A view of mathematics research productivity at U.S. regional public universities

Robert G. Donnelly[1]
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Murray State University, Murray, KY 42071 USA

Abstract

Statistical summaries of certain kinds of mathematics research output are given for a large sample of U.S. regional public universities. These statistical summaries are reported using a variety of metrics that distinguish between single-authored and collaborative work and account for publication length.

Key Words: mathematics research productivity; regional public university; complete and complete-normalized counting

§**1. Introduction.** In June 2006, the Minister of State of Higher Education in Britain proposed a regimen for reforming the system of assessment and evaluation of research productivity in higher education [7]. The new system would involve automated assessment of data. The proposal stated that the old system

> should be replaced with a new and lighter-touch system based largely on metrics. The principle of using information that is already collected routinely to assess research quality and allocate funding must be the right one. The savings of time and effort that this can bring for university teachers and administrators alike should be welcomed by all, as should the transparency that a system based on publicly available data potentially offers.

In October 2006, the Council for the Mathematical Sciences (or CMS, comprised of the Institute for Mathematics and its Applications, the London Mathematical Society, and the Royal Statistical Society) responded to the reform proposal [17], [9]. While acknowledging that the use of a variety of numerical measures is an important part of the picture of productivity, the CMS expressed serious concerns that excessive reliance on numbers can adversely affect the way mathematics research is practiced and that metrics that work well for other science disciplines might not work well for mathematics. In December 2006, it was announced that mathematics would, for the time being, be excluded from the new "lighter-touch" system in favor of a regimen that would rely both on metrics and peer assessment [13].

These events partly inspired the study presented in this paper of mathematics research output at U.S. regional public universities. This study was undertaken with the following goals: (1) To provide some interesting and hopefully useful summary data on mathematics research output as evidenced by publications; (2) to support the use of a variety of measures in assessments of mathematics faculty research output rather than the flawed metric that is often exclusively used (that is, length of the publication list); (3) to demonstrate that raw data supporting such measures is widely available, although some effort might be required to collect and process the data; and (4) to promote the view that in any assessment of mathematics faculty performance, numerical measures should be used with great care and qualified by the perspectives of knowledgeable and established practitioners.

This fourth point is perhaps most important. The following concerns should be kept in mind. The existence of such metrics should not diminish the value or discourage the pursuit of other kinds of scholarly mathematical activities which are beyond the scope of this study (such as time and energy given to teaching and working with students, course development, direction of theses and other student projects, talks and presentations, reviewing and refereeing, editorial work, expository writing, notes on pedagogy, textbook authoring, conference organizing, service to scholarly organizations, consulting, translating, grant writing, etc). Moreover, it should be noted that it is difficult for statistics about output volume to account for less tangible factors such as quality. These concerns are easily forgotten when undue prominence is given to numerical measures, and this can consequently motivate behavior that undermines the efficacy of the discipline. The CMS voiced similar concerns in [17], advocating that metrics for assessing research productivity should not be considered in isolation without the context and moderation of expert viewpoints. Nonetheless, as the CMS readily acknowledges [17], [9], a variety of reliable metrics is desirable.

There is now an extensive literature on evaluative bibliometrics. Since the 1960's, databases of publication information have been used to support metrics for assessments of research performance. Such metrics typically measure output volume or the impact of research and are applied variously to individuals, programs,

[1]Email: rob.donnelly@murraystate.edu, Fax: 1-270-809-2314

journals, disciplines, countries, or regions of the world. At this time it appears there is no uniform standard for measuring scientific research output, see [14]. For one possible approach to the problem of standardizing counting methods, see [8]. One critical issue is whether "total counting" or "fractional counting" should be used in assessing numbers of papers: roughly speaking, total counts do not distinguish between single-authored and collaborative publications, whereas fractional counts do. Impact is often measured by citations. The so-called "Hirsch index" (or h-index) introduced by Hirsch [10] combines output volume and impact in a single numerical measure. This metric and its variations are now widely used but have their limitations, as acknowledged by Hirsch and pointed out by others (see for example [5]). Many mathematical societies have pointed out the limited usefulness of citation statistics (such as the Thomson Scientific impact factors) for measuring the impact of mathematics research ([1], [6], [9]). Partly this is due to different citation habits in mathematics, to overall publication rates, and to the nature of the discipline itself. As noted in [11] and [12], it does seem that "... 'Mathematics' is a field that has quite specific rules, and probably requires individualized treatment." Since the main interest of this study is output volume of mathematics research, measures of impact will not be considered here.

The remainder of the paper aims to address goals (1), (2), and (3). In §2, the design and methods of the study are described. A key aspect of the study is noted in this section, namely the high accessibility of the web-based resources that provided the input data for the study. In §3, descriptions are given for the metrics used here. In measuring output volume, these metrics notably distinguish between single-authored and collaborative work and also account for publication length. While such distinctions might not be appropriate for other science disciplines, it is argued that they are instructive and necessary in mathematics. Such distinctions have been previously discussed within the mathematics community, though rarely (if ever) supported by the kinds of data provided here. Various statistical summaries which are presented in tables at the end of the paper are described in §4. Some concluding remarks are given in §5.

Note. For the benefit of referees, more extensive data was made available which will remain confidential.

§**2. Design of the study.** First a roster was created of mathematics faculty meeting the following criteria: (a) doctorate earned in 2001 or earlier; (b) ranked faculty member in a mathematics department for the 2006-07 academic year at one of 38 certain public universities (including the author's home institution Murray State University) with institutional profile, and presumably mission, comparable to Murray State's; (c) information concerning rank, doctorate school and year, as well as research interests and/or dissertation title readily available online; and (d) academic area in a mathematics field other than computer science, statistics, mathematics education, mathematics history, operations research, or actuarial science. This yielded a list of 366 individuals.

These criteria are further explained/justified as follows. For (a), the data for a certain kind of research output collected for this study only covers publications up through calendar year 2006. Some of the summary statistics presented in this report are for certain five-year periods. Individuals with a doctorate earned in 2001 or earlier would therefore have had the opportunity to contribute for a minimum of five consecutive calendar years. For (b), only ranked faculty are considered since their typical professional responsibilities are not necessarily fully shared by other university faculty (lecturers, adjuncts, etc). Since this study of research productivity at regional public universities originated at Murray State, it made sense to look at other similar institutions. The 38 universities include all 15 of the public universities whose 2005 Carnegie classification[2] is Master's L and which are MSU benchmark schools (see [15]) plus all 23 remaining public Master's L universities with mathematics departments in Kentucky and the Kentucky-area states of Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. These 38 universities are nearly one-quarter of the 157 U.S. public Master's L universities with mathematics departments offering a traditional mathematics major. (There are 166 U.S. public Master's L universities.) For (c), since one of the goals at the outset was to demonstrate the wide availability of data to support such a study, the focus was

[2]See `http://www.carnegiefoundation.org`

limited to information that could be obtained from highly accessible resources. Thus, roster information was obtained from open sources publicly available online: university and department webpages, online bulletins and library catalogs, the Mathematics Genealogy Project[3], and Google searches. For (d), the main reason for excluding individuals in these particular areas is that such faculty often have priorities for productivity other than research leading to the kinds of publications considered here. From the 38 departments there were 341 ranked mathematics faculty who were not eligible for this roster: 15 computer scientists (9 with doctorate before 2002), 94 statisticians (73 with doctorate before 2002), 113 mathematics education specialists (88 with doctorate before 2002), 3 mathematics historians (2 with doctorate before 2002), 12 operations researchers (10 with doctorate before 2002), 2 actuarial scientists (both with doctorate before 2002), 74 others with doctorate between the years 2002 and 2006 inclusive, 16 without a doctoral degree, and 12 others with insufficient information available online.

Second, publication data for all faculty on the roster was obtained from MathSciNet.[4] MathSciNet is a comprehensive searchable online database maintained by the American Mathematical Society (AMS) and which includes bibliographic information for mathematics papers published worldwide for the past 65+ years. MathSciNet has its origins as the monthly print publication Mathematical Reviews, begun in 1940 with the goal of providing timely information on new contributions to mathematics research appearing in the literature. MathSciNet's reputation as one of the world's premiere databases of information on mathematics literature owes to its reliability, wide availability, and vast coverage.[5] For example, each year all papers from nearly 750 mathematics journals worldwide have individual reviews in addition to bibliographic information added to the MathSciNet database. Bibliographic data is also indexed for hundreds of other journals related to the mathematical sciences which are not reviewed cover-to-cover. Many conference proceedings and other compendia of research papers are indexed as well. In what follows, the notation **'MSN'** refers to papers with bibliographic information appearing on MathSciNet. It should be kept in mind that MSN publications represent only one kind of scholarly mathematical contribution. (For instance, some statistics and many education-related journals are not indexed by MathSciNet.) But in view of the position of the AMS that the legacy of the mathematics community is its publication record [2], MSN publications surely represent a very important kind of scholarly mathematical contribution.

Third, a database was created by entering the raw bibliographic information on MSN publications for faculty on the roster into a text file. This raw data was then compiled into statistical summaries using programs written in the computer algebra system Maple. The biographical details obtained for the 366 individual faculty (complete name information, doctorate year, research area, university affiliation, etc) helped identify the MSN publications for each via MathSciNet's author search query.

