Workload Policy Report
Faculty Senate Governance Committee
April 22, 2024

Faculty Senate Governance Committee Members

Kathy Kienstra, Co-Chair, Doisy College of Health Sciences

Marie Philipneri, Co-Chair, School of Medicine

Ellen Carnaghan, College of Arts and Sciences

SangNam Ahn, College for Public Health and Social Justice

Bonnie Wilson, Chaifetz School of Business

Jaime Welborn, School of Education

Pat Freed, School of Nursing

Katy Smith, University Libraries

Stephen McMillin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison

Contents

With the submission of this report, the Governance Committee's charge to collect feedback and o er recommendations on SLU's workload policy is ful lled.

1. Context

Faculty Workload Policy Version 1.0 was developed by a Joint Faculty Senate-Provost Task Force, approved by the Faculty Senate, and adopted by Provost Nancy Brickhouse in 2016. Version 2.0 was developed by a task force composed of representatives of the deans, department chairs, faculty, and Provost's office staff, and adopted by Provost Michael Lewis in 2021. The policy applies to all faculty assigned to colleges, schools, centers or libraries governed by a dean or director reporting to the Provost. It does not apply to faculty at the Madrid campus or those faculty currently employed by SSM, or other third parties.

In early 2023, the Faculty Senate received reports of concerns about the policy and its implementation. In contrast, Provost Lewis reported that the policy has been well-received. In response, in October 2023, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Faculty Senate's Governance Committee to collect feedback on the policy and offer recommendations for its improvement.

In response to its charge, in March 2024, the Governance Committee surveyed faculty. The survey was administered using Qualtrics and shared with faculty via email on March 8 using the Faculty Senate's faculty listserve. The survey closed on March 25.

The survey contained 10 multiple choice questions on the university-level policy, six multiple choice questions on unit-level policies, six demographic questions, and four comment boxes. In addition, the survey contained four general multiple choice questions about workload and Provost Lewis' December 2023 announcement that a definition of scholarship production at an R1 level must be established for all units and that only faculty producing at such a level generally will have a 2/2 teaching assignment. By the Provost's estimate about 200 of SLU's faculty currently produce scholarship at an R1 level. As such, the requirement can reasonably be understood to constitute a significant shift in the nature of work for many faculty all else equal.

The survey instrument and aggregate results are included in the appendix to this report, along with a timeline of context and work. In addition to the overall results, members of the Governance Committee have examined results stratified by (1) administrative role-status, (2) unit, (3) gender, and (4) status (non-tenure track, tenure-track, tenured). Comment box remarks were also reviewed. Since some of the comments are detailed enough to hint at the identity of the respondents, comments will not be shared in full. Summaries of representative comments are included in this report.

2. Findings and Associated Recommendations

Assuming nearly equal numbers of responses and respondents, the survey response rate was roughly 39% (30% if we count only fully completed surveys). Over 80% of the responses indicate familiarity with the policy.

While over 60% agree that a workload policy is needed and only 18% disagree, on numerous items, the shares of both \agree" and \disagree" responses are substantial. For example,

 with the statement, \I am satisfied with the University-level Faculty Workload Policy," 25% agree while 35% disagree. (Among faculty without administrative roles, the figures are 21% and 39%, respectively.) In two units, a majority disagree. In one unit, a majority agrees;

with the statement, \The University-level Faculty Workload Policy motivates faculty to engage in the

and 38% disagree. 28% agree and 49% disagree that the provost's requirement regarding R1 scholarship and teaching loads promotes workload equity across units. The most common comment about equity was that the workload policy undervalues service and student support, often disadvantaging the women, junior faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and people of color who disproportionately do this work. There were also complaints that the workload policy undercounts graduate mentoring and does not account for accreditation requirements or the challenges of keeping classes up to date in rapidly changing elds, demands that do not fall equally on all faculty.

On excellence, substantial shares of faculty agree and substantial shares disagree that the policy promotes excellence in work. For example,
  with the statement, \The university-level faculty workload policy promotes excellence in teaching," 35% agree and 35% disagree;
  with the statement, \The university-level faculty workload policy promotes excellence in scholarship, research, or creative endeavor," 41% agree and 29% disagree. (Among faculty without administrative roles, the gures are 38% and 37%.)
  with the statement, \The university-level faculty workload policy promotes excellence in service to the university, profession, public," 31% agree and 42% disagree. (Among faculty without administrative roles, the gures are 25% and 50%.)

