Not only teachers: What do health administration faculty members do?

Christopher A. Harle, PhD [corresponding author]

Cody Mullen, BS

Joshua R. Vest, PhD

Nir Menachemi, PhD

Department of Health Policy and Management,

Richard M. Fairbanks School of Public Health, Indiana University

1050 Wishard Blvd.

Indianapolis IN 46202-2872

PHONE: 317-274-5396

Keywords: faculty workload, work activity, teaching, research funding, faculty surveys

---

This is the author's manuscript of the article published in final edited form as:

Harle, C. A., Mullen, C., Vest, J. R., & Menachemi, N. (2016, Spring). Not Only Teachers: What Do Health Administration Faculty Members Do? Journal of Health Administration Education.Volume 33, Number 2, Spring 2016, pp. 235-251.

ABSTRACT

Researchers have long been interested in how university faculty allocate their time between professional tasks. This study uses multiple years of Health Administration (HA) faculty survey data to examine how work activity has changed over time and how work activity relates to faculty rank and the type of school in which a faculty member is employed. We report on faculty time allocation to research, teaching, and administration by survey year, faculty rank, and type of school. We also examined factors related to faculty's status as a principal investigator, teaching load, and research funding. On average, HA faculty spent 43% of their time teaching, 31% doing research, 20% in administrative activities, and 5% in other activities. Full professors spent significantly less time teaching, had lighter teaching loads, and spent more time on administration than other faculty. Faculty in schools of health professions, business, and other schools spent more time in teaching and had lower research funding expectations than faculty in schools of public health and medicine. These findings may help faculty identify jobs that best align with their interests and benchmark their work against industry norms. These findings may also help administrators' in HA programs set appropriate expectations for their faculty.

INTRODUCTION

"What do you do?" It is a nearly ubiquitous question that working adults ask when they meet someone new. If you respond: "I am a university faculty member," the next question is almost always: "What do you teach?" When faced with this question, you have options. You can tell the person about the courses you teach and simply ignore the often false assumption that all you do is give lectures and grade exams for nine months and vacation all summer. Alternately, you can explain how your job involves a mix of responsibilities, such as teaching, mentoring, research, service, and administration. Or, if you are like us and often struggle with this awkward conversation, you might just explain your research using lots of big words so you can move on to the next topic of conversation.

While it can help you in casual conversation, systematically understanding how work is distributed within and across health administration (HA) faculty members also has broader value. For example, as doctoral students consider jobs in and out of academia, they want to know what their work lives would look like as a faculty member in an HA program. These students may also want to know if and how work activity varies over time, between different types of schools, and between faculty ranks, so they may find the best fit for their own interests and career objectives. Similarly, as they weigh decisions to change universities or even leave academia, current HA faculty would benefit from a systematic understanding of how work activities vary across their faculty peers. Finally, as universities and faculty face changes in funding and scrutiny over faculty teaching and research productivity (Conner & Rabovsky, 2011; Lebeau, Stumpf, Brown, Lucchesi, & Kwiek, 2012; United States Government Accountability Office, 2014), university administrators, and faculty members would benefit from a clearer understanding of the extent and mix of work activities. With this understanding, academic administrators may make more

informed funding allocations, work assignments, hiring decisions, and promotion and tenure recommendations. At the same time, HA faculty may use information about work activities to engage in more evidence-based shared governance with administrators.

The purpose of this study is to empirically examine the distribution of HA faculty work activity, if and how work activity has changed in recent years, and how work activity relates to faculty rank and the type of school in which a faculty member is employed. To answer these questions, we use data from a comprehensive survey of HA faculty members that was administered in 2009, 2012, and 2015 (Menachemi, 2016). By examining recent data on work activity across many HA programs and over time, we expect our results will provide new information that can inform both individual and administrative decision making.

BACKGROUND

Studies of faculty workload date back at least to the 1960's (Bunnell, 1960; Stecklein, 1961; Yuker, 1974). Thus, there is considerably history of measuring and analyzing faculty work activity in support of various institutional interests and activities, such as budgeting, collective bargaining, policy making, and public reporting of faculty activities. Often, researchers examine institutional records and/or faculty self-reports via surveys to understand allocation of time among typical activities, including teaching, research, administrative work and service (Yuker, 1984). Researchers examine both inputs, such as time spent in different activities, as well as outputs, such as student credit hours or research articles published. However, early work that summarized the literature found that scholarly productivity related more to an individual's

interest and experience than it did to teaching load and thus urged caution about inferring a simple relationship between work assignments and actual productivity (Yuker, 1984).