§**3. Metrics considered.** This report will focus on statistics based on certain *paper* and *page* counts. These counts are tallied for each of the 366 individual faculty on the roster described in §2. Certain averages for the faculty at each of the 38 universities are also calculated. The counts are derived from MSN publication data. Since this study aims to focus on post-doctorate productivity, only MSN papers published after the doctorate year are considered. Those items which are readily identified as errata, addenda, surveys/expositions, or research announcements (offering results without proofs) are excluded from paper-counting metrics. Pages from surveys/expositions and research announcements (offering results without proofs) are excluded from page-counting metrics. These exclusions amount to only a small fraction of the 'attributable' papers (32.4 out of 2,156.3) and 'attributable' pages (340.5 out of 26,386.6) analyzed in the study. Here and throughout, the adjective **'attributable'** refers to the proportion of a paper obtained by dividing by the number of coauthors.

In the category of papers, the metrics considered are single-authored papers, collaborative papers, attributable collaborative papers, and attributable papers. The latter is the sum of the single-authored and

[3]See `http://www.genealogy.ams.org`

[4]See `http://www.ams.org/mathscinet` (This subscription service is available on many university campuses.)

[5]The only other comparable database is *Zentralblatt Math* at `http://www.zentralblatt-math.org/zmath/en`

attributable collaborative papers. For collaborative papers in mathematics, dividing by the number of coauthors is appropriate at times, for the following reasons. First, while it is not likely that contributions of all authors on a collaborative paper are exactly the same in terms of generating ideas, obtaining results, writing, etc, it is nonetheless reasonable to assume that each of the authors has made a significant contribution. This is expressed by the AMS in its ethical guidelines for coauthorship, which state that all of the authors listed on a collaborative paper "must have made a significant contribution to its content" [2]. Moreover, in mathematics the prevailing culture is to list authors alphabetically, so the bibliographic data usually makes no distinctions concerning coauthors' respective contributions. This practice reflects the facts that the typical end-product of a mathematical investigation is a new theorem or proof and that the relative merits of the input ideas contributed by collaborating researchers toward such an end-product can be difficult to distinguish. So, dividing by the number of coauthors is a workably equitable principle for accounting for an individual's relative contribution to a given collaborative paper. Second, from the point of view of editors or referees, there is no distinction made in standards for single-authored or coauthored papers. The evident principle is that the academic merit of a paper is independent of the number of authors. So in assessments of individual research productivity, the author of the single-authored paper can be unfairly disadvantaged when coauthors – who can divide the labor of production amongst themselves – receive the same individual credit as the single author. Further, equating the efforts of single authors and collaborative authors not only disadvantages the single author in this way but can be seen as effectively (and dubiously) giving credit to an author of a coauthored paper for the work of his or her collaborators. Thus, as a metric for assessing individual productivity in mathematics research, the total of items on the publication list is flawed in its conflation of contributions from single-authored and collaborative papers. (The notion that certain bibliometric indicators of scientific research performance should account for coauthorship by dividing by the number of authors is not unusual, see for example in [3], [4], [8], [14].) On the other hand, collaborations can lead to research results that might not otherwise have been obtained and can say something very positive about a researcher or a research program, so it seems imperative that some metrics should specifically recognize this kind of contribution. Overall, as indicators of mathematics research productivity, both single-authored and collaborative publications are important.

In the category of pages, the metrics considered are single-authored pages, collaborative pages, attributable collaborative pages, and attributable pages. The latter is the sum of the single-authored and attributable collaborative pages. In mathematics, such page counts are legitimate and in certain respects better measures than paper counts for assessing research output. Length and content for mathematics papers are reasonably viewed as proportional. In part this is because the recognized standards for journal writing encourage economy and demand that content represent new additions to the literature. Further, attempting to inflate page counts is risky since longer papers demand more of editors and particularly referees and take up more journal space, which is often at a premium. It can be argued that the paper is a far more arbitrary unit of volume than the page and far more susceptible to authors' stylistic choices. Moreover, a system of assessment in which the length of the publication list is the only metric that counts can create incentive for pursuing stratagems that have little or no academic merit, such as arbitrarily subdividing a paper to get multiple submissions. Some of that incentive is dispelled when page counts are also considered. One possible drawback of page-counting metrics is the implicit assumption that the content on any two given pages is roughly comparable, not only within a paper but also between papers in the same or even different journals. However, this flaw seems to be no worse than the assumption that the content of two *papers* is roughly comparable. Indeed, the CMS has recognized that as a "pure, non-evaluative [i.e. objective] output measure", a count of pages is not only legitimate but also less crude than a count of papers; further, counting pages as a measure of output volume can be seen as analogous to counting the monetary totals of grants and not just the number of grants won when assessing the input volume of research funding [9].

§**4. Comments on the statistical summaries.** In the first set of tables (Tables 1.1–1.32), summary data is given for an octet of metrics (single-authored papers and pages, collaborative papers and pages, attributable

collaborative papers and pages, and attributable papers and pages) for the 366-member faculty roster. Publication productivity is considered for the following time frames: The calendar years 2002-2006 (inclusive), the best five years, the best up-to-ten-year period, and total career productivity through calendar year 2006. For a given metric, the best five years for an individual are his/her best five consecutive calendar years during the career span from after the doctorate year up through 2006. The best up-to-ten-year period is the best ten consecutive years during the career span or the period from after the doctorate year through 2006, if the latter is less than ten years. In the language of [8] (see also [14]), the object of study in these tables is the 366-member faculty roster, the basic units are authors, and credits are attributed using complete counting (single-authored papers/pages, collaborative papers/pages) and complete-normalized[6] counting (attributable collaborative papers/pages, attributable papers/pages).

The second set of tables (Tables 2.1–2.16) gives data for faculty at each of the 38 universities which were part of this study. For each school and each of the eight metrics, the average per faculty member is given as well as the median and the average of the middle 50%. These are presented for the four different time frames (2002-2006, best five years, best up-to-ten years, and career). This data could be viewed as a companion to the publication data reported for faculty at research universities in Appendix L of [16]. In the language of [8] (see also [14]), the objects of study in these tables are the 38 sets of faculty obtained by grouping the individuals from the 366-member roster according to their 2006-07 university affiliation. *That is, the objects of study are not the universities themselves.* The basic units are authors, and credits are attributed using complete counting (single-authored papers/pages, collaborative papers/pages) and complete-normalized* counting (attributable collaborative papers/pages, attributable papers/pages). For the "Totals" data reported in these tables, the object of study is the entire 366-member faculty roster.

Data in the first set of tables is reported in "half-deciles" on a 100-place scale (i.e. 100th place, 95th place, 90th place, etc). The 100th place is the highest mark in a list of 366. The 0th place is the lowest mark out of 366. The 50th place is the median. The 65th place (for example) is computed as .75× (238th highest mark) + .25× (239th highest mark), corresponding to position $238.25 = 1 + 65 \cdot \left(\frac{366-1}{100}\right)$ in an ordered list of 366 marks. For the five-year and up-to-ten-year time frames in the first and second sets of data, biennial rather than annual averages are used for the reason that a biennium is more closely attuned to the natural life-cycle of a mathematics paper from initial idea to submission. To compute a biennial average, divide an individual total by half the number of calendar years.

The presentation of summary statistics begins on the next page.

§**5. Concluding remarks.** Distinguishing between single-authored and collaborative publications and accounting for publication length are necessary distinctions for informative statistical summaries of mathematics research output. It is difficult for single numerical measures (such as length of the publication list) to adequately draw such distinctions. In addition to making such distinctions, the statistical summaries presented in this report use certain academic-biographical information to account for faculty research areas and to give a view of productivity for various time frames, most notably including the best five and up-to-ten years for each individual relative to each of the eight metrics used. It is hoped that this data will help support constructive discussions of the use of metrics in assessing mathematics research output, particularly at U.S. regional public universities. Further refinements of this data are planned for future reports, accounting for factors such as subject area within mathematics (using the AMS' Mathematics Subject Classification[7] scheme), diversity in the selection of journals in which an individual's work appears, diversity of coauthors, whether publications have appeared in archival journals or in proceedings or other research compendia, etc.

Acknowledgment. I thank my Murray State colleagues Wayne Bell and Andy Kellie for their encouragement and thoughtful feedback.

[6] In the context of the metrics used here, "normalizing" refers to dividing by the number of coauthors. So, crediting using single-authored papers/pages could be viewed as both complete and complete-normalized.

[7] See `http://www.ams.org/msc`

Tables 1.1 – 1.8: time frame = 2002-2006

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 1.1: Biennial averages for single-authored papers for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	3.6	85th	0.4	70th	0	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	1.2	80th	0.4	65th	0	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	0.8	75th	0	60th	0	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.2: Biennial averages for collaborative papers for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	21.2	85th	1.6	70th	0.4	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	2.8	80th	1.2	65th	0.4	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	2.0	75th	0.8	60th	0.4	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.3: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative papers for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	8.53	85th	0.60	70th	0.20	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	1.12	80th	0.40	65th	0.13	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	0.80	75th	0.33	60th	0.13	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.4: Biennial averages for attributable papers for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	8.53	85th	1.07	70th	0.45	55th	0.20	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	1.90	80th	0.80	65th	0.40	50th	0.13	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	1.53	75th	0.62	60th	0.33	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.5: Biennial averages for single-authored pages for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	64.0	85th	6.1	70th	0	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	16.2	80th	3.6	65th	0	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	8.4	75th	0	60th	0	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.6: Biennial averages for collaborative pages for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	294.4	85th	19.5	70th	6.4	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	46.2	80th	13.2	65th	4.8	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	30.8	75th	10.8	60th	2.8	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.7: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative pages for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	119.03	85th	8.63	70th	2.89	55th	0	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	19.60	80th	5.53	65th	2.00	50th	0	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	12.25	75th	4.15	60th	0.93	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.8: Biennial averages for attributable pages for the five-year period 2002-2006.

