



Workload Policy Issues of Concern

1. **Workload inequity** - Policy inherently reflects (does not solve) already existing workload inequities across rank, departments, and colleges on campus when it comes to teaching and research load allocations, and credit for service.
 - a. Some teaching, student-related duties have been moved to service. That does not accurately represent faculty effort, support teaching quality, or recognize the educational value of these activities to students.
2. **Divide and Conquer** - This formalizes inequities created by the administration, but redirects responsibility for addressing those inequities away from the administration and into colleges and departments without providing the authority to do so effectively.
3. **The value of our labor is subject to whether the administration has provided adequate resources to meet student demand**
 - a. Section F lays out under what circumstances a course can count for more than 10%. Paragraph 2 includes this important qualifier ***“Increases to assigned effort for a course above the general 10% may be considered as long as unit instructional capacity and course delivery are sustained within constraints of resources”***
 - b. If there are faculty shortages in a department, faculty will not get 15% credit for a 120+ person class, when a faculty member in a fully staffed department would get 15% credit.
 - c. During college level town halls, the dean and associate deans of SBS confirmed that the credit a faculty member gets for labor will be subject to having adequate personnel.
4. **This policy is not data driven** - This policy relies on estimates that do not accurately represent current workloads, or actual measures of the labor of teaching various kinds of classes.
 - a. A unit is 3 hours of labor, A 3 credit hour class presumably means we are working 9 hours a week. There is often more than nine hours of work per week for a three credit course.
 - b. There are many types of labor that come up after SOEs are established (search committees, changes to graduate student advisees, etc) and that labor would go uncounted and uncompensated.
 - c. There are huge gaps in how research-active faculty have their time accounted for.

5. **Lack of faculty involvement in determining workload percentages**
 - a. Faculty who served on the committee that started working on this policy have reported that they were outnumbered by administrators, and felt there was a lack of meaningful consideration of their concerns. This does not reflect shared governance.
 - b. We have been unable to find any faculty member who has successfully been able to challenge their workload using the SBS existing workload policy, but we have been able to find faculty members for whom the workload policy was used to justify an uncompensated overload as a result of mass firings.
6. **Potential workload negotiation issues** - Policy does not describe how faculty (especially NTT) are meant to negotiate their workloads equitably without retaliation or interdepartmental conflicts
 - a. No clear way for faculty to challenge how their labor is accounted for and how it will be evaluated, or whether labor is credited equally across departments and colleges.
 - b. Needs a clear definition of what faculty collaboration at the college and department level policies will look like.
 - c. There is no explanation of how this policy or policies based on it will be evaluated for equity. What recourse do faculty have based on this policy, if department and college leaders do not engage in equitable negotiation?
 - d. There is no explanation of how to assess whether or not this policy is effective in addressing workload policy concerns over time.
7. **Incomplete** - The policy references an appendix that wasn't shared with faculty. Its conceptualization and measurement of individual workloads is unclear and incomplete. And it does not provide meaningful ways measuring the uncredited work we do and that are essential to the functioning of the university. If the administration wants to count our labor, they should have to count ALL of our labor.
8. **This is a policy that targets faculty for administration leadership failures**
 - a. The provost has argued that this policy will prevent a handful of privileged faculty from getting special deals from chairs, deans, or the provost's office. Equity requires consideration and flexibility for different circumstances, but this is a one size fits all solution that justifies administrators failing to support equity.
 - b. Chairs, deans, and provosts already have the power to say no to special deals when they do not serve equity, but they fail to do so. ***This is a policy directed at faculty. It does not limit chairs, deans, or provost level administrators. It only further empowers them to devalue our labor.***

Join the fight to make NAU a more equitable workplace! Join UUNA AFT at

<https://www.uunaaft.org/joining-the-union>

We are stronger together!