

Faculty Teaching Workload Report 1999–2000



March 7, 2001

UNC Teaching Workload Report, 1999-2000 Highlights

- Between 1996-97 and 1999-2000, the teaching loads of UNC tenure stream faculty increased from 15.2 to 16.1 course hours per year. When measured in terms of course hours taught and course credit hour equivalents taught, the loads increased from 18.8 to 19.9. Course hour loads at NCSU increased from 13.7 to 13.8 while course hour loads at UNC-CH increased from 9.5 to 10.4.
- The weighted average standard teaching loads at the research universities, with course hour equivalents included, were 13.7 at NCSU and 11.8 at UNC-CH. At UNCG and ECU, the standard loads were 18.1 and 24.0, respectively. At the masters and baccalaureate institutions, the standard loads ranged from 17.6 to 24.0 hours per year. These loads correspond closely to the benchmarks set in the Board's policy and appear to be competitive with those of comparable public institutions.
- Trends in the distribution of lower-division undergraduate student credit hours taught show a slight decrease in the percentage taught by graduate teaching assistants.
- A marked decrease in the percentage of lower division undergraduate student credit hours taught by tenure stream faculty is explained by a corresponding decrease in their numbers relative to those of off-track faculty, a trend that is under study by a University-wide task force staffed by the division of academic affairs.
- Teaching productivity, as measured by student credit hours taught per state-funded faculty FTE, has increased slightly between 1996-97 and 1999-2000 (from 405.3 to 409.4).
- In order to address major shortcomings in the current UNC Teaching Workload Reporting system, it is recommended that it be replaced by data from the Delaware Study, a national data exchange on teaching loads and instructional cost. These data would increase the level of standardization in the data collection, and more importantly, would offer national benchmark data for UNC institutions and their individual departments. It is recommended that participation in the Delaware Study begin with reports due for the 2000-01 academic year. Given the lag in reporting under that system, the next report on teaching workload would be available in the summer or fall of 2002.

Introduction

Growing out of findings and recommendations of the 1995 Legislative Study Commission on the Status of Education at the University of North Carolina, the 1995 Session of the General Assembly enacted House Bill 229, Section 15.9 entitled “Rewarding Faculty Teaching.” Among other things, the bill required that:

“The Board of Governors shall design and implement a system to monitor faculty teaching workloads on the campuses of the constituent institutions... (and) shall report on the implementation of this section to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by April 15, 1996.”

In response to this legislation the [Board of Governors Plan for Rewarding Faculty Teaching](#) was adopted on April 12, 1996 and transmitted to the legislature on April 15, 1996. A copy of that report is available online at www.ga.unc.edu/UNCGA/assessment/reward_teaching.html. On March 19, 1998, the first report to draw data from the new monitoring system was prepared on faculty employed during the 1996-97 year and was presented to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee. Since then, no additional report on this topic has been requested by the committee, but annual data collection has been continued as required by the legislation. This report summarizes the findings of these data collections and recommends a modification of the system presently used by the University of North Carolina institutions to monitor teaching workloads.

The Teaching Workload Database

The Board’s teaching workload monitoring system was designed to measure the standard and the actual teaching loads of UNC faculty, to determine the extent to which regular tenure stream faculty were teaching undergraduates (particularly freshmen and sophomores), and to track the teaching productivity of faculty overall. Its overarching purpose was to create a database that would be used by department heads and other academic administrators to establish and implement policies on teaching workloads. To accomplish this, the data were assembled at each UNC institution at the department level by the department head and made available to other department heads and academic administrators within the campus and among similar departments within the University system. The reporting system was designed to inform academic administrators and faculty about standard and actual teaching loads in order to assist them in managing loads at the departmental level. Institutions were encouraged to find innovative ways to reward faculty who taught more than the standard load and were specifically authorized to use salary stipends to reward overload teaching.

The chancellors were asked to submit an annual institutional summary of data for all departments taken as a group and to show the standard teaching load, measured in terms of three-hour courses and their equivalents, for each department. The summary report included a weighted average of these teaching loads that is referred to as the **standard load** for the institution. The standard load varies among departments due to differences in the graduate teaching and research loads of faculty, the load requirements imposed by specialized accrediting agencies, and other factors. The institutional summary also included a distribution of the student credit hours taught by five groups of faculty in six different

course/degree levels. The data that are summarized in the UNC Teaching Workload Report are drawn from the chancellors' annual summary reports. They cover the years 1996-97 through 1999-2000.

