



UNC  
**GREENSBORO**  
Board of Trustees

Academic Affairs Committee  
September 9, 2025

---

**Discussion Item**

AAC – 5 Faculty Workload Report

**Background Information**

Following the requirements of the UNC Policy on Faculty Workload, the Division of Academic Affairs has compiled its annual report of the 2024-25 faculty workload, which requires approval by the Board of Trustees by September 30. This 2024-25 Faculty Workload Report summarizes faculty effort across teaching, research/creative activity, and service at the level of the institution, the academic unit, and the department. The report also presents the number of course sections, student credit hours, and faculty contact hours at the level of the institution, the academic unit, and the department. Measures of routinely expected duties of teaching, research/creative activity, and service are reported by academic unit.

Attachments:

AAC – 5.1 *2024-2025 Faculty Workload Report*  
AAC – 5.2 *Faculty Workload Report PowerPoint*

---

J. Alan Boyette  
Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

## Faculty Workload Annual Report University of North Carolina at Greensboro

**Institution:** University of North Carolina at Greensboro

**Academic Year:** 2024-2025

**Submitted by:** Randy Penfield, Senior Vice Provost

**Submission Date:** October 1, 2025

**BOT Authorization Date:** September 10, 2025

### Section 1 Institutional Overview

#### 1.1: Institutional Context

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) is a comprehensive institution serving over 18,000 students across approximately 200 undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Devoted to exceptional student learning, innovating research, and enhancing community and economic growth, UNCG holds both the Carnegie Foundation classification for high research activity and the Carnegie Foundation classification for community engagement. UNCG's mission is to redefine the public research university for the 21<sup>st</sup> century as a collaborative and responsive institution making a difference in the lives of students and the community it serves.

UNCG is home to seven academic schools and colleges:

- The College of Arts and Sciences
- The College of Visual and Performing Arts
- The Bryan School of Business and Economics
- The School of Education
- The School of Health and Human Sciences
- The School of Nursing
- The Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering

The students, faculty, and programs of these seven academic units are supported by UNCG's system of University Libraries.

The Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering (JSNN) is an academic collaboration between NC A&T and UNCG consisting of departments: (a) the Department of Nanoscience, which resides within UNCG's academic administration; and (b) the Department of Nanoengineering, which resides within NC A&T's academic administration. Given that only the Department of Nanoscience resides within UNCG's administration, the reporting for JSNN in this document is limited to the Department of Nanoscience.

***A research-intensive institution.*** As an institution with high research activity, UNCG's faculty includes world-class researchers who are highly engaged in research. Numerous members of the UNCG faculty are engaged in securing external grant funding that supports their research and scholarly engagement activities. Annual grant awards have grown by over 65% from 2018-19 to 2023-24, totaling over \$60 million in 2023-24. This emphasis on research activity plays a key role in shaping faculty workload and the corresponding workload policy, as it reallocates a portion of faculty responsibilities from teaching to research and creative activity. In order to manage grant responsibilities, numerous faculty must reallocate effort from their typical teaching load to research and creative activity, with the grant funds supporting the corresponding portion of their salary associated with the reallocated effort. This reallocation of effort to grant-funded research requires UNCG to hire part-time faculty to fill the corresponding teaching vacancies. Thus, the expansion of external grant funding has increased UNCG's reliance on its part-time faculty to teach organized courses.

***Focus on both undergraduate and graduate education.*** A salient property of UNCG's portfolio of academic programs is its balance across both undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In addition to offering over 100 undergraduate programs, UNCG offers nearly 80 graduate programs (55 Masters programs and 24 Doctoral programs) serving approximately 3,700 graduate students. This simultaneous commitment to both undergraduate and graduate education has implications for faculty workload. Many faculty have portions of their teaching effort devoted to activities that align with teaching, but fall beyond organized courses. Examples of such activities include the supervision of student research, Masters theses, and Doctoral dissertations.

***UNCG faculty.*** The faculty at UNCG span both full-time and part-time appointments. The nature of the workload and process for assigning workload depends on whether the faculty appointment is full-time or part-time.

- a) **Full-Time Faculty.** Faculty defined as full-time are those for which the position is 0.75 FTE or greater (i.e., 75% time or greater), regardless of employment category (tenured, tenure-track, professional track). Faculty in this category are benefit-earning. In 2024-25, there were 781 faculty meeting this designation, inclusive of 21 faculty members in the University Libraries.
- b) **Part-Time Faculty.** Faculty having an FTE of less than 0.75 and being non-benefit earning are referred to as part-time. Faculty members in this category are part-time lecturers teaching organized courses or are providing critical support to teaching and the student educational experience through delivering clinical supervision and other instructional supports. A number of these individuals are hired to fill vacancies in course instruction as a result of faculty securing externally funded grants requiring them to reallocate time from teaching to the management and implementation of the grant. Other part-time faculty members are hired to (a) fill teaching vacancies due to unexpected transitions in full-time faculty (e.g., retirements or resignations); (b) teach additional sections of courses being offered due to enrollment growth; and (c) fill teaching vacancies resulting from faculty being on leave (e.g., FMLA and/or parental leave). In 2024-25, UNCG had 285 part-time faculty members.

## 1.2: UNCG Workload Policy and the Process for Assigning Workload

***UNCG workload policy.*** During 2023 and 2024, UNCG engaged in a comprehensive revision of its Policy and Regulations on Faculty Workload, in alignment with UNC Policy 400.3.4. This revised policy covers faculty who are considered full-time (defined in Section 1.1 above). The revised policy provides a clear articulation of the structure of workload for full-time faculty and processes for establishing expectations for workload assignment within each academic unit. The policy also makes explicit the availability of differentiating workload assignments across faculty to meet the particular needs of the department and unit while offering flexibility to shift workload as department and unit needs change over time.

The UNCG Policy and Regulations on Faculty Workload defines faculty workload in terms of the percentage of effort assigned to the professional activities faculty perform as part of their employment with the University. Within this context, the effort assigned to a typical organized 3-credit hour course is 10% of a full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty member's effort. Using this framework, a 1.0 FTE workload is defined as:

- a) 80% of effort is assigned to teaching, corresponding to a teaching load of 24 credit hours or equivalent contact hours per academic year. This 24 credit hours of teaching is conceptualized as being comprised of 8 typical organized 3-credit hour courses.
- b) 20% of effort is assigned to other responsibilities furthering the mission of the unit and university. This category of effort is often conceptualized as service to both the university and profession.

Within this university-level faculty workload framework resides flexibility for each academic unit to develop criteria and expectations for reassigning workload from the 80% effort for teaching organized courses to other areas of research and service, as well as other forms of teaching that do not conform to organized courses (e.g., Doctoral dissertation advising). Unit-specific expectations for workload that offer additional granularity within the context of the UNCG policy are articulated in unit-level faculty workload policies. Each faculty member's workload plan is tailored to their specific distribution of effort across teaching, research and creative activity, and service. Details of how effort is assigned to research and creative activity and service are provided below.

