Helen Giles-Gee and
Javier Miyares

Initiatives Aimed at Increasing Faculty Productivity

Institutions increasingly are needing to do more with less. No issue has been more in the forefront of accountability than that of faculty productivity. Legislators and boards are demanding that institutions account not only for the kind of work that faculty do but also that universities demonstrate increases in faculty teaching loads. Therefore, faculty workload has become the most "strategic" among a host of productivity indicators.

This article describes various approaches states have used to increase faculty teaching productivity. The State of Maryland may be singular in demonstrating effective use of coupling a faculty workload policy with a report not only to provide clear evidence of faculty productivity but also to demonstrate increases in teaching productivity following implementation of the workload policy. As a case study, the article discusses the process used to develop a workload policy at the 13 constituent institutions within the University of Maryland System (UMS). The findings indicate that both the policy and the method of reporting of workload affected faculty productivity and improved relationships with state legislators.

Not many issues have garnered more attention from governing boards, academic leaders, *and* legislators than that of faculty productivity. Of particular concern has been the relationship of accountability measures to teaching productivity. Legislators and boards are demanding that institutions account not only for the kind of work that faculty do but also that universities demonstrate increases in faculty teaching loads. Therefore, faculty workload has become the most "strategic" among a host of productivity indicators.

To assist institutions in improving their performance, Taylor, Meyerson, and Massy (1993) developed "strategic indicators." Strategic indicators facilitate an institution's comparison with peer institutions to determine if productivity can be increased. An institution may choose among a set of indicators that describe financial, physical plant, information, and human resources areas of the campus. It is the de-

cision about which of the indicators is important that makes the indicator "strategic." By identifying and selecting strategic indicators, and collecting data from peers, an institution can determine if it is operating at peak capacity.

Marchese (1995) suggested that the use of benchmarks, measures of the indicator at a given point in time, has been difficult because of the substantial effort required for implementation and because staff are often unskilled in their use. In addition, the absence of a national database of measures of strategic indicators by institution type forces institutions to determine their performance without reference points to successful measures recorded by other institutions. Nevertheless, Marchese suggested that institutions start on a smaller scale within an academic unit rather than approach this task on a large scale. For this and for political reasons as well, many institutions are attempting to measure the productivity of faculty, often for the purpose of determining if more classes can be taught without increasing the number of faculty.

Why Consider Increasing Faculty Productivity?

For most post-secondary institutions, teaching remains the predominant activity. Data from the U. S. Department of Education's National Center on Education Statistics (NCES) (1996) document that in fall semester 1992, full-time faculty at colleges and universities spent 58.8 percent of their work time in teaching activities. From 1969 to 1989, however, many faculty decreased their instructional loads in order to increase their research output (Massy and Zemsky, 1992). The NCES showed that this trend continued through the early 1990s, with the percentage of time spent teaching by full-time faculty decreasing from 61 to 59 percent between 1987 and 1992. In addition, full-time, higher-ranked faculty, especially at research universities, were more likely to spend the higher percentage of their time conducting research rather than teaching than professors of lower rank (U. S. Department of Education NCES, 1996). However, this movement towards research altered some faculty members' commitment to teaching and engendered adverse reactions on the part of students.

Students at research universities complained of lectures delivered by teaching assistants. Students complained about limited access to upper level courses. As the costs of instruction and education increased, students complained that the quality of their education was decreasing while tuition was rising. Students and their parents called upon legislators to address their concerns.

In response to constituent demands, legislators called upon institutions to address issues of faculty productivity and added their own concerns about higher education. Legislators were concerned that tenure now offered an assurance of lifetime employment due to an enactment of a federal law in January

1994 banning mandatory retirement; and legislators feared that universities were ill equipped to monitor, and/or terminate nonproductive faculty. They questioned how faculty spent their time and whether college policies and procedures favored research activities at the expense of teaching.

To a limited extent, legislators were right. Current institutional evaluation practices for hiring, promotion, and granting of tenure often consider research more valuable than teaching, thus encouraging faculty to forsake teaching for greater rewards of research. Legislators looked for ways to increase the teaching productivity of faculty.

