



BOARD OF REGENTS

SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION,
INFORMATION, OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty

COMMITTEE: Education Policy and Student Life

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: Tuesday, November 6, 2018

SUMMARY: At this meeting, the Committee will review the annual report on the instructional workload of the USM faculty. As in the past, the report summarizes instructional workload, which includes teaching, research, and service activities at all USM degree-granting institutions with tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Overall, results showed remain stable but challenges in meeting the Board’s workload goals remain. Key findings include:

- The USM Research institutions collectively met the expected instructional productivity standards (averaging 5.6 courses per faculty member),
- The USM Comprehensive institutions collectively fell below the target of 7.5 courses per faculty member,
- Credit hour production by Core faculty was similar compared to last year, but has decreased over the last five years,
- Student outcomes have improved with more degrees awarded and an improved 4-year graduation rate, and
- USM levels of grants and other research awards stood at nearly \$1.37 billion, representing a significant rise over last year.

ALTERNATIVE(S): This is an information item.

FISCAL IMPACT: This is an information item.

CHANCELLOR’S RECOMMENDATION: This is an information item.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Information Only DATE: November 6, 2018

BOARD ACTION: DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joann A. Boughman	301-445-1992	jboughman@usmd.edu
Ellen Herbst	301-445-1923	eherbst@usmd.edu

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2017-2018



Submitted to the Board of Regents Committee on Education Policy and Student Life
November 6, 2018

Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Office of the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2017-2018

SUMMARY

Key findings of this year's report include:

- As a group, tenured/tenure-track faculty at research institutions met their course unit expectations this year, with an average of 5.6 course units per faculty member. Tenured/tenure-track faculty at comprehensive institutions had a combined average of 7.0 course units per faculty member, which is below the Board of Regents' expectation of 7.5 course units (see Table 1).
- The average course units taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty exceeded workload expectations at two of the nine institutions in this report. Of the seven institutions that were below expectations, three of those did show improvement this year as compared to last year (see Table 1).
- As a group, core faculty at research institutions exceeded their average course unit expectations this year, with an average of 5.9 course units per faculty member. Core faculty at comprehensive institutions had a combined average of 7.2 course units per faculty member (see Table 2).
- The average course units taught by core faculty exceeded workload expectations at four of the nine institutions in this report. Of the five institutions that were below expectations, three of those did show improvement this year (see Table 2).
- Tenured/tenure-track faculty exceeded course unit expectations at five of the nine institutions after including instructional, research, and sabbatical exceptions. All but one institution exceeded the course unit expectations when all possible exceptions were included (see Table 3).
- The average credit hours produced per tenured/tenure-track and core faculty member varies considerably between institutions. In comparison to five years earlier, all institutions report fewer average credit hours per faculty (see Tables 4 and 5).
- Taken together, Tables 6 and 7 indicate that enrollment has increased overall in the past five years. In that same time frame, the proportion of credit hours taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty has decreased, but the proportion taught by full time non-tenure track faculty has increased.
- The number of bachelor's degrees awarded increased slightly this year. There were 38 more bachelor's degrees awarded in the most recent year, and over 800 more degrees awarded compared to five years earlier (see Table 8).
- Four-year graduation rates have improved this year to the best performance since this measure was first tracked (see Table 9a). Six-year graduation rates are the same as the previous year (see Table 9b).
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels with over 650 books and over 12,500 refereed articles published in the 2017-2018 academic year (see Table 10).
- Faculty secured over \$1.37 billion in research funding, representing a 9.8% gain over last year's figure (see Table 11).

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2017-2018

INTRODUCTION

An annual report has been provided to the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents since 1994 that synthesizes and scores faculty workload activities, with a major emphasis on instructional activities. This report provides summary data on faculty activity at USM degree-granting institutions for the academic year 2017-2018.

Governing Policies

The workload of faculty is governed by a series of policies overseen by the USM Board of Regents. These policies are designed to ensure maximum accountability, while providing individual campuses high levels of flexibility to deploy faculty in the most effective and efficient way possible.

The primary USM Board of Regents policy governing faculty workload is:

II-1.25 POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Other policies that clarify specific issues or relate to the faculty workload include:

II-1.19 UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM POLICY ON THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

II-1.05 POLICY ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF FULL-TIME, NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND.