Some faculty commented that it is not the job of the workload policy to promote excellence; that is the task of skilled administrators. When administrators do that well, the policy is irrelevant. Some faculty complained that, in their units, the only research that is recognized is work that brings in external funding, which often means the work is orthodox and mainstream. The result is that other research is not rewarded, even if highly innovative. Others observed that in a misguided e ort to turn faculty work into quantitative indicators, the policy ignores quality of work. There were many complaints that service was e ectively not counted at all. One faculty member commented that the workload policy was more about providing cover for administrators than for promoting excellence or enhancing quality.

Recommendation 1: Given that more than a super-majority of faculty disagree that their workload assignment captures the work that they do and given that a substantial number of faculty disagree that the policy achieves key objectives, the Faculty Senate shall re-examine both the workload policy as well as its underlying objectives with particular focus on the possibility that the nature and diversity of faculty work imply signi cant limits on what a workload policy can achieve.

Recommendation 2: Given that a substantial number of faculty disagree that the policy enhances faculty well-being, morale, retention, and collegiality, the Faculty Senate shall monitor data on faculty departures as well as failed searches.

Recommendation 3: The Faculty Senate shall explore ways to address the timing-mismatch between workload policy and performance evaluation.

On Provost Lewis' December announcement regarding R1 scholarship and teaching load assignments, substantially more disagree (42%) that such a mandate is consistent with shared governance than agree (26%)

and substantially more disagree (41%) that such a mandate is appropriate for SLU than agree (30%). In addition, while 39% of responses agree that it's clear what constitutes R1 scholarship in their discipline, 41% disagree. In six units, more than a majority disagree. More who identify as female disagree than agree.

Comments on the Provost's mandate were extensive. A few faculty members applauded the change, arguing that some of their colleagues should be teaching more. Most of the comments were negative. One common line of criticism was that the mandate chose to punish those who were deemed not to be producing enough research instead of adequately rewarding those who do. In the absence of carrots, the University has opted to wield a stick. To expect R1 research, with resources and grant support far below what faculty would nd at an R1 institution, and with salaries well below those at R1 schools, also seemed unfair to many. One faculty member called the mandate \a grand joke, Kafkaesque." Another said that the Provost could do more to promote research by reforming the grant-handling process.

Respondents also worried that, once o the \highly research active" teaching assignment, it would be hard for a person's research output to recover. Since research output might vary for a variety of reasons outside the control of the researcher (including disability, dependent care responsibilities, and publisher timelines), this could raise equity concerns. Respondents observed that, given the critical importance of maintaining a high research active standing, the policy creates an incentive to shift attention away from good teaching or service, at the expense of other faculty who end up doing that work. One respondent felt this inequity was one the workload policy was supposed to address, but the Provost's mandate was only intensifying it.

A large number of comments questioned the assertion that the standard teaching assignment at R1 institutions is a 2-2, arguing that in their disciplines it was lower. Respondents found the policy inconsistent with policies at peer institutions, which they suggested would make it hard to attract and retain faculty at SLU. Indeed, the comments included threats to leave SLU and observations that some faculty members were already on the job market. Some called the mandate's intent to increase teaching loads as \a thin veneer of rationality over what everyone knows is a speed up," \gaslighting," or e ectively a \pay cut," by requiring more work for the same pay. One faculty member said SLU's policy was turning SLU into \a punchline."

There was disagreement about whether the Provost's mandate is consistent with shared governance. One faculty member strongly believed that it is, given that the Provost is leaving it up to units to decide what \research active" means. Others were less certain that the subsidiarity promised in policy was actually achieved. One respondent noted that their unit's proposals for what constituted research active were rejected, even though they were based on research on expectations at R1 schools. Some commented that the timing of implementing increased teaching loads meant workload was being assigned retroactively, based on standards that were not in place when the work being evaluated was conducted. Another said it seemed like a violation of a previous-agreed upon work contract. One faculty member noted that the workload policy says the \speci c distribution of work assigned for an individual faculty member in any academic year is not prescribed at a University level," making the Provost's mandate not only a violation of shared governance, but also a

teaching load requirement promotes workload equity across units, and (3) disagree that the mandate is appropriate for SLU, the Faculty Senate rejects the Provost's mandate and supports the policy's promise that \The speci c distribution of work assigned for an individual faculty member in any academic year is not prescribed at a University level."

