

Faculty Workload Task Force Release Statement
Metropolitan State University of Denver Faculty Workload Task Force
March 15, 2022

The MSU Denver Faculty Workload Task Force worked for over a year to develop a workload proposal for full time faculty. We released our draft proposal in November 2021 and spent the ensuing four months gathering feedback. Our final proposal includes three documents: Final Recommendations, Final Faculty Workload White Paper, and Summary of Feedback. We urge all community members to read all three documents, as they consider the merits of the proposal. In releasing this revised version of the proposal, the Faculty Workload Taskforce wishes to reiterate the following points:

1) The proposal is to reduce *the overall workload*, not simply the teaching load, of Category I faculty and Category II lecturers and senior lecturers. The default annual teaching load of these faculty would be reduced by six credit hours. Expectations for scholarship and service for Category I faculty would not be increased pursuant to this reduction.

2) Component II of the proposal, the Differentiated Workload Model, would allow Category I and Category II lecturers/senior lecturers to make decisions regarding how to apportion their work activities between the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This apportionment would be enacted *within the context of the six credit-hour reduction in the annual teaching load of these faculty*.

3) Deans and Department Chairs would be primarily responsible for enacting the proposal. In general, the Task Force recommends that decision-makers at the local level, in consultation with their faculty, be empowered to implement the provisions of the proposal in ways that best serve the needs of their departments, following best practices of transparent shared governance.

4) The various constituent groups across the university will have the opportunity to vote on the revised proposal. These votes, and the feedback that has been provided to the Task Force, will be forwarded to Provost Tatum in an advisory capacity. The Task Force itself is not a constituent group, and it does not cast a vote on the proposal. However, individual members are free to vote in their respective venues (e.g., Council of Chairs and Directors, Faculty Senate, etc.). Ultimately, decisions regarding the adoption and implementation of these recommendations rest with Provost Tatum, President Davidson, and, if appropriate, the Board of Trustees.

FINAL FACULTY WORKLOAD TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
Metropolitan State University of Denver Faculty Workload Task Force
March 15, 2022

The Faculty Workload Task Force recommends that the University adopt a strategy involving two components in an effort to rebalance faculty workloads. One component focuses on a reduction of the default teaching load for full-time faculty, to be implemented as soon as fiscally possible, to address the longstanding and growing issue of unsustainable faculty workloads. The Task Force white paper focuses on this component of the proposal, as it most directly meets our original charge. A second component involves the development of a differentiated faculty workload model, working from the baseline of the reduced workload.

Component I: Reduction to the default standard teaching load for full-time faculty

In order to make faculty workloads more manageable, the default standard average teaching load for full-time faculty will be reduced by six credits per year. Tenured/tenure-track (Category I) faculty will move from a 24-credit standard annual teaching load to an 18-credit load. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers (Category II faculty¹) will move from a 30-credit standard annual teaching load to a 24-credit load. The purpose of this adjustment is to acknowledge the work that faculty are already doing outside of formal teaching, and to make the size of the overall faculty workload more reasonable. The accompanying document (Faculty Workload Task Force White Paper) provides a discussion of the background, benefits, and considerations related to this proposal to reduce assigned teaching loads. The Task Force was charged with developing a general proposal, not providing a detailed analysis of implementation steps or finances. Nonetheless, the Task Force acknowledges that implementation of this component may require significant financial investment on the part of the University.

Tenured/tenure-track Faculty

- The default teaching load for tenured/tenure-track faculty will be an average of 18 credits per academic year.
- Scholarship and service expectations will not be increased for faculty as result of moving to the new default teaching load.
- All tenured/tenure-track faculty will continue to engage in teaching, scholarly activities, and service.
- As is currently the case, adjustments to the default teaching load may be negotiated on an individual basis. Additionally, current methods of accommodating standard teaching loads that do not add up to exactly 18 credits annually will be retained (i.e., due to teaching 4-credit courses, etc.).

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

- The default teaching load for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers will be an average of 24 credits per academic year.
- Job descriptions and Department Evaluation Guidelines will be modified as needed to reflect the variability in Lecturer and Senior Lecturer assignments with respect to service and/or scholarship expectations.

¹ The Task Force recognizes that there are many different types of Category II faculty identified in the Faculty Employment Handbook, including Lecturers/Senior Lecturers, Visiting Faculty, FRIP Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, Research Faculty, and Professional/Artist/Executive in Residence. Of these types, only Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are specified as having a 5/5 teaching load. The other categories of Category II faculty have a teaching load less than 5/5. For this reason, the Task Force has opted to apply these recommendations only to Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

- As is currently the case, adjustments to the default teaching load may be negotiated on an individual basis. Additionally, current methods of accommodating standard teaching loads that do not add up to exactly 24 credits annually will be retained (i.e., due to teaching 4-credit courses, etc.).

Component II: Development of a Differentiated Workload Model for full-time faculty

Recently, Provost Tatum has articulated a vision of an increased research footprint for MSU Denver as a strategy to elevate the profile of the University and to better serve our students. In the Spring 2021 survey conducted by the Task Force to assess faculty perceptions of a reduced teaching load, many faculty members expressed a desire for the opportunity to engage in scholarship to a greater extent. At the same time, some faculty members expressed a desire to maintain a greater focus on teaching.

In order to best accommodate these diverse goals *within the context of an overall reduction in workload*, the Task Force recommends development of differentiated workload models for full-time faculty. A differentiated model provides options for adjustments from the revised standard average teaching loads described in Component I above. Departments would develop workload models specific to their disciplines and programs (including graduate programs), whereby department guidelines are revised following the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook (section II, D.). The accompanying white paper contains example differentiated models for Category I and Category II faculty.

General Considerations

- The Task Force recommends that Category I and Category II faculty employed at the time of implementation be provided with the opportunity to opt out of the new workload model. These faculty would continue to be evaluated according to existing Handbook and Department Evaluation Guideline language. Any incoming faculty employed after implementation would be brought in under the new Handbook and Department Evaluation Guideline language.
- The Task Force recommends that the University begin implementation of these changes to the workload model in spring 2023. However, while the initial steps will begin in spring 2023, we recognize that complete implementation of the proposal may require multiple years. The Task Force encourages the University to clearly and transparently commit to full implementation of these proposals regardless of how much time it will take.
- The two components of this proposal (reduced teaching load and differentiated workload) could be implemented sequentially (reduced teaching load first, and then differentiated workload) or simultaneously depending on the specific circumstances within the College/School. Deans will determine which implementation strategy is most appropriate for their academic unit, in collaboration with Chairs and faculty.
- The Task Force acknowledges that a differentiated workload model will require major revisions of the Faculty Employment Handbook and the Department Evaluation Guidelines, as well as the development of policies and procedures regulating how and when faculty select their pathway. The Deans, Council of Chairs and Directors (in collaboration with department faculty), the Office of Faculty Affairs, and Faculty Senate will collaborate on the development of these new controlling documents. The Task Force emphasizes that all revisions and new developments should follow best practices of meaningful shared governance, inclusivity, and transparency.
- Implementation will not alter the university's commitment to its CHP targets, i.e., that full time faculty provide 60% of overall CHP, with 40% provided by part time faculty. Similarly, the Task Force is not

suggesting changes to current Faculty Employment Handbook (section III.B) recommendations for full-time faculty deployment (i.e., a minimum of 80% Category I faculty, and a maximum of 20% Category II faculty). The Task Force recognizes that tenure-line faculty are central to achieving the mission of the University. We recommend that the University retains the commitment to hiring and supporting tenure-line faculty. Other instructional requirements related to program accreditation will also be maintained.

