



Academic Affairs Committee
September 22, 2026

Action Item

AAC – 4 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 2025-26 faculty workload, which requires approval by the Board of Trustees by September 30. This 2025-26 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.

Requested Action

That the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro approves the 2025-2026 Faculty Workload Report.

Attachment:

AAC-4.1 *Faculty Workload Report*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Alan Boyette'.

J. Alan Boyette
Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

**Faculty Workload Annual Report
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
September 3, 2026**

Institution: University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Academic Year: 2025-2026

Submitted by: Randy Penfield, Senior Vice Provost

Submission Date:

BOT Authorization Date:

**Section 1
Institutional Overview**

1.1: Institutional Context

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) is a comprehensive institution serving over 18,500 students across nearly 190 undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Devoted to exceptional student learning, innovative 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 21st 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 the following 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. In 2025-26, UNCG achieved a record \$77.4 million in annual research expenditures, placing the university among the nation's Top 200 research institutions and reinforcing its trajectory toward Carnegie R1 status. To support this growth, UNCG has invested significantly in its research infrastructure and enterprise. The Division of Research and Engagement completed a comprehensive reorganization to strengthen faculty support and interdisciplinary collaboration.

The sustained growth in 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. To manage grant responsibilities, numerous faculty must reallocate effort from their typical teaching load to research and creative activity, with 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.

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 97 undergraduate programs, UNCG offers 91 graduate programs (61 Masters programs and 30 Doctoral programs) serving approximately 3,800 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.

1.2: UNCG Workload Policy and the Process for Assigning Workload

UNCG workload policy. The UNCG workload 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. For 2025-2026, 809 faculty met the policy designation of full-time, inclusive of 15 faculty in the University Libraries.

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.

In March, the faculty member's department head/chair enters the actual effort assigned for the academic year for teaching, research and creative activity, and service into the Faculty Workload Dashboard.

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.

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, and 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.

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 UNCG 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.

1.4: Institutional Workload Percentages

In 2025-26, UNCG had 809 faculty identified as full-time faculty. Table 1 reports the percentage of full-time faculty workload effort allocated to teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

Table 1 Institutional high-level metrics for faculty workload percentages during 2025-2026 Full-Time Faculty Only		
ACTUAL % TEACHING– Faculty workload plan totals only	ACTUAL % RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY– Faculty workload plan totals only	ACTUAL % SERVICE– Faculty workload plan totals only
56.2%	21.5%	22.3%
<i>Note.</i> The reported values are calculated based on the Faculty Workload Dashboard Report Summary of 809 full-time faculty as described in Section 1.2.		

The value of 56.2% 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 56.2% 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.

The value of 21.5% 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 21.5% 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 21.5%.

In general, a typical effort assigned to service for a full-time faculty member is 20%. The observed percentage of 22.3% 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.

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 2025 and the 2025-26 academic year.

Table 2 Institutional high-level metrics for organized course sections, students credit hours, and faculty contact hours, Summer 2025, Fall 2025, and Spring 2026.		
ALL Organized Course Sections ACTUAL #	ALL Student Credit Hours produced ACTUAL #	ALL Faculty Contact Hours ACTUAL #
8,634	483,589	356,621*
*The value for faculty contact hours was calculated using the methodology prescribed by the UNC System Office which is different from the methodology used for the 2024-25 UNCG Faculty Workload Report. As a result, in comparing the faculty contact hours presented in the current report to those displayed in the 2024-25 report, it is important to recognize that a large portion of the difference in the reported values is an artifact of different formulas used for the calculation across the years.		

Section 2

Percentage of Faculty Workload Plans in Place

In the 2025-26 academic year, 809 faculty were required to complete a faculty workload plan for the academic year. The due date for completion of the workload plan is (a) August 15 for returning faculty, and (b) 45 days after the first day of appointment for newly hired faculty. All 809 faculty completed a faculty workload plan by their associated due date.

Section 3 Faculty Workload by School/College

Table 3 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.

Table 3 Faculty Workload by School/College for 2025-2026 Full-Time Faculty Only				
School/College	# Faculty Workload Plans	% Teaching	% Research & Creative Activity	% Service
College of Arts & Sciences	323	55.6%	19.8%	24.6%
College of Visual & Performing Arts	115	60.1%	18.3%	21.6%
Bryan School of Business & Economics	98	50.3%	29.5%	20.2%
School of Health & Human Sciences	120	56.2%	22.6%	21.2%
School of Education	75	54.3%	23.4%	22.2%
School of Nursing	54	67.3%	16.0%	18.5%
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	9	36.7%	43.3%	20.0%
University Libraries	15	64.0%	18.0%	18.0%
<i>Note.</i> The values are based on the workloads of the population of 809 full-time faculty.				