State Strategies to Increase Faculty Instructional Productivity

Many states, including California, Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming, had conducted studies of faculty teaching loads by 1994. States have employed varying strategies to document the workload of faculty, including changes in the budget process and creation of statutory or institutional standards or reporting requirements. For example, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, and Texas have considered amending budget procedures to encourage the attainment of teaching goals. Arkansas considered an incentive funding system based on progress towards statewide teaching goals that are related to the mission of institutions: 15 credit hours/semester at community colleges, 12 hours/semester at four-year institutions, and 9 credit hours/semester at research institutions (MHEC, 1994).

Ohio has required a 10 percent increase in statewide undergraduate teaching through legislation that impacts the budget. By January 1994, the Ohio Board of Regents, jointly with the state universities was to develop standards for instructional workload for full-time and part-time faculty. The standards were to emphasize undergraduate teaching and determine a range of acceptable workload of undergraduate teaching by faculty. By June 30, 1994, the Board of Trustees within each university had to take formal action to adopt a faculty workload policy consistent with the statewide standards adopted by the Board of Regents. State legislation required the Board of Regents to work with the universities to ensure that no later than the fall term 1994, "a minimum 10 percent increase in statewide undergraduate teaching activity is to be achieved to restore the reductions experienced over the past decade" (Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards & Guidelines, February 18, 1994). In June 1994, the Regents Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload issued a report including many recommendations aimed at revitalizing faculty

teaching including incentives to change the reward structure, encouraging methods of teacher evaluation and faculty development programs.

The Ohio Board of Regents reported that by April 1996, all four-year postsecondary institutions in Ohio had submitted institutional workload policies approved by their boards of trustees. Each of the colleges or universities' departments had to demonstrate a percent of teaching consistent with the mission of the institution. For example, departments at colleges offering only baccalaureate programs had to document that teaching accounted for 70 to 80% of the total faculty workload, while departments at research universities were to document that teaching accounted for 50 to 60% of the total faculty workload. The Ohio Board of Regents plans to monitor institutions' compliance with statewide guidelines by using an estimation procedure until 1998, at which time a uniform data information system should be used to monitor faculty teaching workload.

Hawaii mandated a standard teaching load of 12 credit hours/semester at four-year colleges and 15 credit hours/semester at two-year institutions. The governing board of the University of Wisconsin required each of its institutions to develop a teaching workload policy. Legislatures of Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, and New Mexico have required faculty workload reports, while state governing boards in Iowa, Mississippi, and Tennessee have required such reports (MHEC, 1994).

The fact that most colleges and universities have established faculty workload policies to document or to increase faculty instructional productivity raises several questions. If some faculty are shown to be teaching less than a "standard" load, will their teaching productivity increase solely or primarily as a result of establishing accountability mechanisms for faculty workload? That is, will teaching loads increase significantly due to policy implementation without accompanying changes in faculty rewards' policies? Further, will changes in faculty workload expectations trigger reviews of existing evaluation policies? If not, and if establishing accountability mechanisms for faculty workload does not result in increases in teaching, legislatively mandated teaching loads may become more frequent. The outcome will be prejudicial to higher education: teaching workloads will be developed in the high pressure environment of state legislatures that reflect the prevalent skepticism that higher education is constitutionally unable to reform itself. The following case study presents an overview of legislatively mandated workload policy and reporting in Maryland, which may be one of few states with reported measures of faculty workload productivity.

Background: Chronology of Maryland Legislative Workload Requests

In 1994, the Maryland General Assembly withheld money ($21 million) from the University of Maryland Systems' degree granting institutions, Morgan State University, and St. Mary's College of Maryland. Any release of funds was contingent upon receipt by the legislature of a policy and report on faculty workload. The policy "... shall establish standards for teaching loads and provide for specific exceptions to those standards...." While the legislature acknowledged past work by the colleges and universities to respond to questions about workload, it continued to express dissatisfaction: "The committees appreciate the efforts undertaken to quantify and report on faculty workload. However, the committees *do not believe that what has been reported to-date provides them with assurances that the institutions are carefully examining what faculty do or evidence that reductions in teaching loads are balanced by equally important responsibilities for scholarship, public service or administration.* It was requested that the University of Maryland System, St. Mary's College and Morgan State University work with the Maryland Higher Education Commission to develop policies and reporting mechanisms in these areas" (Report of the Joint Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee, 1994). A key issue and one that the UMS used in developing a model workload policy was the need to balance "important responsibilities for scholarship, public service, and administration."

