2021–22

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

WORKLOAD EQUITY COMMITTEE REPORT

duvpfa.du.edu/workload-equity-report

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

Workload equity reflects a complicated web of formal and informal policies and practices that have a significant impact on the experiences of faculty in academe. Over the last 18 months at the University of Denver, we have made progress toward understanding the problem through the work of a committee seated by the Faculty Senate.

The ensuing Report describes issues of workload equity facing our academic community, summarizes equity scholarship and the national policy landscape, and examines historic and current dynamics at the University of Denver. The purpose of the report is to update the institution on the committee's work; share significant findings; and offer short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations for creating a more equitable place to work.

The Workload Equity Committee (WEC) was charged with bringing greater clarity and transparency to three interrelated areas:

1. Faculty responsibilities and expectations

2. Decision-making processes by which department and unit heads assign faculty responsibilities and set faculty expectations

3. Standards through which faculty responsibilities and expectations are measured, assessed, and rewarded.

To that end, the committee completed internal and national comparative research on policies, practices, and procedures. Relevant data and findings that inform this report are included as appendices. We expect that future workload equity committees will make further progress on data collection and sharing.

Our **Recommendations** are differentiated by stakeholder, and offer suggestions for short-, medium-, and long-term changes to improve workload equity, with attention to transparency, clarity, credit, norms, and accountability, as well as principles of faculty sovereignty and shared governance. We encourage you to read the table in full, but some of the most important recommendations include:

- Creation of "guardrail" policies around service at the campus level that protect faculty against the worst inequities, while leaving room for individual

WORKLOAD EQUITY COMMITTEE

Committee Co-Chairs

Renee Botta, College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Kate Willink, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Past Chairs (2020-2021)

Sarah Pessin, College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Kate Willink, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Committee Members

Brian Gearity, Graduate School of Professional Psychology

Dean Saitta, College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Hava Gordon, College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Erin Elzi, University Libraries

Michele Tyson, Morgridge College of Education

Deb Ortega, Graduate School of Social Work

Brian Majestic, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Oliver Kaplan, Josef Korbel School of International Studies

Alison Staudinger, Office of the Provost

Matt Gordon, Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science

units and departments to define workload within their context.

- Faculty with discretionary authority—such as chairs, directors, and deans—should use this power to support equity for faculty in accordance with principles of shared governance and professional responsibility embedded in the University's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) document.

- Departments, units, and the university should develop or improve tools for workload equity, such as dashboards, equity actions plans, articulated service expectations, etc.

- "Invisible labor" and "relational care" work should be made visible and rewarded in merit, tenure, and/or promotion procedures, which may require changes in both policy and practice.

Our **Summary of the Literature** highlights the inequitable impact of service burdens on historically excluded faculty and/or women, identifying the categories of invisible labor and relational care work. We point to research that identifies the particular challenges faced by associate professors and those off the tenure track, such as Teaching and Professional Faculty (TPF), as well as the impetus for addressing workload equity as we emerge from the pandemic.

The **Nature of the Problem at DU** draws on historical and survey data, stakeholder engagement, and committee interview data to illustrate how the broader challenges of workload equity show up at DU. Although a lack of clear data makes it difficult to illustrate the interplay between workload and faculty and staff retention, they likely relate. Other issues include lack of clarity around expectations across units and faculty lines, and whether activities like faculty advising and mentoring are best counted as teaching or service. DU also faces issues around the appropriate counting and crediting of administrative work (e.g., various faculty director positions), especially for associate professors, and how "service" work in general is or is not recognized and celebrated.

In the **Best Practices** section, we share workload equity recommendations from the American Council on Education, including concrete tools that can be implemented. We detail approaches to workload equity at other institutions and highlight practices that might be applicable to DU.

Work Underway at DU illustrates progress occurring on our campus, including creation of dashboards and draft policies in relation to workload equity, and locates areas for growth, coordination, and leadership.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee sought to provide a framework for producing greater equity-mindedness about faculty workload and changing the institutional structures, policies, processes, and practices that create various forms of workload inequity. Producing and sustaining change requires agreement on the basic principles for achieving equity discussed in this report, as well as a good-faith commitment by all stakeholders to put them into action.

In recent years, DU's commitment to the values of shared governance has elicited campus visits from numerous experts whose presentations routinely referenced American Association of University Professors (AAUP) policy principles and recommendations. We are also deeply informed by the American Council on Education (ACE) report on Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads and the workload equity practices and policies at other higher education institutions. Finally, we are encouraged by the nascent work at DU, which indicates that this work is positive, beneficial, and doable. Our recommendations serve as next steps toward institutionalizing this work consistently across campus.

These principles inform specific short-term, medium-term, and long-term recommendations for action at different stakeholder levels as tabulated on the next several pages, guided by the timeline at right.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

SUMMER 2022

DU Chairs and Directors provide feedback on draft report in terms of factual edits or additions.

Deans and vice provosts engage the report during the annual retreat with the Provost.

AY 2022–23

Provost guides all schools and colleges to create unit-level workload equity policies through shared governance, in alignment with guardrails on discretionary authority—including annual accountability mechanisms for departments and grievance procedures.

Faculty Senators discuss workload equity report and next steps.

AY 2023–24

Units create and vote on workload equity policies by September 15, 2023.

Departments create and vote on service expectations at rank and series, and metrics of high-, medium-, and low-serving committees by Sept 15, 2023.

All university committees follow best practices, including scope, charge, projected outcome, expected level of service, and dismissal/evaluation processes.

AY 2024–25

Senate, academic leaders, and the Provost work together to create a university faculty workload policy (see SLU example).

AY 2025–26

Senate passes and the Provost approves a faculty workload policy. Beginning within units and departments aligns with research recommendations from O'Meara et al. and allows time for shared governance across heterogeneous academic schools and colleges.

OUR HOLISTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Stakeholder Group	Short term (AY 22–23)	Medium Term (AY 23–25)	Long term (AY 25–27)
Individual Level	Read the workload equity committee report; talk to department/program colleagues about next best steps (1–2 things to address in next AY); and engage Faculty Senator.	Department and program faculty collaborate to create clear departmental or unit expectations for service articulated at different ranks and series (see AY 22–23 goal).	Develop a sense of shared governance, collective agency, and responsibility for workload policies and practices through participation in annual workload audits and discussions in departments/units.
Unit/Department/ College Level	Identify/quantify extent of the problem in departments, programs, schools, and colleges in light of the nuanced, comparative, and evidence-based observations about the nature and scope of faculty work presented in this report. Collective recognition of workload inequities that exist within and across depts based on data and regular discussions in department/ program meetings, using ACE report worksheets to help structure a collective approach. Provide guidelines on how to have equity conversations with colleagues and peers based on principles of professional behavior and responsibility articulated in the APT document. Inform chairs, program directors, and deans of strategies currently available to them for addressing inequities through AY 22–23 workload equity committee. From "Nature of The Problem" 3b (p. 6) - Expectations vary greatly not only by rank and classification, but also within and among different units at DU. These expectations should be clearly defined, delineated, and communicated by each unit, school and/or college, as well as through the Provost's Office to eliminate ambiguity and enhance transparency.	Devise unit level workload equity policy/ guidelines/processes/ and annual accountability expectations. Develop possible paths to remedy inequities, such as credit systems, service rotations, workload equivalencies, and other mechanisms reported in the literature. Recommend strategies at the department level to make workload transparent. Chairs and deans take concrete action on and monitor change annually for workload inequities recognized within and across departments. Departments/programs continue workload equity conversations to understand work people do with the concrete goal of dashboards and Equity Action Plans for 50% departments/programs. Schools and colleges create guidelines through shared governance processes on how (or if) to provide relief/ credit to faculty who take the brunt of service.	Generate college Equity Action Plan that responds to changes like RI and considers factors that produce faculty dissatisfaction, disengagement, and departures. Recommend strategies on how to provide workload equity in the context of peers who refuse to do work for the whole (e.g., social loafing, free-riding, and beyond). Departments and colleges catalog service positions/committee work as low-intensity, medium-intensity, or high-intensity, and make this available to faculty. This will help differentiate service commitments, create more transparency around time-allocation, guide faculty in making informed workload decisions, and more easily track workload disparities and imbalances within units.

