

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



**Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy
November 13, 2007**

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

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2006-2007

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 2006-2007. 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, 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
2006-2007 Faculty Composition of USM Comprehensive and Research Institutions
(Headcount excluding UMB and UMUC)

Faculty Type	Research		Comprehensive		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured/Tenure Track *	1,822	37%	1,628	55%	3,450	44%
FT NT/NTT Instructional	344	7%	487	17%	831	11%
FT NT/NTT Research	1,343	27%	6	<1%	1,349	17%
Part-time	1,401	29%	824	28%	2,225	28%
Total	4,910		2,945		7,855	

* Includes those with primary assignments of Instruction or Research
 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 maintenance of a substantial core of tenured/tenure-track faculty is a key 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. The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty rose from 3,273 to 3,450 from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007.

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 indicate all institutions have pursued these new goals aggressively, with varying degrees of success at reaching or maintaining the targets.

The remainder of this report for the 2006-2007 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.

2006-2007 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 1.2/1, meeting 121% of Regents policy expectations and those at the research institutions produced a ratio of 1.5/1 and met 149% of the Regent's policy expectations. In other words, collectively USM faculty in 2006-2007 exceeded the Regents' expectations, as set by Regents' policy.

Table 2
Percent of Expected CUs Taught, by Institution(2006-2007)

Inst	Total # of Depts.	Total FTEF	Expected CUs	Actual CUs	% of Expectations Met
Bowie	15	150	1001	1181	118%
Coppin	15	104	732	879	120%
Frostburg	24	179	1157	1368	118%
Salisbury	24	181	1043	1434	138%
Towson	35	401	2486	2790	112%
UB	6	41	255	272	107%
UMES	17	88	423	689	163%
All Comprehensives	136	1144	7097	8613	121%
UMBC	32	318	1390	1827	131%
UMCP	58	1151	4409	6834	155%
All Research	90	1469	5799	8661	149%

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 2006-2007 academic year, tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.5 course units while the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 5.9 course units. In 2006-2007, 7 of 9 USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members at or above the expectation.

Towson University and the University of Baltimore were the two institutions which had lower than expected faculty workload by this measure. At Towson University, this is the result, perhaps counter-intuitively, of the rapid rise in enrollment (due to the success of the Enrollment Funding Initiative). New faculty hires are typically allowed a period of reduced workload in order to establish themselves at the institution. This reduces the average course units per faculty member. At the University of Baltimore, the issue remains that the number of faculty who are covered by the policy is small and that it is difficult to achieve the desired workload level with no exemptions included in this measure. In both cases when other aggregate measures are used, which allow exemptions for instructional or research activity to be added to the calculation, the resulting figures indicate that both institutions meet appropriate levels of activity.

Table 3
Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2002-2003 thru 2006-2007)

	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
INSTITUTIONS	CU /FTEF				
BSU	8.2	8.4	8.2	7.5	7.9
CSU	7.9	8.8	9.0	9.2	8.5
FSU	7.4	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.7
SU	7.1	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.9
TU	6.6	6.9	7.3	7.1	7.0
UB	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.7
UMES	7.6	7.8	7.5	7.8	7.8
Comprehensives Avg.	7.0	7.5	7.7	7.7	7.5
UMBC	5.0	5.2	5.7	5.8	5.8
UMCP	5.0	5.1	5.1	6.1	5.9
Research Avg.¹	5.0	5.1	5.3	6.0	5.9

¹ Research institutions may include Only State Supported FTE at their discretion
 Note: 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 2006-2007, the total course units taught by tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty averaged 7.7 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 (2005-2006 and 2006-2007)

Institution	2005-2006			2006-2007		
	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's
BSU	156	1163	7.5	186	1470	7.9
CSU	101	1057	10.5	124	1081	8.8
FSU	211	1697	8.0	206	1639	8.0
SU	238	1879	7.9	245	1953	8.0
TU	534	3944	7.4	575	4205	7.3
UB	53	367	6.9	59	409	7.0
UMES	142	1136	8.0	148	1166	7.9
Comprehensives	1435	11243	7.9	1543	11916	7.7
UMBC	392	2365	6.0	406	2485	6.1
UMCP	1295	7786	6.0	1346	7960	5.9
Research*	1687	10151	6.0	1752	10445	6.0

* Research Universities may include only State Supported FTE at their discretion in addition to Full-time Non-tenured
 Note: 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 years by tenured/tenure-track faculty. In 2006-2007, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions semester credit hour productivity varied considerably but remained at or near each institution's three year average at 8 of 9 institutions. When full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members are included in the analysis (Table 6), then productivity overall has either risen or remained relatively steady at 8 of 9 institutions. These data can be interpreted to imply that USM institutions are holding class sizes relatively constant over time despite rising enrollment levels.

Table 5

Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2004-2005 thru 2006-2007)*

Institution	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	96	444	124	465	150	485	468
CSU	95	439	101	525	104	361	441
FSU	183	525	184	499	179	485	503
SU**	183	493	179	511	181	488	497
TU	393	450	396	457	401	439	449
UB	39	389	39	393	41	355	379
UMBC	330	389	305	395	318	383	389
UMCP	1118	408	1116	479	1151	455	447
UMES	90	410	90	440	88	420	423

* 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.

** Salisbury University's historic SCH Averages were adjusted for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 because of a calculation error.

