



Addressing Gender Inequalities in Faculty Workloads

Joya Misra^{1*}, Dawn K. Culpepper², Kerry Ann O'Meara³, Audrey J. Jaeger⁴

Social Constellations
1(3): 59–70
DOI: 10.66630/sc.2026.
0019
<https://www.sc-world.org>

Received: Jul 2, 2026
Revised: Aug 14, 2026
Accepted: Aug 31, 2026

Abstract

Faculty workload inequities are common, with women faculty reporting high levels of service, mentoring, and teaching-related activities, even though this work is often devalued in faculty evaluations. We describe insights developed through a National Science Foundation ADVANCE-funded project, “Faculty Workload & Rewards,” aimed at ensuring equity in how teaching and service are taken up, assigned, and rewarded. We identify concrete strategies that improve transparency, enhance perceived fairness, allow for crediting, address accountability, and attend to context to strengthen workload equity. We also identify key challenges to revising workload, including denial, fear, the need for control, and lack of creativity, as well as approaches to addressing these forms of resistance.

Keywords

Faculty; Gender; Inequality; Workload

Introduction

Faculty workload reflects a mix of work – teaching and mentoring students, conducting research, and carrying out service and leadership activities. Yet both structural and cultural pressures lead to some types of work being valued more than others. Differences in workload among faculty in the same department are also common. Faculty members have specific skills and preferences, which may mean prioritizing or being differentially asked to engage in different activities (O'Meara et al., 2017). Inequities in faculty workload are often seen as intractable, given the discretion faculty

¹ Departments of Sociology and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts Amherst, United States

² ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence, University of Maryland College Park, United States

³ Provost's Office, Fordham University, United States

⁴ College of Education, North Carolina State University, United States

*Corresponding Author. misra@umass.edu

members have in how they carry out their work (Culpepper et al., 2022). Yet, if certain elements of workload are less likely to be seen and valued, this creates disparate outcomes (i.e., productivity, promotion) for faculty (Jimenez et al., 2019; Misra et al., 2021). As a result, workload inequities contribute to faculty dissatisfaction at work (Bird, 2011; Britton, 2017).

Inequities in workload have been documented across different types of institutions through analyses of survey data, interviews, focus groups, time diaries, faculty CVs, and annual faculty reports (O'Meara et al., 2021a). Relative to men, women spend more time on service and mentoring work – and, as a result, less time on research (Domingo et al., 2022; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Hanasono et al., 2019; Hirshfield & Joseph, 2012; Misra et al., 2012, 2021; O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al. 2017; Pedersen & Minnotte, 2018; Turner et al., 2011; Winslow, 2010). Yet service and mentoring are less valued, counted, and rewarded at most universities. As a result, women faculty more often engage in work that does not advance their careers and is “invisible” to higher education accounting systems (Hanasono et al., 2019; Jimenez et al., 2019; Misra et al., 2021; O'Meara et al., 2017).

While workload issues are challenging, there are strategies to address them successfully. We engaged in an action-research experiment, the National Science Foundation-funded Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (FWRP), in which departments interested in addressing workload inequities were assigned to a “treatment” or “control” group (O'Meara et al., 2018, 2019). Our goal was to improve fairness in how faculty workloads are allocated, taken up, and rewarded. The treatment was a success, allowing us to identify factors that lead to better outcomes. In departments that received the interventions, faculty were more likely to report transparent and clear workloads, fair distributions of teaching and service, and readiness to take action to promote workload equity (O'Meara et al., 2018, 2019). We have also spent the last decade working with many institutions to address their workload inequities. From these experiences, we identify the most effective strategies and practices.

