year schedule for 12 faculty: (John, David, Jane, Casey, Bob, Rose, Jesse, Oliver, Bill, Nathan, Leslie, Thomas)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Undergraduate Program Director	John	Jesse	Rose	Thomas	Bob	Leslie
Graduate Program Director	David	Oliver	John	Jesse	Rose	Thomas
Admission Chair	Jane	Bill	David	Oliver	John	Jesse
Promotion & Tenure Chair	Casey	Nathan	Jane	Bill	David	Oliver
Merit Chair	Bob	Leslie	Casey	Nathan	Jane	Bill
Representative to College Senate	Rose	Thomas	Sam	Leslie	Casey	Nathan

*Modification will be made annually for faculty on parental or sick leave; they will be placed back into the rotation when they return.

Planned Teaching Time Rotations – Handout #8

THE PROBLEM

The Westros Department had a problem. To meet student needs, the department offered a wide variety of class times. Most faculty members viewed some of these times as undesirable (e.g., 8:00 a.m. on Monday mornings) and others as more desirable (e.g., Tuesday/Thursday 11:00 a.m. classes). In conversations with new faculty, the department chair discovered that they did not know how to request teaching slots at more desirable times. Moreover, in reviewing past course schedules, the chair realized that some senior faculty held onto more desirable teaching slots from year to year.

A SOLUTION

The Westros Department decided to do three things. First, they decided to write a department statement of mutual expectations related to teaching assignments and the rotation of preferred class times (Table 1). In this statement, they reiterated department teaching expectations for faculty by rank. Then, they added a section to note expectations around class times (Table 2). Here, they identified the five main class times the department is required to offer: Monday and Wednesday at 8:00 a.m., Tuesday and Thursday at 11:00 a.m., Monday and Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday and Thursday at 2:00 p.m. and Friday at 11:10 a.m.. The workload team outlined how many courses per year faculty should expect to teach at each day/time, depending on their rank. The survey also asked for special circumstances, such as child-care drop-off and pickup.

Second, the department chair and area coordinators sent out a five-minute survey, asking for faculty interest in teaching at each of these days/times. The survey was intended to gauge faculty interest in class rotations and attempt to match faculty members with their desired schedules, while also being mindful of faculty rank.

Finally, the department adopted a credit system, wherein faculty members who were more interested in teaching at “undesirable” times could get credit for teaching Monday/Wednesday 8:00 a.m. classes. Those credits could then be “cashed in” and exchanged the following year for preferred teaching times, like 11:00 a.m. Tuesday/Thursday classes. The credit system allowed faculty members to be rewarded for teaching at challenging times, encouraged rotation of preferred and challenging times, and accommodated differences in preference for times.

Table 1. Statement of Mutual Expectations for Teaching

Assistant Pre-Tenure Faculty	• teach 7 courses per year (1 at “undesirable times”)
Tenured Associate/Full Professors	• teach 8 courses per year (2 at “undesirable times”)
Instructional Faculty	• teach 9 courses per year (3 at “undesirable times”)

Table 2. Course Expectations

	Desirable Times	Undesirable Times
Assistant Pre-Tenure Faculty	6 courses per year	1 course per year
Tenured Associate/ Full Professors	6 courses per year	2 courses per year
Instructional Faculty	6 courses per year	3 courses per year

*This table represents an approximation of course expectations, which may vary on sabbaticals, parental leaves, course times, and course enrollments.

Differentiated Workload Policy – Handout #9

THE PROBLEM

The I-Deal Department had a problem. In reviewing their workload data, it became clear that tenured faculty were spending very different amounts of time in teaching, research, and service activities. There were some associate professors advising twice as many doctoral students, chairing twice as many committees, and teaching larger courses than full professors. Some of the associates were in the last five to seven years of their career and did not want to reduce teaching and service to do more research. They were excelling and valuable in these areas; they just wanted the department to recognize their effort. The other problem was on the research side. The faculty had a six-courses-per-year instructional workload, with the expectation that they also spend 30 percent of their time conducting research. Some faculty in the department fulfilled the expected course load but were simultaneously research inactive.