A troubling number of responses (47%) indicate that faculty have not been o ered compensation for overload work as required, suggesting compliance problems. In addition, 42% disagree that the university will \function well" if faculty \do not engage in overload work." According to the policy, \Department chairs and deans will be reviewed annually by those persons to whom they report regarding the implementation of and compliance with all aspects of the University and their respective academic unit faculty workload policies, including equity." This \accountability" feature of the policy may be insu cient. Existing mechanisms for addressing compliance issues and complaints include the grievance process of the Faculty Manual and the Faculty Senate's Faculty Manual violation process (as the workload policy is invoked in the Faculty Manual and violations of the workload policy may thus constitute violations of the Faculty Manual).

In their comments, faculty observed that there is not a clear review procedure if faculty disagree with their workload assignment. A large number of comments a rmed that faculty were not o ered compensation for overload work, as required by the policy. Indeed, in a number of units, the lack of compensation for overload work appeared to be o cial policy.

Many of the comments about unfair or unclear processes were targeted at unit-level policies. It appears that some units are quite happy with their policies. One respondent - who noted that in some units workload policies can be interpreted exibly - commented, \My faculty are super happy, and I would not change anything." Others were less enthusiastic. There were complaints that unit-level policies can violate the University policy, and no one does anything. Faculty members from more than one school noted that their deans had unilaterally imposed policies or altered or overturned policies developed by faculty, all violations of the University policy.

Recommendation 5: The Faculty Senate shall consider whether existing accountability mechanisms are su cient and explore the development of an additional mechanism via which faculty can report compliance problems with and complaints about both the university-level and unit-level policies.

3. Concluding Remarks and Additional Recommendations

Overall, the ndings clarify that the workload policy is not working well and may be a source of harm to the university overall especially as it seems to have been destructive of rather than generative of a community of work for substantial numbers of faculty. Further, taken as a whole, the ndings suggest that while the policy may seem general, in practice it is actually overly prescriptive to support a complex, dynamic, innovative, and diverse academic community.

The survey asked respondents for recommendations for how the workload policy could be improved. One of the most common suggestions was that the policy should be eliminated. One respondent argued that the workload policy is not needed. It is the job of chairs to assign workload; the job of deans to hold chairs

accountable for doing this fairly; and the job of the provost to make sure deans do their jobs. It is that vertical accountability that matters, not a \complex, rigid, bureaucratic, and costly policy."

On the other end of the preference spectrum, a few respondents suggested that the policy should be much more detailed and specific, in order to standardize how work counts across the University.

Less drastic recommendations include that workload policies should:
- Be developed at the unit level, with considerable autonomy, in recognition of disciplinary differences
- Be more flexible, set between the department chair and the faculty member
- Factor in time spent in graduate mentoring
- Factor in time spend on accreditation
- Abandon the 24 work unit framework
- Stop the attempt to quantify what is really qualitative
- Provide faculty with more agency
- Return to percent effort
- Align the workload year with the evaluation year (which can be achieved within the present budget framework by setting both on a calendar year)
- Guarantee that overload work is compensated

Recommendation 6: The Faculty Senate shall consider revisions to the policy that would make it practically more descriptive and less prescriptive. In particular, the policy might be best re-constructed in such a way (1) that its objectives remain modest and (2) that it functions more as an accountability mechanism for administrators who have workload assignment and oversight duties.

Finally, a reminder about governance: a beneficial distinction of the governance of Saint Louis University is that key academic matters are governed primarily by faculty and that faculty have a major role in establishing

Timeline of context and work

June 2021: Version 2.0 of the Faculty Workload Policy becomes effective.

February 2023: Governance Committee reports to the Faculty Senate that \Faculty from multiple units have expressed concerns with the current university-wide workload policy."

March 2023: Governance Committee, through its report to the Faculty Senate, invites faculty with concerns about the workload policy to communicate with the committee.

April 2023: College of Arts & Sciences issues statement of \Faculty Concerns and Recommendations Regarding Workload Policy."

July 2023: Faculty Senate President Christine Rollins contacts the co-chairs of the Governance Committee and requests that the committee review the workload policy in coordination with the Academic Affairs Committee.