A paramount concern of legislators was that they did not feel assured that higher education knew what was going on regarding faculty teaching, that institutions were "minding the store." Interestingly, it was widely acknowledged that faculty invest much time and effort in their work. The concern was that too much of faculty time and effort went into research and service (internal and to the profession) and not enough into teaching—particularly, into undergraduate teaching.

As a consequence of the legislature's request, in August 1994, the UMS Board of Regents approved a policy on faculty workload. The policy had two main purposes: to promote optimal performance by UMS faculty and to ensure accountability. The policy indicated the centrality of instruction in three ways: (1) defining a percentage of teaching effort required for each "core" (tenured and tenure track) faculty member that exceeded the effort required for research/ scholarship or service activities; (2) requiring that all tenured and tenure-track faculty be involved in the instructional program; and (3) requiring that senior faculty participate in undergraduate instruction. Faculty teaching in graduate

departments were excluded from the last requirement.

Accountability is a critical element of the UMS workload policy: "Accountability for institutional adherence to the policy rests with the presidents. They are charged with establishing, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, institutional faculty workload policies compatible with the system policy and with their own institutional missions. The main features of the accountability provisions are: All faculty will be given workload expectations in accordance with departmental, institutional, and system policies; faculty members will be reviewed annually throughout their employment based on institutional procedures; as a part of that review, actual performance will be compared with workload expectations; faculty reviews and subsequent actions will reflect fully the results of these comparisons and will take into account the institution's faculty reward structure; consequence for failure to fulfill expectations will be established." (UMSA, 1994).

The UMS workload policy applies to: all persons holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified either as faculty or as administrators at the departmental level, persons who are not tenured or on the tenure track but who are employed full time by the UMS and are classified as "instructional faculty," research faculty whose salaries are supported in whole or in part by state funds.

Subsequent to the legislative mandate, standard teaching load expectations were developed for research institutions (5-6 course units a year), and for comprehensive (state colleges and universities) institutions (7-8 course units a year). "Course unit" was defined as a three-creditcourse. Courses earning a different number of credits were converted to 3-credit equivalent units. For example, a four-credit course is equivalent to 1.3 course units. Further, graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research) are converted to course units, using a set of weights developed by the vice presidents for academic affairs (see Table 1). The basis for the weights is the estimate that to supervise the normal progress of three doctoral students' research (three students registered for three dissertation credits in one semester) is equivalent to teaching a three credit hour course. (Other conversion weights were adopted consistent with the approach.) Clearly, this is a theoretical but useful construct. While the work of doctoral students is uneven and does not necessarily correspond to the number of credit hours for which they have registered, the faculty supervising the dissertations are credited for that work. The adoption of 10 (rather than 9) credits in the conversion table reflects a compromise with the coordinating board, who felt that the weights originally adopted by the vice presidents were "too rich."

Institutional presidents may exempt individual departments from standard teaching loads if justified by accreditation requirements, market forces, and other external regulations. Since the "course" is used as the basic workload unit, allowing individual departments to adopt lower teaching loads also addresses situations where the relationship between contact and credit hours is atypical. Examples are a science department which offers courses that include lab hours, as well as art departments that offer many hours of supervised studio work.

Table 1

Weights Used to Convert Non-classroom Graded Instruction Into Course Units

Course Level	N of Credits= 1 Course Unit
800-899 (dissertation & doctoral level individual studies)	10 credits = 1 course unit
799 (masters thesis)	13 credits = 1 course unit
500-798 (other graduate level individual studies)	18 credits = 1 course unit
400-499 (graduate/undergraduate level individual studies)	21 credits = 1 course unit
100-399 (undergraduate level individual studies)	30 credits = 1 course unit

"Exceptions" (i.e., released time or course units not taught) to the standard workload are allowed for such factors as: (1) instruction-related reasons, like class size or mode of instruction; (2) departmental administration responsibilities; (3) externally funded research and service activities; (4) department-supported research; and (5) department-supported service.

The policy defines standard teaching loads within the larger framework of the "effort" to be expended by each faculty member in the categories of "instruction, research/scholarship, and service." The "percent of effort" expended is to be consistent with the mission of the institution and with the institutional teaching loads (see Table 2). Thus, the policy anticipates that faculty who prefer not to engage in research will teach additional courses.