Key Definitions and Reporting Protocols

Faculty are included in the monitoring system database if they are regular session instructional faculty paid in whole or in part from a state-funded teaching position, or if they are teaching assistants or part-time faculty. They are excluded if they teach in a school of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or pharmacy. In addition, department heads—even if they have no teaching responsibilities during the academic year—and instructors who teach courses on a voluntary basis are included. The categories of faculty are: tenure stream faculty (those on the tenure track and those already tenured); department heads reported separately; full-time non-tenure stream faculty; teaching assistants; and “other” faculty including part-time faculty. Adjunct faculty who teach only during the summer or non-State-supported courses are not included. Faculty who teach degree-credit extension courses are included only if their course loads are administered by the academic department.

In this report faculty counts are in **FTEs**. One faculty FTE is defined in reference to a full-time faculty member on a nine-month appointment. Thus, a full-time instructor who teaches for one semester only, and an instructor hired for the entire year who teaches half-time, would both be counted as half of an FTE.

Teaching activities are measured in terms of **course hours**, **student credit hours**, and **credit hour equivalents**. **Course hours** count the credit hour value of courses taught. Thus, a faculty member who teaches four three-credit hour courses per semester has a 12-hour load in that semester and a 24-hour load for the year. **Student credit hours** are defined as the product of the number of students in a course and the number of credit hours assigned to the course. Thus an instructor who teaches a three-credit hour course with 25 students in it would produce 75 student credit hours. By extension, an instructor with four three-credit hour courses each having 25 students would generate 300 student credit hours. **Credit hour equivalents** are course hour credits given to instructors for instructional activities that are not accurately measured by course hours. Examples of such activities include: supervising graduate students' work on dissertations and theses; directing an honor's thesis or senior thesis; supervising student teachers; supervising student internships and coop assignments; teaching nurses and other health professionals in a clinical setting; and instructing students in studios, laboratories, and independent study courses. The combination of a faculty member's course hours and credit hour equivalents comprises his or her **teaching load**. The student credit hours generated by the faculty member measure his or her **teaching productivity**.

Trends in Teaching Loads, Student Credit Hour Distributions, and Teaching Productivity

Table 1 presents trend data on teaching loads as measured by course hours per year and by the sum of course hours plus credit hour equivalents per year. The data show that, by both measures, the teaching loads of tenure stream faculty University-wide have increased slightly

since 1996-97—rising from 18.8 to 19.9 when measured by course hours plus credit hour equivalents. It should be noted that in the first year of the data collection, departments were in many instances adopting new teaching load policies as required by the Board's policy. Thus it was not until the second year of data collection that many departments had settled on their teaching load policy and the convention they would follow in calculating credit hour equivalents. This means that data in the last three years are generally more comparable than data reported for 1996-97.

The data in the [last column of Table 1](#) present the standard loads reported by all UNC institutions (except NC School of the Arts that does not have tenure) in their most recent reports. There are several reasons why a standard load may vary from an actual load. The actual load may exceed the standard load when faculty teach more than the standard load in response to institutional needs. Conversely, the actual load may fall short of the standard load when faculty are given course reductions that permit them to engage in research and service activities, or to engage in instructional activities not measured in terms of course hours or credit hour equivalents. Some differences are simply due to errors in reported data. Such errors may occur when new department heads are not adequately trained in how to complete the report, or when existing department heads interpret reporting instructions differently from one year to the next. The report of teaching workload is one of the most complex reports that department heads are asked to complete; variability in departmental reports has been identified as a problem by campus report coordinators (a topic to be addressed later in this report).

Despite possible errors in reporting, however, it seems safe to conclude that the teaching loads of tenure stream faculty in the University have increased since the Board adopted its policy to reward teaching and to monitor teaching workloads. Furthermore, it is clear that actual loads reflect differences in institutional mission and, although benchmarks for equivalent measures outside the UNC system are generally not available, the actual loads appear to be within competitive ranges.