100th	119.03	85th	16.60	70th	5.77	55th	2.00	40th	0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	30.26	80th	11.73	65th	4.50	50th	0.93	35th	0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	22.07	75th	9.04	60th	3.20	45th	0	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Tables 1.9 – 1.16: time frame = best five years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 1.9: Biennial averages for single-authored papers for the best five years.

100th	9.6	85th	1.6	70th	0.8	55th	0.4	40th	0.4	25th	0	10th	0
95th	2.7	80th	1.2	65th	0.8	50th	0.4	35th	0.4	20th	0	5th	0
90th	2.0	75th	1.2	60th	0.8	45th	0.4	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.10: Biennial averages for collaborative papers for the best five years.

100th	22.0	85th	2.4	70th	1.6	55th	0.8	40th	0.4	25th	0	10th	0
95th	4.8	80th	2.0	65th	1.2	50th	0.4	35th	0.4	20th	0	5th	0
90th	3.2	75th	1.6	60th	0.8	45th	0.4	30th	0.4	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.11: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative papers for the best five years.

100th	8.70	85th	1.13	70th	0.65	55th	0.33	40th	0.20	25th	0	10th	0
95th	2.02	80th	0.93	65th	0.60	50th	0.20	35th	0.20	20th	0	5th	0
90th	1.40	75th	0.79	60th	0.40	45th	0.20	30th	0.13	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.12: Biennial averages for attributable papers for the best five years.

100th	9.80	85th	2.20	70th	1.53	55th	1.00	40th	0.60	25th	0.40	10th	0
95th	3.52	80th	1.93	65th	1.22	50th	0.80	35th	0.47	20th	0.20	5th	0
90th	2.60	75th	1.61	60th	1.20	45th	0.80	30th	0.40	15th	0.13	0th	0

Table 1.13: Biennial averages for single-authored pages for the best five years.

100th	109.6	85th	18.8	70th	11.6	55th	7.2	40th	4.0	25th	0	10th	0
95th	32.0	80th	16.0	65th	9.6	50th	6.0	35th	2.0	20th	0	5th	0
90th	24.8	75th	13.5	60th	8.8	45th	4.8	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.14: Biennial averages for collaborative pages for the best five years.

100th	294.4	85th	37.7	70th	18.8	55th	10.4	40th	4.8	25th	0	10th	0
95th	69.8	80th	29.2	65th	15.3	50th	8.4	35th	3.2	20th	0	5th	0
90th	45.8	75th	22.8	60th	12.8	45th	6.4	30th	1.2	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.15: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative pages for the best five years.

100th	119.03	85th	14.95	70th	7.77	55th	4.40	40th	2.13	25th	0	10th	0
95th	27.24	80th	12.87	65th	6.65	50th	3.57	35th	1.40	20th	0	5th	0
90th	20.62	75th	10.15	60th	5.33	45th	2.80	30th	0.60	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.16: Biennial averages for attributable pages for the best five years.

100th	121.20	85th	27.49	70th	18.44	55th	12.18	40th	7.20	25th	3.95	10th	0
95th	46.71	80th	23.80	65th	16.40	50th	10.40	35th	6.00	20th	2.40	5th	0
90th	33.74	75th	20.83	60th	14.20	45th	8.55	30th	5.10	15th	1.38	0th	0

Tables 1.17 – 1.24: time frame = best up-to-ten years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 1.17: Biennial averages for single-authored papers for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	8.40	85th	1.03	70th	0.60	55th	0.40	40th	0.20	25th	0	10th	0
95th	1.80	80th	0.80	65th	0.58	50th	0.31	35th	0.20	20th	0	5th	0
90th	1.40	75th	0.80	60th	0.40	45th	0.20	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.18: Biennial averages for collaborative papers for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	21.40	85th	2.00	70th	1.00	55th	0.40	40th	0.20	25th	0	10th	0
95th	3.40	80th	1.50	65th	0.80	50th	0.40	35th	0.20	20th	0	5th	0
90th	2.40	75th	1.20	60th	0.60	45th	0.21	30th	0.20	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.19: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative papers for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	8.53	85th	0.80	70th	0.43	55th	0.20	40th	0.10	25th	0	10th	0
95th	1.42	80th	0.67	65th	0.37	50th	0.17	35th	0.10	20th	0	5th	0
90th	1.08	75th	0.50	60th	0.30	45th	0.10	30th	0.07	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.20: Biennial averages for attributable papers for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	9.10	85th	1.74	70th	1.08	55th	0.67	40th	0.40	25th	0.20	10th	0
95th	2.62	80th	1.45	65th	0.90	50th	0.54	35th	0.30	20th	0.10	5th	0
90th	2.09	75th	1.20	60th	0.77	45th	0.49	30th	0.20	15th	0.07	0th	0

Table 1.21: Biennial averages for single-authored pages for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	92.20	85th	13.00	70th	7.20	55th	4.15	40th	2.20	25th	0	10th	0
95th	23.50	80th	10.40	65th	5.85	50th	3.20	35th	1.00	20th	0	5th	0
90th	15.80	75th	8.58	60th	5.00	45th	2.60	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.22: Biennial averages for collaborative pages for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	277.80	85th	24.95	70th	12.70	55th	6.24	40th	2.60	25th	0	10th	0
95th	48.70	80th	20.89	65th	10.00	50th	4.78	35th	1.75	20th	0	5th	0
90th	33.60	75th	15.35	60th	8.40	45th	3.57	30th	0.60	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.23: Biennial averages for attributable collaborative pages for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	111.77	85th	11.23	70th	5.07	55th	2.58	40th	1.20	25th	0	10th	0
95th	19.79	80th	9.13	65th	4.32	50th	2.00	35th	0.80	20th	0	5th	0
90th	14.64	75th	6.86	60th	3.48	45th	1.67	30th	0.30	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.24: Biennial averages for attributable pages for the best up-to-ten years.

100th	111.77	85th	21.25	70th	12.33	55th	7.79	40th	4.60	25th	2.11	10th	0
95th	33.95	80th	17.57	65th	10.97	50th	6.60	35th	3.71	20th	1.30	5th	0
90th	26.21	75th	15.19	60th	9.20	45th	5.74	30th	2.80	15th	0.69	0th	0

Tables 1.25 – 1.32: time frame = career

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 1.25: Career totals for single-authored papers.

100th	73	85th	6	70th	3	55th	2	40th	1	25th	0	10th	0
95th	12	80th	4	65th	3	50th	1.5	35th	1	20th	0	5th	0
90th	7.5	75th	4	60th	2	45th	1	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.26: Career totals for collaborative papers.

100th	188	85th	11	70th	5	55th	2	40th	1	25th	0	10th	0
95th	22	80th	8	65th	4	50th	2	35th	1	20th	0	5th	0
90th	16	75th	7	60th	3	45th	1	30th	1	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.27: Career totals for attributable collaborative papers.

100th	74.75	85th	4.83	70th	2.50	55th	1.00	40th	0.50	25th	0	10th	0
95th	9.46	80th	3.50	65th	1.83	50th	0.83	35th	0.50	20th	0	5th	0
90th	6.50	75th	2.83	60th	1.50	45th	0.50	30th	0.33	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.28: Career totals for attributable papers.

100th	94.67	85th	11.04	70th	5.50	55th	3.50	40th	2.00	25th	1.00	10th	0
95th	20.42	80th	8.25	65th	4.85	50th	3.00	35th	1.50	20th	0.50	5th	0
90th	13.33	75th	6.50	60th	4.00	45th	2.50	30th	1.00	15th	0.33	0th	0

Table 1.29: Career totals for single-authored pages.

100th	780	85th	64	70th	35.5	55th	21	40th	11	25th	0	10th	0
95th	133.25	80th	52	65th	30.25	50th	16.5	35th	5	20th	0	5th	0
90th	88	75th	42	60th	25	45th	14	30th	0	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.30: Career totals for collaborative pages.

100th	2239	85th	139.5	70th	63.5	55th	32	40th	13	25th	0	10th	0
95th	306	80th	112	65th	50.25	50th	25.5	35th	8	20th	0	5th	0
90th	203.5	75th	81.25	60th	43	45th	17	30th	3	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.31: Career totals for attributable collaborative pages.

100th	890.10	85th	60.92	70th	29.00	55th	13.63	40th	6.00	25th	0	10th	0
95th	133.09	80th	47.92	65th	22.75	50th	10.00	35th	3.88	20th	0	5th	0
90th	87.59	75th	35.90	60th	17.42	45th	8.08	30th	1.50	15th	0	0th	0

Table 1.32: Career totals for attributable pages.

