

THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT

ON THE

INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY



Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy
November 14, 2011

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

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011

SUMMARY

Some highlights of this year's report include:

- Total Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty rose by 11 or .3%, while FTE student enrollment rose by 1,100 or 1.3% in AY 2010-2011
- Tenure Track Faculty continue to meet overall workload demands at 8 of 9 institutions detailed in this report (see table 1)
- Tenure Track Faculty at the Comprehensive Universities as a group met the required Course Unit levels for the first time in three years, Research institutions exceeded their requirement again this year (see table 3)
- When all Core faculty were included in Course Unit calculations, all institutions met or exceed required levels (see table 4)
- Faculty are teaching more students. 5 of 9 institutions saw the average semester credit hours generated per tenure track faculty member rise, and 7 of 9 for all core faculty (see table 5 and 6)
- Total bachelor's degrees awarded continues to rise rapidly with 1,000 more degrees awarded in the most recent year than 5 years earlier (see table 7)
- Time to degree and completion of degrees in 4 years remain at excellent levels, time to degree is at lowest since at least the mid-1980's (see table 8 and 9)
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels with more than 810 books and nearly 11,000 refereed articles published in 2010-2011
- Faculty secured 1.2 billion dollars in research funding, a very high level but a decline of 5% from last year's record

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011

INTRODUCTION

The workload of faculty in the University System of Maryland is governed by a series of policies which are overseen by the USM Board of Regents and which 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. These policies were initially adopted in 1994 under the overall heading: *Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities*. This document was amended in 1999. It was further amended in 2003-2004 as part of the USM Effectiveness and Efficiency process. Prior to this last amendment, 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.

An annual report has been issued since 1994 which synthesizes and scores instructional activities. This 17th annual report provides summary data on faculty activity at USM degree-granting institutions for the academic year 2010-2011. As recommended by the USM Effectiveness and Efficiency Workgroup and the policy changes adopted by the Board of Regents in 2003-2004, the report focuses on faculty productivity at the institutional level rather than the individual level, attempts to characterize the full range of instructional productivity by using a variety of instructional workload metrics (including course assignments, credit hours and degrees awarded), and includes data on the contributions of full-time non-tenured/non-tenure track faculty when calculating an institution's instructional effort and workload averages. The key 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.

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 - 2010-2011 Faculty Composition of USM Comprehensive and Research Institutions (Headcount excluding UMB and UMUC)

Faculty Type	Research		Comprehensive		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured/Tenure Track *	1,845	39%	1,688	42%	3,533	40%
FT NT/NTT Instructional	385	8%	550	14%	935	11%
FT NT/NTT Research	1,660	35%	5	<1%	1,665	19%
Part-time	877	18%	1,761	44%	2,638	30%
Total	4,767		4,004		8,771	

* Includes those with primary assignments of Instruction or Research

Source: MHEC Employee Data System (EDS)

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.

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty rose from 3,522 to 3,533 from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011. This represents an increase of 11 (a .3% increase) tenure-track faculty members in a year which saw an increase of more than 1,100 FTE students (a 1.3% increase) system-wide (excluding UMUC and UMB).

The core of any university is its complement of tenured/tenure-track faculty. As such, it is a key measure of the quality of instruction. In addition, it has considerable implications on a campus for the performance of other faculty members as the tenured/tenure-track faculty oversee departmental and discipline curriculum and advising. They also participate

in university committees and department service activities. It can also be taken as an indicator of funding and reflects a university's priorities in the use of resources.

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 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.

2010-2011 INSTRUCTIONAL AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

The remainder of this report for the 2010-2011 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.

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. 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 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 1.5/1 and met 154% of the Regent's policy expectations. 8 of 9 institutions exceeded expectations, and collectively USM faculty in 2010-2011 exceeded the Regents' expectations, as set by Regents' policy.

