

**Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity Study:
A Look at Two Data Collection Cycles and a Verification Study**

Heather Kelly Isaacs
Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Planning
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

Presented at the 45th Annual Association for Institutional Research Forum
May 30, 2005 ~ San Diego, CA

Abstract

This paper will discuss the results of the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Study. The importance of establishing reliable benchmarking data to successfully plan and assess academic programs will be emphasized. The methodology of a verification study will also be discussed. The goal of the Study is to provide evidence regarding program productivity, as well as the means to encourage more effective management in higher education. Examples of how participating institutions are using the Faculty Activity Study will be highlighted.

**Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity Study:
A Look at Two Data Collection Cycles and a Verification Study**

Introduction

Survey results from the National Center for Education Statistics indicate that full-time faculty at four-year institutions report they spend approximately one-half of their time on teaching activities, which includes approximately 10 hours per week in the classroom (Zimbler, 2001). This leads to the question, “Are faculty being productive 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 particular, the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity, also known as the Delaware Study, takes a look at 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 and the associated costs. The unique feature of the Delaware Study is that this is all done at the discipline level of analysis.

With the assistance of a grant from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) in 2001, the Delaware Study expanded to address out-of-classroom demands on faculty time. The Expanded Delaware Study is also known as the Faculty Activity Study. The nature of higher education is often misunderstood by society. The term “work load” is often thought to refer to the time faculty spend in the classroom. However, work load relates to faculty work and the numerous associated activities and responsibilities in and out of the classroom (Braskamp & Ory, 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

purpose of the Faculty Activity Study is to help alleviate these misunderstandings by providing information to discuss what faculty actually do, how much they do, and the associated products.

The Faculty Activity Study demonstrates faculty outputs that are a result of faculty spending time outside the classroom on non-instructional activities. The activities range from *teaching* (i.e., redesigning course curriculum, advising students, or conducting research with students) to *scholarship* (i.e., refereed and non-refereed publications, editorial positions, juried shows and commissioned performances, or grant activity) to *service* (i.e., institutional service, faculty extension and outreach activities, or professional service). This Study focuses on the discipline level of analysis and is not concerned with individual faculty information. For this reason, all data is reported in the aggregate. The goal of this Study is to provide evidence regarding program productivity, as well as the means to encourage more effective management in higher education.

The methodology, instrumentation, and data definitions for the Faculty Activity Study have been developed with the help of an Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee is comprised of faculty, academic managers, and institutional researchers, all with national reputations for expertise in measuring faculty activity. Despite the efforts of the Advisory Committee, the data collection methods and instruments raise credibility issues. The survey is 'home-grown' and this leads to concerns about its validity. For example, the survey variables may not accurately reflect a particular discipline or institution. For this reason, the limitations of the survey need to be recognized. The self-reported nature of the data leads to the inevitable uncertainties as to how accurate the data will be. Credibility issues may include faulty memory and over-exaggeration of outputs by faculty. Therefore, individual departments should be reviewed to investigate the degree of accuracy of the data reported. This type of investigation will help to ensure that the data is an accurate reflection of the actual out-of-classroom faculty activity.

Methodology

The first full data collection cycle for the Faculty Activity Study took place in spring 2003. The second data collection cycle took place in spring 2004. The data collection instrumentation is comprised of a combination of electronic faculty checklists and a single departmental summary sheet. These materials are designed to ensure full interaction between department chair and faculty in providing maximum information with minimum intrusion. The data collection process has been structured to minimize faculty concerns about unnecessary administrative intrusion or oversight into their work lives, while at the same time encouraging the fullest possible participation.

Specifically, department chairs at participating institutions receive a Departmental Summary Form (see Appendix 1 for the 2002 Departmental Summary Form and Appendix 2 for the 2003 Departmental Summary Form) and a Faculty Checklist 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 submitted for both options. The Departmental Summary Form is then returned to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) at the University of Delaware (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

Approximately fifty-seven institutions participated in the 2002 Faculty Activity Study (see Appendix 3 for a list of 2002 participating institutions by Carnegie Classification). The majority of these institutions were Comprehensive ($n=23$), followed by Baccalaureate ($n=20$), Doctoral ($n=7$), and Research ($n=7$). The control status of these institutions had almost equal representation – 29 private institutions and 28 public institutions. On average, institutions submitted data for approximately 17 disciplines with one being the minimum and 46 being the maximum number of disciplines.

