DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 591 HE 007 332

TITLE	Faculty Activity Survey.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Council for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	46p.; Occasional light print; Appendix A is marginally legibile due to small print in original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Class Size; College Credits; *College Faculty; *Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; Research; *Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teaching Assignment; *Teaching Load; Teaching Methods; Units of Study (Subject Fields)
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland

ABSTRACT

A working group, composed of both faculty and administration representatives from the State Board for Community Colleges and the community colleges, the Board of Trustees for State Colleges, the University of Maryland, and the private institutions, met together over a period of several months to develop the design of the study and the data collection instrument. Responses were obtained from over four thousand full-time faculty members. An additional 1,800 responses were received from part-time faculty members. Some findings were: (1) faculty members in Maryland's institutions of higher education reported workloads similar to those reported by faculty members in other states; (2) the percentages of time devoted to different activities vary according to institutional missions; (3) total workloads of the University faculty members appear to be within the recommended guidelines of the American Association of University Professors; (4) nearly constant amounts of time expended in preparation and administration per credit hour were taught regardless of course levels; (5) product of student credit hours per full-time equivalent faculty member varied greatly by segment, by level of instruction, and by field of knowledge; and (6) by enabling each institution to compare its own data with statewide averages, efficiency or its absence may be recognized. (Author/KE)

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

DR. SHELDON H. KNORR
Executive Director

DR. JOSEPH F. KEIMIG
Associate Executive Director

DR. MONTE P. SHEPLER
Assistant Executive Director

DR. GLENWOOD C. BROOKS, JR.
Chief, Equal Postsecondary Education

DR. REYNOLDS FERRANTE
Chief, Federal-State Relations

JOHN C. CLAYTON
Higher Education Systems Planning

STEPHEN R. HAMPLE
Higher Education Research

DR. DAVID C. HOLLY
Higher Education Academic Planning

DOROTHY L. HOMEWOOD
Equal Postsecondary Education

Higher Education Master Planning

JOAN LEWIS KINZER
Equal Postsecondary Education

K. G. ROBINSON
Higher Education Facilities

ROBERT CHESTER ROGERS
Higher Education Finance

JOHN A. SABATINI, JR.
Associate Staff Specialist

EUGENE STANLEY
Higher Education Interstate and Inter-Institutional Relations

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This study of the range and extent of activity of faculty in Maryland institutions of higher education was undertaken to provide data to State officials on typical weekly activities of faculty members.

A working group, composed of both faculty and administration representatives from the State Board for Community Colleges and the community colleges, the Board of Trustees for State Colleges and the State colleges, the University of Maryland and the private institutions, met together over a period of several months to develop the design of the study and the data collection instrument. The instrument adopted was similar to one developed for the Faculty Activity Analysis of the National Center for Higher Education Managements Systems (NCHEMS).

Each faculty respondent was assured of anonymity in the study. The forms were distributed during the 1974 Spring semester by the appropriate Board to the institutions, collected through the Boards, key-punched by the Council and returned to the Boards for such use as they felt appropriate.

Responses were obtained from over four thousand full-time faculty members (a return rate for the participating institutions of over 80%). An additional 1,800 responses were received from part-time faculty members. The processing of the returns was designed to allow for the use of responses even though only part of the form was properly completed. For example, if only the first portion of a form was completed, the response could be used for computing average credits taught while it could not be used for reporting total activities. The advantage of this treatment was that it allowed the maximum number of usable responses per table. An inherent disadvantage was that it resulted in different size data bases for different tables.

Since the form was being completed by faculty for the first time, it is possible that some double reporting of certain activities may have occurred. If a faculty member spent twenty hours, for example, directing the research of graduate students, he might have reported these twenty hours under both teaching and research, contrary to the intent of the form. Such duplicate reporting or other misunderstanding of the form was assumed to have occurred in cases where a total workload of more than ninety hours per week was reported and those responses were deleted from the calculation of average total hours worked per week.

While approximately 90% of the responses were obtained from the public institutions, Goucher College, Loyola College, the University of Baltimore, and Western Maryland College voluntarily participated in the survey allowing for some comparisons to be made of the faculty activity in the public and private sectors. Other states were also surveyed to obtain information on faculty activity studies that they had conducted. Data was provided by several states allowing for some judgments to be made as to the consistency of Maryland information compared to that furnished by these states. Some variations may have resulted from the fact that the Maryland survey reported Spring semester data while other studies reported Fall or Academic year data.

Detailed comparisons of these data with Maryland information were made where a similarity in collection and classification methods allowed. However, these other states are not intended to serve as models for Maryland higher education.

Data on reported hours presented in the following tables are based on responses from full-time faculty members only. However, the responses received from part-time faculty members were used in compiling the course information.

II. FACULTY WORKLOAD STUDIES IN OTHER STATES

More than forty years ago it was stated that:

> "The evaluation of faculty load is an extremely difficult problem. Teaching duties vary tremendously from institution to institution and from individual to individual within a given institution. In fact, the factors involved in determing total faculty load are so numerous and so varied as almost to preclude precise determination by any mechanical method. No thorough scientific method of measuring faculty load is now available. Existing measures are unsatisfactory and incomplete. The answers are not yet in. Yet, as a practical necessity, some method of measuring and adjusting faculty load - even though only approximate - must be employed".

A letter requesting information on the status of workload studies sent to all state higher education coordinating agencies listed in the Education Directory generated responses from thirty-four states. None of these states reported that any such statewide studies had been conducted although several state university systems reported conducting comprehensive surveys for their institutions.

The University of Hawaii, using Fall 1971 data, conducted a thorough study of faculty workloads which were reported as part of a legislative audit. The State University System of Florida has been collecting faculty, including graduate teaching assistant (GTA), workload data for each of its nine universities on a quarterly basis, but has not yet analyzed the results. The Board of Regents of the State of Kansas published a report in 1972 (a follow-up analysis is in progress) with Fall '71 faculty data in which hours per week spent on various activities by academic rank were reported with total hours per week ranging in the upper fifties.

The State Board of Regents of Iowa published reports for the University of Iowa and Iowa State University (Fall '71 data). Both included a breakdown by area of instruction and by type of activity with total reported hours per week in the upper fifties. Professors in Clinical Medicine, however, reported an average work week of 70.4 hours. Graduate Teaching and Research Assistants in most of the academic areas reported about forty hours per week with higher

averages and variations possibly due to "some difficulty in separating their teaching and research responsibilities to the university".

Oregon has used both a student credit hour per FTE faculty report (by course level) and a faculty activity report; current data, however, were not available.

Several states reported that no statewide data on faculty activities were available but indicated that segment boards (for state colleges, community colleges, etc.), or individual universities might have such information. Since the obtaining of information on statewide measures of faculty activities was of prime interest, no attempt was made to contact individual boards or institutions. The States included in this category are New York, Minnesota, Texas, Louisiana and North Dakota.