Additionally, beginning in 2004-2005, as an initiative of the Board of Regents' Effectiveness & Efficiency workgroup, research and comprehensive universities were directed to reach a target of 5.5 and 7.5 course units per full-time faculty member respectively. These policies apply to all USM institutions with the following exceptions: UMB, UMUC, UB's School of Law, UB's Merrick School of Business, SU's Perdue School of Business, TU's College of Business & Economics, and any other departments and colleges for whom the target would violate accreditation standards.

Measures and Definitions

This report combines various faculty activities and different types of faculty employees into relatively broad categories. The metrics for these activities and the types of faculty are defined below.

Metrics of Activity

- **Course Unit:** A key metric used for measuring instructional activity is the course unit (CU). One course unit is defined as a standard three-credit lecture course. 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. A course unit is recorded equally for courses of all types and enrollment levels.
- **Credit Hours:** Courses are measured in credit hours based on time in classroom (for example, three hours of class contact each week multiplied by the total students enrolled in a course). The sum of the credit hours from all classes taught by an individual faculty member is used as a supplemental metric of faculty instructional productivity.
- **Course Exceptions:** Faculty members are excused from specific teaching duties for a variety of reasons. These may include research, instruction-related assignments, administrative and service duties, sabbaticals, or illness. Exceptions are applied in various calculations to illustrate the work activities of faculty and to determine whether institutions are meeting their instructional workload goals.

Type of Faculty

- Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: This includes all persons (except department chairs) holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are responsible for a large portion of the central faculty missions on campus including teaching, service and research.
- Core Faculty: Tenured/tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenured instructional faculty are classified as an institution's core faculty. These faculty members are responsible for the main activities of teaching and managing the instructional activity of the institutions.
- Part-Time Faculty: This category includes emeritus, adjunct and affiliated faculty, all part-time faculty, and non-departmental administrators (deans, assistant deans, etc.) who taught during the academic year.
- Other Faculty: This category reflects all other faculty, including department chairs, non-tenure track research or public service faculty, and teaching assistants.

These categories vary from terminology used in the reporting process.

INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

Instructional productivity in this report is expressed in terms of course units taught per faculty member (both with and without categories of exceptions) and in credit hours delivered. Additional student outcomes (e.g., graduation rates) are also presented as a measure of the effectiveness of the faculty's activities.

Course Unit Measures

Academic departments are expected to meet the standard instructional expectations set forth by the USM Board of Regents, in addition to their own institutional policies. This report addresses how well the institutions meet the expectations in terms of course units, each of which is the equivalent to teaching a 3-credit hour course.

Faculty members at research institutions (UMCP and UMBC) are expected to teach 5.5 course units on average each year. Faculty members at comprehensive institutions are expected to teach 7.5 course units on average each year. UMB and UMUC are not covered under the Board of Regents' policy, and productivity measures are not included for these institutions.

Course unit productivity requirements for the tenured/tenure-track faculty and core faculty groups are presented separately. Individual faculty members may be assigned alternate responsibilities in place of, and at times in addition to, their standard loads. These additional responsibilities may be instruction-related (such as unusually large advising loads or developing new curricula or modalities of instruction); departmental administrative duties; research-related, and/or service activities. Each responsibility is crucial to the success of the institution in creating a quality learning environment for students, in addition to fulfilling the institutional role in the State as a community resource. These responsibilities are recognized through assigned course exceptions that exempt individual faculty members from classroom teaching. The responsibilities do not alter the overall teaching expectations of a department or an institution; however, they will affect the distribution of the teaching assignments among faculty members within a department.

The following two tables (Tables 1 and 2) display the average course units taught per faculty member over the last five years. **(Note that in these tables and throughout this report the left-most column represents the most recent data.)** Table 1 displays the number of tenured/tenure-track FTEF (Full Time Equivalent Faculty) and the course units per FTEF. During the 2017-2018 academic year (AY), tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.0 course units. Tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 5.6 course units.

In 2017-2018, two of the nine USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members that met the Board of Regents' expectation. This level of performance by USM institutions is roughly equivalent to last year's performance.

Table 1

Trends in Average Course Units Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (AY 2013-2014 to 2017-2018)

	FTEF	Course Units per FTEF				
	2017-2018	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
BSU	142	7.2	7.0	7.3	7.2	7.6
CSU	138	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.5	7.8
FSU	185	7.1	7.1	7.3	7.4	7.5
SU	264	7.3	7.3	7.2	6.9	7.2
TU	486	6.5	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.7
UB	78	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.4	7.0
UMES	130	7.4	7.1	8.1	7.6	7.7
Comprehensive Overall	1,424	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.0	7.2
UMBC	334	6.4	6.3	6.6	7.1	6.9
UMCP	1,174	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.5
Research Overall	1,509	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.8

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: USM Board of Regents standard instructional expectations are 7.5 course units for comprehensive institutions and 5.5 course units for research institutions.

