A Report on Faculty Teaching Workload
Covering the Years 2000 to 2006

2008
University of North Carolina
General Administration

Executive Summary

Much of the information provided in this report is similar to that provided in previous reports that compare the teaching workload of UNC faculty relative to faculty at Carnegie-defined peer institutions based on data available from the University of Delaware. This report traces faculty workload from 2000 through 2006. The report also provides some new analyses, as requested by the General Assembly, including an analysis based on changes made to the university's enrollment funding model.

From the different ways that the data is analyzed, there is a strong case to be made that UNC faculty have a teaching workload comparable to or higher than that of faculty at peer institutions. Overall, UNC faculty teaching workload, measured by courses/sections taught, is above that of all Carnegie classified institutions.
Additionally, calculations of student credit hours taught per faculty FTE show that UNC has increased faculty productivity. Changes to the enrollment funding model further demonstrate that expectations for faculty productivity have increased since the model was implemented in 1998-99.

In analyzing the data provided by the University of Delaware, several specific conclusions can be drawn.

First, the Board of Governors has set a standard for the number of courses that *regular faculty* members are to teach. The Delaware data reveal that only one campus (UNCA) did not meet the Board's standard in the most recent period.

In comparing faculty teaching workloads of *all instructional faculty members* to teaching workloads of the same group at peer institutions, two campuses (ASU and WSSU) fell below established standards and one of those (ASU) was only by .01 of a course. This demonstrates an improvement over information presented in previous reports. For *regular faculty*, three institutions (ASU, UNCA, and WSSU) were below the standard – two of the three (ASU and UNCA) were below by very small margins. The most dramatic improvement was at UNC Wilmington which, as shown in previous reports failed to meet the standards set by the Board. Data within this report show that UNCW now far exceeds the standards. It is clear that most UNC institutions met or exceeded established standards.

This report further shows that the average number course sections taught by UNC faculty is virtually the same as the number taught by *regular faculty* and *all instructional faculty* at institutions nationwide. For the 2003-06 period, sections taught by *regular* UNC faculty are slightly higher than the national average (3.38 for UNC vs. 3.37) and sections taught by *all instructional faculty* are slightly lower (3.54 for UNC vs. 3.55).

Relative to all Carnegie classified institutions, UNC has had a higher percentage of its faculty teaching lower division courses as well as a higher percentage teaching at the undergraduate level. This is a measure of the commitment of UNC and its faculty to undergraduate teaching.

UNC campuses have significantly improved the percentage of departments that have teaching workloads that meet the standards set in regard to their Carnegie peers. For the three-year period from 2000 to 2003, 89% of departments across UNC institutions met the standard. In subsequent three-year periods, the percentage dropped; however, by 2003-06, 97% of all UNC campus departments met the departmental workload standards.

In a review of changes that have been made to the UNC funding model for enrollment growth, it is clear that the expected productivity of faculty members is higher now than when the model was first used in 1998-99.

Teaching is the most important function of UNC; however, faculty have additional required tasks to perform, including advising, research to keep current with their field, grant development that results in outside funding of research projects, and public service. One of the messages that the university has received from participants in the UNC Tomorrow project forums is that the people of North Carolina expect university faculty to engage in more outreach that benefits citizens, industry, and communities of North Carolina. One measure of the value of this work is the amount of externally sponsored research that is funded. Since 2004 UNC faculties have maintained sponsored research at a level of over a billion dollars a year, an average of approximately $100,000 per faculty member across the system, with some campuses having much higher averages. This illustrates that UNC's commitment to teaching is compatible with research activity of this magnitude, and that varying teaching loads are appropriate, depending on the mission of the institution.

Faculty Teaching Workload Report
2000-2003; 2001-2004; 2002-2005; 2003-2006

Introduction

Historically, the Board of Governors has periodically reviewed the workload of faculty within the university and has set standards for the average number of courses that a member of the faculty should teach. The General Assembly, equally interested in the productivity of UNC faculty, passed the following special provision in 2007 requiring that the Board of Governors report on faculty workload.