September 2023: FSEC charges the Governance Committee to (i) review the policy and the philosophy behind it; (ii) understand the structural foundation and surrounding issues; (iii) review the policy university wide and collect data for the units; (iv) provide the Faculty Senate by the end of the 2023-2024 academic year with (1) reflection on university wide policy; (2) examples of successful and positive implementation; (3) recommendations for improvement.

October 2023: Governance Committee chairs propose that work proceed via three subcommittees, one on overall policy feedback, a second on the policy implementation process, and a third on stakeholder interviews.

November 2023: Governance Committee subcommittees draft questions for a survey, preparing items that address the university-level policy as well as items that address unit-level policies. The idea of collecting qualitative evidence based on stakeholder interviews is abandoned due to lack of time and other resources to analyze such data.

December 2023: Provost announces during a presentation to the Faculty Senate that a definition of scholarship production at an R1 level must be established for all units, with the intent that only faculty producing at such a level generally will have a 2/2 teaching assignment or less (12 or fewer workload units). This announcement seemingly renders a number of unit-level policies moot and complicates committee efforts to survey faculty about unit-level policies.

January 2024: A draft survey is completed, containing 19 questions on the university-level policy, 19 largely parallel questions on unit-level policies, and four demographic information questions. Governance Committee members share the draft survey with faculty in their units and solicit feedback, with a deadline of February 9. Volunteer survey testers complete the survey.

February 2024: Based on feedback received, Governance Committee members revise the survey and approve a final version containing roughly 24 questions, mostly focussed on the university-level policy.

March 2024: On March 3, before sending the survey to all faculty, the survey is sent to Governance

Committee's website, and transmitted to Faculty Senate President Christine Rollins with the expectation that the recommendations will be put to a vote at the May Faculty Senate meeting.

Survey instrument

Email message - sent from facultysenate@slu.edu on March 8, 2024

Greetings Colleagues,

<u>This email is intended for all full-time faculty, currently employed by SLU.</u> **I apologize to faculty receiving this who are employed by SSM or another third party. I do not have the capabilities to have a subset email. Chris Rollins**

In October 2023, Faculty Senate President Christine Rollins and the FSEC charged the Faculty Senate's Governance Committee, in part, to collect feedback on the Workload policy and its implementation to date. This survey solicits such feedback. The aggregate results will be posted for the University community on the Governance Committee's website and used by the members of the Governance Committee to develop recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Workload Policy Version 1.0 was developed by a Joint Faculty Senate-Provost Task Force; it was approved by the Faculty Senate on January 26, 2016; it was modi ed and adopted by Provost Nancy Brickhouse on February 29, 2016. Version 2.0 was developed by a task force comprised of representatives of the deans, department chairs, faculty, and Provost's o ce sta . A draft was o ered for a 30-day public comment period during which feedback was obtained via a Qualtrics survey, open fora, email, and discussion with the deans. It was approved by CADD and the Provost in May 2021.

This policy applies to all faculty assigned to colleges, schools, centers or libraries governed by a dean or director reporting to the Provost. It does not apply to faculty at the Madrid campus or those faculty currently employed by SSM, or other third parties.

This is the link to the survey. It should only work for you once. The survey will be open until March 25th. [Link]

The FSEC and the Provost agreed in the fall 2023 semester, the Faculty Senate - through the Governance Committee, would conduct a review of the policy to help inform all parties pursuant to section 10.2 in the policy. The policy anticipates review by the Provost every three years. While, this survey does not constitute such a review, the FSEC and the Provost agreed we would provide feedback for any changes to subsequent versions of the policy.

The survey has several sections, covering:

University-level policy
Unit-level policy required by the University-level policy
Some general questions about workload
Respondent demographics

All questions are optional.

The survey is anonymous and comment-box remarks will be available only to members of the Governance Committee. <u>If you have any problems accessing the survey, please contact Ellen Carnaghan</u>

(ellen.carnaghan@slu.edu).

a. teaching.

b. scholarship, research, or creative endeavor.

c. service to the University, profession, and public.

d. clinical work.

e. the work of administrators.

(Agree, Uncertain, Disagree)

7. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances

a. workload equity.

b. faculty well-being.

c. faculty retention.

d. faculty morale.

e. collegiality.

f. SLU's mission.

g. SLU's nancial condition.