***General process for assigning effort.*** As articulated in the UNCG Policy and Regulations on Faculty Workload, the process of establishing each faculty member's workload begins with a collaborative discussion with their faculty supervisor (typically a department head/chair) about the workload needs of the department, school, or program. With these needs in mind, the faculty supervisor works cooperatively with the faculty member to establish the components of the faculty member's specific workload, along with associated outcomes. This process recognizes the individual faculty member's contributions to the University in alignment with institutional workload policies, procedures, resources, mission, and the support of student success. Once the components of the faculty member's workload are determined, the faculty supervisor approves the workload plan. Each faculty member's workload is then approved by the unit dean.

When a significant circumstance occurs that justifies a mid-year revision of a faculty member's workload, the faculty member's workload is revised accordingly. All changes to the workload and associated outcomes are subject to approval of the faculty supervisor and unit dean.

***Determining effort assigned to research and creative activity.*** Research and creative activity includes but is not limited to empirical laboratory work, field research, experimentation, community-based and community-engaged research, literature review and synthesis, theory development, preparation of manuscripts, artworks or other scholarly products, applying for internal and/or external funding, conducting funded research, presentation at research or other scholarly meetings, traveling for research or other scholarship, and dissemination of findings and other scholarly products to the public.

The full workload for a particular full-time faculty member is established (a) within the context of the UNCG workload framework described above, and (b) in accordance with the unit-level expectations of effort being assigned to research and creative activity and service. Given that UNCG is a research-intensive university, holding the Carnegie Foundation classification for high research activity, appropriate effort must be assigned to those faculty who are engaged in research and creative activity. The effort assigned to research and creative activity will vary across faculty depending on their particular workload expectations. For some faculty, such as those in non-tenure-track positions focused primarily on teaching (e.g., a Full-Time Lecturer) and/or clinical supervision (e.g., a Clinical Professor), the effort assigned to research and creative activity is often 0%. For most tenured and tenure-track faculty who are highly engaged in research and creative activity, the effort assigned to research and creative activity is commonly between 20% - 40%. For faculty holding large externally funded grants requiring substantial time for leading research projects, the effort assigned to research and creative activity may exceed 40%. The final determination of effort is made by the faculty member's department head/chair and approved by the dean.

***Determining effort assigned to service.*** Service includes service to the program, department/school, academic unit, institution, profession/discipline, and University System, as well as professional engagement with community partners. The effort assigned to service for a full-time faculty member will depend on the particular needs of the faculty member's department and unit, along with other roles and responsibilities the faculty member may hold on campus or within their professional community. In general, a typical percentage of effort assigned to service is 20%. There are instances, however, where a faculty member may assume an unusually large administrative obligation, warranting a larger percentage of the faculty member's effort devoted to service. The final determination of effort is made by the faculty member's department head/chair and approved by the dean.

***Determining effort assigned to teaching.*** Teaching includes but is not limited to classroom teaching of organized courses, clinical supervision, community-engaged instruction, mentoring (intensive, one-on-one advising of undergraduate or graduate students), and other activities supporting the student learning experience. The effort assigned to teaching begins with a starting point of 24 credit hours of instruction corresponding to 80% effort (i.e., 8 typical organized 3-credit hour courses), and is adjusted accordingly depending on the percent effort assigned to

research and creative activity and service. These adjustments are made with a strong awareness of the importance of teaching effort in meeting the instructional needs of the faculty member's department and academic unit.

***Workload of part-time faculty.*** The effort of part-time faculty members is nearly exclusively allocated to teaching. Across UNCG's part-time faculty during 2024-25, 99.7% of these appointments were exclusively teaching.

***Consideration of summer in workload plans.*** The vast majority of full-time faculty are on 9-month contracts for which teaching in the summer is not included in the annual workload plans. In the few cases of faculty having 12-month contracts, summer teaching is included in the annual workload plans.

***Evaluation of the Workload Policy.*** In addition to on-going informal review of the policy through its regular implementation, the policy will undergo a comprehensive review no less frequently than every five years.

### 1.3: Process for Calculating Workload Percentages

This report includes numerous calculations of the percentage of faculty effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service at the level of the institution, academic unit, and department (i.e., Tables 1-A, 1-B, 3-A, 3-B, 5). The process for calculating these percentages involved the following steps.

**Step 1: Identifying the List of Full-Time Faculty.** An initial list of full-time ( $FTE \geq 0.75$ ) faculty that met the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) definition of faculty at the time of the data snapshot was assembled from Human Resources (HR) Data Mart records. Eligibility for this list was aggregated across three time points: (a) June 2024, (b) October 2024, and (c) March 2025. All individuals who met the IPEDS definition of faculty at one or more of these three timepoints were included in the initial list.

**Step 2: Finalizing the List of Full-Time Faculty.** The initial list of full-time faculty from Step 1 was refined by removing any individual who was verified at the unit-level as not being a full-time faculty member during this period. This situation might occur when a faculty member has resigned or retired, but the processing of the paperwork for this change in status came after the data snapshots described in Step 1. The resulting list contained 781 individuals and served as the population of full-time faculty used to compute effort percentages. The total number of full-time faculty in this population is hereinafter referred to as  $N_{FT}$  ( $N_{FT} = 781$ ).

**Step 3: Recording Effort of Each Full-Time Faculty Member.** For each full-time faculty member contained in the final population specified in Step 2, the amount of effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service was recorded by the faculty member's academic unit (see Section 1.2 for a description of the process used in assigning effort to a faculty member). Faculty in 9-month appointments had workloads aligning with the 2024-25 academic year, and faculty in 12-month appointments had workloads spanning Summer 2024

and the 2024-25 academic year. The data used in the effort calculations of this report were based on available information documenting the faculty member's workload that includes (a) annual workload forms completed prior to the commencement of the year, detailing the expected effort across teaching, research and creative activity, and service; and (b) information about the actual effort in instances where changes in workload may have shifted from that documented on the workload form, as might occur if a faculty member receives a large grant or teaches additional courses. The resulting values of workload distribution for each faculty member were then entered into a database for analysis.

**Step 4: Computing The Percentages.** Across all  $N_{FT}$  full-time faculty, the values of % effort assigned to teaching were summed to obtain the total combined effort for teaching by full-time faculty. This sum is referred to as *Sum-Teaching-Effort-FT*. Similarly, the values of % effort assigned to research and creative activity across all  $N_{FT}$  full-time faculty were summed to compute *Sum-Research-Effort-FT*, and the values of % effort assigned to service were summed to compute *Sum-Service-Effort-FT*. The institution-wide percentages for teaching, research and creative activity, and service, as reported in Table 1-A, were then computed using:

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{-Teaching-FT} &= \text{Sum-Teaching-Effort-FT} / N_{FT} \\ \% \text{-Research-FT} &= \text{Sum-Research-Effort-FT} / N_{FT} \\ \% \text{-Service-FT} &= \text{Sum-Service-Effort-FT} / N_{FT} \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding percentages for each academic unit and the University Libraries were obtained using the same process, but with the population restricted to individuals in the full-time faculty list residing within the specific academic unit or University Libraries. The resulting values of *%-Teaching-FT*, *%-Research-FT*, and *%-Service-FT* for each academic unit are displayed in Table 3-A. Note that these values were not weighted by FTE.

