



The University of Texas System
Nine Universities. Six Health Institutions. Unlimited Possibilities.

System Audit Office

210 W. 6th Street, Suite B.140E, Austin, Texas 78701
Phone: 512-499-4390 Fax: 512-499-4426

November 12, 2015

Steven Leslie, Ph. D.
Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The University of Texas System
O. Henry Hall, Suite 305
601 Colorado Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Dr. Leslie:

The University of Texas (UT) System Audit Office has completed its audit of compliance with Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 31006: *Academic Workload Requirements*. The detailed report is attached for your review.

We conducted our audit in accordance with The Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

We appreciate the assistance provided by UT System Administration management and personnel from UT Dallas, UT San Antonio, and UT Tyler.

Sincerely,

J. Michael Peppers, CPA, CIA, QIAL, CRMA
Chief Audit Executive

www.utsystem.edu

cc: Francie A. Frederick, General Counsel to the UT System Board of Regents
David Daniel, Ph. D., Deputy Chancellor
Stephanie Bond Huie, Ph. D., Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives
Kevin Lemoine, Ph. D., Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The University of Texas at Arlington
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Brownsville
The University of Texas at Dallas
The University of Texas at El Paso
The University of Texas - Pan American
The University of Texas
of the Permian Basin
The University of Texas at San Antonio
The University of Texas at Tyler

The University of Texas
Southwestern Medical Center
The University of Texas
Medical Branch at Galveston
The University of Texas
Health Science Center at Houston
The University of Texas
Health Science Center at San Antonio
The University of Texas
M. D. Anderson Cancer Center
The University of Texas
Health Science Center at Tyler

**The University of Texas System Administration
The Faculty Academic Workload Audit Report
FY 2015**



November 2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM AUDIT OFFICE
210 WEST SIXTH STREET, SUITE B.140E
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701
(512) 499-4390



Executive Summary

BACKGROUND

Texas Education Code Section 51.402 (TEC 51) requires the Board of Regents (Board) of The University of Texas (UT) System to adopt rules concerning the academic workload of faculty. In compliance with this statute, the Board has adopted *Regents' Rule 31006: Academic Workload Requirements (RR 31006)*, which requires that each full-time faculty member paid entirely from the appropriations item "Faculty Salaries" (state funds) be assigned a minimum workload equivalent to 18 semester credit hours (SCH), or workload credits as referred to in this report. Workload credits are calculated for teaching, related equivalencies, and workload releases for other non-instructional duties. Workload credits may also be granted for other duties not specified in Section 6.1 to 6.12 of RR 31006 and are referred to as presidential credits. These are limited to one percent of the total semester credit hours taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous year. RR 31006 also requires that an officer of an institution be designated to monitor academic workload. Monitoring includes ensuring that workload credits are calculated in accordance with RR 31006, determining each faculty member's compliance with the minimum academic workload requirement, and ensuring that corrective action is taken to prevent noncompliance in the future. In addition, TEC 51 requires that "each institution shall file with its governing board a report, by department, of the academic duties and services performed by each member of the faculty during the nine-month academic year, showing evidence of compliance with requirements established by the governing board."

At the request of members of the Board, we have completed an audit of academic workload for faculty compensated from state funds. The overall objective was to determine whether the UT institutions are operating in compliance with RR 31006 and TEC 51. The scope of this engagement was academic year (AY) 2014. To achieve our objective, we requested that all nine academic institutions complete a questionnaire to enable us to gain an understanding of the process for calculating, approving, monitoring, and reporting upon the academic workload of faculty. Detailed testing was limited to UT Dallas (UTD), UT San Antonio (UTSA), and UT Tyler (UTT).

RESULTS

From the review of self-reported process questionnaires and detailed testing at three institutions, we determined the academic institutions appear to be operating in compliance with most elements of RR 31006. Responsible administrators have been designated to monitor academic workload, monitoring is occurring, and the institutions have software in place that can calculate workload credits in compliance with RR 31006. Responses received indicate that most institutions have processes in place to ensure that presidential credits granted are below one percent of total SCHs taught and testing at UTD, UTSA, and UTT indicate that these institutions have granted presidential credits well below the one percent limit.

Priority- and High-level Findings¹ included:

- Annual reporting on academic workload to the Board has never occurred, as required by TEC 51, and there was no formal monitoring by the UT System Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) of the UT institutions' compliance with academic workload requirements. (Priority-level Finding)

¹ A Priority Finding is defined as an issue identified by an internal audit that, if not addressed timely, could directly impact achievement of a strategic or important operational objective of a UT institution or the UT System as a whole. Non-Priority Findings are ranked as High, Medium, or Low, with the level of significance based on an assessment of applicable Qualitative, Operational Control, and Quantitative risk factors and probability of a negative outcome occurring if the risk is not adequately mitigated. In total, this audit resulted in one Priority-level finding, four High-level findings, seven Medium-level findings, and four Low-level findings.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

- The level and formality of monitoring of academic workload varies by institution and Systemwide guidance to strengthen transparency and accountability of academic workload at the academic institutions has not been developed. (High-Level)
- UTT did not have adequate procedures in place to monitor workload, documentation was not available to confirm presidential credits granted in AY 2012 (AYs 2013 and 2014 were well below the one percent limit), and 14 of 60 faculty tested did not meet minimum workload requirements. (High-level)
- UTD did not have a formal process in place to review the assignment of presidential credits and did not retain all related documentation to support workload releases. (High-level)
- At UTD, there were instances of faculty Social Security numbers being included in unencrypted emails and attachments used to monitor workload. (High-level)

Other opportunities exist to strengthen monitoring, to ensure compliance with RR 31006, and to enhance transparency and accountability for workload and presidential credits granted by the academic institutions. From our testing at UTD, UTSA, and UTT, we also observed that certain sections of RR 31006 may not be sufficiently clear, which led to differences in the manner in which certain workload credits for equivalencies were determined. The variation in application of the rules to determine workload credit resulted in both over- and under-calculation of workload credit at the institutions tested. Inconsistency in interpretation and application of RR 31006 may also exist at the other academic institutions not tested. Enhanced guidance from UT System would ensure consistency and reduce the risk that workload credits are calculated incorrectly.

Four recommendations were made to OAA to address Systemwide issues. Twelve institution-specific recommendations for UTD, UTSA, and UTT appear in the appendices of this report. OAA and the institutions have agreed to address the recommendations and have provided estimated dates for their implementation.

Handwritten signature of J. Michael Peppers in black ink.

J. Michael Peppers, CIA, CRMA, CPA, QIAL
Chief Audit Executive

Handwritten signature of Eric J. Polonski in black ink.

Eric J. Polonski, CIA, CPA
Assistant Director of Audits



Audit Report

BACKGROUND

TEC 51 requires the Board to adopt rules for academic workload of faculty. Accordingly, the Board adopted (RR 31006, which requires that “each person paid full time from the appropriations item ‘Faculty Salaries’ shall be assigned a minimum workload equivalent to 18 semester credit hours (SCH) of instruction in organized undergraduate classes each nine-month academic year, or fiscal year at an institution’s option.” The minimum academic workload requirement is proportional to a faculty member’s full time equivalent (FTE) appointment and to his/her compensation paid from state funds. Consequently, a faculty member paid 50% from state funds would have a minimum workload equivalent to nine SCHs, or workload credits as referred to in this report. RR 31006 “sets the minimum workload and equivalencies only,” and each UT institution “may enact more intensive and/or more detailed minimum requirements.”

TEC 51 also states that “each institution shall recognize that classroom teaching, basic and applied research, and professional development are important elements of faculty academic workloads by giving appropriate weight to each activity when determining the standards for faculty academic workload. An institution may give the same or different weight to each activity and to other activities recognized by the institution as important elements of faculty academic workloads.” In alignment with this statute, RR 31006 provides workload credits for teaching, equivalencies, and other university activities assigned to faculty to meet the minimum academic workload requirement. UT institutions are to calculate workload credits in accordance with RR 31006 requirements. As defined by Section 6.13 of RR 31006, *Credit Granted by Institution Head*, workload credits may be granted for other duties not specified elsewhere in the Regents’ Rule and are referred to as presidential credits. These are limited to one percent of the total semester credit hours taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous year and may be granted for:

- (1) Major academic advising responsibilities,
- (2) Basic and applied research following a research work plan approved pursuant to institutional policy,
- (3) Preparing major documents in the fulfillment of programmatic needs or accreditation requirements, or
- (4) Duties performed in the best interest of the institution’s instructional programs as determined by the president.