Developing the Workload Policy

The process used to develop the workload policy was key to its acceptance by internal and external constituents. By keeping stakeholders both involved in its development and aware of each other's interests, faculty and

administrators accepted the complexity of the policy but they also recognized the high stakes riding on its implementation. The UMS system-wide workload policy was developed through an iterative process elaborated in the following key steps.

Table 2
Percent of Faculty Effort Expended in Institution-Related Activities by Type of Institution

Institution-Type	Instruction	Research/Scholarship	Service
Comprehensive			
% of Total Effort	65 - 75%	15 - 25%	5 - 15%
# Course Units/Yr.	7 - 8%		
Research			
% of Total Effort	45 - 55%	35 - 45%	5 - 15%
# Course Units/Yr.	5 - 6%		
Non-Degree Granting			
% of Total Effort	5 - 15%	75 - 85%	15 - 25%

The Academic Affairs Advisory Council (AAAC)—a collective of the 13 Academic Vice Presidents and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—charged a system-wide task force to develop a workload policy that would articulate broad guidelines for institutions according to their missions.

The task force, chaired by the UMS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, included four academic vice presidents, four faculty members nominated by the Council of University System Faculty (a system-wide group of faculty elected by their campus peers who are advisory to the Chancellor), and two administrators from the UMS System administration.

The policy proposed by the task force was revised by the AAAC and then disseminated for review throughout the 13 UMS institutions.

Following a review of the campus comments and revision by AAAC, the draft workload policy was forwarded to the Chancellor's Council (including the presidents of UMS institutions and chaired by the Chancellor) and then to the Board of Regents for their discussion and adoption.

Throughout the process, the workload policy was negotiated with key staff of the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), the state's coordinating board.

Therefore, the final system-wide policy approved by the UMS Board of Regents was developed after six months (March 17 to August 19, 1994) of collegial deliberation and negotiation.

After adoption of the system-wide faculty workload policy, UMS institutions developed their own policies and established workload expectations for faculty appropriate to their disciplines and consistent with their mission. The professional schools (law, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy) developed their own policies, which required approval by the Chancellor to ensure accountability fully comparable to criteria found in the system-wide policy.

The system-wide policy established connections between workload expectations and procedures to monitor actual work performed. However, the policy did not assure consistency between workload expectations and evaluation procedures. Hence, the question remained, will the workload policies reverse earlier trends of research versus teaching; will faculty teach more? The fact that faculty workload data will be reported to legislators may have influenced key changes in standard workloads at institutions. The second annual report on faculty workload released in December, 1995, noted that progress had been made in increasing the instructional productivity of the UMS faculty (UMSA, 1995). The entire process of developing and implementing the system-wide faculty workload policy took one and one/half years because of the lag time between developing and approving the system-wide and institutional faculty workload policies and the development of faculty schedules for the 1995-96 academic year.

Faculty Workload Format and Indicators

The format for displaying faculty workload data and the indicators used were as hotly debated and negotiated as the policy itself. For example, coordinating board staff required the inclusion of productivity measures of teaching assistants and contractual faculty. Similarly, they required that the UMS differentiate between service to the public, to the institution, and to the profession. The inclusion of faculty on sabbatical, and how to classify them, was also negotiated with legislative analysts.

As required by the Maryland legislature, the workload report format is a 24 by 13 cell matrix designed to gather data at the department level, and flows directly from the system-wide policy (see Table 3). It provides for data to be reported by type of faculty: core faculty, department administrators, full-time non-core instructional faculty, non-core research faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching assistants. Data include number of faculty, credit hours generated, expected teaching load, number of faculty who taught the expected teaching load, number of faculty who did not, and total course reduction by type: instruction-related reasons (e.g., class size); externally funded research and service, department supported research and service, internal service, and service

to the professional. The format also includes information on research/scholarship and service productivity. Since faculty workload has been a recurring issue with legislators, a process to collect data on research/scholarship and service productivity has been established, and a set of indicators of non-instructional productivity has been defined. Workload data, aggregated by faculty for each department are presented on a single page. This encourages reviewers to consider data on faculty productivity in the areas of research/scholarship and service as well as in instruction.

Findings

In academic year 1994-95, core faculty generated 51% of all lower division student credit hours (SCH). At the upper division level, 59% of all SCH were generated by core faculty. At the graduate level, 71% of all SCH were generated by core faculty.

