

Full-time Faculty Survey Report

Draft 2/17/00

Prepared for the Ohio Board of Regents

Report prepared by:

Robert Sheehan, Ph.D., Director, Higher Education Information Systems
Stephanie McCann, Analyst
Ohio Board of Regents

Note: The authors of this report acknowledge and are grateful for contributions to this report provided by the HEI Advisory Committee, the *ad hoc* Full-Time Faculty Survey Committee, the staff of the Ohio Board of Regents, and to Dr. Kathleen Carr, President of Strategic Research Group of Columbus.

Draft 2/17/00

Full-time Faculty Survey Report

Background for Survey

The Ohio Board of Regents is frequently asked to provide data to the public and state policy makers regarding the activities of faculty throughout Ohio's state supported Colleges and Universities. For many years the Regents would collect such data from all faculty in the state for summer and fall terms using an instrument called the Faculty Service Report (FSR). Such data collection was labor intensive for campuses and generated data of questionable integrity due to the nature of some of its data elements as well as the FSR's lack of respondent confidentiality at the campus level. Winter of 1998 marked the implementation of an entirely new Higher Education Information (HEI) system at the Regents. Details of the HEI system are to be found at:

<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/>

As part of HEI's development an alternative method of data collection to the FSR was suggested in 1998 that involved a mail survey of a scientifically stratified sample of faculty. In January, 1999 the Ohio Board of Regents conducted a survey of full-time faculty from state-funded colleges and universities. The survey is designed to capture basic information about full-time faculty activity. This report of the results of the survey considers these three guiding questions:

Questions Guiding Survey of Full-Time Faculty

1. What is the full-time faculty *professional* profile (tenure status, type of institution do they work for, academic area, etc.) for Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?¹
2. What activities constitute faculty work for full-time faculty at Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?
3. What recent changes in activity, if any, are perceived to have occurred in the work patterns of full-time faculty at Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?

In order to focus on faculty activity in a comprehensive manner, full-time faculty and part-time faculty are being treated in different surveys. The 1999 survey was designed only for full-time faculty. A survey of part-time faculty will be conducted in the winter of 2000. The results of these two surveys, in conjunction with other data from the HEI system will provide a useful profile of the activities engaged in by Ohio's public college and university faculty. This report is for the Full-time Faculty Survey.

¹ The Full-time Faculty Survey captures information on only the professional profile of faculty; no demographic information is collected. Demographic data are collected in other Regents' reports.

Survey Methodology

A weighted, stratified, random sample of full-time faculty was selected from a population of all full-time faculty names submitted to the Board of Regents by campuses. The survey was designed by Regents staff with the guidance of a committee of faculty representatives. A copy of the survey is to be found at:

<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/faculty/facsurvey.pdf>

The survey was designed as a six page mail survey, mailed January, 1999 directly to respondents at their work address with a business reply, postage paid reply envelope. Surveys were returned throughout the Winter and early Spring of 1999. Actual sampling of the survey respondents, mailing of the surveys, data collection and data analysis was conducted by a third party contractor (Strategy Team, Inc.²) who then forwarded the computerized survey responses to the Regents for analysis without institutional identification on the surveys. Hence the specific institution associated with each individual response is unknown. There was a 56% response rate of surveyed respondents. Staff of the Strategy Team Inc. prepared an institutional response rate summary (See Table 1). Responses to the survey were weighted proportionately to reflect the known population size of full-time faculty at each institution at the time of the survey.

² The Principal Investigator on this Board of Regents project for the Strategy Team, Inc is Kathleen Carr who has since affiliated with the Strategic Research Group of Columbus, OH.

Table 1: Population Size and Response Rates of Full-Time Faculty

School	Total Faculty	Number Sampled	Number Received	Percent Response
University of Akron	733	223	161	72%
Belmont Technical College	33	33	24	73%
Bowling Green State University	644	196	90	46%
Central State University	68	68	27	40%
Central Ohio Technical College	52	50	27	54%
University of Cincinnati	1,817	552	269	49%
Cincinnati State Technical and Community College	153	58	34	59%
Clark State Community College	56	56	39	70%
Cleveland State University	484	141	67	48%
Cuyahoga Community College	345	105	59	56%
Edison State Community College	38	38	26	68%
Hocking Technical College	187	53	28	53%
Jefferson Community College	35	35	22	63%
Kent State University	1,010	282	162	57%
Lakeland Community College	128	46	35	76%
Lima Technical College	85	85	60	71%
Lorain County Community College	99	99	73	74%
Marion Technical College	33	33	21	64%
Medical College of Ohio	348	106	68	64%
Miami University	864	259	138	53%
Northeastern Ohio Universities - College of Medicine	42	40	34	85%
North Central State College	66	66	45	68%
Northwest State Community College	40	40	26	65%
Ohio University	923	302	156	52%
Ohio State University	3,325	1,035	462	45%
Owen State Community College	133	41	32	78%
Shawnee State University	111	32	16	50%
Sinclair Community College	295	97	50	52%
Southern State Community College	43	43	27	63%
Stark State College of Technology	104	22	14	64%
Terra State Community College	50	48	25	52%
University of Toledo	618	186	101	54%
Washington State Community College	56	56	42	75%
Wright State University	639	212	121	57%
Youngstown State University	410	132	86	65%
Muskingum Area Technical College	49	49	44	90%
Columbus State Community College	241	62	46	74%
No Identification	0	0	25	
TOTAL	14,357	4,981	2,782	56%