100th	1001.10	85th	128.36	70th	62.89	55th	41.98	40th	23.33	25th	10.13	10th	0
95th	251.02	80th	102.50	65th	54.96	50th	36.67	35th	18.00	20th	6.50	5th	0
90th	163.50	75th	75.00	60th	48.00	45th	31.00	30th	14.33	15th	3.44	0th	0

Table 2.1: time frame = 2002-2006

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.1: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative papers by university, for the years 2002-2006. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Papers			Collaborative Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.32	0	0	.20	0	.04
Arkansas State	6	.53	.2	.33	.07	0	0
Central Connecticut State	8	.05	0	0	.85	.6	.53
Central Missouri State	8	.10	0	0	.40	0	0
Chicago State	10	0	0	0	.04	0	0
Eastern Illinois	12	.07	0	0	.30	0	0
Eastern Kentucky	14	.23	0	0	.26	0	0
Eastern Washington	4	.70	0	0	.10	0	0
Frostburg State (MD)	4	0	0	0	.20	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.06	0	0	1.03	0	.15
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	1.80	1.8	1.80	.40	.4	.40
James Madison (VA)	21	.19	0	.04	.88	.4	.33
Marshall (WV)	14	.43	0	.14	.26	0	0
Middle Tenn. State	14	.37	0	.03	.91	.2	.23
Missouri State	17	.21	0	.04	.80	.4	.49
Morehead State (KY)	6	.13	0	0	.73	.2	.40
Murray State (KY)	13	.34	0	.23	1.14	.8	.86
Norfolk State (VA)	12	0	0	0	.03	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	.16	0	.13	0	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	.53	.2	.33	.67	0	.20
Northern Kentucky	11	0	0	0	.15	0	0
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.13	0	.07	0	0	0
Plymouth State (NH)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	0	0	0	.33	0	.07
Rhode Island College	13	.03	0	0	.15	0	.06
Southeast Missouri State	10	.08	0	0	.20	0	0
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	.35	.2	.13	1.60	.8	.67
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.04	0	0	.04	0	0
Tennessee Tech	10	.20	0	.04	.32	0	.12
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.20	0	.04	.64	.2	.36
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	.93	0	.70	0	0	0
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	.25	0	.10	1.53	1.6	1.63
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.10	0	0	.50	.2	.10
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	.03	0	0	2.26	.2	.46
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.10	0	0	.80	.4	.40
Western Illinois	11	.22	0	.10	.65	.4	.47
Western Kentucky	18	.33	0	.13	1.42	1.2	.96
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.09	0	0	.60	.4	.31
Totals	366	.20	0	0	.63	0	.16

Table 2.2: time frame = 2002-2006

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.2: Biennial averages of attributable collaborative and attributable papers by university, for 2002-2006. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Papers			Attributable Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.08	0	.01	.40	0	.09
Arkansas State	6	.03	0	0	.57	.20	.37
Central Connecticut State	8	.37	.27	.22	.42	.43	.35
Central Missouri State	8	.18	0	0	.28	0	0
Chicago State	10	.01	0	0	.01	0	0
Eastern Illinois	12	.14	0	0	.21	0	0
Eastern Kentucky	14	.10	0	0	.33	0	.07
Eastern Washington	4	.03	0	0	.73	.07	.07
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.10	0	0	.10	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.43	0	.07	.49	0	.12
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	.20	.20	.20	2.00	2.00	2.00
James Madison (VA)	21	.30	.13	.10	.49	.20	.28
Marshall (WV)	14	.12	0	0	.55	.05	.17
Middle Tenn. State	14	.38	.07	.10	.75	.30	.47
Missouri State	17	.33	.20	.18	.54	.33	.41
Morehead State (KY)	6	.25	.10	.16	.39	.10	.16
Murray State (KY)	13	.49	.40	.34	.82	.80	.81
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.01	0	0	.01	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	0	0	0	.16	0	.13
Northeastern Illinois	6	.33	0	.10	.87	.80	.83
Northern Kentucky	11	.06	0	0	.06	0	0
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	0	0	0	.13	0	.07
Plymouth State (NH)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	.11	0	.02	.11	0	.02
Rhode Island College	13	.07	0	.02	.10	0	.04
Southeast Missouri State	10	.10	0	0	.18	0	.08
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	.72	.33	.29	1.07	.93	.86
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.01	0	0	.05	0	0
Tennessee Tech	10	.14	0	.05	.34	.17	.19
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.30	.10	.17	.50	.17	.25
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	0	0	0	.93	0	.70
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	.59	.57	.60	.84	.62	.76
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.23	.05	.03	.33	.25	.13
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	.91	.07	.19	.94	.20	.24
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.32	.17	.17	.42	.37	.37
Western Illinois	11	.32	.20	.21	.53	.40	.44
Western Kentucky	18	.60	.40	.40	.94	.87	.87
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.25	.13	.12	.34	.13	.15
Totals	366	.26	0	.06	.46	.13	.18

Table 2.3: time frame = 2002-2006

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.3: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative pages by university, for the years 2002-2006. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Pages			Collaborative Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	2.80	0	0	2.44	0	.64
Arkansas State	6	6.67	2.6	4.27	1.27	0	0
Central Connecticut State	8	.60	0	0	11.70	7.2	6.27
Central Missouri State	8	.95	0	0	6.05	0	0
Chicago State	10	0	0	0	.52	0	0
Eastern Illinois	12	.63	0	0	5.37	0	0
Eastern Kentucky	14	2.80	0	0	2.77	0	0
Eastern Washington	4	16.00	0	0	.60	0	0
Frostburg State (MD)	4	0	0	0	9.80	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	1.03	0	0	16.91	0	0
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	13.60	13.6	13.60	3.40	3.4	3.40
James Madison (VA)	21	2.02	0	.18	13.39	2.8	4.36
Marshall (WV)	14	4.86	0	.77	3.89	0	0
Middle Tenn. State	14	5.17	0	.43	14.94	2.0	3.11
Missouri State	17	1.91	0	.31	13.32	7.6	7.02
Morehead State (KY)	6	2.60	0	0	7.40	1.6	3.40
Murray State (KY)	13	5.60	0	2.51	18.12	10.8	15.31
Norfolk State (VA)	12	0	0	0	.30	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	4.48	0	3.07	0	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	9.47	1.8	5.27	12.40	0	3.00
Northern Kentucky	11	0	0	0	2.22	0	0
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	1.27	0	.53	0	0	0
Plymouth State (NH)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	0	0	0	4.33	0	.47
Rhode Island College	13	.43	0	0	1.97	0	.40
Southeast Missouri State	10	.40	0	0	1.56	0	0
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	3.70	.8	.53	24.95	10.6	10.27
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.58	0	0	.62	0	0
Tennessee Tech	10	2.40	0	.32	4.84	0	1.36
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	3.48	0	.36	9.60	2.4	3.20
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	7.20	0	5.40	0	0	0
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	4.80	0	2.00	24.65	21.6	20.83
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	1.57	0	0	6.97	1.6	.80
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	.17	0	0	31.29	2.8	6.49
Western Carolina (NC)	4	1.90	0	0	8.10	5.0	5.00
Western Illinois	11	2.76	0	1.33	12.76	1.2	7.83
Western Kentucky	18	5.53	0	1.58	19.93	11.6	11.53
Youngstown State (OH)	14	1.31	0	0	8.17	4.4	3.83
Totals	366	2.66	0	0	9.45	0	1.91

Table 2.4: time frame = 2002-2006

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.4: Biennial averages of attributable collaborative and attributable pages by university, for 2002-2006. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Pages			Attributable Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.93	0	.16	3.73	0	1.09
Arkansas State	6	.63	0	0	7.30	2.60	4.27
Central Connecticut State	8	5.15	3.07	2.67	5.75	4.83	3.95
Central Missouri State	8	2.64	0	0	3.59	0	0
Chicago State	10	.17	0	0	.17	0	0
Eastern Illinois	12	2.35	0	0	2.98	0	0
Eastern Kentucky	14	1.15	0	0	3.95	0	.46
Eastern Washington	4	.20	0	0	16.20	.40	.40
Frostburg State (MD)	4	4.90	0	0	4.90	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	7.21	0	1.81	8.24	0	2.71
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	1.70	1.70	1.70	15.30	15.30	15.30
James Madison (VA)	21	4.60	.93	1.36	6.62	2.98	3.45
Marshall (WV)	14	1.64	0	0	6.49	1.20	1.59
Middle Tenn. State	14	6.17	1.00	1.40	11.34	4.20	6.58
Missouri State	17	5.24	2.67	2.55	7.15	4.70	5.56
Morehead State (KY)	6	2.37	.80	1.56	4.97	.80	1.62
Murray State (KY)	13	7.23	5.20	5.20	12.83	10.97	11.37
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.10	0	0	.10	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	0	0	0	4.48	0	3.07
Northeastern Illinois	6	6.20	0	1.50	15.67	14.40	14.90
Northern Kentucky	11	.87	0	0	.87	0	0
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	0	0	0	1.27	0	.53
Plymouth State (NH)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	1.44	0	.16	1.44	0	.16
Rhode Island College	13	.91	0	.13	1.34	0	.27
Southeast Missouri State	10	.78	0	0	1.18	0	.32
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	11.30	4.60	4.36	15.00	12.77	11.13
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.21	0	0	.79	0	0
Tennessee Tech	10	2.11	0	.57	4.51	1.94	1.85
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	4.62	1.20	1.53	8.10	1.34	2.79
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	0	0	0	7.20	0	5.40
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	9.91	6.60	7.60	14.71	9.73	11.11
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	3.11	.40	.20	4.68	2.60	1.30
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	12.67	.94	2.54	12.84	2.14	2.89
Western Carolina (NC)	4	3.22	1.97	1.97	5.12	5.37	5.37
Western Illinois	11	6.31	.60	3.78	9.07	4.40	7.65
Western Kentucky	18	8.44	4.87	4.71	13.98	9.97	12.02
Youngstown State (OH)	14	3.44	1.67	1.45	4.75	1.67	1.76
Totals	366	3.94	0	.76	6.59	.93	2.05

