

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



**Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy**  
**November 19, 2008**

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

# USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2007-2008

## 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 2007-2008. 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**  
**2007-2008 Faculty Composition of USM Comprehensive and Research Institutions**  
**(Headcount excluding UMB and UMUC)**

Faculty Type	Research		Comprehensive		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured/Tenure Track *	1,848	42%	1,563	44%	3,411	43%
FT NT/NTT Instructional	368	8%	485	14%	853	11%
FT NT/NTT Research	1,378	31%	14	<1%	1,392	18%
Part-time	807	18%	1,457	41%	2,264	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,401</b>		<b>3,519</b>		<b>7,920</b>	

\* 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 declined slightly from 3,450 to 3,411 from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008.

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 present economic crisis may change or delay this trend, but the inevitable "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 2007-2008 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.

## **2007-2008 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 118% of Regents policy expectations and those at the research institutions produced a ratio of 1.5/1 and met 146% of the Regent's policy expectations. In other words, collectively USM faculty in 2007-2008 exceeded the Regents' expectations, as set by Regents' policy.

**Table 2**  
**Percent of Expected CUs Taught, by Institution (2007-2008)**

<b>Inst</b>	<b>Total # of Depts.</b>	<b>Total FTEF</b>	<b>Expected CUs</b>	<b>Actual CUs</b>	<b>% of Expectations Met</b>
Bowie	18	116	833	913	110%
Coppin	15	110	793	939	125%
Frostburg	26	180	1170	1406	120%
Salisbury	25	201	1177	1582	139%
Towson	36	429	2681	2939	112%
UB	6	38	255	279	109%
UMES	17	95	513	705	137%
<b>All Comprehensives</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>1175</b>	<b>7398</b>	<b>8757</b>	<b>118%</b>
UMBC	34	321	1449	1929	133%
UMCP	58	1148	4391	6624	151%
<b>All Research</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1469</b>	<b>5840</b>	<b>8553</b>	<b>146%</b>

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 2007-2008 academic year, tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.4 course units while the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 5.8

course units. In 2007-2008, 6 of 9 USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members at or above the expectation.

Towson University, the University of Baltimore, and the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore reported lower than expected faculty workload by this measure. At Towson University, this is the result of the continued 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 institution reported its highest number ever in this measure. As explained last year, a large number of faculty at UB are in the Law and Business schools where accreditation standards require faculty to teach less than the stipulated workload. However, the new UB program admitting freshmen resulted in increased offerings and the number of faculty in Arts and Sciences with the result of an increase of 6.7 to 7.3 course units for the UB workload. UMES fell slightly short of the specified standard because Business Management and Technology accreditation organizations standards require faculty to teach only an average of 6 course units per year instead of 8 course units. When the two departments of Business Management and Technology are excluded, the average course units increase from 7.4 to 7.7. In all 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 (2003-2004 thru 2007-2008)**

	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
<b>INSTITUTIONS</b>	<b>CU /FTEF</b>				
BSU	8.4	8.2	7.5	7.9	7.9
CSU	8.8	9.0	9.2	8.5	8.5
FSU	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8
SU	7.8	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9
TU	6.9	7.3	7.1	7.0	6.9
UB	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.7	7.3
UMES	7.8	7.5	7.8	7.8	7.4
<b>Comprehensives Avg.</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.5</b>
UMBC	5.2	5.7	5.8	5.8	6.0
UMCP	5.1	5.1	6.1	5.9	5.8
<b>Research Avg.<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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 2007-2008, 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 5.9 at the research institutions.

**Table 4**  
**Average Course Units Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track & FT Non-tenured/Non-tenure-track Instructional Faculty ( 2006-2007 and 2007-2008)**

Institution	2006-2007			2007-2008		
	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's
BSU	186	1470	7.9	140	1125	8.0
CSU	124	1081	8.8	128	1152	9.0
FSU	206	1639	8.0	209	1683	8.1
SU	245	1953	8.0	257	2098	8.2
TU	575	4205	7.3	611	4431	7.3
UB	59	409	7.0	61	455	7.5
UMES	148	1166	7.9	151	1151	7.6
<b>Comprehensives</b>	<b>1543</b>	<b>11916</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>1557</b>	<b>12095</b>	<b>7.8</b>
UMBC	406	2485	6.1	415	2634	6.3
UMCP	1346	7960	5.9	1366	7883	5.8
<b>Research*</b>	<b>1752</b>	<b>10445</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1781</b>	<b>10517</b>	<b>5.9</b>

\* 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 2007-2008, 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 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 (2005-2006 thru 2007-2008)\***