In a number of states, detailed information is collected on certain ratios or measures, but not on a wide range of faculty activities. South Carolina calculates student credit hour (SCH) production per full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty member average class sizes, and the ratio of scheduled teaching hours to credit hours. The State of Washington collects information on contact hours by both faculty rank and by field of knowledge as well as SCH/FTE faculty "output" figures. Mississippi publishes numbers of classes and student credit hours produced by level and by field of knowledge. West Virginia and Michigan also obtain SCH/FTE faculty ratios while Nevada reports very detailed information on credits taught. Georgia reports detailed information on SCH production and a percentage distribution of faculty time by academic elements (instruction by level, advising, administration, public service, and research). In Connecticut, gross comparisons are made on the statewide level on student-faculty ratios and on average teaching loads based on weighted units. Pennsylvania and New Jersey report only faculty-student ratios. In each of these states, these data are collected on a regular basis.

Occasional or "one shot" faculty workload studies of some form have been conducted in many states at one time or another. New Mexico recently published a detailed and comprehensive report on production and cost data. Arizona is in the process of analyzing workload data. Rhode Island is working on a concept for faculty load reports as part of a collective bargaining process. Colorado publishes target or expected SCH/FTE faculty ratios rather than reporting past results. Tennessee published a thorough study of faculty time distribution and performance evaluation in 1973.

While this review of activities in other states serves as an indication of the efforts that have been undertaken, no standard recognized study format or methodologies have emerged. The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) has developed a "Faculty Activity Analysis Procedures Manual" detailing application of its study to several institutions. It is hoped that the Maryland study which expanded the NCHEMS tools to a statewide application will contribute to development of both a standard format and methodology for future studies which may provide for an exchange of comparative data among states as well as among similar institutions.

III. RESULTS OF THE MARYLAND FACULTY ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME SURVEY

The following tables and analyses will hopefully be of use at all levels and institutions by focusing attention on selected aspects of higher education in Maryland with the goal of increasing efficiency in the educational processes. By allowing each institution to compare the data submitted by its own faculty with the corresponding statewide averages, relative standings may be obtained. A more efficient use of resources should result in an overall more effective system of higher education.

However, conclusions must not be made without considering the full impact of any decision. In particular, a distinction between efficiency and effectiveness, should be made. If diversity in Maryland's colleges and universities were eliminated and all institutions were required to teach only lower division mathematics courses, great savings could be realized (no laboratories, no libraries, large classes) and the instruction would be highly efficient in terms of funds expended per credit taught or student credit hour produced. But, it would hardly be an effective method of providing worthwhile education to Maryland's students or of supplying the need for research and public service activities. Efficiency, then, is a desirable objective for higher education, but the roles and missions of the institutions must also be considered in order to truly improve the effectiveness of our institutions of higher education.

The eight page form (Appendix A) used in this survey was developed to provide course information as well as information on the extent and distribution of faculty time. The first portion of the form requested information for each course taught, on the field of knowledge, the course level, the enrollment, the method of instruction and the amount of faculty time devoted to the course. In addition to these course related data, information was collected on the typical number of hours per week spent by faculty members on research, scholarship, internal service and public service activities. For each section of the form a subtotal of the number of hours expended per week was requested as well as the total number of hours worked by the faculty member in a typical week.

Class Size By Level of Instruction

TABLE 1

CLASS SIZE BY LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION

	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate
Community Colleges	22.8		
State Colleges	27.0	17.1	15.6
University of Maryland	60.2	26.6	10.0*
Private	29.8	20.2	17.6
All Segments	29.1	22.2	11.3

n = 11,651 classes

*Graduate instruction at the University includes both the masters and doctoral levels.

In general, as the level of instruction increases within a segment, the average class size decreases. The data also indicate that there is considerable variation within a given level of instruction among the various segments. For example, in the lower division, the average class size ranges from 22.8 in the Community Colleges to 60.2 in the University of Maryland (TABLE 1). It should be noted that the contribution of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in the University of Maryland is not included in this survey and that while a lower division class size of 60.2 seems quite large, one or more GTAs may assist the faculty member in teaching the class.

The overall sizes of classes in Maryland appear to be similar to those reported in other states. West Virginia, for example, reports class sizes for all segments of 30 at the lower division, 23 at the upper division and 12 at the graduate level.

Class Size by Method of Instruction

Faculty members were requested to indicate the methods of instruction used in each course which they taught. If more than one method was reported for a course, the corresponding course data were distributed proportionately. While a large majority of the courses reported were taught by a single method, the proportioned entries for combinations of methods probably affected significantly the data reported for the less common methods of instruction. In particular, class sizes reported for independent study, tutorial and programmed instruction methods are probably higher than they would be if courses were sorted on the basis of only the major method used. The class sizes reported under the heading of programmed instruction, however, are significantly large. If great efficiency in instruction is required, this method of instruction should receive further study.

"It is a widely held view that small classes are more productive than large classes. Few would question the conclusion that small classes are more costly than large ones; but the recourse to small classes is supposedly justified by the superior product turned out. The late Beardsley Ruml, anxious to make higher education viable, proposed to do away with medium-sized classes and concentrate on large lectures and small seminars. What is striking is that almost every study made of the subject has revealed that the educational product of the large class either exceeds that of the small class, or at least that class size makes no significant difference in the quality of the product. Furthermore, so many other factors are relevant to the productivity of an institution that class size must be a relatively small influence. But costs are important and under financial pressure costs may be decreased significantly by increasing class size. Unfortunately, the definition of a small or large class is a matter of dispute. In comparing the results of classes of varying size, one should allow for teaching aids made available in the larger classes."

- Seymour E. Harris, A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education, A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education p. 893.

Variations in the data occur more by the type of instruction than by segment. The class sizes, for all segments, ranged from 32.5 for the lecture method to 8.0 for independent study (Table 2). The University reported by far the largest variations, from 45.4 to 6.8 in these categories. The community colleges report relatively large classes under the headings of independent study (17.8) and tutorial (17.6) methods.

TABLE 2

CLASS SIZE BY METHOD INSTRUCTION

	Lecture	Labor-atory	Recitation/ Discussion	Seminar	Indep. Study	Tutorial	Programmed Instruction
Community College	24.5	20.6	23.7	16.4	17.8	17.6	26.6
State College	27.7	19.9	22.0	13.6	6.4	9.1	24.2
University of Maryland	45.4	32.3	29.2	11.6	6.8	6.7	73.5
Private	31.1	20.7	25.5	15.0	4.9	6.8	18.1
All Segments	32.5	23.3	24.9	12.7	8.0	10.8	33.0

n = 11,651 classes

Class Size - By Field of Knowledge

Three other states provided information on class sizes by field of knowledge, using the same Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) classification as used by Maryland. In each of the first three states in Table 3, if the fields of knowledge were listed in rank order according to class sizes from high to low, foreign languages would rank at or near the bottom. In other studies foreign languages have tended to have similar low rankings. Class sizes in biological sciences (39.9) in Maryland are quite large relative both to other Maryland classes and to the West Virginia classes in this area. While classes in the health professions (35.6) are large relative to other Maryland classes, they do not appear large relative to those in West Virginia. Similarly, law classes in Maryland (36.9) are not large when compared to those in West Virginia (56.46) or Tennessee (43). Maryland class sizes in public affairs and services appear low relative both to similar courses in West Virginia and to other fields of knowledge in Maryland.