[Table 2](#) presents data on the distribution of student credit hours in order to address the question of who teaches undergraduates in their lower division (freshman and sophomore year) courses. The data reveal two distinct trends. First, the proportion of student credit hours taught to freshmen and sophomores by graduate teaching assistants has decreased slightly since 1996-97 at all UNC institutions taken together and at NCSU and UNC-CH. Second, the proportion of student credit hours taught to freshmen and sophomores by tenure stream faculty has dropped steadily over the past four years while the proportion taught to them by off-track faculty has increased. In understanding the causes of this second trend, it is worth asking whether it is due to a corresponding change in the proportions of teaching faculty in the two categories, or whether it is due to a change in the proportions of lower division student credit hours taught by faculty in the two categories. We turn first to the question of the number of faculty in the two categories. Data in [Table 2A](#) address these two questions.

The [top section of the Table 2A](#) presents data on the distribution of faculty FTEs and faculty headcounts University-wide over the last four years. By either means of counting faculty the

numbers show a significant increase in the proportion of part-time and off-track faculty and a corresponding decrease in the proportion of full-time tenure stream faculty. In terms of percentage points the shift is similar in magnitude to the shift in the proportion of lower division undergraduate student credit hours delivered by both groups of faculty (Table 2). The [lower section of Table 2A](#) presents data on the percentage of the total student credit hours taught at the lower division undergraduate level, and at the undergraduate level, by each category of faculty. The data show that there is only a slight decrease in the lower division percentage and a slight increase in the overall undergraduate percentage for tenure stream faculty. **Taken together, the data in Table 2A suggest that all of the reduction in lower division student credit hours taught by tenure stream faculty is due to a reduction in their numbers and not to a reduction in the undergraduate proportion of their teaching load.**

It should be noted that the relative change in the numbers of tenure stream and off-track faculty suggested by the data in [Table 2A](#) tracks national trends. It is the subject of study for a new University-wide task force recently formed by the Academic Affairs division in the Office of the President. Underscoring the strength of the trend and the need for this study are data from this fall that show that only 35 percent of newly hired faculty last year were hired into tenure stream positions.

[Table 3](#) presents data on the teaching productivity of faculty as measured by the student credit hours per state-funded FTE. It shows that University-wide, there has been a slight increase in the teaching productivity of faculty over the past four years. The productivity of off-track faculty exceeds that of tenure stream faculty because the former are assigned limited responsibility for research and service and thus have higher teaching loads than the latter. For example, at NCSU where the standard teaching load for tenure stream faculty is 13.7 course hours per year, it is 20.3 course hours for off-track faculty. Similar differences in assigned loads exist at the other campuses. Because the use of teaching assistants on most campuses is limited, the data on their teaching productivity is variable and less reliable than those of tenure stream and off track faculty. Thus the increase in their productivity may be more apparent than real.

To some extent, the data in [Table 3](#) measure the efficiency of the instructional process and are more meaningful than student/teacher ratios and course load statistics. They measure the output of faculty by using two fairly standardized measures: student credit hours and faculty FTE. Nevertheless, there are few benchmarks available for purposes of data comparison. Thus, we cannot know, for example, whether 409.4 student credit hours per state-funded faculty FTE—the University-wide average in 1999-2000—is high or low in comparison with peer institutions. This problem has been tackled by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and by the U.S. Department of Education, both of whom have attempted to establish comparative measures of teaching productivity. Unfortunately, the SREB data collection failed and was cancelled this year, and the USDOE efforts have been based on sample sizes that do not permit inter-institutional comparisons. Even though a number of states have their own measures, they follow local definitions of faculty and courses for inclusion and thus may not be comparable to the UNC study.

The Delaware Study

A major shortcoming of the UNC Teaching Workload Report is the lack of available benchmarks from other systems collecting comparable data. The system most like the UNC system is one that was used for several years in Maryland, but it is no longer required for all Maryland institutions and many have ceased to participate. Thus, the current UNC system has no benchmarks for comparison other than data from UNC peers and data from prior years.

One data collection system that seems to offer a potential benchmarking process for teaching productivity is the **Delaware Study** of teaching loads and cost of instruction. This data collection is voluntary and is presently in its sixth year of operation. Originally funded by a FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) grant, the purpose of the data collection is to collect data from institutions on matters related to teaching load, faculty productivity, and instructional cost. It shares its findings and summary data with the more than 160 four-year institutions that participate, and it is expecting to get a new FIPSE grant next year that will enable it to enhance its service and expand its operation. Last year, all UNC institutions were directed by the Office of the President to join the exchange in order to test this data collection system as an alternative source of data on teaching workload. Based on their experience with the new data collection, campus participants have recommended that the Delaware system **replace the current system** for collecting teaching workload data. Several points support this recommendation.