Table 2.5: time frame = best five years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.5: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative papers by university, for the best five years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Papers			Collaborative Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.84	.6	.64	.60	.4	.48
Arkansas State	6	.73	.4	.53	.27	.4	.33
Central Connecticut State	8	.50	.4	.27	1.30	1.2	1.07
Central Missouri State	8	.60	.4	.27	1.80	.8	.67
Chicago State	10	.24	0	0	.20	0	.04
Eastern Illinois	12	1.03	1.0	.70	1.03	.8	.60
Eastern Kentucky	14	.49	.4	.40	.43	0	.14
Eastern Washington	4	1.50	1.0	1.00	.50	.4	.40
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.30	.2	.20	.20	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.80	.8	.70	2.11	1.6	1.80
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	2.20	2.2	2.20	.80	.8	.80
James Madison (VA)	21	.82	.4	.58	1.28	.8	.91
Marshall (WV)	14	.66	.4	.43	.54	.2	.20
Middle Tenn. State	14	.94	.4	.66	1.63	1.0	1.11
Missouri State	17	1.65	1.2	1.33	2.80	2.4	2.36
Morehead State (KY)	6	.60	.2	.27	1.33	.2	.40
Murray State (KY)	13	1.20	.8	1.03	1.45	1.2	1.26
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.27	0	0	.33	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	.16	0	.13	.32	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	.87	.8	.80	1.13	.4	.73
Northern Kentucky	11	.62	.4	.50	.44	0	.30
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.53	.4	.40	.40	.4	.40
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.40	.4	.40	.40	.4	.40
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	.33	.2	.20	.80	.8	.80
Rhode Island College	13	.18	0	.17	.40	.4	.29
Southeast Missouri State	10	.52	.4	.40	.40	.2	.24
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	1.95	.8	.67	2.70	2.8	2.13
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.22	0	.03	.40	0	.13
Tennessee Tech	10	.88	.8	.88	.64	.4	.52
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.68	.4	.32	1.44	.4	.56
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	1.47	1.6	1.50	1.60	0	1.20
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	1.05	.4	.67	2.44	2.0	2.10
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.87	.6	.50	1.70	1.4	.90
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	.74	.4	.54	3.23	1.6	1.57
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.60	.6	.60	1.10	.6	.60
Western Illinois	11	1.05	.8	.97	1.45	1.6	1.43
Western Kentucky	18	1.56	1.0	1.07	2.18	1.8	1.98
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.83	.4	.51	1.14	1.2	.97
Totals	366	.82	.4	.55	1.25	.4	.73

Table 2.6: time frame = best five years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.6: Biennial averages of attributable collaborative and attributable papers by university, for the best five years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Papers			Attributable Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.24	.17	.19	.94	.77	.77
Arkansas State	6	.13	.20	.17	.83	.60	.70
Central Connecticut State	8	.61	.60	.51	.91	.77	.69
Central Missouri State	8	.79	.37	.31	1.11	.80	.60
Chicago State	10	.09	0	.01	.29	0	.04
Eastern Illinois	12	.47	.30	.25	1.23	1.00	.80
Eastern Kentucky	14	.19	0	.05	.61	.40	.49
Eastern Washington	4	.23	.17	.17	1.58	1.00	1.00
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.10	0	0	.40	.40	.40
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.93	.68	.80	1.59	1.20	1.35
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	.40	.40	.40	2.60	2.60	2.60
James Madison (VA)	21	.53	.40	.40	1.20	1.07	1.00
Marshall (WV)	14	.26	.05	.09	.88	.50	.65
Middle Tenn. State	14	.75	.50	.53	1.41	1.25	1.42
Missouri State	17	1.19	1.00	0.97	2.43	2.00	2.18
Morehead State (KY)	6	.46	.10	.19	.94	.30	.46
Murray State (KY)	13	.63	.47	.53	1.69	1.47	1.49
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.13	0	0	.40	.30	.15
North Carolina Central	5	.16	0	0	.32	.40	.27
Northeastern Illinois	6	.47	.17	.30	1.00	1.10	1.03
Northern Kentucky	11	.21	0	.13	.76	.60	.66
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.18	.17	.17	.69	.67	.61
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.20	.20	.20	.40	.40	.40
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	.37	.37	.36	.61	.50	.52
Rhode Island College	13	.17	.13	.11	.35	.40	.30
Southeast Missouri State	10	.19	.10	.11	.66	.50	.56
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	1.22	1.18	.90	2.54	1.37	1.24
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.18	0	.06	.40	.20	.18
Tennessee Tech	10	.28	.20	.23	1.02	.90	.97
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.68	.20	.28	1.26	.60	.68
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	.69	0	.52	2.02	2.80	2.22
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	1.02	.93	.95	1.92	1.40	1.70
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.76	.59	.39	1.52	1.04	.94
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	1.33	.64	.63	1.74	.89	.98
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.48	.30	.30	1.00	1.00	1.00
Western Illinois	11	.70	.73	.68	1.45	1.20	1.35
Western Kentucky	18	.98	.85	.88	2.14	1.87	1.84
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.53	.44	.42	1.17	.60	.78
Totals	366	.55	.20	.32	1.20	.80	.89

Table 2.7: time frame = best five years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.7: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative pages by university, for the best five years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Pages			Collaborative Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	10.00	10.4	9.28	10.48	10.8	10.96
Arkansas State	6	14.07	10.6	11.27	6.67	6.2	5.40
Central Connecticut State	8	4.85	3.2	2.13	17.55	15.2	13.07
Central Missouri State	8	4.75	2.0	1.33	14.35	7.6	5.87
Chicago State	10	2.48	0	0	3.68	0	.52
Eastern Illinois	12	10.07	8.8	7.80	14.73	8.6	7.60
Eastern Kentucky	14	5.54	4.6	4.17	5.49	0	1.37
Eastern Washington	4	25.30	17.4	17.40	6.40	5.0	5.00
Frostburg State (MD)	4	4.50	2.4	2.40	9.80	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	11.31	8.8	9.30	32.17	26.8	26.55
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	16.60	16.6	16.60	6.60	6.6	6.60
James Madison (VA)	21	9.01	6.4	6.11	17.54	8.0	9.93
Marshall (WV)	14	7.17	2.0	3.17	9.54	1.2	3.97
Middle Tenn. State	14	10.20	5.4	7.03	22.60	13.4	15.06
Missouri State	17	18.64	13.6	14.67	38.52	32.8	29.20
Morehead State (KY)	6	6.07	.8	3.13	15.47	1.6	3.40
Murray State (KY)	13	13.85	13.2	13.89	23.97	20.4	22.46
Norfolk State (VA)	12	2.57	0	0	3.80	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	4.48	0	3.07	5.12	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	14.13	15.0	14.33	22.40	6.0	13.40
Northern Kentucky	11	7.24	6.4	6.43	5.56	0	3.30
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	6.80	3.8	4.53	7.87	7.0	6.40
Plymouth State (NH)	1	5.60	5.6	5.60	2.00	2.0	2.00
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	3.07	.8	1.33	11.80	11.0	11.20
Rhode Island College	13	2.80	0	2.06	4.86	2.8	2.23
Southeast Missouri State	10	6.08	4.2	4.68	4.16	2.8	3.20
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	24.15	7.8	6.80	38.60	36.6	27.73
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	1.82	0	.27	4.65	0	1.97
Tennessee Tech	10	12.40	9.2	10.24	8.92	7.8	7.44
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	8.08	1.6	3.88	23.72	5.0	5.76
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	10.80	10.8	10.80	16.53	0	12.40
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	11.96	8.8	9.67	35.49	29.2	27.20
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	11.83	6.4	5.20	20.83	14.8	10.00
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	8.14	3.6	4.86	45.34	19.8	22.60
Western Carolina (NC)	4	8.70	8.4	8.40	9.90	7.0	7.00
Western Illinois	11	14.11	12.4	12.50	26.55	33.2	27.90
Western Kentucky	18	15.27	11.6	12.60	29.29	21.4	23.09
Youngstown State (OH)	14	12.57	5.0	4.17	12.91	9.8	10.74
Totals	366	9.67	6.0	6.09	17.52	8.4	9.23

Table 2.8: time frame = best five years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.8: Biennial averages of attributable collaborative and attributable pages by university, for the best five years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Pages			Attributable Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	4.11	3.93	4.14	13.55	12.40	12.59
Arkansas State	6	3.33	3.10	2.70	15.73	13.70	13.97
Central Connecticut State	8	8.13	7.20	6.11	11.26	10.40	8.84
Central Missouri State	8	6.04	3.07	2.44	9.26	6.40	4.98
Chicago State	10	1.23	0	.17	3.71	0	.92
Eastern Illinois	12	6.42	4.30	3.63	12.72	10.50	9.35
Eastern Kentucky	14	2.35	0	.53	7.24	6.20	6.30
Eastern Washington	4	2.83	1.75	1.75	26.13	17.90	17.90
Frostburg State (MD)	4	4.90	0	0	9.40	9.00	9.00
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	14.40	10.37	11.98	22.91	18.37	19.86
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	3.30	3.30	3.30	19.60	19.60	19.60
James Madison (VA)	21	7.17	3.40	4.35	14.32	10.53	11.17
Marshall (WV)	14	4.46	.60	1.63	11.09	4.65	7.33
Middle Tenn. State	14	9.86	5.75	6.90	17.33	16.09	15.70
Missouri State	17	15.15	14.13	11.88	29.26	23.20	26.38
Morehead State (KY)	6	4.87	.80	1.56	8.70	1.60	4.69
Murray State (KY)	13	9.94	9.07	8.73	21.07	22.20	20.74
Norfolk State (VA)	12	1.56	0	0	3.66	1.70	.85
North Carolina Central	5	2.56	0	0	7.04	9.20	7.33
Northeastern Illinois	6	9.25	2.14	5.26	16.73	17.60	17.03
Northern Kentucky	11	2.44	0	1.34	8.58	7.60	7.97
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	3.45	2.64	2.42	9.85	10.30	9.44
Plymouth State (NH)	1	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.60	5.60	5.60
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	5.14	5.15	4.72	7.42	8.35	7.70
Rhode Island College	13	2.12	.93	.92	4.51	2.40	3.79
Southeast Missouri State	10	1.93	1.40	1.45	7.58	5.60	6.00
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	17.83	15.67	11.73	30.54	17.97	15.04
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	2.04	0	.87	3.67	3.00	2.76
Tennessee Tech	10	3.84	3.20	3.07	14.86	10.70	10.97
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	11.35	2.50	2.88	18.31	4.40	7.28
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	6.82	0	5.12	16.31	21.60	17.63
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	14.72	12.35	11.68	24.22	26.20	23.71
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	8.95	6.80	4.38	19.25	12.90	10.23
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	18.79	9.05	8.79	23.44	12.35	11.55
Western Carolina (NC)	4	4.05	2.97	2.97	11.78	14.37	14.37
Western Illinois	11	12.92	14.40	13.45	22.99	18.60	20.20
Western Kentucky	18	13.06	10.09	10.47	23.83	24.05	23.41
Youngstown State (OH)	14	5.61	3.77	4.27	16.68	6.10	7.21
Totals	366	7.53	3.57	3.94	15.08	10.40	10.97