REPORTING ON UNC FACULTY WORKLOAD

*SECTION 9.2.(a) * The Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina shall conduct a study on faculty workload at The University of North Carolina. The study shall be done using the Delaware Study Method of collecting data. Information in the report shall include all of the following:

(1) The faculty workload data for each constituent institution of The University of North Carolina compared to The University of North Carolina enrollment model.

(2) The University of North Carolina faculty workload average as compared to The University of North Carolina enrollment model student credit hours per instructional position.

(3) The faculty workload of regional and peer institutions as compared to each constituent institution faculty average and to The University of North Carolina faculty workload average.

*SECTION 9.2.(b) * The Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina shall submit the study report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, the Office of State Budget and Management, and the Fiscal Research Division no later than March 1, 2008.

In 2001 the Board of Governors approved the use of national data collected by the University of Delaware as the source of information for analyzing the workload of UNC's teaching faculty. The system previously used for this purpose had been internally developed and required an inordinate amount of campus time in collecting the data. Additionally, the system was UNC specific and external comparisons were not possible. The switch to the "Delaware Study" data was motivated in part by the desire to make national comparisons for UNC institutions. The sections of this report utilizing Delaware data are based on rolling three-year averages for 2000-01 through 2005-06. This report will trace the changes in faculty teaching workload over this period in a format worked out with legislative staff.

This report also provides an analysis of faculty productivity based on changes made to the university's enrollment funding model. We should make it clear that while this report provide a lot of data about teaching course loads and average student credit hours taught by full-time teaching equivalent faculty (FTE), it is not possible with the data available to fully respond to

items (1) and (2). The reasons are provided in the discussion of the enrollment model and student credit hours. The Delaware Study provides detailed comparative data on faculty teaching workloads, but it allows UNC to have only its own information and the remaining data summarized by Carnegie classification and totaled. So it is not possible to get regional data from the Delaware Study.

A caveat that needs to be stated is that this report is based on faculty *teaching* workload, not on all faculty workload. The Delaware data currently is limited only to data on faculty teaching workload; however, the University of Delaware has expanded the data it collects to include out-of-classroom faculty workload data. With the collection of additional data, a more complete picture of overall faculty effort will be presented in the future.

The Delaware Study

The University of Delaware's institutional research office, under the leadership of Michael Middaugh and with national grant funding, developed a voluntary national data system to collect information on faculty teaching activity and the cost of instruction. With the exception of the North Carolina School of the Arts, all UNC institutions participate; therefore, UNC now has six years of data for its campuses.

The Delaware Study was designed to collect department-level information to be used by deans and provosts to compare the productivity and cost of individual academic programs with similar programs across the country. Since the organizational structure of colleges, schools, and departments can vary significantly, reporting is by four-digit U.S. Department of Education Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes.

Among the data collected on teaching workload are the number of FTE faculty by type, the number of sections taught (including labs), the number of student credit hours, and student credit hours by level, undergraduate or graduate. The data are directly linked to the teaching component (or course load) of a faculty member's responsibility. The Delaware Study as originally developed was not intended to give a full picture of a faculty member's responsibilities, activities, and achievements. Typical faculty activities such as academic advising, course development, academic committee work, or securing and working on grants are not included. The Board of Governors policy on faculty workload recognizes the following as appropriate faculty activities meriting reassignment from courses: course/curriculum development, heavy load of academic advising, accreditation/program review, technology training for instruction, co-curricular activities, academic administration, externally funded research, institutionally supported research, institutional service, service to the public, service to the profession, and off-campus scholarly assignment/on leave. None of these activities is captured in the Delaware teaching workload data, nor were they meant to be, by design. It is important to keep in mind that the data present a snapshot, albeit an extremely important one, of only a part of a faculty member's expected and assigned activity.