(Agree, Uncertain, Disagree)

Comment box: If necessary, expand or clarify your answers.

The University-level Faculty Workload Policy implies that workloads are assigned in spring of one year (e.g., spring 2024) and work is carried out the following fall and spring (e.g., fall 2024 and spring 2025). Faculty performance evaluation practice implies that faculty are evaluated on work conducted during a calendar year (e.g., spring 2024 and fall 2024).

15. In my unit, overload work (compensated or not) is not needed to receive excellent performance ratings. (Agree, Uncertain, Disagree)

16. The unit-level policy that applies to me is implemented such that teaching and researhc/creative endeavor are both valued.

Comment box: If necessary, expand or clarify your answers.

About you

What is your faculty status?
(Non-tenure track, Tenure-track, Tenured)

How many years have you been employed at SLU?
(Less than ten years, Ten to twenty years, More than twenty years)

Do you have an administrative appointment in addition to your faculty appointment?
(No, Yes)

Which race or ethnicity best describes you?
(List of options)

What is your gender?
(List of options)

Results

Participation

	Count	%
All	255	100
Adminisrative role	93	36
No administrative role	122	48
College of Arts and Sciences	72	28
College for Public Health and Social Justice	11	4
Doisy College of Health Sciences	37	15
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	26	10
School for Professional Studies	8	3
School of Education	8	3
School of Law	15	6
School of Science and Engineering	40	16
School of Social Work	7	3
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	19	7
University Libraries	6	2
No unit indicated	6	2
Female	106	42
Male	75	29
Non-tenure track	78	31
Tenure track	37	15
Tenured	112	44

Figures are for submissions with at least one non-empty response.

1. I am familiar with the University-level Faculty Workload Policy.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	80	4	16
No administrative role	75	6	19
College of Arts and Sciences	92	1	7
College for Public Health and Social Justice	73	0	27
Doisy College of Health Sciences	70	8	22
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	81	12	8
School of Law	67	7	27
School of Science and Engineering	80	0	20
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	74	0	26
Other Units	76	7	17
No unit indicated	100	0	0

2. I am satisfied with the University-level Faculty Workload Policy.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	25	35	39
No administrative role	21	39	40
College of Arts and Sciences	24	51	25
College for Public Health and Social Justice	27	9	64
Doisy College of Health Sciences	19	24	57
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	23	54	23
School of Law	27	7	67
School of Science and Engineering	26	42	32
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	26	32	42
Other Units	36	7	57
No unit indicated	33	50	17
Female	22	32	46
Male	31	38	31
Non-tenure track	26	22	53
Tenure track	22	49	30
Tenured	26	41	33

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

3. A University-level workload policy is needed

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	60	18	22
No administrative role	53	23	24
College of Arts and Sciences	46	19	36
College for Public Health and Social Justice	64	9	27
Doisy College of Health Sciences	68	11	22
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	58	35	8
School of Law	40	20	40
School of Science and Engineering	68	21	11
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	68	5	26
Other Units	75	14	11
No unit indicated	67	33	0
Female	59	13	27
Male	58	18	24
Non-tenure track	72	12	17
Tenure track	41	27	32
Tenured	57	21	23

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

4. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy was developed in accordance with shared governance principles.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	39	17	43
No administrative role	35	19	46
College of Arts and Sciences	41	20	39
College for Public Health and Social Justice	36	9	55
Doisy College of Health Sciences	49	11	41
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	27	31	42
School of Law	13	20	67
School of Science and Engineering	37	16	47
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	47	11	42
Other Units	50	7	43
No unit indicated	33	50	17
Female	44	17	39
Male	43	12	45
Non-tenure track	46	9	45
Tenure track	30	22	49
Tenured	38	23	40

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

5. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy motivates faculty to engage in the wide variety of work required for an academic enterprise to function well.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	33	39	27
No administrative role	31	45	24
College of Arts and Sciences	24	49	27
College for Public Health and Social Justice	27	27	45
Doisy College of Health Sciences	43	24	32
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	31	54	15
School of Law	33	33	33
School of Science and Engineering	37	47	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	37	42	21
Other Units	46	11	43
No unit indicated	17	50	33
Female	34	39	27
Male	34	39	27
Non-tenure track	45	24	31
Tenure track	30	51	19
Tenured	25	49	26

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

6.a. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy promotes excellence in teaching