AUDIT OBJECTIVE

At the request of members of the Board, we have completed an audit of academic workload for faculty compensated from state funds. The overall objective was to determine whether the UT institutions are operating in compliance with RR 31006 and TEC 51. This included determining whether:

- UT institutions have policies that define academic workload expectations,
- Presidents have designated officers to monitor workloads,
- Institutions are monitoring academic workload,
- Presidential credits are being granted appropriately,
- Faculty have met minimum academic workload requirements, and whether
- Institutions have filed workload reports as required by the *Texas Education Code*.

AUDIT SCOPE

The scope of this engagement was AY 2014 and included all academic institutions. Detailed testing was limited to three institutions, including UTD, UTSA, and UTT. For this report, the term “workload credit” includes credit for instruction, equivalencies, and workload releases as defined by RR 31006.

AUDIT METHODOLOGY

To achieve our objective we:



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

- Requested that all nine academic institutions complete a questionnaire to enable us to gain an understanding of the process for calculating, approving, monitoring, and reporting workload and presidential credits.
- Conducted interviews with those responsible for monitoring academic workload at UTD, UTSA, and UTT.
- Recalculated workload credits for a sample of faculty members at UTD, UTSA, and UTT to determine whether the minimum academic workload was achieved.
- Determined whether presidential credits were awarded in accordance with RR 31006 at UTD, UTSA, and UTT.
- Performed other procedures not specified above but deemed necessary to meet the engagement objective.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the guidelines set forth in The Institute of Internal Auditors' *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

RESULTS

The observations and related recommendations summarized below include information obtained from the process questionnaires as well as applicable observations from work performed at UTD, UTSA, and UTT.

Testing of Achievement of the Minimum Academic Workload

We tested a combined sample of 182 faculty members from UTD, UTSA, and UTT. We structured our selections to ensure inclusion of faculty members that received presidential credits and workload credit for equivalencies and activities described by RR 31006. Consistent with RR 31006, minimum workload requirements were adjusted proportionately to a faculty member's FTE appointment and to the proportion of compensation from state funds. At UTSA, 60 of 62 (96.7%) faculty members tested met the minimum workload requirement and at UTD, 55 of 60 (91.7%) faculty members tested met the minimum workload requirement. At UTT, 46 of 60 (76.7%) tested met the minimum workload requirement. Factors that affected faculty who did not achieve the minimum workload requirements appear within the *Appendices A, B, and C* for UTD, UTSA, and UTT respectively. The Systemwide observations and recommendations that follow will reduce that risk that faculty will not achieve the minimum faculty workload by enhancing oversight through annual reporting to the Board and by strengthening monitoring, accountability, and improving clarification and application of RR 31006.

Annual Reporting and Monitoring

According to TEC 51, each "institution shall file with its governing board a report, by department, of the academic duties and services performed by each member of the faculty during the nine-month academic year, showing evidence of compliance with requirements established by the governing board." Currently, reporting of academic workload is limited to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) reports prepared by the institutions and available to the UT System Office of Strategic Initiatives (OSI). When requested by the Board or UT System management, OSI has used the THECB reports to prepare reports that have incorporated academic workload and faculty productivity. The THECB reports include workload credits for teaching and several of the reporting elements required by statute; however, they do not include workload and presidential credits for equivalencies and release time granted for institutionally-approved duties. In addition, the THECB reports do not demonstrate compliance with, or exceptions to, achievement of the minimum academic workload requirement. Moreover, reporting on academic workload by the institutions to the Board and OAA, as required by TEC 51, does not occur each year.

In addition to a lack of annual reporting to the BOR, OAA has not been actively monitoring faculty academic workload. Consequently, OAA was not aware of the faculty from across the UT System who may not have met the minimum academic workload requirements, such as those we identified from UTT, and whether the institutions had taken correction action to ensure compliance with RR 31006.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

The observation described above is considered a **priority-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation (1): OAA should develop a Systemwide academic workload report that meets the information needs of the Board and demonstrates compliance with RR 31006. The institutions should provide information required by TEC 51.402 to UT System, which should be made available to the Board within 30 days of the end of each academic year. Using the annual report that will be developed, OAA should implement a monitoring process to evaluate faculty workload for all academic institutions, identify faculty who did not achieve the minimum academic workload, determine whether there were legitimate extenuating circumstances for not doing so, and ensure that, if necessary, the affected campus has taken the appropriate corrective action.

Management's Response: *The Office of Academic Affairs will prepare a summary report on academic workload to be presented to the Board of Regents annually. The Office of Academic Affairs will also use this report to monitor academic workload at the institutions.*

Regarding the institutional reports to the UT System, it is important to note that reporting faculty workload information within 30 days of the end of the academic year is a challenge. TEC 51.402 refers to the "nine-month academic year", which is generally understood to be September to May. The faculty workload information required by TEC 51.402 is reported to the THECB during the month of February for the preceding fall semester and during the month of July for the preceding spring semester. Institutions need this slightly extended timeframe to collect, verify, and certify all of the data. Based on the reports submitted to the THECB in summer 2015, many institutions across the state finalized and certified their data as late as mid-August. Only after the data required by TEC 51.402 are certified and submitted to the THECB does the UT System retrieve the information from the THECB.

It is also important to note that the information submitted to the THECB covers only the instructional side of faculty workload. The next step in the process is the submission of faculty workload information specific to Regents' Rule 31006. In recent years, UT System institutions have submitted this information, which includes certain workload credit equivalencies and presidential credit allowances as permitted in RR 31006, in November of each year. The November submission covers the preceding academic year.

Once the UT System has both sets of information, a report representing a more complete picture of faculty workload can be produced.

Anticipated Implementation Date: *Given the complexity of the reporting requirements, the Office of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the Office of Strategic Initiatives, will be able to produce a detailed report to be presented to the Board of Regents each year at its February meeting. If a special Regent request is made prior to that time, it may be possible to generate a short report with limited background information and analysis.*

Systemwide Academic Workload Guidance

Each institution has university-wide academic workload policies; however, some have not been updated in several years. Individual colleges/schools within the institutions may have their own academic workload policies. From our work at the institutions tested, we determined that not all colleges and schools have documented workload policies. College/school policies can align with but be more specific than the institutional academic workload policy.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

In addition to academic workload policies, there are common criteria that each institution uses to evaluate faculty achievement of the minimum academic workload. For example, each institution determines minimum academic workload on a nine-month, academic year basis. At each institution, the minimum workload expectation for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty compensated 100% from state funds is 18 workload credits. The minimum workload expectation is different for nontenure-track faculty. For most institutions, the minimum workload expectation for full-time, nontenure-track faculty compensated 100% from state funds is 24 or more workload credits. The primary reason for the difference between the minimum workload expectations is that nontenure-track faculty members are focused on instruction. In addition, all classroom instruction is captured by workload credits and, for the most part, is standardized (i.e., a three SCH undergraduate lecture at one academic institution generates the same three workload credits as a three SCH undergraduate lecture at another academic institution.) Non-teaching activities, such as research and administrative duties, performed by tenured and tenure-track faculty are assigned workload credits; however, workload credits assigned for these duties vary by institution and are not standardized. In addition, workload credits for non-teaching duties do not necessarily reflect the time and effort for those duties. Consequently, achievement of the minimum academic workload does not serve as a complete measure of faculty productivity.