The broader external environment is a source of influence on faculty workload activity. Researchers have pointed to macro organizational pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995) that prioritize the value of research and thus increased research workloads over time, in particular at universities that have traditionally placed less emphasis on research (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). In support of this notion, an analysis of 20 years of faculty work activity data from across a variety of disciplines found increasing time allocation to research (Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000). The increase in research activity did not relate to less time spent in teaching. However, reflecting the finite amount of time available to all faculty members, the increase in research activity was related to less time spent advising and counseling students. At the same time, external pressures are also changing teaching expectations. For example, some policymakers and academics have recently pushed for a renewed focus on teaching, including state legislative proposals that would create minimum teaching loads for all faculty members (Fairweather & Beach, 2002; SB 593, 2015; SF 65, 2015). Additionally, reductions in state budget allocations have led some universities to increase course offerings as a source of revenue (Wilson, 2011).

Overall, many studies have examined relationships between work activity, productivity, and characteristics of the individual faculty, their job, the institution, and the environment (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Bentley & Kyvik, 2012, 2013; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Layzell, 1996; Milem et al., 2000; Surratt, Kamal, & Wildfong, 2011). For example, prior studies have also shown differences in time allocation across faculty ranks. Full professors typically engage in less teaching or research time and more in service or administrative activities (Bentley & Kyvik,

2012; Link, Swann, & Bozeman, 2008; Singell & Lillydahl, 1996; Yuker, 1984). Variance also exists by institution type. In the HA field, faculty generally have higher research loads and lower teaching loads in schools of medicine and public health compared to other schools, including health professions and business (Ginter, Menachemi, & Morrisey, 2009). Institutional expectations of publications, research funding in HA programs in schools of public health and medicine are also higher (Ginter et al., 2009), including among assistant professors (Menachemi, Morrisey, Au, & Ginter, 2009), and in particular for tenure-track faculty (Diana, Campbell, Stranova, & Long, 2011). Finally, consistent with the potentially complicated relationship between research and teaching time allocation and actual productivity (Yuker, 1984), evidence from HA faculty found only small effects of research time and teaching load on publication production (Morrisey, Menachemi, Cawley, & Ginter, 2010).

METHODS

This study uses data from the 2009, 2012, and 2015 administrations of a U.S.-based national survey of HA faculty. The design, administration, and response characteristics of this survey are described in detail elsewhere (Menachemi, 2016). For work time allocation, the survey asked faculty to report the "percentage of your annual academic time" spent doing Research, Teaching, Management/Administrative, and Other, with the sum of all activities equaling 100%. For specific activities, faculty reported whether or not they were currently a principal investigator (PI) on a grant or contract and how many courses they taught in the last 12 months. For funded research, faculty reported the percentage of their academic salary they are expected to generate

through grants and contracts as well as the percentage they actually achieved, on average, over the past three years.

Our primary analysis examined how faculty members allocate their work activity across Research, Teaching, Management/Administrative, and Other activities. We also analyzed number of courses taught, PI status, salary coverage expectations, and achievement of the salary coverage expectations. We derived a dichotomous variable on achievement of expected salary coverage based on the difference between expected salary generation and actual salary generation over the last three years. For each measure of work activity, we examined how it varied by survey year (2009, 2012, 2015), faculty rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor), and type of school in which the faculty is primarily appointed (Public Health, Health Professions, Business, Medicine, Other). We first examined these relationships using Chi-Square tests for dichotomous variables and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for non-dichotomous variables. We assessed significance at the P=.05 level generally and used Bonferroni-corrected P-values for post-hoc tests. Next, we used multivariable regression models to assess the relationships between work activity and year, faculty rank and school type while controlling for gender, appointment type (tenured/tenure track or non-tenure track), total faculty members in the respondent's department, academic doctoral degree field (management/health management, health services research/health policy, economics/health economics, other, or no academic doctorate), and possession of a clinical doctorate degree (yes or no).