- Salaries for full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty will not be affected by the change in average teaching load. Salaries for faculty serving in positions of less than 1.0 FTE will be adjusted as appropriate.

Likely Implications

The Task Force recognizes that implementation of these recommendations will occur in a broader university context that includes separate (but related) discussions on issues that could impact faculty workloads.

Therefore, we provide the following auxiliary recommendations:

1. In implementing this proposal, it is likely that Deans, working with their Department Chairs, will conduct an internal analysis of current curriculum and course rotations to identify opportunities to maximize efficiencies.
 - The Task Force recognizes that implementation of a reduced teaching load and a differentiated workload may impact average class sizes. As such, any changes to average class sizes must consider and protect the pedagogical integrity of the curriculum.
 - The Task Force recommends that any potential impacts to staff and administrators be accounted for as implementation plans are developed.
2. It is also likely that Deans, working with their Department Chairs, will review current reassigned time practices to ensure necessity, consistency and transparency of reassigned time allocations.
 - The Task Force recommends that any changes to reassigned time do not undermine the support needed for the growth of our academic programs, that such changes promote balanced faculty workloads, and that any changes are in line with Departmental needs.
3. As part of separate, ongoing discussions, Deans, working with their Department Chairs, may be reviewing current department scholarship guidelines to determine if they are at an appropriate level. This is already occurring in some Schools/Colleges.
 - The Task Force strongly cautions against increasing scholarship requirements for tenured/tenure-track faculty as result of moving to the new default teaching load. This component of the proposal aims to reduce faculty workload, not shift it.
 - The Task Force recommends that any Department Guidelines already undergoing revision as part of normal updates -- based on current workload expectations -- may be modified as deemed appropriate by the Department.
 - The differentiated workload models developed by departments (i.e., component II of this proposal) may include a high scholarship option and associated reduced expectations in other workload areas.
4. Workload equity is an important issue not directly addressed in the two components of this proposal. Thus, in the development of the differentiated workload model, it is critical that special attention be given to ways to improve workload equity, as outlined in the Task Force white paper.

FINAL FACULTY WORKLOAD WHITE PAPER
Metropolitan State University of Denver – Faculty Workload Task Force
March 15, 2022

BACKGROUND

The MSU Denver faculty constitute a talented, skilled, and versatile workforce. Although formal teaching is their most visible activity, faculty are engaged in a diverse array of activities that support the university mission. These activities include formal undergraduate and graduate teaching, informal teaching (i.e., advising, mentoring, and other types individualized work with students), scholarship, and service. This work directly enhances student learning, academic success, recruitment, and retention and has been essential to the growth of MSU Denver from a college to a university.

In fall 2020, President Davidson, responding to feedback from faculty, instructed Interim Provost Bill Henry to engage with Faculty Senate to explore concerns about faculty workload. Interim Provost Henry charged a committee (the Faculty Workload Task Force), co-led by Gabrielle Katz, Chair of the Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee, with examining these issues and generating recommendations for establishing a more sustainable workload model. Early on, the Task Force decided unanimously to include both tenured/tenure track and Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the workload proposal. Following his arrival in March 2021, Provost Alfred Tatum indicated his support for this initiative and challenged the Task Force to provide recommendations for a reduced teaching load and to identify potential benefits and barriers to implementation of such a plan. Further, Provost Tatum clarified that the Task Force should develop a general proposal, and did not need to provide a detailed analysis of implementation steps or finances. Current student enrollment declines may present a window of opportunity to implement this proposal at a reduced cost, at least in the near term.

In spring 2021, the Task Force gathered internal workload data, explored workload models, and conducted a survey of all full-time MSU Denver faculty in order to gauge support for a reduced teaching load. The anonymous survey was distributed to all 585 full-time faculty, and received a total of 410 responses (341 tenured/tenure track, 66 Lecturers/Senior Lecturers, 3 Other) for a response rate of 70.1%. Overall, 83.5% of survey respondents were supportive of reducing the tenured/tenure track teaching load by 6 credits per year, and 63.5% were supportive of reducing the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer teaching load by the same amount. Selected survey results are included in this report, and a complete summary of the results is available from the Task Force. In fall 2021, the Task Force released our draft recommendations (presented in a separate document) and white paper. The Task Force gathered feedback on the draft documents between November 2021 and March 2022. Now, the Task Force is releasing our final set of documents: Final Faculty Workload Recommendations, Final Summary of Feedback, and this Final Faculty Workload White Paper. The purpose of this white paper is to discuss benefits, concerns, and implementation considerations related to the recommendations. This document focuses on Component I of the Task Force recommendations.

Faculty Workload Task Force members:

Gabrielle Katz (EAS, current)

Bill Henry (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, current)

Yunkyung Cho (Management, AY 2021)

Grant Denn (Physics, Spring 22)

Bethany Fleck-Dillen (Psychological Sciences, AY 2022)

Krista Griffin (Elementary Education and Literacy, current)

Christian E. Hardigree (Dean, School of Hospitality; current)

Deborah Horan (Chair, Elementary Education and Literacy; AY 2021, and Fall 2021)

Amie Kaufenberg (School of Education, AY 2021 and Fall 2021)

Tony Lopez (Accounting, AY 2022)

Kat Martinez (Chair, GITA; AY 2021)

Jill Mollenhauer (Art, current)

Erin Murray (Nutrition, AY 2021)

Jessica Ritter (Social Work, AY 2021)

Bob Schatz (Psychological Sciences, current)

Mandi Schaeffer Fry (Math and Statistics, AY 2022)

Kelsey Smith (Business Intelligence, current)

Maggie Thulson (Assistant to the Vice Provost, AY 2021)

Jacob Welch (Chair, Department of Theatre and Dance, AY 2022)

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The Faculty Workload Task Force recommends a two-fold approach to rebalancing faculty workloads. Together, these two components address the primary objectives of the Task Force: To promote a strategy that 1) will reduce the overall workload for faculty; and 2) will provide greater flexibility in how faculty allocate time to teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendations are presented in a separate document (Faculty Workload Recommendations).

The first component of the proposal focuses on a reduction to the standard teaching load, to be implemented as soon as fiscally possible, to address the longstanding and growing issue of unsustainable faculty workloads: The default standard average teaching load for all full-time faculty will be reduced by six credits per year.