A SOLUTION

The department workload committee decided that they needed to lay out several legitimate pathways for tenured faculty to meet work expectations. They wanted to optimize faculty talents and interests and leverage them to different department areas of emphasis.

In the spring semester, each faculty member met with the chair to jointly determine their workload pathway for the following year. The pathway chosen would then be used as the standard for next year’s merit review.

Tenured faculty work effort pathway:

	Teaching	Service	Research
Pathway 1 Balanced Focus	50%	30%	20%
	(7 courses per year)	(chair 1 department committee, serve on 2 other committees)	(moderate intensity, such as submitting a peer reviewed publication each year, and giving a conference presentation)
Pathway 2 Research Focus	30%	20%	50%
	(5 courses per year)	(serve on 2 committees)	(high intensity, such as submitting 2 or more peer reviewed publications, conference presentations, and submitting external grant proposals)
Pathway 3 Teaching/ Service Focus	60%	40%	0%
	(8 courses per year)	(chair 2 department committees, serve on 2 or more other committees)	(research-inactive)

*Assistant professors were limited to Pathway 2 – Research Focus based on the need to keep research at a higher percent to achieve tenure.

Modified Criteria for Promotion and Tenure— Handout #10

Modified Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (Administrative)

THE PROBLEM

Ginsburg University had a problem. They recently hired several faculty members whose appointments are composed of both administrative and faculty responsibilities. For example, the Department of English hired one tenure-track assistant professor to direct the Graduate Student Writing Center, while the Department of Mathematics hired an associate professor who will supervise all undergraduate lab assistants in the department. However, the current appointment, tenure, and promotion guidelines at Ginsburg University do not adequately address the ways in which these faculty members contribute to the university. For instance, departments expect these jointly appointed faculty members to do 50 percent less research compared to faculty with non-administrative appointments, but the current tenure and promotion guidelines heavily emphasize publication output. Faculty on the promotion and tenure committee want to evaluate faculty with joint appointments fairly but are unsure how to do so given the university's current appointment, tenure, and promotion policies.

A SOLUTION

Ginsburg University decided that in unusual situations wherein a faculty member's position will differ significantly from others on the tenure track, departments should create individualized appointment, tenure, and promotion agreements. These agreements will outline modified criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty who are serving in joint administrative and faculty positions and provide specific examples of what work will be evaluated during the promotion and tenure process. Specifically, the agreements make clear: 1) the reason for the modified criteria (e.g., a faculty member is serving as the director of the Graduate Student Writing Center); 2) how the impact of the faculty member's work will be measured; 3) what unique contributions or activities will be included in the evaluation; 4) which duties will be considered "administrative" in nature; and 5) who should serve as appropriate letter writers and/or Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure committee members.

An example of such agreements are listed below.

An Example: Director of the Graduate Student Writing Center

This document marks an agreement between the Ginsburg University Department of English, and Dr. Smith, to modify certain unit criteria for tenure and promotion for her specific case. This agreement is in accordance with Ginsburg University's 2015–2016 Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Manual. The intent of this agreement is to set forth the tenure and promotion evaluative criteria and other modifications to the tenure and promotion process applicable to the review of Dr. Smith in light of her administrative background in directing the graduate student writing center. The unit criteria and procedures to be applied in this case are set forth in the 2015 Plan of Organization of the Department of English, and as set forth in the 2015 Ginsburg University Policy on appointment, tenure, and promotion. Except as expressly set forth below, all other unit criteria and appointment, tenure, and promotion procedures remain in effect.

Publication Types and Venues: The College Plan of Organization (PORG) indicates that in terms of research, “evidence of excellence is found in: Publication of significant research in prestigious, peer-reviewed authored books, edited books, monographs, book chapters, articles, encyclopedia articles, conference proceedings, and book reviews (weighted in roughly that order).” Because Dr. Smith has a joint appointment, her agreement has been modified to include the following criteria for tenure:

- Presentation of scholarship at one national and/or international conference every other year.
- Development and direction of the graduate student writing center on an annual basis, which includes managing a staff of two full-time staff members, and three graduate assistants. This direction also includes helping to secure funding for the graduate writing center.
- Editing a peer-reviewed journal, and serving as co-editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal every other year.