The percentages for each department were obtained using an analogous process, but further restricting the population to those individuals having a primary appointment in the department. In instances where a faculty member had a joint appointment across two departments, the department of primary appointment was the assigned department (each faculty member must have a primary department). The resulting values of *%-Teaching-FT*, *%-Research-FT*, and *%-Service-FT* for each academic department are displayed in Table 5. Note that these values were not weighted by FTE.

**Step 5: Identifying and Finalizing the List of Part-Time Faculty.** Many courses on campus are taught by part-time faculty members. There are numerous reasons why a course may be taught by a part-time faculty rather than a full-time faculty member. One common example is a full-time faculty member securing a large grant that requires more of their effort to be allocated to research. In such cases additional instructional coverage is needed for courses that can no longer be taught by the faculty member. In other cases, a department may not have enough full-time faculty to cover all course sections required to satisfy current student demand. For these reasons, we have also computed the percentages of teaching, research, and service using the combination of full-time and part-time faculty members.

The first step in this process was to develop the list of part-time faculty members. An initial list of part-time (FTE < 0.75) faculty that met the IPEDS definition of faculty at the time of the data snapshot was assembled from HR Data Mart records. Eligibility for this list was aggregated across three time points: (a) June 2024, (b) October 2024, and (c) March 2025. All individuals who met the IPEDS definition of faculty at one or more of these three timepoints were included in the initial list. This list was reviewed and verified by unit-level leadership, and any needed modifications were recorded. The resulting list served as the population of part-time faculty used in computing effort percentage for Tables 1-B and 3-B. The total number of part-time faculty in this population is hereafter referred to as  $N_{PT}$ .

**Step 6: Computing The Percentages Across Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty.** Across all faculty ( $N_{FT} + N_{PT}$ ), the efforts assigned to teaching were summed to indicate the total combined teaching effort. This sum is referred to as *Sum-Teaching-Effort-ALL*. Similarly, the efforts assigned to research and creative activity across all full-time and part-time faculty were summed to compute *Sum-Research-Effort-ALL*, and the efforts assigned to service were summed to compute *Sum-Service-Effort-ALL*. The institution-wide percentages for teaching, research and creative activity, and service, as reported in Table 1-B, were then computed using:

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{-Teaching-ALL} &= \text{Sum-Teaching-Effort-ALL} / (N_{FT} + N_{PT}) \\ \% \text{-Research-ALL} &= \text{Sum-Research-Effort-ALL} / (N_{FT} + N_{PT}) \\ \% \text{-Service-ALL} &= \text{Sum-Service-Effort-ALL} / (N_{FT} + N_{PT}) \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding percentages for each academic unit and the University Libraries were obtained using the same process, but restricting the population to those individuals in the full-time faculty and part-time faculty residing within the specific academic unit or University Libraries. The resulting values of *%-Teaching-ALL*, *%-Research-ALL*, and *%-Service-ALL* for each academic unit are displayed in Table 3-B. Note that these values were not weighted by FTE.

#### 1.4: Institutional Workload Percentages

In 2024-25, UNCG had 781 faculty identified as full-time faculty using the process outlined in Section 1.3. Table 1-A reports the percentage of full-time faculty workload effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

<b>Table 1-A</b> <b>Institutional high-level metrics for faculty workload percentages AY2024-25</b> <b>Full-Time Faculty Only</b>		
ACTUAL % TEACHING– Faculty workload plan totals only	ACTUAL % RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY– Faculty workload plan totals only	ACTUAL % SERVICE– Faculty workload plan totals only
55.0%	20.7%	24.3%

*Note.* The reported values are calculated based on the population of 781 full-time faculty and using the methodology outlined in Steps 1-4 of Section 1.3. The calculations employed an equal weighting for each faculty member and thus do not weight effort by faculty FTE.

The value of 55.0% of effort devoted to teaching reflects the primacy of teaching in the workload of UNCG full-time faculty. While a faculty member's daily responsibilities include a wide range of activities across service, research and creative activity, and teaching, on average over half of this effort is allocated to instructional duties supporting the student learning experience. It is germane to note that this average value of 55.0% represents a mid-point of the range of actual workload effort assigned to teaching across the members of the full-time faculty. Some faculty members allocate 80% of their time to teaching, while others are below 40% due to large time commitments needed in other important areas, such as (a) leading externally funded grants that cover the cost of a portion of the faculty member's salary or (b) taking on unusually large administrative and leadership responsibilities.

In interpreting the value of 55% of effort devoted to teaching, it is also relevant to acknowledge that University Libraries has 21 faculty members who, by the nature of their positions, have relatively high effort devoted to service and low effort devoted to teaching (as demonstrated in Table 3-A), which places downward pressure on UNCG's overall institution-level average effort assigned to teaching. As not all UNC institutions consider professional librarians as faculty, this effect on the overall institution-level average effort assigned to teaching is more pronounced for UNCG than for other campuses in the UNC System.

The value of 20.7% effort assigned to research and creative activities indicates that, on average, full-time faculty allocate 1/5 of their time to engaging in scholarly activities. This average value of 20.7% represents a mid-point of the range of actual workload effort assigned to research and creative activity. For professional track faculty (non-tenure-track faculty, such as Full-Time Lecturers or Clinical Faculty) the effort assigned to research and creative activity is often 0%, while for tenured and tenure-track faculty it is typically greater than 20.7%.

In general, a typical effort assigned to service for a full-time faculty member is 20%. The observed percentage of 24.3% exceeding this standard is not surprising, as faculty can also assume larger administrative responsibilities and directed professional activities that extend beyond that expected of the typical effort for service. This may include directing academic programs, leading special initiatives advancing the mission of the university, or assuming faculty governance leadership roles.

Given that numerous full-time faculty have allocated additional time in support of their research obligations (e.g., leading externally funded research grants) and other administrative service responsibilities, it is useful to include the part-time faculty effort in reviewing the distribution of effort across all UNCG faculty. Table 1-B is analogous Table 1-A, with the exception that it combines the effort of all full-time and part-time faculty.

<b>Table 1-B</b> <b>Institutional high-level metrics for faculty workload percentages AY2024-25</b> <b>All Faculty (Full-Time and Part-Time Combined)</b>		
ACTUAL % TEACHING	ACTUAL % RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	ACTUAL % SERVICE
66.6%	15.4%	18.0%
<i>Note.</i> The reported values are calculated based on the population of 781 full-time faculty and 285 part-time faculty and using the methodology outlined in Step 6 of Section 1.3. The calculations employed an equal weighting for each faculty member and thus do not weight effort by faculty FTE.		