Tenured/tenure track faculty will move from a 24-credit standard annual teaching load to an 18-credit load, with no additional requirements added for scholarship or service. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers will move from a 30-credit standard annual teaching load to a 24-credit load. The purpose of this adjustment is to acknowledge the work that faculty are already doing outside of formal teaching, and to make overall faculty workloads more reasonable. Deans, working with their Department Chairs, will begin implementing these recommendations as soon as possible, with support from the Provost. This white paper focuses on the proposed reduction in teaching load, since it is most directly related to our original charge.

The second component of the proposal entails the development of a differentiated faculty workload model, working from the baseline of the reduced workload described above. The differentiated model could follow the general examples outlined below, although precise implementation in a given department should be decided by the department faculty, in consultation with the appropriate chairs and deans. This will allow for development of equitable models that account for disciplinary and program level differences and needs (e.g., graduate programs, accredited programs, disciplines with substantial studio or practicum teaching, etc.).

For example, for tenured/tenure-track faculty, one possibility would be to consider a model with three workload options:

1. Teaching-centered: This option would allow tenure-line faculty to carry more than an 18-credit teaching load with scholarship and service requirements reduced relative to current expectations. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 70-80% teaching, with the remaining 20-30% of the workload distributed between scholarship and service.

2. **Balanced:** This option would allow tenure-line faculty to carry an 18-credit teaching load with current scholarship and service requirements. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 60% teaching, with the remaining 40% of the workload distributed between scholarship and service.
3. **Scholarship- and/or service-centered:** This option would allow tenure-line faculty to carry less than an 18-credit teaching load with scholarship and/or service requirements increased relative to current expectations. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 40-50% teaching, with the remaining 50-60% of the workload distributed between scholarship and service.

For lecturers/senior lecturers, one possibility would be to consider the corresponding model:

1. **Teaching-centered:** This option would allow lecturers/senior lecturers to carry more than a 24-credit teaching load with minimal or no scholarship and service requirements. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 90-100% teaching, with the remaining 0-10% of the workload distributed between scholarship and/or service.
2. **Balanced:** This option would allow lecturers/senior lecturers to carry a 24-credit teaching load with some scholarship and service requirements. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 80% teaching, with the remaining 20% of the workload distributed between scholarship and/or service.
3. **Scholarship- and/or service-centered:** This option would allow lecturers/senior lecturers to carry less than a 24-credit teaching load with scholarship and/or service requirements increased relative to the balanced option. This model would reflect a workload distribution of 60-70% teaching, with the remaining 30-40% of the workload distributed between scholarship and/or service.

BENEFITS OF REDUCED TEACHING LOADS

A review of published scholarship on faculty workload, as well as an analysis of MSU Denver faculty responses to the survey administered in spring 2021, suggest that the benefits to the University of a reduced teaching load will fall into three broad categories: (1) improved student recruitment and retention; (2) improved faculty recruitment and retention, including greater opportunities to hire diverse candidates; and (3) increased opportunities for community engagement. Below we discuss each of these benefits in greater detail. Engaging in these activities would be implemented in ways that would not increase the overall workload for faculty.

Student Recruitment and Retention

An essential over-arching benefit of this faculty workload adjustment will be to enhance the student educational experience at MSU Denver. Specifically, it will allow faculty to better engage in high quality teaching and student mentoring, both inside the classroom (i.e., in “formal” learning environments) and outside the classroom (i.e., in more “informal” learning interactions). This has the potential to increase student recruitment and retention, as high-quality student-faculty contact has been shown to improve student outcomes in many higher education settings (Kuh et al. 2006).

First, a reduced teaching load (and therefore a more reasonable workload overall) will enable faculty to invest more sustainably in the quality of their formally assigned teaching. High quality classroom experiences are critical to student success, including retention. Indeed, Gyurko et al. (2018) argue that teaching quality is the fundamental determinant of student success in higher education, including development of key intellectual skills, as well as persistence and graduation. Although MSU Denver faculty are already committed to teaching excellence, the reduced teaching load will allow sufficient time to attend to myriad aspects of excellent teaching (e.g., curriculum development, class material preparation and revision, designing/employing active and

collaborative learning activities, providing timely and frequent student feedback, etc.) within a reasonable work week, given other workload responsibilities.

The potential for a reduced teaching load to provide faculty the space needed to engage more deeply with these aspects of teaching is reflected in responses to the survey of faculty conducted by the Task Force in spring 2021. When asked to select among a list of potential benefits of a reduced teaching load, 83.7% of faculty respondents identified “enhanced teaching (e.g., updated pedagogy and curriculum, more timely or thorough student assessments, etc.)” as a benefit. Indeed, this benefit was the most frequently endorsed by survey respondents overall. Among tenured/tenure track faculty, 82% (281/341) of respondents endorsed enhanced teaching as a potential benefit; among Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, 92% (61/66) of respondents reported this as a potential benefit.

Second, a reduced teaching load will enable faculty to more sustainably invest time and energy in student interactions outside of the classroom. Purposeful, high quality informal student-faculty interactions (e.g., research mentoring, serving together on committees, social interactions at campus activities, career advising, etc.) are known to improve student success, including retention and graduation (Kuh et al. 2006).

An extensive body of literature demonstrates that advising and mentoring are two of the most effective means of increasing student retention (e.g., Braxton & Mundy, 2001; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Swecker, Fifolt, & Searby, 2013). Advising is effective in part because it involves one-on-one interaction and engagement with students (Tinto, 1987; Hanover Research, 2014). When faculty engage in these kinds of interactions, they bring considerable expertise, perspective and professional resources that can complement the work of staff advisors and career counselors (Burt, et al. 2013; Ayoubi 2017; Lynch & Lungrin, 2018). Additionally, mentoring students in undergraduate research enhances student success and increases retention rates, especially among first-generation, low-income students (Ishiyama, 2001). The proposed teaching load adjustment will better allow faculty to engage with students through participation in undergraduate research, if it aligns with their professional pursuits.

Overall, the policy also will give interested faculty more time to participate in High Impact Practices that have been shown to improve student retention and learning (Kuh, 2008). These include developing internship opportunities, guiding and advising internships, increasing service-learning involvement, providing capstone experiences, and serving as faculty advisors to student organizations. For example, in a study of 110 undergraduate psychology programs student satisfaction and success were significantly related to the degree of student-faculty interaction outside of the classroom, including via academic advising, research supervision, and attending student events (Stoloff, Curtis, Rodgers, Brewster & McCarthy, 2012). When trust, rapport and respect are established between faculty and students, students are more likely to persist through their college studies to graduation (Lynch & Lungrin, 2018). Such practices entail considerable time and effort on the part of faculty (NSSE, 2007). These potential benefits were recognized by the respondents to the faculty survey. Eighty-one percent of faculty respondents reported that “improved faculty-student interactions, including advising and mentoring” would result from a reduced teaching load, and 71% identified “improved informal learning experiences resulting from faculty having more time to dedicate to one-on-one student interactions” as a potential benefit.