Theories

Organizational change is notoriously difficult, especially in academy (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Because universities are decentralized and faculty have high levels of discretion, department workloads vary, impacted by both institutional and disciplinary norms. Shared governance structures split decision-making between administrators and departments, meaning that faculty may resist centralized change efforts “from above,” particularly if they fail to conform to disciplinary socialization or undercut departmental autonomy. Thus, departments are the critical unit of action, both because change requires local legitimacy and because they are the immediate context in which workload is assigned. Moreover, effective change requires collective learning, teamwork, and dialogue, as well as a culture committed to continuous growth, accountability, and transparency (Bohnet, 2016; Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Recognizing these principles, we designed an action-research project that would emphasize the role of collective learning and teamwork at the department level.

Change focused on equity is particularly difficult. Equity efforts often force faculty members to confront how the status quo has benefited them, thereby calling into question their own merit (Blair-Loy & Cech, 2022). Ambiguous environments, such as when faculty know little about what their colleagues are doing (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004), allow for biases in evaluation. Thus, some faculty members may shirk service, mentoring, or teaching while others pick up the slack, without evaluations recognizing these differences. Our project focuses on making workload clear, while identifying inequalities in workload by factors such as by appointment type, rank, and gender. Our

approach makes differences in workload visible (for example, committees with light versus heavy workloads), and identifies transparent strategies to reward workload fairly.

Redesigning the “choice architecture,” or the context in which decisions about workload are made, can help create more equitable conditions (Bohnet, 2016; Kahneman, 2011; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Within this choice architecture, we encouraged departments to put in place “nudges,” small changes to practice or policy that provide information, reframe decisions, or create different default options (Bohnet, 2016; Correll, 2017; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Nudges helped create workload systems that fostered fairness, accountability, and clarity, while still allowing departments to make decisions in alignment with disciplinary or other contextual norm.

Methods

Having previously studied workload inequities (Misra et al., 2012; O’Meara, 2016; O’Meara et al., 2017), we designed an action research project to explore not only the distribution of workload, but strategies to improve workload equity. We contacted departments in higher education institutions in three U.S. states, advertising the opportunity to engage in workload reform. We received 30 applications from 16 institutions, including baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral institutions. All 30 departments participated in the pre-survey, with a 70.5% response rate. We then created matched groups, primarily based on type of institution and broad field, but accounting for department size and gender representation. We randomly assigned departments within these groups into treatment and control groups. Treatment departments participated in the interventions described below. After the interventions, we sent a post-survey to control and treatment departments, with a 74.3% response rate. Given retirements, moves, and hires, we matched 69% of participants from control and treatment departments between the pre-survey and post-survey. Our surveys provide clear evidence for the effectiveness of the interventions (O’Meara et al., 2018, 2019; Misra et al., 2021). After the initial experiment, all control departments were invited to participate in a second round of interventions.

The interventions took 18 months to carry out. Each department created a workload team of 3-5 members, although these teams also worked with their larger departments. We conducted four half-day workshops with department teams and held check-in calls between meetings. The workshops covered inequalities in academic workload, provided teams with information based on their departments’ pre-survey, trained teams to create work-activity dashboards, and shared evidence-based policies and practices for more equitable workloads. Teams developed work-activity dashboards (O’Meara et al., 2020) and developed “department equity action plans,” describing their department context, equity issues they identified via their dashboards, and policies and practices they proposed to address them, sharing these with other participating departments. Members of treatment departments were also invited to participate in professional development focused on time management.

After completing this project, we continued to present workload equity workshops, serve as advisors, and work with higher education institutions across the United States. This allowed us to learn about implementation from institutions that varied in size, public/private status, and region. For example, we worked with U.S. departments at a small, private college in the West, which adopted workload principles for the campus; a large public university in the South, where a dean pursued college-wide equity plans; a large, private, research university in the Midwest, in which the provost encouraged departments to engage in workload reform; and a large public research university in the Northeast that required departments to develop workload equity plans as part of a union-bargained contract. In each case, our research relied on participant observation, as we provided workshops,

met with team leaders, attended faculty meetings discussing workload reform, and provided feedback on efforts. We draw upon this observational data as well as evidence from the experiment to discuss the process and effective approaches below.