UNC General Administration has explored two ways to use the Delaware data. One is at the four-digit CIP code level (school/college/departmental level) to assess an institution's average departmental teaching workload in comparison with national averages for the same CIP code and Carnegie classification. The other is to roll up the data collected by CIP codes (departmental

units) and establish workload averages for the campus as a whole. The latter is a use of the data not contemplated by the initial project, but a use that General Administration has explored with the campuses to determine its validity. Using a similar roll-up of national data by Carnegie classification provides a comparison for individual campuses to their Carnegie peers. While participation in the Delaware Study provides comparative data, the actual set of peers approved by the Board of Governors for each UNC campus cannot be used in most cases since not enough of UNC's peers participate. Participation is completely voluntary; therefore, the national comparative data may not be entirely appropriate for some campuses. Also, the mix of academic programs can have a significant impact on institutional averages, since many factors shape class size and teaching loads in different disciplines.

Board of Governors Standard Course Load

The Board of Governors has established the following standard annual course loads based on the Carnegie classification taxonomy (during the time period covered, Research I and II classifications were substantially replaced with Doctoral Extensive and Doctoral Intensive classifications).

Carnegie Type	Annual	Semester
Research I Universities [Res. Ext.]	4	2
Research II Universities [Res. Int.]	5	2.5
Masters (Comprehensive) I	6	3
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) I	8	4
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) II	8	4

According to Board policy, "Accreditation requirements or other considerations may result in lower course loads in some departments, but such cases are probably rare. More common are institutions within these groups that will have departments with higher teaching loads than those shown above. It is the function of the proposed monitoring system to reveal the levels that currently exist and the variations among them."[1] Individual assignments and departmental averages within an institution may vary from these standards, either above or below.

Based on the Delaware data's average course loads (Tables 1 A-D in the Appendix) for *all instructional faculty*, thirteen of the fifteen participating UNC campuses (Display 1D) meet the BOG's expected course load for the 2003-06 three-year average. For *regular faculty*, all but one of the participating campuses (Display 2D) meet the BOG's standard (Table 2D in the Appendix). This campus is UNC-Asheville, which falls further below the Board's standard in the most recent three-year period than in previous periods. UNC-Asheville is a liberal arts institution, where faculty are expected to engage students out of the classroom as much as they do in the classroom. Nonetheless, it will be imperative that UNC-Asheville review this data carefully and make adjustments in the teaching workloads of faculty.

[1] *UNC Policy Manual*, 400.3.4, pp. 2-3 (by semester added since Delaware data are by fall terms).

Display 1A (2000-2003)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1A)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 1B (2001-2004)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1B)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 1C (2002-2005)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1C)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 1D (2003-2006)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1D)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 2A
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2A)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Campus does not meet course load								X					X		X

Display 2B
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2B)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 2C
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2C)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campus does not meet course load								X							X

Display 2D
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2D)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Campus exceeds standard course load	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Campus does not meet course load								X							

Organized Course Sections by FTE Faculty

The measure of organized course sections by FTE faculty focuses on the average number of undergraduate and graduate sections, including labs, taught by instructional faculty. There are two comparison standards, the BOG's expected course load and the national data from institutions similarly Carnegie-classified. The Delaware data on course sections are based on fall term, so averages are for one semester. Instructional faculty members are identified in three main categories by Delaware. *Regular* faculty members include tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and other regular faculty with continuing appointments. *Supplemental* faculty members are those with temporary appointments. *Teaching assistants* are graduate students who have a teaching assignment at the institution. *All* instructional faculty include all the types.