Finally, the new policy also will give faculty more time to participate in activities that have been shown to increase student enrollment, such as recruiting high school students and students at two-year colleges (Morreale, 2009; Zink, 1997). In addition, a study of “exemplary” graduate programs in psychology showed that

personal contact with minority faculty is an important strategy in recruiting students of color (Rogers & Molina, 2006).

Faculty Recruitment and Retention

In addition to improving the student educational experience at MSU Denver, this workload adjustment will improve the faculty experience in a variety of ways. In survey comments, both tenured/tenure track and Category II faculty noted that a reduced teaching load would result in increased morale and improved physical and mental wellbeing. Additionally, respondents suggested that this workload adjustment would improve the University's ability to recruit and retain faculty. Indeed, several research studies have demonstrated that workload satisfaction is a key factor in faculty retention (O'Meara et al. 2021). Improved employee wellness, recruitment, and retention align with Pillar V of the University's Strategic Plan. One of the goals associated with Pillar V "Organizational Agility and Sustainability" is for MSU Denver to "be Colorado's most desired place of employment." Beyond improving faculty morale, wellbeing, and job satisfaction, a reduced teaching load also supports the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty. This outcome aligns with Pillar IV of the University's Strategic Plan "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" which calls on MSU Denver to attract and retain a "diverse faculty and staff, while investing in DEI service, scholarship and practice."

A reduced teaching load – and better tracking of workload overall (see 'Implications' section below) – has the potential to improve faculty workload equity. A considerable body of research documents that university faculty workloads are often inequitable. Faculty from historically minoritized groups do more labor related to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) and mentoring of minoritized students than faculty who are white; female faculty tend to do more teaching and service, and less research than male faculty; female faculty are asked more often than male colleagues to do work that is less valued for career advancement or promotion (O'Meara et al. 2021). While we do not have comparable workload data for MSU Denver faculty, re-balancing faculty workloads will benefit all faculty who engage in substantial labor that is not adequately tracked and/or properly rewarded under our current system and may especially improve workloads for faculty from minoritized groups and female faculty.

One additional benefit that may result from a reduced teaching load is the increased flexibility faculty will have to engage in more scholarship. Seventy-nine percent of survey respondents (both tenured/tenure-track faculty and Lecturers and Senior Lecturers) cited "additional opportunities for faculty professional growth" as a potential benefit for a reduced teaching load. In survey comments, faculty of both categories mentioned that a reduced teaching load would provide opportunities for increased engagement in scholarship. Faculty citing this benefit regularly noted that increased engagement in scholarship may result in improved morale and greater overall job satisfaction. To be clear, the Task Force does not recommend increasing expectations related to scholarship (or to service) for tenured/tenure track faculty as part of this proposal.

Community Engagement

This faculty workload adjustment has the potential to enhance the role and reach of MSU Denver in the Denver Metropolitan Area community by enabling faculty to more sustainably engage in outreach, community-based research, service-learning, consulting, and other kinds of community partnerships and activities. This outcome aligns with Pillar I "Student Access, Service, and Achievement" of the University's Strategic Plan, which states that "all students will have the opportunity to research, work and serve in the broader community, through robust service-learning, internships and undergraduate research programs." Further, Pillar III "Civic and Economic Catalyst" of the University's Strategic Plan highlights MSU Denver's role as an anchor institution,

leveraging faculty expertise and programming excellence. This benefit was recognized in the faculty survey. Sixty-four percent of faculty respondents reported that “better ability for faculty to contribute to university strategic initiatives” would result from a reduced teaching load. In the survey comments, tenured/tenure track faculty specifically noted that a reduced teaching load would enhance opportunities for faculty to engage with the community. For example, one tenured/tenure track faculty member wrote that the proposal would allow:

more time devoted to enhancing community participation and partnerships like speaking engagements, boards and commissions, policy work, [and] civic engagement.

Another wrote,

The community partnerships [are] a big factor in what I do, personally, and it would give me more time to engage the community and various community organizations.

IMPLICATIONS OF REDUCED TEACHING LOADS

Fiscal Implications

This teaching load reduction may have near-term and long-term financial costs for the University. There are several financial considerations that may come into play, including the following:

- A reduced standard teaching load for full-time faculty (without simply redistributing the same number of students to fewer sections, see below) will result in reduced per capita CHP production, and therefore reduced per capita tuition generation.
- Assuming future student enrollment creates sufficient demand, additional full-time faculty may need to be hired. Currently, full time faculty generate approximately 57% of MSU Denver CHP, while part time faculty generate 43%. It is not the intent of this proposal to alter those proportions, which may necessitate the strategic hiring of additional full-time faculty. There will be a long-term cost associated with these faculty salaries.
- Additional staff and/or administrators may also need to be hired in some areas, in order to support faculty hiring and the potential for selected increases in the volume of certain faculty activities, such as travel, grant productivity, etc.
- The Task Force recognizes that hiring of additional faculty and staff may require significant time. As such, the Task Force encourages the University to publicly commit to a multi-year implementation plan that will allow the institution to achieve these goals in full over a number of years.

These issues were recognized by some respondents to the faculty survey, with about half of the respondents indicating concerns about potential financial implications. Forty-seven percent of respondents indicated that “potential cost to the university” was a concern, and 50% were concerned about “potential financial impacts to other budget items (e.g., impacts to salaries)”.

On the other hand, the financial impact of the teaching load reduction can be offset and mitigated by a variety of conditions, strategies, and outcomes. Mechanisms to decrease the cost of this proposal include the following:

- Current and projected student enrollment declines may enable full or partial implementation of this proposal without hiring new faculty, at least in the near term. This would greatly reduce the costs of the proposal.
- There are a number of ways to reduce teaching loads without hiring new faculty, mainly by improving efficiencies in course rotation schedules and other aspects of curriculum (Wardell & Yarish 2008). This

could include eliminating certain specialized, elective classes, offering certain classes less frequently, designing new courses that can replace multiple existing classes, employing interdisciplinary courses to fulfill requirements, etc.

- There will be savings associated with improved faculty job satisfaction and retention; this reduces current costs associated with faculty turnover.
- Over the long term, this teaching load adjustment is likely to augment University revenues. It is estimated that 1% increases in student retention and enrollment each generate approximately \$1 million in additional annual revenue. In addition, the teaching load adjustment will enhance the ability of faculty to engage in research and outside partnerships (per individual interests and goals) which has the potential to improve grant-writing and contract revenues. The teaching load adjustment also will enhance the ability of faculty to engage more sustainably in community outreach and programming (per individual interests and goals) which will elevate the visibility and reputation of the University, thereby bolstering fundraising capacities.