Findings

Contexts & Goals for Workload Reform

Workload reform needs to accomplish three goals. First, it must reflect the department's values and goals to be successful and ensure faculty take ownership of the process (Kezar, 2011). Second, reforms must add confidence about both workload fairness and accountability, creating transparent, clear, and consistent approaches (Bohnet, 2016; Boyce, 2003). Confidence about both the process and outcomes of change builds trust, builds ownership, and enhances faculty satisfaction (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Finally, reform must recognize differences among faculty, attending to the contexts in which faculty work, recognizing faculty contributions, talents, and interests, and considering department needs and capacities. Workload reform should build systems that value all faculty work, enhance faculty agency, and allow for both flexibility and equity. Rather than rewarding only particular forms of work, aligning varied workload with rewards leads to greater faculty retention, satisfaction, and morale (O'Meara et al., 2018, 2019; Misra et al., 2021).

Workload reform is best carried out at the department level, given that this is where workload is primarily assigned, though campus-level supports and encouragement can help (O'Meara et al., 2019). Workload differs dramatically from department to department (e.g., physics versus dance), requiring varied strategies. Institutions we observed developing college- or university-wide plans were less successful in identifying and implementing workload strategies. Yet, campuses that allow for cross-fertilization and idea-sharing among department teams are more successful, as these collaborative processes create greater trust, with colleagues building on examples of successful change at their institution (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Campus-level leaders can facilitate workload change by supporting training for workload teams, elevating successful examples, and identifying parameters for activities that should be consistent (e.g., student credit-hour calculations) versus differentiated (e.g., credits for high-intensity teaching or service). Leaders committed to workload equity can create more effective processes and reward structures, but specific decisions about adopting new workload policies and practices should be developed at the department level.

Given that many workload inequities differ by appointment type, rank, and gender, workload teams should be diverse (Domingo et al., 2022; Hanasono et al., 2019; Misra et al., 2021; O'Meara et al., 2017). This requires strategically selecting multiple credible messengers with different perspectives to serve on the team. All faculty should be engaged in a broader discussion of departmental workload (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). For example, in such a discussion, faculty may express that teaching assignments are fair, but advising is not. Faculty members may also identify multiple issues.

Based on our observations, the workload team should prioritize, taking issues one by one, beginning with the top priority or an issue that requires few resources or limited revisions to bylaws or faculty evaluation policies (Correll, 2017). Once the department has successfully addressed the first issue, they have momentum and greater enthusiasm to take on additional challenges. In our observations, departments that insist on addressing all issues at once rarely implement new practices, as they get bogged down in debate.

One central part of workload reform is transparently measuring and sharing workload data in an area of concern, such as mentoring. For example, a dashboard, such as a spreadsheet that

documents departmental advising work, creates greater transparency (Culpepper et al., 2022; O'Meara et al., 2020). Dashboards can also be used to analyze equity issues across a variety of identities, such as appointment type, rank, or gender. Dashboards can track advising honors theses, master's theses, and/or dissertations for each faculty member by rank. Dashboards may include weights recognizing how time-consuming work is, such as giving greater credit for advising a dissertation than an honors thesis.

The goals and scope of the dashboard should be clear from the beginning. A dashboard that tracks all elements of workload fully is neither possible nor useful. For example, we observed many departments effectively revise workload policies in teaching and service, but less success in addressing research, though greater equity in teaching and service can improve equity in research. Thus, research activities are not well-served by dashboards. Even where dashboards are more effective, teams should focus on routine, mission-critical aspects of workload as well as areas they can adjust (e.g., departmental service assignments), identifying how to measure those, rather than areas outside their control (e.g., professional service).

Teams should emphasize progress over perfection in creating a dashboard. A transparent and clear dashboard allows all faculty to understand their shared workload, while providing opportunities to reconsider how the department recognizes workload. Thus, if women mentor more students, the dashboard may help both rebalance mentoring among faculty and consistently credit additional mentoring. Similarly, a dashboard might identify disparities in service work by rank that support the need for change (Culpepper et al., 2022; O'Meara et al., 2020).

