

FINAL

**THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT
ON THE
INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY**



**Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy
November 14, 2006**

**Office of the Chief Operating Officer /
Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance**

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2005-2006

INTRODUCTION

Discussion of higher education issues nationally and in Maryland over the past decade has often focused on accountability and productivity of faculty. In 1994, after much work by the Regents, USM, campus administrators, and faculty, the *Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities* was adopted. It was later amended in 1999. An annual report has been issued since 1994 and has traditionally used the metric of course units and analyzed data at the level of the individual faculty member, focusing solely on the tenured/tenure-track faculty member.

This report provides summary data on faculty activity at USM degree-granting institutions for the academic year 2005-2006. It reflects the changes recommended in the 2003-2004 report and adopted by the Regents at their December 2004 meeting. Specifically, the recommended changes are: (1) to focus more on faculty productivity at the institutional level rather than the individual level; (2) to give a more complete picture of faculty instructional productivity by using instructional workload metrics of course units, credit hours and degrees awarded rather than course units exclusively; and (3) to include the contributions of full-time non-tenured/non-tenure track faculty when calculating an institution's instructional effort and workload averages.

Discussion of faculty instructional workload can best be informed by an understanding of the distinctive missions across higher education institutions and the varied roles of faculty. A brief introductory discussion of three fundamental questions provides a richer context for interpreting the data presented in this report: (1) Who are the faculty? (2) What do they do? and (3) How can we further refine measures of productivity in keeping with USM Regents policy.

Faculty Profile

There are several types of faculty at an institution: tenured/tenure-track faculty, full- and part-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty (who include adjunct faculty, instructors and lecturers) hired primarily for instructional purposes, and full- and part-time research faculty (who are usually funded through grants and contracts) hired primarily to conduct research. The composition of USM institutions' faculty bodies varies depending upon institutional mission, funding, and other factors. Regardless of overall composition, each faculty type is an integral part of the institution and its students' experiences. For example, research faculty members play an important role in the training and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in the conduct of research and critical analysis.

Table 1 depicts the mix of faculty at all USM institutions. Consistent with the profiles of colleges and universities across the nation, the importance of part-time and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty is evidenced in Table 1. These faculty members constitute a majority of all faculty within the USM. One implication of this fact for instructional workload reporting is that focusing only upon tenured/tenure-track faculty provides an incomplete picture of how USM students are taught. Therefore, as agreed last year, this report includes information about the contributions of full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty, as well as tenured/tenure-track faculty, because of their importance to the instructional mission of each USM institution.

Table 1
2005-2006 Faculty Composition of USM Comprehensive and Research Institutions
(Headcount excluding UMB and UMUC)

Faculty Type	Research		Comprehensive		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured/Tenure Track	1,798	(35%)	1,475	(44%)	3,273	(39%)
FT NT/NTT Instructional	835	(16%)	424	(13%)	1,259	(15%)
FT Non-TT Research	1,436	(28%)	6	(<1%)	1,442	(17%)
Part-time	1,094	(21%)	1,426	(43%)	2,520	(30%)
Total	5,163		3,331		8,494	

Source: MHEC Employee Data System (EDS)

Whether tenured/tenure-track faculty members are at a comprehensive or a research university, they are expected to engage in each of three types of faculty activity: **teaching, research, and service**. These three activities are highly integrated and it is often difficult to separate them into distinct categories thus, a faculty member's research and service to the community enhance his or her expertise and ability to provide quality instruction to students, just as engagement with students can enhance research agendas and allow faculty to provide more informed service to the institution and community. Research is converted into knowledge and incorporated into the instructional curriculum. The Regents' faculty workload policy recognizes that the emphasis on each of these three activities will vary depending on institutional mission and funding.

The full-time instructional faculty headcount in the USM changed from 4,455 in 2004-05 to 4,532 in 2005-06. The number of full time faculty is a measure worth tracking in this report because it is widely taken to be an indicator of the quality of instruction that is provided on a campus and has implications for the workload of other faculty members since part-time faculty do not normally assume responsibilities such as advising, university committee membership, and department service. It also can be taken as an indicator of funding and reflects a university's priorities in the use of resources

In fact, a national issue is emerging in recognition of the fact that a disproportionate number of full-time tenured faculty will be retiring in the next several years. The "graying of the faculty," combined with fewer Ph.D.s being produced in some fields, implies that the competition for faculty will intensify and become more costly in the future. Not only will salaries and the cost of start-up packages increase, but instructional workload expectations will be likely to decrease, as faculty candidates negotiate their working conditions and press for greater time for research and public service. As state governments invest significant sums of new dollars to build the faculties of their public universities (to compete with private universities) the competition for, and consequent cost of, new faculty will escalate even more.