Comparison with Delaware Study National Data

Tables 1A-D in the Appendix provide UNC year-by-year and three-year average course loads for all instructional FTE for comparison with Delaware national data. **The standard against which UNC institutions' average course load by FTE is compared is that the average is equal to or above one standard deviation below the national average course load by FTE by Carnegie class**. In each case the comparison is based on the average number of organized course sections and labs a faculty member teaches. Displays 3A-D summarize the results. Tables 2A-D in the Appendix provide the same information for regular faculty, and the summary will be found in Displays 4A-D. In other words, a campus's average FTE course load (for all faculty and for regular faculty) should be at or above one standard deviation below the national average FTE course load for the same faculty group in the same Carnegie class. This standard is based on several factors. First, it would be unrealistic to expect every campus to be at the average, but not unrealistic to expect each to stand in some clear relationship to the average. Next, participation in the Delaware Study is voluntary, so the institutions comprising each Carnegie class may not match up well with the UNC institutions being compared. Also, this institutional measure is not one initially contemplated by the Delaware Study so it is important that a range is established, not a single point for comparison. By the 2003-2006 period all UNC campuses had met the standard for *all faculty* with the exception of ASU and WSSU. ASU was only .01 point below the standard, thereby essentially meeting it. During this time, WSSU was in transition from a baccalaureate level institution to a master's level institution. For *all faculty*, WSSU is still not within the expected range and must take steps to address this. Improvement is evident with *regular faculty* as well, since fewer campuses fell below the standard and by smaller amounts than in previous periods. The most improvement was demonstrated by UNCW, moving from .42 and .41 below the respective standards to well above them by 2003-06.

Display 3A (2000-2003)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term (Based on Table 1A)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Below the national comparison by	.11			.07									.43		.33

Display 3B (2001-2004)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term (Based on Table 1B)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Below the national comparison by	.10												.09		.51

Display 3C (2002-2005)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term (Based on Table 1C)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Below the national	.08														.75

comparison by															

Display 3D (2003-2006)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1D)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Below the national comparison by	.01														.60

Display 4A (2000-2003)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2A)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Below the national comparison by	.28								.11				.41		.23

Display 4B (2001-2004)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2B)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Below the national	.29							.08					.09		.37

comparison by															

Display 4C (2002-2005)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term (Based on Table 2C)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Below the national comparison by	.21							.08							.56

Display 4D (2003-2006)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term (Based on Table 2D)

Campuses	ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU
Above the national comparison		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Below the national comparison by	.08							.10							.29

UNC Average Teaching Course Load

While there have been slight changes over time, the average teaching course load for UNC's *regular faculty* is slightly above the national average for all Carnegie institutions for the 2003-2006 period. For *all instructional faculty* the average is .01 below the Carnegie comparison (Table 5D).

Display 5A (2000-2003)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term (From Tables 1A and 2A)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2000-01	3.42	3.21

2001-02	3.36	3.11
2002-03	3.45	3.17
UNC average	3.41	3.16
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.45	3.12

Display 5B (2001-2004)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term (From Tables 1B and 2B)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2001-02	3.33	3.11
2002-03	3.46	3.23
2003-04	3.50	3.34
UNC average	3.43	3.23
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.35	3.14

Display 5C (2002-2005)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term (From Tables 1C and 2C)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2002-03	3.45	3.23
2003-04	3.53	3.34
2004-05	3.50	3.38
UNC average	3.49	3.32
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.50	3.31

Display 5D (2003-2006)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term (From Tables 1D and 2D)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2003-04	3.53	3.34
2004-05	3.50	3.38
2005-06	3.58	3.42
UNC average	3.54	3.38
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.55	3.37

Percent of Teaching Workload from Undergraduate Student Credit Hours

Displays 6A-D show the percentage of the teaching load associated with lower-division student credit hours and Displays 7A-D show the percentage of the teaching load that is associated with undergraduate student credit hours. The charts show that UNC has a higher percentage of faculty devoted to teaching both lower-division and undergraduate student credit hours than faculty at all Carnegie institutions in the Delaware Study.

