

ATWG-3: Faculty Workload Practices, Policies, and Parity

Update Report to the Provost, April 15, 2024

Mentor:

Turan Kayaoglu, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, Provost Office

Co-facilitators:

Laura Argys, Professor and Associate Dean, CLAS

Maryam Darbaheshti, Clinical Associate Professor and Director, CEDC

Committee members:

Scott Bauer, Professor and Associate Dean, SEHD

Sasha Breger, Associate Professor, CLAS

Jenine Buchanan, Clinical Associate Professor, SEHD

teri engelke, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources

Carol Golemboski, Professor and Program Director, CAM

Catherine Gunny, Professor, Business

Amy Hasinoff, Associate Professor, CLAS

Lorine Hughes, Professor, SPA

Devin Jenkins, Associate Professor and Chair, CLAS

Vicki Lane, Associate Professor, Business

Marta Maron, Clinical Associate Professor, CLAS

Elizabeth Pugliano, Senior Instructor, CAM

Marc Swackhamer, Professor and Chair, CAP

Paul Worthman, Associate Director, ELC

Introduction

Faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service provide critical inputs to the mission and reputation of the university. In addition, faculty perceptions of workload parity can be drivers of important outcomes that impact the future of the institution through their effect on morale, hiring and retention, and overall productivity. In an American Council on Education ([ACE](#)) report on equity-minded workload, the authors note the negative relationship between workload inequities and productivity and retention, and the positive relationship between workload inequities and burnout (O'Meara et al., 2022, p. iv)¹. They also note that "workload inequities accrue over time" (p. iv), suggesting that the establishment of a working group focused on workload parity is both timely and of critical importance to the long-term health of CU Denver.

¹ O'Meara, Kerryanne, Dawn Culpepper, Joya Misra, and Audrey Jaeger. (2022) "Equity-minded Faculty Workloads: What We Can and Should Do Now." American Council of Education. Hyperlink provided. Last accessed 4/12/2024.

This working group, originally charged with addressing issues of workload parity focused on class size variability, began our work by developing a revised charge which was approved by the Academic Transformation Working Group Steering Committee and the Provost and Chancellor on 2/5/2024. The new charge of this working group is “to bring clarity on current faculty workload practices, perceptions, and policies across CU Denver schools and colleges. This working group will develop a collective understanding of how faculty workload portfolios fit together. The committee will also bring clarity on campus and system level policies on faculty workload and articulate values and principles that should guide faculty workload and identify the best practices across higher education for workload parity. Faculty have a portfolio of duties that are generally categorized into three areas:

- a) Teaching classes that vary across colleges and disciplines by the level of the course, number of sections, enrollment, delivery modality, number of preparations per semester, etc.
- b) Conducting research and producing creative works.
- c) Providing service, student advising, curriculum development, and leadership among many other activities.

Faculty in different job titles and ranks are assigned different levels of workload in each of these areas across CU Denver Schools and Colleges. The goal of this committee, reflected in its revised charge, is to develop a framework for how schools, colleges, and the library (S/C/L) can examine different components of faculty workload portfolios, identify potential instances where these portfolios misalign with guiding values and principles, and recommend strategies and actions to address them.

To this end, the committee’s work to date is summarized in this report in five sections, informed by subcommittee work conducted by all working group members. These five sections include: articulating guiding principles and values, measuring faculty workload, documenting campus and system workload policies, understanding S/C/L workload practices and policies, and gauging current perceptions of faculty workload parity.

Progress Reports on 5 Sections of Workload Parity Working Group

Section I. Guiding Principles and Values around Workload Parity

CU Denver principles and values should guide future work on policies and processes to improve workload parity and this section of the update is focused on consideration of the high-level values, ethics, and ideals that should be used to guide our recommendations. As the term “parity” connotes some kind of 'fairness', we first acknowledge that unevenness, inequality, inequity, and disparity are common features of the higher education landscape in the US. We are painfully aware that a committee of this nature cannot redress hierarchical and imbalanced institutional structures and systemic disparities that have come to prevail in higher education. Addressing the roots of structural and institutional disparity is well beyond the scope of our group's charge and would require a broader mobilization of campus leadership, engagement of

the whole faculty, and a radical re-thinking of institutional resource allocations, among other major components. While we welcome such an effort, we understand our work in this ATWG Working Group to be shorter-term and more limited in its scope.