Several notes should accompany Table 3:

(1) The average class sizes reported for Maryland are actually the average sizes of classes taught by faculty members who are in turn classified according to the major field of knowledge in which they teach. Since most faculty members teach in only one field, this distinction is minor. Class sizes for fields in which fewer than 10 faculty members were so classified are not included in the table.

(2) The average class sizes reported for West Virginia (Fall '72 data) and Tennessee are apparently obtained directly from course data, but are weighted averages, being weighted by the number of credits per course.

(3) A document published by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (FY 73 data) listed average reported class sizes by field of knowledge, by course level, and by institution, but did not contain graduate level class sizes or a summary report for all course levels. Hence the class sizes listed for Georgia are those reported for upper level courses. One would expect such average sizes to be smaller than those reported for all levels and direct comparisons between Georgia and the other states should not be made. The Georgia data is reproduced only to aid in the (vertical) comparisons of class sizes by field of knowledge.

TABLE 3
CLASS SIZE - BY FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE
ALL SEGMENTS AND ALL COURSE LEVELS COMBINED

Field of Knowledge	(1) Maryland	West (2) Virginia	(3) Georgia	(2) Tenn.
Agriculture & Natural Resources	21.1	30.09	16	15
Architecture	-	21.15	14	10
Area Studies	-	-	11	-
Biological Sciences	39.9	31.03	16	22
Business & Management	30.9	29.80	25	29
Communications	22.2	21.56	17	17
Computer Sciences	23.2	23.30	20	20
Education	20.7	21.90	18	16
Engineering	14.8	16.24	19	11
Fine & Applied Arts	23.4	19.53	11	14
Foreign Languages	13.7	18.22	8	16
Health Professions	35.6	40.78	17	13
Home Economics	21.4	21.46	16	18
Law	36.9	56.46	21	43
Letters	22.8	24.07	15	23
Library Science	-	18.11	9	16
Mathematics	26.2	28.81	16	23
Military Sciences	-	-	12	12
Physical Science	28.9	30.46	15	24
Psychology	33.6	36.95	20	25
Public Affairs and Service	15.5	27.00	12	16
Social Sciences	29.4	32.61	19	26
Theology	-	18.50	-	-
Interdisciplinary Studies	-	30.27	43	11
Business & Commerce Tech.	21.0	18.48	16	20
Data Processing Tech.	18.5	17.24	-	16
Health & Paramedical Tech.	26.6	40.08	6	10
Mechanical & Engr. Tech.	14.8	14.97	13	12
Natural Science Tech.	-	18.06	-	11
Public Service Tech.	27.1	31.56	11	21
Average All Fields	25.6	25.57	17	20

Course Information Reported by Faculty Members by Course Levels

"Conventional wisdom about higher education traditionally has held that significant differences exist in the time required to teach courses of different levels such as lower division, upper division, and graduate".

- Faculty Activity Analysis: Interpretation and Uses of Data, NCHEMS, p. 124.

The data reported in the MCHE survey bring the above statement into question. The three levels mentioned, lower division, upper division and graduate, represent 85% of the courses taught in Maryland. Since faculty workloads are often measured in terms of credit hours (or simply credits), the reported average amounts of time spent per week in preparation and administration and total scheduled teaching have been computed on a per credit hour basis. Columns (3) and (4) of Table 4 relate to this method of measuring faculty workload. The nearly constant average hours spent in preparation and administration (lower division, 1.4; upper division, 1.4; graduate, 1.5 - Table 4) suggest that if preparation time actually increases as course levels increase, then time spent in administering the course must correspondingly decrease. Further, the average total scheduled teaching hours reported per credit hour (lower division, 3.2; upper division, 3.0; graduate, 3.1) indicate, for example, that a typical faculty member will spend approximately the same amount of time for a three credit lower division course as he will spend for a three credit graduate course.

Recent findings corroborate this observation:

> "Many colleges and universities will lighten the schedule of an instructor teaching a graduate course, but graduate courses involve no more faculty time than undergraduate ones. The available literature indicates that the actual hours spent in the classroom, in preparing lessons and in evaluating student performance is the same regardless of the level of the course involved."
>
> - from a study by Harold Yuker as quoted in the Intercollegiate Press Bulletin, February 28, 1975.

TABLE 4

COURSE INFORMATION REPORTED BY FACULTY MEMBERS

BY COURSE LEVELS

COURSE LEVEL	(1) No. of Courses	(2) % of Total	(3) Preparation and Administration Per Credit Hr.	(4) Total Scheduled Teaching Hrs. per Credit Hour	(5) Total Scheduled Teaching Hrs. per Student Credit Hour(SCH)
Preparatory	267	2	1.3	3.1	.103
Lower Division	6,698	57	1.4	3.2	.105
Upper Division	2,257	19	1.4	3.0	.129
Upper Div. & Grad.	907	8	1.6	3.2	.132
Graduate	1,073	9	1.5	3.1	.258
Professional	183	2	1.6	3.3	.122
Other	54	1	1.2	2.7	.143
Not Specified	212	2	1.4	3.2	.133
TOTAL	11,651	100	1.4	3.1	.118

While credit hours (or credits) are used as an indicator of faculty workload or "input", another measure, the student credit hour (SCH), is often used to indicate instructional "output" in higher education. This measure is simply the product of the credit offered for a course and the enrollment in that course. For example, a three credit (per semester) course with twenty students enrolled would be said to produce 3x20 = 60 student credit hours (SCH). While controvery exists and and a great deal has been written concerning this measure, it is none-the-less used by many institutions and agencies to identify courses or areas with regard to the resources expended per unit of instruction produced.

With this in mind, the total scheduled teaching hours per student credit hour produced have been calculated. If a three credit course with an enrollment of twenty students required 10 scheduled teaching hours per week on the part of an average faculty member, a corresponding entry in column (5) of Table 4 would be (10) ÷ (3x20) = 1/6 = .167. When analyzed by level, a moderate increase is noted between the ratio for lower division courses (.105) and upper division courses (.129). However, the index doubles from the upper division ratio (.129) to the graduate level ratio (.258). Stated in an alternative manner, the production of 60 SCH in a given semester would require 60 x .105 = 6.3 hours of faculty scheduled teaching time per week at the lower division level, 60 x .129 = 7.74 hours at the upper division level, and 60 x .258 = 15.48 hours at the graduate level.

Since the total scheduled teaching hours per credit is nearly constant for each level, these variations are almost entirely the result of differences in class sizes among the course levels.

Course Information Reported by Faculty Members by Method of Instruction

The large majority (83%) of courses are taught by the traditional methods of lecture, laboratory and recitation/discussion. Of these three methods, laboratory courses require the least amount of preparation and administration, but require more contact hours resulting in the highest number of total scheduled teaching hours per credit hour. When all of the methods are considered, relatively large variations in these measures are found to exist.

While the method of independent study requires only 1.9 total scheduled teaching hours per credit hour (Table 5), this method is actually one of the more "expensive" (in terms of faculty time) on the basis of student credit hours produced, due to the fact that the "favorable" 1.9 ratio is more than offset by very low course enrollments.