RESULTS

Over all three survey years, HA faculty spent, on average, 43% of their work time teaching, 31% doing research, 20% in management and administrative activities, and 5% in other activities. In each of the four types of activities, the minimum reported time allocation was 0% and the maximum 100%. Overall, 37% of faculty reported they were currently a PI on a grant or contract. The average respondent reported being required to generate 16% of their salary from grants or contracts, and 87% of all faculty reported actual salary support achieved was equal to or greater than their individual required support. Finally, faculty reported an average teaching load of 4.7 courses per year.

Time spent on research, teaching, administration and other activities

In bivariate analysis, percentage time spent in teaching varied significantly between different faculty ranks ($F=31.13$, $P< 0.001$) (Table 1). On average, instructors allocated 64% of their time to teaching, while assistant professors allocated 47%, associate professors 44% and professors 37%. Furthermore, in regression analysis, instructors ($\beta=20.11$, $P<.001$), assistant professors ($\beta=8.60$, $P<.001$), and associate professors ($\beta=6.44$, $P<.001$) each spent significantly more time on teaching than professors (Table 2). Also, in bivariate analysis, percentage time spent in teaching varied significantly by type of school ($P<0.001$). Faculty in health professions schools allocated 52% time to teaching, while faculty in business schools allocated 43%, public health, 36%, medicine 29%, and other schools, 47%. In regression analysis, faculty in schools of health professions ($\beta=11.97$, $P<.001$), business ($\beta=5.80$, $P=.002$), and other schools ($\beta=9.02$, $P<.001$) each allocated more time to teaching than did faculty in schools of public health. Faculty in schools of public health did not differ from faculty in schools of medicine. Finally, faculty allocated 4.3% less time to teaching in 2015 than they did in 2009 ($\beta=–4.33$, $P=.005$).

In bivariate analysis, percentage time spent in research varied significantly between different faculty ranks (F=21.36, P<.001) (Table 1). On average, instructors allocated 9% of their time to research, while assistant professors allocated 34%, associate professors 32% and professors 32%. Furthermore, in regression analysis, assistant professors spent an estimated 6% more time on research than professors (β=5.90, P<.001) (Table 2). Instructors' research work activity did not differ significantly from professors', likely due to the small number of instructors in the sample (n=59). However, faculty with doctorates in health services research or health policy reported spending 7% more time on research (β=6.85, P<.001) compared to those with doctorates in management or health management, as did faculty with doctorates in economics or health economics who spent 8% more time (β=7.69, P<.001). In contrast, faculty with no doctorate allocated, on average, 13% less time to research compared to faculty with doctorates in management or health management. Also, percentage time spent in research varied significantly by type of school (P<.001). Specifically, faculty in schools of medicine, 41%, and public health schools, 40%, allocated the most time to research. Faculty in business schools allocated 33%, health professions 21%, and other schools 28%. In regression analysis, faculty in schools of health professions allocated, on average, 14% less time to research than faculty in schools public health (β=–14.35, P<.001). Faculty in schools of business, on average, allocated 5% less time to research than faculty in schools of public health (β=–4.77, P=.008).

In bivariate analysis, the percentage of time faculty spent in administrative/management activities also varied significantly between different ranks (F= 22.49, P < 0.001) (Table 1). Instructors allocated 22% of their time to management and administrative activities while assistant professors allocated 15%, associate professors 19%, and professors 26%. In regression analysis, compared to professors, instructors allocated 13% less time (β=–13.36, P<.001),

assistant professors allocated 13% less time (β=–13.38, P<.001), and associate professors allocated 8% less time (β=–8.09, P<.001) to administrative tasks (Table 2). Similarly, tenured or tenure track faculty, on average, allocated 9% less time to administrative activities than non-tenure track faculty (β=–9.05, P<.001).

Teaching course loads

Across the three survey years, faculty reported similar teaching loads (Table 3). However, teaching loads varied by rank (F=5.84, P=.001). On average, instructors reported a 12 month teaching load of 5.1 courses, assistant professors 4.9 courses, associate professors, 5.0 courses, and professors 4.2 courses. In regression analysis, assistant professors (β=0.62, P=.006) and associate professors (β=0.62, P=.006) each had significantly higher teaching loads than professors (Table 4). Also, faculty with doctorates in economics or health economics taught, on average, 1.23 fewer courses than faculty with doctorates in management or health management (β=-1.23, P<.001). And, faculty with no doctorate taught, on average, 1.73 more courses than faculty with a doctorate in management or health management (β=1.73, P<.001). Furthermore, in bivariate analysis, faculty teaching loads varied by type of school (F=43.24, P<.001). Faculty reported the highest teaching loads in schools of health professions, 5.7, schools of business, 5.5, and other schools, 5.0. These compared to 3.4 in schools of public health and 2.4 courses in schools of medicine. In regression analysis, we observed similar results, with teaching loads in schools of health professions (β=1.82, P<.001), schools of business (β=1.82, P<.001), and other schools (β=1.52, P<.001) all being 1.5 or more courses per year higher than in schools of public health.

