



TOPIC: Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty

COMMITTEE: Education Policy and Student Life

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: November 4, 2014

SUMMARY: At this meeting, the Committee will review the twenty-first 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.

The Regents' policy on faculty workload states "the focus of external accountability (to the Regents and the State) will be the department or academic unit and not the individual faculty member." By differentially assigning faculty to meet instructional, scholarly/research/creative, and service functions, the chair maximizes the resources of the department and ensures that its mission is achieved.

Overall, the results indicate substantial success both in meeting the explicit workload goals and in generally improving productivity. Highlights include:

- Total Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty complement fell by 16 or .5%, while FTE student enrollment rose by 595 or nearly 1% in AY 2013-2014,
- The USM Research institutions collectively met the expected instructional productivity standards (averaging 5.7 courses per faculty member),
- The USM Comprehensive institutions collectively fell below the target (7.2 courses per faculty member),
- The time-to-degree reached a new record low last year (8.5 semesters), and
- USM levels of grants and other research awards rose 1% and remained over 1.1 billion dollars.

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 4, 2014

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joann Boughman 301-445-1992
Joseph F. Vivona 301-445-1923

jboughman@usmd.edu
jvivona@usmd.edu

THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

ON THE

INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY



Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy and Student Life
November 4, 2014

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

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-2014

SUMMARY

Some highlights of this year's report include:

- Total Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty fell by 16 or .5%, while FTE student enrollment rose by 595 or nearly 1% in AY 2013-2014.
- FTE tenure-track faculty rose by 2.5% over the past five years while FTE students rose by 5.2%.
- Tenure Track Faculty continue to meet overall workload policy expectations at 7 of 9 institutions detailed in this report (see table 2)
- Tenure Track Faculty at the Comprehensive Universities as a group averaged 7.2 Course Units per faculty member. Research institutions exceeded their requirement again this year with an average of 5.7 Course units (see table 3)
- For Tenured/Tenure-track faculty in Course Unit calculations, 6 of 9 institutions met or exceed required levels (see table 3)
- Total bachelor's degrees awarded continues to rise rapidly with 450 more degrees awarded in the most recent year than last year and nearly 2,700 more than 5 years earlier (see table 7)
- Time to degree and completion of degrees in 4 years remain at excellent levels, time to degree remains at among the lowest level since at least the mid-1980's (see table 8 and 9)
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels with nearly 700 books and more than 13,000 refereed articles published in 2013-2014
- Faculty secured 1.1 billion dollars in research funding, an increase of 2% from last year's figure

USM FACULTY WORKLOAD REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-2014

INTRODUCTION

The workload of faculty in the University System of Maryland is governed by a series of policies overseen by the USM Board of Regents and 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 21st annual report provides summary data on faculty activity at USM degree-granting institutions for the academic year 2013-2014. 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 (including 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 - 2013-2014 Faculty Composition of USM Comprehensive and Research Institutions (Headcount excluding UMB and UMUC)

Faculty Type	Research		Comprehensive		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenured/Tenure Track *	1,864	38%	1,725	41%	3,589	40%
FT NT/NTT Instructional	444	9%	598	14%	1,042	11%
FT NT/NTT Research	1,596	33%	6	<1%	1,602	18%
Part-time	938	19%	1,908	45%	2,846	31%
Total	4,842		4,237		9,079	

* Includes those with primary assignments of Instruction or Research

Source: MHEC Employee Data System (EDS)

Table 1 depicts the mix of faculty at 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 declined from 3,605 to 3,589 from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014. This represents a decrease of 16 tenure-track faculty members, or around .5%, in a year which saw an increase of 595 FTE students (a nearly 1% increase) system-wide. Over the past five years, FTE students have risen by 5.2% with FTE tenure-track faculty rising more slowly at 2.5% (excluding UMUC and UMB).

The core of any university is its complement of tenured/tenure-track faculty. As such, it is a key indicator 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.