TABLE 5

COURSE INFORMATION REPORTED BY FACULTY MEMBERS BY METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

Method of Instruction	Number of Courses	% of Total	Preparation and Adm. per Credit Hours	Total Scheduled Teaching Hours per Credit Hr.	Total Scheduled Teaching Hrs. per Student Credit Hours
Lecture	4,245	37	1.7	3.4	.099
Laboratory	1,905	16	1.3	3.5	.137
Recitation/ Discussion	3,514	30	1.6	3.2	.126
Seminar	518	4	1.5	3.1	.232
Independent Study	693	6	.7	1.9	.202
Tutorial	426	4	.8	2.5	.207
Programmed Instruction	163	1	1.0	2.6	.075
Not Specified	184	2	1.2	2.8	.075
TOTAL	11,648	100	1.4	3.1	.118

Computed Student Credit Hour Load of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty By Segment, By Field of Knowledge

As mentioned earlier in the discussion of reported course information, the student credit hour (SCH) is often used to indicate instructional output in higher education (SCH = student enrollment x course credit). In compiling Table 6, SCH production per full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty in a given category was deleted if fewer than three F.T.E. faculty responses were available for that particular cell in the table. The value of three FTE faculty seemed to be a natural cut-off point with few cells containing responses from between 2.0 and 3.0 FTE faculty. It should be noted that these student credit hours are based on enrollments reported by faculty members during the semester and could be expected to vary from those calculated on the basis of registrars' data. The MCHE data were collected during the Spring of 1974 and therefore differ from Fall Semester data.

The totals (Average All Faculty - Table 6) for each segment indicate decreasing SCH/FTE ratios as the course level increases at the University (519;250;77) and at the state colleges (320;210;170). In an alternative manner, one can calculate the FTE faculty required to produce 1,000 student credit hours using these ratios:

F.T.E. Faculty Needed to Produce 1,000 SCH:

	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate
Community Colleges	3.41		
State Colleges	3.13	4.76	5.88
University of Maryland	1.93	4.00	12.99

TABLE 6

COMPUTED STUDENT CREDIT HOUR LOAD OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY

BY SEGMENT, BY FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE

SCH PER FTE FACULTY

	Lower Division			Upper Division		Graduate	
	Com. Coll.	State Coll.	Univ. Md.	State Coll.	Univ. Md.	State Coll.	Univ. Md.
Agriculture & Nat. Resources	-	-	250	-	91	-	43
Architecture & Environ. Design	-	-	-	-	143	-	-
Biological Sciences	313	313	1443	233	184	-	47
Business & Management	383	391	647	269	357	177	96
Communications	288	227	386	-	251	-	-
Computer & Infor. Science	-	309	317	-		-	70
Education	175	227	251	228	214	165	115
Engineering	305	-	160	-	110		48
Fine & Applied Arts	236	493	266	144	187	-	75
Foreign Languages	212	172	176	115	111	-	55
Health Professions	371	257	-	-	527	-	68
Home Economics	-	-	305	-	180	-	43
Law	-	-	-	-	-	134	271*
Letters	289	273	456	211	221	-	81
Library Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	207
Mathematics	276	296	648	158	99	-	43
Physical Sciences	306	332	505	84	82	-	71
Psychology	431	387	962	293	566	152	52
Public Affairs & Services	-	-	-	-	215	-	92
Social Sciences	390	400	642	235	188	115	79
Business & Commerce Tech.	262	-	-	-	-	-	-
Data Processing	245	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health Services & Paramed.	294	-	-	-	240	-	-
Mech. & Engr. Technology	155	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public Service	319	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average All Faculty	293	320	519	210	250	170	77

* at the "first professional" degree level

While graduate instruction is relatively "expensive" in terms of faculty resources, the relatively "inexpensive" lower division instruction at the University may be due, at least in part, to the presence of graduate teaching assistants whose contributions would not be available without the existence of the graduate courses. It should also be kept in mind that graduate instruction at the University included both the master's and doctoral levels.

Comparisons of Maryland SCH/FTE faculty ratios with those of other states are fraught with difficulties. As in all similar ratios, a small change in the denominator often greatly affects the quotient (1,000 SCH/3 FTE = 333 while 1,000 SCH/4 FTE= 250). Thus, the inclusion or exclusion of graduate teaching assistants in the FTE faculty counted is of critical importance. Different studies also may or may not include some part-time faculty, faculty in other than the most common four academic ranks, faculty members whose duties are largely administrative or faculty members engaged primarily in research. While such discrepancies could be resolved, no standard methodology currently exists. Since variations in student credit hour production are directly related to class size, the interstate comparisons listed in Table and the very limited information on SCH/FTE faculty ratios from other states indicate that Maryland does not appear to differ greatly from other states in student credit hour production.

Computed Student Credit Hour Load of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty by Field of Knowledge - Private Colleges

Since the private colleges included in the survey offer mainly undergraduate instruction with limited graduate programs, SCH/FTE ratios for these colleges were included for comparison with the state colleges in Table 7. As in Table 6, the result was deleted if fewer than 3.0 FTE faculty responses were available for a particular cell in the Table.

TABLE 7

COMPUTED STUDENT CREDIT HOUR LOAD OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY BY FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE - PRIVATE COLLEGES
(Compared with State Four Year Colleges)

SCH per FTE FACULTY

	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate
Biological Studies	414 (313)	181 (233)	
Business Management	499 (391)	364 (269)	
Education	136 (227)	171 (228)	181 (165)
Fine and Applied Art		109 (144)	
Foreign Language	264 (172)	106 (115)	
Letters	364 (273)	171 (211)	
Mathematics	209 (296)		
Physical Sciences	280 (332)	69 (84)	
Psychology		274 (293)	
Social Sciences	431 (400)	252 (235)	
All Faculty	332 (320)	209 (210)	195 (170)

n = 161 FTE Faculty in private colleges

Variations among the fields occur in somewhat the same patterns for both the private and state colleges. In the area of physical sciences both segments reported moderate SCH production ratios at the lower division level, and greatly decreased ratios at the upper division level. The greatest difference, both absolute and relative occurred in lower division instruction. When the ratios for all faculty, regardless of field of knowledge, are compared, slightly higher levels of student credit hours are reported by faculty members in the private colleges.

Average Faculty Teaching Load Information - By Field of Knowledge

Table 8 presents variations in teaching load information with regard to the major field of knowledge in which each full-time faculty member reported he was teaching. Fields, such as theology and military sciences, in which fewer than ten faculty members reported teaching, have been deleted.

The number of courses taught ranges from 2.4 in agriculture and natural resources to 4.4 in business and commerce technology. Faculty members in agriculture and natural resources also report the fewest credit hours, but the credit hour workload reported for data processing exceeds that for business and commerce technology (due to a lower average number of credits per course). The low credit hour load reported for agriculture and natural resources is not surprising since faculty members in this area reported much higher percentages of their time devoted to public service and research than did faculty members in other areas. When the credit hour load is compared in the same manner by discipline for each segment, the average credits reported ranged from 9.2 to 15.5 for the community colleges, from 10.5 to 14.3 for the State colleges, from 5.7 to 13.4 for the University, and from 9.5 to 12.1 for the private colleges.