Stakeholder Group	Short term (AY 22–23)	Medium Term (AY 23–25)	Long term (AY 25–27)
Provost Level	Provost reads report and meets with the workload equity committee to discuss next steps. Require all schools and colleges to create workload guidelines through shared governance process and all-faculty vote. Create guidance structure for decanal accountability on workload equity in college/school. Host all-faculty discussions with the Faculty Senate, Teaching Excellence Task Force, and Workload Equity Committee on how advising, mentoring, academic program directorships, and other activities are categorized and evaluated as part of teaching, administration, or service to assure consistent definitions in evaluative processes.	Provost meets with workload equity committee to identify 1-3 committee recommendations that she believes have the highest priority and an idea about how she would support those priorities in her work/evaluation and support of the deans. Take concrete action for addressing workload inequities that have been recognized to come from Provost. Develop decanal annual reporting and assessment of school/college workload-equity progress as part of decanal annual review process. Host discussions on workload equivalencies and service sabbaticals in shared-governance forums.	Establish a standing committee to address workload equity, so that it becomes a "normal" part of the conversation. Provost catalogs university-level positions/committee work as low-intensity, medium-intensity, or high-intensity and make this available to faculty. This will help to better differentiate service commitments, create more transparency around time-allocation, guide faculty in making more informed workload decisions, and more easily track workload disparities and imbalances at the university level.
Collecting & publishing of Data	Policy clean-up based on equity literature mandated by Provost and enacted by chairs or their equivalent.	Create scorecards and dashboards to establish benchmarks on areas such as demographic information on faculty and staff (i.e., who is here and who is leaving).	Publish data accessible to the university community annually.
Faculty Senate	Reconvene committee as multi-year effort. Personnel Committee reviews university grievance policy and process, and reaffirms the Faculty Review Committee's constitutional responsibility to handle workplace/workload/workload equity grievances.	Put forward recommendations from report as motions where appropriate. Work with Provost's office on policy, action, and accountability. Work with deans on policy, action, and accountability. Institute and manage mandatory training of Faculty Review Committee (FRC) about their charge and basic shared-governance principles.	Revise APT documents where appropriate.

Stakeholder Group	Short term (AY 22–23)	Medium Term (AY 23–25)	Long term (AY 25–27)
Institutional Policy Level	Policy clean-up based on equity literature mandated by Provost and enacted by chairs or their equivalent.	Formally recognize invisible/ undervalued faculty work (e.g., YouRock and others) and standardization of dashboard information. Create of dashboards and/or support for departments to create data-tracking dashboards.	Change the way we recognize work (annual reports, T&P) to make moves toward equity sustainable. Create policy and/or change at the university level for addressing and enacting workload equity.
	Gather existing data and policies.	Tracking construction of policies and associated practices to avoid policy subversion.	
	All committees have effort level, transparent workload, roles and behavior-based accountability (short/mid). Awareness raising/ socialization of issues (incl. for new faculty); accompanying explainer video or slide presentation.	Policy audit and development— whether a unit-level action plan, university-wide policy, or both; include principles and practices as found in the Landscape Scan (Appendix I).	

ACTION STAKEHOLDERS/CHANGE AGENTS CAN TAKE

Deans, associate deans, chairs, and directors have a particular role to play in supporting faculty workload-equity initiatives by establishing meeting agendas that include equity topics, leading informed discussions, responding expeditiously to concerns that arise in their units, and otherwise supporting collective activities and shared governance.

As such, we provide action steps leaders can take to advance workload-equity initiatives and make steps towards greater workload equity among faculties.

DEANS & ASSOCIATE DEANS

Short Term:

- To reduce ambiguity and enhance transparency, set agenda times or committee structures to create clearly defined and delineated expectations that are communicated by each unit, school and/or college, as well as through the Office of the Provost..

Long Term:

- Create an Equity Action Plan by the college, informed by department level work.

Medium Term:

- Set agenda times or committee structures for unit-level workload equity policy, guidelines, processes, and annual accountability expectations.

- In collaboration with chairs and directors, specify concrete action and measured change from chairs and deans for addressing workload inequities that have been recognized within and across departments monitored annually.

- Hold all-faculty meetings and/or charge a committee to create guidelines through shared governance processes on how (or if) to provide relief/credit to faculty who take the brunt of service.

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Short Term:

- Build collective recognition of workload inequities existing within and across departments and programs based on data and regular discussions in faculty meetings, using ACE report worksheets to help structure a collective approach.

- Work on department/program bylaws related to workload equity and decisions that impact workloads, including faculty discretionary leaves.

Medium Term:

- Set agenda times or committee structures for department and program faculty to collaborate to create clear departmental or unit expectations for service articulated at different ranks and series (see AY 22–23 goal).

- Departments/programs have workload equity conversations to understand work people do, with the concrete goal of creating dashboards and Equity Action Plans for 50% of departments/programs.

- Concrete action and measured change from chairs and deans for addressing workload inequities that have been recognized within and across departments monitored annually

NEXT YEAR'S COMMITTEE WORK

- Work with Faculty Governance Committee to create an integrated data approach for workload equity.

- Create several department/program workload equity model bylaws.

- See full Faculty Senate approved charge (Appendix H).

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

DEFINING WORKLOAD EQUITY

Workload equity is an intentional benefit created by academic leaders, departments, and faculty members who take action to create better, fairer, and more equity-minded workloads. Policies and practices can be put in place to

guide faculty and their institutions toward more equitable outcomes. In particular, women faculty members, faculty members from historically minoritized identity groups, and those at the intersections may perform disproportionately more "service" for the university—a work category that requires more careful unpacking. Indeed, many faculty engage in unseen diversity work, mentoring, teaching, and other service activities vital to the functioning of the university.