At the majority of academic institutions, the provost is designated to monitor academic workload and to ensure compliance with RR 31006 and the institution's academic workload policy. The granting of presidential credits is also delegated to the provost. Workload and presidential credits are reviewed at the department and college/school levels prior to review by the provost's office; however, the approval process varies by institution. The timing for granting of presidential credits also varies. In general, most institutions reported determining and granting presidential credits at the beginning of and during the fall and spring semesters. Two institutions reported that presidential credits are determined and granted at the end of the academic year.

Workload and presidential credits must be calculated for each faculty member compensated from state funds for faculty salaries in order to evaluate achievement of the minimum academic workload. Each institution reported that it uses software (which varies by institution) to calculate and assign workload and presidential credits in accordance with RR 31006 and to monitor faculty workload. As previously described, presidential credits are limited to one percent of the total semester credit hours taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous year. In general, most institutions reported a process in place to ensure compliance with this requirement. From our testing, we determined that presidential credits granted at UTD, UTSA, and UTT were well below the one percent limit for AY 2014.

RR 31006 also requires that "every faculty member's compliance with [the] minimum academic workload requirements shall be assessed each academic year. If a faculty member is found to be out of compliance, the institution shall take appropriate steps to address the noncompliance and to prevent such noncompliance in the future." Within the process questionnaires, each institution described a process that it has in place to identify instances of noncompliance and ensure corrective that action, if needed, is taken.

Actual monitoring of faculty workload, including the review and approval of workload and presidential credits, is performed by the provost's designee who may have additional administrators who assist in the process. Monitoring of workload also occurs at the college/school and department levels. From our testing, we observed that the level and formality of monitoring varies by institution:

- UTD and UTSA monitor faculty workload each semester. Evaluation each semester helps ensure that minimum academic workload requirements are met and that any changes, if needed, can be made in the subsequent semester. However, at UTT, the provost's office did not have a formal process in place to monitor academic workload to ensure compliance with RR 31006. We were informed that this was due to frequent changes in leadership in the provost's position and an expectation that the colleges were sufficiently monitoring academic workload. UTT has a new provost effective July 2015 and, since his



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

arrival, has been and developed procedures for monitoring faculty workload that became effective in August 2015.

- The review and approval process of workload and presidential credits for equivalencies and workload releases also varies by institution. At UTD, requests for and review of granting workload and presidential credits for authorized activities occurs; however, the process is not formalized. At UTT, supporting documentation is not available to demonstrate review or approval of presidential and workload credits granted. At UTSA, approval for granting workload and presidential credits is formalized and documented. In addition, many of the colleges at UTSA require written agreements, prior to the start of the academic year, between faculty and college administrators that include the faculty member's workload expectations.

In general, opportunities exist to enhance transparency and accountability for workload and presidential credits granted at the academic institutions.

The observation described above is considered a **high-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation (2): OAA, in coordination with key stakeholders, should provide supplemental academic workload guidance to the academic institutions and/or update RR 31006 to address the following:

- Each college/school should have clearly documented workload policies and procedures for each when those policies differ from institutional workload policies. Such policies should be reviewed and approved by the respective deans and provost.
- Institutions should determine whether workload was met each semester. The process for determining and assigning workload and presidential credits should start at or before the beginning of each semester and be completed within a reasonable period after the census date to ensure that each faculty member achieves the minimum academic workload requirement.
- Workload and presidential credits granted to faculty for approved activities other than instruction should be documented in writing. The documentation should indicate clear expectations for the workload credits and release time granted as well as approval by appropriate chairs and/or deans. The completed documentation should be compiled at the college/school level and submitted by the dean's office to the provost's office for final review and approval. The form and manner in which the requests are made should be determined by the provost's office to ensure consistency of the process across the institution. If the provost's office agrees to the dean's request, the provost (or his/her designee) should document approval of the request.

Management's Response: *The Office of Academic Affairs will form a working group composed of institutional representatives including OAA staff, OSI staff, and Audit staff to develop supplemental guidelines for the institutions. The purpose of the guidelines will be to ensure consistent application of the provisions of the Regents' Rule across all of the academic institutions with a focus on an outcome that will provide a management value to the institutions and to the UT System.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: *OAA has begun preparing a draft set of supplemental guidelines. OAA will also form the working group and finalize the guidelines. The anticipated date of completion of the guidelines is March 2016. The anticipated date of implementation at the institution level is fall 2016.*

Variation in Interpretation of Certain Sections of RR 31006

From our testing at UTD, UTSA, and UTT, we observed variation in interpretation of certain sections of RR 31006. It also appears that certain portions of RR 31006 were not sufficiently clear to ensure consistent



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

application by all academic institutions. This contributed to differences in the manner in which certain workload credits for equivalencies were determined as described below:

- RR 31006 does not specifically mention internship courses. Section 6.3, *Supervision*, mentions intern supervision, and UTT calculated workload credits for internships using Section 6.3 requirements. UTD and UTSA treat internships as a type of practicum course and apply Section 6.4, *Honors Program or Individual Research Projects*, requirements. Section 6.4 includes student practicum courses and provides more workload credits than Section 6.3, and the THECB classifies internships as type of practicum course as well. It appears that the current categorization for internships in RR 31006 may not be sufficiently clear and not aligned with the THECB.
- The academic institutions offer cross-listed courses that can satisfy both graduate and upper-division undergraduate course requirements. UTD, UTSA, and UTT determine workload credits for such courses differently. UTD allocates workload credits based on enrollment. At UTD, a three SCH cross-listed lecture that includes 20 undergraduates and 20 graduate students would result in a blended 3.75 workload credits. At UTSA, the same facts would result in a 4.5 workload credits since UTSA treats all such courses as graduate courses. At UTT, the same facts would also result in 4.5 workload credits; however, if there were less than five graduate students, the affected faculty member would receive three workload credits.
- Sections 6.2, *Labs*, and 6.3, *Supervision*, do not expressly state whether additional credit allowed by Section 6.1, *Graduate Instruction*, may be provided for instructional types under Section 6.2 and 6.3. UTD and UTSA have interpreted that instructional types under Sections 6.2 and 6.3 are eligible for additional credit available under Section 6.1. This interpretation appears reasonable. For AY 2014, UTT did not share this interpretation and did not provide additional workload credit for graduate instruction for Sections 6.2 and 6.3 instructional types. However, UTT changed its process for AY 2015 and is now providing additional credit for Section 6.2 and 6.3 graduate-level instructional types. It appears the applicability of Section 6.1 to Sections 6.2 and 6.3 may not be consistently understood by all academic institutions.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation (3): OAA, in coordination with key stakeholders, should provide supplemental academic workload guidance to the academic institutions or update RR 31006 to address the following:

- Clearly communicate the applicability of Section 6.1, *Graduate Instructions*, to instructional types under Section 6.2, *Labs*, and Section 6.3, *Supervision*.
- Update 6.4, *Honors Program or Individual Research Projects*, to include internships to align with guidance provided by the THECB.
- Provide updated guidance on how to account for cross-listed courses that concurrently serve both graduate and undergraduate students.

Management's Response: *The Office of Academic Affairs will form a working group composed of institutional representatives including OAA staff, OSI staff, and Audit staff to develop supplemental guidelines for the institutions. The purpose of the guidelines will be to ensure consistent application of the provisions of the Regents' Rule across all of the academic institutions across all of the academic institutions with a focus on an outcome that will provide a management value to the institutions and to the UT System.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: *OAA has begun preparing a draft set of supplemental guidelines. OAA will also form the working group and finalize the guidelines. The anticipated date of completion of the guidelines is March 2016. The anticipated date of implementation at the institution level is fall 2016.*



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

Workload Credit for Blended and Online Learning and Other Large Courses

The first focus from the chancellor's *Framework for Advancing Excellence throughout The University of Texas System: Action Plan* is "Undergraduate Student Access and Success." Two of the action items to improve undergraduate student access and success include 1) "enacting the recommendations of the Blended and Online Learning Task Force, as approved by the Board of Regents" and 2) "expanding the portfolio of online courses to be shared Systemwide, thereby increasing outreach to all students." Section 6.7 of RR 31006, *Large Classes*, provides a mechanism for providing additional workload credits for large class sizes. The maximum additional workload credit is 2.0 for class sizes with more than 250 students. RR 31006 may not adequately account for workload equivalencies necessary to deliver and administer online courses or other large courses with very large enrollments that are significantly in excess of 250 students.