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	35	35	29
No administrative role	33	38	29
College of Arts and Sciences	22	52	25
College for Public Health and Social Justice	30	20	50
Doisy College of Health Sciences	59	15	26
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	25	38	38
School of Law	40	13	47
School of Science and Engineering	30	46	24
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	33	33	33
Other Units	52	22	26
No unit indicated	33	50	17
Female	44	29	26
Male	33	33	34
Non-tenure track	49	22	29
Tenure track	32	41	27
Tenured	26	44	30

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

6.b. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy promotes excellence in scholarship, research, or creative endeavor

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	41	29	30
No administrative role	38	37	25
College of Arts and Sciences	26	41	33
College for Public Health and Social Justice	40	20	40
Doisy College of Health Sciences	50	18	32
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	38	33	29
School of Law	40	27	33
School of Science and Engineering	33		

6.c. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy promotes excellence in service to the university, profession, public

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	31	42	26
No administrative role	25	50	25
College of Arts and Sciences	21	54	25
College for Public Health and Social Justice	40	20	40
Doisy College of Health Sciences	44	24	32
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	17	58	25
School of Law	33	20	47
School of Science and Engineering	32	51	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	39	39	22
Other Units	44	30	26
No unit indicated	17	67	17
Female	41	42	23
Male	25	41	34
Non-tenure track	45	30	25
Tenure track	32	54	14
Tenured	22	48	30

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

6.e. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy promotes excellence in the work of administrators

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	19	36	45
No administrative role	18	29	53
College of Arts and Sciences	17	37	47
College for Public Health and Social Justice	0	30	70
Doisy College of Health Sciences	15	27	58
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	21	46	33
School of Law	33	40	27
School of Science and Engineering	19	33	47
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	22	44	33
Other Units	27	27	46
No unit indicated	17	50	33
Female	19	38	43
Male	26	29	46
Non-tenure track	25	32	43
Tenure track	9	37	54
Tenured	19	37	44

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

7.a. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances workload equity

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	29	38	32
No administrative role	25	43	32
College of Arts and Sciences	23	44	33
College for Public Health and Social Justice	40	30	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	41	32	26
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	17	46	38
School of Law	43	21	36
School of Science and Engineering	35	38	27
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	17	44	39
Other Units	30	33	37
No unit indicated	33	33	33
Female	33	38	29
Male	32	32	35
Non-tenure track	36	32	31
Tenure track	14	54	32
Tenured	30	37	33

7.b. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances faculty well-being

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	16	51	32
No administrative role	14	55	31
College of Arts and Sciences	11	59	30
College for Public Health and Social Justice	11	56	33
Doisy College of Health Sciences	21	36	42
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	4	58	38
School of Law	29	36	36
School of Science and Engineering	24	59	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	11	56	33
Other Units	22	37	41
No unit indicated	17	50	33
Female	16	49	35
Male	22	50	28
Non-tenure track	22	42	36
Tenure track	5	68	27
Tenured	15	54	31

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

7.c The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances faculty retention

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	14	43	43
No administrative role	12	48	40
College of Arts and Sciences	8	52	41
College for Public Health and Social Justice	0	30	70
Doisy College of Health Sciences	24	29	47
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	4	54	42
School of Law	21	29	50
School of Science and Engineering	19	49	32
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	11	44	44
Other Units	22	33	44
No unit indicated	17	50	33
Female	12	40	48
Male	19	39	42
Non-tenure track	21	30	49
Tenure track	5	59	35
Tenured	12	48	41

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

7.e. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances collegiality.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	18	40	42
No administrative role	17	45	38
College of Arts and Sciences	14	48	38
College for Public Health and Social Justice	0	30	70
Doisy College of Health Sciences	32	26	41
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	13	52	35
School of Law	21	14	64
School of Science and Engineering	24	49	27
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	17	39	44
Other Units	15	37	48
No unit indicated	0	33	67
Female	21	35	44
Male	20	46	34
Non-tenure track	26	31	43
Tenure track	11	42	47
Tenured	11	42	47

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

7.f. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances SLU's mission

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	29	30	41
No administrative role	26	33	41
College of Arts and Sciences	17	41	41
College for Public Health and Social Justice	10	10	80
Doisy College of Health Sciences	41	19	41
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	29	42	29
School of Law	50	7	43
School of Science and Engd [f. [(Doisying)-27		21	