One notable result in Table 3 is the variability of the distribution of teaching workload effort across the academic units, ranging from 67.3% for the School of Nursing to 36.7% 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, which is reflected in the relatively high level of effort (43.3%) allocated to research and creative activity. Another unit having a relatively high level of effort (23.4%) allocated to research and creative activity is the School of Education, which also has a high level of grant activity per faculty. In contrast, the College of Visual and Performing Arts has one of the lowest per-faculty levels of external grant funding of any unit on campus, which is reflected in a relatively low (18.3%) effort allocated to research and creative activity.

A second 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.

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 and reports the total of all. 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 (e.g., School of Nursing) have the lowest. Departments exhibiting relatively high levels of student instruction include the School of Art, the School of Music, Biology, English, Chemistry and Biochemistry, and Kinesiology. The departments and units with relatively high concentrations of instruction are typically driven by large undergraduate enrollments within the department major and general education courses offered by the department.

As was the case for the faculty contact hours reported in Table 2, the values for faculty contact hours reported in Table 4 were calculated using the methodology prescribed by the UNC System Office which is different from the formula that was used for UNCG's 2024-25 Faculty Workload Report. As a result, in comparing the faculty contact hours presented in the current report to those reported in the 2024-25 report, it is important to recognize that a large portion of the difference in the reported values is an artifact of different formulas used for the calculation across the years.

Table 4 Organized course sections, student credit hours, and faculty contact hours, Summer 2025, Fall 2025, and Spring 2026 by School/College and Department			
Unit/Department	Organized Course Sections	Student Credit Hours	Faculty Contact Hours
College of Arts & Sciences			
African Amer/African Diaspora	33	2,748	1,208
Anc Mediterranean/Archaeology	62	7,909	2,303
Anthropology	19	1,250	685
Biology	434	24,915	19,492
CAS Advising Center (CASA)	1	69	15
Chemistry & Biochemistry	243	14,381	12,538
Communication Studies	154	10,378	5,594
Computer Science	102	7,360	4,227
English	320	15,479	13,015
Freshman Seminars	4	216	139
Geography/Environment/Sustain	157	10,245	5,758
History	142	7,333	5,738
Humanities at Work	4	412	100
Interior Architecture	55	4,139	3,657

Languages, Lit and Cultures	249	13,182	9,151
Liberal/Prof Studies	141	11,235	3,942
Mathematics and Statistics	200	15,217	8,780
Media Studies	101	6,150	4,038
Philosophy	102	11,064	3,715
Physics and Astronomy	50	3,441	895
Political Science	87	6,181	2,987
Psychology	267	19,852	11,709
Sociology/Criminology/Justice	123	9,451	4,790
Women's, Gender, and Sexuality	36	1,852	1,484
College of Arts and Sciences Total	3086	204,458	125,960
College of Visual & Performing Arts			
School of Art	296	16,656	20,462
School of Dance	167	4,139	6,829
School of Music	1123	13,994	39,561
School of Theatre	274	6,612	10,138
College of Visual & Performing Arts Total	1860	41,401	76,990
School of Business & Economics			
Accounting and Finance	128	18,298	4,834
Business and Econ Student Services (BES)	1	90	37
Consumer Apparel-Retail Stds	86	4,114	3,969
Dean's Office – BE	61	4,671	1,330
Economics	88	14,494	3,219
Info Sys and Supply Chn Mngmt	178	18,958	6,974
Management	222	21,995	7,853
MRK/ENT/HTM	113	14,715	4,568
School of Business & Economics Total	877	97,335	32,784
School of Health & Human Sciences			
Comm Sciences and Disorders	126	6,004	5,041
Community and Therapeutic Rec	46	3,556	2,157
Dean's Office HHS	2	153	75
Genetic Counseling	24	483	687
HealthyUNCG	2	60	90
HHS Grad - Undergrad Programs	36	2,418	1,223
HHS Office of Research	4	18	270
Human Devlp and Family Studies	152	13,405	5,990

Kinesiology	310	14,800	11,542
Nutrition	104	6,383	5,162
Peace and Conflict Studies	56	2,990	2,201
Public Health Education	149	12,826	6,349
Social Work	140	6,544	7,519
School of Health & Human Sciences Total	1,151	69,640	48,306
School of Education			
Counseling and Edu Development	130	5,011	5,614
Dean's Office - ED	20	718	662
Ed Ldrship and Cultural Found	120	2,977	6,371
Info/Library/Research/Science	229	10,360	9,047
Institute for Partnerships in Education	4	60	175
Specialized Education Services	133	4,444	7,037
Teacher Educ and Higher Educ	175	6,212	14,049
SOE Student Services Office	1	90	38
School of Education Total	812	29,872	42,993
School of Nursing Total*	443	26,142	16,365
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering Total*	83	820	3,669
University Libraries Total*	8	435	245
Other University Offices[#]	314	13,486	9,309
Grand Total	8,634	483,589	356,621
[#] 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 due to 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.