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation (4): Because online courses may impact faculty that deliver and administer such courses, OAA should review RR 31006 and, in consultation with the academic institutions, determine whether RR 31006 provides adequate workload credit for online courses or other courses with very large enrollments. If warranted, RR 31006 could be updated to ensure that appropriate workload credits are provided to affected faculty. Alternatively, the OAA could provide guidance to the institutions that presidential credits could be granted to applicable faculty.

Management's Response: *As part of the development of the supplemental guidelines, the Office of Academic Affairs will consult with the academic institutions and other System offices to determine whether faculty teaching courses with enrollments in excess of 250 (the enrollment number specified in the Regents' Rule for which the maximum amount of workload credit may be granted) should be granted more workload credit than currently allowed.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: *The anticipated date of completion of the guidelines is March 2016. At that time, OAA will make a recommendation regarding workload credit for courses with more than 250 students.*

Supplemental guidance from OAA or revisions to RR 31006 as described in recommendations two through four may require updates to the university-wide academic workload policies. After the academic institutions update their academic workload policies to ensure alignment with supplemental guidance or updates to RR31006, they should submit their updated academic workload policies to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for review and approval to ensure consistency across UT System.



Appendix A – UT Dallas

RESULTS

According to RR 31006, “the president of an institution shall designate the officer of the institution who will monitor workloads.” At UTD, the designated officer is the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost). The Provost has assigned the Vice Provost to calculate workload credits for all faculty members compensated from state funds for faculty salaries and to monitor faculty workload. The Vice Provost and his staff (provost’s office) monitor faculty workload each semester to ensure minimum academic workload requirements are met by each applicable faculty member on a per-semester and academic year basis. The provost’s office uses three programs to monitor, calculate, and report workload credits. Monitoring of academic workload also occurs at the school and the departmental level. Such monitoring is necessary to ensure faculty course assignments are sufficient to meet student course demand. Assigned administrators at the schools work regularly with the provost’s office to monitor faculty workload. The provost’s office starts calculating workload credits at the beginning of each semester and provides initial workload reports to the schools early in the semester to allow for appointments to be completed through the university’s business and budget systems. The workload reports are updated and provided to the schools weekly until all issues are clarified, which usually occurs by mid-semester.

According to Section 6.13 of RR 31006, presidential credits are limited to 1% of the total SCH taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous academic year. Using total SCH generated by faculty in the previous comparable semester and presidential credits granted during the current academic year, we determined, as noted in the table to the right, that UTD granted presidential credits well below the 1% limit. UTD records did not specifically identify presidential credits for periods prior to the fall of 2013. For fall 2013 and spring 2014, UTD awarded 926 and 680 presidential credits respectively. This represents 0.42% and 0.33% of the total SCH’s reported for the comparable semester in the previous year, which are, again, well below the 1% limit. Separately, we determined that 32% of faculty paid from state funds for faculty salaries was granted presidential credits in AY 2014.

Academic Year	Academic Year Semester	SCH from the comparable semester from the previous year	Total Presidential and Other Workload Equivalency Credits Awarded	Percentage
2012	Fall 2011	184,713	800.99	0.43%
	Spring 2012	175,165	546.3	0.31%
2013	Fall 2012	205,957	839.28	0.41%
	Spring 2013	198,123	957.44	0.48%
2014	Fall 2013	218,157	1,255.87	0.58%
	Spring 2014	206,582	973.63	0.47%

As part of our work, we tested a sample of 60 faculty members’ academic workload to determine whether: (1) workload credits were calculated in accordance with RR 31006, (2) workload releases were appropriate and properly approved, and (3) the minimum academic workload requirements were met. At UTD, the minimum academic workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 18 workload credits while the minimum for nontenure-track faculty is 24 workload credits. Each of these standards assumes a faculty member with a 100% FTE appointment paid 100% from state funds for faculty salaries. Our sample included tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty. Our selections focused on faculty that had received workload or presidential credits for equivalencies or workload releases. For each faculty member tested, we calculated the minimum academic workload in proportion to the percent of each faculty member’s salary supported by state funds for faculty salaries and the faculty member’s FTE appointment.

From our testing, we determined that UTD is generally calculating workload credit’s accurately and consistently. Most UTD faculty tested (55 of 60 tested) met minimum workload requirements. The specific reasons that tested faculty members that did not make the workload are described in the applicable observations below. In addition, we have included other observations and recommendations to strengthen existing controls in place to monitor academic workload and ensure compliance with RR 31006.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

UTD Academic Workload Policy

UTD has a university-wide academic workload policy (*Minimum Faculty Academic Workload Requirement - UTDPP1060*) which was last updated on March 5, 2010. It generally mirrors most elements of RR 31006; however, it does not include workload credit limits for equivalencies and does not reference presidential credits, types of activities for which such credits may be approved, or other general requirements for awarding them.

Within its academic workload policy, UTD has a specific instructional requirement that is more stringent than RR 31006. According to the policy “each faculty member is obligated to teach at least three SCH of undergraduate instruction in organized classes each academic year and at least six SCH of organized class instruction each semester.” We identified seven faculty members from our sample that did not meet this UTD requirement for fall 2013 and ten faculty members from our sample that did not meet this UTD requirement for spring 2014. We were informed that the university has been unable to enforce this policy due to (1) tremendous growth in enrollment over the last ten years, and (2) faculty recruiting that has lagged behind enrollment growth. We were also informed that the policy was designed for a stable enrollment with a matching total faculty size, and that, in the future, when enrollment stabilizes, enforcement of the policy may be possible.

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System’s Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation:

- UTD should update its academic workload policy to more closely align with RR 31006 by defining, where applicable, workload credit limits for workload equivalencies, and presidential credits. The policy should define presidential credits, for what they can be awarded, and the requirements for awarding them.
- UTD has been unable to ensure compliance with its policy for faculty to provide at least three SCH of undergraduate and six SCH of organized class instruction each semester. UTD should consider reviewing this policy and determine whether the policy needs to be updated.

Management’s Response: *Both of these issues will be brought before Dean’s Council for discussion on how to implement. It is likely that requirements will be UTD School specific as the activities in the Sciences and Engineering differ from those in the Arts.*

The second issue of requiring undergraduate instruction and minimum semester requirements will be reviewed. Both of these were introduced when UTD was not growing rapidly. In the future when growth slows the undergraduate requirement will be enforced.

Anticipated Implementation Date: December 31, 2016

Monitoring and Approval of Workload Credits for Equivalencies

UTD has a review process in place for monitoring academic workload. This includes a process for the request and review of workload and presidential credits for equivalencies and workload releases granted to faculty. Workload and presidential credits for equivalencies and workload releases are defined in sections 6.1 to 6.13 of RR 31006 and include equivalencies such as those for graduate instruction and large class sizes and workload releases such as those for administrative duties, course development, and research. In general, the schools request presidential credits and workload credits from the provost’s office while the provost’s office reviews those requests (in coordination with workload credits for instruction) for each faculty member. The process for requesting, reviewing, and granting presidential and workload credits starts at the beginning of the semester. For fall 2013, this process appears to have been finalized by mid-November; and for spring 2014, it appears to have been finalized by toward the end of March 2014.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

As part of its monitoring activities, the provost's office requests clarification for any identified deficiencies and the respective schools provide information for how those deficiencies have been or will be addressed. As part of our work, we interviewed key administrators from The Naveen Jindal School of Management, The Eric Jonson School of Engineering and Computer Science, and The School of Interdisciplinary Studies. Interviews with leaders from these schools indicated that the provost's office actively monitors the academic workloads of their faculty. The faculty workload reports and requests for review of workload and presidential credits that we were provided by the provost's office also support this assertion.

