FACULTY WORKLOAD ADVISORY GROUP

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

April 13, 2012 - Open Session

The Chair of BOG Faculty Workload Advisory Group was appointed at the August 2011 Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs Committee. The group has been charged to "*review existing faculty workload policies, data collection systems, and campus- based processes for monitoring workload expectations. With the assistance of staff, the advisory group will gather information that includes, but is not limited to, best practices in faculty workload reporting, including the Delaware Study, and usage of workload data by campus and system leadership, the Board of Governors, and other key stakeholders*".

Additional committee members were confirmed at the September meeting. The working group is composed of the following members:
    a. Leroy Lail, Advisory Group Chair
    b. Kyle Carter, UNCP Chancellor
    c. James Deal, Board of Governors
    d. Ann Goodnight, Board of Governors
    e. Sandie Gravett, Faculty Assembly Chair
    f. Hari Nath, Board of Governors
    g. Bobby Sharp, ASU, Director, Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning
    h. Raiford Trask, Board of Governors
    i. Randy Woodson, NCSU Chancellor
Staffing for the committee was provided by Suzanne Ortega, Kate Henz, and Cody Thompson

The committee met over the course of five three-hour meetings held on November 17, 2011, December 16, 2011, January 18, 2012, February 14, 2012, and March 27, 2012.

At the November meeting, Bobby Sharp, Director of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning at ASU and a member of the BOG Advisory Group, provided an overview of the historical context and the methodological rationale for the use of the Delaware Study as the method for faculty teaching load reporting. Dr. Sharp contrasted results from the Delaware Study with results of the pre-Delaware data exchange method, explained the actual data collection process, and spoke to the way in which Delaware data are monitored and extensively used during all ASU planning and resource allocation processes.

The ways in which Delaware data were used at NCSU and ECU was addressed by Karen Helms, Director of University Planning and Analysis and SACS Accreditation Liaison at NCSU, and Provost Marilyn Sheerer from ECU. They explained that Delaware data on teaching workload are complemented by additional metrics designed to 1) give a fuller picture of total faculty workload and 2) align faculty teaching load with the current enrollment funding model.

At the December meeting, Keith Brown provided an additional overview of the Delaware Data system, the ways that Delaware data have typically been reported, and alternative ways that these data could be reported in the future. Jonathan Pruitt, Associate Vice President for Finance for the University of North Carolina General Administration, provided a tutorial on our current enrollment funding model. Finally, Suzanne Ortega reported results of a system-wide survey of university provosts and other officers to assess existing practices for monitoring faculty teaching load, approving exceptions to expected minimum teaching loads, and using workload data to inform key strategic decisions. This survey was spearheaded by Provost Marilyn Sheerer of ECU and includes responses from all 17 UNC institutions.

In January, Paul Cohen, NCSU Industrial Engineering Chair, Glen Gilbert, Dean of ECU College of Health and Human Performance, Stacy Altman, ECU Kinesiology Chair; Chanta Haywood, NCCU Graduate Dean; David Marlett, ASU Chair of Finance, Banking, and Insurance; Betty Coffey, ASU Chair of

Department of Management, and William Andrews, UNC Chapel Hill Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities, presented on how faculty teaching load data are used at the college and department level.

On February 14, 2012 presentations were heard by Jay Schalin, Director of State Policy and Jane Shaw, President of, the John W. Pope Center for Higher Education.

During our final meeting, a summary of key findings and recommendations to the Educational Planning and Policy Committee were finalized for presentation at this meeting.

Faculty Work Load Advisory Group Findings and Recommendations

Findings:

1) Teaching represents only one part of the instructional workload of faculty, and instructional workload is only one portion of the overall workload required by BOG and campus policies related to hiring, annual review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review of faculty. UNC, however, is only statutorily obligated to report on faculty teaching load.

2) BOG policy mandates the use of the Delaware Study as the methodology for measuring faculty teaching load. The major advantage of this methodology is that it provides faculty teaching load data at the department or CIP code level in a manner that permits 1) accurate comparisons over time within any given institutions, and 2) appropriate comparisons to peers.

3) Delaware data are sufficiently reliable and highly useful to campuses for strategic planning purposes. ASU and other campuses do make extended use of them.

4) The two major limitations to the Delaware study are 1) the timeliness of reports and 2) the fact that, as noted above, it measures only one portion of what faculty actually do.

5) While faculty teaching load information, as measured by number of sections taught is important (the primary Delaware measure), overall faculty instructional load also is affected by section size. Institutional teaching load should be interpreted in relation to campus mission and average student credit hours per faculty FTE.   For example, increases in section size impact amount of time necessary to grade tests and evaluate papers, meet with students during expanded office hours, and otherwise advise students. Importantly, there is an interaction between number of sections taught and average class size. Since the overall quality of faculty performance is correlated to teaching loads, and appropriate loads are often discipline specific, it is best monitored and managed at the department or school/college level.