Display 6A (2000-2003)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Lower-Division SCHs

Faculty Type	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	57.99	57.60	56.88	57.49	55.30
All Regular Faculty	53.72	52.80	51.88	52.55	51.93

Display 6B (2001-2004)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Lower-Division SCHs

Faculty Type	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	57.38	56.71	56.03	56.69	53.60
All Regular Faculty	52.08	52.10	51.74	51.97	48.96

Display 6C (2002-2005)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Lower-Division SCHs

Faculty Type	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	56.94	56.26	56.22	56.47	53.32
All Regular Faculty	52.10	51.74	51.80	51.88	48.83

Display 6D (2003-2006)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Lower-Division SCHs

Faculty Type	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	56.26	56.22	56.27	56.25	53.23
All Regular Faculty	51.74	51.80	51.42	51.66	48.75

Display 7A (2000-2003)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Undergraduate SCHs

Faculty Type	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	89.50	89.27	88.89	89.23	87.23
All Regular Faculty	87.81	87.00	86.95	87.25	84.45

Display 7B (2001-2004)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Undergraduate SCHs

Faculty Type	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	89.46	89.18	88.26	88.95	86.27
All Regular Faculty	87.00	87.13	86.04	86.71	83.97

Display 7C (2002-2005)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Undergraduate SCHs

Faculty Type	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	89.57	88.68	88.45	88.89	86.16
All Regular Faculty	87.13	86.04	86.50	86.56	83.92

Display 7D (2003-2006)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type
% of Load from Undergraduate SCHs

Faculty Type	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	88.68	88.45	88.35	88.49	86.22
All Regular Faculty	86.04	86.50	86.11	86.23	83.95

Average Teaching Workload by Academic Discipline (CIP)

Campus strategies for deploying faculty vary considerably by Carnegie classification and by mission. One campus may decide to add more faculty members and establish lower teaching loads to allow a department to devote more time to other mission-driven goals, while at the same time establishing higher teaching loads in another department. Therefore, while it is extremely important to assess faculty teaching workloads, there may be justifiable reasons for a particular department to vary from national norms for that discipline. While assigning loads above the national norms in the extreme could be a problem, it is assignments below the norm that require

more critical review. **The standard for comparing academic departments (in reality, disciplines as defined by the CIP coding system) would be whether the academic department is at or above one standard deviation below the average for that discipline as determined by national data by Carnegie classification.**

Tables 3A-D in the Appendix provide the discipline-by-discipline analysis of academic programs by Carnegie classification. In the tables "M" means the standard is met, "B" means the program is below the standard, and "-" means the institution does not have that program or did not report data to Delaware for that CIP. The percentage of programs by campus meeting this standard is displayed below. *It is expected that at least 90% of programs at a campus should meet this standard.* For the 2003-2006 period all UNC campuses, except for Winston-Salem State University, met the 90% threshold. This is a significant improvement over the 2000-03 period when eight institutions failed to meet the threshold.

Display 9A (2000-2003)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP (From Table 3A)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
94	85	100	88	89	77	88	83	96	98	93	94	78	91	53	89

Display 9B (2001-2004)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP (From Table 3B)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
91	93	76	91	89	68	91	79	94	98	95	97	77	86	50	86

Display 9C (2002-2005)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP (From Table 3C)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
84	100	74	83	81	61	94	85	98	95	48	91	71	84	57	78

Display 9D (2003-2006)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP

(From Table 3D)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
100	100	98	100	100	94	98	96	100	100	99	100	100	94	40	97

Comparing Faculty Teaching Workload with the Enrollment Funding Model

The enrollment funding model, which was first used in 1998-99, was based on data for 1996-97 when the average annual number of student credit hours taught by FTE teaching faculty was 421.78. The model contains a twelve-cell matrix - the horizontal cells represent the levels of students (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral) and the vertical cells represent four levels of program costs (low to high). Since no individual faculty member is likely to do all of his or her teaching in a single cell, it is nearly impossible to relate precise faculty FTE to student credit hours per cell in the matrix. And since the actual assignment will vary we have no data for the portion of an assignment that is tied to an individual course and hence the student credit hours in that course. The model did not contemplate this type of analysis when it was developed so it will not be possible to provide some of the data the General Assembly requested.