Even practical, local decisions about faculty workload cannot be made in a vacuum. While faculty workload might be approximately quantified through calculations of hours devoted to different aspects of one's job responsibilities and percentages of time and effort, workload is also bound up, to varying degrees, in the quality of courses and educational programs, the likelihood of broad student success in the academic context, student enrollment and retention, the research mission of the university, the quality of faculty relationships with one another in primary units and S/C/L, and faculty, staff, and student morale, among other related domains. Guidelines or recommendations regarding workload parity put forth by this working group must account for potential consequences in these areas and recognize that these guiding principles should respond to trade-offs that are identified as unacceptable or inappropriate and ensure the consistency of faculty workload decisions with other important campus goals and aspirations.

Guardrails for workload decisions identified to date include several pillars of the strategic plan (#5 on being a people friendly best place to work, #3 about being internationally known for research and creative works, and #2 regarding being a university for life). Other considerations drawn from the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) include extensive research on the relation between course size and student outcomes, as well as research on the drivers and consequences of faculty burnout. Further, research on workload management practices and policies at peer institutions indicate the importance of a multi-tiered approach that involves faculty, Primary Units, Schools/Colleges/Library, and the central administration, as well as the importance of transparency and clarity around faculty workload expectations.

Following initial brainstorming sessions with the entire working group, which highlighted central ideas such as objectivity, transparency, clarity, engagement with shared governance, attention to power differentials, unintended consequences, shared responsibility, and the notion that "difference doesn't equal disparity," the Principles Subgroup embarked on research to better understand relevant guardrails and guiding principles from a workload management perspective. We provide brief summaries of our research from internal documents (CU Denver Strategic Plan and IRC Task Force), literature on pedagogy best practices, ACE report on equity-minded workloads (O'Meara et al., 2022) and peer institutions practices.

All five goals of the **2030 CU Denver Strategic Plan** entail faculty work and therefore have impacts on faculty workload. However, it is goals 5, 3 and 2 (arguably in that order) that relate most directly to faculty workload and considerations of parity, and so those are the goals that will guide our recommendations.

Goal 5: Be known as a people-centered “Best Place to Work” may have been a catalyst for this working group and the attempt to address issues of parity in faculty workload. “We will make intentional investments that support our employees, their work, wellness, and life.” “We will put equitable structures, policies, and pathways in place to help our people reach their full potential.” These points bear directly on issues of faculty burnout and productivity tracked in the SOTL research (discussed below). They also underscore that any recommendations made about workload parity must consider employee wellness and the ability of individuals to define and exercise their full potential.

Goal 3: Be internationally known for research and creative work makes clear a requirement that recommendations around workload parity account for the time and effort necessary to engage in research and creative processes and to produce significant scholarly and creative contributions. Understanding of the requirements for scholarship and creative work in different areas, as not all fields necessitate the same time or effort, is a critical part of assessing workload parity. Additionally, consideration of the relationships between workloads of faculty with research/creative work requirements and faculty without research/creative work requirements is necessary to ensure that unacceptable levels of disparity are not introduced around the instructional workloads of teaching faculty to support the scholarly and creative work of others.

Goal 2: Become known as a university for life includes the instructional mission of the university. For faculty to support student learning and provide opportunities that benefit learners at all points in their lives and careers, they must have the time, space, and flexibility to master and deliver multiple modes of teaching across a range of topics related to their areas of expertise. Moreover, the opportunity to foster student learning at all points in an educational journey should be available to all faculty. Recommendations about workload parity must accommodate faculty professional development, curricular development, pedagogical development, etc., and embed frameworks for incentivizing and supporting this work equally and equitably across disciplines and faculty lines.