7.g. The University-level Faculty Workload Policy enhances SLU's nancial condition.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	32	15	52
No administrative role	32	17	50
College of Arts and Sciences	13	23	65
College for Public Health and Social Justice	0	20	80
Doisy College of Health Sciences	36	12	52
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	42	17	42
School of Law	43	14	43
School of Science and Engineering	46	19	35
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	44	0	56
Other Units	48	4	48
No unit indicated	17	17	67
Female	36	10	53
Male	37	22	41
Non-tenure track	47	8	45
Tenure track	27	30	43
Tenured	25	16	60

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

8. My supervisor and I can predict an accurate workload ve to fourteen months in advance.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	37	39	23
No administrative role	37	42	22
College of Arts and Sciences	29	51	21
College for Public Health and Social Justice	20	50	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	55	30	15
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	26	35	39
School of Law	64	14	21
School of Science and Engineering	38	41	22
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	61	28	11
Other Units	27	38	35
No unit indicated	17	50	33
Female	41	33	26
Male	41	42	18
Non-tenure track	48	34	18
Tenure track	25	44	31
Tenured	35	41	23

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

9. I would prefer that my workload assignment match my calendar year evaluation period.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	54	17	30
No administrative role	57	15	28
College of Arts and Sciences	52	11	37
College for Public Health and Social Justice	50	20	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	50	19	31
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	74	13	13
School of Law	29	21	50
School of Science and Engineering	49	19	32
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	28	28	44
Other Units	77	19	4
No unit indicated	83	0	17
Female	49	13	38
Male	58	16	26
Non-tenure track	64	12	25
Tenure track	54	24	22
Tenured	48	16	35

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

10. My workload assignment accurately captures all the work I do.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	16	68	16
No administrative role	14	69	17
College of Arts and Sciences	14	75	11
College for Public Health and Social Justice	30	60	10
Doisy College of Health Sciences	9	73	18
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	8	79	13
School of Law	21	57	21
School of Science and Engineering	22	59	19
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	11	72	17
Other Units	23	54	23
No unit indicated	33	50	17
Female	15	71	14
Male	20	64	16
Non-tenure track	18	64	18
Tenure track	16	62	22
Tenured	15	73	12

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

11. A college/school-level workload policy applies to me.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	77	9	13
No administrative role	72	11	17
College of Arts and Sciences	71	8	21
College for Public Health and Social Justice	100	0	0
Doisy College of Health Sciences	88	6	6
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	63	17	21
School of Law	85	8	8
School of Science and Engineering	73	11	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	94	0	6
Other Units	81	12	8

12. A department-level workload policy applies to me.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	66	24	10
No administrative role	63	26	11
College of Arts and Sciences	87	6	6
College for Public Health and Social Justice	30	60	10
Doisy College of Health Sciences	53	35	12
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	50	25	25
School of Law	23	54	23
School of Science and Engineering	84	14	3
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	78	11	11
Other Units	40	56	4
No unit indicated	100	0	0
Female	60	28	11
Male	73	19	8
Non-tenure track	64	28	8
Tenure track	57	24	19
Tenured	71	21	8

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

13. The unit-level workload policy that applies to me was proposed by my department chair or faculty assembly.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	68	12	20
No administrative role	66	12	23
College of Arts and Sciences	79	7	14
College for Public Health and Social Justice	80	0	20
Doisy College of Health Sciences	64	18	18
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	25	44	31
School of Law	10	20	70
School of Science and Engineering	81	3	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	71	6	24
Other Units	71	14	14
No unit indicated	83	17	0
Female	64	10	27
Male	75	11	14
Non-tenure track	59	10	30
Tenure track	59	17	24
Tenured	77	12	11

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

14. I am satis ed with the unit-level workload policy that applies to me.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	37	37	27
No administrative role	35	38	28
College of Arts and Sciences	37	44	19
College for Public Health and Social Justice	60	30	10
Doisy College of Health Sciences	29	36	36
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	13	50	38
School of Law	50	40	10
School of Science and Engineering	45	32	23
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	25	31	44
Other Units	48	19	33
No unit indicated	33	50	17
Female	35	32	32
Male	43	31	26
Non-tenure track	40	24	37
Tenure track	24	45	31
Tenured	39	42	19