A salient property of the workload effort distribution displayed in Table 1-B is that 66.6% of effort across all faculty is devoted to teaching activities. Thus, 2/3 of the average workload effort across all faculty (full-time and part-time) is devoted to teaching. The remaining 1/3 of the effort is relatively evenly divided between research and creative activity and service.

1.5: Institutional Courses, SCH, and Contact Hours

Table 2 presents the number of organized sections offered, student credit hours (SCH) generated, and the associated faculty contact hours across Summer 2024 and the 2024-25 academic year.

<b>Table 2</b> <b>Institutional high-level metrics for organized course sections, students credit hours, and</b> <b>faculty contact hours, Summer 2024, Fall 2024, and Spring 2025.</b>		
ALL Organized Course Sections ACTUAL #	ALL Student Credit Hours produced ACTUAL #	ALL Faculty Contact Hours ACTUAL #
8,525	461,426	390,795

**Section 2**  
**Percentage of Faculty Workload Plans in Place**

In the 2024-25 academic year, 781 faculty were required to complete a faculty workload plan for the academic year.

In the 2024-25 academic year, 762 faculty (97.6%) had a workload plan in place by the institutional due date of August 15, 2024. The 19 individuals without a workload plan by this date were newly hired faculty for whom a workload plan had not yet been finalized. As of January 1, 2025, all faculty (100%) had a workload plan in place.

The institutional due date for faculty workload plans for 2025-26 is August 15 for faculty beginning their appointment in the Fall 2025 semester. For any faculty member beginning their appointment in Spring of 2026, the institutional due date for faculty workload plans is January 15.

**Section 3**  
**Faculty Workload by School/College**

Table 3-A presents the percentage of full-time faculty workload effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service for each of the seven UNCG schools and colleges, as well as University Libraries.

<b>Table 3-A</b>				
<b>Faculty Workload by School/College for 2024-2025</b>				
<b>Full-Time Faculty Only</b>				
School/College	# Faculty Workload Plans	% Teaching	% Research & Creative Activity	% Service
College of Arts & Sciences	322	58.0%	20.2%	21.8%
College of Visual & Performing Arts	111	62.1%	17.4%	20.4%
Bryan School of Business & Economics	87	51.1%	29.6%	19.3%
School of Health & Human Sciences	119	45.4%	19.6%	34.9%
School of Education	67	54.1%	22.4%	23.5%
School of Nursing	48	59.8%	13.5%	26.7%
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	6	35.8%	45.0%	19.2%
University Libraries	21	38.3%	18.1%	43.6%
<i>Note.</i> The values are based on the workloads of the population of 781 full-time faculty. The calculations employed an equal weighting for each faculty member and thus do not weight effort by faculty FTE.				

One notable result in Table 3-A is the variability of the distribution of teaching workload effort across the academic units, ranging from 62.1% for the College of Visual and Performing Arts to 35.8% for the Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering. A primary factor creating this variability is differential levels of engagement in research and funded grants, which shifts effort from teaching to activities supporting research projects. For example, funded grants often cover the financial cost of faculty time allocated to managing and leading grant-funded projects. However, this often requires faculty to reallocate time from teaching to research and creative activities associated with the grant. The Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering has by far the highest per-faculty grant funding of any unit on campus, reflecting the high level of faculty engagement in funded research. This brings with it a relatively high level of effort

allocated to research and creative activity (45% effort is allocated to research). Another unit having a relatively high level of grant funding per-faculty is the School of Education, reflected in a 22.4% effort devoted to research and creative activity, which is higher than most other units. In contrast, the College of Visual and Performing Arts has the lowest per-faculty level of external grant funding of any unit on campus, which is reflected in a relatively low 17.4% effort allocated to research and creative activity.

A second factor explaining variability in the distribution of effort is the engagement of faculty in supervision and administration of clinical programs, internship coordination, and student oversight within specialized clinical environments (e.g., the simulation lab used in Nursing), all of which is typically recorded under service. Two examples of this are the School of Nursing, with 26.7% effort assigned to service, and the School of Health and Human Sciences, with 34.9% effort assigned to service.

A third factor reflects differences among units in assigning professional responsibilities to the three workload categories. For example, advising students and serving on thesis and dissertations committees can be classified under the categories of teaching or service, depending on the norms of the academic unit. As a result, units with large graduate programs can see higher levels of service effort recorded due to faculty members assigning student advising and mentoring activities to service rather than teaching.

Table 3-B presents the percentage of workload effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service combined across all full-time and part-time faculty within each of the seven UNCG schools and colleges, as well as University Libraries.

School/College	Total Number of Faculty	% Teaching	% Research & Creative Activity	% Service
College of Arts & Sciences	394	65.2%	16.8%	18.0%
College of Visual & Performing Arts	182	76.9%	10.6%	12.5%
Bryan School of Business & Economics	100	57.5%	25.8%	16.8%
School of Health & Human Sciences	178	62.4%	14.0%	23.6%
School of Education	125	74.9%	12.3%	12.7%
School of Nursing	59	67.3%	11.0%	21.7%
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	6	35.8%	45.0%	19.2%
University Libraries	21	38.3%	18.1%	43.6%

*Note.* The calculations employed an equal weighting for each faculty member and thus do not weight effort by faculty FTE.

In reviewing the values of Table 3-B in relation to those presented for only full-time faculty in Table 3-A, several differences are worthy of note. The most salient difference is the relatively higher percentage of effort assigned to teaching reflected in Table 3-B across all units except the Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering and the University Libraries, both of whom did not employ part-time faculty in 2024-25. By including the part-time faculty in the consideration of the distribution of faculty effort, the effort assigned to teaching rises by 12.2 percentage points on average. The units with the largest difference (College of Visual and Performing Arts, School of Health and Human Sciences, and School of Education) are those having the largest percentage of part-time faculty within their faculty. This reflects the heavy reliance by these units on part-time faculty to meet the instructional need of their courses. In the case of the School of Health and Human Sciences and the School of Education, this is partly accounted for by the need to hire part-time faculty to fill instructional vacancies resulting from faculty securing externally funded grants. In the case of the College of Visual and Performing Arts this reflects a reliance on part-time instructors to meet the instructional demand extending beyond that which can be offered by their full-time faculty. It is important to note that this need to hire part-time faculty in the College of Visual and Performing Arts is not due to their full-time faculty carrying relatively low teaching loads; in contrast, the full-time faculty of this academic unit has the highest effort assigned to teaching across the academic units on campus, as shown in Table 3-A.

**Section 4**  
**Organized Courses, SCH, Contact Hours by Department and School/College**

Table 2 (displayed in Section 1.5) presented the number of organized sections offered, SCH generated, and associated faculty contact hours across all units within the university. Table 4 disaggregates the results of Table 2 by academic unit and each associated department. These values reflect where student instruction is most concentrated across the units and departments. Not surprisingly, the College of Arts and Sciences has the highest concentration of course sections, SCH, and faculty contact hours. The smaller professional schools (School of Nursing and the School of Education) have the lowest. Departments exhibiting relatively high levels of student instruction include Biology, English, Chemistry and Biochemistry, the School of Art, the School of Music, and Kinesiology. The departments and units with relatively high concentrations of instruction are typically driven by large undergraduate enrollments within the department major as well as general education courses offered by the department.