Alternatively, when all core instructional faculty (tenured/tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track instructional faculty) are included, four of the nine institutions met expectations. Table 2 shows the average course units taught by core instructional faculty. In the 2017-2018 academic year, the total course units taught by core faculty averaged 7.2 at the comprehensive institutions and 5.9 at the research institutions.

Table 2

Trends in Average Course Units Taught by Core Faculty (AY 2013-2014 to 2017-2018)

	FTEF	Course Units per FTEF				
	2017-2018	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
BSU	190	7.5	7.6	8.0	7.3	7.8
CSU	145	9.3	9.3	9.0	8.1	8.5
FSU	224	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.3
SU	343	7.4	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.3
TU	765	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2
UB	92	7.1	7.0	6.7	6.9	7.3
UMES	181	7.4	7.0	8.2	7.2	7.4
Comprehensive Overall	1,939	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.4
UMBC	470	6.6	6.5	7.0	7.2	7.2
UMCP	1,467	5.6	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.6
Research Overall	1,937	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.8	6.0

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: USM Board of Regents standard instructional expectations are 7.5 course units for comprehensive institutions and 5.5 course units for research institutions.

Table 3 displays how the results differ for tenured/tenure-track faculty when course exceptions are included in the calculation of course units for an institution. After accounting for the work activities of research, non-course based instruction, and sabbatical to pursue scholarship, five of the nine institutions met the Board of Regents' expectations. After all exceptions are considered (including departmental administration and service work), eight of the nine institutions met the expectations.

Table 3

Average Course Units Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty with Exceptions (AY 2017-2018)

	FTEF	Course Units with No Exceptions Included	Course Units with Research, Instruction, Sabbatical Exceptions Included	Course Units with All Exceptions Included
BSU	142	7.2	7.4	8.1
CSU	138	7.8	7.8	7.9
FSU	185	7.1	7.3	7.8
SU	264	7.3	7.8	8.0
TU	486	6.5	6.7	7.3
UB	78	6.8	7.0	7.6
UMES	130	7.4	8.9	9.4
Comprehensive Overall	1,424	7.0	7.4	7.8
UMBC	334	6.4	6.7	7.2
UMCP	1,174	5.4	6.0	6.7
Research Overall	1,509	5.6	6.2	6.8

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: USM Board of Regents standard instructional expectations are 7.5 course units for comprehensive institutions and 5.5 course units for research institutions.

Credit Hour Measures

Course unit is the prescribed measure in the governing policy on faculty workload, but it is only one of several measures that can be used to consider the instructional activity and effectiveness of faculty. A second key measure is the production of credit hours. Credit hours are the sum of the course hours of all the students taking a class. For example, a 3-credit course with ten students produces thirty credit hours.

Average Credit Hour Generation Per Faculty

The reported credit hours include instructional, research, and sabbatical exceptions. Table 4 displays the average credit hours generated over the past five years by tenured/tenure-track faculty. Overall, there is a slight decrease in credit hours produced as compared to last year. Three institutions did report more credit hours in 2017-2018 as compared to 2016-2017. Table 5, which includes all core faculty, indicates that five of the nine institutions generated more credit hours in 2017-2018 as compared to 2016-2017. Notably, the average credit hours have declined for all institutions over the five-year period, and that trend occurs with both tenured/tenure-track faculty and with core faculty.

Table 4

Trends in Average Credit Hours Generated by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
BSU	388	463	454	402	547
CSU	296	308	316	316	299
FSU	405	401	472	480	505
SU	512	522	522	530	561
TU	399	396	402	423	406
UB	364	366	379	375	410
UMBC	326	350	359	346	383
UMCP	396	412	405	420	426
UMES	689	604	638	684	742

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Table 5

Trends in Average Credit Hours Generated by All Core Faculty

	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014
BSU	410	482	475	422	573
CSU	295	306	313	311	298
FSU	418	411	482	476	477
SU	529	518	537	528	565
TU	420	419	434	442	427
UB	384	377	380	402	407
UMBC	470	482	475	465	497
UMCP	509	525	517	521	524
UMES	671	585	637	615	701

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Total Credit Hour Production

Reports of student enrollment and credit hour production can provide a general sense of whether teaching is keeping pace with enrollment. Overall, enrollment has increased (see Table 6). Specific institutions, however, have had a lower enrollment when comparing their enrollment in FY 2013 versus FY 2018. Credit hours have also increased overall, with five of the nine institutions reporting an increase in credit hours generated.

