



The University of North Carolina

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

POST OFFICE BOX 2688, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27515-2688

ALAN R. MABE, *Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Telephone: (919) 962-4614 Fax: (919) 962-0120 E-mail: mabe@northcarolina.edu

Constituent Universities
Appalachian State
University

East Carolina
University

Elizabeth City
State University

Fayetteville State
University

North Carolina
Agricultural and
Technical State
University

North Carolina
Central University

North Carolina
State University
at Raleigh

University of
North Carolina
at Asheville

University of
North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

University of
North Carolina
at Charlotte

University of
North Carolina
at Greensboro

University of
North Carolina
at Pembroke

University of
North Carolina
at Wilmington

University of
North Carolina
School of the Arts

Western Carolina
University

Winston-Salem
State University

Constituent High School
North Carolina
School of Science
and Mathematics

An Equal Opportunity/
Affirmative Action
Employer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs

FROM: Alan Mabe

DATE: October 21, 2010

SUBJECT: Faculty Teaching Workload Report

Background: UNC campuses developed a data collections system in the mid-90s to report on faculty workload. It was never well received and in the 2001 report it was recommended that the home grown system be dropped in favor of the then newly developed national data collection system for faculty workload and cost at the University of Delaware. One expected advantage of the new system was the possibility of national comparison. While that is possible, participation in the Delaware data collection is voluntary and typically campuses don't find many of their peers participating so comparisons are in terms of broader Carnegie categories. The Delaware study was developed for use at the departmental level for comparisons. We have adapted it for campus-wide measures. The data shows that overall UNC teaching load averages are slightly higher than the overall average of all institutions participating in the Delaware study.

For the Delaware analysis, the most recent year of data is 2008-09. Nationally and locally the economic downturn has had a large impact on support for higher education and subsequent years of data will likely show this. We will expect to get the 2009-10 Delaware data in May/June of 2011.

We have used UNC data to get a sense of what has happened between 2009 and 2010. As would be expected, there are more students per section, more SCHs per instructor, more students per instructor. For UNC as a whole, each instructor is working with 5.89 more students on average in their classes than in the previous year, a growth of 5.9%. There is a similar result for student credit hours with each instructor handling 15.66 more credit hours on average, an increase of 5.8%. While there are no national data available for comparison purposes, this clearly shows the economic downturn is having an impact on faculty teaching workload.

Jurisdictional Authority: In the 2001 Faculty Teaching Workload report it was recommended that the UNC collection system be discontinued and that all campus begin reporting their data to Delaware. That was done and our subsequent reports have been based on Delaware data.

Issues Involved: There are many issues about the use of Delaware data most of which are described in the report. There are limitations and at this point particularly the data is not recent enough to record the impact of the Great Recession. The Executive Summary, pages 2-7 compares the data for the period 2000-2003 to the most recent period, 2006-2009, to give a longitudinal sense of the changes.

This Update has been sent to the campuses and campuses were asked to comment on measures where they were outside the standards for the report. The Executive Summary describes those responses on pages 6-7.

Recommended Action: Report is for information. General Administration will follow up with the issues identified by the report.

Attachment

Change in UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from 2009 to 2010
--

UNC Total		Students Per Section		SCHs Per Instructor		Student Per Instructor
2009		19.6		272.03		99.43
2010		20.32		287.69		105.32
Change		0.72		15.66		5.89
Percent Change		3.7%		5.8%		5.9%

**A Report on Faculty Teaching Workload
Covering the Years 2000 to 2009**

DRAFT

**2010
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 updates the previous reports and provides faculty workload data for 2008-09 while the overall report traces faculty workload from 2000 through 2009. The report also includes 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 workloads, 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 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 Carnegie peer institutions for 2006-09, only one campus fell below established standards. For *regular faculty*, all campuses met the standard set by their Carnegie peers.

This report further shows that the average number of course sections taught by UNC faculty overall is higher than the number taught by *regular faculty* and *all instructional faculty* at institutions nationwide. For the 2006-09 period, sections taught by *regular* UNC faculty are higher than the Carnegie average (3.26 for UNC vs. 3.04) and sections taught by *all instructional faculty* are also higher (3.37 for UNC vs. 3.27).

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.

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. The currently average is approximately \$93,000 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.

Comparing 2000-2003 to 2006-2009

Contained within this report is something of a longitudinal study covering nine years of data about faculty teaching workload based on the Delaware data and methodology. Even with the limitation on the use of the Delaware data, which are detailed in the report, our campuses have responded to these reports and made many improvements relative to their Carnegie peers. While in the report we follow the data year by year and by the rolling three years averages, here we compare the data from the first three-year period with the most recent.

For all instructional faculty all but one campus now meet the comparative standard as can be seen by comparing Display 3A (2000-03) with Display 3G (2006-09). Those highlighted in 3G represent comparative improvement.

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 3G (2006-2009)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1G)

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	X	
Below the national comparison by															.32

Displays 4A (2000-2003) and 4G (2006-2009) represent significant comparative improvement of four campuses so that for regular faculty our campuses went from four not meeting the standard to all meeting the standard.

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 4G (2006-2009)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2G)

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	X	X
Below the national comparison by															

While the previous measures have compared our campuses with Carnegie peers in the Delaware data based on a range, the next comparisons are based on the average loads overall both for UNC and for the Carnegie national average from the Delaware data base. As is evident from Display 5A (2000-2003) and Display 5G (2006-2009) UNC has risen above the national average in this time frame. For all instructional faculty, the overall UNC average has dropped slightly from an average of 3.41 courses per faculty fall semester in 2000-2003 to 3.37 and in comparison to the Carnegie average UNC overall is at 3.37 courses per fall term compared to 3.27 for the national average in the Delaware data base for the most recent period.