The Board of Regents' policy on faculty workload recognizes that, because differential assignments of instructional, research, and service responsibilities maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of individual departments and affect how each department contributes to the institutional mission, the focus of external accountability should be "the department or academic unit and not the individual faculty member" (*Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities*, Approved by the Board of Regents, August 19, 1994 and amended on July 9, 1999). Given the responsibilities and professional pursuits of tenured/tenure-track faculty, it is common for academic departments to use this flexibility to meet their instructional, research, and service obligations. Departments allocate

instructional assignments among the different types of faculty at their disposal. In so doing, departments can achieve their goals in an efficient, cost-effective manner while advancing the quality of the academic program. Therefore, faculty instructional workload is best reviewed at the department or academic unit level because departments have responsibility for establishing instructional loads, making instructional assignments, and monitoring and reporting how those assignments are carried out. Reporting by USM institutions to USM is done using departments as the basic unit of analysis, with department data aggregated to the institutional level for reporting to the Regents.

The metric used for measuring instructional activity under the Regents' policy is the course unit (CU). One course unit is defined as a standard three-credit lecture course, and all other courses and instructional activity, including individual instruction (i.e., undergraduate research, dissertation research, etc.), are converted to course units using conversion factors defined in the USM policy. Instructional activity in this report is defined primarily in course units. The Regents' policy called for an expected instructional workload range of 5-6 course units per tenured/tenure-track faculty member at USM research universities and 7-8 course units per tenured/tenure-track faculty member at USM comprehensive institutions. Beginning in 2004-2005, while the prescribed ranges have not changed, the Regents' E&E initiatives called for research and comprehensive universities to reach a target of 5.5 and 7.5 course units per full-time faculty member respectively. The data presented in this report are the first indication of the success of institutions in attaining these new goals. The data indicate all institutions have made progress towards the new goals with all institutions, with one exception, either at or very close to their goal.

The remainder of this report for the 2005-2006 academic year is divided into two sections: data related to instructional workload activities of faculty (including efficiency and outcomes data) and data on the scholarship and service activities of faculty. This is done for convenience purposes only. As noted elsewhere, it is often very difficult to separate out these activities because they are highly integrated. Faculty members working with undergraduates on research projects are both teaching and conducting research. Faculty engaged in service learning projects may be teaching, conducting research, and/or providing service. A brief summary and discussion of future issues related to faculty composition and workload conclude the report.

2005-2006 INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

Instructional Productivity at the Department Level

Academic departments are expected to meet the standard instructional expectations set forth by USM and institutional policies. Often, individual faculty members are assigned alternate responsibilities in place of, and at times in addition to, their standard loads. These additional responsibilities are recognized as those related to instruction (such as unusually large advising loads, developing new curriculum or modality of instruction); department administrative duties; and critical research and service activities. Each responsibility is crucial to the success of the institution in creating a quality learning environment for students as well as fulfilling the institutional role in the State as a community resource. Although these recognized responsibilities do not alter the overall teaching expectations of a department or an institution, they will affect the distribution of the teaching assignments among faculty members within a department.

One of the indicators collected from all USM institutions and reviewed at this level is the instructional productivity ratio for each department. When these data are aggregated, an instructional productivity ratio for each institution can be developed. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, this ratio is the number of course units taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty

divided by the number of course units expected to be taught by those faculty members. The number of course units expected to be taught is based on the expected load for each full-time equivalent (FTE) tenured/tenure-track faculty member, with adjustments made for externally funded research, sabbaticals, and non-credit bearing instructional activity. Thus, an outcome of 1.00 would mean that the tenured/tenure-track faculty members of a department or institution taught 100% of the expected course units, while a number greater than 1.00 indicates that a department or institution exceeded expectations. When academic departments do not achieve a ratio of 1.00/1, it is the responsibility of the appropriate institutional academic officers (i.e., provosts, deans, department chairs) to examine why and to take action necessary to correct the situation.