6) Using the Delaware Study as the methodology for measuring faculty teaching load, preliminary output indicates that tenure/tenure track faculty instructional teaching load has increased both in number of sections taught and number of student credit hours generated.   The average number of sections taught by tenure/tenure track faculty increased 13.3% system-wide between Fall 2008 and Fall 2011. In addition to teaching more sections, tenure/tenure track faculty are teaching more students per section as indicated by the 9% increase system-wide in average student credit hours per tenure/tenure track faculty between Fall 2008 and Fall 2011. (See Exhibit 1)

7) As shown above, data indicate that faculty members have responded to budget pressures by increasing instructional loads. We are particularly impressed that they have done so without any apparent diminution of research productivity. For example, as you will have seen in the Report on Research and Sponsored Programs included in your Board books, the number of grant

submissions have increased by 29% over the past 5 years and the adjusted award (minus the ARRA funding) have increased by 4% just since last year.

8) A significant majority of campuses pay close attention to faculty workload across administrative levels ranging from department chair, through dean, to Provost and Chancellor. However, while all campuses permit course releases and buy outs under certain circumstances, not all campuses have written policies for them.

9) Faculty teaching load is meant to stand as a proxy for assessing the quality of the student educational experience. However, faculty teaching load as measured by Delaware is an input measure and thus cannot speak directly to the desired outcome.

10) Less than half of UNC institutions have a communication strategy for explaining faculty teaching and overall workload to external stakeholders.

Recommendations:

1) We should develop a reporting protocol that makes campus-level data available in a more timely fashion. While we will still have to wait for peer comparisons, it will provide campus administrators and BOG with more timely information on changes in teaching load. Clarifications and standardization of data definitions and protocols would also enhance the comparability of data within and across the system.

2) Since several campuses do not yet have processes for routinely including faculty teaching load data in larger institutional planning processes and since not all campuses have written policies regarding course releases and buy outs, this is one area where current BOG policy should be improved.

3) As a long-term goal, BOG should continue to encourage UNC to fully participate in ongoing national conversations about valid, reliable and cost-effective ways of measuring student learning outcomes at the course and degree level.

4) More timely reporting of faculty teaching load is one element that should improve communication about overall faculty effort and work load.   However, better metrics of faculty scholarly and service productivity would also produce a fuller picture of what faculty actually do. Thus, development of a comprehensive communication strategy is another long-term goal that warrants careful attention.

UNC Instructional Faculty Teaching Load
Fall Term Data for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty Only

Institution	Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011 (Preliminary Data)		% Change from Fall 2008 to Fall 2011	
	Average Sections per FTE Faculty	Average SCHs per FTE Faculty	Average Sections per FTE Faculty	Average SCHs per FTE Faculty	Average Sections per FTE Faculty	Average SCHs per FTE Faculty	Average Sections per FTE Faculty	Average SCHs per FTE Faculty	Average Sections per FTE Faculty	Average SCHs per FTE Faculty
Research - Very High										
NCSU	2.0	176	2.2	201	2.1	204	2.1	203	5.5%	15.6%
UNC-CH	2.3	160	2.7	162	2.6	157	2.7	158	17.6%	-1.6%
Research - High & Doctoral Research										
ECU	2.8	166	3.5	187	3.5	176	3.6	186	30.8%	11.7%
NCA&T	3.0	155	3.2	211	3.0	180	2.9	177	-0.7%	14.6%
UNCC	2.4	160	2.6	180	2.5	178	2.6	164	4.9%	2.9%
UNCG	3.3	164	4.0	199	3.7	184	4.1	188	24.4%	14.9%
Master's - Large & Medium										
ASU	3.3	201	3.2	206	3.2	198	3.2	210	-0.9%	4.8%
FSU	3.9	203	3.9	235	3.8	220	3.8	234	-1.3%	15.0%
NCCU	3.6	171	3.6	192	4.3	203	4.5	209	24.1%	22.1%
UNCP	3.7	191	3.7	187	3.8	197	3.8	190	1.9%	-0.7%
UNCW	3.5	225	3.7	243	4.4	219	4.3	217	20.7%	-3.7%
WCU	3.0	174	2.9	199	2.8	184	2.9	215	-2.0%	23.8%
WSSU	3.3	181	3.4	182	3.8	169	3.8	197	15.2%	9.2%
Baccalaureate - A&S										
UNCA	3.4	171	4.2	192	4.2	193	4.4	212	28.7%	24.4%
Baccalaureate - Diverse										
ECSU	3.8	188	4.2	218	4.1	215	4.3	205	14.3%	9.2%
UNC Total	2.9	175	3.2	195	3.2	187	3.2	191	13.3%	9.0%

ProgAssess/Incomplete.Fund.GR123S.G/06APR12

Proposed Resolution

The Board of Governors recommends that the President develop regulations for Policy 400.3.4 of the University of North Carolina Policy Manual to ensure timely and consistent reporting of Faculty Teaching Workloads. To that end, the regulations may include establishing procedures to collect data, for creating templates that help ensure consistency, constructing a data dictionary to clearly define data elements, and establishing reasonable reporting timelines. Collectively, these regulations will assist in providing the Board with timely, accurate and relevant information regarding Faculty Teaching Workloads.

In order to insure that Board Policy and regulations developed pursuant to this resolution are fully aligned, the Board of Governors further directs the President to develop and propose revisions to BOG Policy 400.3.4 for BOG consideration and approval. Any policy changes proposed should include a requirement that each campus develop policies and procedures for monitoring faculty teaching loads and approving significant and sustained variations from expected minimums.