For regular faculty UNC overall has grown from 3.16 to 3.26 average course loads and in comparison UNC overall all is at 3.26 while the national average is 3.04. This shows that the average course load for UNC overall has been growing while the national average from the Delaware database has been dropping.

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 5G (2006-2009)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term
(From Tables 1G and 2G)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2006-07	3.55	3.42
2007-08	3.36	3.27
2008-0	3.21	3.10
UNC average	3.37	3.26
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.27	3.04

Another measure is to look department by department and do comparisons with Carnegie peers in the Delaware data base. Again this is a comparison of the performance of departments to ranges set based on Carnegie peers in the Delaware data base. As is evident eleven campuses and UNC overall have shown improvement in regard to this standard (those highlighted). [The pages and pages of tables on which this is based have been omitted from this draft version of the report, but can be provided to anyone for review.]

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 9G (2006-2009)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above
One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP
(From Table 3G)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
100	95	88	100	91	100	81	96	90	76	100	100	100	100	77	93

The use of Delaware data and approach may be an imperfect instrument for assessing faculty workloads, but it was adopted by the Board of Governors as a tool offering the possibility of national comparison of our performance with others institutions. It is evident that campuses have taken the results seriously and have both worked to make their reporting to Delaware better and demonstrated improvements based on the feedback from the reports based on the Delaware data.

Campus Review and Response

This report has been sent to the campuses for response and campuses have carefully reviewed the report and provided the following feedback.

UNC Asheville: For the most recent reporting UNCA does not meet the standard of 8 courses per faculty or 4 courses per term for baccalaureate institutions. The new Provost began working

on this when she arrived at UNCA in the summer of 2008. She thinks the work she and the faculty have done will show improvement in relation to this requirement in the subsequent Delaware data.

ECU has slipped slightly below the 90% standard for degree programs meeting the standard of at least 90% of degree programs being within the range of Carnegie peers. They have basically discovered reporting errors in Marketing and in Political Science. Forty percent of the SCHs and sections for Marketing were reported in another department. The same thing occurred in Political Science with approximately 23 sections not properly attributed to Political Science. They will correct this for future reporting. With these corrections ECU would very likely be above the 90% threshold.

NCSU: The Delaware data shows that NCSU has 81% of its degree programs meeting the standard for its Carnegie class. NCSU has carefully reviewed the individual degree programs not meeting the standard for the report. There are a range of reasons some correctable and some not. English Language and Literature uses four hour courses for first year writing rather than the standard three hour course, so the section load varies from the norm but not the number of students taught. Some have a very small number of peers in the Delaware study (Leisure Facilities Management, Material Engineering, and Nuclear Engineering). Industrial Engineering has a practice of having only one section for all thesis and dissertation students which underreports the work and the number of sections faculty have. Philosophy appears to have larger classes and fewer sections than their peers. In Physics lab sections were not reported which will be corrected.

UNCC: The Delaware data shows that UNCC has 76% of the degree programs meeting the standard. In reviewing the data UNCC found that they had not been reporting teaching assistants appropriately and this tended to skew the comparison with their Carnegie peers. To add all their teaching assistants would move the percent of programs meeting the report standard much closer to the 90% goal.

WSSU: WSSU did not meet the BOG expected standard number of courses per faculty member for a master's level institution. For all instructional faculty members in the 2006-2009 period, WSSU's average was approximately one-third of a course below the standard. For regular faculty they met the standard. While there has been improvement the Delaware data now shows that only 77% of WSSU's degree programs meet the standard of the range for their Carnegie peers. The Provost at WSSU has initiated a review of those programs that do not meet the standard departmental standard in the report.

While UNC-Chapel Hill met the 90% standard for discipline comparisons, the campus discovered some mistakes in reporting that when corrected would yield a higher percent. With the corrections their percentage would be approximately 95%.

Faculty Teaching Workload Report

2000-2003; 2001-2004; 2002-2005; 2003-2006; 2004-2007; 2005-2008; 2006-2009

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.

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 2007-08. 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 make regional comparisons. 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 total 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 eight 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).

<u>Carnegie Type</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>Semester</u>
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-G in the Appendix) for *all instructional faculty*, thirteen of the fifteen participating UNC campuses (Display 1G) meet the BOG’s expected course load for the 2006-09 three-year average. For *regular faculty*, all but one of the participating campuses (Display 2G) meet the BOG’s standard (Table 2G in the Appendix).

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

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

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 1E (2004-2007)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1E)

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 1F (2005-2008)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1F)

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 1G (2006-2009)
All Instructional FTE/BOG's Course Load Standards/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1G)

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 (2000-2003)
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 (2001-2004)
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 (2002-2005)
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 (2003-2006)
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							

Display 2E (2004-2007)
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2E)

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							

Display 2F (2005-2008)
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2F)

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							

Display 2G (2006-2009)
Regular Faculty/BOG's Course Load Standards/ Fall Term
(Based on Table 2G)

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-G 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-G summarize the results. Tables 2A-G in the Appendix provide the same information for regular faculty, and the summary will be found in Displays 4A-G. 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 2006-2009 period all UNC campuses had met the standard for *all faculty* with the exception of WSSU. Improvement is evident with *regular faculty* as well, since all campuses meet the standards (Display 4G)

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 comparison by	.08														.75

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 3E (2004-2007)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1E)

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	X	
Below the national comparison by															.74

Display 3F (2005-2008)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1F)

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	X	
Below the national comparison by															.49

Display 3G (2006-2009)
All Instructional Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 1G)

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	X	
Below the national comparison by															.32

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 comparison by	.29							.08					.09		.37

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

Display 4E (2004-2007)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2E)

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							.06

Display 4F (2005-2008)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2F)

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	X	X
Below the national comparison by															

Display 4G (2006-2009)
Regular Faculty Compared to One Standard Deviation
Below the National Averages by Carnegie Class/Fall Term
(Based on Table 2G)

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	X	X
Below the national comparison by															

UNC Overall Average Teaching Course Load

While there have been slight changes over time, the average teaching course load for UNC's *regular faculty* is above the national average for all institutions in the Delaware data for the 2005-2008 period as is the case for *all instructional faculty* as well. (Display 5F).