The IRC Taskforce Report provides several important recommendations that speak to workload parity. While these issues are presented in the report in relation to and on behalf of IRC faculty, they are, in many cases, not wholly distinct to IRC faculty but rather relate to faculty workload parity issues more broadly. In particular, the recommendations of this working group will be informed by values identified by the IRC taskforce in the areas of support for teaching large classes, workload clarity and differentiated workload.

Research on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) provides additional guidance for important principles and values guiding work in the area of faculty workload parity. Substantial work has been done by our group to identify important considerations and best practices. A database that includes important research in the areas of class size and

student outcomes, faculty composition, spending and student outcomes, and the causes and consequences of faculty burnout will be included in the final report and will guide our recommendations.

An **ACE report on equity-minded workload** that includes top-level recommendations for promoting workload equity presents a potential starting point or comparative check for this working group's recommendations. The following important principles are taken from the executive summary on page iv of the report, and are elaborated in the report text:

Transparency: Departments have widely visible information about faculty work activities available for department members to see.

Clarity: Departments have clearly identified and well-understood benchmarks for faculty work activities.

Credit: Departments recognize and reward faculty members who are expending more effort in certain areas.

Norms: Departments have a commitment to ensuring faculty workload is fair and have put systems in place that reinforce these norms.

Context: Departments acknowledge that different faculty members have different strengths, interests, and demands that shape their workloads and offer workload flexibility to recognize this context.

Accountability: Departments have mechanisms in place to ensure that faculty members fulfill their work obligations and receive credit for their labor.

Finally, principles, values and eventual recommendations are informed by **experiences and feedback from peer institutions** that have developed similar recommendations and practices to address faculty workload equity. This information (to be available as an appendix to the final report) currently includes information from Northeastern University, Saint Louis University, University of Denver, and University of Maryland.

Section II. Measurement of Faculty Workload

Addressing issues of workload parity among faculty requires an understanding of the current distribution in the primary areas of faculty workload in the areas teaching, research, and service. This subcommittee will document measurable work activities among faculty across the various faculty job classifications within and across schools and colleges to understand measurable differences in workload. Data are available from existing OIRE data dashboards, refined OIRE customized data requests, and summary data from faculty annual reports (FAR). This subcommittee is also examining available data to understand workload by gender and BIPOC identity. A goal of this project is to highlight areas that appear to have achieved parity

and areas of disparate workload for explanation, investigation, and/or modification to policy or processes by schools and colleges.

All data to inform the summaries and recommendations of this working group are reported as averages by faculty job title in five groups: Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty; Clinical Teaching Track/Teaching Professor Track Faculty; Instructional Faculty (Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Principal Instructor); Lecturers; and Other Faculty (currently Research Faculty and Postdoctoral Fellows). Average workload by job title is reported separately for each school and college, and for the campus as a whole separately by gender and BIPOC status.

Measuring teaching workload: Progress to date in measuring faculty workload includes collaboration with OIRE in developing interactive Tableau dashboards that help us understand the current workload landscape in the area of instruction. In particular, extensive dashboards have been developed that capture many aspects of faculty instructional workload that include the following:

- Number of Courses (often referred to as ‘teaching load’)
- Assigned credit hours
- Average class size
- Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)
- Teaching load by course level (lower division, upper division, graduate)
- Number of large courses (> 60 students; > 80 students; > 100 students)
- Other registered teaching activities
 - Independent study and directed research courses/credit hours
 - Internship supervision
 - Thesis and dissertation hours

The collection and consistency of such data appears critical for successful understanding, evaluation and policy development in areas of workload parity. Though still preliminary, substantial variation in instructional workload among some of these measures is evident across schools and college, by gender and by BIPOC status. Where present, transparency and further investigation is critical.