Though a review process is in place, approval for the assignment of workload and presidential credits is not formalized. Currently, there is no evidence of signature approval by the department chair, dean or provost's office. Requests for review and approval also vary by college. One school's request includes descriptive information on the purpose of the workload and presidential credits being requested. Another school's request included a matrix with the faculty names, the type of credit being requested, and the amount of credit being requested. In some instances, workload credit requests did not have a specific amount of workload credit being requested for a faculty member. In such cases it is left to the provost's office to determine the minimum amount of credit to assign for the requested activity to achieve minimum workload without exceeding workload credit limits specified in RR 31006. In addition, requests for credit were not always clear as to their purpose and did not always align with the credit being requested. For example, one school requested workload credit for equivalencies or workload releases; however, the documentation did not always specify the activity for which the credit was being requested. In some cases, presidential credits were assigned to faculty; however, the documentation supporting the request was missing. Currently, there isn't a standardized form for requests that could create consistency for the requests being made by each school.

Assigned administrators at the schools monitor academic workload and work regularly with the provost's office. Within the schools, the requests and approval for assigning presidential and workload credits occurs; however the process is not formalized. Approval for workload and presidential credits can be documented in an email, verbally agreed to with faculty, or verbally discussed and approved in administrator meetings. In general, there are no written agreements between faculty and administrators at the schools that document the workload credit equivalency, the presidential credit being assigned, and the deliverable or duty assignment expected of the faculty members for the release time provided.

The observation described above is considered a **high-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation:

- The provost's office should develop a standardized workload equivalency and presidential credit request form. This would be completed by each college and would clearly describe the workload credit equivalency and presidential credit requested along with amounts being requested for each faculty member. The form, to be completed by each college, could include the expected teaching load for the semester, equivalency elements with RR 31006 section references (e.g., Section 6.10, *Administrative Services*; Section 6.11, *New Faculty*; Section 6.12, *Course Development*; etc.), and the amounts being requested. A comment column could also be included that would provide additional descriptive information, if needed, to facilitate the provost's office review. The requests from the school should also include the approval (signature and date) of the respective deans and the provost, or the provost's delegate. Copies of the final approved form should be provided to the respective schools.
- Within each school, approval for workload equivalencies and presidential credit should be documented. A standardized form could be developed within each college that is approved by the department chair or dean, as applicable. The form would include assigned workload and



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

presidential credits and expected deliverable and/or duty assignment for which the release time is being provided.

Management's Response: *This recommendation is strongly related to the first recommendation. It will be discussed with the Deans in connection with the first recommendation and a solution obtained for both.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: December 31, 2016

Presidential and Workload Equivalency Credits Awarded for Individual Agreements

From our testing, we noted two instances in which certain presidential and workload credits were provided as the result of agreements made between former faculty members and leadership within the specific schools. We were informed that one former employee was provided half of the individual's salary for one semester as part of a retirement agreement. Information provided indicated that a presidential credit for research was assigned to the faculty member; however, in the presidential credit request documentation was limited to "retirement agreement." A presidential credit was necessary since the funding source was state appropriated funds for faculty salaries. We were informed that the former faculty member did not have assigned duties for the spring 2014 semester. The provost's office did not have a copy of the agreement negotiated between the former faculty member and the applicable school.

In another instance, a tenured faculty member had taught in excess of the minimum teaching load for periods prior to AY 2014. According to the provost's office, the former faculty member had an understanding with leadership in the applicable school that the faculty member's "over teaching" would be compensated in future semesters by a reduction in the minimum workload requirement in a subsequent semester. This faculty member was provided a workload credit for course development. The provost's office did not a copy of documented approval for this arrangement. RR 31006 sets a minimum workload standard, but does not describe a threshold in which workload in excess of the minimum can be accrued and result in a reduced workload in future periods. This practice appears to be a departure from RR 31006 and this individual was compensated with state appropriated funds for faculty salaries.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation: To the extent to which faculty members are compensated and released from teaching and other university duties allowed by RR 31006, the university should not use state funds appropriated for faculty salaries. Instead, non-state, institutional funds should be used to such releases that are agreed to between applicable faculty and UTD. If workload releases from instruction and other university duties documented in an institutional approved agreement were funded with non-state funding sources, granting of presidential credits or other workload credits permitted by RR 31006 would not be necessary. In addition, the provost's office should obtain copies of such agreements to ensure workload requirements are met and comply with RR 31006.

Management's Response: *To the extent possible this will be implemented beginning with the Spring Semester of 2016. However it should be pointed out that these releases are "allowed" by RR 31006 so that state funds will have to be used if no other fiscal resources are available.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: May 31, 2016



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

Calculation of Workload for Cross-Listed Courses with Large Class Sizes

UTD offers a variety of cross listed courses. Cross-listed courses consist of two or more classes meeting together at the same time. These courses are typically taught by the same instructor and in the same classroom. Graduate and undergraduate classes may be cross-listed together. A combination of cross listed courses can result in a large class size for an assigned instructor. However, the individual cross-listed courses may not, by themselves, make up a large class size. We identified four faculty members from our sample that taught two or more courses in the same room at the same time that, when total enrollment was counted, met the definition of a large class size; however, the faculty members were not provided total teaching load credit allowed by the large class size multipliers described in section 6.7 of RR 31006, *Large Classes*. Technically UTD's practice could be allowed as it is more restrictive, which is permitted by Section 5 of RR 31006, *Institutional Requirements*. An automated solution would eliminate the need to provide additional credit to faculty that might otherwise have otherwise made the minimum workload requirement without an additional, manually adjusted workload credit. For one of the four faculty members, additional credit was given to achieve the minimum workload that was ultimately not necessary to achieve the minimum workload requirement had the additional credit for large class size been applied.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation: The provost's office should update its workload program to ensure that faculty that provide instruction for large, combined cross-listed courses a awarded full workload equivalent credit as permitted by RR 31006.

Management's Response: *The computer programs which compute teaching load are presently being modified to implement this recommendation.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: May 31, 2016

Workload Calculation for University Courses Under Section 6.2 of RR 31006

Workload for certain university courses are to be based upon contact hours. According to section 6.2 of RR 31006, *Labs*, "one and one-half contact hours of instruction of regularly scheduled laboratory and clinical courses, physical activity courses, studio art, studio music instruction, and primary music performance organizations, such as ensembles and marching bands, for each week of a long-term semester will be considered the equivalent of one semester credit hour of undergraduate instruction." Using this definition, we identified three faculty members from our sample that were awarded more workload equivalent credit than the formula described in RR 31006. In addition, we identified two other faculty members that were awarded less workload equivalent credit than allowed by RR 31006. UTD currently awards workload for labs, physical activity courses, studio music instruction based on the semester credit hours available to students that complete the course requirements. UTD's current practice does not align with RR 31006 and can, depending on the amount of contact hours, assign more or less workload credits to affected faculty.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation: The provost's office should modify its workload program to calculate workload equivalents for section 6.2 courses in compliance with the requirements of RR 31006.

Management's Response: *With regards to "laboratory and clinical courses", UTD's policy is stricter than that of the Regents in that we would allow only one hour of credit for a three hour lab or clinical*



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

course rather than the Regent's two hours. This is in line with the granting of student course credit across the US. With regard to studio art, our past investigation indicates that faculty instruction here is a mixture of both group and individual instruction and the faculty effort is equivalent to that of a full time lecture. Accordingly, we will again investigate this issue and may have to reclassify the instruction type of some courses to adequately reflect what happens in the classroom.

Anticipated Implementation Date: December 31, 2016

Over-Award of Administrative Credit

According to Section 6.10 of RR 31006, *Administrative Services*, workload credits can be provided to faculty members who provide non-teaching academic services to the department head. One faculty member was provided a 5.7 workload credit for the fall semester and 4.5 for the spring for the same administrative role. The total credits, 10.2, were necessary for the faculty member to make the minimum workload for the academic year. In addition the department chair was provided 4.5 workload credits for the fall 2013 and 4.5 for spring 2014. Between the chair and the faculty member, 10.2 workload credits were provided in the fall and 9.0 in the spring for departmental administration. According to 6.10, "in no case will the total for departmental administration, including the head, exceed nine workload credits per semester unless the institution's organizational structure includes academic units composed of more than one academic discipline."