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

Display 5E (2004-2007)***UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term
(From Tables 1E and 2E)***

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2004-05	3.48	3.38
2005-06	3.61	3.42
2006-07	3.55	3.42
UNC average	3.54	3.41
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.42	3.26

Display 5F (2005-2008)***UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term
(From Tables 1F and 2F)***

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2005-06	3.61	3.42
2006-07	3.55	3.42
2007-08	3.36	3.27
UNC average	3.50	3.37
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.31	3.09

Display 5G (2006-2009)
UNC Average FTE Teaching Course Load Compared to National Average/Fall Term
(From Tables 1G and 2G)

	All Instructional FTE	Regular Faculty
2006-07	3.55	3.42
2007-08	3.36	3.27
2008-0	3.21	3.10
UNC average	3.37	3.26
Carnegie Nat'l. average (all)	3.27	3.04

Percent of Teaching Workload from Undergraduate Student Credit Hours

Displays 6A-G show the percentage of the teaching load associated with lower-division student credit hours and Displays 7A-G 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 6E (2004-2007)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Lower-Division SCHs					
Faculty Type	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	56.10	55.92	56.18	56.07	53.11
All Regular Faculty	51.80	51.42	52.29	51.85	48.82

Display 6F (2005-2008)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Lower-Division SCHs					
Faculty Type	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	55.92	56.18	57.10	56.42	53.09
All Regular Faculty	51.42	52.29	53.77	52.55	48.82

Display 6G (2006-2009)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Lower-Division SCHs					
Faculty Type	2006-07	2008-09	2008-09	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	56.18	57.10	56.68	56.66	53.10
All Regular Faculty	52.29	53.77	53.13	53.08	48.66

Displays (7A-G) show the average percent of faculty teaching load that involved undergraduate students.

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

Display 7E (2004-2007)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Undergraduate SCHs					
Faculty Type	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	88.34	88.25	88.21	88.28	86.93
All Regular Faculty	86.50	86.11	86.41	86.36	84.92

Display 7F (2005-2008)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Undergraduate SCHs					
Faculty Type	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	88.25	88.71	88.37	88.29	87.23
All Regular Faculty	86.11	86.41	86.75	86.47	85.29

Display 7G (2006-2009)

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data Percentage Distribution of Fall SCH Load by Faculty Type % of Load from Undergraduate SCHs					
Faculty Type	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Inst. Avg.	Carnegie Avg.
Total Instructional FTE	88.21	88.37	88.21	88.2	87.40
All Regular Faculty	86.41	86.75	86.72	86.64	85.40

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 3G 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 2006-2009 period three UNC campuses did not meet the 90% threshold. This is a significant improvement over the 2000-03 period when eight institutions failed to meet the threshold. While, as the tables show, there has been variation over the years, eleven campuses have a higher percentage of their campuses meeting the standard for the 2006-2009 period than the 2000-2003 period.

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

Display 9E (2004-2007)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above
One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP
(From Table 3E)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
100	93	100	100	97	97	96	96	98	95	96	100	97	96	35	95

Display 9F (2005-2008)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above
One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP
(From Table 3F)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
100	100	92	100	94	100	87	100	90	85	99	100	100	96	64	94

Display 9G (2006-2009)
Percent of Programs (by CIP) Meeting Standard of at or above
One Standard Deviation below the Average for that CIP
(From Table 3G)

ASU	ECSU	ECU	FSU	NCAT	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNCCH	UNCC	UNCG	UNCP	UNCW	WCU	WSSU	UNC
100	95	88	100	91	100	81	96	90	76	100	100	100	100	77	93

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 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.

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 is success in getting peer-reviewed grants.

Display 12
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
Sponsored Program Awards Received
Fiscal Year 2009

Constituent Institution	Number of FTE Faculty ²	Dollars	Average per Faculty
Doctoral/Research-Extensive			
North Carolina State University	1,745	\$206,143,934	\$118,134
UNC Chapel Hill	3,345	\$716,242,666	\$220,722
Doctoral/Research-Intensive			
East Carolina University	1,759	\$40,760,962	\$23,173
North Carolina A&T State University	577	\$57,704,040	\$100,007
UNC Charlotte	937	\$36,581,079	\$39,041
UNC Greensboro	801	\$35,375,420	\$44,164
Master's (Comprehensive) I			
Appalachian State University	761	\$14,576,504	\$19,154
Fayetteville State University	314	\$12,484,562	\$39,760
North Carolina Central University	395	\$20,171,627	\$51,067
UNC Pembroke	314	\$4,406,670	\$14,034
UNC Wilmington	586	\$19,394,782	\$33,097
Western Carolina University	526	\$5,790,853	\$11,009
Baccalaureate-Liberal Arts			
UNC Asheville	206	\$1,990,980	\$9,665
Baccalaureate-General			
Elizabeth City State University	176	\$9,572,683	\$54,390
Winston-Salem State University	347	\$12,060,947	\$65,829
Art, Music, and Design			
University of North Carolina School of the Arts	134	\$0	\$0
System Office			
UNC Office of the President			
Internal Awards and Interinstitutional Subagreements		)	
UNC TOTALS	12,823	\$1,193,257,709	\$93,056

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

² Faculty numbers are based on permanent FTE faculty, full and part-time, fall 2008. 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.

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 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-G and 2A-G 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.

³ *UNC Policy Manual*, 400.3.4, p. 3.