Dr. Smith is being hired into a joint administrative and faculty position, with explicit recognition that 50% of her appointment is on managing and directing the graduate student writing center. We have amended expectations in research to reflect both the applied nature of her research and to reflect we expect the amount to be less than someone on a 100% faculty appointment.

Because her impact on the graduate student writing center is important, the unit has agreed to evaluate the impact of Dr. Smith’s work based on the success and production of the graduate student writing center, along with and the editing of a peer-reviewed journal and co-editorship every other year. Additionally, she will be assessed on her conference presentations on a bi-annual basis.

Due to the value of collaboration with other faculty, graduate students, and community partners on these projects, we agree to value participation in such teams. Dr. Smith is encouraged to provide documentation of her specific role in collaborative writing projects.

The College PORG recognizes service to the institution as well as the community. This agreement clarifies that Dr. Smith’s roles in developing and overseeing collaborative writing projects in the graduate student writing center of graduate students will be valued as professional service.

Dr. Smith’s contributions to revising approaches on how to teach writing and involvement in shaping the graduate writing curriculum will be valued as service to the institution.

External Evaluators: Letter writers who are qualified and able to comment on Dr. Smith’s tenure and promotion case should include scholars from English and Comparative Literature as well as Education. This agreement clarified that the selection of external tenure evaluators will reflect the applied nature of Dr. Smith’s work.

Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review Committee: This agreement clarifies that the College Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review Committee and any Advisory Subcommittee for Dr. Smith’s tenure and promotion case should additionally include a professor involved in research on writing centers serve on the committee or as a nonvoting advisor, and to be duly invited to provide context on her portfolio during committee meetings.

Approved by:

Name, Department Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Dean or Unit Chair Date

Name, Provost Date

Modified Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (Engaged)

THE PROBLEM

High Impact University had recently hired several faculty, who conducted “engaged” research. The tenure and promotion guidelines at High Impact University, however, did not adequately address the unique contributions of these faculty members. Faculty conducting engaged research were concerned that their contributions would not be valued in the promotion and tenure process. Individuals serving on tenure and promotion committees were unsure how to evaluate their colleagues’ work.

A SOLUTION

High Impact University decided to encourage departments to create individualized agreements outlining modified criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty who are involved in engaged scholarship. These agreements note the reason for the modified criteria (e.g., a faculty member’s unique background or expertise), how impact will be measured, what unique contributions or activities will be valued, what will be considered service, and who should serve as external letter writers and appointment, tenure, and promotion committee members. High Impact University encouraged departments to provide specific examples of what type of work would be valued in promotion and tenure guidelines.

Two examples of such agreements are listed below:

Example #1: Engaged Scholar and Writer

This document marks an agreement between High Impact University Department of English and Dr. Conroy to modify certain unit criteria for tenure and promotion for her specific case. This agreement is in accordance with High Impact University’s 2015- 2016 Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Manual. The intent of this agreement is to set forth the tenure and promotion evaluative criteria and other modifications to the tenure and promotion process applicable to the review of Dr. Conroy in light of her scholarly background in integrating writing and community engagement. The unit criteria and procedures to be applied in this case are set forth in the 2015 Plan of Organization of the Department of English and as set forth in the 2015 High Impact University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion. Except as expressly set forth below, all other unit criteria and appointment, tenure, and promotion procedures remain in effect.

