AGENDA

Council of Chairs Meeting

April 3, 2023

BI-104

1. Research Visibility Discussion – Monty Van Wart
2. Minutes Approval – Minutes from March 20th meeting
3. Informational Items
4. Announcement from chairs
5. Announcements by administration
* Guillermo’s Report
	+ SOAR Orientation Plans
	+ CNS DEI Committee Update
* Dave’s Report
	+ Review of March 25 CHOOSE CSUSB
	+ Summer SOAR programs for FTF and Transfer Students
* Sally’s report
	+ Scheduling update
	+ Pack Enrollment for Fall 2023 (May 24)
	+ NSCI 3001: Scientific Perspectives on Global Challenges (proposed new course)
	+ Lecturer mentoring regarding Range Elevation
* Sastry’s report

Zoom Link - <https://csusb.zoom.us/j/8576302459>

Upcoming Events

April 3: Summer registration begins

April 11: College of Natural Sciences Open Forum with President Morales and Provost Mohamed

April 17: Fall registration begins
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**CSUSB Research Capabilities, Current Perceptions, and R2 Status**

**Monty Van Wart**

**February 2023**

**Executive Summary**

CSUSB has been dealing with significant challenging issues that impact its mission and resources for some time: Q2S, COVID, and GI 2025 are among them. Workload and teaching load vis-à-vis research intensity have been a concern to many faculty, and the new designation as a Carnegie R2 institution has raised the level of confusion considerably. This report reviews various aspects of CSUSB’s research mission. Those aspects are the current institutional research profile, types of public higher education institutions, current perceptions of a nonrandom sample of faculty, additional considerations, and Faculty Research Fellow recommendations.

**Current Institutional Scholarly Research Profile**

Four aspects of CSUSB institutional scholarly research capacity are discussed below.

**Scholarly research standing**: While CSUSB is not included in most of the more selective world rankings (e.g., Academic Ranking of World Universities), it is ranked in the Scimago Institutions Rankings system of the top 4123 universities in the world of which 511 are in the US (2021). In that ranking on the research element of institutions, CSUSB is in the top 84th percentile (with 1% being the highest). CSUSB is ranked 16th among the CSUs, preceded by, in order: San Diego State, Bakersfield, San Francisco State, Sonoma, Long Beach, Northridge, San Luis Obispo, San Jose, Fullerton, San Marcos, Los Angeles, Fresno, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, and Sacramento. Five other CSUs are classified as R2 institutions by the Carnegie Classification Index (See *Appendix A*).

**Comparative research productivity**: Research productivity of individual faculty vary for many reasons including disciplinary differences in research approaches (e.g., individual versus team approaches), non-research focus per se (e.g., the fine arts), and emphasis on reporting rather than publishing (such as in applied service grants). Successful faculty researchers in the hard sciences and large disciplines tend to have higher rates, followed closely by productive social science faculty, but faculty active in research in small disciplines and the humanities tend to have substantially smaller citation counts solely based on the structure of the discipline. Nonetheless, absolute citation counts do provide a general insight into the comparative productivity of research-intensive faculty. Numerous citation systems exist. Here we rely on Google Scholar because of its inclusiveness of books and non-scholarly citations.

Averaging all disciplines, once a scholar has exceeded 500 Google Scholar (GS) citations, it equates to a modest but significant level of research achievement. Above 1,000 citations indicate a moderate record, and above 2,000 indicates a substantial record. In science and large disciplines, academic “stars” may have above 5,000 citations and “superstars” may have above 20,000 GS citations. At the other end of the citation spectrum, achieving one-third of these citation counts may be equivalent in the small disciplines and humanities.

A review of faculty citation counts in December, 2022, revealed that 91 faculty had above 500 GS citations. Of those, 29 had more than 1,000 citations and 16 had more than 2,000 GS citations. Given that the university has a little less than 200,000 Google Scholar citations by current faculty and the top 91 produced a little over 150,000 GS citations, it means that the top 20% of the faculty produced over three quarters of the research visibility. This is partially caused by the fact that top research faculty are more likely to publish in very good to flagship journals and presses. See Appendix B for details.

