THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
PERMIAN BASIN

FACULTY WORKLOAD AUDIT

Fiscal Year 2026

October 6, 2026

Office of Internal Audit and Advisory Services
4901 E. University Boulevard
Odessa, Texas 79762

Faculty Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2026

SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE

Texas Education Code Section 51.402 (TEC 51) requires the Board of Regents (BOR) of The University of Texas (UT) System to adopt rules concerning the academic workload of faculty. The BOR adopted Regents' Rule 31006: Academic Workload Requirements, which establishes parameters for managing faculty workload.

At UTPB, faculty workload is governed by the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP), Part I, Section 3.1, Faculty Workload Policy, which establishes expectations across the three primary areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, scholarship/creative activity (research), and service. Specific performance expectations for each faculty member are documented annually through a Workload Implementation Plan (WIP). Data for faculty teaching responsibility is tracked in PeopleSoft. Department Chairs and the College Deans confirm that college/departmental and individual WIPs are in conformity with relevant policies during the Spring Semester, while the Office of Institutional Research is responsible for fulfilling external reporting obligations for faculty workload. At the time of the audit, UTPB had engaged Kennedy & Company, an external consultant, to assess academic alignment, instructional capacity, and delivery costs to support strategic portfolio and resource allocation decisions.

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the controls over management and monitoring of faculty workload processes that ensure accountability, fairness, and compliance with applicable policies, procedures, and regulations. The scope included activity between September 1, 2023, and February 28, 2026.

CONCLUSION

While UTPB has established institution-wide requirements governing faculty workload, opportunities exist to strengthen reporting processes and enhance documentation and recordkeeping practices.

OBSERVATIONS

1 High	Reporting Processes Do Not Fully Support Compliance with Applicable Requirements.
2 Low	Documentation and Recordkeeping Practices can be Strengthened to Support Faculty Workload Oversight.
3 Low	Faculty Overload Compensation Was Not Consistently Processed in Compliance with University Requirements.

Management developed action plans to address these observations and anticipates implementation by September 1, 2027.

High

Observation 1: Reporting Processes Do Not Fully Support Compliance with Applicable Requirements.

UTPB is required to comply with reporting requirements established by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and the UT System BOR. A review of faculty workload-related processes identified the following opportunities to strengthen compliance:

- **Formally Designate Responsibility for Faculty Workload Oversight** – An administrator has not been formally designated to monitor faculty workload compliance and oversee workload reporting activities. Under current processes, Institutional Research prepares and submits required faculty workload reports to external stakeholders, while personnel within the colleges are responsible for ensuring compliance with institutional workload requirements. UTS Regents' Rule 31006 requires each institution to designate an officer responsible for monitoring faculty workloads and preparing and reviewing workload reports. Without clearly assigned accountability, faculty workload compliance and reporting issues may not be consistently monitored and addressed.
- **Accurately Report Faculty Compliance Status** – Faculty members were reported as compliant with institutional workload requirements despite workload allocations that did not support the reported compliance determinations. Although teaching responsibilities are tracked in PeopleSoft, data related to faculty scholarship/creative (research) activity and service activities is not tracked in PeopleSoft, resulting in incomplete information for assessing compliance with faculty workload requirements. The published guidance from the THECB for developing the CBM008 Faculty Report requires institutions to distinguish between compliant and non-compliant faculty members with respect to institutional faculty workload requirements.
- **Accurately Report Research Effort Percentages** – Reported workload allocation percentages for faculty members with instructional and research assignments did not accurately reflect the actual effort devoted to each activity. The published guidance from the THECB for developing the CBM008 Faculty Report requires institutions to report faculty assignments associated with activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes.
- **Implement a Documented Reconciliation Process Between THECB and UT System Reports** – A formal process to compare and validate faculty workload data reported separately to the THECB and UT System has not been established. During the audit, supporting documentation to explain the reconciling differences between the reports was not available. Without a documented reconciliation process and supporting documentation, the institution may be unable to identify significant reporting discrepancies or demonstrate a reasonable basis for differences between the reported data sets.
- **Ensure Timely Resolution of Issues Identified During the Reporting Process** – Data integrity concerns identified during the reporting process and tracked through the University's IT Services ticketing system were not always resolved promptly after being escalated to the responsible data owners, with some tickets dating back to 2023. Further review indicated that several tickets were not assigned to a specific HR staff member, resulting in unclear accountability and extended periods without a documented response or resolution. As a result, the identified data discrepancies may persist within the reports submitted to external stakeholders, increasing the risk of inaccurate reporting.