Table 5 Faculty Workload by School/College for 2025-2026 Full-Time Faculty Only				
Unit/Department	# Faculty Workload Plans	Actual % Teaching	Actual % Research /Creative Activity	Actual % Service
College of Arts & Sciences				
African Amer/African Diaspora	5	58.0%	22.0%	20.0%
Anc Mediterranean/Archaeology	7	67.1%	12.9%	20.0%
Anthropology	3	50.0%	26.7%	23.3%
Biology	36	53.9%	21.8%	24.3%
Chemistry & Biochemistry	18	55.3%	21.1%	23.6%
Communication Studies	14	66.4%	7.9%	25.7%
Computer Science	14	51.4%	22.9%	25.7%
English	34	54.7%	16.8%	28.5%
Geography/Environment/Sustain	11	43.2%	27.6%	29.3%
History	19	39.5%	30.5%	30.0%
Interior Architecture	9	68.9%	11.1%	20.0%
Languages, Lit and Cultures	32	68.1%	6.7%	25.2%
Liberal/Prof Studies	13	72.3%	3.0%	24.6%
Mathematics and Statistics	24	52.9%	23.3%	23.8%
Media Studies	8	71.1%	12.0%	16.9%
Philosophy	12	62.5%	11.7%	25.8%
Physics and Astronomy	6	61.7%	16.7%	21.7%
Political Science	12	50.0%	28.3%	21.7%
Psychology	27	42.6%	34.4%	23.0%
Sociology/Criminology/Justice	16	50.0%	28.1%	21.9%
Womens Gender and Sexuality	3	43.3%	26.7%	30.0%

College of Arts & Sciences Total	323	55.6%	19.8%	24.6%
School of Business & Economics				
Accounting and Finance	19	53.7%	27.9%	18.4%
Consumer Apparel-Retail Stds	8	51.3%	22.5%	26.3%
Economics	13	41.5%	34.6%	23.9%
Info Sys and Supply Chn Mngmt	19	48.7%	33.2%	18.2%
Management	23	49.6%	29.6%	20.9%
MRK/ENT/HTM	16	56.3%	26.3%	17.5%
School of Business & Econ. Total	98	50.3%	29.5%	20.2%
School of Education				
Counseling and Edu Development	9	44.3%	30.3%	25.3%
Ed Ldrship and Cultural Found	10	47.5%	20.0%	32.5%
Info/Library/Research/Science	26	55.8%	25.4%	18.9%
Specialized Education Services	11	67.3%	12.7%	20.0%
Teacher Educ and Higher Educ	19	53.2%	25.5%	21.3%
School of Education Total	75	54.3%	23.4%	22.2%
School of Health & Human Sci.				
Comm Sciences and Disorders	19	59.5%	13.1%	27.5%
Community and Therapeutic Rec	4	65.0%	15.0%	20.0%
Genetic Counseling	2	73.5%	11.5%	15.0%
Human Devlp and Family Studies	21	51.4%	28.6%	20.0%
Kinesiology	25	51.1%	30.9%	18.0%
Nutrition	11	52.7%	30.5%	16.8%
Peace and Conflict Studies	6	50.8%	15.8%	33.3%
Public Health Education	18	56.7%	22.2%	21.2%
Social Work	14	67.1%	12.9%	20.0%
School of Health & Hum. Sci. Total	120	56.2%	22.6%	21.2%
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering Total*				
	9	36.7%	43.3%	20.0%
School of Nursing Total*				
	54	67.3%	16.0%	18.5%
University Libraries Total*				
	15	64.0%	18.0%	18.0%
College of Vis. & Performing Arts				
School of Art	28	55.2%	21.8%	23.0%
School of Dance	10	47.0%	21.0%	32.0%
School of Music	56	61.8%	18.8%	19.5%

School of Theatre	21	68.6%	11.0%	20.5%
College of Vis. & Perf. Arts Total	115	60.1%	18.3%	21.6%
*Indicates that there is only one department of record within the unit, and thus individual department-level outcomes are not reported. Source: Faculty Workload Dashboard				

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 (30.3%), which leads to a lower effort devoted to teaching (44.3%). 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 (34.4%). This leads to a relatively low effort assigned to teaching of 42.6%. 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 68.1% and a low effort assigned to research and creative activity of 6.7%.

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 value of each of these four metrics 2025-2026 academic year for each of the seven academic units on campus.