Availability of Survey Data for Query Purposes

This survey had 17 questions and many of the questions had numerous sub-questions. Tables presented in this report represent specific responses to the three questions guiding the full-time survey. There are other data tables that may be of interest to policy makers in the state that may not be included in this report. To accommodate such requests, a public query tool has been developed which will allow those interested readers to create such tables with ease. This query tool (using Netscape's Navigator browser) allows users to choose fields from the survey and have an aggregate analysis performed and returned to their own personal computer as a spreadsheet (e.g. Excel) or ASCII text file. This query tool can be found at:

[http://hei.regents.state.oh.us/cgi-pub/hotlink?\\$hei fime query](http://hei.regents.state.oh.us/cgi-pub/hotlink?$hei%20fime%20query)

Note: The query tool does not work well with Microsoft's Internet Explorer browser.

Persons using this query tool are reminded that the data may be aggregated in a variety of ways, however there are no specific institutional identifiers and no personal identifiers in the computerized database. Persons with questions about use of this query tool should email Robert Sheehan at rsheehan@regents.state.oh.us or Stephanie McCann at smccann@regents.state.oh.us

A Note of Appreciation

The Board of Regents would like to thank and congratulate the faculty and staff who participated in the design of this survey, as well as those faculty who took the time to complete the survey. The information generated by this survey contributes to our statewide understanding of one of higher education's most important resources - the dedicated faculty of our colleges and universities.

SURVEY RESULTS

Full-time Faculty Professional Profile for State-funded Higher Education Institutions in Ohio

Faculty Distribution

Of the statewide full-time faculty population, most are employed by university main campuses.

Table 2: Distribution of Full-time Faculty Across Institution Type

Institution Type	Percentage
Community College	11.2%
Technical College	4.4%
Com-Tech*	2.0%
Univ Main Campus	69.8%
Univ Regional Campus	7.9%
Free-stand Med School	4.6%
Total	100.0%

Tenured Faculty

The percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured is consistent among the different institutions types (63% to 69%), except for the free-standing medical schools where 37% of faculty are tenured and technical schools where 9.7 % are tenured. The low tenure percentage for technical colleges is related to the fact that many technical institutions do not grant tenure to any faculty. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of faculty at technical institutions report their institution as a non-tenure granting institution. However, a higher proportion of faculty, almost 30%, report that they were on continuing contract at the technical institutions.

Table 3: Percentage of Full-time Faculty by Tenure Status

Institution Type	Tenure Status					Total
	Tenured	Tenure-track	Non-tenure-track	Continuing Contract	Institution does not grant tenure	
Community College	63.8%	19.4%	1.5%	8.3%	7.0%	100.0%
Technical College	9.7%	1.0%	1.5%	29.8%	58.0%	100.0%
Com-Tech	69.8%	12.7%	0%	10.2%	7.3%	100.0%
Univ Main Campus	65.9%	21.9%	9.3%	2.5%	0.5%	100.0%
Univ Regional Campus	63.5%	27.2%	8.3%	1.0%	0%	100.0%
Free-stand Med School	37.3%	27.5%	29.2%	4.4%	1.6%	100.0%
Total	61.8%	21.2%	8.8%	4.4%	3.8%	100.0%

* Com-Tech = Community Technical College, a two year degree-granting unit at certain urban university main campuses.

Faculty Rank

The majority of full-time faculty report being ranked as some variation of professor, with approximately 90% of all full-time faculty being professors, associate professors, or assistant professors. Only 7.6 % of all full-time faculty are reported as lecturers or instructors.

University main campuses and community colleges employ more professors than other faculty ranks, 35.4% and 32.3% respectively. Technical colleges employ more associate professors than other ranks. University regional campuses employ more assistant professors than any other rank, 46.2% (vs. only 14.1 % ranks as professor). Free-standing medical schools also employ more assistant professors than any other rank at 37.8 % (vs. 30.4% full professors).

Table 4: Percentage of Faculty by Academic Rank

Institution Type	Faculty Rank						Total
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks	
Community College	32.3%	25.3%	25.7%	14.4%	.3%	1.9%	100.0%
Technical College	24.1%	28.1%	17.3%	24.8%	1.0%	4.6%	100.0%
Com-Tech	24.7%	18.1%	12.7%	22.8%	3.2%	18.5%	100.0%
Univ Main Campus	35.4%	30.1%	28.8%	5.3%	.4%	.1%	100.0%
Univ Regional Campus	14.1%	31.0%	46.2%	8.1%	.6%	0%	100.0%
Free-stand Med School	30.4%	29.5%	37.8%	2.3%	0%	0%	100.0%
Total	32.3%	29.2%	29.5%	7.6%	.5%	.8%	100.0%

Academic Area

The percentage of faculty per academic area varies by sector. Not unexpectedly, community college, technical college, and community-technical college faculty most often report an academic area of Technical Program, and the free-standing medical school faculty report an academic area of Medical and Health Science (94%). Faculty at university main campuses also report an academic area of Medical and Health Science most often (17.8%), with the next highest percentage of faculty reporting Social and Behavioral Science academic area. Finally, university regional campuses faculty report being in the Humanities academic area (17.5 %) most often. Overall, for all institution types, most faculty report an academic area of Medical and Health Science (20%).