Research funding, PI status, salary support expectations and achievement

Across all three survey years, a similar proportion of faculty reported being a PI (Table 3).

However, PI status varied by faculty rank (χ^2= 27.95, P<.001). Only 15% of instructors reported being a PI, while 32% of assistant professors, 38% of associate professors, and 45% of professors reported PI status. In regression analysis, assistant professors were significantly less likely to be a PI than professors (β=–.42, P=.017), though there were not significant differences between any other groups (Table 4). PI status also varied by type of school (χ^2= 114.86, P<.001). In schools of medicine, 58% of faculty reported being PIs. This was similar to schools of public health, 55%, but higher than in schools health professions, 24%, business schools, 24%, and "other" schools, 32%. Similar differences by school type were observed in the regression analyses.

In bivariate analysis, faculty reported similar funding expectations and achievement across the survey years (Table 3). However, in regression analysis, faculty salary coverage expectations were, on average, 4% lower in 2012 than in 2009 (β=–3.71, P=.013) (Table 4). In terms of faculty rank, professors reported salary funding expectations of 19%, on average, while associate professors reported 14%, assistant professors 17%, and instructors 7%. Also, funding expectations for instructors were 8% lower than professors (β=–7.97, P=.039). Furthermore, assistant professors, 80% of whom reported meeting funding expectations, were significantly less likely than professors (β=–1.01, P<.001), 88% of whom reported meeting funding expectations.

Funding expectations also varied by type of school (F=129.49, P<.001) (Table 3). Faculty in schools of medicine and public health reported funding expectations of 40% and 32% respectively, while other schools, schools of health professions and schools of business reported 8%, 7%, and 1% respectively. In regression analysis, faculty from schools of public health reported funding expectations more than 20 percentage points higher than schools of business

(β=–24.79, P<.001), schools of health professions (β=–20.34, P<.001), and other schools (β=–20.19, P<.001) (Table 4). Faculty members' ability to meet funding expectations also varied by type of school. Overall, 76% of faculty in schools of public health and 72% of faculty in schools of medicine reported actual salary support equal to or greater than expected. But, in regression analysis, faculty in schools of business (β=2.72, P<.001), schools of health professions (β=1.11, P<.001), and other schools (β=1.71, P<.001) were significantly more likely to meet funding expectations than faculty in schools of public health.

DISCUSSION

We found wide variation in how HA faculty spend their time. On average, faculty allocate the most time to teaching (43%), followed by research (31%), administrative duties (20%), and other professional activities (5%). With that said, many faculty members' time is well divided among three or four activities, while others spend a large proportion of their time in a single activity. We also found notable differences in work activity based on school type and faculty rank but minimal differences over the 2009 to 2015 time period.

The one observed change over time was the 4.3 percentage point decrease in faculty time spent in teaching activities in 2015 compared to 2009. Moreover, our analysis of both time spent in teaching and teaching course loads indicates that teaching workload decreases with rank, with instructors spending 64% of their time teaching. And, professors spend only 37%, which is significantly lower than all other faculty ranks. These findings are similar to studies of faculty outside of HA, which find senior faculty often have reduced teaching loads and spend more time in administrative or service activities (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Link et al., 2008; Yuker, 1984). Indeed, our results found that full professors spend markedly more administrative time

than all other ranks. These findings align with the perceived concern that the most accomplished faculty members may be spending less time in the classroom, which may be inconsistent with the preferences of some stakeholders (Fairweather & Beach, 2002; Sb 593, 2015; Sf 65, 2015). These findings could also reflect the "academic ratchet," the idea that faculty are incentivized personally and professionally to break away from more clearly institution-supporting tasks, such as teaching (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). However, this is not a completely satisfactory explanation as concerns about the academic ratchet typically reflect faculty shifting responsibilities away from teaching toward research. Outside of instructors, our results do not indicate increases in research time with increases in rank. Instead, assistant professors spend slightly more time (5%) in research than full professors. So, our results suggest that instead of replacing teaching with research, more senior HA faculty members are engaging in more administrative work. Also, it is notable that instructors, despite having the largest teaching loads of any rank, still report over one third of their time is spent in activities other than teaching. Thus, an interesting question, which cannot be answered with our data, is whether or not the different time allocations we observed in this study optimize faculty members' contributions to the core objectives of their programs, departments, and schools.

