

## Frequent Concerns Expressed Regarding Workload Policy Draft

The Workload Committee read carefully all feedback provided within the comment period. Many comments and concerns were addressed in the revised policy now before the Senate. Others were considered, but not implemented. Below, a number of the most common issues are summarized, each with some explanation.

### 1. Faculty Compensation

#### - I have concerns with the section on Faculty Compensation Standards.

The Faculty Compensation Standards are part of a separate section of the HoOP, containing policy related to Human Resource Services. A revision was proposed to set a criterion for approving temporary or overload work. After input from faculty and further discussion with HR, the committee has decided not to pursue that proposed revision at this time. The revision would unnecessarily conflate workload issues with compensation issues. It also appears that there are number of complex issues related to summer compensation that should be addressed in any revision. Those issues are outside the purview of this Committee. Thus, the proposed change has been withdrawn.

#### - I am concerned that the policy does not address compensation for faculty who teach in programs that are run year-round with no breaks or variation.

The Committee has restricted its focus to workload issues in this draft and has not addressed compensation issues. Faculty compensation is not within the purview of the Committee's charge. The Provost is aware of the concerns that have been expressed and is exploring possible avenues to address them in the future.

### 2. Equivalencies

#### - I have a concern about the equivalencies outlined in the document marked "Default Workload Policy and Standards."

The document marked "Default Workload Policy and Standards" will *not* be included in the Handbook of Operating Procedures (the HoOP). To be clear, it reflects the old UTEP policy – the policy currently in place (now part of the HoOP, to be *replaced* by the new draft policy). In the future, it will only apply to departments or programs that have not yet developed their own approved standards. It is what is referenced in the new HoOP language as "the workload policy most recently in effect." It was attached to the working draft in the interest of transparency. It has since been extracted to form a separate document in order to reduce confusion.

Many faculty members proposed changes to the default standards that would more clearly align the standards with the work that they do in their own departments or programs. The Committee believes that the best way to move forward is not to change the default policy, but to permit different departments to propose their own specific standards, which would replace the defaults.

### 3. Teaching Expectations

- **I am concerned that a particular type of activity (e.g., research, clinical supervision, team teaching, online teaching, entrepreneurial work, particularly time-intensive teaching, specific types of lab instruction, independent study or thesis supervision) is not adequately addressed in the new policy.**

The new policy is structured to permit departments and programs to propose standards that reflect the unique needs and missions of their units. The Committee believes that this is a better approach than trying to integrate these specific issues into a one-size-fits-all policy at the University level.

- **I am concerned that for faculty who do not have significant research or service expectations, a 15-hour load per semester is too high (or too low).**

The Committee is keenly aware that a semester credit hour is not a uniform unit of faculty effort – the time and effort devoted to teaching varies significantly as a function of many factors. Departments and programs are encouraged to propose standards that reflect this variation. Depending upon those departmental standards, faculty may teach more or fewer semester credit hours than their colleagues. To be clear, the criterion given in the policy is “a load *equivalent to* 15 semester credit hours of organized undergraduate courses.” The equivalence would be established by department or program standards.

- **I am concerned that Section 4.3.3.2.2 mentions only undergraduate teaching.**

In an effort to establish a criterion, the Committee attempted to identify as homogenous a unit as possible, recognizing that variation exists even then. The policy does not omit graduate teaching; it simply leaves to departments and programs the task of establishing any equivalence between graduate and undergraduate teaching.

- **I am concerned that the policy does not acknowledge the workload associated with RSCH 4033, the zero-credit course associated with participation in undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity.**

RSCH 4033 is only a mechanism for recording the activity of undergraduates on their transcripts and for institutional record-keeping purposes. It should not be used to determine faculty workload, in the same way it does not confer credit to students. If a department wishes to give credit to students and faculty for participating in undergraduate research, it may create a credit-bearing independent research course for that purpose, in which students enroll simultaneously with RSCH 4033. Most departments have such a mechanism currently.

- **I am concerned that Section 4.3.3.2.1 refers only to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Why does the policy exclude other faculty in this section?**

This section includes a requirement that the Committee felt was unnecessary to extend to faculty whose roles are more uniformly teaching-intensive, such as lecturers or faculty of instruction. This would not preclude college policies from extending the requirement to other faculty appointment types.