Class Size

Small classes are a hallmark of MSU Denver’s student-centered approach to undergraduate education. Class size emerged as a key issue in the faculty survey; fifty-eight percent (238/410) of respondents indicated that “potential implications for class sizes (e.g., increased minimum or average class sizes)” were a concern. Several faculty comments also addressed this issue. Average class size at MSU Denver is 21 students. It is not the intent of this proposal to simply redistribute the same number of students into fewer sections, thereby reducing the number of sections offered but increasing class sizes by 33% (i.e., by adding 7 students to a typical section). On the other hand, there may be room to increase class sizes by modest amounts in some contexts, where it is pedagogically appropriate. Such “right sizing” of classes could reduce the cost of this proposal, without diminishing MSU Denver’s educational quality.

Faculty Evaluation

Another implication of a change to the regular teaching load for full-time faculty is that job descriptions and faculty evaluation policies and procedures may need to be revised to reflect that change. For example, the following issues should be considered:

- Our current faculty job descriptions typically reference a normal teaching load of 30 credits per year for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and 24 credits per year for tenured/tenure track faculty. Similarly, the Faculty Employment Handbook specifies that the “regular” teaching load for a Lecturers and Senior Lecturers is 30 credit hours per academic year; this language will need to be revised.
- The sections of the Handbook that define excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service may need to be revised. In developing this proposal, members of the Faculty Workload Task Force noted that many aspects of the faculty workload are not adequately reflected in our evaluation criteria and, because of that, are not consistently documented in faculty evaluation portfolios. Language in the Faculty Employment Handbook should accurately describe the various types of work in which faculty engage (e.g., informal teaching). By extension, our evaluation procedures should be designed to reward faculty for these diverse work activities.
- Department Evaluation Guidelines may need to be revised to reflect changes to faculty workload. If such changes occur, procedures should be developed to manage the changing workload for current faculty

who are mid-way through a given evaluation cycle. However, as noted above, expectations related to scholarship and service for tenured/tenure track faculty will not be increased as part of this proposal.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING REDUCED TEACHING LOADS

Flexible Implementation Strategy

The Task Force recommends that the University begin implementation of these changes to the workload model in spring 2023. However, we acknowledge that complete implementation of the proposal will take significant time. Complete implementation will require, at a minimum, revisions to the Faculty Employment Handbook; revisions to Department Evaluation Guidelines; restructuring curriculum as needed; and hiring of a significant number of new faculty and staff. These changes may require multiple years to fully implement. The Task Force encourages the University to clearly and transparently commit to full implementation of these proposals regardless of how much time it will take.

Within many academic units, some version of a modified teaching load is already being implemented through the use of reassigned time allocations. The two components of the proposal (the reduced teaching load and differentiated workloads) could be implemented either sequentially or simultaneously. However, in order to accrue maximum benefit for students and faculty, these workload recommendations should be implemented as soon as possible. Equally important, implementation of the differentiated workload model must maintain the commitment to an overall reduction in faculty workload, i.e., the goal is to reduce the workload overall, not simply to replace one type of work with another type of work.

In order to adopt a new workload model, any changes to department guidelines will need to be in place by the implementation date. To ease the transition, implementation could entail a phased approach. For example, we could move to a 21-credit annual teaching load for tenured/tenure track faculty and a 27-credit annual teaching load for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers for the spring 2023 semester, and then undertake full implementation over the next several years. The need for a phased approach, however, will depend on enrollment. MSU Denver is currently experiencing enrollment declines, which present an opportunity to implement these recommendations with little cost or scheduling impact. With lower demand for seats and sections, it should be possible to reduce the teaching loads of many full-time faculty without compromising course offerings or necessitating the hiring of additional instructors. This could allow for a low-cost implementation of the teaching load reduction over the short term, with targeted hiring of additional faculty in the future if/when enrollments recover.

Internal Analysis

Deans, working in consultation with Department Chairs, will need to review curricular offerings to look for opportunities to maximize efficiency. For example, a review of curriculum may lead to a change in the frequency with which certain specialized, elective classes are offered or may result in a reduction in the number of sections of a particular course being offered per semester. Additionally, a careful analysis of current faculty teaching loads will be needed to ensure that teaching assignments make the best use of faculty time. This analysis may examine factors such as FTES or CHP at the individual faculty level. Finally, course offerings should be evaluated to determine if and where class sizes could be appropriately increased. Class size adjustments could offset some of the costs of this proposal, if carried out carefully and only where pedagogically appropriate. The advantages and drawbacks of larger class sizes vary depending on context (e.g., class level, pedagogical approach, lecture/lab/studio format, etc.). Within this context, class size adjustments should be implemented in ways that would not exacerbate existing disparities in class size between departments with higher and lower enrollments.

Therefore, a blanket policy may not be appropriate. However, class sizes should be re-considered on a case-by-case basis. After a careful review of Department curriculum and enrollment, Deans and Chairs will be positioned to identify the staffing needs that would be required to support the reduced teaching loads.

Under our current system, reassigned time is used across units to allow faculty to allocate additional effort to duties outside of formal teaching. These duties vary widely across the university, but examples include substantial service commitments (e.g., chairing certain Faculty Senate committees), program directorships, faculty fellow positions (e.g., DEI faculty fellow in College of Business), and substantial department level roles (e.g., technical director of theatre productions). Colleges/Schools will continue to use reassigned time as appropriate to support the growth of our academic programs, promote balanced faculty workloads, and meet Departmental needs. The Task Force recommends that Colleges/Schools review current reassigned time practices to ensure consistency, necessity, and transparency of reassigned time allocations. The Task Force recognizes that Deans and Department Chairs must play a central role in the allocation of reassigned time.

As part of the implementation of this proposal, Deans and Chairs should look for other opportunities to improve faculty workload efficiency and equitability. For example, additional modifications to overall faculty workload may result from streamlining committees. The Task Force recommends a careful review of Department-, College-, and University-level committee structures, including an examination of the overall number of extant committees, the number of members assigned to each committee, and the committee members' roles. Indeed, O'Meara et al. (2021) provide resources for conducting a "service audit" within units, as well as for restructuring and reducing committees to improve efficiency, accountability, and equity.

Additionally, potential impacts to staff and administrators must be accounted for as implementation plans are developed. Both staff and administrator workloads at MSU Denver are already high, and implementation of this proposal should not increase those workloads further or to unsustainable levels. Even if new faculty are not hired, shifts in faculty effort could result in increased needs for staff support. Similarly, there might be additional work for administrators in supporting, tracking and evaluating faculty activities. Thus, to encourage efficiency of processes and budget, potential impacts to staff and administrator workloads should be analyzed and accounted for as this proposal is implemented.