**Research visibility, public access, and professional reporting.**

Research visibility, public access, and professional reporting are vitally important to any university that wants to be widely recognized as a quality institution, as open, and as demonstrably competent. Research visibility ensures easy and wide dissemination about the research achievements of its faculty and students. When universities have well publicized data regarding their research productivity, they tend to have *better reputations*. Better research visibility also *enhances recruitment*. With research visibility, students learn of their faculty’s achievement and tell family and friends. In turn, they spread the good word and future prospective students are more likely to seek out CSUSB. This is paramount in our graduate programs in which reputation is very important for students. Good public access is not simply a nice-to-do function; it is a matter of *public accountability and ethical transparency*. In an age that is critical of government, it is important to prevent perceptions of opaqueness, low productivity, and bureaucratic secrecy. When information is hard-to-find or buried, public suspicion is understandably high. The public has a right to know about our productivity. Finally, all of the traditional professions—medicine, dentistry, and law—expect professionals (who are allowed tremendous flexibility and discretion based on their advanced expertise) to provide professional statistics and self-accountability. Providing productivity metrics in lieu of significant supervision is simply an expectation of professionals today. Further, institutions are expected to make decisions based on *evidence*.

Research visibility is demonstrated in many ways. In a review of research visibility performed in December 2022, several aspects were investigated: (a) a well-articulated and up-to-date university webpage (all faculty have a webpage to fill in), and (b) posted, up-to-date curricula vita OR personal or lab websites, OR a publication list, OR a link to a Google Scholar Profile account.

Twenty-one percent of the faculty have a robust research presence. That is, 21% have both a robust webpage presence and a substantial link to a publication list, or CV, or webpage, etc. Thirty-seven percent of the faculty have a moderate research presence. That effectively means that at least one element of research presence was good. Twenty percent of the faculty have a weak research presence. That means that they have no CV or equivalent link, and that their webpage description is relatively scant (and may not even mention their research interests). Twenty-two percent have no presence whatsoever on their university webpage and no link to a CV or other source such as a personal webpage. See Appendix C for the detailed data estimates.

**Current support for scholarly research productivity**

Several types of major support for scholarly research productivity are briefly reviewed here. Some concrete data was not easily accessible to the report author; it would be useful to gather additional information in the future for comparative purposes.

*Provost-level scholarly research reassign times unrelated to grant buyouts*: The Provost’s Office has used an extensive system of mini-grants for both teaching and research for many years quite successfully. The Provost’s Office also supports mini-grants to encourage student-focused research, as well as junior faculty automatic reassign time their first years of employment. These programs are reported to have been curtailed due to financial constraints. However, several rounds of Provost-level reassign time allocations have been made available in the last several years. The latest round provided approximately 35 faculty (approximately 8% of the tenure track faculty) a research reassign time.

*College-level scholarly research reassign times*: It is perceived by many faculty (in a survey reported on below) that college-level scholarly research reassign times were relatively commonly dispensed in some colleges to highly productive departments and/or individuals prior to the Q2S conversion and COVID. The constraints introduced by these and other issues resulted in a tightening of non-administrative reassign times due to budget constraints (informally reported). Because of stringent accreditation requirements for scholarly productivity under AACSB, the Business and Public Administration College has a routinized reassign policy for basic and high-impact journals based on scholarly productivity. The College of Natural Sciences routinely provides matching reassign times for grants that cover over 1/8th of a PI’s salary in a grant-fund buyout. Other colleges probably have similar arrangements for matching reassign time in excess of what is provided in the grant itself. Deans oversee the distribution of annualized professional development funds which can be used for research travel, equipment, and other miscellaneous types of research support.