Table 6
Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated
by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty AND Full-Time, Non-Ten./Non-Ten.-track Instructional
Faculty (2004-2005 thru 2006-2007) *

Institution	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	142	446	156	516	186	526	499
CSU	95	522	101	636	124	367	498
FSU	202	529	211	502	206	500	510
SU**	234	494	238	506	245	489	496
TU	495	463	534	490	575	447	466
UB	52	374	53	387	59	363	374
UMBC	414	422	392	462	406	461	448
UMCP	1282	470	1295	544	1346	525	513
UMES	139	449	142	464	148	457	457

* 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.

** Salisbury University's historic SCH Averages were adjusted for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 because of a calculation error.

Faculty Workload at the University of Maryland, Baltimore

UMB applies a set of standards that are more appropriate for its professional schools for judging faculty workload. UMB reports that 94% of all core faculty met or exceeded the institution's standard faculty workload. When compared to previous years, this represents a consistent level of attainment in meeting the standard workload. Nearly two-thirds of the faculty exemptions from teaching the standard load did so for reasons related to instruction or to pursue externally funded or department supported research and service.

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 degree recipients reflects the institution's growth in enrollment, success in retaining students to graduation, and the faculty's productivity. The number of graduating students has risen consistently in recent years. Table 7 reports the degrees recipients at USM institutions for the last 5 years.

Table 7
Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Recipients (2002-2006)

Institution	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
BSU	568	540	596	578	610
CSU	390	385	304	314	335
FSU	736	757	797	834	848
SU	1,283	1,364	1,301	1,298	1,387
TU	2,561	2,717	2,740	2,984	3,164
UB	462	455	470	488	496
UMBC	1,570	1,729	1,708	1,819	1,720
UMCP	5,451	5,681	5,959	5,920	5,939
UMES	412	428	374	389	452
Total	13,433	14,056	14,249	14,624	14,951

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. The most recent graduating class recorded the most rapid time-to-degree of any class in the last ten years. 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 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				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
BSU	9.8	9.7	9.7	10.0	9.6
CSU	10.8	10.7	10.8	10.3	9.8
FSU	9.2	9.2	9.3	9.3	9.2
SU	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.3
TU	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.0	9.0
UMBC	9.5	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.1
UMCP	9.3	9.2	9.1	8.9	8.7
UMES	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.1	9.0
All USM	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.0	8.9

Source: Degree Information System, Enrollment Information System

Note: Time-to-degree will vary from institutionally produced figures. They include students excluded from IPEDS rates, students graduating from any USM institutions, and part-time students. UB is not included in these data because they are in the first year of admitting first-time freshmen students

Table 9
4-Year Graduation Rate

	Entering Year				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
BSU	13%	15%	12%	14%	18%
CSU	7%	9%	5%	6%	5%
FSU	21%	20%	21%	23%	24%
SU	47%	51%	52%	46%	46%
TU	31%	31%	31%	34%	38%
UMBC	28%	29%	29%	33%	31%
UMCP	41%	45%	48%	53%	57%
UMES	27%	26%	20%	18%	21%
All USM	34%	36%	35%	37%	39%

Source: Degree Information System, Enrollment Information System

Notes: Rates will vary from institutionally produced rates. Graduation rates include students excluded from IPEDS rates and students graduating from any USM institutions. UB is not included in these data because they are in the first year of admitting first-time freshmen students.

2006-2007 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 2006-2007, USM faculty published 785 books and over 10,000 peer-reviewed articles and made more than 10,000 professional presentations. The average USM faculty member spent approximately 13 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. In AY 2006-2007, the USM was awarded nearly 970 million dollars in external awards, a figure which exceeded last year's number by more than 90 million dollars and more than 10%. 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,* AY 2006-2007

	# 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	8	23	77	336	244	9.3	\$ 9,571,536
CSU	139	9	35	20	67	115	18.4	\$8,303,528
FSU	230	17	77	214	256	187	12.4	\$ 1,912,782
SU	305	29	162	139	231	271	19.4	\$ 3,886,661
TU	687	64	471	278	1,055	847	15.9	\$18,564,606
UB	162	25	188	106	53	211	22.7	\$ 8,004,190
UMES	172	8	114	81	107	223	13.1	\$17,896,261
<i>Research</i>								
UMB	1,527	245	4,364	1,026	613	3,588	11.4	\$410,049,084
UMBC	476	93	737	82	529	1,238	8.1	\$ 85,078,526
UMCP	1,928	287	4,436	945	1,221	3,950	20.4	\$405,616,126
Total USM	5,801	785	10,607	2,968	4,468	10,874	13.3	\$968,883,300

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey (all categories except External Grants and Contracts), 2007 Annual Extramural Awards Survey "Total Less other USM" (External Grants and Contracts category)

* Includes Ten/Ten Track, department chairs, & FT Non-tenure/non-tenure-track instructional and research faculty from all departments for the entire institution.

SUMMARY

This report provides summary data for USM for the academic year 2006-2007. The data indicate that in 2006-2007 individual USM institutions have, in most instances, successfully met the goals set by Regents' policy. Overall, the core faculty collectively **exceeds the expected instructional productivity standards**. This was the case when measured by either total course units taught or by the standard of average course units taught. In addition, the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded has increased system-wide over the past several years, and 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. **In fact, the time to degree has now reached its shortest duration since at least the early 1980's**. 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. Finally, non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) remains at impressive levels, and **external research funding has reached record levels rising over 10% in one year**.