Workload equity is different from faculty workload—which reflects the total amount of work across diverse tasks that university faculty must complete. Workload equity also differs from pay equity. Workload, workload equity, and pay equity are important and interrelated, impacting faculty at all ranks and career stages to varying degrees. By increasing the visibility of how collective workload is distributed in departments and programs, we can better understand and value the amount of work being done (to address workload) and institute commensurate rewards in annual faculty merit reviews (to address pay equity). Consideration of transparency, clarity, credit, norms, context, and accountability is a vital starting point for producing departmental and program climates where faculty stay, feel valued for their contributions, and thrive.

Workload equity requires that academic leaders and faculties maintain a shared understanding of workload, and remain accountable for implementing fair divisions of labor in departments and programs. Furthermore, taking an "equity-minded approach" understands the social and historical context that has embedded exclusionary practices in academia, takes responsibility for these practices, and seeks more equitable outcomes through changes in practices, policies, and resource allocation (see the work of Estela Bensimon in creating this concept and an application to faculty evaluation by O'Meara and Templeton.)

Progress toward workload equity requires a holistic perspective, continual iterative adjustments that

take stock of faculty work, and particular attention to hidden forms of labor. According to DU's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document (section on Professional Behavior and Responsibility, pp. 5–6), it requires, "collegial relationships built on trust and confidence." Indeed, workload equity elevates our collective enterprises and aims to increase faculty desired productivity, satisfaction, and retention.

WHY NOW? WHY CARE?

According to the 2018 COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey and the 2020 "R1 Report" administered by the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs (VPFA) and Faculty Senate, in addition to concerns about how teaching will be valued (and evaluated), faculty worry about their service workloads and those of their colleagues—especially in terms of teaching, mentoring, and student support. DU's 2022 reclassification to R1 has the potential to exacerbate concerns articulated in the COACHE data, such as that the greatest areas of dissatisfaction among faculty are "teaching load" and "service load." These results connect to our other COACHE identified areas for improvement: leadership, service, promotion, and departmental collegiality.

Faculty in the academic units and programs work hard to recruit, welcome, and retain new colleagues. The way we distribute collective work in departments and programs—from graduate student advising, to teaching capstone classes for undergraduates, to a host of departmental, unit, and university service activities—impacts whether individual faculty members feel valued, rewarded, and experience a sense of equitable distribution of work across the collective. Research shows that faculty leave institutions not because of salary but because of their departmental climate and whether they feel they belong. Inequitable workloads and perceptions of inequity can create unwelcoming, resentful, and even toxic departmental climates that compound other inequities related to salary and compensation. Finally, mismatches between the time faculty plan to spend on certain activities and the time they actually spend can generate resentment, especially if such mismatches hinder career advancement and/or benefit those making fewer or no contributions to serve the collective. O'Meara et al. (2019) refer to the latter practice as "social loafing."

At DU, these issues are accentuated by the distinctiveness of our Teaching and Professional Faculty (TPF) lines, comprising faculty who are not on the tenure track yet are an essential part of the DU faculty. In particular, teaching faculty and adjunct faculty—who often have no research expectations—may face increasing workloads both in terms of teaching load and service, a lack of respect, and increased precarity. Support and programming aimed at valuing teaching, workload equity, attention to rank and series, and support for TPF and adjunct faculty is key to maintaining our distinctiveness, to the promise of the teacher-scholar model, and to achieving R1 "our way." Many faculty come to DU because they see themselves as teacher-scholars. Maintaining and expanding the conditions for teacher-scholar-practitioners to grow in this institutional identity is vital to faculty satisfaction and talent retention. It will help sustain a diverse, productive faculty, committed to educating and mentoring the next generation of thinkers, scholars, and practitioners.

We also recognize that there are complex aspects of workload inequity that relate to online teaching at DU, as units have developed unique arrangements to offer their curriculum, including partnerships with 2U.

SOURCES OF WORKLOAD INEQUITY: WORKLOAD EQUITY ISSUES THAT AFFECT PARTICULAR GROUPS OF FACULTY

HISTORICALLY MARGINALIZED FACULTY
Women faculty, faculty of color, and especially women of color disproportionately perform more service for the university. These faculty members might say yes to service because they are pressured to do so, because there are hidden consequences to saying no, and because saying yes can bring important personal and institutional benefits. The service these faculty members contribute is often referred to as "invisible labor." Invisible labor includes student and faculty mentoring; department work not formally recognized or adequately compensated; work on curricular innovation and interdisciplinary projects; and work toward diversity, equity, and inclusion. These are all vital to the relevance and advancement of the university, yet are often not considered merit or promotion worthy.

Women of color in particular face the additional challenge of navigating the devaluation of their efforts, as they receive little recognition from the university. Research productivity has increasingly become the most valued enterprise at many higher education institutions. While this brings economic, social, and cultural capital to those who focus primarily on scholarship, the primacy of research productivity eclipses other kinds of academic labor, such as the relational care work (including teaching), that so many women and faculty of color engage. Minoritized faculty who shoulder a larger share of relational care work may later be penalized in consequential reviews, perceived as academically unproductive. Yet, relational care work is central to the university as it supports students, making them feel like they belong. Such efforts directly impact recruitment, retention, persistence, and the overall university mission. Clear guidelines for what constitutes visible and invisible labor elude most faculty members. Service work consistently carries less weight in tenure and promotion processes. However, faculty often feel compelled to say yes to service requests, even though doing so may detract from other career-advancement goals.

Despite campus policies supporting diversity and inclusion, higher education grossly undervalues the type of invisible labor known as care work. This type of invisible labor derives from an unspoken pressure to serve others in ways that universities do not adequately measure. It is the relational "secret service" that is more feminized and less likely to be visible, valued, and quantifiable than the task-oriented labor such as serving as a faculty senator or chairing a university committee. These expectations develop in line with stereotypical social and cultural roles assigned to people—especially women and women of color more specifically. There are also specific burdens on LGBTQ+ faculty to support students (see chapter 4 of Moon Johnson & Javier, 2017), especially during the pandemic. The "hallway ask" also perpetuates invisible labor; these are the informal, unscripted requests that usually fall on the shoulders of women, occurring in the hallways, so to speak, where performances of bias occur unchecked and with little reflexivity. Such solicitations of invisible labor often occur in passing, making them even harder to record and track.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
While invisible labor presents challenges for all faculty,

and especially for non-tenure track women of color, associate professors tend to experience it acutely, as evidenced by the 50.8% of associate professors who contemplate leaving their institution (compared to 45% of full professors and 48.6% of assistant professors). Assistant professors are generally more protected by colleagues and institutional norms, and less solicited for significant labor. By contrast, associate professors have less clarity around promotion expectations, a less-fixed timeline for promotion, and significantly less protection from service responsibilities—all while receiving less mentorship than assistant professors. Full professors, who are already promoted, experience fewer career advancement consequences (although equity issues also ensnare these faculty, who do service, relational care, and governance work that can be similarly "disappeared" in annual reviews). Associate professor dissatisfaction reflects important institutional inequities that cannot be remedied by *just saying no*; yet, the pressure to *just say no*—alongside the assumption that all tenured faculty share equal discretion in saying no—is pervasive at this rank.