*Faculty Research Fellow*: A new research support resource was created in fall of 2020 to provide individualized support for faculty (lecturers through full professors). The Faculty Research Fellow works out of the Office of Faculty Development and participates in the annual faculty certificate program (a seminar series with numerous professional development options) with stipends that include the Teaching Resource Center, DEI seminars, some RPT mentoring workshops, and others. Faculty can participate in individual seminars of interest, or seek a certificate with the stipend. The program is very inclusive (lecturers participate in significant numbers), allows for various levels of participation, gives many faculty the opportunity to present to their colleagues in areas in which they are expert, and creates a strong sense of community across colleges. The range of services provided by the Faculty Research Fellow over the first three years of the program with examples of service provide (projecting through the spring) are below:

* Seminars for faculty focusing on research (e.g., 64 seminars with 1,413 bodies in seats)
* Copyediting and manuscript critique (e.g., 171 manuscript reviews; many reviewed multiple times)
* Individual consultations, problem solving, and journal selection (approximately 234 inclusive of multiple consultations with some faculty)
* Direct collaboration on research or funded activities (e.g., 15 jointly-authored publications with CSUSB faculty)
* Enhancing research visibility (via Inside CSUSB and FRF newsletters)

**Distinguishing Public Higher Education Institutions**

This report focuses on expectations and institutional types, so a review of institutional (idealized) types is provided. Four major types are reviewed, each with a constellation of integrated factors related to mission (e.g., teaching, research emphasis), student preparation, tuition, programmatic focus, default teaching load, type of research preferred, types and amounts of external funding, and distribution of faculty compensation.

**Preliminary comments**

* Public institutions of higher education have equally valid and important societal missions. The mission of a community college is as important as the mission of a flagship public R1. Missions are not a hierarchy; they are on a spectrum.
* Public higher education institutions do not need to be a “pure” type, but they need to be very careful in planning and explaining how and why they are mixing institutional types because of possible mismatches in resources, expertise, expectations, depletion of resources to the primary mission, etc. For example, a low-intensity research university funded as primarily undergraduate that ventures into doctoral programs may end up with very weak doctoral programs, stripping resources and attention from undergraduate and master’s students, and causing confusion and resentment among faculty.
* Institutions can be evaluated at how well they accomplish their mission. Some institutions do a better job at assisting the most vulnerable populations and social mobility, others may be better at supporting their local communities, while still others may be better at procuring grant dollars or research productivity.
* Administrators, faculty, and the community will tend to see the institution as blind men feeling a particular part of the elephant. Listening to the array of opinions is informative but not sufficient to describe the elephant. Integration of ideas, and careful implementation are key to short and long-term success in diversifying mission. Otherwise, mission creep and mission confusion are the likely outcomes of poor planning.
* Some degree of shared nomenclature and concepts is key to having discussions that can provide meaningful understanding of different perspectives.

**Four types of public higher education institutions**

In this report we distinguish among community colleges, primarily undergraduate institutions, moderately-intensive research institutions, and intensive research institutions. They are described here as Weberian “ideal” types.

Community colleges focus exclusively on teaching (and service), very high acceptance rates, very low tuition, and small classes throughout the curriculum. They also only provide limited programming (lower division) for focus and quality, high regular-faculty/student contact, very high teaching/service workloads, absence of focus on research and external funding except for teaching grants, and relatively flat teaching compensation among faculty and fewer ranks.

Primarily undergraduate institutions (aka, low-intensity research institutions) focus primarily on teaching and service, high acceptance rates, low tuition, and primarily a small class approach with some large classes selectively. They focus on undergraduates but often have applied/profession masters programs, some but few teaching assistants, modest research expectations, modest external funding primarily for service and teaching functions, and only traditional ranks with little salary dispersion within ranks (at least by discipline). See table D in appendix for additional detail.

Moderately-intensive public research institutions can have extensive overlap with Carnegie-categorized R2 institutions. R2 institutions must meet only moderate external grant funding levels and very low PhD production levels (which is a proxy for scholarly focus). It is possible for the ideal moderately-intensive public institution to vary extensively with an R2 designation. The “ideal” moderately-intensive research institution splits its focus between research and teaching, has moderate acceptance rates, moderate tuition, and frequently uses largess at the lower division. They also focus as much on graduate programs (including doctoral) as undergraduate programs, use teaching assistants frequently, support both applied and theoretical research, seek applied and basic search funding, and use some super ranks and a greater salary differentiation in faculty salaries by department.

