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SF State TRANFORMS Initiatives

- **Values - Addressing Service Inequities**
  - *Addresses workload inequities, as well as how service is valued, and its roles in retention, tenure, and promotion*

- **Expands – Research & Collaboration**
  - *Research & Scholarship Hubs to provides opportunities to meet, exchange research ideas, and share on-going scholarship*

- **Restores – Promoting Equity & Relationship among Colleagues**
  - *Training faculty in how to address bias, through active listening, mediation, and restorative justice.*
Unequal Distribution of Faculty Work

- Women spend more time on teaching and service activities, and less time on research (particularly Associate Professors)
- Faculty of color report more mentoring and diversity related work
- Women & faculty of color asked more often & for non-promotable tasks
- Women of color are less likely to see their work as “counted” in rewards systems

- Faculty Activity Reports (O’Meara, Kuvaeva & Nyunt, 2017; Guarino & Borden, 2017)
- Time Diary Studies (O’Meara et al., 2017)
- Experiments (El-Alayli et al., 2018; Babcock et al., 2017)
Survey Findings

• Men of color, white women, and particularly women of color report more time on service & mentoring work

• Time spent on service, mentoring and teaching reduce time spent on research
  
  • Added impact of gender * parent of a child <12

• White women are significantly less likely to see workload distributed fairly or think their department has a commitment to sharing workload equally

• Women of color are significantly less likely to see the work they consider important credited fairly in departmental rewards systems


Faculty Activity Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Other Unit</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Color</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Women report more total campus service, controlling for rank, discipline, and race

• Faculty of color report more service for “other units,” for example departments or colleges to which they do not belong

Tracking Requests

Who Makes Requests

- Students/Former Students
- Off-campus colleagues
- Administrator
- Peer Colleague
- Chair

Gender Differences in Types of Requests

- Campus Service
- Professional Service
- Faculty Advising
- Student Advising
- Teaching
- Research

Women receive 3.4 requests for every 1 request men receive!

Associate professors 4.26:1
Full professors 2.75:1

Men receive more requests from men
Women receive more requests from women

Experimental Results

Expectations by Professor Gender

- Perception of dislike
- Pleading
- Negative Emotion if Denied
- Expect Yes
- Request Favor

Students are more likely to
- Request a favor from a woman
- Expect a woman to say yes
- Feel negatively toward a woman professor if she says no
- Plead for help if a woman says no
- Believe the professor dislikes them if a woman says no

El-Alayli, Amani, Ashley A. Hansen-Brown, and Michelle Ceynar. "Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor requests, particularly from academically entitled students." Sex Roles 79.3 (2018): 136-150.
Interview results

I mean, I’ve had people say to me things like, you know, ‘Could you have dinner with this job applicant? We need a woman, we need a black woman.’

Hirshfield, Laura E., and Tiffany D. Joseph. "‘We need a woman, we need a black woman’: Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy." Gender and Education 24.2 (2012): 213-227.

I... just list “mentoring” and [how many] student I work with ... I have a two-hour meeting every week with these [students]. I’m not complaining. I’m also saying I do not think anyone that reads my vitae... would have a clue what [the mentoring labor] entails.


And so, the example I have is I’m on four university-wide committees right now. And you know, and in the past, I’ve just, you know—we need somebody who’s a woman. We need somebody who’s a minor-ity. And so, I have the intersectionality.


I’ve had to serve on so many such committees but there are other people in the college. So, I’m like just because I’m Black doesn’t mean that I’m the only minority . . . They needed a Black person; they needed a woman, and they think [of] me.