Since the enrollment funding model was first used, the Board of Governors has periodically reviewed the model and has updated the model to reflect changing costs of instruction. Below is the initial funding matrix. The numbers shown within each cell are the student credit hours of instruction within the level/category that would generate one additional faculty member

Display 10
Initial Funding Matrix

Program Category	SCH per Instructional Position		
	Undergraduate	Masters	Doctoral
Categ. I	643.72	171.44	138.41
Categ. II	487.37	249.94	146.74
Categ. III	364.88	160.93	122.95
Categ. V	230.52	102.45	70.71

When projecting the number of new faculty required to accommodate enrollment growth, different campuses will have different mixes of programs, so each campus will have a different mix of projected additional credit hours and a different mix of faculty associated with teaching the additional credit hours.

In analyzing the cells, one could conclude that if faculty were, counter to any actual situation, equally divided among the 12 cells, then the average student credit hour load per faculty FTE would be 240.83 hours. If a campus had mostly undergraduate courses it would have a much higher average number of student credit hours taught per FTE faculty than the average of the

funding matrix. On the other hand, if most of the instruction is at the graduate level, then the average student credit hours taught would be lower than the average for the whole matrix. Both the UNC average and the individual campus averages are much higher than the matrix average since approximately three quarters of all instruction is at the undergraduate level.

Following the review of the model, the Board of Governors approved changes to reflect updated instructional costs. The revised cells of the funding model are shown below.

Display 11
Revised Funding Matrix

Program Category	SCH per Instructional Position		
	Undergraduate	Masters	Doctoral
Categ. I	708.64	169.52	115.56
Categ. II	535.74	303.93	110.16
Categ.III	406.24	186.23	109.86
Categ.IV	232.25	90.17	80.91

For this funding matrix, and using the same rationale, the average for the revised matrix is 254.10. In other words, based on a review of national practice and national cost data, the average SCH per FTE for the matrix increased. That means that for the revised matrix, it requires more SCH on average to generate a new position than in the original funding matrix. This updated model essentially motivates faculty productivity since, on average, the number of SCH required for an additional faculty position is higher than the number required previously. This was the consequence of the study and this result was adopted by the Board of Governors. As indicated above, this average is based on the assumption that faculty are equally divided by the cells, which, as indicated, will not be the case since the actual distribution will depend on the degree program mix and level of instruction at each campus. It is, however, a way to compare the original matrix and the revised matrix to demonstrate that the number of SCH per FTE to generate a faculty position has increased. The comparison between the values in the original matrix and the revised matrix demonstrate that the expected productivity of faculty has increased, particularly for undergraduate instruction – the largest volume of instruction for UNC institutions.

It should be further noted that this analysis is only a portion of the picture since many credit hours taught by faculty are not funded through the enrollment funding model. Credit hours are generated for some programs and campuses on the FTE model, for example the medical schools at ECU and UNC-Chapel Hill as well as all of the hours taught at the North Carolina School of the Arts. Credit hours are also produced in the summer sessions where classes taught on campus are not funded by the state. Distance learning courses taken by non-resident students outside of North Carolina are entirely off the funding model. Therefore, there are multiple ways for faculty to produce student credit hours of instruction that are not based on the enrollment funding model. The chart below illustrates different ways to look at student credit hour production.

Display 12

Student Credit Hours for 2006-07

Total SCH (from all sources, funded and unfunded)	5,362,935
Total SCH funded by SCH Model and FTE Model	4,938,587
Total SCH funded by SCH Enrollment Funding Model (Fall/Sp/Su)	4,780,822
Total SCH funded by SCH Enrollment Funding Model (Fall/Sp)	4,689,421

Dividing the total number of funded fall and spring student credits hours taught by total faculty teaching FTE for the most recent year (2006-07) shows an increase in the number of actual average credit hours per FTE teaching. For the fall and spring terms of 2006-07, student credit hours taught per FTE faculty member were 439.36, an increase of 17.58 student credit hours over the average of 421.78 that existed when the enrollment funding model was developed. This represents a 4.2% increase in productivity. Displaying this information for the fall and spring terms of 2006-07 on a campus by campus basis demonstrates the wide mix of programs offered at UNC institutions.

