

Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity *Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity (2007-08)*

Data Collection Walk-Through (FAQ)

The following set of questions and answers reflects queries that we hear most frequently from colleagues preparing to submit data to the Delaware Study, using the survey form for *Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity*. We hope this paper dialogue assists you in your efforts. Please also be sure to consult the definitions that accompany the data collection forms. If you have any additional questions not addressed here, please feel free to contact either Heather Kelly (hkelly@udel.edu) or Michael Middaugh (middaugh@udel.edu), or call us at the University of Delaware at (302) 831-2021.

Items 1 through 4 on the Data Collection Forms deal with separate course preparations, redesigning curriculum, and creating new courses. Are these items mutually exclusive?

These items are not mutually exclusive. Item #1 seeks the number of separate course preparations. The number of separate course preparations should reflect separate courses or course sections. Item #2 seeks the number of existing courses that have been redesigned to incorporate enhanced instructional methods and materials. Item #3 seeks the number of brand new courses that have been created by faculty and approved for delivery. The creation of a brand new course goes beyond the normal updating of course materials. Item #4 seeks the number of brand new courses that have been created and delivered primarily or fully online. It is quite possible and likely that item #3 and #4 will include courses counted in item #1 and #2.

Aren't all faculty engaged in curriculum revision to one extent or another? What exactly are you after in Item #2 on the Data Collection Forms?

The Delaware Study assumes that most faculty regularly update their teaching materials to stay current. This item seeks those circumstances where faculty might be granted release time to engage in extensive pedagogy redesign and curriculum reform. For example, the University of Delaware recently received a major grant from the Pew Foundation to examine the impact of problem based learning (PBL) on student performance. Faculty in several disciplines received reduced teaching loads to revise both the curriculum and instructional delivery strategies in their respective courses to reflect the PBL pedagogy.

What do you consider to be refereed journal articles and/or book chapters?

The Delaware Study does not presume to tell institutions what constitutes a refereed publication. Use your institutional definitions and conventions for that purpose. The definitive element is that the publication has external referees who review submitted manuscripts and act as quality filters to ensure that acceptable submissions only move forward to ultimate publication.

How do we parse out multiple author publications and multiple publication authors?

Let's look at several examples. Suppose John Smith, a Professor in the University of Delaware's History Department co-authored a refereed article with Mary Jones, also a Professor in the History Department, on "The Emergence of Free Trade in the Russian Economy." With both faculty in the same department, History gets credit for two refereed publications. Suppose Smith was with the History Department, but Jones was in the Political Science Department. History would get credit for one refereed publication, as would Political Science. Suppose Smith was with the History Department at the University of Delaware, but Jones was with the Political Science Department at the University of Kansas. Delaware would get credit for one refereed publication – in the History Department, while Kansas would get credit for one refereed publication – in Political Science.

Editorial positions and edited volumes require some clarification. Let's look at a real case study. Fred Volkwein is a Professor of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University, and is Series Editor for the Jossey-Bass monograph series, *New Directions in Institutional Research*, published four times each year. His duties include recruiting single volume editors and overseeing the general editorial content of each volume. Because this is a major editorial position, Volkwein would receive credit and be counted once under item #25 on the data collection forms. Suppose that Michael Middaugh, Project Director of the Delaware Study, was a full time member of the Educational Leadership Faculty at the University of Delaware. In summer of 2001, Jossey-Bass published a volume he edited in the *New Directions in Institutional Research* series, *Analyzing Costs in Higher Education: What Institutional Researchers Need to Know*. He also wrote a chapter in that volume. He would receive credit for one edited volume (item #22 on the data collection forms), and would also receive credit for a book chapter (item #18 on the data collection forms). Earlier in 2001, Jossey-Bass also published Middaugh's book, *Understanding Faculty Productivity: Standards and Benchmarks for Colleges and Universities*. For that, he would receive credit for a single-author book (item #20 on the data collection forms).

The bottom line is to use common sense in assigning credit for editorial and edited work. The publication should be scholarly and have distribution beyond the institution. Departmental or institutional newsletters do not meet these criteria. On the other hand, *The Journal of Higher Education*, although it is housed at The Ohio State University, is obviously far more than an institutional publication and would meet all of the criteria for editorships and/or articles in a refereed publication.

Any qualifying conditions with respect to formal faculty presentations at regional and national professional meetings?

Yes – the paper must actually be presented. If a single-author paper is proposed for presentation at a national meeting, for example the American Sociological Association, and ASA accepts the proposal and lists it in their program, but the faculty member does not attend the meeting and deliver the paper due to budget constraints, the paper does not count under item #31 on the data collection forms. We are not, however, insensitive to departmental budgetary constraints. Suppose the above referenced paper was jointly authored by two faculty from the same or different departments, but budget constraints permitted only one faculty member to attend the meeting and present the paper. So long as the paper was actually delivered, all authors may receive credit under item #31 on the data collection forms.

Explain what you're after in Items 32 through 36 on the Data Collection Forms, all of which deal with grants and contracts.

All items deal with an academic or fiscal year, i.e., the period from July 1 through June 30. It is possible to formally submit a grant proposal during that year without it either being awarded or funded. Item #32 on the data collection forms is seeking the number of proposals that have gone through a formal submission process at an institution, usually through an office of sponsored research or grants/contracts administration. We are not seeking proposals “in the conceptual or developmental stage.” Rather, we are looking for the number of polished proposals that have gone through formal institutional submission to a funding agency, and for which word on funding may or may not have been received during that year. This enables us to account for faculty activity that goes into proposals that are developed and submitted, but which may ultimately prove unsuccessful.

Item #33 and #35 on the data collection forms looks at the number of successful grants or contracts in that same year. These are grant proposals for which a formal award letter and/or funding have been received. This item takes into consideration those situations where a faculty member has been formally notified in writing by a funding agency that they have been awarded a grant or contract. This item allows inclusion of faculty who have received award letters during the year, but for which funds may have not yet been disbursed. It also includes those situations where funds may have been disbursed during the year but not spent. Both of these situations would not have been captured by the research and service section of the quantitative portion of the Delaware Study, which looks only at actual expenditures during a fiscal year. Item #34 and #36 on the data collection forms asks for the dollar value of grants awarded to faculty during the year, again whether or not the funds have actually been expended.

A faculty member may have been awarded a multi-year grant, contract, or scholarly fellowship. Does the Data Collection Form account for continuing grants, contracts, or scholarly fellowships?

Yes. Item #37 seeks the number of continuing external and internal grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships. It is understood that grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships may extend past a year or be multi-year. Grants, contracts, and scholarly fellowships accounted for in this item would have been initially awarded previous to the 12-month evaluation period under examination.

Everything else on the Data Collection Forms seem fairly straightforward, although a little clarification on Items 39 through 42 on the data collection forms would be helpful.

These four items ask for the number of discrete service activities – to the institution, community, or profession – engaged in by faculty during the time frame under analysis. National studies often talk about the proportion of time that faculty spend in service; this item attempts to quantify that by accounting for the number and variety of service activities that faculty perform.

We trust that this discussion has been helpful to you. As noted earlier, if you still have unanswered questions, by all means – call us!