Tables 3G is 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

APPENDIX

Tables 1A-G

Tables 2A-G

Table 3G

Data Element and Year

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Totals
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2000-2001	3.54	3.80	5.09	3.43	3.89	-	2.56	3.66	2.51	3.58	3.19	3.87	3.11	4.33	3.87	3.42
2001-2002	3.35	3.74	4.35	3.42	3.88	3.67	2.66	3.39	2.38	3.71	3.50	3.90	3.01	4.18	3.01	3.36
2002-2003	3.35	4.16	4.64	-	3.52	4.09	2.62	3.87	2.64	3.61	3.44	4.00	3.17	4.04	2.90	3.45
Institutional Average:	3.41	3.90	4.70	3.45	3.75	3.90	2.61	3.64	2.51	3.63	3.38	3.92	3.09	4.18	3.20	3.41
Carnegie Average	4.08	3.32	4.31	4.08	3.32	4.08	2.93	4.31	2.93	3.32	3.32	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.31	3.45
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.42	0.78	0.56	0.42	0.56	0.43	0.78	0.43	0.42	0.42	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.78	0.58
Average - 1 Std.	3.52	2.90	3.53	3.52	2.90	3.52	2.50	3.53	2.50	2.90	2.90	3.52	3.52	3.52	3.53	2.87
Average + 1 Std.	4.64	3.74	5.09	4.64	3.74	4.64	3.36	5.09	3.36	3.74	3.74	4.64	4.64	4.64	5.09	4.03

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
5. Total

5. Total															Table 1B
Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (2/1)															
2001-2002	3.35	3.74	4.35	3.42	3.88	3.67	2.66	3.39	2.98	3.71	3.50	3.90	3.04	4.18	3.01 3.33
2002-2003	3.35	4.16	4.64	4.12	3.52	4.09	2.62	3.87	2.64	3.61	3.44	4.00	3.17	4.04	2.90 3.46
2003-2004	3.37	3.58	4.53	4.27	3.77	4.11	2.81	3.70	2.89	3.64	3.58	3.89	4.01	4.09	3.03 3.50
Institutional Average	3.36	3.82	4.50	3.94	3.72	3.97	2.70	3.65	2.63	3.65	3.51	3.93	3.37	4.10	2.98 3.43
Carnegie Average	3.96	3.26	4.21	3.96	3.26	3.96	2.91	4.21	2.91	3.26	3.26	3.96	3.96	3.96	4.21 3.35
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.41	0.71	0.51	0.41	0.51	0.43	0.71	0.43	0.41	0.41	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.71 0.55
Average - 1 Std.	3.46	2.85	3.49	3.46	2.85	3.46	2.48	3.49	2.48	2.85	2.85	3.46	3.46	3.46	3.49 2.80
Average + 1 Std.	4.47	3.68	4.92	4.47	3.68	4.47	3.34	4.92	3.34	3.68	3.68	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.92 3.89

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
5. Total

Table 1C

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)															
2002-2003	3.35	4.16	4.64	4.12	3.52	4.09	2.62	3.87	2.64	3.61	3.44	4.00	3.17	4.04	3.45
2003-2004	3.37	3.58	4.53	4.27	3.77	4.11	2.81	3.70	2.89	3.64	3.58	3.89	4.01	4.09	3.53
2004-2005	3.48	3.61	4.58	4.11	3.84	4.28	2.78	3.54	2.88	3.69	3.51	3.72	3.84	4.04	3.50
Institutional Average	3.40	3.77	4.58	4.17	3.71	4.18	2.74	3.70	2.81	3.65	3.51	3.86	3.63	4.05	3.49
Carnegie Average	3.93	3.27	4.12	3.93	3.27	3.93	3.21	4.12	3.21	3.27	3.27	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.50
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.40	0.64	0.45	0.40	0.45	0.77	0.64	0.77	0.40	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.70
Average - 1 Std.	3.48	2.87	3.49	3.48	2.87	3.48	2.44	3.49	2.44	2.87	2.87	3.48	3.48	3.48	2.80
Average + 1 Std.	4.38	3.67	4.76	4.38	3.67	4.38	3.98	4.76	3.98	3.67	3.67	4.38	4.38	4.38	4.21

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
5. Total

Table 1D

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)															
2003-2004	3.37	3.58	4.53	4.27	3.77	4.11	2.81	3.70	2.89	3.64	3.58	3.89	4.01	4.09	3.03
2004-2005	3.48	3.61	4.58	4.11	3.84	4.28	2.78	3.54	2.88	3.69	3.51	3.72	3.84	4.04	2.38
2005-2006	3.64	3.69	4.40	3.97	5.60	4.72	2.64	3.59	2.76	3.31	4.13	4.26	3.97	4.09	2.72
Institutional Average	3.50	3.63	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.35	2.74	3.61	2.84	3.54	3.75	3.97	3.96	4.07	3.58
Carnegie Average	3.98	3.30	3.93	3.98	3.30	3.98	3.30	3.93	3.30	3.30	3.30	3.98	3.98	3.98	3.54
Standard Deviation	0.47	0.43	0.61	0.47	0.43	0.47	0.89	0.61	0.89	0.43	0.43	0.47	0.47	0.47	3.93
Average - 1 Std.	3.51	2.87	3.32	3.51	2.87	3.51	2.41	3.32	2.41	2.87	2.87	3.51	3.51	3.51	0.61
Average + 1 Std.	4.45	3.72	4.55	4.45	3.72	4.45	4.19	4.55	4.19	3.72	3.72	4.45	4.45	4.45	3.32
															2.80
															4.55
															4.31