Intensive research institutions that are public overlap with the R1 Carnegie classification, but as with R2 and moderately intensive institutions, they are not coterminous. Intensive research institutions focus on research, have lower acceptance rates, high tuition, and limit small classes at the lower division and use more doctoral and master’s students as lecturers at that level. They also frequently deemphasize undergraduate teaching (relying on a higher quality of academically prepared students), limit regular faculty contact with lower division students, focus on prestige journals and publishers, rely on large amounts of external funding in many disciplines, and restrict promotion, provide super ranks, and allow highly differential pay levels.

The change in reclassification to Carnegie R2 raises a number of distinct questions that must be answered before a coherent plan can be executed that will have wide acceptance within the faculty. Those questions are:

1. To what degree is CSUSB *currently* a primarily undergraduate institution by type?
2. To what degree is CSUSB *currently* a moderately-intensive research institution by type?
3. To what degree, if at all, does CSUSB want to move toward being a more moderately-intensive research institution?
4. To the degree that CSUSB wants to move toward having characteristics of a moderately-intensive research institutions type, how does it plan to:
	1. Provide resources for changes (e.g., lowering the default workload)?
	2. What concurrent expectations will accompany those changes, if any (e.g., higher research expectations)?
	3. How will a relatively high level of consensus be achieved in making or not making, changes since there will be constituencies wanting and not wanting changes, and those wanting changes will want different things?

**Current Faculty Perceptions, Hopes, and Concerns about R2 Status: Faculty Survey of High-productivity Faculty**

In order to have a better sense of how faculty perceived the new R2 status, 24 high productivity faculty were asked, and 19 responded to nine questions about their: current load; is the current load appropriate for R2 status?; what should be the primary source of research reassign time (beyond grant funding)?; is consistency a concern in research reassign time?; is department efficiency near to being optimal?; do you feel recognized/appreciated for your scholarly productivity?, and additional comments?

In brief, all respondents indicated that they had a functional 4-4 workload. Assuming an 8-course (annual) load, they reported slightly more than a 2-3 teaching load (5.3) and slightly more than one administrative reassign time (1.2) on average. Because the sample was research intensive faculty, funded or matching reassign was unusually high (0.7). Reassign time specifically for research and sabbaticals was 0.8. The vast majority (79%) felt that the teaching load was not appropriate for an R2 institution. Preferences for the mechanism to be used were largely split between combination-of-approaches (47%) and primarily-past-research-productivity (42%). All respondents reported with concerns about the consistency of research reassign time year-to-year. Over half (53%) expressed confidence in the teaching efficiency in their department but a substantial number declined to answer, and a handful of respondents expressed or implied distrust in the idea of increasing teaching efficiency actually being used to reduce teaching load. Over half (52%) of the respondents felt recognized and appreciated but 37% did not; 11% did not respond. Open ended comments from 52% of the respondents included a variety of suggestions and concerns worth consideration. See Appendix E for more detailed information.

**Additional Issues to Consider**

**Teaching demands**

The standard default workload for tenure track faculty is a 4-4 (based on 3 credit courses), with a portion of a class allocated for university service and student advising. Reassign times, whatever their purpose, start from this workload basis. While teaching a 4-4 load is uncommon, the workload is not substantially diminished with alternate assignments and their respective expectations. This is heavy teaching/administrative load, with significantly less research expectations than some, but not all, public institutions of higher education. A review of public institutions of higher education is reviewed later in this report.

As important as the workload allocation for research intensity is the range and nature of the students being educated. As a high-quality regional institution with relatively affordable tuition and fees, CSUSB attracts many top students who chose it for convenience, locale, and other reasons. It has a relatively inclusive acceptance policy, so it also attracts many students needing remediation and customized teaching support. The range of student abilities in any given classroom can be quite large. Teaching a range of students with different needs is generally considered more difficult than teaching a lot of students with similar abilities (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2023). As an Hispanic Serving Institution, it attracts an enormous population of first-generation college students who need more support from the institution in lieu of an academic tradition in their families. Family responsibilities and financial burden add to the challenges that students confront and with which faculty must find as many appropriate accommodations and specialized strategies as possible. Therefore, the teaching load at CSUSB is not only heavy, but the nature of teaching is especially demanding for those who want to be excellent instructors.