Table 2.9: time frame = best up-to-ten years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.9: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative papers by university, for the best up-to-ten years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Papers			Collaborative Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.59	.33	.38	.35	.23	.25
Arkansas State	6	.54	.22	.31	.15	.20	.17
Central Connecticut State	8	.32	.20	.13	.96	.78	.65
Central Missouri State	8	.33	.20	.13	1.23	.40	.33
Chicago State	10	.14	0	0	.14	0	.02
Eastern Illinois	12	.65	.50	.40	.67	.40	.30
Eastern Kentucky	14	.33	.20	.20	.30	0	.07
Eastern Washington	4	1.10	.50	.50	.30	.30	.30
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.20	.10	.10	.20	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.57	.40	.43	1.51	1.00	1.15
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	1.70	1.70	1.70	.50	.50	.50
James Madison (VA)	21	.55	.40	.38	.90	.40	.60
Marshall (WV)	14	.48	.20	.23	.35	.10	.13
Middle Tenn. State	14	.56	.20	.39	1.16	.60	.76
Missouri State	17	1.00	.80	.80	2.05	1.80	1.73
Morehead State (KY)	6	.43	.15	.21	1.02	.20	.36
Murray State (KY)	13	.85	.75	.78	1.08	.80	.93
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.15	0	0	.25	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	.08	0	.07	.16	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	.52	.40	.45	.66	.20	.39
Northern Kentucky	11	.33	.20	.25	.29	0	.18
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.37	.30	.33	.23	.20	.20
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.20	.20	.20	.20	.20	.20
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	.20	.10	.10	.57	.60	.53
Rhode Island College	13	.12	0	.09	.26	.20	.14
Southeast Missouri State	10	.31	.30	.29	.31	.10	.12
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	1.58	.42	.41	1.85	1.68	1.39
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.13	0	.02	.27	0	.07
Tennessee Tech	10	.57	.50	.52	.49	.40	.41
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.47	.20	.22	.96	.25	.34
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	1.24	1.40	1.28	1.27	0	.95
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	.69	.40	.49	1.76	1.50	1.48
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.55	.49	.35	1.11	.93	.62
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	.47	.20	.31	2.78	.90	1.12
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.30	.30	.30	.85	.40	.40
Western Illinois	11	.69	.60	.60	1.03	1.20	1.00
Western Kentucky	18	1.13	.80	.75	1.69	1.40	1.52
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.54	.20	.26	.89	.70	.72
Totals	366	.55	.31	.33	.91	.40	.47

Table 2.10: time frame = best up-to-ten years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.10: Biennial averages of attrib. collaborative and attributable papers by university, for the best up-to-ten years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Papers			Attributable Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.14	.09	.10	.69	.42	.46
Arkansas State	6	.07	.10	.08	.60	.33	.41
Central Connecticut State	8	.44	.39	.32	.64	.52	.49
Central Missouri State	8	.54	.19	.16	.80	.49	.36
Chicago State	10	.06	0	.01	.18	0	.02
Eastern Illinois	12	.30	.15	.13	.84	.55	.46
Eastern Kentucky	14	.13	0	.03	.44	.20	.27
Eastern Washington	4	.13	.11	.11	1.23	.65	.65
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.10	0	0	.30	.30	.30
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	.68	.42	.52	1.13	.70	.93
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	.25	.25	.25	1.95	1.95	1.95
James Madison (VA)	21	.37	.20	.26	.89	.70	.69
Marshall (WV)	14	.17	.05	.06	.65	.30	.40
Middle Tenn. State	14	.52	.30	.35	1.03	1.01	1.00
Missouri State	17	.87	.62	.71	1.76	1.23	1.50
Morehead State (KY)	6	.36	.10	.17	.71	.25	.38
Murray State (KY)	13	.46	.40	.39	1.30	1.30	1.28
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.10	0	0	.25	.15	.08
North Carolina Central	5	.08	0	0	.16	.20	.13
Northeastern Illinois	6	.28	.09	.18	.76	.70	.68
Northern Kentucky	11	.14	0	.09	.45	.40	.37
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.11	.09	.08	.47	.54	.50
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.10	.10	.10	.30	.30	.30
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	.24	.29	.25	.40	.39	.35
Rhode Island College	13	.11	.07	.06	.24	.20	.19
Southeast Missouri State	10	.15	.05	.06	.43	.45	.40
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	.83	.76	.62	2.03	.91	.85
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.12	0	.03	.25	.10	.09
Tennessee Tech	10	.21	.19	.17	.73	.59	.64
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	.45	.12	.16	.88	.30	.48
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	.54	0	.41	1.65	2.33	1.82
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	.72	.65	.63	1.38	1.17	1.30
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	.49	.42	.28	1.01	.80	.71
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	1.13	.40	.46	1.39	.69	.69
Western Carolina (NC)	4	.35	.17	.17	.64	.57	.57
Western Illinois	11	.50	.53	.46	1.09	.93	.98
Western Kentucky	18	.75	.63	.68	1.70	1.30	1.36
Youngstown State (OH)	14	.39	.34	.30	.88	.40	.53
Totals	366	.39	.17	.21	.88	.54	.60

Table 2.11: time frame = best up-to-ten years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.11: Biennial averages of single-authored and collaborative pages by university, for the best up-to-ten years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Pages			Collaborative Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	6.21	5.20	5.36	5.99	6.03	5.85
Arkansas State	6	8.86	5.89	6.55	3.56	3.30	2.99
Central Connecticut State	8	3.19	2.50	1.67	12.39	10.00	8.13
Central Missouri State	8	2.78	1.00	.67	10.25	3.80	2.93
Chicago State	10	1.50	0	0	2.32	0	.26
Eastern Illinois	12	6.13	5.00	4.20	10.22	4.30	3.80
Eastern Kentucky	14	4.00	2.30	2.09	3.31	0	.86
Eastern Washington	4	21.00	9.10	9.10	3.50	3.10	3.10
Frostburg State (MD)	4	2.95	1.20	1.20	9.80	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	7.49	5.20	5.85	24.29	15.40	17.23
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	12.30	12.30	12.30	4.10	4.10	4.10
James Madison (VA)	21	5.97	3.80	3.98	12.77	4.00	6.96
Marshall (WV)	14	5.64	1.00	1.82	6.00	1.00	2.19
Middle Tenn. State	14	5.84	2.70	3.77	15.81	9.50	9.61
Missouri State	17	10.99	8.20	8.62	27.46	21.20	21.56
Morehead State (KY)	6	4.32	.57	2.35	11.18	1.60	3.01
Murray State (KY)	13	10.10	10.00	10.59	17.14	10.20	12.70
Norfolk State (VA)	12	1.52	0	0	2.50	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	2.24	0	1.53	2.56	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	7.77	7.50	7.41	13.12	3.00	7.22
Northern Kentucky	11	3.69	3.20	3.28	3.55	0	2.08
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	4.33	2.70	3.40	4.23	3.50	3.20
Plymouth State (NH)	1	2.80	2.80	2.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	1.63	.40	.67	8.13	7.80	7.40
Rhode Island College	13	1.71	0	1.11	3.66	1.40	1.11
Southeast Missouri State	10	3.33	2.30	2.76	3.18	1.40	1.70
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	18.24	4.56	4.10	26.98	22.94	18.62
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.96	0	.18	2.75	0	.98
Tennessee Tech	10	8.45	5.70	5.80	7.25	5.40	5.32
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	5.63	.80	2.32	15.63	3.02	3.29
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	9.47	10.40	9.70	12.27	0	9.20
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	7.76	4.40	6.55	25.40	22.25	19.00
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	7.43	5.07	3.68	13.64	9.12	6.41
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	5.02	2.10	2.73	38.06	11.77	16.71
Western Carolina (NC)	4	4.35	4.20	4.20	7.60	4.70	4.70
Western Illinois	11	8.76	7.80	7.51	19.10	23.20	19.06
Western Kentucky	18	11.08	8.20	8.43	22.17	15.64	16.65
Youngstown State (OH)	14	9.51	2.50	2.27	9.15	6.00	8.39
Totals	366	6.39	3.20	3.56	12.53	4.78	5.83

