



— ASSOCIATED —  
COLLEGES OF THE SOUTH

## Addressing Hidden Workloads: Supplemental Material

This supplemental material offers helpful background information and implementation guidance for those looking for additional support.

### Committees, advising, and community engagement: What's the big deal about "service"?

Most faculty evaluation schemas boil down to 3 categories: Teaching, Research, and Service. This section concentrates on service because expectations are often ill-defined. How service gets allocated, what forms of service arise, who gets informally versus formally tagged for what, and how service is evaluated or "counted" can have an unintentional impact on promotion trajectories. Therefore, analyzing your institution's allocation practices, policies and implications can make significant inroads to increasing equity. Training and skills development may also be needed to improve effectiveness among some faculty members' service capabilities. Institutions need to regularly assess and adapt their policies and practices – particularly guiding distribution of service labor – to foster a supportive, diverse, and inclusive academic environment.

This section discusses strategies for implementing tools and resources in the Toolkit section on [Hidden Workloads](#) first by addressing 7.A. Service in General (e.g., committees and task forces) and then by addressing the separate sub-sections 7.B. Civic Engagement and 7.C. Advising – two types of service that will vary depending on an institution's approach to these needs. For reference, Millsaps College and Hendrix College offer their service evaluation language as examples of how expectations might be articulated (see Appendices B and C at the end of this document), including civic engagement and advising.

#### 7.A. Service in General.

Implementation of the Toolkit's Conversations about Service/Hidden Workload section assumes a two-year planning horizon with the possibility for more intensive follow-on parts as needed for comprehensive attention to hidden workloads. Tools and resources for structuring these critical conversations include:

- an extensive literature review documenting the situation,
- results from a survey of hidden workloads within ACS schools, and
- intervention recommendations.

(Also see this document's section 4: Aligning values, two research resources: one on transparency of service allocation, and one on disproportionate allocation).

Questions worth addressing in considering the role of service:

- How are service responsibilities assigned to faculty?
- How do faculty document their service during the evaluation process?
- How is service work assessed in terms of quality and quantity? Are some types of service more valued than others?
- How are faculty compensated for service work? Is this consistent throughout the institution?
- Are the same faculty members continually asked to take on leadership/service roles on campus? How can service be distributed more equitably?
- Are all faculty given equal opportunities to participate in faculty service?
- Are faculty expected to take on leadership roles as part of their service? How explicit are those expectations?

- Which forms of service are trainable for increased quality? Who is choosing to engage in professional development of skills needed for effective service delivery? How is that accounted for in the review process?

### **Stage 0: Planning.**

Institutions are highly encouraged to establish a coordinating committee to assure integration of questions, findings, and recommendations. The coordinating committee should have clear oversight from Academic Affairs and might include representatives from human resources, institutional research, tenure and promotions committee, faculty governance committee, and the faculty handbook committee. The coordinating committee might choose to gather relevant documentation for the Inventory process before defining how an inventory will be done.

### **Stage 1: Inventory the “as is.”**

The objective of this stage is to anchor emergent guidelines and training programs in evidence-based needs that begin to be built in an implementation stage. Note that a reliable inventory accounts for the realities of multiple stakeholder perspectives (e.g., because a policy is written does not mean it is followed; and because a practice is not documented does not mean it is not reliably followed). The inventory does groundwork for identifying gaps.

See the appendix for a Service Inventory. The sample questions guide inventory of the types of activities that would fall into the service category of an evaluation portfolio. Questions refer to formal service to the college, department/program level service, service in student recruitment, service to students, and service to the community. Note that faculty responding to a survey about what service they perform might easily be different at this stage from what the CAO or the Handbook indicate; therefore, an inventory process should occur across multiple stakeholders’ perspectives. Use disparate data to guide “alignment” planning and use aligned data to understand gaps between intention and actual.

### **Stage 2: Gap assessment and guidelines.**

Analyze the inventory for two areas: what guidelines need to be established, and where do different stakeholder groups have different guidelines or perceptions. These areas shape how an institution will approach establishing guidelines about appropriate amounts of service, mechanism for assigning service, potential for assessing or evaluating quality or effectiveness of service, and potential for training and development. Gap assessments clarify the distance an institution might need to go to reach intentions.