Table 2 - Percent of Expected Course Units taught, by Institution (2010-2011)

Institution	Total # of Depts.	Total FTEF	Expected CUs	Actual CUs	% of Expectations Met
Bowie	17	145	988	1189	120%
Coppin	18	125	892	1014	114%
Frostburg	26	182	1250	1365	109%
Salisbury	27	233	1419	1757	124%
Towson	32	468	3174	3263	103%
UB	7	56	409	380	93%
UMES	19	123	595	939	158%
All Comprehensives	146	1332	8727	9907	114%
UMBC	34	334	1591	2204	139%
UMCP	62	1145	4213	6730	160%
All Research	96	1479	5804	8934	154%

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 2010-2011 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 6.0 course units. In 2010-2011, 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 reported lower than expected faculty workload by this measure. At Towson University, this reflects a number of trends including increased research activity (which rose by 18% over the last two years even as other institutions have struggled to maintain current levels, see table 10) and the institutional development of a trimester program. At the University of Baltimore, ongoing reorganization of the institutions academic programs and departments continues to frustrate efforts to meet required levels. 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. Even within the small complement of faculty covered by the policy requirements of other disciplinary accreditors have limited UB's ability to improve attainment and led to the lowest levels in five years.

Table 3 - Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2006-2007 thru 2010-2011)

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
INSTITUTIONS	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF
BSU	7.9	7.9	7.5	7.3	8.2
CSU	8.5	8.5	7.9	7.9	8.1
FSU	7.7	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.5
SU	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.6	7.6
TU	7.0	6.9	7.0	7.0	7.1
UB	6.7	7.3	7.1	7.1	6.8
UMES	7.8	7.4	7.7	8.4	7.7
Comprehensives					
Avg.	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.5
UMBC	5.8	6.0	6.1	6.6	6.6
UMCP	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.8	5.9
Research Avg.¹	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.0	6.0

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. Table 4 shows the average course units taught by these two groups of full-time instructional faculty combined. In AY 2010-2011, 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 6.1 at the research institutions.

Table 4 - Average Course Units Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track & FT Non-tenured/Non-tenure-track Instructional Faculty (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)

Institution	2009-2010			2010-2011		
	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's	FTEF	CU's	AVG CU's
BSU	177	1,338	7.6	206	1,702	8.3
CSU	141	1,485	10.5	135	1,210	9.0
FSU	219	1,632	7.5	218	1,627	7.5
SU	307	2,340	7.6	310	2,388	7.7
TU	694	5,090	7.3	690	5,284	7.7
UB	69	529	7.6	61	476	7.8
UMES	143	1,331	9.3	174	1,409	8.1
Comprehensives	1,750	13,745	7.9	1,794	14,096	7.9
UMBC	422	2,861	6.5	432	3,001	6.9
UMCP	1,368	7,950	5.8	1,369	8,006	5.8
Research*	1,790	10,810	6.0	1,801	11,007	6.1

* 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 2010-2011, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions semester credit hour productivity varied considerably but rose at 5 of 9 institutions indicating faculty are teaching larger classes. Table 6 includes full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members and reflects this same increase at 7 of 9 institutions. These data can be interpreted to imply that USM institutions are feeling increasing pressure to increase class sizes and that these class sizes may be rising slowly in the face of ongoing economic pressure.

Table 5 - Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2008-2009 thru 2010-2011)*

Institution	2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	128	521	137	550	145	461	509
CSU	119	289	126	299	125	343	311
FSU	183	488	186	496	182	503	496
SU	205	528	228	552	233	557	546
TU	453	417	475	419	468	425	420
UB	45	444	45	392	56	381	404
UMBC	320	368	326	371	334	371	370
UMCP	1171	492	1153	511	1145	500	501
UMES	100	448	101	725	123	896	690

* 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 (2008-2009 thru 2010-2011)*

Institution	2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	178	575	177	570	206	506	548
CSU	134	276	141	284	135	382	314
FSU	215	486	219	491	218	498	492
SU	278	527	307	546	310	560	545
TU	663	436	694	439	690	449	441
UB	66	444	69	418	61	496	451
UMBC	421	463	422	465	432	474	467
UMCP	1392	555	1368	580	1,369	572	569
UMES	156	471	143	744	174	789	668

* 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 93% 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. More than half of the faculty exemptions from teaching the standard load did so 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 steadily in recent years and is at the highest level yet achieved by the USM. Table 7 reports the degrees recipients at USM institutions for the last 5 years.