TABLE 8

AVERAGE FACULTY TEACHING LOAD INFORMATION BY FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE
ALL SEGMENTS COMBINED

	Number of Courses	Number of Credit Hrs.	Total Students	Enrollment per Course
Agriculture & Nat. Resources	2.4	5.7	50.6	21.1
Biological Sciences	3.0	8.4	120.9	39.9
Business & Mgmt.	3.5	11.0	108.8	30.9
Communications	3.8	11.3	83.4	22.2
Computer & Infor. Science	2.7	8.3	63.2	23.2
Education	3.7	9.7	76.9	20.7
Engineering	2.6	7.6	39.1	14.8
Fine & Applied Arts	4.0	11.0	93.0	23.4
Foreign Languages	3.6	11.6	49.3	13.7
Health Professions	2.2	7.9	78.2	35.6
Home Economics	3.3	8.9	71.1	21.4
Law	3.0	8.7	111.9	36.9
Letters	3.9	11.8	88.6	22.8
Mathematics	3.4	10.9	88.6	26.2
Physical Sciences	2.9	7.8	84.5	28.9
Psychology	3.9	11.8	132.3	33.6
Public Affairs & Services	2.8	9.0	43.6	15.5
Social Sciences	3.6	11.0	104.8	29.4
Bus. & Commerce Tech.	4.4	12.5	93.4	21.0
Data Processing Tech.	4.1	12.6	75.1	18.5
Health Services & Paramed.	2.5	9.2	67.5	26.6
Mech. & Engr. Technology	3.5	10.9	52.2	14.8
Public Service	4.1	10.9	111.3	27.1
Average All Faculty	3.4	9.9	86.0	25.6

n = 2758 faculty

Average Credits Taught by Full-Time Faculty Members

The variations in the total number of credits taught by faculty members in the various ranks and segments follow differences in institutional missions. Faculty members in the University, with greater research and public service responsibilities, have lighter teaching loads (7.8 credits) than their counterparts in the State (11.2 credits) and community (11.5 credits) colleges. In all segments, there exists a tendency for the number of credits taught to increase as academic rank decreases, with a range of 8.8 credits for professors to 10.6 credits for instructors (Table 9).

TABLE 9

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CREDITS TAUGHT BY FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Community Colleges	11.3	11.4	11.6	11.8	11.5
State Colleges	10.5	11.3	11.6	11.0	11.2
University of Md.	6.3	7.9	8.2	9.1	7.8
Private Colleges	10.9	11.6	11.6	10.2	11.3
All Segments	8.8	9.9	10.2	10.6	9.9

n = 2758

Since credit hours are used primarily as a measure of student (rather than faculty) effort, the measurement of faculty teaching loads has more often been based on formal contact hours, listed in the next table.

Average Formal Contact Hours - Full-Time Faculty

In 1969, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education conducted a survey of students and faculty members from which the following information was obtained:

Median Classroom Hours Per Week

	Public	Private
Research universities I	6.0	5.2
Other doctoral-granting universities	7.3	8.2
Comprehensive universities and colleges	11.0	10.0
Liberal arts colleges	11.2	11.0
Two-year colleges	15.1	13.6

- The More Effective Use of Resources, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, p. 69.

While median classroom hours were not calculated, the average (mean) formal contact hours reported in the MCHE survey should serve as a fair substitute. With this in mind, the average formal contact hours per week (all ranks) reported in Table 10 from the University (8.2 compared to 7.3 above), the state colleges (11.9 compared to 11.0) and the community colleges (14.0 compared to 15.1) in Maryland appear to be consistent with the Carnegie figures. While research is important at the University of Maryland, the aggregate average of hours reported for all campuses at the University was compared with those for "other doctoral-granting universities". rather than with "research universities I", a group of the leading fifty schools in terms of "federal support of academic science." The College Park campus of the University by itself would be more comparable with this latter group. (For a discussion of these classifications. see the Carnegie report, New Students and New Places, p. 122).

TABLE 10

AVERAGE FORMAL CONTACT HOURS PER WEEK FULL-TIME FACULTY

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Community Colleges	13.0	13.7	14.3	14.7	14.0
State Colleges	10.5	12.1	12.2	12.7	11.9
University of Md.	5.9	7.8	8.6	12.1	8.2
Private	10.1	10.9	11.9	10.4	11.0
All Segments	8.8	10.7	11.4	13.2	11.0

n = 2280

The American Association for University Professors (AAUP) recommends in its "Statement on Faculty Workload" teaching loads of 6-9 formal contact (classroom) hours per week at the graduate level and 9-12 hours per week at the undergraduate level. The formal contact hours reported by the University faculty, varying from 5.9 (Professors) to 12.1 (Instructors), span this recommended range. If the assumption is made that the higher ranked faculty members tend to teach the higher level courses, then it may be inferred that formal contact hours reported by the University faculty fall within the AAUP guidelines.

The formal contact hours reported by rank and by segment follow a pattern similar, but not identical, to the reported number of credits taught. The general trend may be illustrated by comparing the combined figures reported for all segments - Table 11. (The use of different size data bases has only a minor effect on the comparison).

TABLE 11

CONTACT HOURS PER CREDIT HOUR - ALL SEGMENTS

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Credits Taught	8.8	9.9	10.2	10.6	9.9
Formal Contact Hours	8.8	10.7	11.4	13.2	11.0
Contact Hours per Credit	1.00	1.08	1.12	1.25	1.11

The probable explanation for this trend is that lower ranked faculty members teach lower level courses which typically require more classroom hours per credit granted.

When a separate computer run was made without regard to segments, the results from using this larger data base were virtually identical with those reported for All Segments in Table 10; the only difference was that, for professors, the average rounded to 8.9 rather than 8.8. This second computer run also indicated a rather wide dispersion of reported formal contact hours.

TABLE 12

RANGE OF FORMAL CONTACT HOURS - FULL-TIME FACULTY

0-4	4-7	7-10	10-13	13-16	16-19	19 +
290	426	484	703	512	297	193

n = 2905

If other contact hours (related to course work, but in addition to the scheduled classroom contact hours) are included, the average faculty member in Maryland spends 16.9 hours (27.2% of his total time) in course related contact hours. An average additional 3.2 hours (6.7%) is spent on academic advising and student services for a total average contact time with students of 20.1 hours per week (33.9% of the total workweek). These figures do not differ significantly from the results reported in other studies.

The variations between ranks and segments are lessened when total teaching hours (including preparation, grading papers, thesis advising) are considered.

Average Total Teaching Hours (Per Week) for Full-Time Faculty

Total teaching hours include the schedule teaching activities (those directly related to courses), unschedule teaching activities (graduate committees, guest lecturing), academic program advising, and course and curriculum development.

Variations occur both when comparisons are made by academic rank and by segment. As academic rank increases, the amount of time devoted to teaching tends to decrease. Segmental comparisons show that faculty members in the University, in each of the ranks, spend less time teaching than do faculty members in other segments. These variations range from 29.4 hours per week (43.8% of the total reported work week) for professors in the University to 44.6 hours per week (70.6% of the total reported work week) for instructors in the community colleges (Table 13).

This table, more fully reflecting time spent in informal graduate instruction, offers a more complete basis for comparisons between ranks and segments than do the tables reporting only credits taught or formal contact hours.