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation: The provost's office should ensure that faculty members are awarded workload equivalency credits within limits provided by RR 31006.

Management's Response: *UTD Policy was created when the minimum faculty workload was defined by semester rather than by the academic year. The policy will be modified to use the academic year as the base for this "credit."*

Anticipated Implementation Date: December 31, 2016

FTE Percentage for Workload

Academic workload is proportional and depends (1) on the proportion of salary paid from state appropriated funds for faculty salaries to total salary paid and (2) the full time equivalent (FTE) appointment percentage. We recalculated the FTE percentage for the sample that was used to determine workload and found the provost's office is determining this percentage correctly; however, we noted two exceptions where faculty did not meet the minimum academic workload requirement for the year. In one instance a faculty member paid from state appropriations for faculty salaries received a faculty job code that is normally used to pay faculty supplements. This job code was not considered an acceptable by the UTD workload program. Consequently, the affected faculty member did not meet the annual workload expectation.

In the second instance, a faculty member had zero workload expectation fall 2013 since the faculty member's compensation was originally from other non-state funding sources; however, the faculty member was compensated from state appropriations for faculty salaries for the last two months of the fall semester. According to the provost's office, this error was caused by an appointment change made by payroll. By November, the fall 2013 teaching load was finalized and the faculty member had no assigned academic workload expectation. We were informed that the provost's office was provided information about the appointment change in January 2014 but was not provided the reason for the change.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation:

- The provost's office should update the workload program to ensure that it accounts for all applicable faculty codes.
- UTD payroll should provide timely updates of mid-year changes in funding sources and the purpose of the changes so that provost's office has up-to-date and complete information to monitor faculty workload and make changes if necessary.

Management's Response: *With regards to faculty "codes", the computer programs are currently being modified to remove this problem. With the adjustment of UTD to a new financial system, the problem of "retrospective" changes should disappear. However, the Provost's Office will alert the UTD Payroll area that any such changes must be reported to the Provost Office.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: May 31, 2016

Use of Social Security Numbers in Academic Workload Communications

UTS 165 Standard 13: Use and Protection of Social Security Numbers, Section 13.1 states, "All Institutions shall reduce the use and collection of social security numbers. All Institutions shall discontinue the use of all or part of the social security number as an individual's primary identification number unless required or permitted by law. The social security number may be stored as a confidential attribute associated with an individual only if use of the social security number is essential for the performance of a mission related duty." With respect to monitoring academic workload, we found that faculty social security numbers (SSN) have been included in unencrypted emails and email attachments between the provost's office and the university schools. SSN's are required information to be included within the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) reports; however, they are not necessary for monitoring workload between the schools and the provost's office. Unsecured communication of employee names with associated SSN's put faculty at unnecessary risk of identity theft.

The observation described above is considered a **high-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system

Recommendation: The use of SSN's should be limited to that which is necessary for the THECB reporting requirements. Otherwise, the provost's office and the university schools should discontinue using faculty social security numbers for monitoring faculty workload.

Management's Response: *It should be noted that all correspondence from the Provost Office to other University Offices precludes inclusion of SSN's as well as UTD ID's. Teaching load information which has SSN is hand carried from the Provost Office to other University Offices. The inclusion of SSN's in emails, mentioned above, was from the Office of a Dean to the Provost Office. The office was informed that this was in violation of university policy. We shall immediately make Dean's Offices aware that SSN's or any other personal information should not be included in email or email attachments.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: Immediate

Auditor's Note: We verified that management communicated to the UTD schools that "the use of SSN's in emails is not allowed under UTD policy" and that if any request which requires the use of SSN for faculty identification should be sent in hard copy form directly from the deans' offices to the Vice Provost. Consequently, we consider this recommendation to be **Implemented**.



Appendix B – UT San Antonio

RESULTS

According to RR 31006, “the president of an institution shall designate the officer of the institution who will monitor workloads.” At UTSA, the designated officer responsible for monitoring academic workload is the Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (VPIE). The VPIE office calculates workload credits for all UTSA faculty members compensated from state funds for faculty salaries and actively monitors faculty workload to ensure they meet the minimum workload requirements established by RR 31006. The VPIE office uses an application called Digital Measures to monitor and report workload credits for the fall and spring semesters. The student system (Banner) contains course and enrollment data for each faculty member that is the basis for determining faculty workload. Banner is programmed to calculate workload credits for each course and the data is migrated to Digital Measures throughout the semester. In addition, the departments enter workload credit granted for approved workload releases (e.g., administrative assignments) into Digital Measures. The VPIE office monitors faculty workload each semester to ensure minimum academic workload requirements are met on both a semester and academic year basis. Monitoring of faculty workload also occurs at the college and departmental level. College deans and department chairs certify their faculty members’ workload in Digital Measures prior to the monitoring efforts of the VPIE office. Such monitoring is necessary to ensure proper course assignments and to meet student demand.

The VPIE office starts the process of calculating faculty workload at the beginning of each semester and finalizes its calculations mid-semester after the colleges have entered and received approval for their workload releases in Digital Measures. If it is determined that a faculty member may not meet their workload for the semester, the VPIE office reaches out to the college for further clarification and any action, if needed.

According to Section 6.13 of RR 31006, presidential credits are limited to 1% of the total SCH taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous academic year. Using total SCH generated by faculty in the previous comparable semester and presidential credits granted during the current academic year, we determined, as noted in the table to the right, that UTSA grants presidential credits that are well within the 1% limit. Separately, we determined that 52% of faculty members paid from state funds for faculty salaries were granted a presidential credit in AY 2014.

Academic Year (AY)	Semester	SCH from the Previous Comparable Semester	Presidential Credits Granted	Percentage
AY 2012	Fall 2011	344,326	826	0.24%
	Spring 2012	319,605	802	0.25%
AY 2013	Fall 2012	355,447	944	0.27%
	Spring 2013	331,321	862	0.26%
AY 2014	Fall 2013	353,234	1,097	0.31%
	Spring 2014	324,234	979	0.30%

As part of our work, we tested a sample of 62 faculty members’ academic workload, including a review of workload releases granted to these faculty members, to determine whether: (1) faculty workload was calculated in accordance with RR 31006, (2) workload releases were appropriate and properly approved, and (3) the minimum academic workload requirements were met. At UTSA, the minimum academic workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 18 workload credits, while the minimum for nontenure-track faculty is 24 workload credits. These standards are applicable to faculty paid 100% from state funds for faculty salaries and with a 100% FTE appointment. Our sample included tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty and focused on faculty members that had received presidential credits and workload credits for workload releases. For each faculty member tested, we calculated the minimum academic workload in proportion to the percent of each faculty member’s salary supported by state funds for faculty salaries and the faculty member’s FTE appointment. From our testing, we have determined that UTSA is generally calculating faculty workload accurately and consistently, in accordance with RR 31006; workload releases, including presidential credits, appear appropriate



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

and were properly approved; and the majority of UTSA faculty tested (60 of 62 or 96.8%) met the minimum academic workload requirements. The specific reasons that led to the faculty members that did not meet the minimum workload are described in the observations that follow. In addition, we included a recommendation to strengthen existing controls in place to monitor academic workload and ensure compliance with RR 31006.

Monitoring Workload Releases

As previously mentioned, UTSA, through the VPIE office, has a process in place for monitoring academic workload. There is also a formal, documented approval process in place for requesting workload releases, including presidential and workload credit granted for the workload releases. The requests from the departments are reviewed and approved by the college deans in Digital Measures. The VPIE office reviews these requests and follows up with the respective colleges if additional clarification is needed. Approval of the deans' requests is indicated by the signature or sign-off of the Vice Provost. Furthermore, some, but not all, of the colleges require written agreements between faculty and college administrators that document the faculty member's workload expectations, deliverables, and/or other administrative assignments prior to the start of the academic year.