Publication Types and Venues. The College Plan of Organization (PORG) indicates that in terms of research, “evidence of excellence is found in: Publication of significant research in prestigious, peer-reviewed authored books, edited books, monographs, book chapters, articles, encyclopedia articles, conference proceedings, and book reviews (weighted in roughly that order).” Under scholarly work, the PORG also lists:

- Editing a peer-reviewed journal and serving as co-editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal (ISI-ranked journals are weighted the highest)
- Presentation of scholarship at national and international conferences
- Development of an externally funded research program, including those that provide support for graduate research assistants or other support for the college

Dr. Conroy is being hired into a tenure-track position with explicit recognition that the focus of her writing scholarship is on developing the voice, agency, and capacity of community organizations and novice writers. The main goal of her work is thereby to change writing training and writer agency, not theoretical work to impact how writing scholars think about writing or books or peer-reviewed essays of her own. Because impact on community organizations is important in community-based writing, the unit has agreed to evaluate the impact of Dr. Conroy’s work based on community organizations’ and community members’ success in grant writing, public relations, and published op-eds. Pre- to post assessment of writing work with public audiences will be included in Dr. Conroy’s tenure portfolio as evidence of impact. Due to the value of collaboration with

other faculty, graduate students, and community partners on these projects, we agree to value participation in such teams. Dr. Conroy is encouraged to provide documentation of her specific role in collaborative writing projects.

Service. The College PORG recognizes service to the institution as well as the community. This agreement clarifies that Dr. Conroy's roles in developing and overseeing collaborative writing projects of faculty, graduate students, and community members will be valued as professional service. Shaping new approaches to teaching writing in a university setting are an important aspect of integrating writing and community engagement. Dr. Conroy's contributions to revising approaches on how to teach writing and involvement in shaping the undergraduate writing curriculum will be valued as service to the institution.

External Evaluators. Letter writers who are qualified and able to comment on Dr. Conroy's tenure and promotion case should include scholars from English and Comparative Literature as well as Education. This agreement clarified that the selection of external tenure evaluators will reflect the engaged nature of Dr. Conroy's work.

Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. This agreement clarifies that the College Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and any Advisory Subcommittee for Dr. Conroy's tenure and promotion case should additionally include a full professor involved in work with non-profits and/or community engagement to serve on the committee or as a nonvoting advisor, and to be duly invited to provide context on her portfolio during committee meetings.

Approved by:

Name, Department Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Dean or Unit Chair Date

Name, Provost Date

Example #2: Engaged Scholar and Humanities in the World

This document marks an agreement between the High Impact University Department of English and Comparative Literature and Dr. Lloyd to modify certain unit criteria for tenure and promotion for this specific case. This agreement is in accordance with the High Impact University 2015–2016 Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Manual. The intent of this agreement is to set forth the tenure and promotion evaluative criteria and other modifications to the tenure and promotion process applicable to the review of Dr. Lloyd in light of his disciplinary background in education and deep involvement in community engagement, which is atypical for the department. The unit criteria and procedures to be applied in his case are set forth in the 2015 Plan of Organization of the Department of English and Comparative Literature and as set forth in the 2015 High Impact University Policy on Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Except as expressly set forth below, all other unit criteria and appointment, tenure, and promotion procedures remain in effect.

Publication Types and Venues. The College Plan of Organization (PORG) indicates that in terms of research, "evidence of excellence is found in: Publication of significant research in prestigious, peer-reviewed authored books, edited books, monographs, book chapters, articles, encyclopedia articles, conference proceedings, and book reviews (weighted in roughly that order)." Under scholarly work, the PORG also lists:

- Editing a peer-reviewed journal and serving as co-editor or associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal (ISI-ranked journals are weighted the highest)
- Presentation of scholarship at national and international conferences
- Development of an externally funded research program, including those that provide support for graduate research assistants or other support for the college.

Because Dr. Lloyd’s work strives to translate theoretical academic research in British Renaissance literature into terms and activities that make sense to teachers, students, and community members outside the university, the impact of his work cannot be measured by peer-reviewed publications on their own. This agreement clarifies that the impact of Dr. Lloyd’s work will be measured based on growth of the educational partnership programs he has developed, replication of his evidence-based curriculum and workshops, outcomes from evaluations of his programs, and tracking data on success of students involved in his programs. Op-eds, newspaper articles, and other reviews of Dr. Lloyd’s work in the media will be considered as well.

Service. The College PORG recognizes service to the institution as well as the community. This agreement clarifies that Dr. Lloyd’s roles in collaborations with school districts and among universities will be valued as professional service.