#### **Three phases of work to close the gaps:**

(Phase 1.) Establish guidelines on how much service work is appropriate and the consequences of exceeding or failing to reach benchmarks. This works well in settings like retreats and administrative meetings; coordinating committee meetings; faculty handbook committee.

Individuals responsible for this area typically include – CAO/Dean of faculty; human resources; tenure and promotions committee; faculty governance committee; faculty handbook committee.

(Phase 2.) Establish formal mechanisms to assess faculty service workloads (and potentially the quality of service delivered) with special attention paid to assessing hidden workloads. Because of the complex nature of service and inherent intersectionality that compounds inequalities in service loads, the coordinating committee might choose to convene a retreat with key stakeholder representatives, to design portions of work that can be clarified in particular administrative meetings including faculty handbook committee meeting, human resources and the CAO’s office regarding appointment letters, and/or faculty governance representatives.

(Phase 3.) Beta test the formal guidelines and assessment mechanisms with a myriad of faculty attending to a) faculty from multiple levels of hierarchies, levels of historic engagement in service activities, and both dominant and minority identity groups; and b) department chairs and other program leads who will be tasked with following or using guidelines and/or mechanisms. The coordinating committee holds responsibility for assuring that all feedback – especially from traditionally underrepresented groups and outlier opinions – receives attention before formalizing guidelines or new assessment mechanisms.

### **Stage 3: Implementation.**

Implementation itself requires deliberate planning and customization of any best practice, tool, or resources to best match the institution's needs identified through inventory and gaps. No two implementation processes will be the same, though all leaders are wise to consider options before fashioning a plan.

Here are 6 areas to consider as you evaluate your institution's need.

(1.) Train faculty leaders to adopt reporting tools to surface invisible or hidden workloads. Can occur in chair development sessions. Include the Dean of the Faculty and chairs.

(2.) Design faculty awareness campaigns and professional development opportunities on how and when to strategically say "yes" and "no." Can occur in workshops, training sessions, and informative and practical seminars designed to communicate and clarify the expectations for service load; can be reiterated on the institution's website. These methods should address how the institution recognizes the potential for intersectionality that compounds inequalities in service workloads. Include mentoring programs, faculty training sessions (faculty conferences), new faculty orientation.

(3.) Design and implement a service audit/survey designed to identify the workload for each committee. Can occur in Academic Affairs meetings in collaboration with Institutional Research, and in Chair meetings. Include CAO/Dean of Faculty, Institutional Research, and Chairs.

(4.) Develop a system to rank service activities and to distribute them equitably among the faculty members. Can occur in administrative retreats and meetings; and in Faculty Governance, committee chair, and department chair meetings. Include CAO/Dean of Faculty, Governance Committee Chairs, Department Chairs.

(5.) Develop a systematic training system for faculty who are eligible for promotion. Can occur in monthly workshops for tenure/promotion candidates and chairs (include deputy chairs if the candidate is the next chair). Include Dean of Faculty, chair of handbook and training committees, chair of Tenure and Promotion committee.

(6.) Recognize and address the inequitable distribution of service work. Can occur through a faculty survey about which results should be reviewed with the CAO office and the Chief Diversity Officer. Include Academic Affairs, Dean of Faculty, Chief Diversity Equity and Inclusion Officer, DEI committee members.

### **7. B. Faculty-Service – "Civic Engagement"**

This section's relevance varies by institution and explores the importance (or lack of importance) given to civic engagement work. Some (although not all) faculty evaluation documents explicitly mention community service or civic engagement as relevant to the tenure and promotion process. In the Furman document, "community service" is listed alongside "advising and mentoring" and "contributions to diversity and inclusion" in a separate category of "supporting activity." The call for community service aligns appropriately with the Furman Advantage promise of "community impact," but the level to which it is valued may be difficult for a faculty

member to discern when relegated to a catch-all category of “supporting activity.” Some schools (e.g., Rollins) leave room for community service by noting that “service to the college can take many forms,” others (e.g., Centre) encourage reporting of service to “your professional academic community or the off-campus community,” while others (e.g., Millsaps) specify that “off-campus service” may be included “as long as it has an impact on the college.”