Revisions to Handbook Language and Evaluation Guidelines

As described in the "Faculty Evaluation" section above, adoption of a reduced teaching load may have implications for our faculty evaluation policies and procedures as delineated in the Faculty Employment Handbook and Department Evaluation Guidelines. One issue that will require careful consideration is the timing of any revisions to these documents relative to the implementation of a reduced teaching load -- i.e., should the revisions to the Handbook and Guidelines be made prior to the introduction of the reduced teaching load or could the changes to teaching load be made before the revisions of the Handbook and Guidelines?

There are currently two other Task Forces working on issues that are somewhat related to the work being done by the Faculty Workload Task Force. The Teaching Evaluation Task Force and the Faculty Diversity Task Force are both exploring topics that may result in changes to the Handbook and Department Guidelines. The Faculty Workload Task Force recommends that members of the three groups coordinate their efforts to revise these documents to ensure consistency and clarity in the resulting products.

Workload Equity and Transparency

A key finding of the Faculty Workload Task Force was that a substantial amount of faculty work is not adequately tracked under our current framework. This “invisible labor” is important and valuable to the university, and thus should be accommodated in faculty workloads and rewarded. For example, student mentoring and advising can be critical factors in student success, but currently we do not have consistent mechanisms for reporting and rewarding this kind of work. Our existing use of Digital Measures (now Watermark Faculty Success) lays a solid foundation for this effort, but additional training or development of “best practices” may be required in order to ensure success. Further, better workload data could inform assessment of the impacts of this workload adjustment (e.g., in terms of scholarship, outreach, student retention, etc.).

Informal teaching is a specific area of faculty workload that is in need of better definition and visibility. The Task Force recommends that the definition of teaching be clarified to include formal teaching (i.e., assigned organized courses) and informal teaching (i.e., academic and career advising, mentoring, supervision of undergraduate research, and other individualized work with students outside of the formally assigned course load). While formal teaching is relatively straightforward to quantify and track, methods of tracking and rewarding informal teaching should be improved.

Better tracking of faculty work would also support faculty workload equity. This is important because faculty workloads are often inequitable, with female faculty and faculty from historically minoritized groups often engaging in more “invisible” or unrewarded work compared to their male or white colleagues (O’Meara et al. 2021). It also is important that adjustments to faculty workload be implemented equitably between departments. O’Meara et al. (2021) highlight six conditions that promote faculty workload equity -- Transparency, Clarity, Credit, Norms, Context, and Accountability -- all of which rely on accurate tracking of faculty workloads. Transparency entails sharing information about the range of faculty effort in various workload areas (e.g., teaching, service, student mentoring, etc.), thereby enhancing trust, accountability and a shared sense of justice. Clarity entails clear articulation of workload expectations or benchmarks, in all areas of evaluation. Together, transparency (accounting for what faculty are doing) and clarity (articulating what faculty should be doing) lay the foundation for credit, whereby faculty are rewarded for their effort in various workload areas. Norms involve developing fair workloads, e.g., by rotating certain service or teaching duties. Context acknowledges that faculty have different strengths and interests, and allows for workload flexibility to account for those differences (see “Workload Equivalencies” below). Accountability entails ensuring that faculty fulfill their workload obligations and are properly rewarded for their work.

The Task Force is aware that our current faculty evaluation systems essentially employ a pass/fail rubric to assess faculty performance. It may be beneficial to investigate more nuanced evaluation models, that could differentially recognize and reward varying levels of faculty effort and achievement. For example, the university could consider a three-tiered rating system for the evaluation of faculty. Rather than relying on the current rating system of “Needs Improvement” and “Meets Standards,” a rating system of “Needs Improvement,” “Meets Standards,” and “Exceeds Standards” would allow for better delineating levels of performance. Such a rating system would more clearly articulate to faculty where their performance falls with respect to expectations, and could allow for the possible future implementation of a system of merit adjustments to base salary.

Workload Equivalencies (Teaching)

The Faculty Workload Task Force recognizes that not all teaching activities are the same. The time and energy required to teach a course will vary as a function of many factors, including, but not limited to:

- The type of course (e.g., lecture vs. Laboratory, contact hours per credit hour, etc.);
- The level of the course (e.g., undergraduate 1000-level vs. 4000-level, graduate level);
- The intensity of interaction between faculty and student (e.g., seminar course vs. survey course); and
- Class size.

In implementing a reduced teaching load, the Faculty Workload Task Force recommends that we carefully consider whether different “weights” should be assigned to the different types of courses a faculty member teaches. For example, a faculty member teaching a large section could be given additional “workload credit” toward their required teaching load. The development of a procedure for assigning differential weights or credits for different types of teaching experiences would also allow for a more nuanced assessment of faculty who teach primarily in graduate programs. Graduate-level coursework typically entails a greater degree of engagement between faculty and students. It may be appropriate to further reduce the teaching load of faculty extensively engaged in these high-intensity courses. Faculty would not be required to reallocate their present work activities; instead, faculty would be given more opportunity to do so.

Workload Models and Credit Systems

The Task Force carefully considered proposing a differentiated workload model only, but ultimately decided that the most straightforward way to reduce faculty workloads was to propose a unimodal workload reduction for each faculty category (i.e., 18-credit standard annual teaching load for tenured/tenure track faculty, and 24 credits for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers), as the first component of the workload adjustment, to be implemented as soon as possible. However, the second component of our proposed workload adjustment entails development and implementation of a differentiated workload model. Broadly speaking, a differentiated model would include a selection of pre-set workload allocation options with teaching, scholarship and service adjusted accordingly, e.g., a teaching-focused option, a balanced option, and scholarship-focused option. Benefits of a differentiated model could include improved clarity in workload expectations, and explicit evaluation guidelines for each workload option. Furthermore, this model would allow some faculty (per individual interests) to devote more effort to scholarship, thereby addressing Provost Tatum’s interest in elevating the scholarship profile of MSU Denver. Moving to a differentiated workload model may require a longer-term planning and implementation process, with many details to be worked out. For example, there are important questions related to the level of flexibility in workload options, e.g., would workloads be adjusted annually? Would the options be available to both tenured/tenure track faculty and Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, and to all faculty ranks (e.g., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor)?

In conjunction with implementation of a reduced teaching load and/or future differentiated workloads, the Task Force recommends that some academic units may want to consider a workload credit system that would allow faculty and departments to better track, balance, and reward faculty workloads. A workload credit model could encompass all aspects of the faculty member's responsibilities, including teaching, scholarship, and service. As mentioned above, differentially crediting faculty for higher or lower workload effort is a key element of workload equity (O’Meara et al. 2021). Thus, a workload credit system could be created to account for differential effort in various workload areas, such as overload teaching, advising, research mentoring, etc. One way to do this would be to develop a more consistent method for “banking credits” whereby faculty who do more work in one area could do less in another area. This would be particularly beneficial in improving tracking and reward for credits earned by teaching overloads such as independent studies, thesis supervision, etc. A workload credit system also could allow faculty to devote more time to service roles, such as chairing committees, serving on search committees, etc. (e.g., see O’Meara et al. 2021, Equity-Minded Faculty

Workloads Worksheet Booklet). Faculty members also could be given the opportunity to earn workload credits by engaging in more intensive one-on-one student advising/mentoring, high impact practices, and/or recruitment efforts.