Finally, the dashboard is not the endpoint. While dashboards provide information about workload equity, a dashboard alone is transparency without strategy. In fact, we have observed that departments that create dashboards without enacting policy or practice change engender greater resentment, particularly among groups doing more work, if faculty now know the extent of workload disparities and see no action to disrupt them. Dashboards are a first step, but do not replace strategies to address disparities. Transparent and consistent systems that track workload can engender greater trust in the fairness and accountability of workload reform (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Transparency can also enhance faculty satisfaction by tracking whether workload revisions make a difference (Culpepper et al., 2022; O'Meara, 2018).

Workload Strategies

Once workload issues or inequities are identified, the team should craft a strategy to address the problem uncovered. Problems of workload can be categorized in five groups: transparency and clarity; perceived fairness; credit; accountability; and context (O'Meara et al., 2019), with potential strategies varying by department and institutional type (O'Meara et al., 2021a, 2021b). While the workload team and department should choose an appropriate approach, each strategy must be tweaked to fit each specific departmental context. Rather than each department recreating the wheel, they can revise strategies that have proven effective in our work with departments.

Transparency and clarity reflect the need for faculty to understand departmental work as a whole, their individual work, and what others do (O'Meara et al., 2019). Dashboards can help faculty develop *Expectations Guidelines*, creating clear norms around expected workload by rank. These guidelines limit faculty doing either substantially less or more than expected simply because they do not understand expectations, which may reflect gendered processes. *Performance Benchmarks* work similarly, but include more qualitative evidence of effectiveness, such as how to engage constructively in committee work. *Restructuring Committees* align department committees with

current workload priorities, consolidating committees or dividing one high-workload committee into two. As discussed below, approaches such as *Rotations*, *Credit Systems*, and *Making Work Visible* also improve transparency. These policies create clarity among faculty members where it was previously missing.

Issues of perceived fairness emerge when faculty members do not understand how workload is distributed or compensated (O'Meara et al., 2019). Faculty may suspect favoritism if some receive advantageous workload arrangements and others do not, but such issues also reflect poor departmental communication. *Policies for compensation of key roles* provide clear information explaining which roles (e.g., department chair) include workload adjustments (e.g., one teaching release) or compensation versus which are considered part of normal workload. Similarly, *policies for teaching assignments* and *service assignments* improve transparency and perceived fairness by clarifying how teaching and service are assigned. For example, chairs may regularly ask faculty members about their teaching interests rather than assuming preferences. Alternatively, policies may require that all faculty teach one required or large course each year. The goal is a fair policy communicated clearly to all faculty, limiting the chance that certain faculty, such as women, have less information about processes.

Service audits identify the work that each committee is expected to complete each year, signaling to current and future committee members both expectations and effort. *Service audits* can be combined with *restructuring committees*, since restructuring requires clarity on committee workload. *Rotations* also create perceived fairness by, for example, consistently rotating senior faculty through leadership positions. Policies aimed at perceived fairness often overlap with transparency; in both cases, the goal is to ensure that people understand workload expectations and see workload assignments (and associated rewards) as fair.

Crediting faculty work also reflects fairness and the need to recognize different forms of workload. Faculty have different strengths and interests. For example, women often invest in advising students (Griffin & Reddick, 2011). When such work is not counted in workload arrangements, it creates frustration and undermines equity. *Credit Systems* identify how additional work is compensated. For example, if a faculty member advises a certain number of completed theses, they may receive a course release or "service sabbatical" (a semester or year without assigned service), choose a preferred teaching slot or course, or other benefits the department identifies. Faculty may be allowed to do *Credit Swaps*, replacing certain work for other work. Thus, a faculty chairing multiple major committees might be able to swap this leadership work for a teaching release or a service sabbatical in another year. Similarly, a faculty member teaching an extra course could swap out some service work. Here the goal is to recognize extra work with workload adjustments, while maintaining flexibility.