Table 2.12: time frame = best up-to-ten years

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.12: Biennial averages of attrib. collaborative and attributable pages by university, for the best up-to-ten years. Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Pages			Attributable Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	2.41	2.18	2.15	8.58	8.01	7.41
Arkansas State	6	1.78	1.65	1.50	9.80	7.54	8.05
Central Connecticut State	8	5.65	4.57	3.70	7.85	6.87	6.12
Central Missouri State	8	4.45	1.54	1.22	6.70	3.60	2.76
Chicago State	10	.85	0	.09	2.11	0	.46
Eastern Illinois	12	4.35	2.15	1.82	8.92	7.10	5.60
Eastern Kentucky	14	1.40	0	.33	5.31	3.10	3.25
Eastern Washington	4	1.51	1.08	1.08	22.51	11.05	11.05
Frostburg State (MD)	4	4.90	0	0	7.85	5.90	5.90
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	10.84	6.18	7.74	16.66	9.20	13.23
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	2.05	2.05	2.05	14.35	14.35	14.35
James Madison (VA)	21	5.09	2.00	2.88	10.55	6.87	7.44
Marshall (WV)	14	2.69	.50	1.05	8.31	3.82	4.66
Middle Tenn. State	14	6.87	4.01	4.39	11.98	9.35	10.11
Missouri State	17	10.86	9.08	8.46	20.22	14.77	17.79
Morehead State (KY)	6	3.61	.80	1.39	6.75	1.37	3.93
Murray State (KY)	13	6.88	4.60	5.53	16.65	17.00	16.64
Norfolk State (VA)	12	1.00	0	0	2.51	.85	.43
North Carolina Central	5	1.28	0	0	3.52	4.60	3.67
Northeastern Illinois	6	5.45	1.07	3.19	12.23	11.07	10.90
Northern Kentucky	11	1.60	0	.98	5.09	4.40	4.62
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	1.87	1.32	1.21	6.21	7.00	6.55
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.50	.50	.50	3.30	3.30	3.30
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	3.55	3.53	3.45	4.34	5.13	4.52
Rhode Island College	13	1.52	.47	.46	3.23	1.20	2.46
Southeast Missouri State	10	1.49	.70	.79	4.54	3.45	3.94
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	12.31	10.63	8.38	24.47	12.18	10.74
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	1.18	0	.44	2.14	1.50	1.38
Tennessee Tech	10	3.05	2.24	2.15	10.85	6.83	7.10
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	7.35	1.51	1.61	12.66	2.20	5.14
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	5.23	0	3.93	13.16	18.00	14.37
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	10.65	8.08	7.91	17.75	16.50	16.28
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	5.94	4.25	2.89	13.17	9.40	7.70
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	15.56	4.86	6.67	18.20	8.33	8.12
Western Carolina (NC)	4	3.03	1.89	1.89	7.03	8.52	8.52
Western Illinois	11	9.22	9.93	8.98	16.80	14.70	15.40
Western Kentucky	18	9.83	7.09	7.63	18.59	17.95	17.81
Youngstown State (OH)	14	3.88	2.65	3.22	12.44	3.74	4.84
Totals	366	5.35	2.00	2.49	10.90	6.60	7.26

Table 2.13: time frame = career

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.13: Career totals for single-authored and collaborative papers by university.
Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Papers			Collaborative Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	3.50	1.5	1.60	2.00	1.0	1.20
Arkansas State	6	2.67	1.0	1.33	.67	1.0	.83
Central Connecticut State	8	1.38	1.0	.67	5.13	4.0	3.67
Central Missouri State	8	1.75	1.0	.67	7.88	2.0	1.67
Chicago State	10	.70	0	0	.70	0	.10
Eastern Illinois	12	3.75	3.0	2.25	4.83	2.0	1.75
Eastern Kentucky	14	1.29	1.0	1.00	1.64	0	.36
Eastern Washington	4	7.25	3.0	3.00	1.50	1.5	1.50
Frostburg State (MD)	4	1.00	.5	.50	.50	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	3.43	2.0	2.38	10.00	7.0	7.50
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	13.50	13.5	13.50	3.00	3.0	3.00
James Madison (VA)	21	3.38	2.0	1.91	5.57	3.0	4.09
Marshall (WV)	14	1.93	1.0	1.21	1.71	.5	.50
Middle Tenn. State	14	3.21	1.0	2.14	7.64	3.5	4.71
Missouri State	17	6.18	4.0	4.22	13.41	12.0	11.22
Morehead State (KY)	6	2.00	.5	.67	7.83	.5	1.00
Murray State (KY)	13	4.46	3.0	2.86	4.62	4.0	4.29
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.75	0	0	2.08	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	.40	0	.33	.80	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	2.50	2.0	2.17	3.67	1.0	1.83
Northern Kentucky	11	1.82	2.0	1.58	1.64	0	.92
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	2.33	2.0	2.17	1.17	1.0	1.00
Plymouth State (NH)	1	1.00	1.0	1.00	1.00	1.0	1.00
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	1.17	.5	.67	4.50	3.5	3.17
Rhode Island College	13	.54	0	.43	1.15	1.0	.71
Southeast Missouri State	10	1.70	1.5	1.40	1.40	.5	.60
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	9.75	2.5	2.00	11.13	8.5	6.33
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.91	0	.08	1.45	0	.33
Tennessee Tech	10	2.90	3.0	2.70	2.60	2.0	1.90
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	2.40	1.0	1.10	4.80	1.0	1.70
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	5.67	7.0	6.00	13.33	0	10.00
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	3.91	2.0	2.58	10.55	6.0	8.58
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	2.92	2.5	1.75	6.08	3.5	2.50
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	2.93	1.0	1.50	19.43	4.5	4.79
Western Carolina (NC)	4	1.75	2.0	2.00	7.25	2.5	2.50
Western Illinois	11	4.00	3.0	3.00	6.00	6.0	5.33
Western Kentucky	18	7.61	3.5	3.50	10.67	8.0	8.28
Youngstown State (OH)	14	4.21	1.0	1.50	6.21	4.5	4.21
Totals	366	3.18	1.5	1.62	5.66	2.0	2.39

Table 2.14: time frame = career

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.14: Career totals for attributable collaborative and attributable papers by university.
Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Papers			Attributable Papers		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	.82	.42	.48	4.32	1.92	2.02
Arkansas State	6	.33	.50	.42	3.00	1.50	1.75
Central Connecticut State	8	2.37	1.84	1.67	3.75	2.58	2.44
Central Missouri State	8	3.55	.92	.78	5.30	2.42	1.78
Chicago State	10	.28	0	.03	.98	0	.10
Eastern Illinois	12	2.17	.79	.71	5.92	3.75	2.96
Eastern Kentucky	14	.70	0	.13	1.99	1.00	1.33
Eastern Washington	4	.65	.54	.54	7.90	3.75	3.75
Frostburg State (MD)	4	.25	0	0	1.25	1.00	1.00
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	4.48	3.50	3.40	7.91	3.50	6.12
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	1.50	1.50	1.50	15.00	15.00	15.00
James Madison (VA)	21	2.23	1.45	1.59	5.62	4.50	4.27
Marshall (WV)	14	.84	.13	.21	2.77	1.50	2.05
Middle Tenn. State	14	3.37	1.75	2.13	6.58	6.29	6.56
Missouri State	17	5.67	3.75	4.52	11.84	9.33	9.77
Morehead State (KY)	6	2.72	.25	.47	4.72	.75	1.14
Murray State (KY)	13	1.99	1.67	1.80	6.46	4.92	5.01
Norfolk State (VA)	12	.74	0	0	1.49	.75	.38
North Carolina Central	5	.40	0	0	.80	1.00	.67
Northeastern Illinois	6	1.56	.42	.86	4.06	3.92	3.95
Northern Kentucky	11	.76	0	.43	2.58	2.00	2.15
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	.53	.42	.42	2.86	3.17	3.00
Plymouth State (NH)	1	.50	.50	.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	1.99	1.58	1.43	3.15	2.08	2.10
Rhode Island College	13	.49	.33	.28	1.03	1.00	.80
Southeast Missouri State	10	.65	.25	.28	2.35	2.25	2.07
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	5.09	3.88	2.86	14.84	4.67	4.22
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	.62	0	.15	1.53	.50	.49
Tennessee Tech	10	1.13	.92	.80	4.03	3.25	3.37
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	2.18	.50	.79	4.58	1.63	2.53
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	5.83	0	4.38	11.50	7.00	10.38
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	4.32	2.58	3.52	8.23	6.50	6.61
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	2.68	1.46	1.11	5.60	4.00	3.67
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	7.92	1.75	1.93	10.84	2.63	3.21
Western Carolina (NC)	4	3.13	1.09	1.09	4.88	2.84	2.84
Western Illinois	11	2.86	2.67	2.46	6.86	5.33	5.32
Western Kentucky	18	4.80	3.42	3.79	12.41	7.00	7.74
Youngstown State (OH)	14	2.70	1.71	1.75	6.91	2.67	3.20
Totals	366	2.44	.83	1.05	5.62	3.00	3.14