Approximately forty-seven institutions participated in the 2003 Faculty Activity Study (see Appendix 4 for a list of 2003 participating institutions by Carnegie Classification). Similar to the previous year, the majority of these institutions were Comprehensive ($n=27$), followed by Baccalaureate ($n=7$), Doctoral ($n=7$), and Research ($n=6$). While the control status of the 2002 participating institutions had almost equal representation, more than half (70%) of the 2003 participants were public institutions ($n=33$). On average, institutions submitted data for approximately 21 disciplines with five being the minimum and 39 being the maximum number of disciplines. A combined participant list for the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Studies is presented in Appendix 5.

Refined means were not calculated for the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Studies 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: English, Chemistry, and Business Administration.

Appendix 6 details the median analysis for a select number of variables for English. In 2002 and 2003, with respect to teaching, baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research or graduate advisees. In 2002, there is an upward trend for undergraduate research for comprehensive to research institutions. In 2002 and 2003, regardless of Carnegie Classification, there is substantial activity for refereed and non-refereed publications, as well as juried shows and exhibitions. In addition, regardless of Carnegie Classification, institutional service followed by extension and outreach is the primary focus of faculty service activities.

Appendix 7 details the median analysis for a select number of variables for Chemistry. In 2002 and 2003, with respect to teaching, baccalaureate institutions do not show any evidence of graduate research or graduate advisees. In addition, there is a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for redesigning curriculum in 2002 and 2003. It is no surprise with regard to activities related to scholarship, there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions for external grant proposals and external grants awarded for both data collection cycles. Looking at professional service in 2002 and 2003, all institutions, regardless of Carnegie Classification, focus on institutional service.

Appendix 8 details the median analysis for a select number of variables for business administration. In 2002, looking at activities related to teaching, undergraduate advisees show a downward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions. Within activities related to scholarship, in 2002 and 2003 there is substantial activity related to refereed publications. Within activities related to service, there is an upward trend from baccalaureate to research institutions

for professional service in 2002 and 2003. It is evident that regardless of Carnegie Classification, institutions focus on institutional service.

The 2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Study results provide evidence that in addition to time spent in the classroom teaching students, faculty engage in numerous activities related to departmental and institutional missions. These activities include, but are not limited to, curriculum redesign, academic advising, thesis and dissertation supervision, academic scholarship, and service to the institution, community, and profession. It is clear that the results of how faculty spend their time are a reflection of institutional mission. In addition, regardless of Carnegie Classification, it is evident that faculty achieve a balance between teaching, scholarship, and service.

Proposed Verification Study

The data elements collected in the Faculty Activity Study are self-reported. Miller (1994) recognizes that the question of how faculty spend their time can only be answered by faculty themselves. Nonetheless, individuals outside higher education view these self-reports as insufficient. Unfortunately, methods to collect faculty activity data are limited and self-reported data tends to be the primary source for this type of information.

Braskamp and Ory (1994) suggest that "...[faculty] self-appraisals have sufficient credibility and trustworthiness to warrant their use..." (p. 103). However, it is inevitable that the issue of credibility and confidence in the data will arise. It is important to know that the data received are authentic and represent an accurate picture of out-of-classroom faculty activity. The hope is that the Faculty Activity Study will provide participating institutions, prospective participants, as well as various supporters and critics of the Study, evidence that the data departments submit are indeed credible and reflective of reality.

In summer 2005 the credibility issues surrounding the Faculty Activity Study will be addressed by reviewing the data collection instruments and data submitted by individual departments. The review process will measure the level of inconsistency in the data submitted. The review will indicate whether faculty data for specific variables are under-reported or exaggerated. It is likely that data elements will be exaggerated. It is important to keep in mind that the data received are only representative of faculty within a particular department who chose to respond to the survey instrument. The data does not represent a department in its entirety, unless there is 100% participation. Therefore, the data submission of four departments who had a 100% response rate for the Faculty Activity Study will be reviewed. Attempts will be made to verify that these departments had a 100% response rate. This will be accomplished through conversations with department chairs and the individuals who coordinated the data collection effort and a review of the material submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Faculty Workload Plans, faculty vitae, citation indices, discussions with department chairs and faculty, and other relevant resources will be utilized to verify the data submitted.