Table 5: Percentage of Full-time Faculty by Academic Area

Academic Area	Institution Type						Total
	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
Agriculture	.2%	5.4%	0%	3.1%	13.3%	0%	3.5%
Computer Science	3.9%	3.4%	.5%	1.5%	2.1%	0%	1.8%
Education	5.8%	.5%	1.6%	7.7%	6.5%	.8%	6.6%
Engineering	3.4%	4.8%	4.7%	7.1%	2.4%	0%	5.8%
Law	.4%	.7%		1.6%	0%	0%	1.2%
Art	2.7%	.2%	1.6%	7.0%	3.9%	0%	5.5%
Business	6.0%	6.7%	5.9%	6.5%	3.3%	0%	5.9%
Humanities	14.7%	4.4%	9.2%	12.2%	17.5%	.8%	12.0%
Math & Natural Science	17.0%	8.6%	16.1%	14.2%	15.3%	1.5%	13.8%
Med & Health Science	13.7%	15.3%	9.8%	17.8%	9.7%	94.0%	20.0%
Public Admin	1.3%	3.3%		.6%	.6%		.8%
Social & Behav Sci	7.5%	8.4%	11.7%	16.0%	11.5%	1.3%	13.6%
Tech Programs	18.8%	34.3%	35.0%	1.2%	12.2%	0%	6.1%
Interdisciplinary	.9%	1.1%	0%	.6%	0%	1.0%	.6%
Other	3.8%	3.1%	3.8%	2.6%	1.6%	.8%	2.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Faculty Activity: What Constitutes Faculty Work?

Full-time faculty were asked to consider their activity under the categories of teaching, research/scholarship/performance, professional growth, administration, service to profession and professional public service.

Teaching included teaching, grading papers, preparing courses; developing new curricula; advising or supervising students; working with student organizations or intramural athletics.

Research/Scholarship/Performance included research; reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing grant proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches.

Professional Growth included taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree, participating in faculty externships; or engaging in practices or activities to remain current in an academic field.

Service to profession included service to professional societies/association; being an officer or member of professional organizations.

Administration included only administrative tasks performed for a faculty member's home institution, including service on technology advisory committees, president's cabinet, university senate, business and industry advisory committee, or accreditation committee.

Professional Public Service included paid or unpaid community service; providing legal or medical services or psychological services to clients or patients.

While we recognize these are not mutually exclusive categories, faculty were asked to think of their activity's primary focus and group the activity as if the categories were exclusive. For this question, faculty were asked to focus on time spent per activity during the 1998 Fall Term only. Across the state, faculty said that more time was spent on teaching (51.2% of time) than on other activities. The second highest amount of time was delegated to research, scholarship, performance (20.4%) and administrative (13.1%) activities.

Table 6: Percent of Work Time Spent by Activity in the Fall Term of 1998

Activity	Percentage
Teaching	51.2%
Research, Scholarship, Performance	20.4%
Professional Growth	5.3%
Administration	13.1%
Service to Profession	3.7%
Professional public service	3.6%
Other paid or unpaid service	1.9%
Total reported percentages	99.20%

Activity by Rank and Institution Type

The amount of time spent on different activities varies across rank and institution type. Table 6 reflects this multitude of data. An extensive review of this table is not possible for this report; therefore, only a few items of interest are discussed here.

Professors (all ranks--full, associate, and assistant) at community and technical colleges tended to report more time spent in teaching (67-81%) than did professors at university main campuses, regional campuses, and free-standing medical schools (30-58%). Compare, for example, the average professor at the community college who reported 67.4% of time spent teaching versus the average professor at a university main campus who reported 43.5% time spent teaching. For most institution types, professors reported less time spent on teaching than did associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers: the range differed according to the institution type. For example, at university main campuses professors, associate professors and assistant professors reported 43.5%, 47.3%, and 46.7% (respectively) on teaching. The range was wider at university regional campuses where professors reported 42.3% of time spent teaching and associate professors, and assistant professors reported much more time on teaching (60.8% and 58.7%).

Expectedly, professors at university main campuses and free-standing medical schools tended to spend more time on research, scholarship, performance (25.0% and 27.4%) than community college professors (5.3%). University regional campus professors tended to report more time spent in research, scholarship, performance than university main campus professors; at regional campuses the average time spent on research, scholarship, performance was 27.3% of time. Associate and assistant professors at regional campuses reported less time on research, scholarship, performance--14.9% and 16.4%, but still twice as much as their counterparts at community colleges (their similar mission) where associate professors reported 7.4% and assistant professors reported 5.5% on research, scholarship, performance.

After teaching and research, scholarship, performance, the next highest amount of activity reported is in administration. Percentage of time spent in administration is fairly consistent across institution type, but varies somewhat across rank. In general, professors spent more time on administrative activity than did associate professors, assistant professors, or lecturers (the rank "other" tended to report an amount of time spent on administration that equaled or exceeded the amount reported by professors). For example, on average the university regional campus professor reported an average of 16.8% of time spent on administration, while the associate professor reported 10.7%, the assistant professor reported 11.2% and the lecturer reported 8.2%. Similar ranges were reported at the other institution types.