Other efforts to credit faculty emphasize making aspects of faculty work visible and rewarded. *Making Work Visible* recognizes and credits faculty for their work and can include ensuring that systems of merit and promotion weigh mentoring students or colleagues or count student recruitment and community engagement towards service workload. U.S. women of color are most likely to note that the work they do is not counted in department accounting systems (Misra et al., 2021). *Revising Merit Systems* to better align with workload can also make a difference. For example, many faculty spend substantial time on teaching, advising, and leadership, though research is given outsized impact in merit evaluations and promotions. If departments determine yearly merit criteria locally, they might weigh teaching and service more heavily, given that research will be rewarded in promotions. Another system gaining popularity is *Broader Criteria for Promotion*. For example, faculty members may find themselves stuck at "associate professor" while making contributions to the institution in other arenas (e.g., serving as department chair) because only research is credited for promotion to full professor. Systems that recognize substantial commitments in other areas create greater opportunities for faculty, while crediting their work for the institution (Misra et al., 2012). These

crediting efforts create systems that better recognize and reward faculty for their contributions to their departments and institutions.

Accountability is particularly challenging. Faculty have much autonomy over their work. Some faculty members may place little value, time, and effort into certain types of work. Building accountability is critical but challenging given these parameters. *Mutual Expectations* guidelines allow department faculty to articulate shared expectations for how work is approached (e.g., effort, communication, timeliness). Identifying expectations allows all faculty to weigh in while creating greater pressure for faculty to conform to agreed-upon norms. *Reducing Committee Size* is another successful strategy. Limiting the number of people on a committee and assigning very specific roles to each member makes avoiding work more difficult. These strategies improve faculty accountability to one another; other successful strategies in this area include *Rotations and Performance Benchmarks*.

Finally, recognizing context also improves workload inequities. Faculty members often have different strengths and positions. For example, Lecturers, Research Faculty, Extension Faculty, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty often differ in responsibilities. Evaluating all faculty members on the same criteria denies their specific contexts and contributions, while contributing to racial and gender inequities given differences in representation in these roles. *Differentiated Workloads* allow faculty members to contribute based on their position and interests. While tenure-track faculty usually assume a standard workload, once tenured, faculty might shift to tracks that reflect their current responsibilities, such as focusing on leadership, advising, or research. Faculty meet with their Chair to determine next year's track and are later evaluated based on their mutually chosen track. Departments with differentiated workloads report much satisfaction with the model. Other context-based approaches already discussed include *Credit Swaps*, *Expectation Guidelines* (when differentiated by rank), and *Broader Criteria for Promotion*. Taking a faculty member's context into account helps create greater workload equity.

Challenges to Change

Once the workload team has identified the workload issue the department will tackle, as well as potential strategies, they should discuss their process and ask faculty for feedback on strategies. Keeping the larger faculty engaged in the project engenders greater success. Yet in our observations, implementation may be a moment when faculty members put up the greatest resistance. Thus, it is important to anticipate resistance and how to address it.

There are various root causes of resistance. One root cause is denial, not wanting to admit that there are inequalities in workload. Faculty may claim that they would never take advantage of one another or that the chair is trusted to ensure fair workload. In response, the team can emphasize dashboard findings or previous discussions that identify challenges. They should also note that workload revision does not assume "bad actors," and simply puts good principles in place. Some may argue that the problem is not the system, but simply colleagues who "can't say no," but as research shows, workload inequities reflect variations in the number of requests, which differ by gender, not the answers they give (O'Meara et al., 2017). Asking allies to speak up can address these claims. While faculty who benefit from the current workload system may voice denial, they tend to be in the minority. Emphasizing better morale and stronger community among faculty members due to workload revisions can be persuasive.