2013-2014 INSTRUCTIONAL AND NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

The remainder of this report for the 2013-2014 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 109% of Regents policy expectations and those at the research institutions produced a ratio of 1.5/1 and met 147% of the Regent's policy expectations. 7 of 9 institutions exceeded expectations, and collectively USM faculty in 2013-2014 exceeded the Regents' expectations, as set by Regents' policy.

Table 2 - Percent of Expected Course Units taught, by Institution (2013-2014)

Institution	Total # of Depts.	Total FTEF	Expected CUs	Actual CUs	% of Expectations Met
Bowie	17	148	912	1127	124%
Coppin	13	136	1011	1064	105%
Frostburg	22	149	1002	1110	111%
Salisbury	24	236	1441	1701	118%
Towson	34	478	3345	3225	96%
UB	7	72	504	500	99%
UMES	18	130	682	1004	147%
All Comprehensives	135	1349	8897	9731	109%
UMBC	34	342	1575	2208	140%
UMCP	65	1186	4389	6548	149%
All Research	99	1528	5964	8756	147%

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, FSU, 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

The most rigorous measure of faculty workload, which discounts virtually all exemptions, is the 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 2013-2014 academic year, tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.2 course units while the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 5.7 course units. In 2013-2014, 5 of 9 USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members at or above the expectation.

Although the course units per faculty members are below the expected values for a number of institutions, two issues have continued to hold down total figures and generating a decline. First, growth of high demand departments and colleges serving large numbers of upper division students including healthcare and education has impacted average courses per faculty. These disciplines, in many cases, have limiting accreditation requirements, and as they become a larger portion of the total have depressed the totals. They also require greater levels of experiential and clinical involvement by faculty, which are not as effectively translated by current workload scoring. The second trend is time devoted to curricular and course redesign is increasing and not accounted for and reorganization around new approaches to teaching are not well captured in the current reporting. It is unclear what the magnitude of this second trend is but it is likely to increase as the work on academic transformation proceeds.

Table 3 - Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2009-2010 thru 2013-2014)

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
INSTITUTIONS	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF
BSU	7.3	8.2	7.5	7.6	7.6
CSU	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.0	7.8
FSU	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.5
SU	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.3	7.2
TU	7.0	7.1	7.0	6.8	6.7
UB	7.1	6.8	6.6	6.2	7.0
UMES	8.4	7.7	7.6	7.9	7.7
Comprehensives Avg.	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.2	7.2
UMBC	6.6	6.6	6.8	6.6	6.5
UMCP	5.8	5.9	5.6	5.5	5.5
Research Avg.¹	6.0	6.0	5.9	5.7	5.7

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 2013-2014, the total course units taught by tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty averaged 7.4 at the comprehensive institutions and 5.9 at the research institutions.

Table 4 - Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track & FT Non-tenured/Non-tenure-track Instructional Faculty (2009-2010 thru 2013-2014)

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
INSTITUTIONS	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF	CU /FTEF
BSU	7.6	8.3	7.7	8.0	7.8
CSU	10.5	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.5
FSU	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.3
SU	7.6	7.7	7.8	7.4	7.3
TU	7.3	7.7	7.4	7.3	7.2
UB	7.6	7.8	6.5	6.4	7.3
UMES	9.3	8.1	7.6	8.1	7.4
Comprehensives Avg.	7.9	7.9	7.6	7.5	7.4
UMBC	6.5	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9
UMCP	5.8	5.8	5.6	5.6	5.6
Research Avg.¹	6.0	6.1	5.9	5.9	5.9

* Research Universities may include only State Supported FTE at their discretion in addition to Full-time Non-tenured

Note: FSU, SU, TU 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 semester credit hours (SCH) generated over the past three years by tenured/tenure-track faculty. In 2013-2014, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions semester credit hour productivity varied considerably but remained largely stable at 6 of 9 institutions. Table 6 includes full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members and reflects this same trend at 7 of 9 institutions. These data can be interpreted to imply that USM institutions are successfully managing faculty and maintaining class size and distribution at the level established over the last several years.