Consider reviewing whether expectations for civic engagement and/or community service are explicit or implicit in the College’s mission statement or strategic plan. Consider reviewing your college’s Faculty Handbook especially in the language on promotion, tenure, and evaluation. In particular, consider how the Handbook language separates the categories of teaching, research, and service.

Consider reaching out to the following groups to learn more about how the Handbook language is usually interpreted:

- Chief Academic Officer
- Tenure and promotion committee
- Department chairs

Consider whether there are other campus constituencies that benefit from this civic engagement:

- Living-learning communities
- Student life community outreach programs
- Community Engaged Learning or Service-Learning academic courses
- Clubs/honors organizations for which there is a philanthropy component
- Reinforce student recruitment efforts
- Institutional brand awareness

### **7. C. Faculty-Service – Advising: The role of academic advising in faculty evaluations**

At any liberal arts college, advising students is an important part of a faculty member’s interactions with students. Interactions range from working with new students to acclimate to college to working with students in the major who are deciding how to best complete their undergraduate educations. Therefore, wide variations arise in how faculty are sought out for service and in how effective each individual is in various service roles.

The following questions can help determine how best to include assessment (load and effectiveness) of advising in the regular faculty evaluation process both before and after tenure. That any evaluation of advising be included in regular faculty evaluations both before and after tenure.

#### **(1.) Faculty Involvement**

- Are all faculty expected to be involved in some form of advising?
- How well defined are the expectations of faculty in advising?
- What types of training is given to advisors to make them aware of best practices?
- Does advising have a narrow or broad definition? Does it include new student advising, major/minor advising, mentoring, or writing letters of recommendation?
- How is advising assigned?
- What is the relationship to staff advising and specialty advising (like pre-med)?

#### **(2.) Faculty Evaluation Process**

- Is the evaluation process formative or summative or some mix?

- Where in the process are forms of student development beyond teaching included?
- Is advising considered part of teaching in the evaluation process? Is the expected involvement clearly defined and are expectations clear?
- Is advising considered part of service in the evaluation process? If so, then how well-defined are the items considered as service and are any of them evaluated by formal measures?
- Are informal or unofficial advisees considered in the evaluation process? If so, how?

### (3.) Advising Expectations and Measures

- How might your institution quantify a faculty member's advising load?
- Number of formal advisees (either new students or majors)
- Types of advising done by faculty
- What is the relationship between how a faculty member's advising load is divided between first-year students and upper-level majors in the department?
- Who pays attention to inequities in advising loads within and across departments/divisions?
- How might your institution evaluate a faculty member's advising?
- College-wide advising survey or part of another type of survey
- Information obtained in senior exit interviews in departments
- Support letters from students or supporting student advising awards
- Participation in advising training programs
- As part of the faculty member's evaluation by the department chair (for major advisees) or advising office (for first-year students)

## Appendix A: Service Inventory Questions

Example Question	Who responds?	Potential source of information
What explicit guidelines exist for defining service needs and opportunities within the college?	CAO/Deans	Faculty Handbook Faculty meeting minutes (including school/department levels)
What types of service are formally assigned by the College? Examples include college committees/task forces, administrative duties (program, department chair), faculty mentors.	CAO/Deans	Faculty Handbook Employment contracts
Who assigns/elects/nominates faculty to these positions?	CAO/Deans	Faculty Handbook Surveys
What department/program service is required or expected? Examples include program assessment, faculty search committees, evaluating faculty for promotion or tenure, class observations, maintaining equipment.	Department/ Division Chairs Faculty	Surveys
How do department/program service duties get assigned?	CAO/Deans Program leads Department chairs	
What types of student recruitment activities are expected? Examples could include hosting class visits,	Department/ Division Chairs	Surveys Admissions Office

attending recruitment events, meeting parents/prospective students, giving recruitment presentations.	Faculty	
Beyond teaching, what other services do faculty provide to students? Examples could include advising (formal and informal), pre-professional mentoring, sponsoring student organizations, recommendation letters, faculty athletic liaisons.	Department/ Division Chairs Faculty Head of Advising	Surveys
In what ways do faculty represent the College in the community? Examples could include giving talks for community groups, serving as resource to local media, participating in events sponsored by ACS or professional organizations	Faculty	Surveys
How is the mechanism for tracking and assessing the quantity of individual faculty service-loads?	CAO/Deans Department Chairs Heads of: Admissions, Advising, Engaged Learning, etc.	Administrative meetings, retreats, faculty handbook committee, university website
What, if any, mechanisms exist for tracking effectiveness or quality of services provided?	CAO/Deans Department Chairs	