First, the Delaware system is similar in many respects to the UNC system. Both systems use the academic department as the basic unit of analysis. They use similar categories of faculty (regular tenure stream, other regular, supplemental and teaching assistants) and similar categories of student credit hours (lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate and graduate). Both are annual data collections. Both have high degrees of comparability across participating institutions. Although data in the Delaware study must work around differences in state accounting conventions and budgeting procedures, they are as comparable as any available elsewhere. Indeed, the prestigious Association of American Universities has decided to use Delaware Study data collection in lieu of starting one on its own and has encouraged all of its members to participate.

Second, the Delaware study has some clear advantages over the UNC system:

- It requires data that can be provided directly from the campus centralized database and does not rely on individual department heads, thus eliminating the primary source of **burden** and **error** in the UNC system;
- It is free of cost to its members, and its data summaries can be customized to give institutions, and departments within institutions, comparisons with as many of its peer institutions as participate each year. The director of the Delaware study has offered to work with staff from the Office of the President and from the campuses to develop customized data summaries that meet their needs;

- It does not attempt to capture data on standard teaching loads, credit hour equivalents and course reductions—the most problematic portion of the UNC data collection system. Instead, it chooses to focus on the two questions of greatest relevance to the issue of teaching workload: which categories of faculty are teaching undergraduates; and how productive are all categories of faculty as measured by their student credit hours taught.

Third, the Delaware system is philosophically consistent with the Board's commitment to place the management of teaching workload under the responsibility of the department head and dean, but to insist that their management decisions be informed by valid comparative data. Such a system will help assure that UNC faculty will demonstrate instructional productivity and a commitment to the teaching of undergraduates that are both responsible and competitive.

Given these advantages, it is recommended that the UNC Board of Governors switch from its current data collection system on teaching workload to the Delaware Study. This means that the 1999-2000 academic year would be the last year of the current UNC report, and 2000-01 would be the first year of the Delaware Study report. The Board would continue to monitor teaching workloads through this data collection as required by statute.

Table 1. Two Measures of Teaching Load for UNC Tenure-Stream Faculty, 1996-97 through 1999-2000

Institution	Course Credit Hours Per FTE				Courses Plus CHEs Per FTE				Standard Load
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	
Research I									
NCSU	13.7	13.7	15.5	13.8	19.4	18.6	20.1	17.8	13.7
UNC-CH	9.5	9.4	9.7	10.4	14.3	13.9	14.4	15.3	11.8
Research I Total	11.4	11.4	12.3	12.0	16.7	16.0	17.0	16.4	
Doctoral I									
UNCG	12.7	12.6	12.5	12.2	16.6	17.7	17.6	17.2	18.1
Doctoral II									
ECU*	16.1	17.3	19.6	18.5	18.5	19.4	21.3	20.5	24.0
Master's I									
ASU	16.9	19.1	16.3	16.2	19.5	20.6	20.7	19.7	23.9
FSU	22.7	22.8	22.8	22.2	22.9	22.9	22.9	22.5	24.0
NCA&T	16.1	16.1	17.5	17.4	20.7	20.1	21.3	21.6	23.8
NCCU	18.4	17.8	19.5	30.5	21.3	20.0	25.3	33.5	22.7
UNCC	15.9	15.7	16.3	16.7	17.4	16.8	17.7	18.1	17.6
UNCP	21.0	21.6	20.6	21.4	23.2	22.7	22.3	22.6	24.0
UNCW	19.0	19.9	20.1	19.7	21.8	22.8	23.2	23.6	22.8
WCU	17.7	18.5	18.6	18.8	22.3	24.1	24.5	24.5	23.9
Master's I Total	17.3	18.1	18.4	19.1	20.0	20.3	21.5	22.2	
Bacc. I									
UNCA	18.1	18.0	18.9	15.3	21.9	22.5	24.2	20.0	24.0
Bacc. II									
ECSU	22.8	25.2	25.3	23.6	25.6	26.5	25.8	24.5	24.0
WSSU	18.3	22.4	18.7	20.8	23.1	28.9	27.1	31.0	24.0
Bacc. II Total	20.1	23.4	21.2	21.8	24.1	28.0	26.6	28.6	
UNC All	15.2	15.6	16.1	16.1	18.8	19.0	19.9	19.9	

UNC-GA ProgAssess/Per.UR001A/2-22-01

*ECU became Doctoral II in 1999-2000. Master's I Total included ECU in 1996-97 through 1998-99.

**Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Undergraduate Student Credit Hours, 1996-97 through 1999-2000
Lower Division Undergraduate Including Basic Skills Courses But Not Remedial Courses**

Institution	Tenure Stream/Dept. Head				Off Track/Other				Teaching Assistant			
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Research I												
NCSU	51.1%	48.6%	46.3%	46.1%	38.8%	43.5%	44.0%	48.0%	10.1%	8.0%	9.6%	6.0%
UNC-CH	42.2%	45.3%	42.5%	41.0%	20.3%	17.4%	20.7%	22.0%	37.5%	37.3%	36.8%	37.0%
Research I Total	47.3%	47.1%	44.7%	43.9%	30.9%	32.0%	33.8%	36.8%	21.9%	20.9%	21.5%	19.3%
Doctoral I												
UNCG	40.4%	41.0%	41.0%	40.8%	48.4%	48.9%	45.2%	46.2%	11.3%	10.1%	13.7%	13.0%
Doctoral II												
ECU*	51.6%	47.1%	45.9%	47.0%	35.7%	40.8%	42.9%	43.5%	12.7%	12.1%	11.2%	9.5%
Master's I												
ASU	60.2%	54.5%	53.9%	50.5%	34.5%	41.1%	41.6%	44.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.5%	4.8%
FSU	60.7%	58.7%	64.0%	64.4%	39.3%	41.3%	36.0%	35.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NCA&T	54.5%	49.4%	48.5%	44.2%	43.1%	47.8%	49.0%	53.2%	2.5%	2.8%	2.5%	2.6%
NCCU	68.2%	69.0%	53.7%	55.3%	31.8%	31.0%	45.9%	44.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
UNCC	50.7%	45.7%	45.3%	45.2%	44.5%	50.1%	50.3%	50.0%	4.8%	4.2%	4.4%	4.8%
UNCP	62.9%	66.3%	64.5%	59.0%	37.1%	33.7%	35.5%	41.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UNCW	67.3%	66.8%	62.6%	58.1%	30.7%	30.0%	34.5%	35.2%	2.0%	3.2%	3.0%	6.8%
WCU	73.9%	61.3%	62.2%	50.6%	23.2%	36.0%	35.2%	46.8%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.7%
Master's I Total	58.3%	53.8%	52.5%	51.2%	36.6%	41.2%	42.8%	45.0%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%	3.8%
Bacc. I												
UNCA	55.8%	57.3%	61.9%	54.3%	44.2%	42.7%	38.1%	45.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bacc. II												
ECSU	64.0%	56.7%	59.9%	52.7%	36.0%	43.3%	40.1%	47.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WSSU	64.4%	72.4%	60.9%	67.8%	35.6%	27.6%	39.1%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bacc. II Total	64.3%	65.4%	60.5%	60.9%	35.7%	34.6%	39.5%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
School of Art												
NCSA	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.9%	100.0%	99.7%	99.8%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UNC All	53.7%	51.1%	49.4%	47.9%	36.2%	39.3%	40.6%	43.0%	10.1%	9.6%	10.0%	9.2%

UNC-GA ProgAssess/Per.UR001C/2-22-01

*ECU became Doctoral II in 1999-2000. Master's I Total included ECU in 1996-97 through 1998-99.

Table 2A.