We also found stark differences in time allocation and other measures of work activities across different types of schools. Faculty members in schools of health professions and schools of business reported the heaviest teaching efforts, while medicine and public health have lower teaching efforts and relatively higher research efforts. These differences in annual teaching loads across schools are mirrored by significant differences in funded research expectations and research productivity, as indicated by PI status. Over 50% of faculty in schools of medicine and schools of public health reported being a PI on a grant. Moreover, faculty in schools of medicine

and schools of public health are typically expected to raise 20 percentage points more funding toward their salary than are faculty in the three other types of schools we studied. Given the lower funding expectations, it is not surprising that faculty in schools of health professions, business, and other are also more likely to report success in achieving funding expectations. These differences are important for doctoral students' or faculty when searching for faculty jobs. For example, some students trained in schools of business or health professions may have had less exposure to faculty advisors who are PIs or who have experience regularly funding substantial percentages of their salaries via research grants. Thus, these students may have a steeper learning curve if they take jobs in which they are expected to develop a substantial funded research portfolio. Similarly, when considering moves between institutions, faculty who desire time to conduct more research may need to balance their desire for reduced teaching loads with the reality of higher external funding expectations.

This study has a number of strengths and weaknesses. We obtained direct self-reports of faculty time allocation, which may be more accurate than secondary measures. At the same time, people likely suffer from an inability to recall and report their time allocation with perfect precision. Furthermore, we analyzed data on a relatively large, several hundred in each year, people who identified as HA faculty members and assessed multiple measures of both teaching and research work activities. However, while the overall sample was reasonably large, it contains a small number of faculty in the instructor rank (n=59), which may have contributed to a lack of statistically significant differences in some instructor work activities. Also, we did not have data on part-time or adjunct faculty, which would have helped us understand these important faculty members' activities, in particular teaching activities. Indeed, it is possible that the trend we observed of less time spent teaching in 2015 versus 2009 is related to increases in adjunct faculty

teaching in HA programs. Another limitation is that the survey questions may be susceptible to biases in reporting, such as social desirability, though it's unclear if faculty generally would be systematically biased toward reporting more or less effort in certain kinds of activities, such as research. Finally, the fact that we found minimal differences in work activity across years may be due to the relatively short, 6 year, time span between the first and final survey waves. Continued data collection over a longer time span may ultimately reveal more general time trends in how HA faculty spend their time.

In conclusion, we found HA faculty engage more in teaching than any other activity, but many faculty members also spend significant amounts of time involved in research, administration, and other activities. At the same time, we found that actual and expected work activities are clearly different across faculty ranks and across different types of schools that house HA faculty members. These findings may help doctoral students and faculty identify job opportunities best align with their interests and to benchmark their work activities against industry norms. These findings may also help administrators' in departments or schools with HA programs set appropriate work activity expectations for their faculty.

Table 1. Average percentage of academic time spent in different types of work activities by year, faculty rank, and type of school

	N	% Time Research	% Time Teaching	% Time Management/ Administration	% Time "Other"
YEAR					
2009	549	30.9	44.1	19.9	5.1
2012	415	30.9	43.6	20.1	5.4
2015	345	32.0	41.6	21.1	5.4
RANK					
Instructor	59	8.6	64.4	22.4	4.6
Assistant Professor	414	33.7	46.5	14.9	5.0
Associate Professor	385	31.9	43.7	18.8	5.6
Professor	438	31.4	37.3	25.8	5.5
TYPE OF SCHOOL					
Public Health	442	40.2	35.7	19.8	4.3
Health Professions	400	20.5	51.6	21.9	6.0
Business	207	32.7	43.2	18.7	5.5
Medicine	63	40.8	29.4	20.9	8.9
Other	191	27.8	47.6	19.9	4.7

Note: % time statistics are means based on faculty response to "percentage of your annual academic time" spent doing Research, Teaching, Management/Administrative, and "Other."