Table 6

Change in Fall Headcount Enrollment and Total Credit Hours (FY 2013 versus FY 2018)

	Enrollment	Total SCH
BSU	13.4%	16.9%
CSU	-19.9%	6.1%
FSU	-0.5%	-3.9%
SU	0.7%	3.2%
TU	3.4%	-2.2%
UB	-15.1%	-7.3%
UMBC	0.2%	0.5%
UMCP	8.8%	3.9%
UMES	-21.6%	-21.1%
Overall	2.0%	0.9%

Sources: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload and USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Table 7 illustrates the degree to which different types of faculty are responsible for the production of credit hours. Core faculty (including tenured/tenure-track and full time non-tenure track faculty) account for 64% of all credit hours generated. Of note, tenured/tenure-track faculty are producing fewer credit hours compared to five years ago, while full-time non-tenure track faculty are producing over 18% more. Specific institutions do differ from this trend.

Table 7

Percentage of Credit Hours Produced by Type of Faculty (FY 2018) and 5-Year Percent Change

	Tenured/ Tenure Track (T/TT)	Full Time Non-TT	Part-time	5-Year Change in % Taught by T/TT Faculty	5-Year Change in % Taught by Full Time Non-TT Faculty	5-Year Change in % Taught by Part-Time Faculty
BSU	35%	15%	44%	-8.7%	-7.8%	52.9%
CSU	56%	3%	35%	9.4%	-41.3%	3.2%
FSU	58%	15%	21%	-5.9%	18.9%	-5.0%
SU	54%	19%	22%	4.1%	9.5%	-1.0%
TU	38%	27%	33%	-4.1%	15.5%	-11.7%
UB	43%	10%	43%	13.0%	-22.8%	-20.4%
UMBC	29%	32%	33%	-7.7%	17.3%	-3.7%
UMCP	38%	25%	29%	-8.9%	35.5%	8.2%
UMES	52%	23%	21%	-5.6%	-19.1%	-44.3%
Overall	40%	24%	30%	-4.9%	18.4%	-0.9%

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: Other faculty (including department chairs, non-tenure track research or public service faculty, and teaching assistants) account for 6% of the credit hours produced.

Student Outcomes

Course units and credit hours are measures of production efficiency within the system. Student outcomes, such as number of degrees awarded and graduation rates, are also useful indicators. An increase or decrease in the number of degree recipients reflects the institution's growth in enrollment, their level of success in retaining students to graduation, and the faculty's productivity.

The number of graduating students has risen in recent years and is at the highest level yet achieved by the USM. Table 8 displays the number of degree recipients at USM institutions for the last five years.

Table 8

Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Awarded (FY 2014-2018)

	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
BSU	781	713	832	801	741
CSU	399	421	464	416	478
FSU	1,027	1,060	964	1,032	1,011
SU	1,873	2,026	1,982	1,935	1,899
TU	4,609	4,628	4,428	4,422	4,291
UB	711	755	721	694	665
UMBC	2,578	2,572	2,521	2,432	2,250
UMCP	7,559	7,292	7,253	7,166	7,279
UMES	482	514	574	577	585
Overall	20,019	19,981	19,739	19,475	19,199

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

The ability of students to rapidly and successfully matriculate is also dependent on the efficiency and productivity of the faculty, the quality of advising, and the appropriateness of course offerings. Effectiveness and Efficiency efforts implemented by the USM Board of Regents identified improving student time-to-degree as a major academic initiative.

Notably, in recent years, USM overall has seen progress in this area. Table 9a illustrates changes in the four-year graduation rates and Table 9b documents changes in the six-year graduation rates. Although graduation rates reflect only a part of the larger picture (and transfers are not included), they are a useful measure of efficiency of matriculation and speed to degree.