Additionally, RR 31006 Section 6.13, *Credit Granted by Institutional Head*, specifically states that workload releases for basic and applied research should have a research work plan approved pursuant to institutional policy. Upon review of three faculty members who received a presidential credit for basic and applied research during the academic year, we observed that there was not consistent documentation maintained by the colleges regarding the research work plans. In one instance, there was a three-year workload agreement, including research that was signed by the faculty member and approved by the department chair. In the other two instances, we were provided information about research that the faculty member had performed during the year but there was no formal work plan approved at the department or college level. This inconsistency may be due to a general assumption that tenured and tenure-track faculty engage in research or a lack of institutional guidelines for awarding presidential credits for basic and applied research.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation:

- Management should consider having each college document workload agreements that include the faculty member's duties, expectations, deliverables, administrative assignments, and/or other approved activities. In addition to serving as a basis for the faculty member's performance evaluation, these agreements could serve as support for workload release time granted.
- In addition, management should establish institutional guidelines for awarding presidential credits for basic and applied research, including documentation of a research work plan, pursuant to RR 31006.

Management's Response: *We appreciate this recommendation and believe that clear discipline-based expectations help colleges meet their strategic goals and help faculty successfully manage their careers. The provost's office will re-emphasize that faculty workload commitments, including a research work plan if presidential credits are requested for research, should be carefully reviewed and signed off on every year to be in compliance with the requirement of Regents' Rule 31006, Section 6.13.*

Regarding research plans, currently the workload policies for the Colleges of Business, Liberal and Fine Arts, and Public Policy lay out explicit requirements for their faculty members' research productivity (as well as for teaching and service), depending on the 'track' to which the faculty member is assigned, and provide the timespan over which the productivity is expected to occur. The revised workload policy of the College of Engineering, under development at the time of the audit, also reflects the requirements noted



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

for the three colleges above, and will go into effect in AY 2015-16. The College of Architecture, Construction and Planning and the College of Sciences vary in the level of detail and application of their workload policies. The College of Education and Human Development currently holds all faculty to the balanced workload.

Every faculty member reports her/his productivity outcomes every year in the required Annual Report. The outcomes are evaluated by the supervisor given the weighting to which the faculty member agreed in her/his workload plan. The evaluation of outcomes is reflected in both faculty merit awards and in any adjustments to the following year's workload plan.

Those colleges that have not developed clear guidance regarding outcomes for workload releases will amend their current workload policies. We will use this management tool for chairs and deans to improve documentation.

Anticipated Implementation Date: June 1, 2016

Percentage of Responsibility in Banner

The calculation of academic workload is partially based on faculty members' proportion of responsibility for the courses they teach in a given semester. We identified one instance in which a faculty member's percentage of responsibility was incorrect in Banner and therefore, their workload was not accurately calculated. RR 31006 Section 6.8, *Proportional Credit*, states "When more than one teacher participates in the instruction of a single course, the credit is proportioned according to the effort expended." Based on information provided by the VPIE office, the correct percentage was lower than what was manually entered by the department in the system which resulted in an overstatement of the faculty member's workload. The faculty member had a teaching assistant helping with the lab portion of the course but this was not properly recorded. If the percentage of responsibility had been entered correctly, the faculty member would not have met the minimum academic workload requirement.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation: Management should strengthen existing controls to include verification of the accuracy of information manually recorded by the departments in Banner.

Management's Response: *We appreciate this finding because it gives us an opportunity to better educate the staff members who enter teaching responsibility percentages into the Banner Student Information System –from which workload reports are generated. They will be reminded to make the allocations based on effort, regardless of source of funding (faculty salary, Ph.D. student stipend, etc.). In addition, we will instruct the department chairs, who determine the assignments of their instructors, to more closely review to make sure that everyone assigned teaching responsibilities is given appropriate workload credit in the department report. We have modified annual workload training sessions as well as our workload guidelines to note that assignment of teaching responsibility is based on the actual share of teaching time rather than on source of pay. Lastly, we will develop a standard report that will list class/lab section teaching percentage assignments to assist us in searching for and remedying discrepancies such as this.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: August 25, 2015



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

Auditor's Note: We verified that management communicated to department chairs the defining factors of the percentage of responsibility field in Banner, modified its training materials, and developed a standard report to identify specific areas of concern related to faculty percentage of responsibility in order to more closely monitor the values assigned within each department, and we consider this recommendation to be **Implemented**.

Undergraduate/Graduate Cross-Listed Courses

UTSA offers courses that it considers "cross-listed." These courses consist of more than one course and/or course section taught at one designated date and time. In our sample of 62 faculty members, we found two instances in which there were cross-listed courses consisting of one undergraduate section and one graduate section. In these instances, UTSA collectively accounted for these courses at the graduate level. As outlined in Section 6.1 of RR 31006, *Graduate Instructions*, one SCH of graduate instruction is considered the equivalent of 1.5 SCH of undergraduate instruction. If the workload for these courses had been allocated by student, one faculty member would not have met the minimum academic workload requirement. Other UT academic institutions offer similar cross-listed graduate/undergraduate courses and calculate workload credits for such courses differently. We have informed the UT System OAA of the variation observed and recommended that OAA provide updated guidance on how to account for cross-listed courses that concurrently serve both undergraduate and graduate students. We anticipate that such guidance will be provided to all academic institutions during fiscal year 2016 and applicable to AY 2017. Consequently, the manner in which UTSA is calculating workload credit for such courses could change.



Appendix C – UT Tyler

AUDIT RESULTS

According to RR 31006, “the president of an institution shall designate the officer of the institution who will monitor workloads.” At UTT, the designated officer responsible for monitoring academic workload is the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. With the colleges, the deans are responsible for monitoring faculty workload for their respective departments. Interviews with a sample of university deans indicate that academic workload of their faculty within their respective colleges is monitored each year.

To calculate workload credits for all faculty members, management has developed a custom module within the student information system, PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (PeopleSoft). The module calculates workload credits using course and enrollment data for each faculty member and can be used to monitor faculty workload. It is also used to calculate teaching load credits (the instructional portion of workload credits) that are reported to the THECB each semester. Beginning in the fall 2014 semester, the institution expanded their use of PeopleSoft to track workload and presidential credits for workload releases, such as administrative assignments.

According to Section 6.13 of RR 31006, presidential credits are limited to 1% of the total SCH taught at the institution during the comparable fall or spring semester in the previous academic year. Using total SCH generated by faculty in the previous comparable semester and presidential credits granted during the current academic year, we determined, as noted in the table to the right, that UTT granted presidential credits well below the 1% limit. However, management was unable to provide a record of the presidential credits granted in AY 2012. Consequently, we could not calculate whether the institution was compliant with the 1% limit. Separately, we determined that 39% of faculty paid from state funds for faculty salaries was granted presidential credits in AY 2014.

Academic Year (AY)	Semester	SCH from the Previous Comparable Semester	Presidential Credits Granted	Percentage
AY 2012	Fall 2011	69,726	No Record	Could Not Be Calculated
	Spring 2012	65,859	No Record	Could Not Be Calculated
AY 2013	Fall 2012	73,080	46.07	0.06%
	Spring 2013	68,569	58.06	0.08%
AY 2014	Fall 2013	75,064	333	0.44%
	Spring 2014	71,908	301	0.42%

As part of our work, we tested a sample of 60 faculty members’ academic workload to determine whether: (1) faculty workload was calculated in accordance with RR 31006, (2) workload releases were appropriate and properly approved, and (3) the minimum academic workload requirements were met. At UTT, the minimum academic workload for tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty is 18 workload credits, and we were informed that there is a general expectation that nontenure-track faculty will have an academic workload that is greater than 18. These standards are applicable to faculty paid 100% from state funds for faculty salaries and with a 100% FTE appointment. The minimum academic workload is also proportional to the percent of state funds used to compensate faculty salaries and to the FTE appointment. Our sample included tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty and focused on faculty members that had received presidential credits and workload credits for workload releases. For each faculty member tested, we calculated the minimum academic workload in proportion to the percent of each faculty member’s salary supported by state funds for faculty salaries and the faculty member’s FTE appointment.