Display 13
SCH/FTE

2007	FTE Faculty	Total SCH	SCH/FTE
ASU	896	399,192	445.52
ECU	1,488	564,923	379.63
ECSU	157	74,700	474.89
FSU	293	156,765	535.34
NCA&T	505	279,156	552.40
NCCU	390	173,189	443.55
NCSU	1,626	712,384	438.09
UNCA	256	91,064	355.97
UNC-CH	1,316	577,585	438.97
UNCC	1,098	480,570	437.68
UNCG	913	389,293	426.46
UNCP	326	130,111	398.55
UNCW	547	304,181	555.96
WCU	517	207,055	400.86
WSSU	345	149,255	433.23
UNC Totals	10,673	4,689,421	439.36

Productivity Increase

An analysis of changes in the enrollment funding model as well as an analysis of actual student credit hours taught per FTE faculty show an increase in the teaching productivity of UNC faculty. The enrollment funding model now requires more student credit hours, on the average, to be taught to generate an additional faculty position (5.5% more). A comparison of the average number of student credit hours taught per FTE teaching faculty in 1996-97 (the year the enrollment funding model calculations were based) to the average in 2006-07 shows an increase of 4.2% in the productivity of FTE teaching faculty. Due to the fact that General Administration has no data sets containing the actual percent of each faculty member's time associated with each course assignment, it is not possible to do a more detailed analysis, for example, of productivity

by cell. Most faculty members will teach at more than one level in a year, and some will teach at three levels. It is not clear what benefit this would add if such data were available.

Faculty Research and Economic Development

Faculty are expected to support their course teaching loads with a range of additional academic-related activities, many of them time consuming and labor intensive, such as student advising and counseling, new course development, and learning the use of new technologies for teaching. All faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship and research to inform their teaching. Many faculty members, particularly at institutions with advanced graduate programs, are expected to do research at the cutting edge of their discipline and contribute to the growth of knowledge in their area. One measure of this work in many fields is success in getting peer-reviewed grants to support their research.

Display 14

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Sponsored Program Awards Received

Fiscal Year 2004

Constituent Institution	Number of Faculty[2]	Dollars	Average per Faculty
Doctoral/Research-Extensive			
North Carolina State University	1,461	$208,589,749	**$142,772**
UNC Chapel Hill	2,783	$577,577,064	**$207,538**
Doctoral/Research-Intensive			
East Carolina University	1,426	$39,119,076	**$27,433**
North Carolina A&T State University	365	$34,269,459	**$93,862**
UNC Charlotte	783	$24,058,470	**$30,726**
UNC Greensboro	630	$31,295,411	**$49,675**
Master's (Comprehensive) I			
Appalachian State University	603	$9,124,663	**$15,132**
Fayetteville State University	217	$9,586,165	**$44,176**
North Carolina Central University	282	$36,269,898	**$128,617**
UNC Pembroke	208	$8,365,560	**$40,219**
UNC Wilmington	438	$20,291,291	**$46,327**
Western Carolina University	276	$11,286,133	**$40,892**
Baccalaureate-Liberal Arts			
UNC Asheville	179	$4,781,215	**$26,711**
Baccalaureate-General			
Elizabeth City State University	147	$7,014,899	**$47,720**
Winston-Salem State University	185	$12,178,418	**$65,829**
Art, Music, and Design			
North Carolina School of the Arts	134	$65,000	**$485**

[2] Faculty numbers are based on permanent FTE faculty, full and part-time, fall 2003. This is the most conservative way to show research dollars by faculty. Most campuses could identify a smaller number of faculty members as appropriate for this calculation, thus resulting in a higher amount per faculty.