Table 7: Percentage of Work Time Spent by Activity, Rank, and Institution Type during the 1998 Fall Term

Institution Type	Activity	Rank						Total*
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks	
Community College	Teaching	67.4	67.9	74.1	70.2	46.2	62.4	69.5
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	5.3	7.4	5.5	5.2	11.5	6.8	5.9
	Professional growth	5.9	7.6	6.7	8.4	6.3	8.3	6.9
	Administration	14.0	9.9	8.0	8.1	20.1	7.4	10.5
	Service to profession	2.8	3.1	2.1	2.9	9.0	3.7	2.7
	Professional public service	1.8	2.3	2.3	1.1	8.9	8.7	2.1
	Other paid or unpaid service	1.6	2.3	1.6	3.0	0.0	2.6	2.0
	Total*	98.8	100.5	100.3	98.9	102	99.9	99.6
Technical College	Teaching	71.8	71.9	75.5	76.2	25.0	64.4	72.7
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	5.1	4.6	2.6	4.2	7.0	3.0	4.2
	Professional growth	5.4	8.0	9.1	7.7	8.5	5.2	7.4
	Administration	11.5	10.3	7.2	4.9	42.0	19.6	9.4
	Service to profession	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	9.5	2.3	2.1
	Professional public service	3.1	1.8	2.5	4.4	6.5	1.4	2.9
	Other paid or unpaid service	5.8	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.5	4.1	2.3
	Total*	104.7	99.8	100.1	100	100	100	101
Com-Tech	Teaching	62.2	74.9	81.7	81.9	22.5	78.3	73.2
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	5.4	3.8	3.8	2.7	7.5	5.3	4.3
	Professional growth	5.3	8.7	8.5	5.0	6.0	3.1	5.8
	Administration	14.2	6.6	3.5	6.5	14.0	8.9	8.7
	Service to profession	2.7	2.3	1.2	2.2	5.0	2.7	2.4
	Professional public service	9.4	2.1	1.0	0.6	0.0	1.3	3.2
	Other paid or unpaid service	0.8	1.7	0.3	1.0	45.0	0.4	2.3
	Total*	100	100.1	100	99.9	100	100	99.9

*Note: Due to the nature of respondent's answers, totals may not equal 100%

Table 7: Percentage of Work Time Spent by Activity, Rank, and Institution Type during the 1998 Fall Term (Continued)

Institution Type	Activity	Rank						Total*
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks	
Univ Main Campus	Teaching	43.5	47.3	46.7	68.7	28.7	30.0	46.8
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	25.0	23.8	27.4	7.8	5.5	5.0	24.3
	Professional growth	4.3	5.5	4.8	5.3	2.3	5.0	4.8
	Administration	17.9	14.7	9.4	7.5	4.8	50.0	13.9
	Service to profession	4.7	3.8	3.5	2.1	4.7	5.0	3.9
	Professional public service	2.4	3.1	4.6	2.9	0.0	5.0	3.2
	Other paid or unpaid service	1.7	1.1	2.4	1.9	37.7	0.0	1.9
	Total*	99.5	99.3	98.8	96.2	83.7	100	98.8
Univ Regional Campus	Teaching	42.3	60.8	58.3	71.5	20.0	0.0	57.6
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	27.3	14.9	16.3	6.5	65.0	0.0	17.0
	Professional growth	4.6	5.6	6.4	6.5	5.0	0.0	5.9
	Administration	16.8	10.7	11.2	8.2	5.0	0.0	11.6
	Service to profession	6.1	1.6	2.7	2.6	1.0	0.0	2.8
	Professional public service	2.6	3.8	3.4	3.9	1.0	0.0	3.4
	Other paid or unpaid service	0.3	1.1	1.5	0.7	3.0	0.0	1.2
	Total*	100	98.5	99.8	99.9	100	0.0	99.5
Free-stand Med School	Teaching	31.0	26.9	36.5	45.0	0.0	0.0	32.2
	Research, Scholarship, Performance	27.4	22.1	28.3	11.7	0.0	0.0	25.8
	Professional growth	4.5	4.4	5.0	11.7	0.0	0.0	4.8
	Administration	22.1	16.4	9.9	19.3	0.0	0.0	15.7
	Service to profession	4.5	8.0	3.8	11.7	0.0	0.0	5.4
	Professional public service	5.7	16.8	16.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	12.8
	Other paid or unpaid service	2.1	3.7	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
	Total*	97.3	98.3	100.3	100.1	0.0	0.0	98.7

*Note: Due to the nature of respondent's answers, totals may not equal 100%

Activity by Academic Discipline

Activities of faculty were also analyzed by academic discipline. As Table 8 indicates, faculty in Technical programs, Computer Science, Humanities, Business and Art report spending the greatest percentage of their time teaching (from 68% to 54%). Faculty in Agriculture, Medical and Health Sciences, Interdisciplinary, Law and Engineering spent the lowest percentage of their time teaching compared to other disciplines (from 38% to 48%). Faculty in Engineering, Social & Behavioral Sciences, Math and Natural Sciences, Law, and Agriculture report spending the greatest percentage of their time in research, scholarship, performance compared to other disciplines (from 28% to 23%).