Table 2 displays the instructional productivity percentages for each USM institution. The data indicate that the tenured/tenure-track faculty members of each USM institution are generating more course units than expected based on the Board of Regents' policy. Those faculty members at comprehensive institutions collectively produced a ratio of 1.1/1, meeting 114% of Regents policy expectations and those at the research institutions produced a ratio of 1.3/1 and met 129% of the Regent's policy expectations. In other words, collectively USM faculty in 2005-2006 exceeded the Regents' expectations, as set by Regents' policy.

Table 2
Percent of Expected CUs Taught, by Institution
(2005-2006)

Inst	Total # of Depts.	Total FTE	Expected CUs (Updated Standard)	Actual CUs	% of Expectations Met (Updated Standard)
Bowie	15	124	893	926	104%
Coppin	15	101	645	927	144%
Frostburg	23	184	1305	1434	110%
Salisbury	24	179	1118	1408	126%
Towson	34	396	2693	2812	104%
UB	6	39	248	271	109%
UMES	18	90	537	702	131%
All Comprehensives	135	1113	7439	8480	114%
UMBC	32	305	1429	1753	123%
UMCP	58	1116	4797	6803	142%
All Research	90	1448	5780	7447	129%

Notes: Percentages are calculated for all departments using instructional data from T/TT faculty. Excluded are faculty on sabbatical and those exempted as a result of illness or death. Adjustments are also made for instruction-related activity and external funding. Data for UB, SU and TU exclude the business and law schools because accreditation requires law faculty to teach 4.0 CU's and business faculty to teach 6.0 CU's annually.

Average Course Units Taught Per Faculty

Table 3 shows the five-year trends for the number of course units taught per FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty. During the 2005-2006 academic year, tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.7 course units while the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 6.0 course units. In 2005-2006, 7 of 9 USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members at or above the expectation.

Table 3
Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty
(2001-2002 thru 2005-2006)

INSTITUTIONS	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
	CU /FTEF				
BSU	7.3	8.2	8.4	8.2	7.5
CSU	9.2	7.9	8.8	9.0	9.2
FSU	7.3	7.4	7.9	7.8	7.8
SU	7.2	7.1	7.8	7.9	7.9
TU	6.6	6.6	6.9	7.3	7.1
UB	7.8	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.9
UMES	5.7	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.8
Comprehensives Avg.	7.0	7.0	7.5	7.7	7.7
UMBC ¹	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.7	5.8
UMCP ¹	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.1	6.1
Research Avg.	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.3	6.0

¹ Include Only State Supported FTE

Note: For the 2001-2002 academic year, Towson University had expectations set at 6.0 course units per FTEF. The Course unit calculations for Salisbury, Towson and UB omit the schools of law and business because accreditation requires law faculty to teach 4.0 CU's and business faculty to teach 6.0 CU's.

In addition to the tenured/tenure-track faculty, the non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty members contribute to and support the instructional goals of each institution. As noted in the introductory section of this report, USM institutions, and colleges and universities nationally, consider these two groups of full-time faculty to be their core instructional workforce. Table 4 shows the average course units taught by these two groups of full-time instructional faculty combined. In AY 2005-2006, the total course units taught by tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty averaged 7.9 at the comprehensive institutions and 6.0 at the research institutions.

Table 4
Average Course Units Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track & FT Non-tenured/Non-tenure-track
Instructional Faculty (2004-2005 and 2005-2006)

Institution	2004-2005 ¹			2005-2006 ¹		
	FTE	CU's	AVG CU's	FTE	CU's	AVG CU's
BSU	142	1205	8.5	156	1163	7.5
CSU	95	1002	10.6	101	1057	10.5
FSU	202	1621	8.0	211	1697	8.0
SU	234	1860	7.9	238	1879	7.9
TU	495	3670	7.4	534	3944	7.4
UB	52	360	6.9	53	367	6.9
UMES	139	1139	8.2	142	1136	8.0
Comprehensives	1357	10856	8.0	1435	11243	7.9
UMBC	390	2298	5.9	392	2365	6.0
UMCP	1282	6677	5.2	1295	7786	6.0
Research	1696	8975	5.4	1687	10151	6.0

1. Research Universities include State Supported plus Full-time Non-tenured

2. Table reflects weighted averages

3. Salisbury, Towson and UB's FTE's and CU's are adjusted to omit the schools of business and law.

Average Credit Hour Generation per Faculty

Table 5 displays the FTE and the average credit hours generated over the past ^{three} two years by tenured/tenure-track faculty. In 2005-2006, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions increased their average credit hour productivity. When full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members are included in the analysis (Table 6), faculty productivity overall has also increased over the last three years. The data can be interpreted to imply that USM institutions are being more efficient with their faculty on average teaching more students. Others may read the data to suggest that increased class size portends a threat to the quality of instruction that is delivered. Nonetheless, the data confirm that USM faculty instructional productivity in 2005-2006 has improved over the last two years.