**Mission expansion, mission creep, and mission confusion**

One’s mission is what your critical purpose and scope is. For significant impact, the breadth of mission should match the resources to sustain it. The more resources, the broader the mission can be. While it is possible to have a broad mission with limited resources, the likelihood of limited impact and lack of guiding focus among organizational members is very high. Generally speaking, CSUSB’s mission is focused on: underrepresented minorities, region, primarily undergraduate, low-cost tuition, etc. In short, it is a relatively classic low-intensity research institution. Resources for *mission expansion* are relatively limited.

Mission expansion is not always a strategic plan. It often just happens in organizations in small incremental bits. When resource expansion does not happen concurrently, it is often referred to as *mission creep*. Mission creep can be curbed or eliminated by requiring matching mission expansion with new resources in the administrative or governance process. Mission creep can also be mitigated by eliminating unsuccessful programmatic initiatives from time-to-time in order to focus resources, maintain high quality, and increase achievement.

Organizational identity, which is highly tied to mission, is important for member motivation, client and donor recruitment, reputation, etc. However, when mission creep occurs, it inevitably leads to *mission confusion*. When this happens, members may spend more time squabbling over resources than attracting new resources, clients and donor may become less committed to the institution, reputation will be significantly diminished, and so on.

**New faculty issues**

A major issue related to mission confusion is new faculty recruitment, retention, and long-term satisfaction. Are new faculty being recruited to a low or moderate research intensity department or university? Who and how is this determined? Who ensures new faculty are provided an accurate picture of the mission and resources? When aspects of institutional mission are decentralized to departments, who ensures aspirational goals will be realistic and sustainable? While moderate and high research intensity faculty can be relatively satisfied when a low research intensity is clearly conveyed in advance, when it is not clearly conveyed it can lead to frustration, anger, burnout, and/or bitterness. An example of this occurs when departments recruit high-caliber faculty with promises of a 3-3 load because of the initial, but temporary, tenure-track workload reduction. When faculty later learn that the 3-3 workload is, in fact, temporary and maintaining such a load is difficult or impossible through various types of research reassign time (e.g., internal and external grants), they can become cynical, uncommitted, or leave.

**Faculty preparation for research**

Yet another issue related to faculty is their preparation for research. When recruitment is for a low-intensity research institution, faculty recruitment can deemphasize candidate research capacity. If promotion is essentially noncompetitive, this is not particularly problematic because low research standards ensure high levels of faculty success. When there is a desire to move to a higher research intensity, the quality of training and skills for research become more critical. On one hand, recruitment of new faculty can focus more rigorously on research capability. On the other, faculty who are recruited with weak research skills can be supported by being able to work in teams, auxiliary research methods training, individualized support (a research mentor), etc. Currently at CSUSB, the capacity of faculty for research varies greatly, as does faculty interest in doing research.

**Accountability as workloads and teaching loads decrease**

While all professions rely heavily on intrinsic professionalism, all have extrinsic mechanisms to ensure that minimal professional standards and/or productivity are maintained. Therefore, another issue to think through is accountability for productivity—teaching and service as well as research—if and when work and teaching loads are decreased. Will faculty workloads be decreased based on merit or across-the-board? If across-the-board and productivity levels are well below a professional average for some faculty, will there be any governance recourse? If workloads are decreased across-the-board, will this encourage “free-riders” and simultaneously demotivate highly dedicated faculty? If a merit system is implemented to enhance motivation and resource conservation, how does such a system get effectuated? Getting widespread buy-in for changes to the overall accountability system, of whatever type, will be a significant challenge in the CSUSB environment.