Table 8: Percent of Work Time Spent by Activity in the Fall Term of 1998

Academic Area	Activity							Total*
	Teaching	Research, Scholarship, performance	Professional growth	Administration	Service to profession	Professional public service	Other paid of unpaid service	
Agriculture	38.09%	23.35%	6.50%	20.39%	4.37%	3.18%	2.74%	98.62%
Computer Science	64.02%	9.11%	6.03%	14.60%	1.67%	0.98%	1.07%	97.48%
Education	51.68%	17.57%	5.53%	14.95%	4.51%	3.57%	2.20%	100.01%
Engineering	47.98%	27.92%	4.10%	11.98%	4.07%	1.64%	2.14%	99.83%
Law	45.16%	24.24%	2.70%	19.86%	4.33%	2.43%	5.46%	104.18%
Art	54.05%	19.86%	6.76%	13.67%	2.65%	1.87%	0.99%	99.85%
Business	57.96%	18.36%	5.21%	10.65%	3.81%	2.17%	1.22%	99.38%
Humanities	58.61%	18.11%	4.51%	13.12%	3.13%	1.31%	1.20%	99.99%
Math & Natural Science	54.76%	24.42%	4.51%	11.07%	2.96%	1.03%	0.83%	99.58%
Med & Health Science	41.35%	20.91%	5.34%	12.59%	4.47%	9.53%	2.81%	97.00%
Public Admin	49.81%	22.20%	5.44%	8.60%	5.06%	6.29%	1.37%	98.77%
Social & Behav Sci	48.22%	25.01%	4.87%	14.18%	3.60%	2.48%	0.99%	99.35%
Tech Programs	68.42%	5.60%	7.07%	11.65%	2.70%	1.88%	2.82%	100.14%
Interdisciplinary	43.33%	20.72%	6.98%	10.34%	5.96%	3.26%	1.31%	91.90%
Other	45.50%	14.48%	7.89%	14.78%	4.58%	3.85%	6.30%	97.38%

*Note: Due to the nature of respondent's answers, totals may not equal 100%

Specific Research and Teaching Activities by Institution and Rank

The broad categories of activity that were defined in Table 8 were also broken down into specific tasks. Faculty were asked whether they had performed specific activities during the previous academic year (between the end of the 1997 Fall Term and the end of the 1998 Fall Term)*. Tables 9 and 10 reflect the percentage of faculty who answered that they **did** perform specific tasks. Table 9 looks at these responses across institution type. The final column of Table 9 provides totals for all faculty. Table 10 looks at the same activities across faculty rank. Statistics vary according to the activity.

* Future references in this document to the previous academic year refer to the period between the end of the 1997 Fall Term and the end of the 1998 Fall Term.

One notable area includes alternative learning systems. Technology seems to be influencing the faculty world no less than the rest of the world. Overall, between 26.2 % and 46.4 % of faculty developed or administered courses using alternative learning systems in the previous academic year. Also, a large percentage of faculty are publishing research; overall, 66.4 % of faculty reported publishing a book, monograph, article, or abstract in the previous academic year. This activity tended to be concentrated more among faculty employed at university main and free-standing medical institutions. For example, 77.1% of faculty at university main campuses and 75.4% of faculty at free-standing medical schools reported publishing a book, monograph, or other scholarly work in the previous academic year. University regional campus faculty are the next highest percentage (57.8%) in this category, while under 27% of community and technical institution faculty reported publishing activity in the previous academic year. Similar percentage differences occurred in the other research related activities.

Table 9: Percentage of Respondents who Spent Time in Selected Activities in the Previous Academic Year, by Institution Type

Activity	Institution Type						Total
	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free Standing Med School	
Develop a new course or program	69.1%	62.3%	80.1%	64.0%	67.2%	48.8%	64.3%
Teach summer school classes	65.2%	57.6%	49.0%	47.0%	58.4%	38.9%	50.0%
Mentor faculty	65.3%	53.9%	47.7%	54.3%	57.2%	47.0%	55.3%
Market a new program or recruit students	57.9%	63.0%	70.3%	58.5%	52.0%	47.5%	57.9%
Develop or administer alternative learning systems	46.4%	45.9%	26.2%	39.3%	44.0%	45.0%	40.8%
Publish a book, monograph, article, abstract, etc.	26.6%	17.9%	19.7%	77.1%	57.8%	75.4%	66.4%
Present a paper at a conference	30.3%	17.3%	24.4%	73.7%	58.9%	66.9%	64.2%
Give a formal or creative performance, etc.	15.7%	15.2%	9.0%	17.6%	16.1%	19.2%	17.1%
Write a research grant proposal	18.3%	15.4%	7.1%	60.4%	47.2%	54.1%	51.5%
Receive research grant funding	11.3%	11.1%	1.1%	48.7%	33.7%	47.5%	40.9%

Table 10: Percentage of Respondents that Spent Time in Selected Activities in the Previous Academic Year, by Faculty Rank

Activity	Rank					
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks
Develop a new course or program	63.3%	67.2%	65.0%	56.6%	40.6%	65.8%
Teach summer school classes	52.3%	55.9%	42.1%	50.6%	34.9%	41.5%
Mentor faculty	72.5%	62.2%	35.0%	34.2%	25.1%	58.2%
Market a new program or recruit students	62.2%	59.7%	54.0%	46.8%	48.2%	68.7%
Develop or administer alternative learning systems	41.1%	41.1%	42.3%	33.3%	20.6%	50.0%
Publish a book, monograph, article, abstract, etc.	75.9%	69.3%	65.9%	21.9%	28.2%	26.4%
Present a paper at a conference	71.4%	65.2%	66.2%	26.7%	35.5%	25.7%
Give a formal or creative performance, etc.	18.2%	16.9%	16.4%	18.0%	0%	7.3%
Write a research grant proposal	55.2%	51.5%	58.6%	15.3%	16.6%	9.2%
Receive research grant funding	46.1%	40.4%	45.6%	8.1%	10.2%	2.9%

Specific Research and Teaching Activities by Academic Discipline

The specific research and teaching activities of full-time faculty were also analyzed by academic discipline. These data are presented in Table 11. As these data indicate, faculty across all disciplines are quite active in developing new coursework of programs. New state licensing requirements in Education might be influencing the unusually high percentage of faculty in education (77%) who report developing new courses or programs, but other disciplines (e.g. Humanities – 76%) are report high involvement of faculty in developing new courses or programs. With the exception of faculty in Technical programs (26%), Computer Science (42%) and Art (47%), a majority of faculty in all other disciplines report having published a book, monograph, article or abstract in the previous year. A majority of faculty in most disciplines also report engaging in mentoring activities with other faculty.