From our testing, we determined that UTT is generally calculating faculty workload accurately and consistently, in accordance with RR 31006; however, management’s calculations of workload credits are more restrictive for certain courses and have, in some instances, led to some faculty members not meeting the minimum workload requirements. We also determined that management did not document its review or approval of workload releases, including those for which presidential credits were granted; therefore, we could not determine whether



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

they were properly approved. In addition, we determined that a substantial portion of UTT faculty tested (14 of 60, or 23.3%) did not meet the minimum academic workload requirement.

Monitoring of Academic Workload

During AY 2014, the provost's office did not have a formal process in place to monitor academic workload to ensure compliance with RR 31006. We were informed that this was due to frequent changes in leadership in the provost's position combined with a general expectation that the colleges and departments were sufficiently monitoring academic workload and would communicate any issues to the provost's office when necessary.

As previously mentioned, 14 faculty tested did not meet the minimum academic workload requirement. From the population of faculty paid from state funds, we identified 13 additional faculty members who, according to management's calculations, did not meet the minimum academic workload requirement. We requested but were not provided documentation to demonstrate that these deficiencies were identified by the provost's office or that corrective action was taken to address noncompliance. We were also informed that the provost's office was not made aware, by the respective colleges, that any workload deficiencies had been identified.

There was also no formal process in place within the provost's office to monitor or approve workload credits and presidential credits for workload releases. We were informed that the provost's office was briefed on workload and presidential credits granted within each college, but there was no documentation provided to support this assertion. Documentation of workload releases should include clear expectations for the workload release time granted and approval from appropriate levels of management, including the department chair (where applicable), the college dean, and the provost or the provost's designee. It should also include the applicable workload or presidential credits for the workload release time granted. In addition, management did not retain workload and presidential credit information for workload releases until the fall 2014 semester. As a result, UTT could not provide historical data on presidential credits granted prior to AY 2013 and there was no monitoring of the 1% limit for presidential credits.

In addition, Section 6.13 of RR 31006, *Credit Granted by Institutional Head*, states that workload releases for basic and applied research should have a research work plan approved pursuant to institutional policy. We were informed that documentation of a research work plan will differ depending on the type of funding (external or internal) and the involved department or college; however, the colleges are not provided institutional guidance for granting presidential credits for basic and applied research.

In general, there was insufficient documentation available to demonstrate that effective monitoring of academic workload by the provost's office was taking place; however, UTT has begun taking steps to strengthen and formalize monitoring. Effective July 1, 2015, a new individual became Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. We were informed that the provost's office, since the appointment of the new provost, has been and is currently working on developing procedures for monitoring faculty workload, including documentation requirements, review, and approval of workload releases. A formal request for a faculty member's reduced instructional workload will include the reasons for the release, a description of duties to be performed by the faculty member, and expected deliverables, if any.

The observation described above is considered a **high-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation:

- The provost's office should continue to develop and implement its procedures for monitoring faculty workload, including the documentation, review, and approval of workload releases. Monitoring efforts should include a review of presidential credits to ensure that UTT is not exceeding the 1% limit.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

- In addition, UTT should develop institutional guidance for granting presidential credits for basic and applied research to ensure compliance with RR 31006.

Management's Response: *A workload process has been designed and a standard form for requesting limited workload credit is in place. In addition, guidelines for awarding presidential credits for basic and applied research have been developed.*

Anticipated Implementation Date:

- **August 17, 2015:** Monitoring procedures and form for approving workload credit requests. Review of procedures and form.
- **January 1, 2016:** Implementation of guidelines for awarding presidential credits for basic and applied research.

Auditor's Note: We verified that management has developed procedures for monitoring faculty workload. In addition, management has developed a standardized form for the requesting workload credit by the colleges that are subject to approval by the provost. Consequently, we consider this part of the recommendation to be **Implemented**.

Faculty Academic Workload Calculations

UTT is generally calculating faculty workload credits accurately and consistently, in accordance with RR 31006; however, management has implemented more restrictive calculations of workload credits that can impact faculty members' achievement of the minimum academic workload as described below:

- In AY 2014, management did not apply the graduate multiplier available under Section 6.1, *Graduate Instructions*, of RR 31006 to courses pursuant to Section 6.2, *Labs*, and Section 6.3, *Supervision*. According to Section 6.1, one SCH of graduate instruction is considered the equivalent of 1.5 SCH of undergraduate instruction. Management has since modified its calculation for labs and supervision courses to include the additional credit for graduate instruction. This change became effective in summer 2015 and will be applicable to AY 2016.
- UTT has developed more restrictive calculations of workload credits for certain equivalencies than what is permissible by RR 31006 for some of its courses. Although Section 5 of RR 31006, *Institutional Requirements*, allows UTT to set more restrictive requirements, four faculty members in our sample did not meet the minimum academic workload as a result of the more restrictive calculations. In particular, management's calculation for clinical supervision courses, which reduces the lab supervision portion by the lecture SCH, can result in a reduced calculation of workload credits for those types of courses.
- Management calculated all of its lecture courses based on contact hours, instead of SCH. In most cases, the SCH were equal to the contact hours; however, there were several instances where the contact hours were less than the SCH, resulting in a reduced calculation of workload credit for affected faculty members.

The observation described above is considered a **medium-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation: Although Section 5 of RR 31006 allows the institution to set more restrictive requirements, UTT should consider revising its clinical supervision and lecture workload calculations, especially when the calculation does not provide applicable faculty with an accurate level of workload credit. UTT should also ensure that it determines workload credits for lecture courses on SCH instead of contact hours.



**The University of Texas System Audit Office
Faculty Academic Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2015**

Management's Response: *Workload calculations will be reviewed and, when appropriate, corrections will be made to assure that workload credits are based on semester credit hours rather than contact hours. Clinical supervision and lecture workload calculations will be reviewed.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: August 17, 2015

Academic Workload Requirements for Nontenure-Track Faculty

RR 31006 Section 2, *Minimum Workload*, requires each person paid full time from state funds for faculty salaries to be assigned a minimum workload equivalent of 18 SCH for the year. UTT's Policy 3.2.3, *Faculty Duties and Workload*, specifies that the institution may require teaching in excess of the minimum when necessary to meet its obligations and operate effectively. UTT indicated that the minimum workload expectation of nontenure-track faculty, who are paid full time and paid 100% from state funds, is no less than 18 workload credits but can typically be 24-30 workload credits. The deans and department chairs make this determination based on their needs.

The observation described above is considered a **low-level** finding in accordance with UT System's Internal Audit finding classification system.

Recommendation: Management should consider updating its workload policies to include a clearly defined expected minimum academic workload requirement of nontenure-track faculty. This will ensure consistent minimum workload expectations for nontenure-track faculty across the institution.

Management's Response: *The university will propose amending the Handbook of Operating Procedures to require a minimum of 24 semester hours of teaching per academic year for nontenure-track faculty.*

Anticipated Implementation Date: October 31, 2015

Undergraduate/Graduate Cross-Listed Courses

UTT offers courses that it considers "cross-listed." These courses consist of more than one course and/or course sections taught at one designated date and time. There are instances in which a cross-listed course may consist of undergraduate and graduate courses. When this occurs, management calculates faculty workload credits at the graduate level if the cross-listed course has five or more graduate students. As outlined in Section 6.1 of RR 31006, *Graduate Instructions*, one SCH of graduate instruction is considered the equivalent of 1.5 SCH of undergraduate instruction. Other UT academic institutions offer cross-listed graduate/undergraduate courses and calculate workload credits for such courses differently. We have informed the UT System OAA of the variation observed and have recommended that OAA provide updated guidance on how to account for cross-listed courses that concurrently serve both undergraduate and graduate students. We anticipate that such guidance will be provided to all academic institutions during Fiscal Year 2016 and applicable to AY 2017. Consequently, the manner in which UTT is calculating workload credit for such courses could change.