**Recommendations of the Faculty Research Fellow**

* Differentiate between modestly (low) research-intensive institutions, R2 status institutions, and moderately research-intensive institutions because they are different (mission confusion).
* Since R2 is a classification, not a ranking, do not use boastful language in discussing this classification (mission confusion); establish a well-defined working nomenclature having to do with terms like workload, teaching load, reassign time, R2, low and moderate research-intensity, etc. Use more precise language in describing scholarly research accomplishments.
* Because CSUSB’s current mission is robust and broadly supported and resources are currently configured as those supporting a primarily undergraduate institution, more than modest mission expansion is unwise. However, some modest mission expansion is possible, but can only be sustained if it is done thoughtfully and carefully.
* Provide a research support plan that is less ad hoc and more continuous; think carefully about the best mix of research incentives to accommodate both different needs and the need for some accountability.
* Work to have an environment in which an “honest conversation” about RPT standards and moving toward a more moderately-intensive institution. Work to reduce widespread, but not universal, distrust of the administration regarding genuine support for research.
* Enhance scholarly research visibility as well as research recognition.
* Have a tough discussion about the need to review administration and teaching efficiency. A five percent across-the-board increase in teaching efficiency, and a five percent decrease in administrative bloat could fund an across-the-board reduction of the tenured and tenure-track default workload by a full course, moving it from a 4-4 to a 4-3.

**References**

Scimago university rankings, https://www.scimagoir.com/rankings.php?sector=Higher%20educ.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2023). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Ascd.

**Appendix A**

**Scimago 2022 university rankings based on *research*: Rankings of the CSUs**

Based on 511 US ranked institutions (84th percentile)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rank based largely absolute productivity | # of students | Rank based solely on size of student population  |
| 1. San Diego State: 125 R2
 | 35,732 | 4 |
| 1. Bakersfield: 151
 | 10,624 | 17 |
| 1. SF State: 175 R2
 | 26,620 | 9 |
| 1. Sonoma: 182
 | 7,182 | 19 |
| 1. Long Beach: 186
 | 39,434 | 2 |
| 1. Northridge: 188
 | 38,551 | 3 |
| 1. San Luis Obispo: 188
 | 22,028 | 11 |
| 1. San Jose: 190 R2
 | 33,848 | 5 |
| 1. Fullerton: 190
 | 40,087 | 1 |
| 1. San Marcos: 190
 | 14,503 | 15 |
| 1. Los Angeles: 193
 | 27,029 | 7 |
| 1. Fresno: 198 R2
 | 24,946 | 10 |
| 1. Dominguez Hills: 205
 | 16,916 | 13 |
| 1. East Bay: 206 R2
 | 13,499 | 16 |
| 1. Sacramento: 207
 | 31,573 | 6 |
| 1. **San Bernardino: 210** R2
 | 19,182 | **12** |
| 1. Pomona: 212
 | 29,103 | 7 |
| 1. Chico: 219
 | 15,421 | 14 |
| 1. Stanislaus: 222
 | 10,028 | 18 |

**Unranked: Channel Islands, Monterey Bay, Californian Maritime, Humboldt**

**Appendix B**

|  |
| --- |
| **Top scholars by Google Scholar (university total: 197,248 est., Dec. 2022)** |
|  | **Above 2000 citations** | **16** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **1000 to 1999 citations** | **29** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **500 to 999 citations** | **46** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total 500+ citations** | **91** | **19% of faculty** | **Top faculty produced 152,069 citations or 77% of all citations.**  |

**Appendix C**

|  |
| --- |
| **Grand Totals of Presence** (est. December 2022) |
| **NO PRESENCE on University Webpages****No faculty description on university website no matter how brief nor CV, website, or other listing attached (functionally invisible); no unlinked Google Scholar Profile****No faculty description on university website no matter how brief nor CV, website, or other listing attached (functionally invisible) but does have Google Scholar Profile not linked to their university webpage—Primarily JHB faculty****Total no presence and no GS Profile + no presence but do have GS Profile** |  80 27**107** |  16% 6%**22%** |
| **WEAK OR MODERATE faculty presence (from weak webpage presence up to strong webpage presence but no CV or other link) (weak=99 or 20%; Moderate=180 or 37%)** | **279** | **57%** |
| **Faculty with a ROBUST PRESENCE on university webpages (both a substantial university webpage and a CV or other auxiliary attachment (e.g., website or Google Scholar)** | **102** | **21%** |
|  | **488** | **199%** |