Table 3 summarizes data for AY 1994-1995. Thirty percent of the core faculty had been released from teaching one or more courses.

Table 3
Summary of Faculty Workload Academic Year 1995-95

Total # of Courses Taught	19,446	
Total # of Course Exceptions	2,489	
# and % of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load	1,308	36%
# and % of Faculty Who Taught More than Standard Load	1,234	34%
# and % of Faculty Who did not Teach Standard Load	1,111	30%
Total # of Core & Full-time Faculty	3,653	100%

Number and Percent of Course Exceptions by Type of Exception

Type of Course Exception	#	%
Instruction	440	18%
Departmental Administration	488	20%
Externally Funded Research & Service	473	19%
Departmentally Supported Research	178	7%
Service to Profession	45	2%
Internal Service	126	5%
Public Service	41	2%
Sabbatical	531	21%
Other	167	7%
	2,489	100%

On the other hand, 34% of the UMS faculty taught more than the standard load. An analysis of course "exceptions" shows the number of courses the faculty had been released from teaching. Twenty percent of the released time was accounted for by departmental administration, 19% by externally funded research, 18% by instruction-related reasons, 7% by department supported research, 9% by service (to the profession, to the institution, or to the public), and 21% by sabbaticals.

An analysis of noninstructional (mostly scholarly) productivity for AY 1994-1995 showed that the UMS faculty published 800 books, more than 8,000 peer reviewed articles, and made more than 10,000 professional presentations. The UMS faculty spent 10-20 days per faculty member in service to business, government, schools their institutions, and their profession. Not including funds awarded to nondepartmental units (e.g., Title III), 315 million dollars were obtained by the UMS institutions in externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members. Within UMS research institutions, the average dollars awarded for research per full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) ranged from $337,000 to $71,000 per faculty member.

Data obtained in academic year (AY) 1994-95 showed an increase of 158 course units when compared to AY 1993-94, while the core number of full-time faculty decreased by 106. The data of AY 1994-95 showed that faculty had been released from 2,489 course units (11% of the total). Comparatively, AY 1993-94 showed faculty released from 2,844 (13%) of all course units that could have been taught by full-time faculty.

Most departments at comprehensive institutions that have a limited research mission reported a standard load of eight courses, and no increases were necessary to comply with the Board of Regents' policy. One comprehensive institution that had a more significant research mission had to increase its standard teaching load from 6 to 7 to comply with the system-wide policy. The two research institutions are increasing their standard teaching load to five.

The workload data can be helpful to institutional administrators by providing a rationale for increasing departmental faculty workloads. For example, at one research university, the department of chemistry and biochemistry, with a low teaching load of 2 courses a year, brings more than $200,000 in externally funded research. On the other hand, departments with no externally funded research have higher teaching loads. For institutional administrators, such an analysis identifies departments in which a lower teaching load might not correspond to a desirable alternative (research funds or time committed to public service). It also allows examination of de facto decisions made in an institution, as well as the opportunity either to affirm the decisions or change some directions.

Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

Negotiations of the UMS with MHEC staff on the issue of faculty workload necessitated development of a periodic review policy of faculty. The Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) recommended a policy on the periodic review of faculty to the AAAC. This draft was reviewed by a task force including institutional faculty and administrators with UMSA staff. In March 1996, the AAAC reviewed the revised policy submitted by the Task Force, further amended it to specifically apply to tenured faculty, and submitted it to the Chancellor and Presidents. They reviewed and revised the proposed policy and by May 6, 1996 forwarded it to the Education Policy Committee of the Board of Regents. The University of Maryland System Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty was approved by the full Board on July 12, 1996. Each institution must now submit to the Chancellor for his approval an institutional policy consistent with the periodic review policy by May 1997.

The proposed policy specifically coordinates and implements the Board of Regents policies on the "Evaluation of Performance of Faculty" and "Faculty Workload Responsibilities." Specifically, quantitative workload expectations are those required by the workload policy, while qualitative expectations are to be determined by the department/unit. The periodic review policy requires institutions to commit resources not only to the process itself, but also to its accompanying development program. The post-tenure review policy requires institutions to clarify the roles of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean, Chairperson, and faculty colleagues in the review process. The policy does not limit the application of UMS policies concerning faculty evaluation and/or termination. The consequence for failing to meet qualitative expectations is a plan of faculty development that is mutually developed by the faculty member and the chair and monitored by the chair. The consequences for failing to meet quantitative expectations are not specified within the policy.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The involvement of internal and external constituents in developing both the workload policy and the reporting form kept the realities of accountability in the forefront. Changes in standard workload were acceptable to faculty and responsive to legislators. The latter believed that higher education was "minding the store," and that faculty were indeed teaching in accord with the public and parents' expectations.