UNC Faculty Teaching Work. from Delaware Data

Table 1

5. Total

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2004-2005	3.48	3.61	4.58	4.11	3.84	4.28	2.78	3.54	2.88	3.69	3.51	3.72	3.84	4.04	2.38	3.48
2005-2006	3.64	3.69	4.40	3.97	5.60	4.72	2.64	3.59	2.76	3.31	4.13	4.26	3.97	4.09	2.72	3.61
2006-2007	3.87	3.51	4.48	3.96	3.86	4.39	2.86	3.72	2.87	3.10	4.05	4.17	3.91	3.99	2.76	3.55
Institutional Average	3.67	3.60	4.48	4.01	4.39	4.44	2.76	3.62	2.84	3.35	3.90	4.06	3.91	4.04	2.62	3.54
Carnegie Average	3.83	3.36	4.02	3.83	3.36	3.83	3.18	4.02	3.18	3.36	3.36	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.47
Standard Deviation	0.47	0.42	0.53	0.47	0.42	0.47	0.70	0.53	0.70	0.42	0.42	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.68
Average - 1 Std.	3.36	2.93	3.49	3.36	2.93	3.36	2.48	3.49	2.48	2.93	2.93	3.36	3.36	3.36	3.36	2.78
Average + 1 Std.	4.30	3.78	4.55	4.30	3.78	4.30	3.88	4.55	3.88	3.78	3.78	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.15

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data

Table 1F

5. Total

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2005-2006	3.64	3.69	4.40	3.97	5.60	4.72	2.64	3.59	2.76	3.31	4.13	4.26	3.97	4.09	2.72	3.61
2006-2007	3.87	3.51	4.48	3.96	3.86	4.39	2.86	3.72	2.87	3.10	4.05	4.17	3.91	3.99	2.76	3.55
2007-2008	3.84	3.28	4.22	4.01	3.47	4.28	2.70	3.72	2.70	3.06	3.90	3.75	3.74	3.69	2.83	3.36
Institutional Average	3.79	3.48	4.36	3.98	4.20	4.43	2.73	3.68	2.77	3.15	4.02	4.05	3.87	3.92	2.83	3.50
Carnegie Average	3.74	3.39	3.99	3.74	3.39	3.74	2.96	3.99	2.96	3.39	3.39	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.31
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.42	0.51	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.38	0.51	0.38	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.47
Average - 1 Std.	3.32	2.97	3.48	3.32	2.97	3.32	2.58	3.48	2.58	2.97	2.97	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	2.84
Average + 1 Std.	4.17	3.81	4.49	4.17	3.81	4.17	3.35	4.49	3.35	3.81	3.81	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.17	3.78

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
5. Total

Table 1G

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2006-2007	3.87	3.51	4.48	3.96	3.86	4.39	2.86	3.72	2.87	3.10	4.05	4.17	3.91	3.99	2.76	3.55
2007-2008	3.84	3.28	4.22	4.01	3.47	4.28	2.70	3.72	2.70	3.06	3.90	3.75	3.74	3.69	2.83	3.36
2008-2009	3.51	3.10	3.97	3.94	3.38	4.20	2.58	3.67	2.59	3.02	3.59	3.88	3.74	3.17	3.20	3.21
Institutional Average	3.73	3.29	4.22	3.97	3.56	4.29	2.71	3.70	2.71	3.05	3.84	3.93	3.79	3.60	2.96	3.37
Carnegie Average	3.70	3.35	3.93	3.70	3.35	3.70	2.94	3.93	2.94	3.35	3.35	3.70	3.70	3.70	3.70	3.27
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.34	0.51	0.42	0.34	0.42	0.38	0.51	0.38	0.34	0.34	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.44
Average - 1 Std.	3.28	3.02	3.42	3.28	3.02	3.28	2.55	3.42	2.55	3.02	3.02	3.28	3.28	3.28	3.28	2.83
Average + 1 Std.	4.12	3.69	4.45	4.12	3.69	4.12	3.32	4.45	3.32	3.69	3.69	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	3.72

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table 2A

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Lab/TFE Faculty (8/1)																
2000-2001	3.17	4.06	4.56	3.53	3.87	-	2.46	3.62	2.02	3.24	2.97	3.78	2.97	4.01	3.77	3.21
2001-2002	3.01	3.66	4.19	3.72	3.86	3.85	2.57	3.30	1.89	3.46	3.24	3.81	2.88	4.02	3.24	3.11
2002-2003	3.07	4.06	4.50	-	3.50	3.91	2.48	3.68	2.16	3.37	3.16	3.90	3.00	3.83	2.91	3.17
Institutional Average	3.08	3.95	4.42	3.62	3.73	3.92	2.50	3.54	2.02	3.35	3.12	3.83	2.95	3.96	3.31	3.16
Carnegie Average	3.93	3.09	4.27	3.93	3.09	3.93	2.56	4.27	2.56	3.09	3.09	3.93	3.93	3.93	4.27	3.12
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.46	0.73	0.56	0.46	0.56	0.43	0.73	0.43	0.46	0.46	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.73	0.60
Average - 1 Std.	3.36	2.63	3.54	3.36	2.63	3.36	2.13	3.54	2.13	2.63	2.63	3.36	3.36	3.36	3.54	2.52
Average + 1 Std.	4.49	3.55	5.00	4.49	3.55	4.49	2.99	5.00	2.99	3.55	3.55	4.49	4.49	4.49	5.00	3.73