Office Hours and Advising

In conjunction with a change to the regular teaching load and/or with development of future differentiated workloads, the Task Force encourages reconsideration and clarification of faculty office hours. Historically, office hours have had two separate functions: (1) Supporting students enrolled in a faculty member's courses, e.g., answering course-related questions, clarifying course content, etc.; (2) Advising students on broader academic and career-related questions. The fact that office hours have multiple functions makes it difficult to evaluate this aspect of a faculty member's performance. Does maintaining a set number of office hours per week fulfill a faculty member's advising responsibilities? Is there a better way of assessing a faculty member's advising activities beyond a simple reference to the number of office hours held? Should faculty who do professional advising on top of their class-related office hours receive some type of workload credit for that?

The Task Force recommends that faculty workloads explicitly differentiate between office hours used to support students with course-related issues versus time used to provide students with broader academic and career advising. There is substantial variability in the faculty advising commitment across campus, depending on department needs and faculty interests. Some departments require faculty to serve as professional advisors, where they help students plan classes, create Program plans for students, submit Degree Exceptions, review transfer courses, record advising notes in Navigate, and fill out applications for internships and student teaching, for example, on top of supporting the students in their classes. Others do not have this additional advising responsibility. The Task Force suggests that all faculty workloads should explicitly include a minimum number of office hours as part of formally assigned teaching, with the option of including additional office hours for advising as part of 'informal teaching', per faculty interests and department needs. In addition, processes for evaluating faculty advising activities should be developed to allow for better reward of these important efforts.

Affiliate Faculty

The Task Force suggests that impacts to Affiliate Faculty (i.e., part-time faculty) be considered as these recommendations are implemented. Part-time faculty serve an essential role at MSU Denver, providing approximately 40% of credit hour production and constituting 50-60% of faculty headcount. Part-time faculty are a critical component of the overall faculty workforce, but it is beyond the scope of this proposal to address part-time faculty workload issues or other concerns. However, possible benefits to Affiliate Faculty from this proposal include increased teaching opportunities for current Affiliates, re-hiring of Affiliate Faculty lost due to recent enrollment declines, and the potential for Affiliates to apply for newly created full time faculty positions.

REFERENCES

- Ayoubi, A. (2017). *The tremendous benefits of connecting academic and career advising*. The Career Leadership Collective, Fort Collins, Co. Retrieved from <https://www.careerleadershipcollective.com/single-post/2017/01/06/The-Tremendous-Benefits-of-connecting-Academic-and-Career-Advising>.
- Braxton, J. M. (2001). Powerful institutional levers to reduce college student departure. *Journal of College Student Retention*. 3(1), 91-118.
- Burt, T. D., Young-Jones, A. D., Yadon, C. A., & Carr, M. T. (2013). The advisor and instructor as a dynamic duo: Academic motivation and basic psychological needs. *NACADA Journal*, 33(2), 44– 54.

Crisp G. & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 525-545.

Dennison, G. (2012). Faculty workload: An analytic approach. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(4) 297-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-011-9211-y>

Faculty Workload Task Force. "Spring 2021 Faculty Feedback Survey: Adjusted Workload". Survey. 28 April 2021. Available upon request.

Gyrko, J., MacCormack, P., Bless, M. M., & Jodl, J. (2018). Why Colleges and Universities Need to Invest in Quality Teaching More Than Ever: Faculty Development, Evidence-Based Teaching Practices, and Student Success. Association of College and University Educators. <https://acue.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/ACUE-White-Paper1.pdf>

Hanover Research (2014). *Strategies for improving student retention*. <https://www.hanoverresearch.com/media/Strategies-for-Improving-Student-Retention.pdf>

Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser, W.E., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1994). Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(2), 164-174.

Ishiyama, J. (2001). *Undergraduate research and the success of first-generation, low-income college students*. Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly. Retrieved from www.cur.org

Johnsrud, L. K. & Rosser, V. R. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education* 73(4), 518-542.

Kuh, G.D., Kinzie J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.A., & Hayek, J.C. (2006). What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature. https://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/kuh_team_report.pdf

Kuh, G.D. 2008.

Lynch, J., & Lungrin, T. (2018). Integrating academic and career advising toward student success. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2018(184), 69-79. doi:10.1002/he.20304

Morreale, P., Kurkovsky, S., & Chang, G. (2009). Methodology for successful undergraduate recruiting in computer science at comprehensive public universities. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM technical symposium on Computer science education* (pp. 91-95).

O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Misra, D. & Jaeger, A. (2021, January 8th). Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads. What We Can and Should do Now. ACE-ENGAGE Report. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf>

Rogers, M. R., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Exemplary efforts in psychology to recruit and retain graduate students of color. *American Psychologist*, 61(2), 143-156.

Stoloff, M. A., Curtis, N. A., Rodgers, M., Brewster, J., & McCarthy, M. A. (2012). Characteristics of successful undergraduate psychology programs. *Teaching of Psychology*, 39, 91–99. doi:10.1177/0098628312437721.

Swecker H. K., Fiflot M., & Searby, L. (2013). Academic advising and first-generation college students: A quantitative study on student retention. *NACADA Journal*, 33(1), 46-53.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wardell, D. & Yarish, J. (2008). Faculty Workload Reduction Custom Research Brief – March 6, 2008. The Advisory Board Company, Washington, D.C.

https://www.rit.edu/provost/sites/rit.edu.provost/files/docs/faculty_workload_reduction.pdf

Zink, A. G. (1997). Elements of a successful undergraduate student recruiting program. *Wood and fiber science*, 29(2), 142-147.

Summary of Feedback – Faculty Workload Proposal

MSU Denver Faculty Workload Task Force

March 15, 2022

I. Background

The Faculty Workload Task Force released our draft workload recommendations in November 2021 for community feedback. During the ensuing four months we collected feedback in a variety of venues, including the following:

- A Qualtrics “idea catcher” open to anyone from November 19, 2021, to February 11, 2022.
- Two faculty forums hosted by Bethany Fleck Dillen, Faculty Trustee (January 24th and February 1st, 2022).
- One open forum with Provost Tatum (February 7th, 2022).
- Meetings of Task Force representatives with the Graduate Council Leadership (January 13th, 2022), the Metropolitan State Faculty Federation Leadership (January 28th, 2022), Staff Senate (February 8th, 2022), and the Council of Chairs and Directors (February 16th, 2022).
- Informal conversations in our departments, and with colleagues across the university.

The purpose of this document is to synthesize and summarize the feedback we have received. However, it is important to note that this is a qualitative document, which summarizes ideas/themes that do not necessarily constitute a representative picture of overall community sentiment about the proposal. A more definitive measure of community support will come from the upcoming endorsements/votes of various constituent groups (e.g., Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs and Directors, Deans Council, etc.) on the final Task Force recommendations.

