

Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity Study: A Discussion of the Results, Utilization, and Lessons Learned

Heather Kelly Isaacs
Institutional Research Analyst
University of Delaware
Associate Principal Investigator, Delaware Study of Measures of
Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity

Michael F. Middaugh
Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning
University of Delaware
Principal Investigator, Delaware Study of Measures of
Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity

Introduction

Survey results from the National Center for Education Statistics indicate that full-time faculty at four-year institutions report they spend approximately 10 hours per week in the classroom (Zimbler, 2001). This leads to the question, “What are faculty doing with the rest of their time?” Faculty workload studies (e.g., Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Jordan, 1994; Middaugh, 2001; Miller, 1994; Zimbler, 2001) have been developed to better understand the allocation of personnel and fiscal resources.

In 1992, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) at the University of Delaware (UD) developed the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (a.k.a. the Delaware Study) by creating a survey, collecting and analyzing relevant data, and establishing benchmarkable norms that help to answer the question, “Who is teaching what to whom and at what cost?” (Middaugh, 2001). The data collected has allowed participating departments across the country to understand how many lower and upper division and graduate student credit hours are being taught by full-time equivalent (FTE) tenured and tenure-track faculty, other regular faculty, supplemental faculty, and teaching assistants, as well as the associated costs. A unique

feature of the Delaware Study is that national benchmarks and peer analyses at the department or academic discipline level of analysis are available. Approximately 400 colleges and universities utilize the Delaware Study to facilitate strategic planning and decision-making processes.

While the Delaware Study provides information to analyze and benchmark faculty teaching loads, direct institutional expenditures for instruction, and externally funded research and service activity, it lacks measures that demonstrate faculty outputs that result from time spent outside the classroom. The output measures for out-of-classroom faculty activity range from the number of refereed publications, juried shows and performances, externally funded contracts and grants, and institutional service to faculty mentored student research, academic advising, and thesis/dissertation committee involvement (Middaugh, 2001). It is important to understand who is teaching what to whom at what cost, as well as how faculty spend their time outside the classroom and the resulting products. This more complete picture of faculty activity may facilitate educated decision-making regarding personnel and fiscal resources.

The Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity Study

In 2001, the OIRP at UD received a grant from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to expand the Delaware Study in order to address out-of-classroom demands on faculty time. The expanded Delaware Study is known as the Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity Study, and is also referred to as the Faculty Activity Study. Similar to the Delaware Study, a national Advisory Committee was established to help develop instruments and methods for assessing faculty productivity. The Advisory Committee has played an integral role in expanding the Delaware Study to incorporate *Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity*. The Advisory Committee met three times during the 2001-02 academic year, and developed data collection instruments, data definitions, and protocols which were pilot tested in

spring 2002 among a sample of member institutions from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), as well as institutions represented by the Advisory Committee members. The Advisory Committee continues to actively refine and enhance the data collection methodology. The first full Faculty Activity Study data collection cycle took place in spring 2003.

Methodology

Department chairs at participating institutions receive a Departmental Summary Form (see Appendix 1) and a Faculty Checklist (see Appendix 2) that mirrors the Summary Form in content. Many of the Faculty Checklist variables are items that would be discussed during a typical faculty performance appraisal. It is understood that the Faculty Checklist should reflect the most recent faculty evaluation period. At this point, there are two methodology options for the Faculty Activity Study. The first option is that department chairs complete the Departmental Summary Form using documents and materials they have on hand that reflect the variables on the Summary Form. The second option is that department chairs ask their faculty to individually complete the checklist to reflect their out-of-classroom activity during the preceding 12 months. Department chairs are asked to verify the data in submitted for both options. The Departmental Summary Form is returned to UD. The OIRP at UD verifies the data only to the extent of making sure departments are assigned the correct Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes and reviews the completeness of the data submitted. Once data verification and analyses are complete, national benchmarks for measures of out-of-classroom faculty activity at the discipline level of analysis by Carnegie classification are produced.

Results

Fifty-seven institutions participated in the 2003 Faculty Activity Study (see Appendix 3 for a list of participating institutions by Carnegie Classification). The breakdown of institutions by Carnegie Classification is as follows: 40% Comprehensive (Master's) ($n=23$), 35% Baccalaureate ($n=20$), 12% Doctoral ($n=7$), and 12% Research ($n=7$). The participating institutions were almost equally split by control. Fifty-one percent of the institutions were private ($n=29$) and 49% were public ($n=28$). It should be noted that the characteristics of participants for the first full data collection cycle for the Faculty Activity Study is similar to the first full data collection cycle for the Delaware Study. The most recent Delaware Study data collection cycle includes over 200 colleges and universities from across the country.