Action Plan:
The following actions are planned or in progress:

- **Formally Designate Responsibility for Faculty Workload Oversight** – Academic Affairs will formally designate an administrator responsible for faculty workload oversight and compliance monitoring. This administrator will collaborate directly with and provide operational support to the Office of Institutional Research to review, reconcile, and validate workload data, ensuring accuracy and full regulatory compliance prior to final reporting sign-off.
- **Accurately Report Faculty Compliance Status** – ITS will ensure that the information is incorporated into the reports for making the required determination. ITS will rely on the Associate Provost to coordinate the process for capturing and reporting the workload components for faculty in an electronic format.
- **Accurately Report Research Effort Percentages** – Academic Affairs will generate an annual spreadsheet by the end of May for each program and college. The report will document faculty teaching, research, and service efforts. The Business Manager in Academic Affairs will coordinate this effort with ITS and HR.
- **Implement a Documented Reconciliation Process Between THECB and UT System Reports** – Institutional Research will develop a formalized process for completing a comparative analysis to identify variances that need to be addressed/explained before routing to Academic Affairs for signoff prior to submission.
- **Ensure Timely Resolution of Issues Identified During the Reporting Process** – HR has restructured its Systems & Data function and will address the observation in two phases.
    - Phase 1 focuses on resolving the existing ticket backlog and establishing clear accountability by working with Information Technology Services and Institutional Research to improve ticket routing, assignment, prioritization, oversight, and documentation processes. Open data-integrity tickets, including those identified during the audit, will be reviewed and resolved, with priority given to issues affecting state and system reporting. The agreed methodology will be documented into an HR desk procedure.
    - Phase 2 strives to facilitate lasting data integrity. HR will partner with the Office of Institutional Research on the University's Enterprise Information Management (EIM) project to define clear ownership of the data itself and plans in partnership with the Office of Institutional Research:
        - Identify authoritative sources for key HR data elements used in internal and external reporting.
        - Assign accountable data owners and data stewards for critical HR datasets.
        - Document business processes and data definitions supporting the creation and maintenance of HR data.
        - Implement recurring validation procedures before state and system reporting cycles to identify and correct data-quality issues.

Target Implementation Date: September 1, 2027

Responsible Party: Business Manager, Academic Affairs; Associate Chief Information Officer, ITS; Director, HR

Low

Observation 2: Documentation and Recordkeeping Practices can be Strengthened to Support Faculty Workload Oversight.

In alignment with the UTPB Academic Affairs Handbook (AAH), faculty workload documentation is prepared and maintained across multiple colleges. The completed documentation is subject to review by Department Chairs, Deans, and the Provost. The following opportunities exist to improve oversight of faculty workload:

- **Maintain the Required Workload Implementation Plans Consistently** – For the College of Education, the Workload Implementation Plans (WIPs) were not consistently maintained or completed in alignment with institutional requirements for the faculty members that were selected for review. Section 5 of the AAH outlines institutional expectations for WIPs. Inconsistent recordkeeping limits the University's ability to detect, investigate, and address deviations from workload requirements.
- **Digitize Faculty Workload Documentation and Approvals** – Under current processes, faculty workload documentation is routed among various stakeholders using paper-based forms. Reliance on manual processes increases the risk of inconsistent record retention, particularly when personnel transition.

Action Plan:

The following actions are planned:

- Academic Affairs will issue formal guidance to Deans and Department Chairs (specifically within the College of Education) requiring annual verification and centralized retention of all completed Workload Implementation Plans (WIPs) in alignment with Section 5 of the Academic Affairs Handbook.
- Academic Affairs will collaborate with ITS to transition faculty workload submissions and approvals from paper-based routing to an electronic/digital workflow.