External Evaluators. Letter writers who are qualified and able to comment on Dr. Lloyd’s tenure and promotion case should come from different disciplines, which may include English and Comparative Literature as well as Education. This agreement clarifies that the selection of external tenure evaluators will reflect the interdisciplinary and engaged nature of Dr. Lloyd’s work.

Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review Committee. This agreement clarifies that the College Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review Committee and any Advisory Subcommittee for Dr. Lloyd’s tenure and promotion case should additionally include a full professor from Education to serve on the committee or as a nonvoting advisor, and to be duly invited to provide context on his portfolio during committee meetings.

Approved by:

Name, Department Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Dean or Unit Chair Date

Name, Provost Date

Restructuring and Reducing Committees – Handout #11

THE PROBLEM

The Grande Department had a problem. The department had far too many committees and too few faculty members to serve on them. Since the committee sizes were first established, the department had lost many tenure-track faculty lines and/or shifted to more non-tenure track faculty who were currently ineligible to serve on certain committees. Despite the expectation that all faculty members contribute to department, college, and university service roles, some faculty were over-engaged in service, while other faculty members rarely showed up to committee meetings and hardly ever took on committee assignments. Additionally, there were vague expectations for how much work each faculty member should contribute to each committee, resulting in some faculty carrying more of the weight, and others “free-riding.” Morale was low among the faculty who typically took on committee leadership roles, because they felt the department was taking advantage of their willingness to lead. There were also some committees that were too large, met too frequently, and/or seemed to have outlived their purpose within the department.

A SOLUTION

The Grande Department decided to conduct an audit of existing committees, while working to reorganize and reduce committee service within the department. The department determined which committees were still needed, and which could be combined. They formally established the purpose for each committee, while also proposing guidelines for how often the committee should meet, the number of faculty members that are needed for each committee, and the assigned roles of the committee. They also classified each committee as having high, medium, or low intensity, which signified the faculty time commitment required to serve. Additionally, the department created a document that listed nine department committees (Table 1), and the three positions wherein the department sends a single representative to the college, university senates, or IRB council. Finally, the Grande Department clarified how many committees each faculty member should serve on to meet service expectations (Table 2). In all, the audit reduced ambiguity regarding committee service within the department and clarified the purpose and requirements of department committees. It became much harder for individual faculty to “shirk” committee work because they had more defined roles.

Table 1. Committees

	Purpose of the Committee	How many times it meets and time of year	Number of Members	Assigned Roles of the Committee	Intensity
Merit Review	Make recommendations for merit; provide guidance on merit review materials	3 meetings in April each year	4 faculty	Chair, 3 members	High-intensity
Promotion & Tenure Subcommittee	Work with candidate as they prepare materials; review promotion and tenure applications; review and make recommendations regarding the promotion and tenure process	1 meeting in May to review timeline; review of materials online over summer, 1 meeting to review drafts, 1 meeting to confirm final case	4 faculty	Chair, 3 members; 3 members each focus on one area: teaching, research or service	High-intensity
Admissions and Fellowships	Facilitate the admissions process, including recruitment, review of applications, and selection of students; review fellowship applications and select recipients	1 meeting in fall to review timeline; 1 meeting in January to review files Submission of final decisions online	5 faculty, 2 doctoral students	Chair, 4 members Each faculty member presents an even number of candidates	High-intensity
Curriculum Review	Review, make recommendations, and oversee policies on curricular matters; review course proposals	1 meeting to review the process; ad hoc meetings every 6 weeks if proposals are submitted	3 faculty	Each faculty member rotates presenting the proposal and writing the letter	Medium-intensity
Workload Committee	Review workload of faculty; make policy and practice recommendations	1 meeting to review timeline; ad hoc as necessary; work online	4 faculty	Assigned roles	Medium-intensity
Research & Grants	Recommend ways of enhancing the research function of the department	3 meetings a year	3 faculty	Advisory group roles	Low-intensity
Budget & Planning	Make recommendations regarding the department budget and strategic planning; review budget applications	2 meetings in April before department budget is submitted	3 faculty	Advisory roles	Medium-intensity