<b>Table 4</b>			
<b>Organized course sections, student credit hours, and faculty contact hours, Summer 2024, Fall 2024, and Spring 2025 by School/College and Department</b>			
Unit/Department	Organized Course Sections	Student Credit Hours	Faculty Contact Hours
<b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</b>			
African Amer/African Diaspora	30	2,550.0	1,096.0
Anc Mediterranean/Archaeology	57	5,775.0	2,366.4
Anthropology	38	2,984.0	1,736.6
Biology	407	23,379.0	19,335.3
Chemistry & Biochemistry	252	14,394.0	12,987.3
Communication Studies	161	10,127.0	7,231.0
Computer Science	143	9,168.0	5,996.3
English	320	15,724.5	14,080.6
Geography/Environment/Sustain	164	10,016.0	6,613.4
History	161	7,695.0	7,716.8
Humanities at Work	3	216.0	95.2
Interior Architecture	56	3,677.0	4,195.0
Languages, Lit and Cultures	284	14,153.0	11,304.8
Liberal/Prof Studies	142	10,611.0	4,635.6
Mathematics and Statistics	212	15,025.0	10,248.6
Media Studies	92	6,124.0	4,639.4
Philosophy	99	10,760.0	4,086.9
Physics and Astronomy	40	2,832.0	771.2
Political Science	95	5,787.0	3,534.4
Psychology	243	17,831.0	9,993.9

Sociology/Criminology/Justice	126	9,260.0	5,789.9
Women's, Gender, and Sexuality	39	2,614.0	1,782.9
<b>College of Arts and Sciences Total</b>	<b>3,164</b>	<b>200,702.5</b>	<b>140,237.4</b>
<b>College of Visual &amp; Performing Arts</b>			
School of Art	285	16,039.0	19,772.6
School of Dance	150	4,159.0	7,254.4
School of Music	1097	14,301.5	45,038.0
School of Theatre	255	6,616.0	10,736.4
<b>College of Visual &amp; Performing Arts Total</b>	<b>1,787</b>	<b>41,115.5</b>	<b>82,801.3</b>
<b>School of Business &amp; Economics</b>			
Accounting and Finance	128	15,907.0	5,555.4
Consumer Apparel-Retail Stds	83	3,505.5	4,264.2
Dean's Office – BE	61	4,228.0	1,712.7
Economics	97	13,745.0	4,065.2
Info Sys and Supply Chn Mngmt	173	17,177.0	8,430.8
Management	210	20,690.0	8,404.9
MRK/ENT/HTM	112	13,399.0	5,233.3
<b>School of Business &amp; Economics Total</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>88,651.5</b>	<b>37,666.6</b>
<b>School of Health &amp; Human Sciences</b>			
Comm Sciences and Disorders	121	5,666.0	5,228.9
Community and Therapeutic Rec	47	3,625.0	2,772.6
Genetic Counseling	26	527.0	944.1
HealthyUNCG	2	39.0	97.9
HHS Grad - Undergrad Programs	33	2,102.0	1,415.8
HHS Office of Research	7	33.0	602.8
Human Devlp and Family Studies	172	14,758.0	8,689.4
Kinesiology	326	15,216.0	14,289.7
Nutrition	107	6,469.0	5,517.1
Peace and Conflict Studies	51	2,953.0	2,442.1
Public Health Education	138	11,257.0	6,599.7
Social Work	139	5,574.0	6,923.4
Comp Trans and Post-Sec Edu	1	87.0	38.2
<b>School of Health &amp; Human Sciences Total</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>68,306.0</b>	<b>55,561.5</b>
<b>School of Education</b>			
Counseling and Edu Development	120	4,866.0	5,111.6

Dean's Office - ED	19	375.0	919.3
Ed Ldrship and Cultural Found	121	2,689.0	6,132.4
Info/Library/Research/Science	200	8,538.0	8,429.4
Institute for Partnerships in Education	13	164.0	583.6
Specialized Education Services	133	4,230.0	8,146.7
Teacher Educ and Higher Educ	178	5,520.0	12,558.4
<b>School of Education Total</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>26,382.0</b>	<b>41,881.2</b>
<b>School of Nursing Total*</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>21,900.0</b>	<b>16,066.1</b>
<b>Joint School of Nanoscience &amp; Nanoengineering Total*</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>934.0</b>	<b>4,568.7</b>
<b>University Libraries Total*</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>396.0</b>	<b>241.9</b>
<b>Other University Offices<sup>#</sup></b>	<b>281</b>	<b>13,038.0</b>	<b>11,770.7</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8,525</b>	<b>461,425.5</b>	<b>390,795.5</b>

<sup>#</sup>Other university offices include a range of offices and programs that house courses, such as the Lloyd International Honors College, the University Teaching and Learning Commons, and the Global Engagement Office.

\*Indicates that there is only one department of record within the unit, and thus individual department-level outcomes are not reported.

**Section 5**  
**Faculty Workload by Department**

Table 5 presents the percentage of full-time faculty workload effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service for each department within each of the seven UNCG schools and colleges, as well as University Libraries. The departments within a given unit display variability in the distribution of effort across teaching, research and creative activity, and service. This is to be expected given between-department variability in the types of programs and faculty housed within each department. Departments with higher research and creative activity expectations – often those with doctoral programs – typically have a higher percentage of faculty who are highly engaged in research and creative activity (being either tenured or tenure-track), with effort assigned reflective of this emphasis and correspondingly less effort devoted to teaching. Departments with less focus on graduate education typically have more faculty with the majority of their effort devoted to teaching, leading to less effort assigned to research and creative activity.

<b>Table 5</b>				
<b>Faculty Workload by School/College for 2024-2025</b>				
<b>Full-Time Faculty Only</b>				
Unit/Department	# Faculty Workload Plans	% Teaching	% Research /Creative Activity	% Service
<b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</b>				
African Amer/African Diaspora	3	56.7%	21.7%	21.7%
Anc Mediterranean/Archaeology	7	71.4%	12.9%	15.7%
Anthropology	4	47.5%	27.5%	25.0%
Biology	42	66.5%	21.9%	11.5%
Chemistry & Biochemistry	19	57.1%	18.9%	23.9%
Communication Studies	13	66.9%	8.5%	24.6%
Computer Science	17	55.9%	20.0%	24.1%
English	32	55.6%	16.9%	27.5%
Geography/Environment/Sustain	11	44.5%	24.1%	31.4%
History	18	35.6%	38.6%	25.8%
Interior Architecture	10	61.0%	16.0%	23.0%
Languages, Lit and Cultures	33	74.4%	8.0%	17.6%
Liberal/Prof Studies	12	74.4%	3.3%	22.3%
Mathematics and Statistics	24	48.3%	31.3%	20.4%
Media Studies	7	66.4%	20.7%	12.9%
Philosophy	12	65.0%	9.2%	25.8%
Physics and Astronomy	6	61.7%	16.7%	21.7%

