

**Faculty Senate**  
**Workload Policy Review**  
**Memorandum of Process and Feedback**

As stated in the University *Faculty Workload Policy* (2.0) the Provost shall conduct a review of the policy every three years. According to the Policy Review Schedule, section 10.0, the Provost is required to ask for faculty input during this review process. Per the Policy, approval of any revisions made takes place at the Council of Academic Deans and Directors (CADD).

Substantive revisions to the policy were drafted by the University Workload Policy workgroup composed of six faculty members (one dean and five faculty members) representing both north and south campuses. The workgroup was formed and charged as part of a broader university development initiative and the FS President nominated faculty members to serve on the workgroup. Their work primarily took place in the fall of 2024 through January 2025.

During December 2024 and January 2025, the Faculty Senate provided members with a variety of mediums to express their comments and concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the University workload policy.

- Faculty Townhalls – hybrid, recorded, posted
- Emails sent to the Faculty Senate
- Anonymous comments to the Faculty Senate Suggestion Box
- Ongoing conversations across campus

Feedback was also received from groups of individuals via a variety of faculty assemblies, counsels, departments and Faculty Senate Committees.

The FSEC would like to thank all individuals and groups for their responses. Constructive suggestions regarding language changes were helpful when proposing adjustments.

A summary of these comments (with attached full text) was provided to the Provost and discussed with members of CADD during the normal course of business meetings. In addition, materials were provided to the leads of the Team A when discussing potential changes.

This document represents a summary of comments, grouped by category, and documents the location of the answer within the policy. Likewise, it lists changes made during the revision process based upon faculty comments.

NOTE: More than 20 pages of comments were received, reviewed, summarized, discussed and deliberated on as potential adjustments to the policy were considered.

Summary of Comment Received	Location of answer within document/changes listed
My school/program/department has used/wants to use multipliers to help more equitably assign workload. How is coteaching, labs and other intentionally small courses weighed against highly enrolled classes.	See Appendix A, 1.4 g  Language change occurred
Librarianship needs to be called out	See Section 5.1  Language change occurred
Service needs to be more clearly called out	See section 4.0  Language change occurred
Tenure track needs to be on a 2-2 until complete	See section 4.0  Language change occurred
Research productively is too vague be more specific/ do not be so prescriptive on what counts toward acceptable research productivity	See Appendix. This will be more fully defined at the unit level. Each college is required to develop a workload policy
There is no flexibility to take into account the variable course credit offerings	See section 4  Language change occurred
Additional research infrastructure is needed to support faculty, not getting support for smaller grant, Need more grant support to submit and manage grants, we need more funding not less, I can't get my research done with the support I am given	Outside the scope of policy but comments have been communicated to OVPR
People need to be able to shift between "tracks"	See Section 6.2  Language change occurred
How does this policy translate to graduate course work/ this doesn't work for master level classes	This document is primarily structured for the undergraduate experience. Unit level polices need to be developed, to account for graduate level work. See Appendix
We need better tech support	Outside the scope of policy but comments have been communicated to IT

Need Mechanisms for Dispute Resolution	See Appendix 1.5
Changes in expectations for Workload need to be taken into account for P&T guidelines	Agreed, once workload policy is approved, Group C will be working on suggested guidelines for units/departments to take into account for updated P&T guidelines.  P&T documents are developed at the unit level
The is an overemphasis on Unit-level Flexibility – too much risk for inconsistencies across campus/This entire policy should not be a university led process it should entirely rest within the Unit	No language change occurred there were almost equal comments on both sides of this issue
Need guidance on Clinical workload assignment	General guidance provided section 4, unit/school workload policies must define further. See Appendix
When does this take effect	With workload assignments beginning spring 2025
How will overload be accounted for/ what if a unit is short staffed	See section 5.2
Chairs should be assigning workload in consultation with Faculty and should take into account the overall needs, mission and goals of the academic unit	See section 6.2  Language change occurred
How do we account for team taught courses	See Appendix A 1.4g  Language change occurred
You need to allow for some flexibility for chairs with teaching, service, research / Each workload designation needs to have some flexibility	See section 4.0  Language change occurred

January 26, 2025