It was not possible to calculate refined means due to the small number of participating institutions and large variance. The large variance for the majority of the variables within each Carnegie classification makes the median a better statistic to describe the central tendency for the sample. This paper takes a look at the results of three departments: Business Administration, Chemistry, and English.

Appendix 4 details the mean analysis for a selected number of variables. Note that the mean scores reported are *not* refined means. First, let's look at the mean analysis for business administration. The results of the mean analysis are not at all surprising when considering Carnegie Classification and institutional mission. For instance, within activities related to teaching, graduate research shows an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions and undergraduate advisees show a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions. Within activities related to scholarship, both refereed publications and external grant proposals show an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions. There is evidence of

exhibitions within business administration. Most likely this activity is associated with business expos and such. There is evidence of activities related to service. Baccalaureate, comprehensive, and research institutions tend to focus on institutional service, while doctoral institutions tend to focus on extension and outreach.

Next, let's take a look at the mean analysis for Chemistry. Interestingly enough with regards to teaching, baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research or graduate advisees. When looking at comprehensive, doctoral, and research institutions, there is an upward trend for graduate research and graduate advisees, respectively. With regards to activities related to scholarship, there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for refereed and non-refereed publications and external grant proposals and grants awarded. There is also evidence of exhibitions within chemistry. Most likely this activity is associated with academic competitions and poster sessions. Far as professional service, once again baccalaureate and comprehensive institutions focus on institutional service while doctoral institutions and research institutions focus on professional service.

Finally, let's take a look at the mean analysis for English. Once again with regards to teaching, baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research or graduate advisees. When looking at scholarship, regardless of Carnegie Classification, there is substantial activity for refereed and non-refereed publications, as well as juried shows and exhibitions. Most likely the latter activity is associated with poetry readings and the like. When looking at activities related to service, there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for professional service and institutional service and a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for extension and research.

Appendix 5 details the median analysis a selected number of variables. First, let's look at the median analysis for business administration. Looking at activities related to teaching, similar to the mean analysis, undergraduate advisees show a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions. Within activities related to scholarship, refereed publications show an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions. Within activities related to service, there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for leadership in professional associations and professional service. Similar to the mean analysis, baccalaureate, comprehensive, and research institutions tend to focus on institutional service, while doctoral institutions tend to focus on extension and outreach.

Next, let's take a look at the median analysis for Chemistry. With regards to teaching, baccalaureate and comprehensive institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research. Baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate advisees. There is a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for redesigning curriculum. It is no surprise with regards to activities related to scholarship that there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for all the variables displayed (juried shows and exhibitions, refereed and non-refereed publications, external grant proposals, and external grants awarded). Looking at professional service, all institutions, regardless of Carnegie Classification, focus on institutional service.

Finally, let's take a look at the median analysis for English. With regards to teaching, similar to the mean analysis, baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research or graduate advisees. There is an upward trend for undergraduate research for comprehensive to research institutions. Once again when looking at scholarship, regardless of Carnegie Classification, there is substantial activity for refereed and non-refereed publications, as well as

juried shows and exhibitions. When looking at activities related to service, institutional service is the focus regardless of Carnegie Classification.

Utilization

The nature of higher education is often misunderstood by society. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, full-time faculty at four-year institutions report they work approximately 54 hours per week (Zimbler, 2001). Still, many critics question how faculty spend their time (Miller, 1994). Wilson (1997) suggests that public criticism of faculty workloads is a result of “misunderstandings” by “outsiders” who do not comprehend what faculty actually do. The Faculty Activity Study should help alleviate these misunderstandings by providing information to discuss what faculty actually do, how much they do, and the associated products.

The goal of the Faculty Activity Study is to improve the quality of information administrators and faculty receive about faculty productivity. The data gathered via the Faculty Activity Study will provide information to make knowledgeable decisions and answer accountability questions such as, “What do faculty report they do outside the classroom and what do they actually do?” and “Are faculty academically productive with their time spent outside the classroom?” This Study will supplement information that is already available regarding program performance. This Study will also serve as a resource to encourage more effective management in higher education and more effective and efficient uses of personnel resources.

Lessons Learned

The Faculty Activity Study is a work in progress. This initial data collection has already provided valuable insight that will lead to modifications for future data collection cycles. It is understood that the Study is only as good as the quality of the data. For this reason, the variables

included in the Study will be clarified to include details of the accompanying data definitions. Efforts will be made to increase the consistency of how the data is collected, as well as the number of participating institutions. The reports generated by the Faculty Activity Study will become more user friendly by being broken down by Carnegie Classification and highest degree offered and reported by discipline versus by variable. Please visit <http://www.udel.edu/IR/cost/> for more information about the Delaware Study and <http://www.udel.edu/IR/fipse/> for more information about the Faculty Activity Study. We continue to encourage feedback to improve the Faculty Activity Study. Please do not hesitate to contact us (Heather Isaacs, hkelly@udel.edu or Michael Middaugh, middaugh@udel.edu) with any questions or if additional information is needed.