**Appendix D**

**Common Characteristics of Public Higher Education Institutions by Type/Classification**

(Model for Heuristic Purposes Only)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Community College** | **Primarily Undergraduate Institution (PUI)**(with master’s programs) | **Moderately Intensive Research Institution**--Public (Frequently Overlaps with R2 Status) | **Intensive Research Institution**--Public (Frequently Overlaps with R1 Status) |
| Teaching & service versus research emphasis in faculty evaluation | 100/0 | 75/25 | 50/50 | 25/75 |
| Nature of students by preparation and academic orientation | Very high acceptance rates: Wide range of students from those needing substantial remediation to academically prepared students—the wide range necessitates smaller classes | High acceptance rates: Wide range of students from those needing substantial remediation to academically prepared students—the wide range necessitates more smaller classes  | Moderate acceptance rates: Moderate range of students with greater focus on academically gifted students—the moderate range allows for more large class | Low acceptance rates: Relatively narrow range of students focusing almost entirely on those who are academically prepared—the narrower range allows for extensive use of large classes in the lower division |
| Comparative tuition | Very low | Low | Moderate | High |
| Teaching focus: size | Teaching exclusively through small and medium sized classes | Teaching primarily through small classes in GE; occasional use of large intro classes | Large classes common in lower division programs across both GE and introductory courses | Teaching small classes largely limited to upper division major courses and graduate programs |
| Teaching focus: emphasis of academic programs | Lower division only | Primarily undergraduate; some master’s; few, if any, doctoral | Substantial undergraduate; substantial master’s; modest doctoral | Modest undergraduate; moderate master’s; major focus on doctoral programs |
| Teaching focus: lower division student contact with tenured contact | Lower division contact solely with regular faculty; no TAs | Lower division contact largely with regular faculty--TT and Lecturers; few TAs | Lower division contact primarily with regular faculty but still frequent TAs  | Little lower division contact with regular faculty; wholesale use of TAs |
| Typical default teaching load | 5/5 | 3/3 to 4/4 | 2/2 to 3/3 | 1/2 to 2/2 |
| Research focus: type of research and publication venue ranking | None | Primarily applied and exploratory; limited focus or support for publication in “high-end” journals | Mix of applied and cutting-edge; acceptance of modest publication venues but significant recognition and support for publication in “high-end” journals | Primarily theoretical and cutting-edge; primary focus on highly competitive journals and publishers |
| Research focus: external funding (grants) | Funding for teaching and students with high support needs | Most funding for teaching, students with high support needs, and applied projects | Funding balanced between teaching, students with high support needs, applied projects, and basic research | Minimal funding for undergrad teaching, extensive funding for doctoral students, focus on basic research |
| Faculty compensation: distribution | Relatively flat; no research merit | Relatively flat; some research merit at promotions, little or no super ranks | Mixed; significant research merit at promotions, with counter offers, and with occasional use of super ranks | Quite differentiated; widespread use of merit and super ranks to elevate the pay of some faculty (endowed chairs, regents or “university” professors) |

Notes: To the degree that institutions serve different missions, they should be conceived as a spectrum—not a hierarchy or ranking. Functionally, CSUSB is quite consistent with the Public Teaching Institution type. Large-scale movement to an R2 status is inconsistent with the institutional mission; modest adaptation of R2 of some characteristics is possible with careful institutional planning utilizing a shared governance model. Because of their large endowments, prestigious private universities have different functional models.