Faculty Type	Distribution of Faculty							
	FTE				Headcount			
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Tenure Stream/ Dept. Head	66.4%	64.7%	63.5%	61.0%	47.4%	47.7%	46.7%	46.3%
Off Track/Other	25.3%	27.0%	28.8%	32.7%	35.4%	35.9%	37.3%	39.6%
Teaching Assistant	8.3%	8.3%	7.7%	6.3%	17.2%	16.4%	16.0%	14.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Faculty Type	Percentage of SCH Load That Is:							
	Lower Division				Undergraduate			
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Tenure Stream/ Dept. Head	49.4%	49.5%	48.8%	47.4%	84.6%	86.9%	86.6%	85.7%
Off Track/Other	67.6%	70.3%	69.8%	69.2%	95.2%	95.3%	95.6%	95.8%
Teaching Assistant	86.1%	84.7%	85.0%	88.2%	98.8%	99.1%	99.4%	99.4%
Total	57.5%	58.6%	58.4%	57.7%	89.2%	90.3%	90.4%	90.1%

Table 3. Student Credit Hours Per State-Supported FTE Faculty, 1996-97 through 1999-2000

Institution	Tenure Stream/Dept. Head				Off Track/Other				Teaching Assistant				Per FTE			
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Research I																
NCSU	425.5	425.9	435.2	423.2	654.4	438.7	625.7	522.4	230.0	225.8	240.9	295.4	445.1	406.7	455.7	447.2
UNC-CH	268.0	278.0	295.3	282.0	558.2	482.2	447.7	378.0	420.3	477.1	706.4	518.0	332.7	340.6	372.6	331.2
Research I Total	341.7	346.3	360.9	344.1	616.5	451.6	555.0	466.8	339.6	372.2	455.2	451.9	387.1	374.4	414.7	385.6
Doctoral I																
UNCG	339.5	325.7	347.6	333.1	644.7	485.6	611.9	561.4	544.6	440.4	671.5	475.0	433.5	384.3	441.2	409.0
Doctoral II																
ECU*	388.8	383.7	397.7	381.3	603.0	622.1	615.1	631.7	242.0	186.6	180.1	165.1	413.6	405.9	418.4	409.6
Master's I																
ASU	382.9	387.9	389.2	358.6	447.4	516.4	505.8	501.4	280.2	366.4	361.8	359.2	394.8	423.2	423.7	403.3
FSU	387.5	387.3	390.2	418.8	497.9	432.2	338.2	509.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	417.0	400.4	373.4	444.5
NCA&T	398.4	422.9	354.4	373.9	631.8	887.3	746.9	807.5	491.1	479.7	946.8	N/A	465.9	534.0	457.4	497.7
NCCU	349.3	261.1	362.0	352.3	322.4	279.3	447.6	375.2	N/A	N/A	490.0	N/A	342.0	265.7	388.3	360.0
UNCC	391.6	369.0	383.0	370.8	621.8	596.0	640.7	623.7	553.0	564.3	594.5	681.1	455.3	441.3	465.9	454.7
UNCP	397.7	409.4	399.1	375.0	409.2	432.6	420.3	420.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	401.2	415.8	405.5	391.4
UNCW	466.7	464.6	461.3	490.6	551.0	609.6	546.7	548.7	122.9	165.3	163.8	326.3	468.0	477.0	467.5	496.4
WCU	375.4	395.3	363.8	359.7	346.7	509.5	456.4	504.9	169.8	111.5	189.4	548.6	362.6	404.5	379.5	402.0
Master's I Total	393.9	387.6	390.6	386.6	523.7	569.7	557.3	551.3	263.6	228.0	239.9	466.7	419.2	424.2	428.5	437.7
Bacc. I																
UNCA	333.4	357.9	374.9	340.5	333.6	370.4	364.4	370.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	333.5	362.4	371.4	351.9
Bacc. II																
ECSU	436.7	438.5	409.7	396.4	348.7	283.1	307.3	340.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	403.6	362.9	363.5	369.6
WSSU	373.9	427.8	384.8	388.5	401.4	266.4	369.9	417.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	382.3	377.0	379.9	396.8
Bacc. II Total	399.3	431.8	394.3	391.5	375.9	275.7	337.7	372.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	391.5	370.7	372.8	384.4
NCSA	N/A	600.8	185.0	100.7	274.7	203.2	264.9	268.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	274.7	207.6	261.6	259.5
UNC All	372.7	370.9	378.0	367.3	526.2	489.1	530.0	510.9	327.6	323.7	388.1	380.7	405.3	398.7	419.6	409.4

UNC-GA ProgAssess/Per.UR001F/2-22-01

*ECU became Doctoral II in 1999-2000. Master's I Total included ECU in 1996-97 through 1998-99.