We briefly indicate the presence of differences for various faculty groups from this preliminary data – but in this report, we stress the word *preliminary*. The data from these dashboards is not included as part of this report as some measures have not yet been incorporated into the dashboard and classifications of activities have yet to be refined in potentially important ways. One important consideration is instructional workload adjustment in response to official reallocation of time to due administrative responsibility, externally-funded alternative work, and sabbaticals. In addition, some aspects of instructional workload are not easily available from our current institutional data sources. In addition, yet to be added to this dashboard is contact hours, a measure important to faculty who have substantial studio,

practicum and/or laboratory curriculum. Furthermore, we anticipate consultation with faculty around workload measurement to highlight areas that are not yet easily captured. These include understanding how the use of and responsibilities for Teaching Assistants/Learning Assistants/Graders at both the undergraduate and graduate levels impact faculty instructional workload (potentially both positively and negatively). Other areas include measuring instructional workload time devoted to curriculum development and coordination (e.g. Studio Coordinators/Lab Coordinators/Composition Directors) and the large area of student advising and mentorship.

Measuring research and creative activities workload : With expected variation by job title, faculty workload in the area of research and creative activities is largely specified in very broad terms (percentage of workload) in a faculty contract. The overall data dashboard to accompany the final report will summarize data available in faculty annual report data. Most schools and college faculty use the FAR system in Interfolio, though Business School faculty rely on Digital Measures for their annual reports. The following faculty activities can be reported in the current FAR system: Books, chapters, articles (with distinction for peer review), presentations, conference proceedings, patents, popular press and other research outlets. Grant submission and award data are also recorded as part of the annual report process. Reports of creative work in the FAR system include an even broader set of alternative activities across a number of media that include, but are not limited to: poetry, short stories, scripts, films, theater, music, installations, exhibitions, festivals, digital design, books, visual arts, animation, and professional competitions.

The nature of research and creative work and our data collection of faculty output presents challenges to meaningfully capturing faculty workload in this area. The wide range of possible activities, and impossibility of assigning equivalence among them highlights the difficulty in interpreting aggregate measures. We also note that the data available largely captures work that has completed the dissemination process rather than providing a measure of the effort required to undertake these activities. The final report on faculty workload will advise caution in interpreting these data as fully capturing faculty research workload and recommend data collection for evaluation purposes.

Measuring faculty service and leadership workload: Similar to research and creative work, faculty workload in the area of service and leadership is typically specified as percentage of time in a faculty contract and basic accounting of selected service and leadership roles and activities are recorded in the faculty annual reports. The ability to effectively capture service and leadership activities across faculty is substantially limited by the data available in the FAR system. Although the level of service (CU system, campus, S/C/L, primary unit, institute or center, community or professional organization) is reported, the activities themselves are input in text format making categorization difficult. Upcoming work in this subcommittee and working group will explore alternative methods for data collection in this area.

Data distribution concerns and future communication: Concerns with the measurement of specific activities has been discussed above, but there have already been concerns raised with widely distributing faculty workload data. We believe that these data should be distributed to schools and colleges for use in their efforts to address workload parity issues. Making data dashboards available to the wider campus community, with statistical information by job title at the S/C/L and campus levels and by gender and BIPOC group, is more controversial. Some faculty have expressed concern that, particularly the FAR (and Digital Measures) data, should be treated as confidential data. Discussions with legal staff suggest that disseminating aggregate data, for sample sizes that meet OIRE reporting requirements, do not breach data confidentiality expectations communicated when the data are reported. This issue will be a topic of discussion as the draft recommendations are communicated to faculty governance and town hall groups in the fall. Additional concerns with distributing workload data to the campus community is the level of technical explanation that would be required to meaningfully interpret the data. Data will be reviewed to better assess completeness and quality as reports from the FAR become available and will be critical in decision making around recommendation for data distribution.

Section III. Campus, System, and Other Policies on Faculty Workload

Faculty workload is shaped by campus and system policies, with human resources policies nested within state and federal regulations (all of the policies discussed briefly below will be summarized and included in a detailed appendix in the final report). We aim to identify and clarify key policy documents influencing faculty workload, pinpoint areas lacking campus and system policies, and establish parameters for college faculty workload policies. The goal is to provide a comprehensive understanding and identify potential areas for improvement, while also defining guidelines for the development of college-level faculty workload policies in alignment with the CU Denver faculty workload values and principles.