Table 5
Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated
by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2003-2004 thru 2005-2006)

Institution	2003-2004		2004-2005*		2005-2006*	
	FTE	Avg. SCH	FTE	Avg. SCH	FTE	Avg. SCH
BSU	106	419	96	444	124	465
CSU	92	427	95	439	101	525
FSU	188	470	183	525	184	499
SU	209	509	183	552	179	673
TU	394	389	393	450	396	457
UB	40	362	39	389	39	393
UMBC	326	325	330	389	305	395
UMCP	1125	343	1118	408	1116	479
UMES	93	386	90	410	90	440

* Excluded are faculty on sabbatical and those exempted as a result of illness or death. Adjustments are also made for instruction-related activity and external funding. Salisbury, Towson and UB's FTEs are adjusted to omit the schools of business and law.

Table 6
Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated
by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty AND Full-Time, Non-Ten./Non-Ten.-track Instructional Faculty (2003-2004 thru 2005-2006)

Institution	2003-2004		2004-2005*		2005-2006*	
	FTE	Avg. SCH	FTE	Avg. SCH	FTE	Avg. SCH
BSU	169	453	142	446	156	516
CSU	106	463	95	522	101	636
FSU	214	469	202	529	211	502
SU	253	509	234	539	238	624
TU	470	399	495	463	534	490
UB	52	349	52	374	53	387
UMBC	404	374	414	422	392	462
UMCP	1298	376	1282	470	1295	544
UMES	131	445	139	449	142	464

Excluded are faculty on sabbatical and those exempted as a result of illness or death. Adjustments are also made for instruction-related activity and external funding. Salisbury, Towson and UB's FTEs are adjusted to omit the schools of business and law.

Student Outcomes (Degrees Awarded and Time-to-Degree)

All of the measures of faculty instructional productivity which have been presented to this point are measures of production efficiency within the system; however, the question is ultimately one of outcome efficiency in terms of degrees produced. The student receiving a high quality degree in a reasonable period of time is the end product which defines success for students, faculty, and the public. Increase or decrease in number of degrees granted reflects the institution's growth in enrollment, success in retaining students to graduation, and the faculty's productivity. The number of degrees awarded has risen consistently in recent years. Table 7 reports the degrees granted by USM institutions for the last 5 years.

Table 7
Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Awarded (2001-2005)

Institution	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
BSU	533	568	540	596	578
CSC	372	390	385	304	314
FSU	812	736	757	797	834
SU	1,285	1,283	1,364	1,301	1,298
TU	2,608	2,561	2,717	2,740	2,984
UB	462	462	455	470	488
UMBC	1,606	1,570	1,729	1,708	1,819
UMCP	5,304	5,451	5,681	5,959	5,920
UMES	443	412	428	374	389
Total	13,425	13,433	14,056	14,249	14,624

Source: Degree Information System

As part of the Effectiveness and Efficiency effort implemented by the USM Board of Regents, improving student time-to-degree has been identified as a major academic initiative. Many factors can influence a student's time-to-degree including level of pre-enrollment preparation, need to work while enrolled, requirements of degree program, and the degree of clear realistic planning by the student. The ability of students to rapidly and successfully matriculate is also dependent on efficiency and productivity of the faculty, the quality of advising, and the appropriateness of course offerings. Changes in time-to-degree are thus, in part, a reflection of faculty productivity. In recent years, the system overall has seen modest progress in this area. Table 8 presents the time to degree of recent class cohorts. Table 9 illustrates changes in the four-year graduation rates, which although only a part of the graduation rate picture are useful to examine supplemental measure of time to degree. When taken together these elements place the process measures into a more complete context.