Table 9a

Four-Year Graduation Rate by Entering Year

	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
BSU	17%	16%	16%	15%	13%
CSU	12%	12%	9%	9%	6%
FSU	27%	27%	29%	27%	23%
SU	49%	52%	50%	50%	49%
TU	47%	45%	46%	45%	44%
UB	18%	17%	15%	8%	12%
UMBC	42%	39%	40%	36%	34%
UMCP	65%	66%	66%	63%	65%
UMES	21%	21%	22%	20%	17%
All USM	47%	46%	46%	44%	43%

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Note: Percentages reflect graduation anywhere in USM for all First-time Full-time Freshmen

Table 9b

Six-Year Graduation Rate by Entering Year

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
BSU	46%	42%	41%	44%	37%
CSU	21%	23%	20%	19%	18%
FSU	57%	56%	55%	61%	55%
SU	71%	76%	74%	74%	72%
TU	75%	74%	72%	73%	70%
UB	41%	34%	36%	38%	48%
UMBC	68%	65%	66%	65%	66%
UMCP	86%	85%	86%	86%	85%
UMES	44%	42%	42%	37%	41%
All USM	70%	70%	68%	69%	66%

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Note: Percentages reflect graduation anywhere in USM for all First-time Full-time Freshmen

Instructional Faculty Workload at the University of Maryland, Baltimore

The Maryland General Assembly requires the USM to include information regarding the workload of the University of Maryland, Baltimore in the faculty workload report each year. UMB applies a different set of standards for judging faculty workload that are more appropriate for its professional schools. UMB reports that 96% 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.

SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND SERVICE PRODUCTIVITY

Table 10 is a summary of the scholarship and service activity of the USM faculty from degree-granting institutions (including UMB). During the 2017-2018 academic year, USM faculty published 668 books and over 12,000 peer-reviewed articles. Faculty also participated in over 18,000 professional presentations and creative activities combined. The average USM faculty member spent almost eleven days in public service to businesses, government, schools, and non-profit organizations.

Table 10

Scholarship and Service of the USM Faculty (Academic Year 2017-2018)

	Number of Books Published	Number of Refereed Publications	Number of Non-Refereed Publications	Number of Creative Activities	Number of Professional Presentations	Days in Public Service per FTEF
Comprehensive						
BSU	7	43	42	85	126	10.0
CSU	1	94	59	35	56	14.2
FSU	12	121	89	278	199	8.1
SU	32	255	101	172	446	11.1
TU	66	859	259	936	730	13.0
UB	10	62	65	28	52	5.0
UMES	10	113	56	72	300	6.6
Research						
UMB	239	5,179	972	852	3,709	9.6
UMBC	36	577	195	241	1,436	6.5
UMCP	255	5,249	1,734	1,939	6,907	24.3
Overall	668	12,552	3,572	4,638	13,961	10.8

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: Includes tenured/tenure track, department chairs, and full time non-tenure/non-tenure-track instructional and research faculty from all departments for the entire institution.

External Funding

Securing external funding for research and other activities is an important aspect of faculty work and is often seen as a proxy measure for research productivity. It is also 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. 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.

Table 11 records the level of external funding received by USM institutions, as reported by each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs. Throughout the 2017-2018 academic year, the USM was awarded over \$1.37 billion in external awards. This represents a 9.8% change from the 2016-2017 academic year.

Table 11
Faculty Research Awards

	FY 2018	FY 2017	FY 2016	FY 2015	FY 2014
Comprehensive					
BSU	\$10,025,960	\$8,750,023	\$7,988,546	\$8,786,813	\$7,532,576
CSU	\$6,524,176	\$7,765,864	\$5,850,572	\$6,815,776	\$7,669,565
FSU	\$2,041,543	\$7,818,382	\$3,279,980	\$6,975,842	\$3,578,720
SU	\$5,141,941	\$5,760,833	\$4,584,488	\$4,882,812	\$5,019,735
TU	\$12,953,604	\$10,439,414	\$16,789,859	\$17,729,843	\$14,447,113
UB	\$13,387,065	\$10,582,279	\$7,729,907	\$7,399,317	\$6,095,525
UMES	\$15,601,754	\$19,728,418	\$17,827,443	\$21,224,282	\$17,629,598
Research					
UMB	\$664,599,070	\$553,170,320	\$494,477,177	\$497,918,281	\$500,912,032
UMBC	\$77,180,308	\$92,193,683	\$76,215,884	\$71,134,098	\$74,026,763
UMCP	\$538,013,239	\$509,225,382	\$554,177,223	\$545,633,305	\$479,069,009
UMCES	\$26,833,197	\$24,739,098	\$24,815,908	\$24,508,834	\$23,783,962
Overall	\$1,372,301,857	\$1,250,173,696	\$1,213,736,987	\$1,213,009,203	\$1,139,764,598

Source: Annual Extramural Awards Survey, "Total Less Other USM"

SUMMARY

This report provided summary data about the University System of Maryland for the 2017-2018 academic year. The data indicated that some USM institutions were able to improve their course units taught per faculty as compared to the 2016-2017 year. When no exceptions were considered, many comprehensive institutions remained below the Board of Regents' policy target. However, if allowed exceptions were considered, the majority of institutions did meet or exceed the expectations. This trend reflects the assignment of tenured/tenure-track faculty to a wide variety of responsibilities on campus.