The adoption of "course unit" in the workload policy as the key teaching productivity measure proved beneficial for accountability. It has an intuitive

appeal to lay people and legislators, and it also corresponds to a way faculty think of their workload ("How many courses are you teaching this semester?" is a very common question among faculty!). The conversion of nonclassroom graded instruction (e.g., dissertation research) through a set of weights was accepted by legislators as a valid and appropriate measure of work. This was a major achievement in introducing legislators to the complexity of faculty workload.

The analysis of course exceptions by type for AY 1994-54 indicated considerable dedication of faculty to research supported by either external or internal departmental funds. For those legislators who decried any nonteaching activity in which faculty were engaged, it was important to demonstrate the contribution, monetary or otherwise, that resulted from research. This, in turn, reinforced the need to provide data on faculty research productivity, income to the state from contracts and grants and publications. The report thus communicated the richness of faculty productivity beyond the basic "number of courses taught" approach and became a document aimed at educating the public.

A clear limitation faced by most states in the area of faculty workload is the absence of national data for comparison purposes. The Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting is not expected to adopt recommendations on the area of faculty workload until 1997. The adoption by the University of North Carolina (UNC, 1996) of a course based approach to monitor faculty teaching workload will provide the University of Maryland System institutions with a measure of comparative information.

To the basic questions posed at the beginning of this article ("will teaching productivity increase simply as a result of establishing accountability mechanisms for faculty workload?"), the tentative answer seems to be "Yes." Reporting to outside constituencies and, in some cases for the first time, to institutional administrators, creates pressure in the departments to maximize teaching and minimize released time.

However, setting clear workload expectations seems to trigger pressures to review evaluation policies so that they can be better aligned with the new realities of accountability. The additional development of a periodic review policy added to the belief that the institutions were seriously addressing issues of faculty performance. The faculty workload policy provided a clear mechanism to address the quantitative aspects of faculty work. The periodic review policy addressed qualitative aspects of a faculty member's performance as well.

Post-tenure review appears to be increasing as a means to assure the accountability of tenured faculty; i.e. that tenured faculty are performing duties

satisfactorily. The elimination of the mandatory retirement age is neither a legitimate nor legal criterion to terminate faculty. Institutions' evaluations of all faculty, regardless of age, need to assure that both competence and effort are sustained over time.

Therefore, to address mandates for accountability, institutions will need to first focus on productivity, providing not only incentives to teach more but also recommending better ways to reward teaching effort, with perhaps fewer exemptions at the department level. Institutions appear to focus more on developmental needs of faculty and on providing incentives for faculty to teach more. These incentives may be insufficient to overcome promotion and tenure practices that favor research/ scholarship and publishing over teaching.

After demonstrating that faculty are reasonably engaged in teaching, institutions may find legislators who are still not satisfied. Linking faculty workload reporting with a policy on periodic review of faculty has provided clarity about workload expectations and consequences for failing to meet the expectations.

Suggested Readings

Marchese, T. "Understanding Benchmarking," *AAHE Bulletin* 47(April 1995):3-5.

Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC). "Faculty Teaching Load Analysis." Annapolis, MD. 1994.

Massy, W. and Zemsky, R. "Faculty Discretionary Time: Departments and the Academic Ratchet," Stanford Institute of Higher Education Research, Discussion Paper 4. Stanford, CA. 1992.

Mingle, J. "Faculty Work and the Cost/Quality/Access Collision." *Trusteeship* 1:5(September/October, 1993):11-16.

Rush, S. "Productivity or Quality? In Search of Higher Education's Yellow Brick Road," *NACUBO Business Officer*. (April, 1992):36-42.

Taylor, B, Meyerson, M., and Massy, W. *Strategic Indicators for Higher Education: Improving Performance*. , Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guides. 1993.

U. S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). *The Condition of Education 1996*, NCES 96-304 by Thomas M. Smith. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June, 1996).