The review methodology will consider all full- and part-time, tenured and tenure track faculty within a department during fall 2002 and a select number of variables listed on the Study survey instrument. The results received on the survey instrument for selected variables will be compared with primary data sources (e.g., Faculty Workload Plans and citation indices).

Utilizing the Faculty Activity Study Instruments and Data

Institutions that participate in the Instructional Costs and Productivity portion of the Delaware Study find the Faculty Activity Study data particularly useful. The contextual information provided by the Faculty Activity Study supplies a backdrop for examining teaching loads and associated costs. Some institutions experience state mandates that require institutions to annually

provide data on certain areas of faculty activity. Institutions experiencing such mandates have combined the state-mandated elements with the Faculty Activity Study variables to develop one instrument. Likewise, institutions have integrated Faculty Activity Study variables into their annual review process.

In many instances, institutions summarize the faculty activity data by looking at the benchmark ratios by Carnegie Classification or highest degree offered versus the departmental ratios. This is all summarized at the discipline level of analysis. Summary reports have also been aggregated to the university and college level. These summaries are typically forwarded to the Provost, Dean, and the Department Chairs. Participating institutions utilize the Faculty Activity Study for informational and discussion purposes within their institution. Participants also find the Faculty Activity Study data to be helpful in answering requests from state agencies as well as other external constituents.

Conclusion

The Faculty Activity Study demonstrates the numerous faculty outputs that are a result of faculty spending time outside the classroom on non-instructional activities. For example, the results of the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Study provide evidence that faculty engage in activities such as curriculum redesign, academic advising, thesis and dissertation supervision, academic scholarship, and service to the institution, community, and profession. While institutional mission is reflected by how faculty spend their time, regardless of Carnegie Classification, faculty achieve a balance between teaching, scholarship, and service. The data collected via the Faculty Activity Study has the potential to provide evidence about program productivity. This information will facilitate informed decision making and encourage more effective management in higher education.

Please visit <http://www.udel.edu/IR/fipse/> for more information about the Faculty Activity Study. We invite and 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 of Instructional Costs and Productivity
Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity - Summary Form

Institution: _____ FICE Code: _____

Discipline: _____ CIP Code: _____

Degrees Offered in Discipline (check all that apply): Bachelor's Master's Doctorate Professional

This study focuses on the discipline level of analysis. Please carefully consult the data definitions accompanying this data collection form before reporting information. All data should be reported for the most recent 12-month faculty evaluation period as defined in the instructions. Please denote any not-applicable data as 'na' and any data element that is truly zero as '0'.

DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC STATISTICS

- A. Total number of FTE tenured and tenure-track faculty. _____
- B. Total number of FTE tenured and tenure-track faculty on which your responses below will be based. _____

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TEACHING

1. Number of new courses which faculty have created. _____
2. Number of **existing** courses where faculty have redesigned the pedagogy or curriculum. _____
3. Total number of course preparations faculty have made. *(This number should reflect unique courses versus different course sections).* _____
4. Unduplicated headcount of **undergraduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to faculty. _____
5. Unduplicated headcount of **graduate** academic advisees **formally assigned** to faculty, excluding thesis/dissertation advisees. _____
6. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees where faculty served as first reader or chairperson. _____
7. Number of **active** thesis/dissertation committees where faculty served in a non-chairing role. _____
8. Number of undergraduate senior theses (e.g., senior thesis, recital, art show, other capstone experiences) that faculty have advised. _____
9. Total number of students taught individually in independent or directed studies. _____
10. Number of **undergraduate** students formally engaged in research with a faculty mentor. _____
11. Number of **graduate** students formally engaged in research with a faculty mentor. _____

12. Number of clinical students (e.g., student nurses), practicum students (e.g., student teachers), and internship students formally assigned to faculty.

13. Number of students (undergraduate and graduate) who have co-authored a journal article or book chapter with a faculty mentor.

14. Number of students (undergraduate and graduate) who have co-presented a paper at a professional meeting with a faculty mentor.