References

- Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jordan, S. M. (1994). What we have learned about faculty workload: The best evidence. In J. F. Wergin (ed.), *Analyzing faculty workload*. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 83. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Middaugh, M. F. (2001). *Understanding faculty productivity: Standards and benchmarks for colleges and universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, M. A. (1994). Pressures to measure faculty work. In J. F. Wergin (ed.), *Analyzing faculty workload*. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 83. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, R. (1997, February 28). Faculty leaders in New York and California unite on productivity issues. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Zimbler, L. J. (2001). *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99): Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions: Fall 1998* (NCES Publication No. NCES 2001-152). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity
Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity - Summary Form

Institution: _____

Discipline: _____ CIP Code: _____

Please carefully consult the data definitions accompanying this data collection form before reporting information. All data should be reported for a 12-month period, specifically the most recent 12-month faculty evaluation period as defined in the instructions. Please denote any not applicable data with 'na' and any data element that is truly zero, '0'.

- A. Total number of FTE tenured and tenure-track faculty. _____
- B. From the above total (question A), number of FTE faculty included in the data collected on this form. _____
- 1. Number of refereed journal articles, book chapters, and/or creative works published by faculty. _____
- 2. Number of non-refereed journal articles, book chapters, and/or creative works published by faculty. _____
- 3. Number of single-author or joint-author books or monographs published by faculty. _____
- 4. Number of books, collections, and/or monographs edited by faculty. _____
- 5. Number of books, journal articles, and/or manuscripts reviewed by faculty. _____
- 6. Number of juried shows, commissioned performances, creative readings, or competitive exhibitions by faculty. _____
- 7. Number of editorial positions held by faculty. _____
- 8. Number of external grant, contract, and/or scholarly fellowship proposals approved by institution on behalf of faculty. _____
- 9. Number of external grants, contracts, and/or scholarly fellowships formally awarded to institution on behalf of faculty. _____
- 10. Total dollar value for the externally funded grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships reported in Item 9. _____
- 11. Number of internal grants and/or contracts formally awarded to faculty. _____
- 12. Total dollar value for the internally funded grants and contracts reported in Item 11. _____
- 13. Number of provisional or issued patents registered by faculty. _____
- 14. Number of courses where faculty have developed or redesigned the pedagogy or curriculum. _____
- 15. Number of formal presentations made by faculty at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings. _____

- 16. Number of leadership positions in a professional association held by faculty (e.g., elected officer, committee chairperson, conference chair, etc.). _____
- 17. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees where faculty served as first reader or chairperson. _____
- 18. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees where faculty served in a non-chairing role. _____
- 19. Number of **undergraduate** students formally engaged in research with a faculty mentor. _____
- 20. Number of **graduate** students formally engaged in **non-credit** research with a faculty mentor. _____
- 21. Number of clinical (e.g., student nurses), practicum students (e.g., student teachers), and/or internship students formally assigned to faculty. _____
- 22. Number of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) who have co-authored a journal article or book chapter with a faculty mentor. _____
- 23. Number of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) who have co-presented a paper at a professional meeting with a faculty mentor. _____
- 24. Total number of **undergraduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to faculty. _____
- 25. Total number of **graduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to faculty. _____
- 26. Number of copyrighted computer creative works related to field of expertise (e.g., software development, web-based learning modules, etc.). _____
- 27. Number of faculty activities related to recognized or visible service to profession (e.g., serve on a regional or national committee, review grant proposals, etc.). _____
- 28. Number of faculty extension and outreach activities related to field of expertise (e.g., community workshops, invited talks to community groups, seminars, lectures, demonstrations, etc.). _____
- 29. Number of faculty activities related to institutional service (e.g., faculty senator, promotion and tenure committee, other faculty committees, student activity advisor, etc.). _____

Thank you!

Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist

Dear Colleague:

Your institution has agreed to participate in the Delaware Study of Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity. This is a national data project, underwritten by the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education. Data will be collected by academic department/discipline at each participating institution, and will be reported in aggregate form for each unit. I seek your assistance in providing your department chair with your personal tally for each of the following variables, which he/she will aggregate and report as department/discipline totals. We will not see your individual responses, only departmental totals. These aggregate data will be used to develop national benchmarks to assist your department to see how it compares with similar departments at similar institutions for each of the variables. I thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Michael F. Middaugh
National Director
The Delaware Study

Please report your activity for each of the following measures. Report only what you accomplished in each area during the 2002-03 Academic Year, i.e., your activity which corresponds to your most recent faculty evaluation period. Be sure to review the definitions provided before responding. Please denote any not applicable data with 'na' and any data element that is truly zero, '0'.