Federal and State Laws Potentially Related to Workload (and Compensation) Parity:

The committee studied federal and state laws, particularly those pertaining to overtime, non-discriminatory compensation, and work conditions, to inform their discussion on faculty workload. Both federal and state laws address overtime compensation requirements. These laws could potentially apply if workload parity is assessed based on hours worked, if faculty are typically expected to work an average of 40 hours per week to fulfill their responsibilities, if some faculty members must exceed an average of 40 hours per week to fulfill their position's responsibilities, and if certain faculty positions are not exempt from overtime requirements. However, many faculty members, as salaried exempt employees, are not covered by overtime requirements in remuneration, regardless of whether they work more or fewer hours than other faculty members, or more than 40 hours per week. University policy should align with the various aspects of these laws to ensure proper application.

Federal and state laws also safeguard faculty members from discrimination in compensation and employment conditions (the final report will include the extensive appendix). Federal laws highlighted by this group include: the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. State laws also prohibit certain forms of discrimination, for example, Colorado's Equal Pay for Equal Work Act. As a matter of policy, CU ensures that these laws are adhered to, provides training to educate CU entities and employees about them, and utilizes HR officials and the Office of Equity to facilitate their application.

However, unintended discrimination may potentially result from policies that stipulate varying responsibilities for different faculty groups, especially when these groups also differ in terms of race, gender, or other protected statuses. Administrators, primary units, and faculty committees establish standards for faculty performance concerning tenure and annual evaluation criteria and may establish different criteria and/or standards for different faculty groups. Such policies, when enacted without expert guidance in the application and interpretation of anti-discriminatory law, may inadvertently delve into the realm of discrimination in workload parity. Legal and HR experts well-versed in the intricacies of these laws should ensure that well-intentioned policies avoid discriminatory repercussions.

Regent Laws and Policies on Workload Parity: Regent Laws and Policies provide a broad framework for establishing and adjusting faculty workloads (provided in an appendix in the final report). According to Regent Law, faculty assignments and workloads are the responsibility of deans (Policy 4.A) and must be delineated in the faculty member's letter of offer or employment agreement (Policy 5.C.3.b). Faculty may hold appointments beyond the primary appointment (Policy 5.C.4.a) and negotiate a differential workload to accommodate professional development (Policy 5.C.3.b.1) or performance of faculty governance roles requiring time exceeding ordinary service expectations (Policy 5.C.4.c.1). Negotiated workloads must be consistent with the university's commitment to teaching, research, and service and, where applicable, unit-specific needs (e.g., faculty needs, disciplinary conventions, goals/objective of unit and campus, etc.) (Policy 5.C.4.c). Moreover, regardless of whether primary units choose to evaluate merit over one or multiple years (Article 11.B.1.b.1.b), all three areas—research, teaching, and service—must be considered in performance evaluations of faculty with differentiated workloads (Article 11.A.1.e). Evaluation scores and salary increases provided by unit heads also must be weighted according to each faculty's workload allocation/assignment in the prior year (Article 11.B).

Campus Policies on Workload Parity: Campus policies emphasize several themes regarding faculty workload. These policies typically consider the standard Tenure Track/Track distribution of 40/40/20 as an implicit baseline and articulate variations from that baseline through differentiation of workload distribution or the workload of IRC faculty.

Flexibility in Workload: The policies recognize the need for flexibility in workload distribution to accommodate differences in faculty development needs, interests, and abilities (CAP 1012: Differentiated Annual Workloads).

Fair Faculty Compensation: There is a focus on establishing fair compensation for faculty members based on workload standards, with specific attention to workload specification in employment contracts (CAP 1006: Faculty Compensation).

Administrative Oversight: There is a clear delineation of administrative responsibilities in overseeing workload distribution, including department chairs' roles in implementing workload policies (CAP 1020: Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs).