Gender Inequality Magnified by Covid-19

Total research productivity has increased, but women’s productivity dropped by 13.9% compared to that of men.¹

A recent study of submissions to more than 2000 journals shows that (1) submissions are 1/3 higher than in previous years; (2) men and women still accept reviews at the same rate (56%), but (3) women submitted fewer manuscripts in STEM.²

The decrease in time for research and writing is greater for women than men and greatest for women with young children.³⁴

From Feb-April 2020, mothers with young children reduced work hours 4-5x more than fathers.⁵
Changes in Work Time Allocation

Fig. 1 | Changes in levels and allocations of work time. a. Distribution of total hours spent on work
• By Fields
  • Biochemistry vs. computer science
  • Within fields: theorists vs. experimentalists

• By Status
  • Women
  • Faculty with children under 12
  • Women with dependents
Racial Inequality Magnified by Covid-19

Racial injustice creating disruptive distress for faculty of color.\textsuperscript{6}

Faculty of color are doing more emotional labor through supporting students and performing service.\textsuperscript{7}

Faculty of color engage in more care for extended family, and have been more likely to experience losses among family and close friends, given racialized impact of COVID.

Black workers face two of the most lethal preexisting conditions for coronavirus – racism and economic inequality.\textsuperscript{8}
Outcomes for Inequitable Workloads

Higher service and mentoring roles reflect gender as well as race
- Faculty with higher service and mentoring loads spend less time on research
- Faculty with higher service and mentoring loads are more likely to take longer to be promoted

Associate Professor Differences

Gender & Racial Difference in Progression to Full

Gender Difference in Service Roles


The Faculty Workload & Rewards Project

Culpepper, Jaeger, Kuvaeva, Lennartz, Misra, O’Meara

GOAL: Ensure that department workload is taken up, assigned, and rewarded equitably

PLAN:
- Make it collective
- Slow down the process
- Be intentional
- Use data & tools

“A goal without a plan is just a wish.”
— Antoine de Saint-Exupéry
Identify Priorities

• Measure and discuss workload concerns and departmental priorities
• What does the department value (e.g., DEI work)?
• What work no longer serves the department?
• What expectations are there for who does what work (role, rank, etc.)?
Discuss Variations in Workload: Pain Index

• What are the high, medium, and low time commitments?
  • What courses require more work? (required courses, community-engaged, number of students, no TA support, etc.)
  • What service commitments require more time (hiring, promotion & tenure, etc.)?
  • How does chairing differ from serving on a committee?
Collect Data on Workload

- Collect data from existing sources (faculty review) or limited new data
- Be focused and intentional on areas of concern
Advice for Faculty Work Activity Dashboards

- Take a small wins approach!
- Publish simple tables that represent data on a few routine teaching and service activities
- Build on this with additional data later

Practical details for creating dashboards can be found in O’Meara et al. 2020 Change Magazine article!
Use Data to Identify Workload Policies,

- Discuss the data
  - What are the problems it points out?
- Identify workload policies that address problem areas
- Identify proposed workload policies
- Present proposed changes to department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked not shared in equitable ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of expectations/consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of teaching/service assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility, credit, and reward for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social loafing/slacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-size-fits-all approaches to workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical details with workload policies are available through two ACE reports!

Report: https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf

Worksheet Booklet: https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads-Worksheet-Booklet.pdf
## Equitable Workload Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency &amp; Clarity</th>
<th>Widely visible information about faculty work activities available for departments members to see; clearly identified and well-understood benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Fairness in assigning workload, taking into account faculty preferences; shared commitment to ensuring faculty workload is distributed fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Recognition and rewards for faculty members who are expending more effort in certain areas; ensuring important work is credited in promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Acknowledgment that different faculty members have different strengths, interests, and demands that shape their workloads with workload flexibility to recognize this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Mechanisms to ensure that faculty members fulfill their work obligations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies for transparency & clarity

- Dashboards
- Rotations
- Expectations Guidelines
- Performance Benchmarks
- Restructuring Committees
- Credit Systems
Dashboards

Service Workload by Rank
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### Rotations/Service

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Program Director</strong></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Program Director</strong></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission Chair</strong></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion &amp; Tenure Chair</strong></td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Chair</strong></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative to College Senate</strong></td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Worksheet Booklet Page 7-10**