Table 2. Regressions of percent time allocated to different activities on year, faculty rank, type of school, and other factors

	% Time Teaching	% Time Research	% Time Mgmt/Admin	% Time Other
YEAR (ref. 2009)				
2012	0.73	-1.14	0.63	-0.23
2015	-4.33**	2.36	1.11	0.85
FACULTY RANK (ref. Professor)				
Instructor	20.12***	-1.34	-13.36***	-5.42**
Assistant	8.60***	5.90***	-13.38***	-1.12
Associate	6.44***	1.71	-8.09***	-0.06
TYPE OF SCHOOL (ref. Public Health)				
Health Professions	11.97***	-14.35***	0.86	1.52*
Business	5.80**	-4.77**	-2.24	1.22
Medicine	-5.39	1.61	0.09	3.70**
Other School	9.02***	-8.01***	-1.64	0.63
GENDER (ref. Male)				
Female	-2.14	0.17	1.17	0.80
POSITION TYPE (ref. non tenure track)				
Tenured or Tenure Track Position	-3.34	12.88***	-9.05***	-0.49
DEGREE TYPE (ref. Mgmt/Hlth Mgmt)				
Doctorate in Hlth Svcs Res or Health Policy	-3.45	6.85***	-2.84	-0.56
Doctorate Economics or Health Economics	-3.62	7.69***	-2.08	-1.99*
Doctorate in Other Area	0.17	-0.58	1.00	-0.59
No Doctorate	12.32***	-13.27***	-1.02	1.96
CLINICAL TRAINING (ref. no clinical doctorate)				
Clinical Doctorate	-5.30	1.52	-1.19	4.97**
TOTAL FACULTY IN DEPARTMENT	-0.21***	0.30***	-0.08	-0.01

Note: Each column contains coefficient estimates and significance levels from an ordinary least squares regression.
**P<.05; **P<.01; ***P<.001*

Table 3. Proportion of faculty PIs, salary funding expectations, and teaching loads by year, faculty rank, and type of school

	N	Number of courses taught per year	% Faculty who are PI (yes/no)	% Salary funding expectations	% Faculty who meet funding expectations (yes/no)
YEAR					
2009	541	4.6	37.9	16.2	86.8
2012	414	4.9	36.5	14.7	88.0
2015	342	4.7	36.8	17.9	85.1
RANK					
Instructor	60	5.1	15.0	5.4	100
Assistant Professor	408	4.9	32.1	17.1	80.0
Associate Professor	384	5.0	38.0	14.4	89.5
Professor	433	4.2	44.8	18.6	88.5
TYPE OF SCHOOL					
Public Health	437	3.4	54.7	32.0	76.1
Health Professions	395	5.7	24.3	6.5	91.1
Business	208	5.5	24.0	1.4	98.0
Medicine	62	2.7	57.1	40.1	71.7
Other	190	5.0	31.6	7.6	95.1

Table 4. Regressions of faculty PI status, salary funding expectations, and teaching loads, faculty rank, type of school, and other factors

	Number of courses taught per year	% Salary funding expected	Faculty who meet funding expectations	PI status
YEAR (ref. 2009)				
2012	0.41	-3.71*	0.27	-0.13
2015	-0.13	0.52	0.10	-0.01
FACULTY RANK (ref. Professor)				
Instructor	0.24	-7.97*	17.59	-0.23
Assistant	0.62**	-1.06	-1.01***	-0.42*
Associate	0.62**	-2.97	-0.10	-0.15
TYPE OF SCHOOL (ref. Public Health)				
Health Professions	1.82***	-20.34***	1.11***	-1.05***
Business	1.82***	-24.79***	2.72***	-1.12***
Medicine	-0.65	4.74	-0.51	0.30
Other School	1.52***	-20.19***	1.71***	-0.82***
GENDER (ref. Male)				
Female	-0.13	1.03	0.02	0.16
POSITION TYPE (ref. non tenure track)				
Tenured or Tenure Track Position	0.30	-1.18	-0.29	0.70**
DEGREE TYPE (ref. Mgmt/Hlth Mgmt)				
Doctorate in Hlth Svcs Res or Health Policy	-0.46	5.22**	0.15	0.63**
Doctorate Economics or Health Economics	-1.23***	3.50	-0.40	0.36
Doctorate in Other Area	-0.04	2.82	0.16	0.30
No Doctorate	1.73***	-5.46	2.00	-0.64
CLINICAL TRAINING (ref. no clinical doctorate)				
Clinical Doctorate	-0.90	5.60	1.01	0.59
TOTAL FACULTY IN DEPARTMENT	-0.03***	0.40***	-0.03**	0.02**