System Office UNC Office of the President		$9,286,962	
Internal Awards and Interinstitutional Subagreements		($26,676,200)	
UNC TOTALS	**10,117**	$1,016,473,232	**$100,472**

As the importance of UNC in economic development grows, the responsibility of faculty, particularly those with a significant research assignment, is increasingly to be catalysts for economic development by securing more grant dollars. Any fair assessment of the teaching workload of faculty by institutional type must be made in the context of the full range of faculty responsibilities at that type of institution. UNC received more than $1 billion dollars in sponsored program awards in fiscal year 2004. The average per faculty member varies by campus but it is clear that average dollars brought in per faculty member are highest at those campuses that have been assigned the lowest average number of courses per faculty and have a strong research mission and seek federal, state, and private grants. Display 14 provides the details by campuses in Carnegie categories. On average, a UNC faculty member secures $100,472 in external funds, an amount in excess of the average teaching salary within UNC in 2004.

The UNC Tomorrow initiative has resulted in a long list of activities that the people of North Carolina expect from their universities in the area of economic and community development and improvement of public schools. The list includes additional non-instructional activities to be executed by UNC faculty members.

Campus Response to the Faculty Teaching Workload Report

Based on previous discussion and reporting, while some of the campuses reiterated some of the shortcomings of the Delaware data set, all have engaged in analyses where they fell below the standards and have identified avenues to improve campus performance. The Faculty Teaching Workload Study has helped identify specific programs to be examined for productivity and has engendered a review of faculty assignment policies in several instances. Campus changes will be reflected in future reporting since data for the annual report is based on three-year averages, and the most recent year of data is normally two years prior to the year of the report. Nonetheless, UNC has a process to achieve objectives set by the Board of Governors in its teaching workload policy. The improvements demonstrated indicate that the objectives are being achieved.

Conclusion

Board of Governor's Policy 400.3.4 states that "The purpose of the Board's system for monitoring teaching workloads is to provide information to campus academic administrators that will help them manage teaching workloads in an efficient and equitable manner. It is the Board's belief that teaching loads are best managed at the department and school level and not at the system or state level."[3]

Overall, as demonstrated in this report, the productivity of teaching faculty within UNC is increasing. However, this report, along with supporting data, is provided to the chief academic

[3] *UNC Policy Manual*, 400.3.4, p. 3.

officer of each campus with a request to review the findings and address campus-wide average teaching loads or program teaching loads that fall below comparative standards.

Technical Information

Tables 1A-D and 2A-D are based on the data reported to Delaware without any editing to eliminate outliers. Campuses have had an opportunity to review their reported data and to make corrections. The averages were calculated by summing sections and FTE faculty across all CIPs and for all three years, and dividing the sum of the sections by the sum of the FTE faculty. Sections include organized course sections, and laboratory, discussion, and recitation sections. The sections do not include undergraduate or graduate individual instruction.

Tables 3A-D are based on data reported to Delaware without any editing to eliminate outliers. Campuses had an opportunity to review their reported data and make corrections. The averages for CIP areas are the three-year average of the ratio of sections to FTE faculty in a given CIP. The standard deviation is computed by averaging the standard deviations for each of the three years

FTE Faculty for the analysis in Display 13 includes full-time and part-time employees whose primary function is teaching. Primary teaching function is determined when salary or a portion of salary comes from funds designated for teaching positions. Specifically, this determination is made when at least 50% of salary is paid from Budget Object Code, 1310. In addition, the population includes non-tenure-track EPA employees whose primary function is non-teaching, but whose secondary function is teaching. Secondary teaching function is assumed when EPA-non-faculty are reported with a department of rank.

APPENDIX

Tables 1A-D
Tables 2A-D
Tables 3A-D