Political Science	11	55.0%	23.7%	21.3%
Psychology	23	42.2%	33.0%	24.8%
Sociology/Criminology/Justice	15	49.0%	24.3%	26.7%
Womens Gender and Sexuality	3	53.3%	16.7%	30.0%
<b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences Total</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>21.8%</b>
<b>School of Business &amp; Economics</b>				
Accounting and Finance	18	53.3%	28.9%	17.8%
Consumer Apparel-Retail Stds	7	55.7%	24.3%	20.0%
Economics	12	44.6%	34.2%	21.3%
Info Sys and Supply Chn Mngmt	16	51.9%	29.1%	19.1%
Management	20	45.5%	33.5%	21.0%
MRK/ENT/HTM	14	58.6%	24.3%	17.1%
<b>School of Business &amp; Econ. Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>
<b>School of Education</b>				
Counseling and Edu Development	9	46.9%	23.3%	29.8%
Ed Ldrship and Cultural Found	10	47.5%	20.0%	32.5%
Info/Library/Research/Science	20	56.0%	24.8%	19.3%
Specialized Education Services	9	66.7%	12.2%	21.1%
Teacher Educ and Higher Educ	19	53.2%	25.5%	21.3%
<b>School of Education Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>
<b>School of Health &amp; Human Sci.</b>				
Comm Sciences and Disorders	20	26.6%	12.1%	61.3%
Community and Therapeutic Rec	4	62.5%	10.0%	27.5%
Genetic Counseling	2	58.5%	8.5%	33.0%
HealthyUNCG	1	30.0%	0.0%	70.0%
HHS Grad - Undergrad Programs	1	70.0%	0.0%	30.0%
Human Devlp and Family Studies	21	43.2%	25.7%	31.1%
Kinesiology	25	46.1%	23.7%	30.2%
Nutrition	11	50.8%	20.9%	28.3%
Peace and Conflict Studies	4	57.5%	12.5%	30.0%
Public Health Education	16	53.8%	24.1%	22.2%
Social Work	14	50.0%	17.1%	32.9%
<b>School of Health &amp; Hum. Sci. Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>45.4%</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>34.9%</b>
<b>Joint School of Nanoscience &amp; Nanoengineering Total*</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>35.8%</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>
<b>School of Nursing Total*</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>59.8%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>

<b>University Libraries Total*</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>43.6%</b>
<b>College of Vis. &amp; Performing Arts</b>				
School of Art	25	57.8%	18.2%	23.9%
School of Dance	9	49.4%	22.2%	28.3%
School of Music	56	61.4%	18.2%	20.4%
School of Theatre	21	74.5%	12.4%	13.1%
<b>College of Vis. &amp; Perf. Arts Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>62.1%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>55.0%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>
*Indicates that there is only one department of record within the unit, and thus individual department-level outcomes are not reported.				

As an example of a department following trends expected by their emphasis on graduate versus undergraduate programming, consider the Department of Counseling and Educational Development (CED). CED is comprised primarily of graduate programs (Masters and Doctoral) that are nationally recognized for the preparation of mental health professionals in schools and communities. Due to CED’s emphasis on graduate education, we observe a relatively high allocation of effort to research and creative activity (23.3%), which leads to a lower effort devoted to teaching (46.9%). The Department of Psychology is a similar example, having exceptional graduate programs in psychology with a relatively high effort assigned to research and creative activity (33.0%). This leads to a relatively low effort assigned to teaching of 42.2%. In contrast, the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures focuses its programs at the undergraduate level and has a corresponding high effort assigned to teaching of 74.4% and a low effort assigned to research and creative activity of 8.0%.

**Section 6**  
**Routinely Expected Duties for Teaching**

The most routinely expected duty for teaching is that of teaching organized courses. Effort and productivity associated with teaching organized courses is captured at UNCG using a range of metrics, including: (a) the number of courses taught by a full-time faculty member, (b) the number of credits taught by a full-time faculty member, (c) the total number of students taught across the courses for which the faculty member is the instructor, and (d) the number of student credit hours (SCH) generated by a faculty member. Table 6 presents the average values of each of these four metrics across the fall and spring semesters (fall and spring combined) of the 2024-25 academic year for each of the seven academic units on campus.

<b>Table 6</b> <b>Measures of Organized Course Teaching for 2024-2025</b> <b>Full-Time Faculty Only</b>				
School/College	Average # of Courses Taught by Full-Time Faculty	Average # of Credits Taught by Full-Time Faculty	Average # of Students Taught by Full-Time Faculty	Average # of SCH Generated by Full-Time Faculty
College of Arts & Sciences	7.5	18.6	170.6	474.7
College of Visual & Performing Arts	11.4	19.3	99.6	229.4
Bryan School of Business & Economics	7.1	18.7	248.0	726.1
School of Health & Human Sciences	6.3	17.1	110.6	333.1
School of Education	6.8	17.6	76.7	221.7
School of Nursing	6.3	14.9	135.6	372.8
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	8.6	17.1	34.4	100.6

In examining the number of courses taught by full-time faculty, the College of Visual and Performing Arts stands out with a notably high average of 11.4. This high value is attributed to the School of Music’s instructional format, where many courses involve one-on-one teaching, allowing faculty to lead numerous individual sections.

Another trend that emerges in the data is the variability across the units with respect to the average number of students taught by full-time faculty and the average SCH generated by full-time faculty. These values tend to vary in accordance with the prevalence of doctoral programs relative to undergraduate programs within the academic unit. Doctoral programs are typically characterized by small course sections of advanced content, leading to substantially fewer students taught and less SCH generated compared to their undergraduate counterparts. Academic units focusing primarily on undergraduate programs will be expected to have notably larger values in these areas than academic units with a large doctoral program representation. We see this trend emerging in Table 6. The academic unit with the highest number of students taught and SCH generated per full-time faculty member is the Bryan School of Business and Economics, for which doctoral education is a small portion of the academic portfolio relative to undergraduate programs. In contrast, the School of Education's programs have a large representation of doctoral programs, whereby each of its five departments has a doctoral program. This composition of programs leads the School of Education to have among the lowest values of number of students and SCH per full-time faculty. Other units with large doctoral program representation include the School of Health and Human Sciences and the Joint School of Nanoscience and Nanoengineering, both demonstrating relatively low values of the number of students and SCH per full-time faculty.

In addition to teaching organized courses, other teaching-related duties that are routinely expected of UNCG faculty include: developing materials for new courses, supervising undergraduate and graduate student research, supervising masters theses and doctoral dissertations, supervising internships and other clinical placements, and supervising co-curricular activities such as plays. UNCG is currently exploring how to implement processes to collect quantitative measures of engagement in these duties.