Clear Policies and Process: Policies aim to establish campus-wide standards for faculty appointments, evaluations, and workload distribution to ensure consistency and fairness across academic units (CAP 1019: Instructional, Research, And Clinical Faculty Appointments; CAP 1026: Evaluating Qualifications of Instructional Faculty).

Accountability: There is an emphasis on accountability for faculty productivity and performance evaluation, with policies outlining processes for performance review and promotion (CAP 1006: Faculty Compensation; CAP 1028: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Performance Review).

Non-Discrimination: Policies aim to ensure inclusivity and non-discrimination in workload distribution, with considerations for factors such as race, gender, and other protected statuses (CAP 1012: Differentiated Annual Workloads).

Differentiation among Faculty Tracks: There is recognition of the need for differentiation in workload expectations among different faculty tracks (e.g., tenure-track, non-tenure track) based on their roles and responsibilities (CAP 1028: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Performance Review).

Section IV. School/College Workload Practices and Policies

One aim of this working group is to catalog and compare current CU Denver school and college faculty workload practices and policies. Faculty workload is ultimately operationalized, enacted, and monitored at the S/C/L level, and in tandem with policies and practices related to merit review, unit-level policies and practices are vital to understand both in terms of their structure and operation, and in terms of their impact on perceptions of fairness. The purpose of this subcommittee is to amass information to provide a clear picture of workload-related policies and practices, which may contribute both to our understanding of faculty workload and may suggest a set of workload policies that units are expected to define and share to promote transparency.

Data Collection from Schools and Colleges: Workload process information was requested from Associate Deans in all schools and colleges, followed by the same request to Human Resources/ Finance offices within schools and colleges. Because of expected workload differences, data gathering from the library is not yet fully underway. After receiving the information from all seven schools/colleges, we are conducting high-level comparisons based on faculty categories across schools and colleges. A summary was created for each unit, which is discussed briefly here and will be appended in the final report.

Questions asked from Schools and Colleges: The following questions were presented to schools and colleges:

1. Processes for faculty annual plans and merit – how and when do units ask for or receive an accounting of what work faculty are doing, who receives and approves, etc.?
2. How are exceptions or variances proposed, approved?
3. Integration or association of merit standards for research, service?
4. Ancillary but predictable workload – how are things like advising, curriculum/course development, accreditation reporting, etc. accounted for or assigned?
 - a. When responsibilities are distributed, how acknowledged/paid?
 - b. What are faculty doing that is not “counted” or compensated?
5. What role do deans, AD’s, program leads or chairs play in setting or approving workloads (or holding people accountable)?
6. How – if at all – do units monitor workload fairness – data collected and examined?
7. What rules exist related to TA support and/or opportunity to split sections?
8. When, if at all, might a course count as more than 1 in the calculation of “load”?

Preliminary Outcomes of the Collected Data: The committee has made the following preliminary observations based on the analysis of the collected data:

1. When asked about workload, the information we received was primarily about teaching loads.
2. There are more similarities than differences across units. These similarities seem to be most pronounced in the policy-driven faculty categories.
 - a. Interestingly, no unit counted teaching load any other way than sections of classes (almost always 3 credit class sections) -- none seem to have rules associated with SCH.
 - b. Almost universally, one three-credit class is counted as 10% of work effort.
 - c. Only a fraction of the units, when queried, included any policy or practice related to adjusting course load for class size or other variables. Whether, or in what

ways, adjustments might be made because of the course being small or large; a new prep; a new course; of varied modalities; etc. is not entirely clear.