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table 28

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNCA	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (9/1)																
2001-2002	3.01	3.66	4.19	3.72	3.86	3.85	2.57	3.30	1.89	3.46	3.24	3.81	2.88	4.02	3.24	3.11
2002-2003	3.07	4.06	4.50	4.12	3.50	3.91	2.48	3.68	2.16	3.37	3.16	3.90	3.00	3.83	2.91	3.23
2003-2004	3.03	3.53	4.54	4.27	3.74	3.74	2.67	3.38	2.69	3.46	3.27	3.82	3.98	3.89	3.37	3.34
Institutional Average	3.04	3.75	4.42	4.07	3.69	3.86	2.58	3.46	2.24	3.43	3.22	3.85	3.24	3.91	3.17	3.23
Carnegie Average	3.90	3.02	4.25	3.90	3.02	3.90	2.60	4.25	2.60	3.02	3.02	3.90	3.90	3.90	4.25	3.14
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.43	0.71	0.57	0.43	0.57	0.45	0.71	0.45	0.43	0.43	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.71	0.62
Average - 1 Std.	3.33	2.59	3.54	3.33	2.59	3.33	2.15	3.54	2.15	2.59	2.59	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.54	2.52
Average + 1 Std.	4.46	3.45	4.96	4.46	3.45	4.46	3.05	4.96	3.05	3.45	3.45	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.96	3.76

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table 2C

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)															
2002-2003	3.07	4.06													
2003-2004	3.03	3.53	4.50	4.12	3.50	3.91	2.48	3.68	2.16	3.37	3.16	3.90	3.00	3.83	2.91 3.23
2004-2005	3.30	3.65	4.54	4.27	3.74	3.74	2.67	3.38	2.69	3.46	3.27	3.82	3.98	3.89	3.37 3.34
Institutional Average	3.14	3.74	4.53	4.17	3.80	3.99	2.63	3.36	2.65	3.67	3.27	3.60	3.65	3.88	2.72 3.38
Carnegie Average	3.85	3.03	4.16	3.85	3.03	3.89	2.60	3.48	2.50	3.50	3.24	3.76	3.52	3.87	3.00 3.32
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.42	0.60	0.50	0.42	0.50	0.87	0.60	0.87	0.42	0.42	0.50	0.50	0.50	4.16 3.31
Average - 1 Std.	3.35	2.61	3.56	3.35	2.61	3.35	2.05	3.56	2.05	2.61	2.61	3.35	3.35	3.35	0.60 0.82
Average + 1 Std.	4.35	3.46	4.77	4.35	3.46	4.35	3.79	4.77	3.79	3.46	3.46	4.35	4.35	4.35	3.56 2.49
															4.77 4.13

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table 2D

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)															
2003-2004	3.03	3.53	4.54	4.27	3.74	3.74	2.67	3.38	2.69	3.46	3.27	3.82	3.98	3.89	3.34
2004-2005	3.30	3.65	4.55	4.11	3.80	3.99	2.63	3.36	2.65	3.67	3.27	3.60	3.65	3.88	3.38
2005-2006	3.46	3.43	4.38	3.97	5.63	4.02	2.51	3.31	2.48	2.99	3.83	4.08	3.91	3.87	3.42
Institutional Average	3.28	3.53	4.49	4.11	4.39	3.91	2.60	3.35	2.60	3.37	3.46	3.83	3.84	3.88	3.38
Carnegie Average	3.88	3.06	4.01	3.88	3.06	3.88	3.02	4.01	3.02	3.06	3.06	3.88	3.88	3.88	3.37
Standard Deviation	0.52	0.45	0.57	0.52	0.45	0.52	1.03	0.57	1.03	0.45	0.45	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.90
Average - 1 Std.	3.36	2.61	3.45	3.36	2.61	3.36	1.99	3.45	1.99	2.61	2.61	3.36	3.36	3.36	2.47
Average + 1 Std.	4.40	3.52	4.58	4.40	3.52	4.40	4.05	4.58	4.05	3.52	3.52	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.27

UNC Faculty Teaching Work, from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table E

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2004-2005	3.30	3.65	4.55	4.11	3.80	3.99	2.63	3.36	2.65	3.67	3.27	3.60	3.65	3.88	2.72	3.38
2005-2006	3.46	3.43	4.38	3.97	5.63	4.02	2.51	3.31	2.48	2.99	3.83	4.08	3.91	3.87	3.33	3.42
2006-2007	3.66	3.40	4.51	3.96	3.85	3.77	2.72	3.49	2.68	2.87	3.88	4.12	3.81	3.90	3.37	3.42
Institutional Average	3.48	3.48	4.48	4.01	4.37	3.92	2.62	3.39	2.60	3.16	3.67	3.94	3.79	3.88	3.17	3.41
Carnegie Average	3.74	3.17	3.96	3.74	3.17	3.74	2.88	3.96	2.88	3.17	3.17	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.26
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.45	0.56	0.51	0.45	0.51	0.77	0.56	0.77	0.45	0.45	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.80
Average - 1 Std.	3.23	2.72	3.40	3.23	2.72	3.23	2.11	3.40	2.11	2.72	2.72	3.23	3.23	3.23	3.23	2.46
Average + 1 Std.	4.26	3.62	4.52	4.26	3.62	4.26	3.65	4.52	3.65	3.62	3.62	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.05

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Tabel 2F

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2005-2006	3.46	3.43	4.38	3.97	5.63	4.02	2.51	3.31	2.48	2.99	3.83	4.08	3.91	3.87	3.33	3.42
2006-2007	3.66	3.40	4.51	3.96	3.85	3.77	2.72	3.49	2.68	2.87	3.88	4.12	3.81	3.90	3.37	3.42
2007-2008	3.64	3.54	4.13	4.01	3.50	3.56	2.57	3.49	2.56	2.81	3.79	3.52	3.60	3.59	3.22	3.27
Institutional Average	3.59	3.46	4.36	3.98	4.21	3.76	2.60	3.43	2.57	2.89	3.83	3.89	3.77	3.78	3.40	3.37
Carnegie Average	3.63	3.21	3.91	3.63	3.21	3.63	2.65	3.91	2.65	3.21	3.21	3.63	3.63	3.63	3.63	3.09
Standard Deviation	0.46	0.50	0.53	0.46	0.50	0.46	0.38	0.53	0.38	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.55
Average - 1 Std.	3.17	2.72	3.38	3.17	2.72	3.17	2.27	3.38	2.27	2.72	2.72	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	2.55
Average + 1 Std.	4.09	3.71	4.45	4.09	3.71	4.09	3.04	4.45	3.04	3.71	3.71	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.64