Fear creates another intense form of resistance, since change engenders anxiety. Workload revisions make some faculty members uneasy and unhappy. The faculty who may benefit most may also be less likely to speak up, since the least powerful in the department often have the most to

gain. Transparency is a threat to those who may lose special privileges and resources. A fairer and more transparent system reflects a workplace in which colleagues know the department is committed to fairness and addressing challenges, rather than ignoring them. Creating a more transparent system where incentives are clear also means faculty can be more certain that accommodations will be granted automatically, without need for special favors.

Faculty may fear that administrators might use the process to increase faculty workload, rather than make it more equitable. Any data about workload should be confined to the department to address these concerns. A related fear is loss of professional norms and agency over faculty work. The workload team should allow faculty to choose among a range of strategies, empowering them to identify approaches that retain their sense of professionalism. Another fear is that workload revision will lead to a cookie-cutter system that treats all faculty members the same, based on the notion that clarity is only possible when workload systems are rigid. Here, the team must emphasize creating a flexible system that recognizes different contexts and interests that faculty bring. Identifying systems that allow multiple paths to meeting expectations allays these concerns.

Faculty may fear how and when to revise workload, given existing workload and other competing priorities. Emphasizing that workload revision should be broken down into small parts can address these fears and allows the team to emphasize prioritization and focus as essential to the success of the reform. Current stresses may also lead to concerns about timing. Universities have experienced a series of challenges, including the pandemic, the growth of AI, and political instabilities that have reshaped higher education and led to burnout. Yet ignoring workload inequities does not solve those problems, while addressing them can lower burnout. Thinking of the workload revision process as slow, rather than immediate, can help. We suggest an 18-month timeline, spending one semester prioritizing a workload issue, another semester identifying and adapting a workload policy or practice, and the last semester implementing and adopting the strategy into departmental bylaws.

Another source of resistance is control. Faculty members may assert control over the process the team uses. For example, we observed departments where members insist on collecting evidence from every element of workload into a dashboard. This creates an impossible task before addressing any specific workload issue, limiting progress. Rather than capitulating, the team should recognize this as a form of resistance and instead collect data specific to the priority they have identified. Another control issue is that many faculty members want to address larger inequities. Faculty might, for example, recognize inequities across departments and institutions and want to address those issues as well. For example, certain fields may have lower teaching loads – but higher expectations for grant writing and achieving funding (in part due to funding availability). Thus, the workload team should focus on what the department can control, while pointing to faculty governance mechanisms that might address other aspects (such as the chair compensation for small, medium, or large departments).

Another root cause of resistance is lack of creativity. Faculty may argue that change is only possible with more resources, such as new hires or more teaching releases. Workload committees can emphasize that while lobbying for resources is sensible, the department can take steps within institutional constraints to reduce both workload inequities and workload. Reducing the number of or size of committees can have immediate tangible effects. In addition, collecting data can provide evidence for resource requests. Faculty may also argue that some faculty will never do their share of the work or stop overworking. Yet adopting accountability measures can change behaviors, including allowing faculty to focus their contributions toward their areas of commitment. Identifying creative strategies used by other departments can help move from resistance to action-readiness.

Overall, there are many forms of resistance to workload revisions. Yet, the workload team, as well as the academic leaders who support them, can prepare for resistance. By structuring a workload committee to include faculty members of different ranks, the committee members can also identify

allies who vocalize support during departmental discussions and illuminate that change is possible. Many of the workload policies directly address the denial, fear, efforts to assert control, and lack of creative thinking that lead to resistance. Providing faculty members with a variety of strategies can help them feel more confident and in ownership of the process.