Academic pressures are particularly gendered at the associate level. Seventy-five percent of women associates report serving in major service capacities, as compared to 50% of men associates. Women tend to serve in labor-intensive positions such as undergraduate advisor sooner than men, potentially further stalling their progress to full professor. Women associates spend two hours less per week on research and writing than men, and spend more time on grading and course preparation each week. They are less likely to be promoted, and their promotions take one to three and a half years longer than men's, with the longer timeline at more research-intensive institutions. According to the American Association of University Professors, women comprise just 32.5% of full professors; most of these women (80%) are white.

Women and minoritized faculty are often directed to ask senior colleagues for advice on how to manage their service loads. But senior colleagues who are more likely to be white and male often have little direct experience with the kinds of institutional pressures to perform more service women face. For women of color associates, the lack of mentorship from white senior colleagues is often compounded by microaggressions from superiors, colleagues, and students.

What is the alternative to just saying no? We must design new systems that serve as institutional guardrails on unequal workloads across faculty ranks and make chairs, directors, deans, and other academic leaders aware of and accountable for equity-minded workloads annually. Guardrails in the form of policies, guidelines, bylaws, and processes generated through shared governance can promote consistent action and implementation, regardless of the personality or discretionary authority of the decision maker. These guardrails can foster more robust and equitable faculty participation and engagement, and greater consistency and transparency across leaders. We believe that rendering invisible labor visible and valuable, and better valuing the more visible forms of faculty labor that add value to the academic enterprise, are critical to addressing issues of workload inequity.

PANDEMIC WORK AND THE CHANGING NATURE OF FACULTY WORKLOAD

Neoliberal forces have intensified faculty workloads and increased demands for invisible labor. Market competition and shrinking public spending on education have challenged faculty to bring in more grant money, teach more courses, and increase service loads to sustain and advance higher educational institutions—thus augmenting institutional prestige in an increasingly competitive landscape. Service work remains central to the market presence of the university, as it ensures that students have relationships with faculty and that the university can adapt. However, there is often little agreement about what the category of "service" should contain. Service has become a bottomless bucket into which all manner of faculty work is dumped—from garden variety committee work to work that's more properly seen as administrative in nature, to student advising and mentoring work that can reasonably be seen as teaching. Despite their centrality to university functioning, however, university reward systems undervalue service and care-oriented labor, and overvalue research productivity in line with competitive individualism, or the effort to define and redefine oneself as a value to the university and in contrast to one's colleagues (e.g., market competition).

As we well know by now, the pandemic has increased faculty workloads, raised stress levels, and compounded inequities already magnified by neoliberalism. It caused faculty to withdraw into their own bubbles or leave the university altogether, a

phenomenon described as The Great Disengagement or The Big Quit. Universities across the nation are working to address faculty burnout, pandemic-related challenges, and disparate impacts. The pandemic is expected to amplify preexisting inequities in faculty promotion and tenure processes (Malish et al., 2020). Existing inequities include gender and racial bias across key areas of faculty experience, including grant funding (Ginther et al., 2011), peer review (Tamblyn et al., 2018), student evaluations of teaching (Chavez & Mitchell, 2020), teaching and service loads (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), and the tenure evaluation processes (Weisshaar, 2017). Additionally, certain types of faculty work have intensified, especially due to the twin pandemics of COVID and racial injustice. For example, student-care activities rose significantly both for coursework and for advising (academic and other), and this work intensified for faculty of color in the wake of the police killing of George Floyd. Faculty also find themselves with additional teaching responsibilities: serving as a replacement instructor for a colleague; increasing their workload to compensate for colleagues who can't teach on campus; and supporting colleagues in their transition to online teaching. Nine-month contract faculty can be put into situations that require them to perform summertime work if the university initiatives they care about are to be advanced. While faculty service and leadership demands have mushroomed, we have yet to fully capture and find ways to recognize and reward this often invisible labor. These burdens fall

on all faculty, but they can fall disproportionately on women and faculty of color. As we move forward, we need to consider both how to make adjustments for the current pandemic context, and also how to be more proactive and less reactive, for example, by designing for the "post-virus" professor and professoriate.

The argument for creating tools for workload equity, such as dashboards, is that the pandemic offers a unique opportunity to reconfigure the future of academic work in the academy. However, we must be intentional. Otherwise, we only exacerbate or ignore existing inequalities. In the area of workload, this means harming women, especially women of color, and other minoritized faculty. (For one of many examples, see Misra et al., 2021). Addressing workload equity systemically may require more upfront work but decreases workload on the backend by lowering conflict and resentment, as well as faculty departures and grievances.

As part of the WEC work and report, we created a Research Guide for Faculty Workload Equity Resources. Managed by the DU Library, this guide serves as a quick reference for those wanting to get started on addressing workload equity or looking to learn more. The Guide includes resources on workload equity, literature, DU events with national experts, best practices, and contacts at DU for workload equity, and will evolve as the next iteration of the WEC continues and expands this work.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM AT DU

Many of the problems identified in the literature have been identified by the DU community (see DU data in Appendices A–C). As one dean pointed out in a meeting with the WEC, there is an inherent tension in academic life between an independent contractor/individual entrepreneur model of faculty work and a collegial model that's oriented to the welfare of the collective. There are also nuances specific to DU organizational structures. These issues have been further complicated in both promising and challenging ways as the DU professoriate has evolved (e.g., creation of a Teaching and Professional series). Clearly, low faculty morale, dysfunctional work environments, and workplace conditions that hinder productivity are problems; and many have attributed factors related to work equity as a challenge to faculty retention. Addressing them and moving toward solutions is critical.

This section provides a snapshot of concerns identified within the DU context to frame the problem of workload inequity at our institution. Topics are not exhaustive nor are they listed in order of importance; however, each item emerged consistently in informal conversations, structured information-gathering events, the Faculty Senate and Provost Reception (see Appendix C), and most recently, through survey data collected by the Faculty Senate (see Appendices B & C). Note that key university data are missing from this report (e.g., retention of faculty by demographic, exit survey data, etc.) and should be incorporated as they become available to future iterations of the WEC.

LACK OF ACCESSIBLE DATA

COLLECTING
It is unclear what data is gathered institutionally regarding faculty retention patterns, teaching loads across the institution, staffing levels that impact faculty workload, and other variables (e.g., information on series/rank of department chairs) that would allow full investigation of workload-equity issues as DU. Collection and dissemination of these data will be important moving forward, if we are to achieve full transparency around workload equity.

PUBLISHING
Information collected by the University does not appear to be available for public consumption. It is not clear if the data does not exist (see above) or if it is simply not made public. Regardless of the reason, the result is a lack of transparency on much of the information that the task force deemed necessary to fully understand the extent of the problem at DU. We hope the AY 22–23 workload equity committee will partner with IR and the Faculty Data Governance Committee to dive deeper into the existing data and consider new forms of data that will help us understand the nature of the problem at DU.