## Section 7 Measures of Research & Creativity Activity for Each School/College

In accordance with UNCG's Annual Review Policy for Faculty, each year full-time faculty undergo a comprehensive review of the contributions to research and creative activity in relation to their specified annual goals and expectations for progress towards promotion and tenure. The annual review process includes an evaluation conducted by the department head/chair, a departmental peer-review committee, and the unit-level dean. As part of the review process, a faculty member's productivity in research and creative activity is evaluated using a range of outcomes appropriate for the faculty member's particular disciplinary area. These outcomes can be purely quantitative (e.g., number of journal articles published) or more qualitative in nature (e.g. a holistic interpretation of time allocated in preparing a large externally funded grant submission). Through the annual review process, academic leadership is able glean a qualitative assessment of performance outcomes related to research and creative activity.

While the annual review process uses specific research and creative activity outcomes for each faculty member, campus-wide systems to aggregate this information and report unit-level results are in varying phases of being implemented across UNCG. For some measures of research and creative activity productivity, such as grant submissions and grant award amounts, fully implemented campus-wide reporting systems existed in 2024-25. For other measures, however, reporting systems in 2024-25 were not yet comprehensively implemented across all faculty and all academic units. As a result, the available evidence of productivity on key measures of research and creative activity during 2024-25 consists of a combination of (a) quantitative data covering the entire faculty population for some outcomes and (b) quantitative data covering available samples of faculty for other outcomes.

The list of outcomes that are currently available within campus-wide reporting systems includes:

- a) **Number of publications.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of journal articles and book chapters accepted for publication, submitted for publication, or in preparation. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 300 faculty members across the academic units.
- b) **Number of conference presentations.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of conference presentations delivered, including serving as a session discussant or panel/roundtable presenter. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 300 faculty members across the academic units.
- c) **Grant proposals submitted.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the number of grant proposals submitted in 2024-25. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.

- d) **Grant proposals awarded.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the number of grant proposals awarded in 2024-25. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.
- e) **Grant dollars awarded.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the total dollar values of grants awarded during 2024-25. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.

It is relevant to note that the list of outcomes above is not an inclusive list of key outcomes considered by each academic unit. Some academic units, such as the College of Visual and Performing Arts, engage in substantial work related to performances, exhibitions, and installations. Our current reporting system, however, currently is unable to aggregate outcomes in these areas.

Table 7 summarizes measures of research and creative activity for each academic unit. The results pertaining to publications and conference presentations are intended to serve as points of evidence of faculty engagement in research and creative activity. The data are not, however, collected in a highly controlled manner to support comparisons between different academic units; some units had more faculty reporting out than others, and reporting research and creative activity using this campus-wide system was not yet mandatory.

<b>Table 7</b>	
<b>Measures of Research &amp; Creative Activity by School/College During 2024-25</b>	
School/College	Description of Measures
College of Arts & Sciences	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.2 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.8 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 106 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 51 new grants were secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$9,517,027 were secured.</p>
College of Visual & Performing Arts	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.2 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.3 conference presentations.</p> <p>Outcomes related to grant activity have not been considered relevant measures of research and creative activity for this academic unit, and thus are not reported here.</p>
Bryan School of Business & Economics	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.1 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p>

	<p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.7 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 10 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 7 new grants were secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$213,219 were secured.</p>
School of Health & Human Sciences	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 6.1 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.8 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 60 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 41 new grants were secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$7,405,552 were secured.</p>
School of Education	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.7 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.7 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 41 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 39 new grants were secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$5,746,507 were secured.</p>
School of Nursing	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.2 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.5 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 16 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 9 new grants were secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$2,946,867 were secured.</p>
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.5 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.9 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 40 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 15 new grants were secured.</p>

	<b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$2,780,440 were secured.
University Libraries	<p><b>Number of Publications:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.1 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation.</p> <p><b>Number of Conference Presentations:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.2 conference presentations.</p> <p><b>Grant Proposals Submitted:</b> Across the faculty, 5 grant proposals were submitted.</p> <p><b>New Grants Received:</b> Across the faculty, 1 new grant was secured.</p> <p><b>Grant Dollars Awarded:</b> Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$2,500 were secured.</p>
<p><i>Note.</i> The UNCG system for collecting data on the number of publications and the number of conference presentations records data within each calendar year. To obtain an estimate of the 2024-25 academic year (spanning half of 2024 and half of 2025), the following weighted estimate was used: (a) 50% weight was assigned to ½ of the total values recorded for 2024 (an estimate of the second half of 2024), and (b) 50% weight was assigned to the values recorded through the first half of 2025.</p>	

## Section 8 Measures of Service Contributions for Each School/College

In accordance with UNCG's Annual Review Policy for Faculty, each year full-time faculty undergo a comprehensive review of the contributions to service in relation to their specified annual goals and expectations for progress towards promotion and tenure. The annual review process includes an evaluation conducted by the department head/chair, a departmental peer-review committee, and the unit-level dean. As part of the review process, a faculty member's productivity in service is evaluated using a range of outcomes appropriate for the faculty member's particular disciplinary area. These outcomes can be purely quantitative (e.g., number of committees on which the faculty member has served) or more qualitative in nature (e.g. strength of leadership to professional organizations). Through the annual review process, academic leadership is able glean a qualitative assessment of performance outcomes related to service.

While the annual review process uses specific service outcomes for each faculty member, a campus-wide system to aggregate this information and report unit-level results is in the process of being implemented. Reporting systems in 2024-25 were not yet comprehensively implemented across all faculty and all academic units. As a result, available evidence of productivity on key measures of service activity during 2024-25 involves outcomes based on available samples of faculty outcomes.

The list of service outcomes that are currently available within campus-wide reporting systems includes:

- a) **Number of university committees served.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of departmental, school/college, or university committees on which the faculty member serves. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 600 faculty members across the academic units.
- b) **Number of professional organization committees served.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of professional organization committees on which the faculty member serves. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 500 faculty members across the academic units.
- c) **Number of community engagement activities.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of engagements of service to the community. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 250 faculty members across the academic units.

Table 8 summarizes measures of service for each academic unit. These results are not, however, collected in a highly controlled manner to support comparisons between different academic units; some units had more faculty reporting out than others, and reporting service activities using this campus-wide system was not yet mandatory.

<b>Table 8</b>	
<b>Measures of Service by School/College During 2024-25</b>	
School/College	Description of Measures
College of Arts & Sciences	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.6 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.8 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.1 engagements of service to the community.</p>
College of Visual & Performing Arts	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 8.8 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 2.4 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.6 engagements of service to the community.</p>
Bryan School of Business & Economics	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.7 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.0 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.2 engagements of service to the community.</p>
School of Health & Human Sciences	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.8 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.0 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.0 engagements of service to the community.</p>
School of Education	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.8 department, school/college, or university committees.</p>

	<p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.2 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.6 engagements of service to the community.</p>
School of Nursing	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.9 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.8 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.4 engagements of service to the community.</p>
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.0 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 10.3 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.3 engagements of service to the community.</p>
University Libraries	<p><b>Service to University Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 7.1 department, school/college, or university committees.</p> <p><b>Service to Professional Committees:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.4 professional organization committees.</p> <p><b>Community Engaged Service:</b> On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.8 engagements of service to the community.</p>
<p><i>Note.</i> The data reported correspond to faculty reporting occurring during the first half of 2025.</p>	

## **Section 9**

### **Process Evaluation and Compliance**

As articulated in the UNCG Policy and Regulations on Faculty Workload, the process of establishing each faculty member's workload begins with a collaborative discussion with their faculty supervisor (typically a department head/chair) about the workload needs of the department, school, or program. With these needs in mind, the faculty supervisor works cooperatively with the faculty member to establish the components of faculty member's specific workload, along with associated outcomes. This process recognizes the individual faculty member's contributions to the University in alignment with institutional workload policies, procedures, resources, mission, and the support of student success. Once the components of the faculty member's workload are determined, the faculty supervisor approves the workload plan. Each faculty member's workload is then approved by the unit dean.