Conclusion/Discussion

To return to our key findings, we have found that a “small wins” approach to workload reform is most effective (Correll, 2017). Departments that try to address all workload issues at once inevitably give up. Similarly, process matters and should be deliberate. Workload reform requires slow action, which allows faculty to engage with the idea multiple times, have their voice heard in discussions, consider both issues and strategies, and create workload strategies with strong support. Data-driven work allows faculty to better understand, assess, and diagnose workload inequities. While a diverse workload equity team is important, the full faculty should be regularly consulted. With ownership of the process, faculty become more “action ready,” confident that workload inequities can be addressed, leading to many positive outcomes, including greater collegiality.

Relationships are critical to the success of the project. Resistance is common. Diverse teams that include respected department members can break through resistance, particularly if they call upon their relationships with their colleagues. Leaders and institutional support also matter. Department chairs who are dismissive or disengaged can derail the projects. Drawing on chairs’ observations of workload issues, and institutionalizing good practices already used, creates easy wins. Where Deans and Provosts communicate prioritizing addressing workload disparities, greater success is likely. Good relationships and broad faculty engagement through efforts localized in departments, can not only address workload inequities – but boost department morale and esprit de corps.

Our efforts to create changes in workload equity have helped us understand change efforts (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). Research has shown that teamwork, collective learning, and dialogue are critical to change, and our work underscores this point. One person cannot devise a workload equity plan that will receive broad buy-in, but an engaged, collective approach that supports diverse voices can be successful (Boyce, 2003; Kezar, 2011). At the same time, research shows that inequities emerge in ambiguous environments (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004); we find that making workload clearer and more transparent helps address inequities that often reflect rank and gender (Bohnet, 2016). By drawing from research aimed at redesigning the “choice architecture” around how faculty workload is assigned, taken up, and rewarded, we have shown how these principles can operate in the real world to create greater equity (Bohnet, 2016; Correll, 2017; Kahneman, 2011; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Given our experience with many different workload teams attempting to enact change in varied institutional settings, we have further identified the resistance that emerges to change efforts. We categorize resistance to change as seated in denial, fear, efforts to assert control, and lack of creativity, while suggesting strategies for addressing resistance.

We have provided a roadmap to workload revision, based on our existing research and experience (Culpepper et al., 2022; Misra et al., 2021; O’Meara et al., 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021a, 20201b). Workload inequities are common, and these inequities disproportionately disadvantage women faculty. Proven strategies can make workload more transparent and resolve workload inequities in a variety of creative ways. While any policy must be adjusted to a department’s context, we believe these building blocks provide a strong starting point.

Most full-time faculty spend their careers at one institution. For institutions, faculty engagement across all aspects of their work is a vital resource to achieve the mission, respond to challenges, and

seize opportunities. Faculty engagement is highly correlated with perception of fairness at work, of feeling valued, and having one's work witnessed and valued. Creating fair, transparent systems to recognize faculty work is one of the most important ways, we believe, to support and retain faculty (Bird, 2011; Britton, 2017).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the many colleagues, departments, and institutions who have worked toward greater workload equity, and whose work has helped us rethink how to create more equitable workplaces.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

None identified, other than close collaborators who co-authored papers with us that are listed in the references.

Funding

This material is based upon work funded through the National Science Foundation ADVANCE-IHE Program #1463898 as well as the University of Massachusetts System Roy J. Zuckerberg Endowed Leadership Chair award.

ORCID

Joya Misra <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9427-3952>

Dawn K. Culpepper <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3547-4615>

Kerry Ann O'Meara <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5586-7379>

Audrey J. Jaeger <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4562-3274>

References

- Bird, S. R. (2011). Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: A case-study approach. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(2), 202–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x>
- Blair-Loy, M., & Cech, E. A. (2022). *Misconceiving merit: Paradoxes of excellence and devotion in academic science and engineering*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bohnet, I. (2016). *What works: Gender equality by design*. Harvard University Press.
- Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 28(2), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000006287.69207.00>
- Britton, D. M. (2017). Beyond the chilly climate: The salience of gender in women's academic careers. *Gender & Society*, 31(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243216681494>