3. Research and service standards are typically associated with merit review; how this is factored into workload planning and accountability is an open question.
 - a. A possible source of perceived parity issues may be tied to the fact that almost across the university, 40% or so of T/TT faculty work is the amorphous category “research” for which faculty would be evaluated and held accountable. It is unclear from the process information collected to date how this aspect of workload is assessed.
4. Some units include policies that offer TA support or the opportunity to split classes at a particular enrollment level.
5. It seems clear that many of these processes occur in the department, as opposed to school or college level. Consequently, in larger units, we will need to account for greater variability by querying departments. Future data collection in this area is planned.
6. Some units have well- articulated rules about ancillary categories of workload (e.g., advising, internships, practicum, etc.). The ability to widely collect this data across all schools and colleges is under discussion.
7. Most units report some process related to adjusting or varying standard workload proportions, sometimes for specified reasons and sometimes there is a process for doing this formally (often it is expressed informally, i.e., at the discretion of a chair or dean).

Section V. Faculty Perceptions of Workload Parity

The faculty’s Perceptions of Workload Parity is generally determined by conducting a series of interviews, focus groups, and surveys. Collecting and analyzing the qualitative data from the surveys is underway and the results of the study will be shared in our final report. To this end, ATWG has developed a comprehensive survey that was disseminated to all CU Denver rostered faculty on April 1, 2024. The workload parity group contributed to this survey by adding 4 questions. These questions are designed to gain some information about faculty’s perception of their workload in areas of teaching, research, and service compared to:

- a. Faculty with the same job title, within the same rank, in their school/college.
- b. Faculty with the same job title, within the same rank, in other schools/colleges.
- c. Faculty within different ranks in their school/college.

The survey also asks about the reason(s) for the workload disparity perceptions among the faculty. These reasons include, but are not limited to, the hours of work, faculty

compensation, level of academic freedom, and the sense of appreciation, especially for faculty outside of the tenure line.

Our primary objective is to find commonalities between the faculty's perception of workload disparity in the areas of teaching, research, and service across all schools and colleges and the library, within each rank, and across different ranks. This subcommittee also intends to investigate the perception of the workload disparity among specific demographic groups. target the minoritized groups of faculties across schools and colleges. Although it might be harder to identify the measures of workload parity related to service and research among underrepresented groups, we believe that careful examination of the teaching measures of workload parity would add valuable information that can be the basis of the investigation in other areas of faculty's job responsibilities.

Next steps

To complete the research, archiving, and consultation relevant to each of the subcommittee's work. The working group's next steps, led by subcommittee chair commitments into the summer and convening the full working group again in the fall, include the following tasks:

- Complete the research, archiving, and consultation relevant to each of the subcommittee's work.
- Conduct interviews with university(ies) with experience implementing workload parity initiatives.
- Form focus groups and safe spaces for the faculty from different programs to share their individual experiences. The anonymous outcomes of these focus groups should further be discussed with the executive leadership.
- Complete individual appendices that will be included in the final report detailing the scholarship of teaching and learning related to student outcomes and workload practices; best practices around workload equity at peer institutions; CU Denver data dashboards of teaching, research and service workload data; federal, state and CU Regent employment and workload policies; school and college workload practices; and summary data from the workload section of the CU Denver spring 2024 faculty survey.
- Make action-oriented draft recommendations intended for the Provost and engage faculty and administrators in primary unit, school and college and campus in discussion for final revision.

Consultation, Shared Governance and Feedback

The Faculty Workload Practices, Policies, and Parity Working Group leadership has presented progress summaries to the Dean's Council (April 3) and the CU Denver Council of Chairs (April 11). Both of these presentations had as a primary goal providing an opportunity for feedback

from among the participants. In both cases, meaningful feedback was provided. A noteworthy point, raised at both meetings, was the wide view that faculty workload is a nuanced concept and, particularly in areas of measurement and interpretation of differences, disciplinary subtleties at the S/C/L and even primary unit levels, are critical to take into account. This reinforces the tentative plans that the working group recommendations will encourage the assignment of responsibility for future workload parity efforts be focused within schools and colleges with reporting to and accountability at the campus level. Some additional feedback from these groups has been discussed in the sections above.

Many other stakeholders need to be updated throughout the process, including student governance leaders, supporting staff in the primary units, and non-rostered faculty representatives. Ultimately, transparency in communications at all levels should be a primary goal of this working group.