Table 11: Percentage of Respondents that Spent Time in Selected Activities in Previous Academic year, By Discipline

Academic Area	Activity									
	Develop a new course or program	Teach summer school classes	Mentor faculty	Market a new program or recruit students	Develop or administer alternative learning systems	Publish a book, monograph, article, abstract, etc.	Present a paper at a conference	Give a formal or creative performance, etc.	Write a research grant proposal	Receive Grant Funding
Agriculture	69%	30%	57%	76%	44%	82%	82%	14%	70%	65%
Computer Science	68%	56%	70%	71%	56%	42%	43%	7%	45%	38%
Education	77%	72%	60%	65%	41%	65%	76%	12%	61%	46%
Engineering	59%	27%	52%	72%	44%	77%	74%	11%	74%	67%
Law	61%	36%	50%	57%	20%	75%	64%	8%	35%	45%
Art	66%	48%	62%	73%	26%	65%	47%	81%	44%	36%
Business	69%	59%	52%	57%	51%	66%	65%	6%	37%	23%
Humanities	76%	51%	56%	47%	41%	74%	71%	24%	42%	32%
Math & Natural Science	57%	50%	48%	48%	38%	70%	66%	12%	60%	51%
Med & Health Science	56%	44%	56%	52%	41%	65%	63%	13%	52%	43%
Public Admin	59%	76%	74%	71%	48%	51%	64%	15%	52%	19%
Social & Behav Sci	65%	55%	58%	60%	37%	78%	75%	11%	59%	45%
Tech Programs	71%	60%	56%	69%	45%	21%	26%	9%	21%	9%
Interdisciplinary	82%	54%	64%	64%	50%	48%	60%	25%	58%	43%
Other	45%	37%	44%	43%	54%	52%	43%	25%	40%	24%

Specific Service Activity by Institution and Rank

Tables 12 and 13 look at service related activities. Table 12 focuses on this activity across institution type. The final column of Table 12 provides overall totals for all faculty. Table 13 considers the activity across faculty rank. Most faculty (between 88.4% and 96.5 %, 91.9 % overall) of all ranks at all institutions served on committees at the institution. The type of committee varies. Fewer faculty served on undergraduate committees (31.6 %) than on most other committees, probably because there is less need for committees on a per undergraduate basis. Moreover, lecturers reported serving on committees (of all types) less than other faculty ranks.

Table 12: Service Activities of Full-time Faculty in the Previous Academic Year, by Institution Type

Activity	Institution Type						Total
	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
Serve on a committee at your institution	93.4%	88.4%	95.2%	91.3%	96.5%	90.3%	91.9%
Serve on an undergraduate students committee	18.2%	9.5%	14.4%	38.5%	19.5%	8.9%	31.6%
Serve on undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	5.1%	7.7%	6.4%	12.1%	7.4%	10.5%	10.5%
Serve on graduate thesis or dissertation committees	1.4%	1.4%	2.4%	66.0%	21.6%	48.2%	50.6%
Serve on graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	1.8%		2.4%	56.4%	16.3%	46.8%	43.4%
Serve as an officer of a local institutional organization	28.2%	29.1%	29.1%	29.6%	35.2%	37.5%	30.3%
Serve as an officer of a regional, national, international organization	16.4%	13.1%	13.7%	33.5%	23.3%	32.0%	29.6%

Table 13: Service Activities of Full-time Faculty in the Previous Academic Year, by Faculty Rank

Activity	Rank					
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks
Serve on a committee at your institution	95.3%	95.5%	89.8%	71.7%	64.1%	96.2%
Serve on an undergraduate students committee	36.9%	35.0%	27.5%	15.7%	2.7%	9.4%
Serve on undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	13.6%	12.8%	7.2%	3.0%	4.9%	1.5%
Serve on graduate thesis or dissertation committees	64.0%	55.2%	44.3%	6.3%	20.3%	6.7%
Serve on graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	58.5%	48.0%	33.5%	4.1%	20.3%	0%
Serve as an officer of a local institutional organization	34.3%	30.6%	27.1%	24.5%	29.2%	39.1%
Serve as an officer of a regional, national, international organization	37.2%	31.1%	24.2%	12.4%	38.6%	27.0%

Specific Service Activity by Academic Discipline

Table 14 presents service-related activities by academic discipline.