Table 6 Measures of Organized Course Teaching for 2025-2026 Full-Time Faculty Only				
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	7.8	22.5	181.0	502.1
College of Visual & Performing Arts	11.0	26.3	98.1	216.8
Bryan School of Business & Economics	7.1	21.0	267.1	776.9
School of Health & Human Sciences	6.4	19.7	129.1	362.1
School of Education	7.4	23.4	91.4	240.6
School of Nursing	7.0	16.7	166.8	432.0
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	7.6	21.6	30.4	74.6

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. 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. Another unit with large doctoral program representation includes the School of Health and Human Sciences, 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 to 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 2025-26. For other measures, however, reporting systems in 2025-26 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 2025-26 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 465 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 405 faculty members across the academic units.
- c) **Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations.** Per faculty member, the self-reported number of performances and exhibitions delivered. Faculty in the College of Visual and Performing Arts and the College of Arts and Sciences are those who primarily engage in this type of creative activity. Data for this measure is available for samples of faculty within each academic unit, with the total sample size on the order of 165 faculty members across the academic units; 97 of those reporting are in the College of Visual and Performing Arts, where performances, exhibitions, and installations are their primary research and creative activity.

- d) **Grant proposals submitted.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the number of grant proposals submitted in 2025-26. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.
- e) **Grant proposals awarded.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the number of grant proposals awarded in 2025-26. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.
- f) **Grant dollars awarded.** Across all faculty in each academic unit, the total dollar values of grants awarded during 2025-26. Data for this measure is available for all faculty from each unit.

Table 7 summarizes measures of research and creative activity for each academic unit. The results pertaining to publications, conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, and installations 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.

Table 7 Measures of Research & Creative Activity by School/College During 2025-26	
School/College	Description of Measures
College of Arts & Sciences	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.3 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.9 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.5 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 152 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 40 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$6,120,059 were secured.
College of Visual & Performing Arts	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.7 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 15.0 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.2 conference presentations. 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.

Bryan School of Business & Economics	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 7.6 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.0 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.6 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 15 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 5 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$139,447 were secured.
School of Health & Human Sciences	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 6.0 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.7 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.8 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 95 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 36 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$7,612,768 were secured.
School of Education	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 4.7 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.1 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.2 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 35 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 32 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$4,617,327 were secured.
School of Nursing	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 6.8 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.0 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 1.8

	performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 14 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 8 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$2,784,420 were secured.
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 10.2 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.6 conference presentations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 49 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 12 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$3,548,936 were secured. Outcomes related to performances, exhibitions, and installations have not been considered relevant measures of research and creative activity for this academic unit, and thus are not reported here.
University Libraries	Number of Publications: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 6.3 publications accepted, submitted, or in preparation. Number of Conference Presentations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 5.5 conference presentations. Number of performances, exhibitions, and installations: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.5 performances, exhibitions, and installations. Grant Proposals Submitted: Across the faculty, 2 grant proposals were submitted. New Grants Received: Across the faculty, 2 new grants were secured. Grant Dollars Awarded: Across the faculty, grant awards totaling \$242,903 were secured.
<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. The data presented here is for the 2025-2026 academic year.	

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 2025-26 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 2025-26 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 644 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 560 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 354 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.

Table 8 Measures of Service by School/College During 2025-26	
School/College	Description of Measures
College of Arts & Sciences	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 9.1 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.3 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.3 engagements of service to the community.
College of Visual & Performing Arts	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 9.0 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.1 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.0 engagements of service to the community.
Bryan School of Business & Economics	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 7.6 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 7.7 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.6 engagements of service to the community.
School of Health & Human Sciences	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 8.5 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 6.7 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.7 engagements of service to the community.
School of Education	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 8.0 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 9.3 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 3.1 engagements of service to the community.

School of Nursing	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.6 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.9 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.7 engagements of service to the community.
Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 4.7 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 7.2 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.3 engagements of service to the community.
University Libraries	Service to University Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 7.9 department, school/college, or university committees. Service to Professional Committees: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported service to 5.5 professional organization committees. Community Engaged Service: On average, each faculty member in the available sample reported 2.8 engagements of service to the community.
<i>Note.</i> The data reported correspond to faculty reporting occurring during the 2025-2026 academic year.	

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 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.

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. In 2025-26, UNCG achieved a record \$77.4 million in annual research expenditures, placing the university among the nation's Top 200 research institutions. 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 of 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 BRIGHT 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. We successfully implemented a new reporting process this year using a common database to record faculty-level data of effort of allocation. Additional reflection on this new reporting process through the compilation of this report will help us identify even more efficient processes.
- 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. The 2025-2026 reporting of research and creative activity and service was more robust than the previous year, and for 2026-2027 we plan to further improve the 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.