*Note: The first two columns contain coefficient estimates and significance levels from an ordinary least squares regression. The second two columns contain coefficient estimates (log odds) and significance levels from a logistic regression. *P<.05; **P<.01; ***P<.001*

REFERENCES

Bellas, M.L., & Toutkoushian, R.K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(4), 367-390.

Bentley, P., & Kyvik, S. (2012). Academic work from a comparative perspective: A survey of faculty working time across 13 countries. *Higher Education, 63*(4), 529-547. doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9457-4

Bentley, P., & Kyvik, S. (2013). Individual differences in faculty research time allocations across 13 countries. *Research in Higher Education, 54*(3), 329-348. doi: 10.1007/s11162-012-9273-4

Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 154-186.

Bunnell, K. (Ed.). (1960). *Faculty workload*. Washington, D.C.

Conner, T.W., & Rabovsky, T.M. (2011). Accountability, affordability, access: A review of the recent trends in higher education policy research. *Policy Studies Journal, 39*, 93-112. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00389_7.x

Diana, M.L., Campbell, C., Stranova, T., & Long, H.W. (2011). Faculty productivity expectations among CAHME-accredited programs. *Journal of Health Administration Education, 28*(3), 237-248.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(4), 147-160.

Fairweather, J.S., & Beach, A.L. (2002). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 97-115.

Ginter, P.M., Menachemi, N., & Morrisey, M.A. (2009). Academic health administration: Who are we? What do we do? And what are our views concerning the profession? *Journal of Health Administration Education, 26*(4), 259-276.

Layzell, D.T. (1996). Faculty workload and productivity: Recurrent issues with new imperatives. *Review of Higher Education, 19*(3), 267-281.

Lebeau, Y., Stumpf, R., Brown, R., Lucchesi, M.A.S., & Kwiek, M. (2012). Who shall pay for the public good? Comparative trends in the funding crisis of public higher education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 42*(1), 137-157. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2012.635418

Link, A.N., Swann, C.A., & Bozeman, B. (2008). A time allocation study of university faculty. *Economics of Education Review, 27*(4), 363-374. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.04.002

Massy, W.F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet". *The Journal of Higher Education, 65*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.2307/2943874

Menachemi, N. (2016). Research note: Overview of the data used in the current issue of JHAE and tests for response bias. Working paper.

Menachemi, N., Morrisey, M.A., Au, D., & Ginter, P.M. (2009). Job responsibilities and expectations of assistant professors: Does school of employment matter? *Journal of Health Administration Education, 26*(4), 277-291.

Milem, J.F., Berger, J.B., & Dey, E.L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(4), 454-475.

Morrisey, M.A., Menachemi, N., Cawley, J., & Ginter, P.M. (2010). Publication activity of health administration faculty. *Journal of Health Administration Education, 27*(3), 199-217.

SB 593 - improve professor quality/UNC system, SB 593, North Carolina Senate (2015).

Scott, W. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

SF 65 - an act relating to the teaching effectiveness and employment of professors employed by institutions of higher learning under the conrol of the state board of regents, SF64 - Introduced, Iowa Senate (2015).

Singell, L.D., & Lillydahl, J.H. (1996). Will changing times change the allocation of faculty time? *The Journal of Human Resources, 31*(2), 429-449.

Stecklein, J. (1961). *How to measure faculty workload*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Surratt, C.K., Kamal, K.M., & Wildfong, P.L.D. (2011). Research funding expectations as a function of faculty teaching/administrative workload. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy, 7*(2), 192-201. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2010.04.006

United States Government Accountability Office. (2014). Higher education - state funding trends and policies on affordability Retrieved from: http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/667557.pdf

Wilson, R. (2011, 16 Oct 2011). Back in the classroom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Yuker, H. (1974). *Faculty workload: Facts, myths, and commentary AAHE-ERIC higher education research report no. 6*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Yuker, H. (1984). *Faculty workload: Research, theory, and interpretation. ASHE-ERIC higher education research report no. 10*. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.