#### Associate/Full Professor Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching/Mentoring</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below Expectations</strong></td>
<td>• teach less than 5.5 courses per year&lt;br&gt;• teaching evaluations below college average&lt;br&gt;• advise less than 10 undergrads; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students (if 2 of these 3 bullets are met)</td>
<td>• 0-1 peer reviewed publications per year&lt;br&gt;• 0 conference presentations</td>
<td>• chair 0 department and/or other committees&lt;br&gt;• serve on 0-1 university/college/other committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets Expectations</strong></td>
<td>• teach 5.5 courses per year&lt;br&gt;• teaching evaluations consistent with or above college average&lt;br&gt;• advise 10 undergraduates; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students</td>
<td>• 2 peer reviewed publications per year&lt;br&gt;• 1 conference presentation</td>
<td>• chair 1 department committee&lt;br&gt;• serve on 2 other college/university or department committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Expectations</strong></td>
<td>• teach more than 5.5 courses per year&lt;br&gt;• teaching evaluations above college average&lt;br&gt;• advise more than 10 undergraduates; 3 MA; 4 doctoral students (meet 1 of these)</td>
<td>• 3 or more peer reviewed publications per year&lt;br&gt;• 2 or more conference presentations&lt;br&gt;• grant/award proposals submitted and/or accepted (meet 1 of these)</td>
<td>• chair 2 department and/or other committees&lt;br&gt;• serve on 3 or more university/college/other committees (meet 1 of these)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Far Exceeds Expectations</strong></td>
<td>• teach more than 6.5 courses per year&lt;br&gt;• teaching evaluations significantly above college average&lt;br&gt;• advise more than 12 undergraduates; 4 MA; 5 doctoral students&lt;br&gt;• teaching or mentoring awards (meet 1 of these)</td>
<td>• 4 or more peer reviewed publications per year in top tier journals&lt;br&gt;• 3 or more conference presentations&lt;br&gt;• grants received&lt;br&gt;• research awards (meet 1 of these)</td>
<td>• chair 3 department and/or other committees&lt;br&gt;• serve on 4 or more university/college/other committees&lt;br&gt;• recognition for service&lt;br&gt;• played key leadership role in major effort (accreditation, chair of university senate, etc.) (meet 1 of these)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Benchmarks

- Benchmarks that clarify expectations for teaching load, advising, and service workload by rank
  - Connecting expectations not only to quantity, but also quality (such as cancelling many class sessions, not providing timely feedback to advisees, not completing service work)

- Connecting Benchmarks to Merit Criteria
Restructuring and Reducing Committees

- Meet to discuss committees in department
- Disband committees that no longer serve department
- Merge committees with similar charges
- Rework committee size in line with workload
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# Restructuring and Reducing Committees

## Table 1. Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the Committee</th>
<th>How many times it meets and time of year</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Assigned Roles of the Committee</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit Review</td>
<td>Make recommendations for merit; provide guidance on merit review materials</td>
<td>3 meetings in April each year</td>
<td>4 faculty</td>
<td>Chair, 3 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion &amp; Tenure Sub-committee</td>
<td>Work with candidate as they prepare materials; review promotion and tenure applications; review and make recommendations regarding the promotion and tenure process</td>
<td>1 meeting in May to review timeline; review of materials online over summer; 1 meeting to review drafts, 1 meeting to confirm final case</td>
<td>4 faculty</td>
<td>Chair, 3 members; 3 members each focus on one area: teaching, research or service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Fellowships</td>
<td>Facilitate the admissions process, including recruitment, review of applications, and selection of students; review fellowship applications and select recipients</td>
<td>1 meeting in fall to review timeline; 1 meeting in January to review files; Submission of final decisions online</td>
<td>5 faculty, 2 doctoral students</td>
<td>Chair, 4 members; Each faculty member presents an even number of candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Review</td>
<td>Review, make recommendations, and oversee policies on curricular matters; review course proposals</td>
<td>1 meeting to review the process; ad hoc meetings every 6 weeks if proposals are submitted</td>
<td>3 faculty</td>
<td>Each faculty member rotates presenting the proposal and writing the letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to increase perceived fairness in assignments

• Policies for compensation of key role
• Service Audits/Preferences
• Policies for Service Assignments
• Policies for Teaching Assignments
• Rotations
Policies for Compensation of Key Roles

Table II. Standard vs. Compensated Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Performance</th>
<th>Extra Effort Compensated Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Merit Review</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Promotion &amp; Tenure Subcom-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mittee</td>
<td>Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Admissions &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td>Associate Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Curriculum Review</td>
<td>Chair of Online MA Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Workload Committee</td>
<td>Chair of Accreditation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Research &amp; Grants</td>
<td>Chair of College Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Budget &amp; Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of Rep to University Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or member of IRB Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Service Audits
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Service Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Associate/Full Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Are you interested in chairing any committees? If so, which ones?
Policies for service/teaching assignments

Discuss and develop clear statements about teaching and service assignments. For example:

■ Teaching assignments will include one graduate course every other year.