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SCHOLARSHIP

15. Number of print or electronic **refereed** journal articles, book chapters, and creative works published by faculty.

16. Number of print or electronic **non-refereed** journal articles, book chapters, and creative works published by faculty.

17. Number of single-author or joint-author books or monographs written by faculty and published by an academic or commercial press.

18. Number of manuscripts (e.g. journal articles, books) submitted to publishers.

19. Number of books, collections, and monographs edited by faculty.

20. Number of books, journal articles, and manuscripts reviewed and formally submitted by faculty.

21. Number of editorial positions held by faculty.

22. Number of juried shows, commissioned performances, creative readings, and competitive exhibitions by faculty.

23. Number of digital programs or development of applications and items for technology transfer (e.g., software development, web-based learning modules) designed by faculty related to field of expertise.

24. Number of provisional or issued patents registered to faculty.

25. Number of faculty works in progress (e.g., journal articles, paintings, musical compositions).

26. Number of invitations received by faculty to perform or present.

- 27. Number of formal presentations made by faculty at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings. _____
- 28. Number of external and internal grant, contract, and scholarly fellowship proposals submitted by faculty. _____
- 29. Number of **new** external grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships formally awarded to faculty or to the institution on behalf of faculty. _____
- 30. Total dollar value of the **new** externally funded grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships indicated in the previous question. _____
- 31. Number of **new** internal grants and contracts formally awarded to faculty. _____
- 32. Total dollar value of the **new** internally funded grants and contracts indicated in the previous question. _____
- 33. Number of continuing external and internal grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships. _____

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SERVICE

- 34. Number of faculty activities related to institutional service (e.g., faculty senate, faculty committees, peer mentoring, academic programs in residences, recruiting efforts, student activity advisor, other student activity involvement). _____
- 35. Number of faculty extension and outreach activities related to field of expertise (e.g., K-12 service, community workshops, invited talks to community groups, seminars, lectures, demonstrations). _____
- 36. Number of faculty activities related to recognized or visible service to profession (e.g., service on a regional or national committee, service on a self-study visitation team for another institution). _____
- 37. Number of grant proposals reviewed by faculty related to field of expertise. _____
- 38. Number of leadership positions in a professional association held by faculty (e.g., elected officer, committee chairperson, conference chair). _____

Thank You!

**2002 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.

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

Baccalaureate II Institutions

Bethel College
College of Saint Mary
Elizabeth City State University
McMurry University
Ohio Northern University
Shorter College
Villa Julie College

Comprehensive I Institutions

Centenary College of Louisiana
Central Michigan University
College of St. Scholastica
Delta State University
East Tennessee State University
Friends University
Gannon University
Grambling State University
Indiana University - South Bend
Jackson State University
Nicholls State University
North Carolina A&T State University
Oakland University
Rider University
Rowan University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern Univ and A&M College - Baton Rouge
Tennessee Technological University
Texas A&M University - Kingsville
University of Tennessee - Martin
University of West Florida
Valdosta State University
Youngstown State University

Comprehensive II Institutions

Cabrini College
Marion College of Fond du Lac
Montana Tech - University of Montana
University of Southern Indiana

Doctoral I Institutions

SUNY - Binghamton University

Doctoral II Institutions

Cleveland State University
Idaho State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Montana State University - Bozeman
University of South Dakota
Wichita State University

Research I Institutions

Oregon State University
University of Connecticut
Wayne State University

Research II Institutions

Northeastern University
University of Delaware
University of South Carolina - Columbia

2002 and 2003 Faculty Activity Study
Combined 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
Elizabeth City State University
McMurry University
Montreat College
Mount Marty College
Mount Union College
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
Northwestern College
Ohio Northern University
Shorter College
Spring Arbor College
Thiel College
Union University
University of Sioux Falls
Villa Julie College
Waynesburg College
Winston-Salem State University

Comprehensive I Institutions

Centenary College of Louisiana
Central Michigan University
College of St. Scholastica
Delta State University
East Tennessee State University
Friends University
Gannon University
Georgian Court College
Grambling State University
Indiana University - South Bend
Jackson State University
Louisiana State University - Shreveport
Nazareth College of Rochester
New Mexico Highlands University
Nicholls State University
North Carolina A&T State University
Oakland University
Oklahoma City University
Rider University
Rowan University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern Univ and A&M College - Baton Rouge