## Appendix B – Millsaps College Service Evaluation Language

Example of language explicating service and its evaluation.

### Millsaps Handbook Language for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- Among the kinds of evidence to be considered when assessing serious attention to the duties and responsibilities of a faculty member are:
- a written statement by the candidate reviewing how he or she has served the College thus far.

Service may take the following forms, but is not limited to them:

- initiation and/or participation in innovative projects that strengthen or invigorate the academic program, and cooperation on the implementation of existing academic projects or programs;
- evidence of cooperative interaction with colleagues, respect for the abilities of others, willingness to work toward a common purpose, and to contribute actively toward discerning, articulating, and furthering that purpose;
- evidence of active participation in academic governance, efficiency in committee work, academic or professional representation of the College locally, nationally, and/or internationally;
- guest lectures to the different programs, departments, or organizations, or artistic performances or exhibits, that enrich the academic life of the College;

### Millsaps Handbook Language for Promotion to Full Professor

- Among the kinds of evidence to be considered when assessing distinguished faculty leadership and devoted service are:

- a written statement by the candidate reviewing how he or she has shown distinguished leadership and devoted service to the students, the faculty, and the College through activities such as (but not limited to) the following:

Service can be demonstrated through activities such as (but not limited to) the following:

- initiation of and/or leadership in innovative projects that strengthen or invigorate the academic program, and leadership on the implementation of existing academic projects or programs;
- evidence of cooperative interaction with colleagues, respect for the abilities of others, willingness to work toward a common purpose, and to contribute actively toward discerning, articulating, and furthering that purpose;
- evidence of leadership in academic governance and committee work, and academic or professional representation of the College locally, nationally, and/or internationally;
- guest lectures to the different programs, departments, or organizations, or artistic performances or exhibits, that enrich the academic life of the College.

### **Appendix C: Hendrix College “Community Service” Evaluation Language**

Example of language explicating service and its evaluation.

When one becomes part of a community like the faculty, students, and staff at Hendrix, a typical component involves the genuine desire to be part of the process that makes and maintains that community. “Service,” then, is a natural outgrowth of campus life. Moreover, the community to which service is rendered may be on campus or more widely conceived, extending into the local community, state, nation, or world.

Hendrix seeks Faculty who aspire to model the College’s motto “Unto the whole person.” Clearly what we seek are Faculty who believe in and work to strengthen and support our liberal arts community. This participation may be represented in diverse ways. Accordingly, Hendrix Faculty typically seek to do many of the following:

- Contribute to the collective work of the Faculty by engagement through committees and active participation at Faculty meetings;
- Serving as needed as department, program and area chairs;
- Help to oversee and direct the work of student organizations;
- Support the life of the College through planning, participating in, and attending campus events and activities.

In addition, involvement in the community beyond Hendrix is recognized as “role modeling” service. It is seen as supplementing, though not supplanting, the commitment to remain engaged in the on-campus community. Thus, many Faculty become involved in service beyond Hendrix, and such service is recognized in the evaluation process.

#### **Assessment of Community Development**

- Both the more and less visible forms of community engagement are chronicled in the Faculty member’s self-evaluation letter. This is the primary source of information about the Faculty member’s contribution to the Hendrix community and, if the Faculty member so wishes, to the community beyond the College.
- The Department Chair’s letter as part of the evaluation process also evaluates the Faculty member’s commitment to the community.

- Colleagues with whom the Faculty member has had close working relationships on community-enhancing endeavors may be invited by the Faculty member to write evaluations of the Faculty member's service in a peer letter to be included in the evaluation materials.