Table 8
Undergraduate Time-to-Degree in Semesters

	Entering Year				
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
BSU	9.7	9.8	9.7	9.7	10.0
CSU	10.7	10.8	10.7	10.8	10.3
FSU	9.4	9.2	9.2	9.3	9.3
SU	8.7	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6
TU	9.3	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.0
UMBC	9.6	9.5	9.3	9.4	9.3
UMCP	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.1	8.9
UMES	9.5	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.1
All USM	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.0

Source: Degree Information System, Enrollment Information System

Note: UB is not included in these data because they do not admit first-time freshmen students

Table 9
4-Year Graduation Rate

	Entering Year				
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
BSU	13%	13%	15%	12%	14%
CSU	4%	7%	9%	5%	6%
FSU	26%	21%	20%	21%	23%
SU	50%	47%	51%	52%	46%
TU	31%	31%	31%	31%	34%
UMBC	30%	28%	29%	29%	33%
UMCP	41%	41%	45%	48%	53%
UMES	30%	27%	26%	20%	18%
All USM	34%	34%	36%	35%	37%

Source: Degree Information System, Enrollment Information System

Note: UB is not included in these data because they do not admit first-time freshmen students

2005-2006 Scholarship and Service Activity

Table 10 is a summary of the scholarship and service activity of the USM faculty from degree-granting institutions (including UMB). Data show that in AY 2005-2006, USM faculty published 799 books and over 10,000 peer-reviewed articles and made more than 10,000 professional presentations. The average USM faculty member spent approximately 12 days in public service to business, government, schools, and non-profit organizations.

Table 10 also records the level of external funding received by USM institutions, as reported by each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs. These data reflect the overall grants and contract productivity for each institution. Although, USM faculty are primarily responsible for their campus' external funding levels, not all external funding is attributable to tenured/tenure-track faculty. Staff and other research faculty also attract external dollars.

As State funding has decreased, external funding has become even more critical for higher education. It is used as a criterion for ranking institutions nationally, supports the creation and transfer of new technologies, contributes to the economic development of critical areas in Maryland, provides community services to underserved populations, feeds into the creation of new curriculum and course development and, most importantly, assures that students receive their instruction from faculty members who are recognized as being at the cutting edge of their disciplines.

Table 10
Scholarship and Service of the USM Faculty,¹ AY 2005-2006

	# FTEF Faculty	# of Books Published	# of Refereed Publications	# of Non-Ref. Publications	# Creative Activities	Professional Present.	Days in Pub. Service per FTEF	External Grants & Contracts
<i>Comprehensive</i>								
BSU	175	10	29	29	258	176	4.0	\$ 750,974*
CSU	136	9	60	42	40	144	18.7	\$ 4,177,620
FSU	240	11	129	73	294	153	9.8	\$ 1,481,936*
SU	328	21	193	147	285	315	22.4	\$ 4,310,691
TU	642	83	467	285	956	851	11.1	\$16,365,476
UB	65	20	116	74	15	97	9.6	\$ 7,536,223
UMES	179	6	139	78	226	214	10.4	\$18,051,895
<i>Research</i>								
UMB	1,540	189	3,972	864	463	3,200	11.3	\$378,641,460
UMBC	490	104	917	78	483	1,192	7.2	\$ 53,144,382*
UMCP	2,124	346	4,059	564	1,394	3,933	13.9	\$347,849,069
Total USM	5,919	799	10,081	2,234	4,414	10,275	12.0	\$832,309,726

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey (all categories except External Grants and Contracts), Annual Extramural Awards Survey "Total Less other USM" (External Grants and Contracts category)

1. Includes Ten/Ten Tk & FT Non-tenure/non-tenure-track instructional and research faculty from all departments for the entire institution.

* Note: BSU, FSU and UMBC did not respond to the Annual Extramural Activity Survey in time for this report, this figure was provided with the faculty workload report.

SUMMARY

This report provides summary data for USM for the academic year 2005-2006. Tenured/tenure-track faculty members constitute less than 40% of all USM faculty members (by headcount, see Table 1). The data indicate that at each USM institution this group of faculty collectively **exceeds the expected instructional productivity standards** set by Regents' policy. This is the case when measured by either total course units taught or by the standard of average course units taught. This is also the case when credit hours are used as a metric of faculty instructional productivity with increases over past performance at all institutions. Non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) also remains impressive. Similarly, the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded has increased system-wide over the past several years. Finally, improvement has been realized in the "through-put" of students through the system as demonstrated by reduced time to degree and improved 4 year graduation rates over the last few years at most institutions. As USM implements and tracks E&E initiatives, more detailed information will be reported to describe the impact on faculty productivity and success, and its affect on achieving E&E goals.