**Appendix E**

Opinions of 19 Highly Productive Faculty Across Colleges\*, November 2022 through January 2023\*\*

1. **What is your *current teaching load* this year for the fall and for the spring? Did you get assign time based on research mini-grants, college/departmental reductions based on research productivity, or reassign time from external grants?**

All 19 faculty in this nonrandom sample indicated that they contractually and functionally have a 4/4 (24 unit) workload (not including six units for service). One respondent was a chair and two had sabbaticals during the current year. Overall, based on an 8-course load, the average was:

Teaching: 5.3

Administrative (e.g., graduate advisor): 1.2

Release for funded grants: 0.7

Release specifically for research: 0.4

Release for sabbatical: 0.4

Total: 8.0 course equivalents

1. **Given our role as a teaching/research institution and now R2 institution, do you feel that your teaching load is *appropriate*?**

Our teaching load is appropriate…

Yes, unqualified: 1

Yes, qualified: 3

No, qualified: 3

No, unqualified: 12

1. **Do you personally think that the primary *source of research assign times* should be across-the-board to all faculty regardless of past research productivity, based on mini-grants that focus on future productivity, or based on past research productivity emphasizing the last three to five years?**

Research reassign times should be…

primarily across-the-board: 2

Primarily mini-grants: 0

Primarily past research productivity: 8

Combination of approaches: 9

Notes: several respondents were strongly against across-the-board; one faculty member emphasized re-invigorating mini-grants but two were critical of mini-grant competition and quality of evaluation; strong sentiments were expressed by primarily-past-research-productivity respondents; some of the combination of approaches broadened the discussion to include more reassign time for teaching and service projects.

1. **To what degree, if any, is the *consistency* of research assign times from year-to-year a concern to you?**

Research assigned time is a concern…

Yes, unqualified: 17

Yes, qualified: 2

No, qualified: 0

No, unqualified: 0

Notes: Because this sample is selected from among the most scholarly productive faculty on campus, it is not surprising that reassign time consistency is very important. Those faculty who have not received reassign time for research, grants, etc. and thought that this was problematic were classified as Yes, unqualified. Reassign time to gear up for major projects was highlighted by numerous respondents.

1. **Research reassign times are largely generated by public institutions from teaching efficiency. Do you feel that *teaching efficiency* in your department is near to being optimal for an R2?**

Teaching efficiency in your department is near to being optimal for an R2…

Yes optimal, unqualified: 4

Yes optimal, qualified: 6

No optimal, qualified: 0

No optimal, unqualified: 3

Did not understand, insufficient information: 6

Notes: Most respondents who made a judgment felt that their respective departments did a good to very good job based on instructional customization for high quality teaching and/or teaching maximal size classes based on class type. Only three respondents thought teaching efficiency was problematic, but felt so strongly. Six respondents declined to answer because they did not understand the question or had insufficient information. A handful of respondents stated or implied that trust was a major barrier to any prospect of increasing numeric efficiency because of lack of trust in administrators.

1. **Do you feel properly *recognized/appreciated* (in terms of acknowledgments, honors, etc.) by your department, college, and/or university for your research productivity?**

Yes, I feel recognized/appreciated, unqualified: 7

Yes, I feel recognized/appreciated, qualified: 3

No, I do not feel recognized/appreciated, qualified: 4

No, I do not feel recognized/appreciated, unqualified: 3

Other: 2 (no distinction between low quality and high-quality research; don’t want recognition)

Notes: Qualified yes answers indicated that they were appreciated at one level but not at others. Four of the no’s were sanguine; three were bitter.

1. **Are there any other comments you would like to make?**

10 respondents had additional comments. Gist of comments:

* More timely payments in sponsored projects
* Lack of transparency about use of indirect cost recovery monies
* Hire a professional grant writer
* Extend timeline usage requirements to fit circumstances (e.g., COVID)
* Reduce teaching loads (time) for high impact journal publication
* Increase incentives ($) for those who publish in high impact journals
* “Assigned time should be available to anyone with a halfway decent research plan”
* Institute research reassign time for research productivity
* More encouragement for big projects; more focus on faculty-oriented research because it is currently ignored except in the RPT process and thus altogether absent for full professors
* More focus on research teams

\* Arts and Letters, 2 (several declines); Education, 2; Business and Public Administration, 4; Natural Science, 6; Social and Behavioral, 5

\*\* Prepared by Monty Van Wart, Faculty Research Fellow, anonymized raw data available upon request.