■ Teaching assignments will take into account preferences of faculty member and department needs, and include one service course (defined as a required course, or a large course) each year. Teaching releases cannot be applied to service courses.

■ Service assignments will take into account preferences of faculty member & committee chair.

■ Service assignments will be made in consultation with the personnel committee, aimed at ensuring that service workload is fairly distributed.
Strategies to give credit and visibility

• Credit Systems
• Merit Review
• Making Invisible Work Visible
• Modified/Broader Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
• Dashboard
• Teaching credit swaps
## Credit Systems

### Instructional Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Standard Performance</th>
<th>Extra Effort</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach 7.5 courses per year</td>
<td>taught 1/3 more courses, course size twice faculty average</td>
<td>Faculty who provide extra effort in teaching for 2 years can receive a course release for the third year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising</th>
<th>Standard Performance</th>
<th>Extra Effort</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advise 15 undergraduates, advise 1-2 MA, advise 0 doctoral students</td>
<td>advise 20 or more undergraduates, advise 4 MA or more, advise 1 doctoral students or more</td>
<td>Faculty who provide extra effort in advising can be exempted from committee service the following year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Service</th>
<th>Standard Performance</th>
<th>Extra Effort</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chair 1 department committee</td>
<td>chair 3 department/college/university committees</td>
<td>Faculty who chair 3 or more committees can be exempted from committee service the following year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Committee Service</th>
<th>Standard Performance</th>
<th>Extra Effort</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serve on 1 search committee per year</td>
<td>serve on 3 search committees per year or 6 over 2 years</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credit Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Nature of Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair (term of 5 years or more)</td>
<td>2 course release during year serving; 1 semester sabbatical once term completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Program Director (3-year term)</td>
<td>1 course release a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Program Director (3-year term)</td>
<td>1 course release a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Accreditation Review</td>
<td>1 course release in last year of external visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revising Merit Review

One form of crediting faculty workload is recognizing it in merit review. For example, if faculty members spend 25% of their time on service, but only 10% of their merit is based on service – this mismatch can make people feel undervalued for their service work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making Invisible Work Visible

• Mentoring students (formal, informal)
• Mentoring Colleagues (formal, informal)
• Letters of recommendation
• Career guidance
• Social support
• Attending recruitment events/recruiting students
• Community service
• Advising student groups

Make this work visible in faculty reviews, promotion cases, and everyday emails.
Strategies for accountability

• Reducing Committee Size & Increasing Accountability
• Mutual Expectations
• Rotations
• Performance Benchmarks
Reducing committee size & increasing accountability

- Creating committees of one
  - *Building committee*
  - *Awards Nominations*
- Making large committees smaller
- Creating roles on each committee, with clear output required of each member
- Delegating work so that each person has equal workload
Mutual expectations

First step: Establish Faculty Expectations Guidelines by Rank

Second step: Development Statement of Mutual Expectations

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.
Strategies to recognize different contexts equitably