Institution	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
<b>BSU</b>	124	465	150	485	116	472	474
<b>CSU</b>	101	525	104	361	110	458	448
<b>FSU</b>	184	499	179	485	180	479	488
<b>SU</b>	179	511	181	488	207	493	497
<b>TU</b>	396	457	401	439	429	432	443
<b>UB</b>	39	393	41	355	38	390	379
<b>UMBC</b>	305	395	318	383	321	368	382
<b>UMCP</b>	1116	479	1151	455	1148	467	467
<b>UMES</b>	90	440	88	420	95	395	418

\* 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 (2005-2006 thru 2007-2008)\***

Institution	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
<b>BSU</b>	156	516	186	526	140	492	511
<b>CSU</b>	101	636	124	367	128	490	498
<b>FSU</b>	211	502	206	500	209	491	498
<b>SU</b>	238	506	245	489	262	510	502
<b>TU</b>	534	490	575	447	611	454	464
<b>UB</b>	53	387	59	363	61	382	377
<b>UMBC</b>	392	462	406	461	415	457	460
<b>UMCP</b>	1295	544	1346	525	1366	536	535
<b>UMES</b>	142	464	148	457	151	412	444

\* 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.

*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 rose steadily in recent years and has held steady at the elevated level in the most recent year. Table 7 reports the degrees recipients at USM institutions for the last 5 years.

**Table 7**  
**Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Recipients (2003-2007)**

Institution	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
BSU	540	596	578	610	621
CSU	385	304	314	335	375
FSU	757	797	834	848	796
SU	1,364	1,301	1,298	1,387	1,420
TU	2,717	2,740	2,984	3,164	3,120
UB	455	470	488	496	507
UMBC	1,729	1,708	1,819	1,720	1,914
UMCP	5,681	5,959	5,920	5,939	5,749
UMES	428	374	389	452	436
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,056</b>	<b>14,249</b>	<b>14,624</b>	<b>14,951</b>	<b>14,938</b>

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 two most recent graduating classes 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 a useful 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				
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
BSU	9.7	9.7	10.0	9.6	10.0
CSU	10.7	10.8	10.3	9.8	10.3
FSU	9.2	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.2
SU	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.5
TU	9.1	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.0
UMBC	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.2
UMCP	9.2	9.1	8.9	8.7	8.7
UMES	9.3	9.2	9.1	9.0	9.2
<b>All USM</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>

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 have only recently begun 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%
<b>All USM</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>39%</b>

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 have only recently begun admitting first-time freshmen students.

### **2007-2008 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 2007-2008, USM faculty published 839 books and over 11,000 peer-reviewed articles and made more than 11,000 professional presentations. All of which represent the highest aggregate level of scholarly production since these measures have been tracked. The average USM faculty member spent approximately 16 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 over 1 billion dollars in external awards for the first time exceeding last year's number by 4%. 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 2007-2008**

	# 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>								
<b>BSU</b>	140	19	73	45	99	125	18.6	\$ 7,151,777
<b>CSU</b>	149	8	79	26	56	171	19.3	\$10,422,102
<b>FSU</b>	209	21	129	244	291	204	11.8	\$ 2,494,096
<b>SU</b>	297	22	161	153	238	272	22.0	\$ 4,702,476
<b>TU</b>	689	67	611	340	991	910	13.7	\$22,798,924
<b>UB</b>	156	31	192	239	101	180	20.4	\$ 7,122,987
<b>UMES</b>	172	5	143	76	163	222	11.4	\$19,319,248
<i>Research</i>								
<b>UMB</b>	1,605	249	4,677	1,155	1,312	4,075	10.8	\$449,020,777
<b>UMBC</b>	445	92	818	112	525	1,392	11.4	\$ 83,111,717
<b>UMCP</b>	1,901	343	4,331	631	1,186	4,439	22.8	\$399,291,350
<b>Total USM</b>	<b>5,753</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>11,214</b>	<b>3,021</b>	<b>4,962</b>	<b>11,990</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>\$1,005,435,454</b>

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey (all categories except External Grants and Contracts), 2008 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 2007-2008. The data indicate that in 2007-2008 individual USM institutions have, in most instances, successfully met the goals set by Regents' policy. Overall, the core faculty collectively met the expected instructional productivity standards at both the comprehensive and research institutions. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded, after several years of rapid increases, has also leveled off this year. Despite these changes, the improvement in the "through-put" of students through the system as demonstrated by reduced time to degree and improved 4 year graduation rates was maintained in the most recent year. **The time to degree remains at 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 to over 1 billion dollars in one year for the first time.**