Target Implementation Date: July 31, 2027

Responsible Party: Business Manager, Academic Affairs

Low

Observation 3: Faculty Overload Compensation Was Not Consistently Processed in Compliance with University Requirements.

A sample of faculty overload compensation payments was selected to assess compliance with requirements established in the Academic Affairs Handbook (AAH) and the UTPB Records Retention Schedule. While required approvals were consistently obtained, the review identified instances where payment timeliness, supporting documentation, and compensation calculations could be improved. Opportunities to standardize the processing of faculty overload compensation are summarized in the test results below. Failure to consistently adhere to established university requirements increases the risk that faculty overload compensation is processed incorrectly.

Observation	Transactions Tested	Transactions Not Aligned	Exception Rate
Approximately **$18,202** in overload compensation was paid after the established processing deadlines.	91 Payments	13	14.2%
Supporting documentation was not readily available to support approximately **$26,000** in overload payments.	37 Requests	5	13.5%
Errors in compensation calculations resulted in underpayments that totaled **$1,040**	37 Requests	3	8%

Action Plan:

The following actions are planned:

- Establish standardized submission deadlines and automated calendar reminders for colleges to submit overload requests prior to payroll cutoff dates.
- Implement a secondary review/audit checklist within Academic Affairs to verify that overload compensation is calculated accurately and supported by appropriate documentation prior to routing for payment. Because overload compensation and additional stipends vary based on the nature of the assignment and cannot be standardized within a single rate category, Academic Affairs will also continue to rely on the established review and approval process, including verification by the hiring manager and Human Resources, to ensure compensation requests are processed in accordance with established requirements.
- Ensure all supporting documentation and signed overload agreements are digitally archived in accordance with university record retention schedules.

Target Implementation Date: August 1, 2027

Responsible Party: Business Manager, Academic Affairs; Director, HR

Faculty Workload Audit
Fiscal Year 2026

METHODOLOGY

This audit was conducted in accordance with the Institute of Internal Auditors' *Global Internal Audit Standards* and generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). Those standards require that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. The UTPB Office of Internal Audit meets the independence requirements set forth in GAGAS.

Scope & Procedures: The scope included activity between September 1, 2023 and February 28, 2026. Audit procedures were conducted between April 2026 and August 2026. We will follow up on action plans in this report to determine their implementation status. Any request for extension to the implementation dates for observations rated Priority or High requires approval from applicable executive officers. This process will help enhance accountability and ensure that timely action is taken to address the observations.

Observation Ratings

Priority	An issue or condition that, if not addressed timely, has a high probability to directly impact achievement of a strategic or important operational objective of UT Permian Basin or UT System as a whole.
High	An issue considered to have a medium to high probability of significant adverse effects to UT Permian Basin as a whole or at the college/department/unit level.
Medium	An issue considered to have a low to medium probability of adverse effects to UT Permian Basin either as a whole or at the college/ department/unit level.
Low	An issue considered to have minimal probability of adverse effects to UT Permian Basin either as a whole or at the college/department/ unit level.

Criteria:

- Texas Education Code Title 3 Subtitle A Chapter 51 Subchapter H Sections 51.400 - 51.402
- University of Texas System Regents Rule Regents' Rule 31006: Academic Workload Requirements
- University of Texas Permian Basin Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy Number: Part 1 - Faculty Issues - Section 3.1 Faculty Workload Policy
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Reporting and Procedures Manual for Public Universities Version Fall 2025

Report Distribution:

To: Dr. Raj Dakshinamurthy, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bradley Shook, Sr. V.P. of Technology and Operations, Chief Information Officer (CIO) / Chief Operations Officer (COO)
Natalie Harms, V.P. of Business Affairs, Chief Business Officer (CBO)

cc: Dr. Sandra K. Woodley, President
UT Permian Basin Internal Audit Committee
External State of Texas Agencies (State Auditor, Legislative Budget Board, Governor's Office)