Table 14: Service Activities of Full-time Faculty in Previous Academic year, By Discipline

Academic Area	Activity					
	Serve on a committee at your institution	Serve on an undergrad students committee	Serve on undergrad comp. exams or orals committee	Serve on graduate thesis or dissertation committee	Serve as an officer of a local institution or organization	Serve as an officer of a regional, national, international, local institution or organization
Agriculture	26%	13%	45%	41%	51%	45%
Computer Science	24%	7%	43%	35%	22%	20%
Education	27%	8%	71%	66%	36%	35%
Engineering	51%	19%	77%	68%	23%	35%
Law	4%	0%	29%	16%	35%	45%
Art	53%	36%	56%	47%	26%	32%
Business	31%	3%	27%	23%	30%	34%
Humanities	35%	12%	52%	47%	21%	29%
Math & Natural Science	34%	9%	60%	53%	21%	22%
Med & Health Science	21%	8%	44%	37%	40%	30%
Public Admin	21%	6%	30%	30%	57%	32%
Social & Behav Sci	42%	11%	67%	54%	25%	31%
Tech Programs	12%	4%	6%	2%	34%	16%
Interdisciplinary	31%	24%	54%	54%	34%	14%
Other	26%	2%	23%	16%	47%	39%

Student Contact Outside of Class Time

In recognition that more time is spent with students than strictly class time, faculty were asked to consider how much time they spend with students outside of class time. Faculty were asked to quantify the number of hours they spend with students during the 1998 Fall Term. Tables 15 and 16 consider this activity by institution type and faculty rank. More faculty (28%) at all institutions reported hours of student contact in categories that spanned 7-10 hours of student contact. Community and technical college faculty reported more contact on average than university main campus, regional campus, and medical school faculty.

Table 15: Average Hours of Student Contact Outside of Classroom during the Fall Term of 1998, by Institution Type

Hours per week spent with students outside of class	Institution Type						Total
	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
0	0.4%	0%	0%	2.4%	2.6%	5.5%	2.1%
1 - 3	4.2%	2.8%	2.1%	10.0%	5.6%	21.6%	9.1%
4 - 6	12.1%	16.5%	8.2%	27.5%	27.1%	28.8%	24.9%
7 - 10	30.5%	37.2%	42.4%	27.6%	26.6%	17.5%	28.0%
11 - 15	30.5%	28.2%	28.5%	17.6%	20.9%	15.6%	19.9%
16 - 20	13.2%	10.2%	13.2%	7.6%	8.1%	6.5%	8.5%
21 - 25	4.8%	2.6%	2.4%	3.3%	4.2%	0.4%	3.3%
26 - 30	2.3%	2.0%	1.6%	2.0%	2.3%	2.6%	2.1%
31+	2.0%	0.5%	1.6%	2.1%	2.6%	1.6%	2.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16: Average Hours of Student Contact Outside of Classroom during the Fall Term of 1998, by Faculty Rank

Hours per week spent with students outside of class	Rank						Total
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks	
0	1.4%	1.1%	3.5%	2.5%	28.7%	0%	2.1%
1 - 3	8.9%	7.7%	11.1%	7.0%	26.8%	5.1%	9.1%
4 - 6	26.4%	26.1%	24.3%	18.3%	12.0%	6.1%	24.9%
7 - 10	29.0%	30.4%	24.8%	26.3%	21.5%	39.9%	28.0%
11 - 15	20.7%	20.7%	17.7%	23.4%	0%	22.3%	19.9%
16 - 20	6.6%	8.1%	10.1%	11.1%	8.4%	9.2%	8.5%
21 - 25	3.3%	2.3%	3.6%	5.3%	2.7%	9.8%	3.3%
26 - 30	1.8%	2.1%	2.3%	2.2%	0%	3.8%	2.1%
31+	1.8%	1.5%	2.6%	4.0%	0%	3.8%	2.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing

Because of recent public interest in the written communication skills of college graduates, faculty were asked to consider the amount of time they spent reviewing and critiquing student writing during the Fall Term of 1998. Tables 17 and 18 review this activity by institution and rank. 17.8 % of faculty reported spending no time at all critiquing student writing--a portion of this percentage may include professors in technical fields (computer programming, etc.). A little more than a third (35.9%) of faculty reported 1 - 3 hours a week reviewing student writing. The next highest percentage (21.7) is in the 4 - 6 hour range.

Table 17: Average Hours Spent by Full-time Faculty Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing during the Fall Term of 1998, by Institution Type

Hours per week spent reviewing students writing	Institution Type						Total
	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
0	16.2%	16.5%	14.7%	16.3%	18.2%	43.9%	17.8%
1 - 3	33.8%	42.8%	39.3%	37.0%	30.3%	26.6%	35.9%
4 - 6	19.6%	17.2%	28.4%	22.7%	22.3%	13.9%	21.7%
7 - 10	10.9%	10.8%	8.7%	12.1%	12.0%	12.2%	11.8%
11 - 15	6.5%	3.6%	3.2%	6.3%	8.3%	2.5%	6.1%
16 - 20	5.1%	4.3%	2.6%	2.6%	3.9%	0%	2.9%
21 - 25	2.1%	0.4%	1.6%	1.5%	2.4%	0%	1.5%
26 - 30	3.3%	3.0%		0.2%	1.1%	0.8%	0.7%
31+	2.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	1.6%	0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 18: Average Hours Spent by Full-time Faculty Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing, by Faculty Rank

Hours per week spent reviewing students writing	Rank						Total
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer, Instructor	Other	No Ranks	
0	15.4%	14.6%	23.3%	16.2%	65.4%	16.0%	17.8%
1 - 3	39.3%	38.2%	30.0%	35.3%	10.9%	55.7%	35.9%
4 - 6	22.4%	20.7%	23.9%	16.3%	9.0%	13.1%	21.7%
7 - 10	11.5%	12.1%	12.2%	11.7%	2.1%	3.8%	11.8%
11 - 15	5.9%	7.0%	5.1%	6.8%	6.3%	3.8%	6.1%
16 - 20	2.2%	4.0%	2.1%	4.8%	0%	3.9%	2.9%
21 - 25	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%	3.1%	6.2%	0%	1.5%
26 - 30	1.0%	0.2%	1.0%	1.1%	0%	0%	0.7%
31+	1.1%	1.4%	1.1%	4.6%	0%	3.8%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As Table 19 below indicates, faculty in the Humanities disciplines spent more time per week on average critiquing student writing than do faculty in other disciplines.