When a significant circumstance occurs that justifies a mid-year revision of a faculty member's workload, the faculty member's workload is revised accordingly. All changes to the workload and associated outcomes are subject to approval of the faculty supervisor and unit dean.

## Section 10 Additional Context and Highlights

**Teaching.** The centrality of teaching to UNCG’s mission and faculty productivity is underscored within the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, which state “The most fundamental function of the University is teaching.” This sentiment is echoed within UNCG’s five-year strategic plan, *Forward Together*, where the first pillar focuses on enhancing student success, emphasizing student persistence and improving graduation rates. Central to these goals is the commitment to exceptional instruction ensuring all students have opportunity for success. To support faculty in delivering outstanding teaching, UNCG’s University Teaching and Learning Commons provides expert guidance in pedagogy, student learning, instructional technology and educational assessment.

**Research.** UNCG integrates the centrality of teaching with a strong commitment to research and creative activity. UNCG holds the Carnegie Foundation classification for high research activity, reflecting a campus that is highly engaged in the advancement of knowledge and the development of innovation to address pressing issues in society. The acceleration of research and creative activity by faculty at UNCG is evidenced by steep increases in research funding. Annual grant awards have increased by more than 65% from 2018-19 to 2023-24, totaling over \$60 million in 2023-24. Among the UNCG faculty are nationally and internationally renowned scholars, editors of premier academic journals, and recipients of national and international research awards. Innovate UNCG, housed within the Division of Research and Engagement, is an umbrella initiative that includes the NC Entrepreneurship Center, the Innovation Partnership Services Office, UNCG Esports, and the Impact Through Innovation Community Practice, with multiple hubs across campus. The commitment to research and creative activity is also leveraged through a wide range of research centers and networks at UNCG, including the BIRGHT Institute (Battery Research, Innovation, and next-Gen Energy Harvesting Technologies Institute), Early College Research Center, iCommand (Convergence of Optimized Methods for Military Advances and National Defense), the Center for Industry Research and Engagement, the Center for the Health of Vulnerable Populations, and the Center for Athlete Well-Being.

**Service.** Core to the mission of UNCG is that of service, both within the university and in the wider community. Holding the Carnegie Foundation classification for community engagement, UNCG promotes a wide range of service to the broader community. The commitment to community engaged service is evidenced through the numerous networks, centers, and institutes focused on serving pressing needs in our community, such as the Center for New North Carolinians, the Center for Housing and Community Studies, the Institute for Partnerships in Education, the Center for Community-Engaged Design, the SERVE Center, and the Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships.

## **Section 11**

### **Concluding Remarks**

The process of completing the Faculty Workload Report provided an opportunity to engage in a thorough analysis of available data, reflect on trends emerging in the results, and identify gaps in our current processes. Through the creation of this report, several key takeaways have surfaced.

- a) **Process for Workload Data Collection.** In assembling this report, we gained extensive insight into our current available processes for collecting workload data and how this can be improved moving forward. For some areas (e.g., courses offered, SCH generated) we have strong reporting processes already in place. For other areas, such recording faculty-level data of effort allocation in a common database, our current processes were inefficient and labor intensive. This offers us an opportunity to identify more efficient processes as we move towards the reporting of 2025-26 workload information.
- b) **Evaluation of Workload Trends.** The process of assembling the report afforded our team the opportunity to take a rigorous look at how workload effort is being distributed across our academic units and departments. Variations across departments with respect to the distribution of effort allocated provided a window into departmental practices for the structure of workload and where additional exploration will be needed to better understand the decision rules departments are using in making workload assignments.
- c) **Comprehensive Reporting of Outcomes.** Completing this report surfaced gaps that exist within our current reporting process for specific workload outcomes. While our campus has comprehensive reporting processes in place for outcomes pertaining to teaching (e.g., number of courses taught per faculty, number of credits taught per faculty), we are in need of developing more comprehensive processes for reporting out key measures of research and creative activity and service. This report helped us identify areas requiring the further development of data collection systems and associated decision rules.

### **Certification**

This report was prepared by Randy Penfield, Senior Vice Provost, and reviewed by Alan Boyette, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, prior to submission.



# Faculty Workload Report

Randy Penfield  
Senior Vice Provost



# Background

- Faculty workload is assembled using three categories of **effort**:



- Factors impacting the profile of effort across departments and academic units
  - i. Professional Track vs. Tenure Track
  - ii. Research engagement
  - iii. Graduate education (Doctoral, in particular)



## What is the campus-wide profile of effort? (**Table 1-A in Report**)

	Teaching	Research & Creative Activity	Service
Full-Time Faculty Only (n = 781)*	<b>55.0%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>

- Faculty are highly engaged in teaching, supporting the centrality of teaching to UNCG's mission.
- In addition to teaching, faculty are making important contributions to research/creative activity and service.



# What is the effort profile of each unit? (Table 3-A in Report)

Unit	Teaching	Research & Creative Activity	Service
Col. Arts & Sci.	58.0%	20.2%	21.8%
CVPA	62.1%	17.4%	20.4%
Bryan	51.1%	29.6%	19.3%
HHS	45.4%	19.6%	34.9%
Education	54.1%	22.4%	23.5%
Nursing	59.8%	13.5%	26.7%
JSNN	35.8%	45.0%	19.2%
Libraries	38.3%	18.1%	43.6%



# What does the effort assigned to teaching courses look like across campus? (Tables 2 & 4 in Report)

Unit	Course Sections	Student Credit Hours (SCH)	Faculty Contact Hours
<b>Campus-Wide</b>	<b>8,525</b>	<b>461,426</b>	<b>390,795</b>
Col. Arts & Sci.	3,164	200,702	140,237
CVPA	1,787	41,115	82,801
Bryan	864	88,651	37,667
HHS	1,170	68,306	55,561
Education	784	26,382	41,881
Nursing	385	21,900	16,066
JSNN	82	934	4,569



# What is the productivity for Research/Creative Activity & Service?

- The report presents extensive evidence of the productivity of our faculty in:
  - a) Research & Creative Activity
    - Publications & Conference Presentations
    - Grants
  - b) Service
    - To the university
    - To professional organizations
    - To the community



*Find your way here*

# What questions do you have?