1. Number of refereed journal articles, book chapters, and/or creative works you have published. _____
2. Number of non-refereed journal articles, book chapters, and/or creative works you have published. _____
3. Number of single-author or joint-author books or monographs you have had published by an academic or commercial press. _____
4. Number of books, collections, and/or monographs you have edited. _____
5. Number of books, journal articles, and/or manuscripts you have reviewed. _____
6. Number of juried shows, commissioned performances, creative readings, or competitive exhibitions in which you have participated. _____
7. Number of editorial positions you have held. _____
8. Number of external grant, contract, and/or scholarly fellowship proposals approved by institution on your behalf. _____
9. Number of external grants, contracts, and/or scholarly fellowships which have been formally awarded to your institution on your behalf. _____
10. Total dollar value for the externally funded grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships which you reported in Item 9. _____
11. Number of internal grants and/or contracts which have been formally awarded to you. _____
12. Total dollar value for the internally funded grants and contracts which you reported in Item 11. _____

Delaware Study Faculty Activity Checklist - Continued

13. Number of provisional or issued patents registered in your name. _____
14. Number of courses where you have developed or redesigned the pedagogy or curriculum. _____
15. Number of formal presentations you have made at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings. _____
16. Number of positions in professional associations where you held a leadership role (e.g., elected officer, committee chairperson, conference chair, etc.). _____
17. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees on which you served as first reader or chairperson. _____
18. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees on which you served in a non-chairing role. _____
19. Number of **undergraduate** students formally engaged in research with you. _____
20. Number of **graduate** students formally engaged in **non-credit** research with you. _____
21. Number of clinical (e.g., student nurses), practicum students (e.g., student teachers), and/or internship students formally assigned to you. _____
22. Number of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) who have co-authored a journal article or book chapter with you. _____
23. Number of students (undergraduate and/or graduate) who have co-presented a paper at a professional meeting with you. _____
24. Total number of **undergraduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to you. _____
25. Total number of **graduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to you. _____
26. Number of copyrighted computer creative works related to your field of expertise (e.g., software development, web-based learning modules, etc.) in which you have engaged. _____
27. Number of activities related to recognized or visible service to your profession (e.g., serve on a regional or national committee, review grant proposals, etc.) in which you have engaged. _____
28. Number of extension and outreach activities related to your field of expertise (e.g., community workshops, invited talks to community groups, seminars, lectures, demonstrations, etc.) in which you have engaged. _____
29. Number of activities related to service to your institution (e.g., faculty senator, promotion and tenure committee, other faculty committees, student activity advisor, etc.) in which you have engaged. _____

Thank You!

**2003 Faculty Activity Study
Participants by 1994 Carnegie Classification as of Academic Year 2000**

Baccalaureate I Institutions

Franklin and Marshall College*
St. Olaf College

Baccalaureate II Institutions

Bethel College
College of Saint Mary
College of St. Elizabeth
Covenant College
McMurry University
Montreat College
Mount Marty College
Mount Union College
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
Northwestern College
Ohio Northern University
Shorter College
Spring Arbor University
Thiel College
Union University
University of Sioux Falls
Waynesburg College
Winston-Salem State University

Comprehensive I Institutions

Central Michigan University
Delta State University
East Tennessee State University
Georgian Court College
Grambling State University
Indiana University - South Bend
Louisiana State University - Shreveport
Nazareth College of Rochester
New Mexico Highlands University
Oakland University
Oklahoma City University
Rider University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern Univ and A&M College - Baton Rouge
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee - Martin
University of West Florida
Wagner College
Western Carolina University
Youngstown State University

Comprehensive II Institutions

University of New England
University of Southern Indiana

Doctoral I Institutions

University of Akron
University of Toledo
Western Michigan University

Doctoral II Institutions

Idaho State University
Montana State University-Bozeman
Wichita State University

Research I Institutions

Georgetown University
Oregon State University
University of Colorado - Boulder
University of Connecticut

Research II Institutions

Clemson University
Northeastern University
University of Delaware

Specialized Institutions - Business

Thunderbird, AGSIM
(Highest Degree: Master's)

Specialized Institutions - Health

University of the Sciences in Philadelphia
(Highest Degree: Doctorate)

*All disciplines combined, therefore will not be included in analysis.