UNC Faculty Teaching Workload from Delaware Data
6. All Regular Faculty

Table 2G

Data Element and Year	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
11. Organized Sections & Labs/FTE Faculty (8/1)																
2006-2007	3.66	3.40	4.51	3.96	3.85	3.77	2.72	3.49	2.68	2.87	3.88	4.12	3.81	3.90	3.37	3.42
2007-2008	3.64	3.54	4.13	4.01	3.50	3.56	2.57	3.49	2.56	2.81	3.79	3.52	3.60	3.59	3.22	3.27
2008-2009	3.27	3.13	3.96	3.94	3.36	3.63	2.42	3.46	2.53	2.82	3.38	3.70	3.63	3.14	3.08	3.10
Institutional Average	3.51	3.35	4.20	3.97	3.57	3.65	2.56	3.48	2.59	2.83	3.68	3.77	3.68	3.53	3.25	3.26
Carnegie Average	3.55	3.16	3.85	3.55	3.16	3.55	2.63	3.85	2.63	3.16	3.16	3.55	3.55	3.55	3.55	3.04
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.38	0.54	0.45	0.38	0.45	0.40	0.54	0.40	0.38	0.38	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.52
Average - 1 Std.	3.10	2.78	3.31	3.10	2.78	3.10	2.23	3.31	2.23	2.78	2.78	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	2.52
Average + 1 Std.	4.00	3.55	4.40	4.00	3.55	4.00	3.03	4.40	3.03	3.55	3.55	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.57

Table 3G

UNC Fall Faculty Teaching Workload Comparisons
Average OC Sections (Including Labs) / FTE Faculty by CIP Area (Department)
Standard: At or Above One Standard Deviation Below National Average by Carnegie Class
Carnegie Average

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
01.xx 01.01 - Agricultural Business & Mgmt	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
01.09 - Livestock Mgmt	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
01.10 - Food Technology	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
01.11 - Plant Breeding	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
01.12 - Soil Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
03.xx 03.01 - Natural Resources Conservation	-	-	-	-	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	M
03.02 - Natural Resources Mgmt & Protection	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
03.05 - Forestry & Related Sciences	-	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	M	M	B	M	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	50.00
04.xx 04.02 - Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B
04.03 - City/Urban, Community & Regional Planning	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.00
04.06 - Landscape Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.00
05.xx 05.01 - Area Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
05.02 - Ethnic & Cultural Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
09.xx 09.01 - Communications, General	M	M	-	-	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
09.07 - Radio & Television Broadcasting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	-	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
11.xx 11.01 - Computer & Information Sciences, General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
11.04 - Information Sciences and Systems	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	B	33.33
11.07 - Computer Science	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	50.00
11.08 - Computer Software and Media Applications	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
11.09 - Computer Systems Networking	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	50.00	M	-	M	M	33.33	85.00
13.xx 13.01 - Education, General	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	M	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	M
13.03 - Curriculum & Instruction	-	-	-	-	M	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
13.04 - Education Administration	M	M	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	M	M	-	M	-	-	75.00
13.05 - Media Design	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
13.06 - Evaluation & Research	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
13.10 - Special Education	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	M
13.11 - Student Counseling & Personnel Services	M	M	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	B	M	-	M	M	-	87.50
13.12 - General Teacher Education	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	M	-	M	M	-	M
13.13 - Teacher Education, Specific Programs	-	M	M	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	M	-	M
13.99 - Education, Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	80.00	M	M	75.00	M	M	M	M	M	96.08
14.xx 14.01 - Engineering, General	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.03 - Agricultural Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.05 - Biomedical Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.07 - Chemical Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.08 - Civil Engineering	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.10 - Electrical & Electronics Engineering	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	M
14.18 - Mechanical Engineering	-	-	-	-	M	-	B	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	B
14.19 - Mechanical Engineering	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.23 - Nuclear Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B
14.28 - Textile Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
14.35 - Industrial Engineering	-	-	-	-	M	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	M	-	-	M	-	70.00	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	50.00
15.xx 15.00 - Engineering-related Technologies	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	M	-	84.21
15.01 - Architectural Engineering Technology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.67
15.03 - EE Engineering-Related Technology	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
15.06 - Industrial Production Technologies	M	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
15.10 - Construction Engineering Technologies	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	M
15.99 - Engineering Technologies, Other	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	M	-	91.67

(Continued)

UNC-OP SDA/Incomplete Fund.GR123E.G21JUN10
M: Institution is at or above 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.
-: Institution does not have that program or did not report data to Delaware for that CIP.

B: Institution is more than 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.
-: Institution does not have that program or did not report data to Delaware for that CIP.

UNC Fall Faculty Teaching Workload Comparisons
Average OC Sections (Including Labs) / FTE Faculty by CIP Area (Department)
Standard: At or Above One Standard Deviation Below National Average by Carnegie Class
Carnegie Average