Table 19: Median Time Spent by Full-time Faculty Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing

Academic Area	Hours Spent Reviewing Student Writing
Agriculture	1 - 3 hrs
Computer Science	1 - 3 hrs
Education	4 - 6 hrs
Engineering	1 - 3 hrs
Law	4 - 6 hrs
Art	1 - 3 hrs
Business	1 - 3 hrs
Humanities	7 - 10 hrs
Math & Natural Science	1 - 3 hrs
Med & Health Science	1 - 3 hrs
Public Admin	4 - 6 hrs
Social & Behav Sci	4 - 6 hrs
Tech Programs	1 - 3 hrs
Interdisciplinary	4 - 6 hrs
Other	1 - 3 hrs

How Faculty Activity Has Changed

The final question on the survey was open-ended. Faculty were asked how the way they spend their time has changed the most in the last two years. They were not given predefined categories, but were asked to write in their responses. When survey responses were analyzed, faculty responses were grouped into categories. Table 20 below displays the responses to this question according to these categories. The highest frequency of response regarded administrative duties; 24.6 % of faculty reported additional administrative responsibilities. 13% reported no change at all. Other faculty reported more time spent in other areas including teaching (7.8 %), non-teaching duties (8.6 %), curriculum development (7.9 %), student advising (9.0 %), research (6.1 %), and computer technology (8.7%). Fewer faculty (6.7 % total) reported less time spent on activities.

Table 20: How has time spent changed in the past two years?

Category	Percentage
More Administrative Duties	24.6%
No Change	13.0%
More Student Advising	9.0%
More Computer-technology	8.7%
More Non-teaching	8.6%
More Curriculum Development	7.9%
More Teaching	7.8%
More Time Research	6.1%
More Professional Service	2.5%
Less Time Research	1.9%
Less Teaching	1.6%
More Clinical	1.5%
More Outside Grant Funding	1.4%
More Professional Growth	1.4%
Less Administrative Duties	1.1%
Less Classroom Preparation	1.1%
More Community Service	0.6%
More Assessment-Evaluation	0.3%
Less Professional Growth	0.3%
Less Committee Work	0.2%
Less Clinical	0.2%
Less Service to Profession	0.2%
Less Time Student Advising	0.1%
Other	0%
Total	100%

Conclusions

These data were gathered to answer three questions that are frequently posed to the Board of Regents regarding full-time faculty in Ohio's state supported institutions. The questions were:

Questions Guiding Survey of Full-Time Faculty

1. What is the full-time faculty *professional* profile (tenure status, type of institution do they work for, academic area, etc.) for Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?
2. What activities constitute faculty work for full-time faculty at Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?
3. What recent changes in activity, if any, are perceived to have occurred in the work patterns of full-time faculty at Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?

The answers to these questions have been reviewed in this report. Faculty's professional profiles do vary considerably for Ohio's state funded colleges and universities but their similarities are perhaps more noticeable than their differences.

Full-time faculty do engage in a variety of activities, and these activities vary greatly by institution type, but in all types of institutions the average faculty member's academic term is a balance between teaching, research, administration, and service. Further, a large percentage (typically a majority) of full-time faculty are engaged in curricular planning, mentoring and marketing of new programs or recruitment of students to existing programs. Scholarly activities including publishing books and articles, presenting papers, giving formal or creative performances, and research grant work are evident in all institutions among all disciplines.

Faculty do report that their academic lives have changed in the past two years, with many faculty citing increased performance of administrative duties and increased time spent teaching and advising of students.

While the full-time faculty at four year institutions is a majority of faculty, that is not the case at other types of institutions. Table 21, below, presents data that have been submitted to the Regents by institutions as part of their All Employee (AM) file submission. As these data indicate, for many types of institutions there are more individuals who are part-time faculty than full-time faculty, even though a majority of instruction may still be taught by full-time faculty.

**Table 21: Full-time and Part-time Faculty -
October 1, 1999 All Employees File Submission by Campuses**

Institution Type	Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty		Total Faculty	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Community College	964	39%	1534	61%	2498	100%
State Community College	1608	49%	1648	51%	3256	100%
Technical College	607	38%	991	62%	1598	100%
University Branch	953	37%	1620	63%	2573	100%
University Main	11608	68%	5547	32%	17155	100%
Total	15740	58%	11340	42%	27080	100%

Table 22 below presents data recently released by the Chronicle of Higher Education. These data indicate that Ohio's reliance on part-time faculty is quite close to the national average.

Table 22: National Faculty Employment Status, Fall 1997

Faculty Status	2 year Institutions	4 Year Institutions
Part-time	64.6%	32.6%
Full-time	35.4%	67.4%

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, January, 28, 2000

The Survey of Part-Time Faculty that is scheduled to be conducted in Winter of 2000 will contain many of the same questions as asked for full-time faculty and help complete this statewide understanding of faculty profiles, faculty activities, and faculty changes in Ohio's state supported institutions.