	Purpose of the Committee	How many times it meets and time of year	Number of Members	Assigned Roles of the Committee	Intensity
Rep to University Senate	Represent the department's interests at University Senate meetings; report University Senate decisions to the department	4 meetings each semester	1 faculty	Advisory	Low-intensity
IRB Representative	Review department IRB applications; answer faculty IRB questions	1-day training at the start of each semester; ad hoc online review	1 faculty	Advisory	Low-intensity

Table 2. Faculty Commitment to Committee Work:

Assistant Professors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on 2 college/university or department committees
Tenured Associate/Full Professors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair 1 department committee • Serve on 2 other college/university or department committees
Instructional Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair 1 department committee • Serve on 3 or more other college/university or department committees

Statement of Mutual Expectations – Handout #12

THE PROBLEM

The Expectations Department had a problem. There had been significant changes in the faculty over the last five years, with retirements and replacement of tenure-track faculty with non-tenure track faculty. There were factions of faculty forming, largely mirroring career stages, with some early-career faculty trying to emphasize research and late-career faculty taking on more research. Yet both groups, as well as those mid-career, seemed to have different sets of expectations for appropriate workload.

In addition, there had been some heated disagreements over some curricular and faculty evaluation changes in the department, with some faculty feeling bullied or disrespected. Some faculty reported that others routinely missed committee meetings, did not respond to colleague emails on important matters, or did not do their fair share of promotion and tenure committee review work. There did not seem to be any common values or guidelines to turn to for norms of collegiality, respect, and professional interactions. The department chair feared that without some kind of formal guidelines and written policies, the situation might get even worse.

A SOLUTION

The department formed a small advisory group. The first thing they did was establish faculty expectations guidelines (see Handout #3: Faculty Expectations Guidelines) that made it clear what the minimum expectations were for each faculty member in teaching, research, and service. They also amended their differentiated workload policy, so that there could be some flexibility in how faculty met these benchmarks.


Then they created a document for review by the faculty that emphasized mutual obligations to each other and to the community that they wanted to have within the department. They focused on two things: effort within their programs and shared expectations that everyone does their part within committee operations and common department house-keeping (within committee assignments and meetings) and ways of communicating.

Statement of Mutual Expectations: Shared Roles

1. **Shared Governance:** We each agree to do our fair share of the common tasks assigned to committees, including but not limited to attending meetings, writing reports, reviewing files, and scheduling meetings.
2. **Meeting Attendance:** We agree to attend our monthly department meeting regularly with primary exceptions being for illness or disciplinary conferences.
3. **Respectful Dialogue:** We agree to communicate by email respectfully and not make accusations or try to argue key points by email. We will save discussions of the pros and cons of key decisions for meeting discussions.

Department Equity Action Plan (DEAP) - Handout #13

Background Context (relevant context for workload analysis and reform)



Department Conditions Report and Dashboard Findings (note most important findings as they relate to department satisfaction with workload and equity)



Equity Issues We Want to Address Moving Forward (distinguish between goals to address current equity issues and goals to proactively design equity moving forward)

Proposed Actions (changes to current organizational practices, policies, or plans)

Intended Outcomes

Department Equity Action Plan (DEAP)

EXAMPLE ONE: SERVICE

Background Context (relevant context for workload analysis and reform)

The Service Department includes 30 faculty (seven assistant professors, seven associates and 16 full). We have seven women and three Black and two Latinx faculty members. Research productivity is critical for promotion, as are good teaching evaluations. As a STEM discipline, we engage over 80 percent of our students in undergraduate research, either in labs or small courses. We also produce 15 to 20 doctoral degrees each year, and bring in over \$2 million in external research dollars annually. Our faculty teach and advise all levels—undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral students. As there has been much interest in increasing the number of STEM majors at our institution and from NSF, our faculty are frequently asked to serve on campus committees, write curricular grants, and assist in new cross disciplinary efforts. Given that our institution’s tenure and promotion system focuses so heavily on research, it is critically important that assistant and associate professors have a workload that allows them to succeed as researchers while also being good teachers. While service is important and needed, it is not as critical for promotion.