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
16.xx 16.01 - Foreign Languages & Literature	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	-	-	-	M	-	M
16.04 - East European	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
16.05 - Germanic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	M	-	-	-	-	50.00
16.09 - Romance Languages	M	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	-	M	M	-	M
16.12 - Classical & Ancient Near Eastern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	M	80.00	M	M	-	M	M	-	95.00
19.xx 19.01 - Home Economics, General	M	-	-	-	B	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.67
19.05 - Food & Nutrition	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
19.07 - Individual & Family Development	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
19.09 - Clothing & Textile	-	M	-	-	B	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	88.89
22.xx 22.01 - Law & Legal Studies	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
23.xx 23.00 - ENGLISH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
23.01 - English Language & Literature, General	M	M	M	M	M	M	B	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	93.33
23.05 - Creative Writing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
23.10 - Speech & Rhetorical Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	B	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	94.44
24.xx 24.01 - Liberal Arts & Science, Humanities	M	-	-	-	M	M	M	B	M	-	-	-	M	M	-	80.00
Subtotal	M	-	-	-	M	M	M	B	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	80.00
25.xx 25.01 - Library Science	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.xx 26.01 - Biology, General	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	B	85.71
26.02 - Biochemistry & Biophysics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.03 - Botany	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.05 - Microbiology/Bacteriology	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.07 - Zoology	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.08 - Genetics	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.10 - Pharmacology & Toxicology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.11 - Biomathematics	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
26.13 - Ecology & Population Biology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	66.67	M	M	M	M	M	B	91.67
27.xx 27.01 - Mathematics	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M
27.05 - Mathematical Statistics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	-	M
30.xx 30.08 - Mathematics & Computer Science	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
30.11 - Gerontology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
30.17 - Behavior Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
30.19 - Nutrition Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
31.xx 31.00 - PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE & FITNESS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
31.01 - Parks, Recreation & Leisure Studies	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.67
31.03 - Leisure Facilities Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	M	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	B	75.00
31.05 - Health & Physical Education/Fitness	M	B	M	-	B	M	50.00	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	50.00	83.33
Subtotal	M	50.00	M	-	B	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	80.00
38.xx 38.00 - PHILOSOPHY & RELIGION	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
38.01 - Philosophy	M	M	-	-	-	-	B	M	M	M	M	-	-	M	-	87.50
38.02 - Religion/Religious Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	-	-	-	-	M
38.99 - Philosophy & Religion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	-	-	-	B	M	M	M	M	M	-	-	-	93.33
40.xx 40.01 - Physical Sciences, General	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
40.04 - Atmospheric Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
40.05 - Chemistry	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
40.06 - Geology	M	M	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
40.08 - Physics	M	M	-	-	M	M	B	M	B	M	M	-	M	M	-	81.82
40.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	-	M	M	66.67	M	66.67	M	M	-	M	M	M	94.59

(Continued)

UNC-OP SDA/Incomplete.Fund.GRI23E.G/21JUN10

M: Institution is at or above 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.

B: Institution is more than 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.
-: Institution does not have that program or did not report data to Delaware for that CIP.

UNC Fall Faculty Teaching Workload Comparisons
Average OC Sections (Including Labs) / FTE Faculty by CIP Area (Department)
Standard: At or Above One Standard Deviation Below National Average by Carnegie Class
Carnegie Average

	ASU	ECU	ECSU	FSU	NCA&T	NCCU	NCSU	UNC-A	UNC-CH	UNC-C	UNC-G	UNC-P	UNC-W	WCU	WSSU	UNC Total
42.xx 42.01 - Psychology	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
42.10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
43.xx 43.01 - Criminal Justice & Corrections	-	B	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	-	B	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	60.00
44.xx 44.02 - Community Organization & Advocacy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.00
44.04 - Public Administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
44.05 - Public Policy Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
44.07 - Social Work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
45.xx 45.01 - Social Sciences, General	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
45.02 - Anthropology	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	M	50.00
45.06 - Economics	M	B	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.67
45.07 - Geography	M	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
45.08	M	M	M	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
45.10 - Political Science & Government	M	B	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	B	M	M	M	M	-	83.33
45.11 - Sociology	M	B	-	-	-	M	M	M	M	B	M	M	M	M	-	92.86
Subtotal	M	50.00	66.67	M	75.00	M	M	M	M	75.00	M	M	M	M	M	90.32
50.xx 50.01 - Visual & Performing Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.00
50.03 - Dance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
50.04 - Design & Applied Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
50.05 - Dramatic/Theater Arts & Stagecraft	M	M	-	-	-	M	-	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
50.06 - Film, Video, & Photography	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
50.07 - Fine Arts & Art Studies	M	M	M	M	-	M	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
50.09 - Music	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	66.67	75.00	M	M	M	M	-	91.67
Subtotal	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	66.67	75.00	M	M	M	M	M	95.12
51.xx 51.00 - HEALTH PROFESSIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.02 - Communication Disorders	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.07 - Health Administration	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.00
51.09 - Diagnostic & Treatment Services	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.10 - Medical Laboratory Technologies	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.15 - Mental and Social Health Services	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.22 - Public Health	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	M
51.23 - Rehab & Therapeutic Services	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
51.31 - Dietetics and Clinical Nutrition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	-	M	-	-	-	M	-	M	M	B	M	-	-	-	M	96.00
52.xx 52.01 - Business	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.00
52.02 - Business Admin & Mgmt	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	B	50.00
52.03 - Accounting	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	-	M
52.06 - Business / Managerial Economics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
52.07 - Entrepreneurial and Small Business Ops.	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	B	M	-	-	-	-	75.00
52.08 - Financial Mgmt & Services	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
52.09 - Hospitality Services Mgmt	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	M	83.33
52.10 - Human Resources Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
52.12 - Information & Data Processing Services	M	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	-	-	-	80.00
52.14 - Marketing Mgmt & Research	M	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	83.33
52.18 - Sales, Merchandising, & Marketing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M
Subtotal	M	83.33	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	50.00	M	M	M	M	66.67	91.07
66.xx 66.16 - Nursing	M	M	-	M	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Subtotal	M	M	-	M	M	M	-	-	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Grand Total	M	88.24	95.24	M	91.43	M	81.82	96.30	90.48	76.19	M	M	M	M	77.27	92.63

UNC-OP SDA/Incomplete.Fund.GR123E.G/21JUN10

M: Institution is at or above 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.

B: Institution is more than 1 standard deviation below the national average for its Carnegie class.
-: Institution does not have that program or did not report data to Delaware for that CIP.