TABLE 13

AVERAGE TOTAL TEACHING HOURS (PER WEEK) FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Community Colleges	40.2	41.4	43.8	44.6	42.7
State Colleges	39.1	41.3	41.8	43.6	41.5
University of Md.	29.4	33.4	34.7	36.1	33.3
Private	35.6	38.8	43.9	35.9	39.8
All Segments	34.6	37.8	39.6	41.3	38.3

Average Hours Per Week Devoted to Research and General Scholarship

Activities reported under the heading of research consist of work related to specific projects while general scholarship includes activities related to keeping current in a professional field. Thus, while the University faculty reports a relatively very large amount of time (17.7 hours) devoted to these activities, the faculty in the other segments also engage in such pursuits (community college faculties reported the smallest amount, 9.4 hours). Faculty members in all segments spend approximately the same amount of time (5 to 7 hours) per week in general scholarship; hence the variations in Table 14 are largely due to differences in research activities. It should be noted that if a faculty member were working on his own dissertation, he would probably report hours so worked in this category.

TABLE 14

AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO RESEARCH AND GENERAL SCHOLARSHIP BY FULL TIME FACULTY

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Community Colleges	10.1	9.1	9.5	8.9	9.4
State Colleges	9.9	8.4	11.1	10.7	10.1
University of Md.	19.1	18.7	17.2	14.4	17.7
Private	13.6	13.9	10.4	13.1	12.4
All Segments	14.6	13.4	13.1	11.4	13.2

n = 2280

Average Total Work Week - Full-Time Faculty

When all faculty activities are considered, the total hours worked per week by Maryland's faculty members average in excess of 60 hours per week as shown in the following table and discussion:

TABLE 15

AVERAGE TOTAL WORK WEEK - FULL-TIME FACULTY

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor	All Ranks
Community Colleges	63.2	61.0	62.9	60.9	62.0
State Colleges	63.6	62.0	62.7	63.9	63.0
University of Md.	62.9	62.6	61.7	58.1	61.7
Private	63.7	60.8	61.7	57.4	61.5
All Segments	63.2	61.9	62.3	60.6	62.1

While there exists a slight tendency for the number of total hours reported to increase as academic rank increases, the average total hours reported are noticeably consistent.

The following table indicates a fairly normal distribution of the total hours reported.

TABLE 16

RANGE OF TOTAL HOURS PER WEEK REPORTED BY FULL-TIME FACULTY

0-42	42-50	50-58	58-66	66-74	74-82	82 +
97	238	499	580	449	264	153

n = 2280

In order to put these results into perspective, the following quotes and comments are provided:

(1) Error in the reporting procedure would tend to inflate the number of hours due to duplicate reporting of effort. If a professor worked 20 hours per week on research in public transportation, he might misread the directions on the form and report these hours under both the research and the public service categories. Responses indicating gross errors of this type (over 90 total hours per week) were deleted from the calculation of average total hours worked per week.

(2) A study at Florida State University, based on a sample of forty eight faculty members, compared faculty workload data obtained from questionnaires with that obtained from faculty "diaries". The study concluded that significant differences did occur in the data and that the differences were more pronounced in Arts and Letters than in the other fields of knowledge examined.

- Sullivan, Patrick H., "Bias in Faculty Reports of Time and Effort Expenditure" Tomorrow's Imperatives Today, The Association for Institutional Research, 1973.

(3) A Summer, 1974 Jossey-Bass publication, "New Directions for Institutional Research: Assessing Faculty Effort", edited by James I. Doi, contains several interesting viewpoints: Robert Blackburn writes,

"The fact that academic people are more likely to be found reading than watching television (Gerstl, 1959; Anderson, 1967; Wilkensky and Ladinsky, 1967) illustrates the basic inability of distinguishing leisure activities from professional development. If an historian is reading a biography, he is engaged in both leisure and academic pursuits. When a sociologist scans the papers, he inevitably is applying what he read to his work, either in the classroom or in his scholarly investigations. Free time and work time are indistinguishable." (p. 78)

John Stecklein recounts a well known study:

"A different approach, designed to investigate the validity of criticism of the questionnaire survey approach, was used by Lorento in 1970 with the assistance of Higher Education Coordinating Commission in Minnesota. Drawing on self-sampling techniques used in business and industry, Lorento gave selected samples of faculty members small battery-operated units that emitted a tone at randomly determined intervals and instructed them to indicate on a small form the category of activity that they were performing at the time the beeper sounded, and reset the alarm for the next random interval ... By aggregating the records over the sample of faculty members, estimates of total work weeks and hours devoted to various activities were determined. Comparisons with findings obtained by traditional estimation methods showed fair comparability, although some variation was found in hours devoted to course preparation, departmental services, and professional development. Total work-week was about 10 percent lower than that reported by the faculty in the same units in a subsequent all-university survey using the traditional questionnaire technique." (p. 12)

(4) Almost all other studies report faculty workloads of 55 to 65 hours per week.

"Both historically and currently, faculty tend to work between fifty-five and sixty hours a week." (Blackburn, in Assessing Faculty Effort, p. 77)

"Ordinarily, the professional work week of the college or university instructor, like the work week of professional practitioners generally in the United States, exceeds 40 hours and is likely to run to 60 hours or more".

- Faculty Productivity, A Report Prepared by the Ohio Board of Regents 1969, p. 18.

"During our pilot test of our own Faculty Activity Analysis, the meaningful range of reported average hours per week was approximately 55 o 65 hours per week. In addition, it's important to note that this range of results has been confirmed again and again in a wide variety of studies that deal with the full range of faculty activities."

- Leonard Romney, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Utilization of Time by Full-Time Faculty Members

In all segments, the higher ranked faculty members devote a smaller percentage of their time to teaching and more time to other activities than do the lower ranked faculty members (Table 17).

As might be expected, faculty members in the community colleges report the highest percentages of time devoted to teaching while faculty members in the University reported the largest percentages devoted to research.

TABLE 17

PER CENT OF TIME SPENT PER WEEK IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES BY FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS

		Teaching	Research	Internal Service	Other
Community Colleges	Professor	61.4	15.9	18.6	4.1
	Associate	65.1	14.8	15.4	4.7
	Assistant	67.6	14.9	13.5	4.0
	Instructor	70.6	14.7	10.8	3.9
State Colleges	Professor	57.9	15.5	20.4	6.2
	Associate	63.5	13.5	17.8	5.2
	Assistant	64.3	17.8	13.7	4.2
	Instructor	66.0	16.6	13.4	4.0
University of Md.	Professor	43.8	30.2	19.2	6.8
	Associate	50.3	29.7	13.3	6.7
	Assistant	53.2	28.0	12.8	6.0
	Instructor	59.8	24.7	10.2	5.3
Private Colleges	Professor	52.9	21.4	19.9	5.8
	Associate	60.8	22.9	10.0	6.3
	Assistant	68.2	16.8	10.1	4.9
	Instructor	61.3	22.7	13.2	2.8
All Segments		59.1	21.1	14.5	5.3

Faculty members teaching in different fields of knowledge reported different patterns of time devoted to teaching, research, internal service and other activities. Agriculture and natural resources and engineering show the largest percentages devoted to research while the health professions and education indicate the largest percentages devoted to internal service. Agriculture and natural resources and library science are areas in which relatively large portions of time are devoted to public service.