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

Comprehensive I Institutions (continued)

Tennessee Technological University
Texas A&M University - Kingsville
University of Tennessee - Martin
University of West Florida
Valdosta State University
Wagner College
Western Carolina University
Youngstown State University

Comprehensive II Institutions

Cabrini College
Marion College of Fond du Lac
Montana Tech - University of Montana
University of New England
University of Southern Indiana

Doctoral I Institutions

SUNY - Binghamton University
University of Akron
University of Toledo
Western Michigan University

Doctoral II Institutions

Cleveland State University
Idaho State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Montana State University - Bozeman
University of South Dakota
Wichita State University

Research I Institutions

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

Research II Institutions

Clemson University
Northeastern University
University of Delaware
University of South Carolina - Columbia

Specialized Institutions - Business

Thunderbird, AGSIM (Highest Degree: Master's)

Specialized Institutions - Health

University of the Sciences (Highest Degree: Doctorate)

**Select Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity
Median Values per FTE Tenured, Tenure-Track Faculty**

English

Teaching

	<i>Redesign Curriculum</i>			<i>Ugrad Research</i>			<i>Grad Research</i>			<i>Ugrad Advisees</i>			<i>Grad Advisees</i>		
	2002	2003	Change ¹	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	1.50	2.11	0.61	0.00	0.54	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.12	10.75	1.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comprehensive	1.25	1.20	-0.05	0.21	0.15	-0.06	0.00	0.31	0.31	7.97	7.92	-0.04	0.87	1.00	0.13
Doctoral	1.72	1.54	-0.18	0.59	0.32	-0.27	0.36	0.50	0.15	11.10	9.73	-1.37	2.24	2.09	-0.15
Research	0.72	0.41	-0.31	0.71	0.25	-0.46	1.40	1.45	0.05	8.75	11.37	2.62	1.61	2.54	0.93

Scholarship

	<i>Juried Shows, Exhibitions</i>			<i>Refereed Pubs</i>			<i>Nonrefereed Pubs</i>			<i>External Grant Proposals</i>			<i>External Grants Awarded</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.23	0.50	0.28	0.40	0.50	0.10	0.33	0.44	0.12	0.00	0.45	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comprehensive	0.33	0.36	0.03	0.66	0.58	-0.08	0.33	0.32	-0.01	0.14	0.35	0.21	0.07	0.00	-0.07
Doctoral	0.72	0.76	0.05	0.90	1.26	0.36	0.57	1.38	0.81	0.15	0.98	0.84	0.15	0.08	-0.07
Research	0.45	0.90	0.45	0.72	1.75	1.03	0.72	0.56	-0.16	0.11	0.64	0.53	0.16	0.14	-0.02

Service

	<i>Leadership in Prof Assoc</i>			<i>Professional Service</i>			<i>Extension/Outreach</i>			<i>Institutional Service</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.25	0.22	-0.03	0.50	0.27	-0.23	2.00	1.00	-1.00	4.25	6.00	1.75
Comprehensive	0.58	0.27	-0.31	0.37	0.52	0.15	1.25	0.89	-0.36	3.66	4.40	0.74
Doctoral	0.32	0.32	0.01	0.98	0.58	-0.40	1.50	0.95	-0.55	3.85	3.95	0.10
Research	0.54	0.50	-0.04	1.17	0.95	-0.22	1.42	1.69	0.27	4.28	4.25	-0.03

¹"Change" is equal to the unit value in 2003 minus the unit value in 2002.