LACK OF CLARITY AND NORMS FOR WORKLOAD EQUITY

TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL FACULTY
For Teaching and Professional Faculty (TPF), a lack of consistency exists between and among these non-tenure-track positions. Some TPF do not have an obligation to do research, scholarship, and creative activity, while others do. For teaching faculty the balance between teaching, advising, mentoring, and service to the university can be a challenge. Teaching faculty are often viewed as individuals who can/should pick up extra classes or represent the department or unit on a committee due to the perception that they do not have expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity. The WEC also encountered inconsistencies across units in procedures used to conduct annual and consequential reviews of Teaching and Professional Faculty, creating challenges for advancing equity in faculty workloads and rewards. The effects of these assumptions at DU are explored in greater detail in Dr. Laura Sponsler's 2021 white paper: "Institutionalizing a Culture of Respect for Teaching and Professional Faculty."

VARYING TEACHING LOADS
Different teaching loads exist within and across units. For example, some units on campus require one TPF member (Clinical) to teach 24–27 credits, while another in the same college is required to teach 48. Teaching loads for tenure-track faculty range from 2–6 courses (12–24 credits) on nine-month contracts. This is further complicated by distinctions in loads related to online programs, even within the same unit. Consistency and transparency per credit or per

course would help clarify what workload inequities exist and why they exist. The committee is aware of these issues, and will urge units to address them going forward, as well as charge the 2022–2023 WEC with pursuing these issues.

INCONSISTENT METRICS OF MEASUREMENT FOR WORKLOAD

Different areas use different metrics for measuring workload. For example, there is no universal system for defining, tracking, and rewarding service commitments. While these responsibilities inevitably vary based on department and unit-level needs, the institution's mechanism for accounting for this workload (Activity Insight/Watermark) is not sufficient to capture the amount of time put into a service activity, the level of significance of the work, and the outcome or product of the work.

Overall, faculty recognize and report a lack of consistency and need for institutional and division-level policies to establish expectations for the ways workload responsibilities are discussed and tracked (see Appendix B).

LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY FOR INEQUITIES

INEQUITIES IN FACULTY RETENTION

It has become increasingly important to understand which faculty are leaving the University and why. Current data mechanisms at DU do not allow for such information to be widely communicated. Absent this information, the committee must depend on qualitative data gathered over the last year, which suggests concerns about significant pay disparities (exacerbated by the increasing cost of living, particularly housing, in the Denver area—named fifth most expensive city in the U.S.); increasing teaching expectations, including skyrocketing student socio-emotional issues; challenges with excessive service load; and general faculty burnout. Finally, research, teaching, and service workloads are often unclear between faculty lines. Consistent with the literature detailed above, DU faculty noted the gravity of these issues as they relate to women and faculty of color. It seems clear that we are currently asking too much of some and not enough of others. The COACHE faculty retention and exit-survey results will be shared in Fall 2022, and may be informative for why people leave. Likewise, keeping a dashboard of faculty retention would further clarify who is leaving. In both instances,

clear, accessible data on faculty retention will clarify workload equity issues that hurt faculty retention.

LACK OF RECOGNITION FOR INEQUITIES

ASSOCIATE LEVEL FACULTY AS DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

As a smaller university, DU often finds itself in the position of needing to employ associate professors in positions of leadership—most commonly as department chairs but sometimes as deans and associate deans. This occurrence puts faculty members in a tough position, as they try to lead a unit while making progress towards promotion to full professor. In many cases, success at both tasks is unattainable. Data clarifying the number of faculty who have stalled at the associate level for more than 10 years—especially among faculty who have served as department chair or in another significant administrative position—is needed to better understand the extent of this issue at DU, as well as any demographic inequities. The VPFA is working on a project to create such a dashboard, but uneven data has slowed the process. If it is determined to be a problem, one possible solution is to modify expectations of what is required to be promoted to Full Professor. Another is to maintain current expectations but adopt a more liberal approach to assigning workload equivalencies that would give Associate Professors the time and opportunity they need to meet expectations and attain promotion.

CONSIDERING LATE CAREER-STAGE FACULTY

Many workload equity policies recommended in the literature and implemented at other institutions identify career stage as a relevant variable in determining and adjusting workload via various equivalencies. DU provides multiple career supports and development opportunities for assistant and associate professors in both the tenure-line and TPF series. While the sacrifice might be all too rare, some senior, late-career stage faculty at the associate and full professor levels take seriously an obligation to engage in heavy-lift service work as a consequence of their longevity and experience. This includes departmental housekeeping duties that benefit from having an informed, experienced hand at the wheel (e.g., chairing tenure, promotion, and mid-tenure review committees, taking the first cut at drafting department policy documents, writing new position

proposals and job descriptions, etc.), as well as more high-profile work (e.g., curriculum reform, strategic planning activities, special studies) commissioned by the Faculty Senate and other university agencies. The desire to do these things well alongside the recognition that "institutional memory" is critical for guiding departmental and university decision-making produces good results; however, it can also lead to resentment and burnout, if workload adjustments are not made in other areas.

INEQUITIES IN FACULTY PROMOTION

For tenure-track faculty, productivity in research, scholarship, and creative work will continue to be an essential metric. Raising the importance of other areas must start at the top: provost, dean, chair. In many departments, new tenure-track faculty are shielded from non-research/teaching activities to allow them to perform better in research. Should this change? The question requires robust discussion. Concerns around how teaching is valued exist, as some faculty believe that strong research should compensate for mediocre teaching. This mindset must change to see real improvement in workload equity. Annual reports and merit reviews need to weigh teaching and service areas more heavily. APT policies might also need revision to reflect the importance/value of relational care, service, and governance work, and to clarify the status of mentoring.

CHALLENGING WORK ENVIRONMENTS

Faculty have been greatly affected by challenging work environments which are often created by the workload inequities and invisible labor cited above. Some have even defined and described these environments as dysfunctional or toxic. Among the conditions that produce toxicity are suspicion of differential or unequal treatment; perceptions of favoritism; failures to adhere to established by-laws and policies; and resentments stemming from the fact that necessary work is done by some because others refuse to do it. It is also important to note the effects that these and similar conditions have on university staff, which inevitably contributes to challenges (and extra work) for faculty as well.

INEQUITABLE ADVISING AND MENTORSHIP

a. As mentioned above, there is confusion about how the essential responsibility of advising and mentoring students should be counted and credited as an aspect of faculty work. While some units consider this work service, others define it as part of teaching. If one unit considers advising and mentoring service while another considers it teaching, disparities in individual service and teaching loads may result. Faculty who have the reputation of being a good advisor or mentor are often approached by students (and maybe even other faculty) for additional support beyond what they are receiving from an assigned advisor. This seemingly small request to answer a question, sign a form, or acquire career advice may overburden individual faculty members. These small tasks are rarely recognized by formal systems of quantifying faculty work.

b. Faculty of color and women faculty tend to be especially overburdened in this regard. So too are faculty who teach first-year/introductory classes, as they are often better known to students.

c. Finally, academic program directors who typically receive no workload equivalencies or course credit for their administrative work (e.g., directors of interdisciplinary minors) conduct advising and mentoring for both their program and for students in their home departments, thereby creating additional inequities in this area of faculty work.