Information obtained from other states generally did not include such percentage distributions of faculty time. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission reported that its study indicated that faculty members in Tennessee spend a larger percentage (over 80%) of their time in instructional activities than do faculty members in other states for which comparable data were available. Faculty members in Ohio were reported to spend approximately 75% of their time on instruction. Kansas reported a range of 53.9% at Kansas State University to 80.3% at Kansas State College. Washington reported a range of 60% at the University of Washington to 80% at Central Washington State College.

IV. Summary:

- Faculty members in Maryland's institutions of higher education report workloads similar to those reported by faculty members in other states.
- While the total reported hours worked per week is nearly the same for all segments, the percentages of time devoted to different activities vary according to institutional missions with University faculty members devoting a large portion of their time to research.
- The total workloads of the University faculty members appear to be within the recommended guidelines of the American Association of University Professors. (Guidelines for other segments were not available.)
- The analysis of courseload information by course level revealed nearly constant amounts of time expended in preparation and administration per credit hour taught, regardless of course levels.
- The production of student credit hours per full-time equivalent faculty member varied greatly by segment, by level of instruction, and by field of knowledge. The pattern of these variations are similar to those in data from other states.
- By enabling each institution to compare its own data with statewide averages, efficiency or its absence, at least in terms of faculty effort, may be recognized with a view toward future improvement.

The 1973 Tennessee report concluded the section on faculty workload by stating:

> "Still another factor that should guide interpretations of these data has to do with the measurement of faculty effectiveness. Although progress is being made in defining more clearly what some of the outputs of higher education are, evaluation techniques are not available that will measure how good a job faculty members are doing. Substitute measures such as average class size, and average workload are sometimes used by faculty. State legislatures and external agencies invoke other measurements such as hours of work, credit hour production, and number of graduates. Because such measures may be expressed in quantifiable terms, they are easy to evaluate and, thus, are frequently used in making decisions, etc. These kinds of measures are important and useful in educational decision making; however, they are not the only items that should guide public policy and decision making."

APPENDIX A: THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Name _____

(retained at institution)

MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

93 MAIN STREET

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

FACULTY ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME SURVEY

MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

93 Main Street—Annapolis
Maryland—21401

FACULTY ACTIVITY AND OUTCOME SURVEY

Academic Unit _____

Academic Rank		Employment Status	
Professor	____	Full time	____
Assoc. Professor	____		
Asst. Professor	____	Part time	____
Instructor	____		
Lecturer	____		
Other Faculty Title	____		
Administrator teaching part time	____		

Purpose of Survey:

This Faculty Activity and Outcome Survey is undertaken to obtain a meaningful and reliable profile of the range and extent of activities performed by faculty members in the public and private sectors of higher education in Maryland.

Workload differences between level and field of study and other relative factors are recognized. Data substantiating the extent of these differences are not readily available, and it is the development of these measures which this study can achieve. Responses to questions posed by governing boards, public groups, legislators, etc., will be supported by meaningful data.

It should be emphasized that this study is made in order to obtain measures, and is not an evaluation of the performance of an individual in the classroom or elsewhere on campus. It provides an opportunity for the faculty to inform others of the extent of their time commitments in fulfilling their unique, academic role. Individual anonymity is assured.

General Instructions:

The survey form details the activities in which faculty were involved during a typical work week this semester. The specific instructions for completing the survey are given on pages (4) and (6).

ACTIVITY ANALYSIS OF AN AVERAGE WEEK, SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

SECTION A: TEACHING ACTIVITIES

A. 1 Scheduled Teaching: Spring Semester, 1974
All activities related to courses (degree and nondegree, credit and noncredit, day or evening) given in the current term. These activities would include:

- Meeting informally with course participants
- Supervising these courses
- Meeting scheduled classes
- Grading
- Reading student papers
- Supervising teaching assistants
- Tutoring
- Supervising independent study
- Giving remedial help to course participants.
- Supervising laboratories
- Evaluating students
- Contacting guest lecturers
- Preparing lectures
- Preparing media

Instructions for Columns (a) through (i)

(a) Code each course corresponding to the following fields of knowledge.

01	Agriculture & Natural Resources	16	Library Science
02	Architecture & Environmental Design	17	Mathematics
03	Area Studies	18	Military Sciences
04	Biological Sciences	19	Physical Sciences
05	Business & Management	20	Psychology
06	Communications	21	Public Affairs & Services
07	Computer & Information Sciences	22	Social Sciences
08	Education	23	Theology
09	Engineering	49	Interdisciplinary Studies
10	Fine & Applied Arts	50	Business & Commerce Technologies
11	Foreign Languages	51	Data Processing Technologies
12	Health Professions	52	Health Services and Paramedical Technologies
13	Home Economics	53	Mechanial & Engineering Technologies
14	Law	54	Natural Science Technologies
15	Letters	55	Public Service Related Technologies

(Each Department Chairman has a complete list of areas within each major field of knowledge)

(b) Enter the course level code (see below)

(c) Enter the number of students enrolled and code (R) if course material is remedial (below college level) or (E) if it is extension (principally directed toward nonmatriculated students) or (O) if an overload course (any course in addition to the normal fulltime assignments for which additional compensation is received) or (V) vocational courses normally associated with two year career programs.

(d) Enter the number of student credit hours given for course. In the case of variable credit, give the credit hour range.

(e) Enter the method of instruction as coded below. When multiple methods are used, list them in order of importance.

(f) Enter the scheduled contact hours/week.

(g) Enter the average hours/week of unscheduled contact with students in course.

(h) Enter the average hours/week spent in preparing and arranging the activities of the current course.

(i) Enter the total average hours/week (sum of columns (f), (g), and (h) in Section A.1)

Method of Instruction Column (e)

Code	Method	Definition
A	Lecture	Formal presentation—primarily one-way communication
B	Laboratory	Instructing, preparing, and supervising student investigations
C	Recitation/Discussion	Two-way communication of course materials
D	Seminar	Group research directed by faculty
E	Independent Study	Students work independently with faculty direction
F	Tutorial	Students work one-to-one with the instructor
G	Programmed Instruction	Supervised, self-paced instruction

A. 2 Unscheduled Teaching: Teaching not associated with the specific courses listed in A. 1. For example:

- Thesis committee participation
- Thesis advising
- Student honors committees
- Guest lecturing in another faculty member's course
- Direct instruction on special equipment

A. 3 Academic Program Advising: Giving advice to students concerning course scheduling and academic programs. Not to be confused with counseling that is included in C.1.