II. Key themes: Support

Clearly, many faculty feel that this adjustment is needed, and would provide welcome relief to the excessive workload they are experiencing. This support is shared by some department chairs, and some staff as well. In addition, some Deans have expressed their agreement with the premise of this proposal, namely that faculty are over-worked and that a workload reduction is needed. Individuals expressed enthusiastic support for the proposal in most venues, particularly in the “idea catcher” and in the faculty forums. Perceived benefits of the teaching load reduction largely echoed those outlined in the Task Force White Paper. Specifically, many constituents feel that a more manageable workload will enable faculty in both undergraduate and graduate programs to better carry out their current varied job activities, specifically their ability to teach (both formal and informal teaching). Others mentioned it would allow them to conduct scholarship and service with a higher degree of excellence. The result would be an overall better work-life balance. A new benefit that was identified was the potential for new faculty hiring (necessitated by the teaching load reduction) to result in improved faculty diversity, in alignment with the university strategic plan. These improvements would benefit students via improved learning and engagement, and would benefit the university via improved student and faculty recruitment and retention, and elevated reputation.

III. Key themes: General Concerns

Not all community members support the Task Force recommendations. Others support the recommendations, but with substantial reservations. There were several recurring concerns expressed by various constituents. Of note, based on trends in the “idea catcher” responses, support for the proposal appeared to decrease – and concerns appeared to increase – during the feedback gathering phase. In this section, we summarize general

over-arching concerns about the proposal related to the premise, underlying philosophy and general implementation.

A. Faculty Workload

Some constituents do not agree with the primary premise of this proposal, which is that full-time faculty are currently over-worked. Others do agree that faculty workload is an issue, but do not agree that a reduced teaching load is the solution.

B. Teaching mission

Some constituents do not support the proposal because they feel that it moves MSU Denver away from its primary mission, which is understood to be undergraduate education. This group does not support a teaching load reduction on philosophical grounds, and thus would not support it even if it were enacted exactly as the Task Force has proposed (i.e., even if all implementation concerns are adequately addressed – see below).

Within this general theme, there was a request to offer an “opt out” option to current faculty. That is, it was suggested that current faculty should be allowed to choose to keep their current workload and evaluation guidelines, while allowing others to opt into the new workload. Some individuals who are interested in the “opt out” option raise concerns that they have devoted their career to teaching and might not be able to meet evaluation guidelines that *could* potentially include increases in scholarship (see section IV, B. Scholarship). This option would respect faculty who have devoted their careers to serving the institution as it is currently oriented.

C. Cost

Concerns over cost were expressed in all venues. Community members asked a number of recurring questions related to this theme, such as:

- What is the estimated cost of this workload change (Component I and Component II)?
- How will we pay for this?
- Is this the best use of university funds?
- How will this impact other budget items or priorities, either now or in the future?
- How will this impact faculty salaries?
- Should we focus more on improving faculty salaries?
- What are the implications for cash-funded graduate programs?

Clearly, many community members are aware that this proposal could have a substantial price tag. There are fears related to the dollar figure, and how it might impact other university priorities, as well as faculty salaries. Several individuals requested a cost analysis to be presented prior to the constituent groups voting on the proposal and indicated that without it they cannot make an informed decision.

IV. Key themes: Implementation Concerns

A second set of concerns relates to potential ramifications of proposal implementation. While these issues affect the level of community support (or lack thereof) for the proposed workload changes, they are focused on secondary impacts rather than the premise or approach of the proposed workload adjustment as articulated by the Task Force. If these issues were to be satisfactorily addressed by the Provost and the Deans, some of these concerns would likely be resolved.

A. Class size

Some community members see increased class sizes as an inevitable outcome of the proposed teaching load reductions. While some faculty view modest increases in class size as a fair and reasonable way to reduce the cost of the proposal, others expressed strongly held opposition to any class size increases. There is a fear that increased class sizes will – at best – result in no net workload reduction for faculty. At worst, increased class sizes could increase workloads for some faculty, reduce teaching quality, and result in inequitable workloads across courses or departments (i.e., because some class sizes might be increased more than others).

B. Scholarship

Some constituents see an increase in scholarship expectations as a foregone conclusion of the proposed teaching load reduction. While some faculty would love to devote more effort to scholarship under Component II of the Task Force proposal, all agree that simply trading reduced teaching for more scholarship would not achieve the goal of Component I, which is an overall workload reduction. Thus, if scholarship requirements are increased for faculty who remain on the default teaching load, then implementation of Component I would result in no net workload improvement, or at worst, could even result in more work for faculty. The fears expressed around increased scholarship requirements center on concerns about Provost Tatum's stated desire to elevate the scholarship profile of MSU Denver, as well as external pressures (e.g., accreditation requirements, external review).

C. Workload inequities

Additional concerns focused on perceived existing faculty workload inequities such as:

- Larger class sizes in some departments, disciplines, or sub-disciplines (e.g., lecture courses, surveys).
- Greater teaching effort required for certain kinds of classes (e.g., graduate level, or writing intensive classes) compared to others.
- Differences in scholarship requirements between departments (caused by unavoidable and inherent differences in disciplines, but also caused by evaluation guidelines as currently written).
- More advising or "invisible labor" undertaken by some faculty (e.g., women or BIPOC faculty).

The Task Force proposal does not directly address these existing workload inequities. Further, some community members raised concerns about the potential for the proposal to exacerbate existing inequities, particularly related to class size. That is, there is a fear – working from the assumption class sizes would be increased as a result of the teaching load reduction – that departments or programs that already have large classes would be differentially and unfairly impacted.

D. Logistical issues

There were several questions and concerns raised that touched on other details of proposal implementation, e.g., related to staffing, individual workload allocations, and specific contexts. For example, in some areas it is already difficult to find qualified instructors to teach certain courses, and this challenge would likely be exacerbated if teaching loads are reduced for full time faculty. As another example, in some programs faculty workloads are currently adjusted to account for contact hours rather than credit hours, or teaching loads are already reduced due to pilot programs or accreditation requirements, and there were concerns that implementation of this proposal would undermine those existing practices. Additionally, potential impacts to staff workloads were raised as an area of concern related to proposal implementation.

Finally, there were concerns raised about potential impacts to affiliate faculty, who teach on a part-time basis for the university and serve a critical role in allowing the university to serve its students. Over the past several years, MSU Denver has held a target goal of no less than 60% of credit hour production by full-time faculty, and 40% by part-time faculty. Some community members raised concerns about potential changes to these ratios as a result of the proposal. Others expressed concerns that this workload proposal could unfairly impact part-time faculty by increasing their workloads. On the other hand, it was pointed out that this proposal could result in a net benefit to affiliate faculty, e.g., by creating more work opportunities for those who want them, and by opening up full-time faculty positions for which affiliates could apply.