- Differentiated Workloads
- Teaching Credit Swaps
- Modified/Broader Criteria for Promotion
Differentiated Workloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured faculty work effort pathway:</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1 Balanced Focus</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 courses per year)</td>
<td>(chair 1 department committee, serve on 2 other committees)</td>
<td>(high intensity, such as submitting 2 or more peer reviewed publications, conference presentations, and submitting external grant proposals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2 Research Focus</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8 courses per year)</td>
<td>(chair 2 department committees, serve on 2 or more other committees)</td>
<td>(research-inactive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Type</th>
<th>Unit Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-credit courses</td>
<td>1 course = 1 unit; 4 courses = 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-dissertation credits</td>
<td>3 students registered = 1 course unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation writing credits</td>
<td>2 students = 1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A BA or MA internship credit</td>
<td>4 students = 1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA seminar paper credits</td>
<td>2 students = .5 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Pathway Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway Option</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Advising &amp; Mentoring</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Pathway A</td>
<td>4 courses per year (4 units)</td>
<td>1.5 unit in dissertation/ MA credits</td>
<td>5.5 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway B - Option 1</td>
<td>3 courses per year (3 units)</td>
<td>2 students for MA seminar papers (.5 units)</td>
<td>5.5 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway B - Option 2</td>
<td>3 courses per year (3 units)</td>
<td>2 students writing dissertations (1 unit), 4 BA/MA internship students (1 unit)</td>
<td>5.5 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway B - Option 3</td>
<td>3 courses per year (3 units)</td>
<td>1 student writing dissertation (1 unit), 4 BA/MA internship students (1 unit)</td>
<td>5.5 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet
Booklet pp. 16-17
Modified or broader criteria for promotion/tenure

Modified or broader criteria could recognize a variety of factors that are valued by the university:

- Leadership roles (Director, Writing Center; Associate Dean for Equity; President, faculty union; Director Academic Fellows program)
- Research (Scholarship of teaching and learning, community engaged research, public engagement, grants focus)
- Other valued activities such as mentoring students or colleagues, unusual contributions to teaching, etc.

May include clarifications about who should be involved in assessing the case, both externally and internally.

Worksheet Booklet pp. 21-25
Implement Workload Policies

• Vote in and implement new policies
• Return to data, and consider other problems that need addressing
• Keep updating the dashboard and looking for new issues

We ended up having a retreat to discuss teaching and what we wanted our guiding principles and goals to be for assigning future teaching responsibilities. One thing that surprised us was that some people were teaching things that they didn't necessarily want to be teaching, so we reconsidered those assignments.

Having the dashboard... made us more aware of how hard everyone was working especially in different areas.”

This has given us a reference point for crafting a new tenure-track position advertisement and has prompted conversations about future junior faculty workloads...
Does it work?

Departments applied to engage in a workload equity project

- Randomly assigned to treatment & control groups
- Pre-test and post-test surveys of faculty

Treatment departments found improvement (relative to control) from pre-test to post-test on:

- There is awareness of implicit bias
- Faculty know strategies to improve fairness
- Faculty have concrete steps to ensure equity
- Faculty can use data to initiate discussions about workload
- Faculty can create benchmarks for work activities
- Distribution of teaching and service work is fair overall
- Faculty feel they can say no to requests
- Faculty feel comfortable asking for additional resources

Does it work?

In departments where faculty perceive:

- Transparent workload data
- Clear workload policies
- Fair assignment of teaching/service

Race and gender differences in how they perceive workload equity disappear

Where faculty perceive equitable practices & conditions, faculty report:

- Greater satisfaction with workload
- Greater perception of fairness
- Lesser intent to leave

---


Outcomes for Equitable Workloads

- Greater productivity
- Less time to advancement
- Retention, satisfaction, sense of fairness
- Sense of inclusion and belonging
- Greater diversity among faculty & leaders
Final Thoughts...

- We become cynical and develop a sense of learned helplessness if we do not have strategies to address equity issues.
- These approaches will not solve all issues but they can make a difference.
- Silence and inaction is a response.
- There is much we can do.
Thank you and reach out
misra@umass.edu

Peer-Review & Long-form Reports:


Popular Writing:


To learn more about the Faculty Workload and Rewards Project please visit: [https://facultyworkloadandrewardsproject.umd.edu/](https://facultyworkloadandrewardsproject.umd.edu/)

See 2 Minute Video: [https://youtu.be/cbRxrVA8C_4](https://youtu.be/cbRxrVA8C_4)

See 7 Minute Video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RAFaK6wicF0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RAFaK6wicF0)

This material is based upon work funded through the National Science Foundation ADVANCE-IHE Program, Grant 146389