Department Conditions Report and Dashboard Findings (note most important findings as they relate to department satisfaction with workload and equity)

Our initial department conditions workload report in showed that only 25 percent of the faculty members who completed the survey felt that teaching and service workload was divided fairly in the department and 18 percent felt there was a strong commitment to fairly dividing work. Only 6 percent noted that data on workload was transparent. There was reasonable satisfaction with teaching and advising related work (e.g., over 80 percent were satisfied with class sizes, kinds of classes taught, and number of classes taught). However, we found more dissatisfaction with service. Our department conditions report showed less than 50 percent of faculty members were satisfied with the amount of work they do on committees, and the process in which committees are assigned. Furthermore, our initial report revealed that less than 40 percent of faculty members reported the department had planned rotations of time intensive roles, credit systems to equalize share of work, or the ability to differentiate different levels of committee service.

When we began to collect data for our dashboard, we were therefore attuned to issues of campus service. We gained consensus within our department as to low, medium, and high committee assignments across department, college, and university levels and assigned points to each in our dashboard. As we examined the final dashboard data we found there were important differences and significant ranges of activity among our faculty. Women faculty and associate faculty were both found to be doing more overall committee service, and women faculty more time-intensive committee service at all three levels—department, college, and university.

Equity Issues We Want to Address Moving Forward (distinguish between goals to address current equity issues and goals to proactively design equity moving forward)

We have discussed as a department the following goals for our workload policies and practices:

- We want to make sure assistants and associates are not engaged in above average service for their rank, or if they are, it is a choice. [This is an issue now.]
- We want to reduce gender differences in campus service; and/or credit campus-wide contributions above and beyond our requirements so that women and Black and Latinx faculty who are asked more often to serve can either say no, or have their service credited toward other activities (so they do less in another key work area or receive additional merit points). [This is an issue now.]

- We want to make sure workload data is transparent, and updated annually, along with our department workload policy and reward system statement. [Proactive goal]

Proposed Actions (changes to current organizational practices, policies, or plans).

1. We created a department dashboard and have published it to all department members in order to increase transparency about faculty workload. It will be updated annually. We have also asked that faculty mentors look it over with their mentees (assistants and associates) annually when they meet and discuss where faculty fit in relationship to department averages by rank.
2. We are developing a planned rotation of seven identified time-intensive roles that eliminates the possibility assistants will play these roles altogether while in assistant rank. It also requires that associate professors not serve in any of these roles more than once (for one year) during the first five years of their appointment as associates in order to continue the momentum of their research toward promotion to full professor (list of identified roles and planned rotation attached).
3. We have re-examined our merit pay criteria and found a way to add points to faculty who provide service in advising, or campus service, that is among the highest for the department (top 10 percent).
4. We have created a set of mutual expectations for professional interactions that was discussed over two department meetings, tweaked, and then confirmed as department guidelines. The mutual expectations included the following:
 - **Email Responses:** We will respond to colleague emails during the nine-month academic year within five days, instead of a week.
 - **Recognition:** We agree to recognize each other's accomplishments and not dismiss a colleague's achievements.
 - **Collaboration:** We agree to look for and take advantage of opportunities to collaborate with colleagues in the department. If a colleague comes to us with an idea, we agree to seriously consider the project.
 - **Mentorship:** Senior colleagues agree to take an interest in junior colleagues' career advancements and to offer advice and guidance when appropriate.

Each new faculty member was given a copy to review and sign when entering the department. It was agreed to be revisited and had to be renewed by unanimous vote every three years. Department chairs were allowed to raise issues noted in the mutual expectations document in one-on-one meetings with the faculty member if there was a consistent pattern of a faculty member not meeting an expectation.

Intended Outcomes

These actions are intended to foster the following outcomes:

1. **Recognition:** Faculty members will feel recognized for their labor and contributions to the department.
2. **Transparency:** Faculty members will have data and benchmarks available as they consider service activities they are asked to complete.
3. **Career Advancement:** Assistant and associate faculty members will be given opportunities to achieve a workload that allows them to advance their research and junior and senior faculty will engage in mutual mentoring and support.