**Select Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity
Median Values per FTE Tenured, Tenure-Track Faculty**

Chemistry

Teaching

	<i>Redesign Curriculum</i>			<i>Ugrad Research</i>			<i>Grad Research</i>			<i>Ugrad Advisees</i>			<i>Grad Advisees</i>		
	2002	2003	Change ¹	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	1.00	1.08	0.08	0.88	0.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.58	7.00	-0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comprehensive	0.80	0.80	0.00	1.40	1.50	0.10	0.00	0.83	0.83	10.46	7.20	-3.26	0.64	0.88	0.25
Doctoral	0.77	0.77	0.00	1.85	2.15	0.31	1.27	1.92	0.66	3.51	4.60	1.09	2.76	1.00	-1.76
Research	0.64	0.00	-0.64	1.00	0.00	-1.00	2.81	0.00	-2.81	4.04	0.00	-4.04	3.57	0.00	-3.57

Scholarship

	<i>Juried Shows, Exhibitions</i>			<i>Refereed Pubs</i>			<i>Nonrefereed Pubs</i>			<i>External Grant Proposals</i>			<i>External Grants Awarded</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comprehensive	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.43	-0.14	0.04	0.15	0.11	0.43	0.82	0.40	0.43	0.25	-0.18
Doctoral	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.42	2.15	-0.27	0.24	0.18	-0.06	1.99	2.58	0.59	1.11	0.84	-0.27
Research	0.14	0.00	-0.14	4.00	0.00	-4.00	0.68	0.00	-0.68	3.30	0.00	-3.30	1.60	0.00	-1.60

Service

	<i>Leadership in Prof Assoc</i>			<i>Professional Service</i>			<i>Extension/Outreach</i>			<i>Institutional Service</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.53	1.25	0.73	3.10	5.00	1.90
Comprehensive	0.50	0.61	0.11	1.07	0.66	-0.41	2.19	2.31	0.13	4.17	4.34	0.18
Doctoral	0.64	0.15	-0.49	2.96	1.37	-1.59	0.79	1.00	0.22	3.88	4.50	0.63
Research	1.14	0.00	-1.14	2.51	0.00	-2.51	1.34	0.00	-1.34	4.64	0.00	-4.64

¹"Change" is equal to the unit value in 2003 minus the unit value in 2002.

**Select Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity
Median Values per FTE Tenured, Tenure-Track Faculty**

Business Administration

Teaching

	<i>Redesign Curriculum</i>			<i>Ugrad Research</i>			<i>Grad Research</i>			<i>Ugrad Advisees</i>			<i>Grad Advisees</i>		
	2002	2003	Change ¹	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	1.00	1.33	0.33	0.71	0.62	-0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.73	20.50	-0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comprehensive	1.29	1.44	0.15	0.08	0.23	0.16	0.06	0.29	0.23	18.75	28.38	9.63	0.00	1.30	1.30
Doctoral	1.14	1.47	0.33	0.14	1.00	0.86	0.54	0.80	0.26	12.75	16.20	3.45	0.00	1.30	1.30
Research	0.85	1.04	0.19	0.40	0.31	-0.09	0.51	0.00	-0.51	3.27	0.00	-3.27	4.70	0.00	-4.70

Scholarship

	<i>Juried Shows, Exhibitions</i>			<i>Refereed Pubs</i>			<i>Nonrefereed Pubs</i>			<i>External Grant Proposals</i>			<i>External Grants Awarded</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.00	0.33	0.33	0.28	0.38	0.10	0.16	0.00	-0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.12
Comprehensive	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.20	1.26	0.06	0.40	0.51	0.11	0.00	0.28	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
Doctoral	0.08	0.00	-0.08	1.39	1.14	-0.25	0.57	1.60	1.03	0.16	0.60	0.44	0.03	0.12	0.09
Research	0.00	0.04	0.04	1.67	1.42	-0.25	0.09	0.68	0.59	0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.03	0.00	-0.03

Service

	<i>Leadership in Prof Assoc</i>			<i>Professional Service</i>			<i>Extension/Outreach</i>			<i>Institutional Service</i>		
	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change	2002	2003	Change
Baccalaureate	0.14	0.00	-0.14	0.27	0.66	0.40	2.00	1.75	-0.25	2.63	3.12	0.50
Comprehensive	0.20	0.54	0.34	0.61	0.82	0.21	1.62	2.24	0.62	3.83	5.11	1.28
Doctoral	0.83	0.50	-0.33	1.16	2.19	1.03	6.57	1.37	-5.20	3.28	6.42	3.14
Research	1.00	0.57	-0.43	1.25	2.63	1.38	1.00	0.71	-0.29	3.00	3.38	0.38

¹"Change" is equal to the unit value in 2003 minus the unit value in 2002.