- Correll, S. J. (2017). SWS 2016 Feminist Lecture: Reducing gender biases in modern workplaces: A small wins approach to organizational change. *Gender & Society*, 31(6), 725–750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217738518>
- Culpepper, D. K., Misra, J., O'Meara, K. A., & Jaeger, A. (2022). Addressing workload equity: Seven strategies for chairs. *The Department Chair*, 32(3), 8–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dch.30423>
- Domingo, C. R., Gerber, N. C., Harris, D., Mamo, L., Pasion, S. G., Rebanal, R. D., & Rosser, S. V. (2022). More service or more advancement: Institutional barriers to academic success for women and women of color faculty at a large public comprehensive minority-serving state university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 15(3), 365–379. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000292>
- Griffin, K. A., & Reddick, R. J. (2011). Surveillance and sacrifice: Gender differences in the mentoring patterns of Black professors at predominantly White research universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1032–1057. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211405025>
- Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in higher education*, 58(6), 672–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>
- Hanasono, L. K., Broido, E. M., Yacobucci, M. M., Root, K. V., Peña, S., & O'Neil, D. A. (2019). Secret service: Revealing gender biases in the visibility and value of faculty service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(1), 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000081>
- Hirshfield, L. E., & Joseph, T. D. (2012). 'We need a woman, we need a black woman': Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education*, 24(2), 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.606208>
- Jimenez, M. F., Laverty, T. M., Bombaci, S. P., Wilkins, K., Bennett, D. E., & Pejchar, L. (2019). Underrepresented faculty play a disproportionate role in advancing diversity and inclusion. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, 3(7), 1030–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0911-5>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking fast and slow*. Macmillan.
- Kezar, A. (2011). What is the best way to achieve broader reach of improved practices in higher education? *Innovative Higher Education*, 36(4), 235–247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-011-9174-z>
- Misra, J., Kuvaeva, A., O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D. K., & Jaeger, A. (2021). Gendered and racialized perceptions of faculty workloads. *Gender & Society*, 35(3), 358–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432211001387>
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., & Templer, A. (2012). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. *Sociological Forum*, 27(2), 300–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01319.x>
- O'Meara, K. (2016). Whose problem is it? Gender differences in faculty thinking about campus service. *Teachers College Record*, 118(8), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811611800808>
- O'Meara, K., Beise, E., Culpepper, D., Misra, J., & Jaeger, A. (2020). Faculty work activity dashboards: A strategy to increase transparency. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52(3), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2020.1745579>
- O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Misra, J., & Jaeger, A. (2021a). *Equity-minded faculty workloads: What we can and should do now*. American Council on Education. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf>
- O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., Misra, J., & Jaeger, A. (2021b). *Equity-minded faculty workloads worksheet booklet*. American Council on Education.

<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads-Worksheet-Booklet.pdf>

- O'Meara, K., Jaeger, A., Misra, J., Lennartz, C., & Kuvaeva, A. (2018). Undoing disparities in faculty workloads: A randomized trial experiment. *PLOS ONE*, 13(12), e0207316. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207316>
- O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., Waugaman, C., & Jackson, R. (2017). Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(6), 1154–1186. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217716767>
- O'Meara, K., Lennartz, C. J., Kuvaeva, A., Jaeger, A., & Misra, J. (2019). Department conditions and practices associated with faculty workload satisfaction and perceptions of equity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 90(5), 744–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025>
- Pedersen, D. E., & Minnotte, K. L. (2018). University service work in STEM departments: Gender, perceived injustice, and consequences for faculty. *Sociological Focus*, 51(3), 217–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2018.1393607>
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society*, 18(4), 510–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204265269>
- Thaler, R.H., & Sunstein, C.R. (2009). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Penguin Books.
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wong (Lau), K. (2011). Faculty women of color: The critical nexus of race and gender. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(4), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024630>
- Winslow, S. (2010). Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty. *Gender & Society*, 24(6), 769–793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243210386728>