Table 7 - Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Recipients (FY 2006-2010)

Institution	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
BSU	610	621	615	613	606
CSU	335	375	290	354	377
FSU	848	796	789	752	767
SU	1,387	1,420	1,512	1,557	1,615
TU	3,164	3,120	3,167	3,358	3,610
UB	496	507	517	528	516
UMBC	1,720	1,914	1,844	1,798	1,839
UMCP	5,939	5,749	5,936	6,301	6,174
UMES	452	436	448	429	463
Total	14,951	14,938	15,118	15,690	15,967

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 maintained a very rapid time-to-degree although it has retreated somewhat from the best performance achieved last year. This may represent the impact of reduced course offerings in the face of the difficult financial straits and may also indicate the limits of reduction of time to degree under current academic program structures and organization. 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						
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
BSU	9.7	10.0	9.6	10.0	9.7	9.5	9.5
CSU	10.8	10.3	9.8	10.3	10.0	10.3	9.5
FSU	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1
SU	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.3
TU	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.7
UMBC	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.2	9.1	9.2	8.8
UMCP	9.1	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.4	8.4
UMES	9.2	9.1	9.0	9.0	8.8	8.7	8.6
All USM	9.2	9.0	8.9	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.6

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				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
BSU	18%	14%	15%	23%	11%
CSU	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%
FSU	24%	24%	24%	21%	19%
SU	46%	48%	49%	48%	50%
TU	38%	44%	39%	40%	38%
UMBC	31%	35%	35%	34%	37%
UMCP	57%	58%	58%	61%	59%
UMES	21%	20%	20%	14%	14%
All USM	39%	41%	40%	41%	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 have only recently begun admitting first-time freshmen students.

2010-2011 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 2010-2011, USM faculty published 810 books and early 11,000 peer-reviewed articles and made or participated in more than 15,000 professional presentations and creative activities. These levels remain at among the highest levels 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 2010-2011, the USM was awarded nearly 1.2 billion dollars in external awards which represents a decline of approximately 5% or 60 million dollars. This, in part, represents the end of the Federal economic stimulus funding. Despite this decline, the level remains higher than in 2008-2009, and represents the second highest level of achievement ever in this area. These data reflect the overall grants and contract productivity for each institution. This represents the highest total achieved in the USM, both at the research and at the comprehensive institutions. 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 2010-2011

	# 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	223	7	50	20	38	119	10.2	\$18,414,542
CSU	153	1	66	91	36	159	18.8	XXXXXXXXXX
FSU	244	17	159	197	296	211	13.6	\$2,834,786
SU	374	16	200	146	282	348	11.2	\$3,414,321
TU	815	91	767	339	1061	857	15.3	\$30,252,411
UB	190	32	174	193	99	213	11.0	\$5,571,603
UMES	200	6	116	55	119	247	8.9	\$23,314,434
<i>Research</i>								
UMB	1,713	242	4,996	1,124	4,133	3,840	9.0	\$587,353,266
UMBC	485	86	833	102	536	1,398	8.0	\$79,969,483
UMCP	1,994	312	3,531	6,707	337	832	25.7	\$468,377,525
Total USM	6,391	810	10,892	8,974	6,937	8,224	15.6	\$1,219,502,371

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey (all categories except External Grants and Contracts), 2010 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 2010-2011. The data indicate that in 2010-2011 individual USM institutions have, in all but a few instances, successfully met the goals set by Regents' policy often in the face of fiscal strictures. Overall, the core faculty collectively met the expected instructional productivity standards in most categories at both the comprehensive and research institutions. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded continued to rise rapidly in the past year. The improvement in the "through-put" of students through the system as demonstrated by reduced time to degree and improved 4 year graduation rates remains at a very high level. Finally, non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) remains at impressive levels, and external research funding remained very strong at over 1.2 billion dollars in the last year.