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

15. In my unit, overload work (compensated or not) is not needed to receive excellent performance ratings.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	39	33	28
No administrative role	38	34	28
College of Arts and Sciences	35	38	27
College for Public Health and Social Justice	50	30	20
Doisy College of Health Sciences	47	32	21
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	35	35	30
School of Law	17	8	75
School of Science and Engineering	46	24	30
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	44	28	28
Other Units	35	46	19
No unit indicated	50	50	0
Female	42	34	25
Male	43	27	31
Non-tenure track	42	31	27
Tenure track	31	36	33
Tenured	41	34	25

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

16. The unit-level policy that applies to me is implemented such that teaching and research/creative endeavor are both valued.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	44	41	16
No administrative role	41	46	14
College of Arts and Sciences	47	33	19
College for Public Health and Social Justice	60	20	20
Doisy College of Health Sciences	42	42	15
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	19	69	13
School of Law	40	60	0
School of Science and Engineering	52	32	16
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	29	71	0

17.a. The Provost's mandate regarding R1 level scholarship and teaching loads is consistent with shared governance

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	26	42	31
No administrative role	22	43	35
College of Arts and Sciences	22	48	30
College for Public Health and Social Justice	10	40	50
Doisy College of Health Sciences	29	21	50
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	21	67	13
School of Law	17	58	25
School of Science and Engineering	27	43	30
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	44	33	22
Other Units	31	31	38
No unit indicated	40	60	0
Female	30	34	36
Male	28	42	31
Non-tenure track	38	18	44
Tenure track	14	51	35
Tenured	23	55	22

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

17.b. The Provost's mandate regarding R1 level scholarship and teaching loads is appropriate for SLU.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	30	41	29
No administrative role	22	44	34
College of Arts and Sciences	27	45	27
College for Public Health and Social Justice	0	60	40
Doisy College of Health Sciences	41	26	32
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	25	67	8
School of Law	25	33	42
School of Science and Engineering	27	43	30
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	39	33	28
Other Units	36	24	40
No unit indicated	40	60	0
Female	33	34	32
Male	27	39	34
Non-tenure track	47	20	33
Tenure track	16	54	30
Tenured	23	51	26

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

17.c. The Provost's mandate regarding R1 level scholarship and teaching loads promotes workload equity across units.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	28	49	23
No administrative role	23	55	21
College of Arts and Sciences	25	52	23
College for Public Health and Social Justice	10	60	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	38	32	29
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	17	67	17

18. In my discipline, it is clear what constitutes scholarship production at an R1 level.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	39	41	21
No administrative role	34	44	22
College of Arts and Sciences	53	34	13
College for Public Health and Social Justice	20	50	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	24	53	24
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	35	39	26
School of Law	8	58	33
School of Science and Engineering	49	27	24
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	50	28	22
Other Units	31	50	19
No unit indicated	20	80	0
Female	36	42	23
Male	43	34	23
Non-tenure track	35	40	25
Tenure track	39	39	22
Tenured	41	41	18

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

19. If asked to take on work beyond the required amount, additive pay or a workload reduction has been o ered to me.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	43	47	11
No administrative role	43	46	11
College of Arts and Sciences	31	58	12
College for Public Health and Social Justice	33	33	33
Doisy College of Health Sciences	75	21	4
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	38	62	0
School of Law	27	73	0
School of Science and Engineering	27	52	21
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	69	19	13
Other Units	43	52	4
No unit indicated	40	40	20
Female	47	44	9
Male	40	44	16
Non-tenure track	42	22	4
Tenure track	30	50	20
Tenured	33	56	11

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.

20. If faculty ful ll their workload units but do not engage in overload work, the University will function well.

	% Agree	% Disagree	% Uncertain
All	22	42	36
No administrative role	21	45	35
College of Arts and Sciences	13	53	33
College for Public Health and Social Justice	10	60	30
Doisy College of Health Sciences	21	36	42
Richard A. Chaifetz School of Business	17	63	21
School of Law	25	17	58
School of Science and Engineering	30	24	46
Trudy Busch Valentine School of Nursing	39	44	17
Other Units	19	42	38
No unit indicated	50	17	33
Female	15	47	38
Male	32	30	38
Non-tenure track	31	32	37
Tenure track	22	35	43
Tenured	16	52	32

\Other Units" includes four units with fewer than 10 responses.