INCREASED INEQUITY IN WORKLOADS DUE TO REDUCTION IN STAFF SUPPORT

a. Staff reductions have resulted in increased workloads for faculty, and anecdotal evidence indicates that increased workloads have been unequal. These differences can be seen across faculty line, gender, and race. An example of this includes event planning for the unit.

b. Faculty and staff seek clarity around what tasks should by handled by staff versus faculty. The fact that these workload issues are different in different units adds to the lack of clarity. Moreover, it remains unclear whether staff reductions are permanent or temporary.

In summary, concerns faculty raised about inequities at DU reflect the absence of O'Meara's conditions for workload equity (discussed below in Best Practices) indicating confusion about and dissatisfaction with workload equity that comes from a lack of clarity, consistency, norms, accountability, transparency, and reward.

Clearly, not every issue can be addressed as a part of a workload-equity policy. For example, it is clear that "work equity" and "working too much" are not the same conversation, although they are often conflated. And any attempts to address workload equity may not remedy working too much. As we ensure safeguards that create more equitable work environments, we are not able to make individual work more manageable. However, faculty workload management will become more attainable as policies and procedures are evaluated and refined.

BEST PRACTICES

EVIDENCE-BASED CONDITIONS AND TOOLS FOR EQUITABLE WORKLOADS

The WEC suggests several conceptual and concrete tools to begin to address the issues detailed above. For more detail and related worksheets to make progress in these areas, see appendices and worksheet booklet in O'Meara et al.'s (2021) "Equity Minded Faculty Workloads."

TRANSPARENCY

Visible information about faculty work activities.

Faculty Work Activity Dashboard: Identifies the kinds of work required to maintain an academic unit. Dispels myths and misconceptions among faculty about colleague workloads. Informs historically marginalized faculty of norms, so they know when to refrain from volunteering. Reveals unintended inequities in assigned service and teaching that compound over the trajectory of a faculty member's tenure in a department.

Requirements: Faculty service audit; faculty work activity dashboard

CLARITY

Identified, defined, and understood benchmarks of faculty work activities.

Explicit Policies: Faculty expectations guidelines, identifying the exact amount of teaching, research, and service expected for faculty at different ranks and different employment categories (tenure-eligible, instructional, and clinical). Clarity about conditions under which compensation is associated with taking on a role, compensation range, type of compensation, and how faculty may indicate interest in a role.

Requirements: Faculty collaboratively create guidelines that balance university, departmental, and faculty needs given employment categories.

CREDIT

Departments recognize and reward faculty expending more efforts in specific areas.

Extra Effort Workload Bank: Faculty members can bank extra work in one area and do less in another.

Teaching Credit Swap Systems: Units define teaching workload for all faculty and provide opportunities for faculty to meet teaching obligations through different pathways

NORMS

Departmental culture includes the expectation and commitment that workloads are equitable.

Opt-Out System: Addresses disparity for less desirable/career-enhancing work. Faculty make the argument for why they alone should not have to do the work versus approaching it with a "why would I agree to do that work?" mentality."

Planned Rotations: Service and teaching assignments are rotated among all department members to address social loafing.

CONTEXTS

A reward system and load assignment that recognizes different strengths and interests to achieve shared departmental goals.

Personalized Employment Arrangements: Policies that include negotiated deviations from traditional work expectations. These arrangements are used to evaluate faculty members at the end of the year.

Individualized/ Modified Appointments: Agreements for faculty members hired to do interdisciplinary scholarship or faculty work that is difficult to evaluate by traditional standards.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Mechanisms track fulfillment of work obligations, award credit for fulfilled responsibilities, and address social loafing.

Restructure and Reduce Committees: Review all committees to determine the number of members, the role of each member, committee purpose, and meeting frequency to determine redundancy and degree of effort.

Statements of Mutual Expectations: Outlines obligations faculty members have to the community, ideally with reference to the professional responsibilities stipulated in the

APT document (pp. 5–6). This might also include agreed-upon behaviors that foster completion of departmental work (attending committee meetings). Statements may be used in annual reviews.

DEVELOPING AN EQUITY PLAN

Use data about faculty workload to assess and address equity issues.

This will inform actions needed (policy or practice) to rebalance workload. This should be tied to concrete outcomes and be evaluated regularly. The Department Equity Action Planning (DEAP) teams which are part of the R1 Our Way will pilot this process in 2022–2023. .

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP) GUIDELINES

AAUP policy recommendations cover the entire spectrum of faculty activities and have served as the gold standard for the academic profession for over a century. AAUP has generated multiple policy statements regarding faculty workload and workload equity over the last 50 years, with updates that track the changing nature of faculty work. These policy statements are archived on DU Portfolio. They establish basic principles for achieving workload equity. Moreover, they align with the workload equity scholarship discussed in this report and with principles embedded in the specific workload policies of the institutions discussed in Appendix I. AAUP recommends, and WEC supports, the following basic principles for promoting and achieving faculty workload equity:

- Implementation of policy should be at the level of the academic unit most familiar with the research, teaching, advising, mentoring, administrative, service, and invisible labor demands placed on faculty.

- Faculty should participate fully in the determination of workload and workload equity policy.

- Department chairs, program directors, and other responsible parties should have a significant measure of latitude in making workload adjustments consistent with basic principles of shared governance.

- In determining and distributing workload, care should be taken to consider the totality of an individual's contributions to the academic unit, college/school, and institution.

- Workload distribution should be mindful of factors that have historically produced inequity, including variations in course load, number of different course preparations, course scope and difficulty, class size, instructional modality, out-of-class student supervision (e.g., independent studies), extra-curricular educational activities, and other variables. To these factors, our committee adds the "hallway ask" and other conditions of the academic workplace that can differentially burden faculty, especially women and faculty of color.

- Adjustments to workload are manifestly in order when the institution draws heavily and/or regularly on an individual for university committee work, academic program development and administration, community or government service, and any other activity that risks impairing a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher and scholar. We highlight existing DU Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development and specifically job responsibility discussions, which are available to all DU appointed faculty.

- Transparency and regular faculty reappraisals of workload are critical.

EXAMPLES OF WORK UNDERWAY AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Equity work happening at U.S. colleges and universities varies widely. A WEC subcommittee examined workload policies in faculty handbooks or administrative/governing documents across 28 universities. The sample includes 12 peers (per DU's list of peers prior to R1 designation in 2021) and 16 non-peers. Of these, 10 institutions (36%) maintain R1 status. The subcommittee also examined recent Workload Equity Task Force reports from three institutions: one from peer-school Villanova University; one from the non-peer R1 University of California-San Diego; and one from "aspirational" peer and R1 institution Columbia University. A full description of policy highlights from each institution covered by our research appears in Appendix I of this report. Some common themes emerge from our comparative analysis:

FLEXIBILITY

Workloads and workload policies must be flexible. This is evident in the widespread acknowledgement (and in some cases requirement) that workloads and their policies must be established by academic units

and their faculties. These unit and department-level policies acknowledge that workloads can fluctuate for a variety of reasons: career phase, personal circumstances, unique teaching and research opportunities, student research supervision, special projects, instructional modality, major university service, etc. Workloads change every year, and over the span of career phases. Equity Policies must acknowledge and allow for these fluctuations, while recognizing that faculty discretionary authority can also be used to decrease equity.