Table 2.15: time frame = career

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.15: Career totals for single-authored and collaborative pages by university.
Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Single-authored Pages			Collaborative Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	36.10	26.0	23.20	34.20	27.0	28.00
Arkansas State	6	42.50	26.5	28.17	16.67	15.5	13.50
Central Connecticut State	8	13.38	8.0	5.33	64.63	56.0	46.67
Central Missouri State	8	14.13	5.0	3.33	63.63	19.0	14.67
Chicago State	10	7.50	0	0	11.60	0	1.30
Eastern Illinois	12	34.33	25.5	23.00	74.25	25.5	21.00
Eastern Kentucky	14	14.36	13.0	11.36	16.86	0	3.43
Eastern Washington	4	125.75	48.0	48.00	17.50	15.5	15.50
Frostburg State (MD)	4	14.75	6.0	6.00	24.50	0	0
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	44.00	26.0	32.75	163.86	78.0	110.25
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	90.50	90.5	90.50	23.50	23.5	23.50
James Madison (VA)	21	34.33	19.0	19.64	76.43	32.0	43.45
Marshall (WV)	14	20.93	6.0	9.00	27.07	3.0	9.93
Middle Tenn. State	14	34.14	13.5	20.50	99.86	51.0	57.43
Missouri State	17	65.76	41.0	47.89	178.76	117.0	140.67
Morehead State (KY)	6	18.50	2.0	7.83	83.00	4.0	8.50
Murray State (KY)	13	48.46	33.0	40.86	71.85	52.0	62.00
Norfolk State (VA)	12	7.58	0	0	20.75	0	0
North Carolina Central	5	11.20	0	7.67	12.80	0	0
Northeastern Illinois	6	37.67	37.5	35.83	70.50	15.0	33.50
Northern Kentucky	11	21.09	29.0	20.92	18.73	0	10.42
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	25.00	15.0	19.33	21.17	17.5	16.00
Plymouth State (NH)	1	14.00	14.0	14.00	5.00	5.0	5.00
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	9.00	2.0	4.17	56.17	42.0	40.17
Rhode Island College	13	7.46	0	5.14	15.23	7.0	5.57
Southeast Missouri State	10	17.30	11.5	12.90	14.40	7.0	8.50
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	109.38	21.5	18.33	161.63	114.0	84.33
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	7.00	0	.92	15.27	0	4.92
Tennessee Tech	10	39.80	28.5	29.40	37.00	27.0	26.80
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	25.30	4.0	13.00	72.70	12.5	15.80
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	46.00	54.0	48.00	123.00	0	92.25
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	42.18	27.0	32.00	152.82	88.0	99.00
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	38.17	31.0	21.00	71.17	45.5	32.00
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	29.79	9.0	13.43	246.36	56.5	66.93
Western Carolina (NC)	4	22.75	23.0	23.00	64.50	23.5	23.50
Western Illinois	11	51.64	39.0	38.08	108.64	116.0	95.67
Western Kentucky	18	73.06	42.0	40.17	135.61	88.0	93.22
Youngstown State (OH)	14	75.43	12.5	12.57	60.71	42.5	45.86
Totals	366	35.87	16.5	17.95	74.68	25.5	29.69

Table 2.16: time frame = career

(See §4 for clarifying comments on the results presented here.)

Table 2.16: Career totals for attributable collaborative and attributable pages by university.
Reported for each metric are the mean, median, and mean of the middle 50% for the eligible faculty at each school.

University	Faculty	Attributable Collaborative Pages			Attributable Pages		
Appalachian State (NC)	10	13.87	9.83	10.63	49.97	31.00	32.27
Arkansas State	6	8.33	7.75	6.75	50.83	34.25	34.92
Central Connecticut State	8	29.92	25.84	21.45	43.29	36.25	29.72
Central Missouri State	8	28.32	7.67	6.11	42.45	18.00	13.78
Chicago State	10	4.27	0	.43	11.77	0	2.30
Eastern Illinois	12	31.90	11.75	9.58	66.24	44.50	38.25
Eastern Kentucky	14	7.13	0	1.32	21.49	15.50	17.68
Eastern Washington	4	7.56	5.38	5.38	133.31	57.75	57.75
Frostburg State (MD)	4	12.25	0	0	27.00	29.50	29.50
Indiana Univ. - South Bend	7	73.81	39.00	49.56	117.81	46.00	86.95
Indiana Univ. - Southeast	2	11.75	11.75	11.75	102.25	102.25	102.25
James Madison (VA)	21	30.38	10.75	17.54	64.71	50.50	46.78
Marshall (WV)	14	12.77	1.50	4.07	33.70	11.63	21.68
Middle Tenn. State	14	43.58	21.79	26.04	77.73	50.79	68.69
Missouri State	17	72.08	52.00	54.40	137.84	122.50	117.97
Morehead State (KY)	6	27.03	2.00	3.89	45.33	4.00	11.72
Murray State (KY)	13	29.26	23.00	25.92	77.73	75.53	74.27
Norfolk State (VA)	12	7.36	0	0	14.94	4.25	2.13
North Carolina Central	5	6.40	0	0	17.60	23.00	18.33
Northeastern Illinois	6	29.67	5.34	15.31	67.34	55.34	59.47
Northern Kentucky	11	8.50	0	4.90	29.59	31.00	27.00
Pittsburg State (KS)	6	9.36	6.59	6.06	34.36	36.50	35.11
Plymouth State (NH)	1	2.50	2.50	2.50	16.50	16.50	16.50
Radford Univ. (VA)	6	24.99	19.13	18.64	33.99	29.63	25.64
Rhode Island College	13	6.36	2.33	2.31	13.83	6.00	10.31
Southeast Missouri State	10	6.70	3.50	3.97	24.00	19.17	19.87
Southern Ill. Univ. - Edwardsville	8	74.83	54.67	39.67	184.21	60.67	49.78
Stephen F. Austin (TX)	11	6.41	0	2.39	13.41	7.50	8.33
Tennessee Tech	10	15.95	11.17	10.91	55.75	41.75	39.45
Univ. Central Arkansas	10	33.92	6.25	7.63	59.22	11.50	24.97
Univ. Illinois - Springfield	3	53.28	0	39.96	99.28	54.00	87.96
Univ. Nebraska - Omaha	11	64.09	38.42	41.24	106.28	86.42	85.73
Univ. North Carolina - Wilmington	12	30.83	18.92	13.27	69.00	50.50	48.11
Univ. Tennessee - Chattanooga	14	100.26	24.96	26.23	130.04	34.63	35.91
Western Carolina (NC)	4	27.67	9.42	9.42	50.42	46.42	46.42
Western Illinois	11	52.06	49.67	45.08	103.70	73.50	78.88
Western Kentucky	18	60.90	37.59	42.99	133.95	95.50	90.81
Youngstown State (OH)	14	25.64	14.75	18.51	101.07	23.09	29.01
Totals	366	31.94	10.00	12.88	67.81	36.67	37.41

References.

[1] R. Adler, J. Ewing, and P. Taylor, "Citation statistics: A report from the International Mathematical Union (IMU), in cooperation with the International Council of Industrial and Applied Mathematics (ICIAM) and the Institute of Mathematical Statistics (IMS)," corrected version of June 12, 2008. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.mathunion.org/publications/report/citationstatistics

[2] American Mathematical Society, "Ethical guidelines," adopted by the Society January 2005. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.ams.org/secretary/ethics.html

[3] P. D. Batista, M. G. Campiteli, O. Kinouchi, and A. S. Martinez, "Is it possible to compare researchers with different scientific interests?" *Scientometrics*, **68** (2006), 179–189.

[4] P. D. Batista, M. G. Campiteli, O. Kinouchi, and A. S. Martinez, "Universal behavior of a research productivity index," 2005. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0510142

[5] L. Bornmann and H.-D. Daniel, "What do we know about the h-index?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, **58** (2007), 1381–1385.

[6] A. Bultheel (Belgian Mathematical Society) and J. Teugels (Belgian National Committee of Mathematics), An open letter on the subject of differences between science disciplines in their publishing practices, October 2003. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://bms.ulb.ac.be/documents/scieng.pdf

[7] Department for Education and Skills (United Kingdom), "Reform of Higher Education Research Assessment and Funding," June 13, 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/consultationDocument%20jcutshall2.doc

[8] M. Gauffriau, P. O. Larsen, I. Maye, A. Roulin-Perriard, and M. von Ins, "Publication, cooperation and productivity measures in scientific research," *Scientometrics*, **73** (2007), 175–214.

[9] C. M. Goldie (Council for the Mathematical Sciences), "Annex B: Bibliometric Indicators," an appendix to [17], October 11, 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.cms.ac.uk/reports/2006/AnnexB_FINAL.pdf

[10] J. E. Hirsch, "An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, USA, **102** (2005), 16569–16572.

[11] J. E. Iglesias and C. Pecharromán, "Scaling the h-index for different scientific ISI fields," *Scientometrics*, **73** (2007), 303–320.

[12] J. E. Iglesias and C. Pecharromán, "Scaling the h-index for different scientific ISI fields," 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0607224

[13] A. Johnson (Education Secretary, United Kingdom), Letter to D. Young (Chairman, Higher Education Funding Council for England) reacting to the outcome of the consultation exercise for the reform proposed in [7], December 6, 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/hefce/2006/LetterAJtoDY.pdf

[14] P. O. Larsen, "The state of the art in publication counting," *Scientometrics*, **77** (2008), 235–251.

[15] Murray State University Office for Institutional Research, "Benchmark institutions," November 9, 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.murraystate.edu/oir/benchmarks.pdf

[16] National Research Council, *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*, National Academy Press, 1995.

[17] D. Wallace (Chair, Council for the Mathematical Sciences), Letter to J. Cutshall (Department for Education and Skills, United Kingdom) in response to [7], October 11, 2006. Retrieved July 12, 2009 from http://www.cms.ac.uk/reports/2006/Reform_of_HE_research_asess_response.pdf