Average credit hours generated by both tenured/tenure-track faculty and core faculty have decreased over the five-year span. Enrollment has increased and the proportion of credit hour production for tenured/tenure-track faculty has decreased. Institutions were more often relying non-tenure track full-time faculty to teach, and therefore the proportion of credit hours taught by full time non-tenure track faculty increased.

The outcomes of faculty instructional activity continued to be strong. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded continued to rise. Students continued to move efficiently through most USM institutions as indicated by improved four-year graduation rates. Non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) remained at a very high level. Finally, external research funding rose to over \$1.37 billion in the last year.

APPENDIX A: FACULTY PROFILE

USM Faculty Complement

This appendix provides an overview of the faculty complement at USM institutions included in this report. In 2017-2018, the USM had an instructional complement of 7,655 faculty. Table A-1 provides a detailed breakdown of these faculty by tenure status, and full or part time employment status.

Table A-1

USM Faculty Profile (Academic Year 2017-2018)

	Tenured/ Tenure Track	Full Time Non-Tenure Track Instructional	Part-time	All Faculty
BSU	126	87	231	444
CSU	112	9	125	246
FSU	208	41	141	390
SU	347	87	230	664
TU	596	308	807	1711
UB	153	35	233	421
UMCP	1397	431	803	2631
UMBC	403	147	291	841
UMES	149	60	98	307
Overall	3,491	1,205	2,959	7,655

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty remained essentially the same from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018. Table A-2 displays the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of that category of faculty.

Table A-2

Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

	2017-2018	2016-2017	2012-2013	1-Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track	5-Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track
BSU	126	137	158	-8.0%	-20.3%
CSU	112	120	135	-6.7%	-17.0%
FSU	208	219	212	-5.0%	-1.9%
SU	347	324	312	7.1%	11.2%
TU	596	593	594	0.5%	0.3%
UB	153	160	166	-4.4%	-7.8%
UMCP	1397	1382	1390	1.1%	0.5%
UMBC	403	396	375	1.8%	7.5%
UMES	149	161	153	-7.5%	-2.6%
Overall	3,491	3,492	3,495	0.0%	-0.1%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

Full-time Instructional Non-Tenure Track faculty

The total number of full-time instructional non-tenure track faculty increased dramatically in recent years. In the period from 2012-2013 through 2017-2018, the numbers increased by 239 or almost 25%. Table A-3 displays the number of full time instructional non-tenure track faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of that category of faculty.

Table A-3

Full-Time Instructional Non-Tenure Track Faculty

	2017-2018	2016-2017	2012-2013	1-Year Change in Non Tenure Track	5-Year Change in Non Tenure Track
BSU	87	82	58	6.1%	50.0%
CSU	9	12	21	-25.0%	-57.1%
FSU	41	40	33	2.5%	24.2%
SU	87	86	91	1.2%	-4.4%
TU	308	309	254	-0.3%	21.3%
UB	35	35	31	0.0%	12.9%
UMCP	431	421	287	2.4%	50.2%
UMBC	147	142	127	3.5%	15.7%
UMES	60	58	64	3.4%	-6.3%
Overall	1205	1185	966	1.7%	24.7%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

Part-time Faculty

Finally, part-time faculty continue to play an important role in instruction at USM institutions. The number of part-time faculty increased (3.9%) from 2016-2017, which is similar to the five-year trend. Table A-4 displays the number of part-time faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of that category of faculty.

Table A-4

Part-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty

	2017-2018	2016-2017	2012-2013	1-Year Change in Part-Time	5-Year Change in Part-Time
BSU	231	222	192	4.1%	20.3%
CSU	125	135	152	-7.4%	-17.8%
FSU	141	128	133	10.2%	6.0%
SU	230	226	257	1.8%	-10.5%
TU	807	758	795	6.5%	1.5%
UB	233	223	206	4.5%	13.1%
UMBC	803	772	698	4.0%	15.0%
UMCP	291	278	280	4.7%	3.9%
UMES	98	107	128	-8.4%	-23.4%
Overall	2,959	2,849	2,841	3.9%	4.2%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)