GRANULARITY

The traditional three workload buckets of (a) teaching/librarianship/practice, (b) research/scholarship, and (c) service are being parsed out more granularly. Some universities count advising and mentoring as two additional buckets that earn teaching equivalencies instead of counting both under service. Even more common is the distinction between administrative duties/appointments/responsibilities (e.g., academic program director or coordinator), and what is traditionally thought of as "service" (e.g., committee and other governance work). Essentially, some universities have six buckets of activities that count towards workload: (a) teaching/librarianship/practice, (b) research/scholarship/creative endeavor, (c) administrative duties, (d) committee-type service, (e) advising, and (f) mentoring. For institutions with a six-bucket approach, some acknowledge that certain colleges or programs may be required to utilize the traditional three buckets for accreditation or other reasons. In such cases, it is still clear that service includes a variety of roles—not just committee work—and that different service roles carry varying levels of responsibility and time commitment.

FACULTY SOVEREIGNTY

Departments chairs and other unit-level leaders having most familiarity with the activities of their faculty have clear discretionary authority to determine appropriate workloads and make appropriate adjustments. This is typically done in consultation with deans, but it appears implicit that deans must have a compelling reason to veto workload decisions agreed upon by department chairs and faculty. Most university-level policies call for faculty involvement in the workload determination process—ranging from department faculty working as a collective, to individual faculty working one-on-one

with department chairs. In some cases, university-level policy provides specific processes for reporting and adjusting inequitable or unreasonable workloads, but leaves the rest of the workload management to departments, chairs, and faculty.

EQUIVALENCIES

Equivalencies are used to determine workloads and adjustments. Some institutions leave the definition of equivalencies broadly stated; others provide lengthy and detailed lists of what qualifies as an equivalency, as well as numeric ways of tallying workload units and their equivalencies. For teaching faculty, course buy-outs and releases are a common application of equivalencies.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Several policies stipulate the responsibility of deans or other upper-level administrators to assure that basic shared governance principles around establishing workload equity are observed in units, and that policies are reviewed and reappraised at regular intervals (e.g., every three years).

STANDOUT INSTITUTIONS

Of the 28 universities WEC reviewed, there are two that stand out: Saint Louis University and Northeastern University. Both institutions are considered DU peer institutions; and Northeastern is an R1. Both institutions require a comprehensive workload policy for each academic unit, and these policies are approved by the Provost, University Administration, and/or Faculty Senate. The policies for each unit are readily available on their websites.

Northeastern University Faculty Workload Policy

Northeastern University Faculty Workload Policies by Department

Saint Louis University Faculty Workload Policies

Saint Louis University (SLU) is the only institution we found to explicitly address equity in their workload policies. SLU revisited their workload policies from 2016, with a deliberate focus on improving workload equity for faculty of color, junior faculty, and faculty of additional underrepresented identities. The resulting 2021 university-wide Faculty Workload Policy is robust, while still allowing for flexibility and department sovereignty to develop their own workloads and policies.

Some strengths of the university-level policy at SLU include:

- Explicit definitions of workload, workload units, and the areas that make up a faculty member's workload. Examples are provided for (but not limited to) what qualifies as teaching, service, research/scholarship/ creative endeavors, administration, and clinical work.

- Service is split into various types: university, professional, and public service.

- Workload balance among the types listed above vary yearly. A note is provided on SLU's shift away from the traditional three-pronged approach (teaching, research, service) for all faculty in every year to one that allows for any distribution of effort in a given year, so long as the faculty member's workload includes at least one of the areas (knowing that many faculty in most years will still work within the three-pronged approach, and that tenure track may require the three-prongs).

- Uncontrollable and unforeseen circumstances may affect an individual's or unit's workload in any given year. Needed workload modifications can be made in conjunction with chairs and deans.

- A cap and minimum on workload units per faculty member per academic term. An "overload" beyond this cap requires either additional compensation or a reduction/release in a near-future academic term. A required minimum of units per year are listed for 9, 10, 11, and 12-month faculty.

- Guidelines for ensuring faculty from underrepresented identities, or junior faculty, are not burdened with inequitable service appointments. Identity must not be used to guide service appointments. Instead, these appointments should be driven by diversity of thought, professional goals, and levels of expertise.

- Required components for unit-level workload policies.

- Processes and schedules for determining the workload for each faculty member, and for reviewing and approving unit-level and university-level workload policies.

EXAMPLES OF WORK UNDERWAY AT DU

DU faculty and administrators have already taken steps to advance workload equity, including those detailed in this report. Notable accomplishments at the campus level include:

- Workload Equity Committee (WEC) creation and convening (Fall 2020)

- WEC presentations at Dean's Council (January 2020, March 2022)

  - See: COVID Accommodations Think and Drink Reflection (duvpfa.du.edu, May 27, 2021) and Spring 2021 "Think and Drink" Events (duvpfa. du.edu, April 5, 2021)

  - KerryAnn O'Meara keynote at the Provost Conference: "Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads by Design" (May 2021)

- Faculty Affairs Associate Deans (FAAD) huddle on Workload Equity (March 2021, April 2021)

- May 2021 report Increasing Teaching Equity for Faculty Thriving and Student Success, produced by the CAHSS Enrollment and Teaching Capacity Review Committee (see Appendix G). This extensive, data-driven report articulates principles and contextual considerations for establishing teaching equity in CAHSS. It recommends the following:

  - Further develop and launch quantitative dashboard(s), qualitative contextual template, and guiding reference document for use by the Dean and department chairs and directors

  - Use the data and context as a starting point for conversations around allocation of faculty positions

  - Support equity through permanent, department-based course releases

  - Use data and context to evaluate distribution of common curriculum targets

  - Address courses with low enrollments equitably

The CAHSS report does not explicitly consider areas of faculty work beyond classroom teaching that would warrant consideration for workload equity adjustments/equivalencies. These include student advising, mentoring, relational care work, and community and university service. Nor did it consider

the non-CAHSS/non-department based academic activities of its rostered faculty (e.g., administrative work on behalf of interdisciplinary programming as well as other faculty director work that has drawn attention in Faculty Senate). The report does imply, however, that such a holistic evaluation of faculty work is required in order to achieve true workload equity.