A. 4 Course and Curriculum Research and Development. Developing and preparing for future courses. For example:

- Preparing course outlines
- Developing book lists
- Evaluating courses
- Devising new instructional materials
- Revising existing materials
- Planning summer or intersession programs
- Developing department curriculum requirements
- Evaluating teaching effectiveness and planning changes

Level Codes Column (b) and (p)

Code	Description	Code	Description
A	Preparatory	D	Upper division and graduate
B	Lower division	E	Graduate
C	Upper division	F	Professional
		G	Other

ACTIVITY ANALYSIS, SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

SECTION A: TEACHING ACTIVITIES										PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION TO INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES					
A. 1 SCHEDULED TEACHING: SPRING SEMESTER, 1974															
(a) FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE	(b) COURSE LEVEL	(c) SECTION Enrollment	(c) SECTION Code (R Remedial, E Extension, O Overload, V Vocational)	(d) CREDIT HOURS	(e) METHOD OF INSTRUCTION	f+g+h=i (f) FORMAL CONTACT HOURS	(g) OTHER CONTACT HOURS	(h) PREPARATION & ADMINISTRATION	(i) AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK	(j) % STUDENT GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	(k) % CREATION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND ART FORMS	(l) % INSEPARABLE COMBINATION OF (j) & (k)	(m) % SERVICE AND DEVELOPMENT	(n) % GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES	(o) % PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
SCHEDULED TEACHING ACTIVITIES					SUBTOTAL										

	(a) LEVEL	(b) ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION								
A.2 UNSCHEDULED TEACHING										
UNSCHEDULED TEACHING ACTIVITIES			SUBTOTAL							

A.3 ACADEMIC PROGRAM ADVISING										
ADVISORY ACTIVITIES			SUBTOTAL							

A.4 COURSE AND CURRICULUM RES. & DEVELOP.										
			SUBTOTAL							

OUTCOME DEFINITIONS

This section of the form allows you to indicate what outcomes your activities principally benefit. Please try to make a rough estimate of the percentage distribution for each of your activities to the following outcomes:

(j) Student Growth and Development: Results and benefits of activities that contribute to enhancing personal, social, academic, and/or career aspects of students who are registered in the institution.

(k) Development of New Knowledge and Art Forms: Results and benefits of activities that contribute to the development, storage, utilization, and/or appreciation of knowledge and art.

(l) Inseparable Combination of (j) and (k): Results and benefits of activities that contribute to both student growth and development and creation of new knowledge and art forms and cannot be separated. (It is preferable to separate these it possible.)

(m) Development and Service to society: Results and benefits of activities that contribute to educational growth in and provide short- or long-term utility to the society.

(n) General Institutional Support: Results and benefits of activities that contribute to maintaining the institution.

(o) Personal Professional Growth: Results and benefits of activities that contribute principally to your professional growth.

ACTIVITY ANALYSIS OF SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

SECTION B: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES

B.1 Specific Projects: Research, scholarship, and creative work activity related to a specific project. For example:

- Departmental research
- Sponsored research
- Performing your professional skill
- Your dissertation research
- Reviewing a colleague's research work
- Writing or developing research proposals
- Administering research grants
- Giving recitals
- Maintaining an artistic skill
- Writing articles
- Writing books
- Writing reviews
- Creating new art forms
- Exhibitions

B.2 General Scholarship and Professional Development: All research, scholarship, and creative work activities related to keeping current in a professional field. For example:

- Reading articles and books related to your profession
- Officer in a professional society
- Attending professional meetings
- Attending seminars
- Research-related discussion with colleagues
- Editor of a journal

SECTION C: INTERNAL SERVICE ACTIVITIES

This section includes activities related to general contact with students, to professional responsibilities within other organizational units within the institution, and to fulfilling institutional requests.

C.1 Student-oriented Service: For example:

- Personal, career, and financial counseling
- Preparing recommendations
- Recruiting students
- Sponsoring student organizations
- Attending student recitals
- Coaching intramural or intercollegiate athletics
- Directing the band, orchestra, student plays, debate team, or and other student group

C.2 Administrative Duties: For example:

- Performing the duties of a department chairman, dean, vice-president or any other administrative position
- Administering personnel policies
- Faculty service reports and questionnaires
- Keeping records
- Preparing minutes
- Writing and answering memoranda
- Assigning faculty course loads
- Preparing budgets
- Gathering data
- Helping during registration
- Interviewing candidates for faculty positions
- Escorting visitors
- Recruiting faculty
- Advising on library purchases
- Recruiting students

C.3 Committee Participation. For example:

- Admission committees
- Departmental meetings
- Faculty senate
- Planning committees
- Administration committees

Code the level of these activities as described at the foot of the form.

SECTION D: PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES

This section includes activities that are directed outside the institution (except for those associated with community education (extension instruction), which should be included in A.1).

General Professional Services/Advice Directed Outside the Institution: Activities meant to benefit the community outside the institution. For example:

- Consulting
- Advising
- Professionally performing as in plays, orchestras
- Community training grants
- Patient care
- Lectures or seminars for the public
- Agricultural extension
- Urban extension

ACTIVITY ANALYSIS OF SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

ACTIVITY	(a) ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	(b) AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK	PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION TO INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES					
			(g) % STUDENT GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	(h) % CREATION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND ART FORMS	(i) % INSEPARABLE COMBINATION OF (g) & (h)	(m) % SERVICE AND DEVELOPMENT	(n) % GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES	(o) % PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
SECTION B: RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP & CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES — B.1 SPECIFIC PROJECTS								
B.2 GENERAL SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT								
	SUBTOTAL RESEARCH							
SECTION C: INTERNAL SERVICE ACTIVITIES — C.1 STUDENT-ORIENTED SERVICE								
CODE LEVEL								
C.2 ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES								
C.3 COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION								
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE							
SECTION D: PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES — GENERAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICE ADVICE DIRECTED OUTSIDE THE INSTITUTION								
	SUBTOTAL SERVICE							
	TOTAL HOURS/WEEK							

LEVEL OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Code	Level
1	Department / Unit
2	College / School / Division
3	Campuswide
4	Systemwide / Statewide

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ANALYSES ON THE FACULTY ACTIVITY SURVEY

(Performed by C. Mitchell Dayton at the University of Maryland for MCHE)

Numerous statistical tests have been performed on the Faculty Activity Survey data. These detailed analyses support the more general results stated in Chapter III, but do not contain any significant additional conclusions. The statistical report is composed of three major parts:

Analysis of Percentage of Time - This section consists of a graphical presentation of the percentage distributions of faculty time by academic rank and type of institution.

Discriminant Analyses - This set of analyses focosed on locating teachers who exhibited certain specific behaviors at an extreme rate (i.e., either extremely often or extremely seldom); having defined such groups (upper and lower quartiles), the groups were compared on several background variables in order to determine whether or not this "extremeness" was associated with other salient features within the study. Faculty members with certain characteristics (academic rank, full-time/part time and type of employing institution) were studied with respect to research involvement, public service involvement, institutional service involvement and novelty in teaching style. These studies generally served to reinforce general stereotypes (e.g. University faculty members have a greater involvement in research activities than do faculty members in the community colleges)although the University faculty members were found to employ a relatively frequent use of "novelty" teaching styles, defined as independent study, tutorial, and programmed instruction.

Correlation Analyses: These analyses focused on the relationship between research involvement and other categories of activity from the Survey. Comparisons of observed correlations with those predicted on the basis of a multinomial distribution indicated that research activity and advising or institutional service are not independent competitors for a faculty members' time in the University segment. Rather, those teachers who spend, say, a large portion of their time in research are likely to spend less time in advising or in institutional service than would be expected

simply on the basis of the reduced non-research portion of their time. No conclusive results were obtained for faculty members in the other segments.

Limited copies of these statistical analyses are available from the Maryland Council for Higher Education.