- Dean's and Provost Office Retreat on Workload Equity (August 2021)

- Provost & Faculty Senate Reception: "Advancing Equity in Faculty Workloads and Rewards" (October 2021)

- WEC presentation at Faculty Senate & Follow-up Survey (January 2022)

- Chairs & Directors Solution Seeking Clinic on Workload Equity (March 2022)

- Funding & Launch of inaugural Department Equity Action Planning (DEAP) teams (February 2022)

- Spring 2022 Provost Conference Series keynotes on workload equity:

  - "Making the Invisible Visible and Valued: Understanding the Intersections of Faculty Workload Equity and DEI," Kim Case, Virginia Commonwealth University (April 2022)

  - "Understanding and Acting to Advance Workload Equity," KerryAnn O'Meara, University of Maryland-College Park (May 2022)

  - "Tools for Advancing Workload Equity: Creating Faculty Work Activity Dashboards," Joya Misra, University of Massachusetts-Amherst (Summer 2022)

DEPARTMENT EQUITY ACTION PLANNING THROUGH VPFA

In Spring 2022, Faculty Affairs launched an 18-month Department Equity Action Planning (DEAP) pilot project aiming to (a) increase the number of routine work practices that department faculty enact to ensure equity, (b) enhance department conditions known to positively enhance equity, and (c) improve the readiness of department faculty to ensure equity in division of labor. This project supports the work of the WEC and guides departments through

a research-based change process where they interrogate their own practices and policies around ways workload is distributed, taken-up, make visible, and rewarded. DEAPs are funded through R1 Our Way.

The four inaugural DEAPs are Higher Education in Morgridge College of Education; Graduate School of Professional Psychology; Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences; and Spanish Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. After attending workshops with KerryAnn O'Meara and Joya Misra, they will create dashboards to increase transparency and create a plan to improve conditions for faculty in their department or unit.

DASHBOARDS TO DATE AT DU

Several nascent efforts at DU seek to quantitatively track distribution of service workloads within units and departments. Along with transparency, dashboards provide data to stimulate faculty discussion around what service looks like in their context and how to measure it. Dashboards also provide information for chairs and deans to better monitor and balance service workloads. However, no current efforts at DU yet fit the criteria of an accessible and easily visible online dashboard. Instead, current dashboards are non-dynamic, non-centralized tools that are not easily shareable—such as Word documents and Excel spreadsheets. Some units at DU do not have any structured approaches to tracking service efforts.

The tracking efforts of different units and departments reflect different approaches and data specificity. For example, Morgridge College of Education's Higher Education Department (HED) prepares a Microsoft Word document with a (static) table that lists faculty member committees, service assignments, and associated timeframes by quarter and year. The table is shared at a spring quarter department meeting and revisited throughout the year to determine service loads for the following academic year.

Since 2021, University Libraries has used a (static) Excel table populated by Associate Deans to list Library and University committees and service tasks undertaken by faculty. Available roles are listed and awarded scores to aggregate a point total that reflects an estimate of overall service contributions (e.g., Chair: 3 points, Member: 2 points, Convener of meeting: 1 point, Part of job: 1 point). Names and contributions are visible to all faculty members.

CASE STUDY: LIBRARY USE OF DASHBOARDS

When paired with deliberative processes, dashboards can help units engage in sometimes difficult conversations about the scope and distribution of collective workload. While they do not substitute for faculty-led engagement with the data, they do provide a common set of indicators around which such engagement can occur.

For example, University Libraries faculty took up workload equity in a series of conversations. These led to creation of a dashboard, which includes division-level and institutional-level service. A group of six faculty members, including the Library's two Associate Deans, used the ACE report to inform dashboard construction and facilitate conversations with faculty on what to include and how to use dashboard data. These discussions provided opportunities to work through questions, assumptions, or differences in opinion, helping clarify and better define what qualifies as "service" for University Libraries faculty. The faculty decided that the dashboard will not to be used for performance evaluation, but rather to establish transparency and inform decision making affecting faculty member workloads.

Going forward, University Libraries will pilot the dashboard as a tool to establish a committee rotation schedule and to inform committee assignments. The dashboard is seen as one piece of information used in these decisions, with the understanding that division and institutional-level service are just some of the factors that should be considered in the process of establishing and evaluating faculty workload. Libraries faculty also plans to discuss how and if the dashboard should be expanded to include other types or levels of service.

Presently, the dashboard is used by Associate Deans to identify new committee members and to rotate long-serving or over-committed faculty members. Other examples include the Languages, Literatures, and Cultures department; the Lamont School of Music; and University College. Please see Appendix D for sample dashboards.

These examples suggest several options in terms of the amount and granularity of workload data. A centralized structure for online dashboards at DU would provide customizable options that could be accessible to all faculty members and department leadership. MyDU could host such a tool, thus enabling access for administrators, deans, and faculty members. The tool may also draw information from Activity Insight or other sources of service reporting.

WORKLOAD POLICIES AT DU

According to results from the 2022 Faculty Senate survey on workload equity, there is a dearth of policy related to workload equity at DU (see Appendices A & B). However, some units have generated instructive documents and proposals. In April of 2021, the Josef Korbel School of International Studies circulated a draft of *Proposed Measures to Improve Workload Equity*. The document was prompted by the ongoing efforts of the WEC committee and visits from KerryAnn O'Meara, as well as previous attempts to articulate service expectations at Korbel relative to rank, series, and inclination. The document proposes a suite of possible solutions including dashboards, a service audit, etc. Please see Appendix F.

Other units have had workload discussions, including those prompted by the survey and ongoing programming. Some changes are a combination of policy and practice, such as a Spring 2022 request by the CAHSS Dean for department chairs to make transparent the mechanisms by which they are assigning merit ratings. This builds on their 2021 *CAHSS Enrollment and Teaching Capacity Review Committee Report* (see Appendix G). Similarly, some units have discussed the possibility of quarter-long "service sabbaticals," though actual implementation is unclear.

PAIRING POLICIES AND PRACTICES AT DU

Necessary and sometimes difficult conversations about workload equity complement campus, unit, and department-level policy changes. Many departments and units engaged workload equity questions explicitly for the first time as part of the process of

completing the faculty senate survey. See Appendix B for quantitative data from this process. WEC member Brian Majestic followed up with departments that indicated they were actively working on equity in their unit, including RSECS, NSM, the Writing Program, and University Libraries. Progress differs by context, especially as these programs range from research-intensive to teaching-focused and carry different types of workloads. However, they include:

- Reducing teaching loads for those in certain administrative positions (e.g., program directors, new program development, assessment, co-chairs, curricular positions)

- Engaging in new course development or (via buy-out) certain types of research including some "intensive grant proposals that benefit an entire department"

- Additional compensation for people with additional service responsibilities

- Creation of a workload equity group and use of a service dashboard

- Survey administration and listening sessions related to service and workload equity, to the level of "soul-searching" in some areas

Generally, there is an appetite for solving the very difficult problem of workload equity, but there is also a hunger for more guidance and understanding of campus-level expectations.

These tools include deliberative decision making. Appendix E includes some guidance shared with departments as they engaged in the Faculty Senate Workload Equity survey to help them navigate these conversations. It may be useful for departments as they discuss this report.

We know workload equity discussions can surface existing tensions around how work is currently distributed, recognized, and rewarded. However, we hope the tools, research and recommendations contained in this report will help faculty take the action to learn and act on workload equity in their department, unity, and DU at large.