Table 5 - Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2011-2012 thru 2013-2014)*

Institution	2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	143	526	149	446	148	547	506
CSU	126	263	131	291	136	299	284
FSU	186	496	185	496	149	505	499
SU	223	606	238	560	236	561	576
TU	473	402	482	422	478	406	410
UB	58	404	64	366	72	410	393
UMBC	335	363	336	345	342	357	355
UMCP	1,186	491	1,199	470	1,186	445	467
UMES	114	448	130	708	130	742	633

* 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. FSU, SU, TU 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 (2011-2012 thru 2013-2014)*

Institution	2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		3 year
	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	FTEF	Avg. SCH	Avg. SCH
BSU	199	561	193	479	193	573	538
CSU	146	255	146	283	144	298	279
FSU	218	494	220	492	181	477	488
SU	298	615	324	536	308	565	572
TU	704	425	716	440	737	427	431
UB	72	419	81	381	91	407	402
UMBC	440	456	450	469	457	473	466
UMCP	1,429	568	1,454	553	1,419	547	556
UMES	143	542	178	733	202	701	659

* 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. FSU, SU, TU 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 95% 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 Awarded (FY 2010-2014)

Institution	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
BSU	606	683	688	739	741
CSU	378	379	460	409	478
FSU	768	850	892	969	1,011
SU	1,661	1,709	1,787	1,872	1,899
TU	3,625	3,948	4,101	4,147	4,291
UB	516	631	625	670	665
UMBC	1,915	1,905	2,140	2,230	2,250
UMCP	6,569	6,987	7,043	7,192	7,279
UMES	463	506	627	514	585
Total	16,501	17,598	18,363	18,742	19,199

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	2004	2005	2006
BSU	9.7	10.0	9.6	10.0	9.7	9.5	9.5	9.9	9.2	9.3
CSU	10.8	10.3	9.8	10.3	10.0	10.3	9.5	10.5	9.9	9.5
FSU	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.2	9.2	9.0
SU	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.3	8.1	8.5	8.1
TU	9.1	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.7	9.0	8.8	8.5
UMBC	9.4	9.3	9.1	9.2	9.1	9.2	8.8	9.1	9.0	8.6
UMCP	9.1	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.0
UMES	9.2	9.1	9.0	9.0	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.6	9.2	9.3
All USM	9.2	9.0	8.9	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.5

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				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BSU	23%	11%	14%	8%	12%
CSU	4%	5%	4%	4%	5%
FSU	21%	19%	24%	21%	23%
SU	48%	50%	49%	46%	47%
TU	40%	38%	39%	41%	44%
UB	n/a	n/a	19%	17%	9%
UMBC	34%	37%	35%	33%	35%
UMCP	61%	59%	61%	63%	65%
UMES	14%	14%	14%	19%	14%
All USM	41%	39%	40%	40%	43%

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. The USM Board of Regents receive more detailed data on retention and graduation, including 6-year graduation rates for freshmen and graduation rates for transfers in a separate report.

2013-2014 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 2013-2014, USM faculty published nearly 700 books and over 13,000 peer-reviewed articles and made or participated in more than 19,000 professional presentations and creative activities. The

average USM faculty member spent approximately 14 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 2013-2014, the USM was awarded over 1.1 billion dollars in external awards. This represents a small increase of approximately 2% or 24 million dollars. 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 2013-2014

	# 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	193	2	50	41	31	126	9.4	\$7,532,576
CSU	144	5	94	59	35	56	16.3	\$7,669,565
FSU	224	15	122	51	269	201	11.6	\$3,578,720
SU	357	15	260	106	219	438	12.3	\$5,019,735
TU	737	60	610	309	1,063	870	12.7	\$14,447,113
UB	160	29	283	237	122	260	12.4	\$6,095,525
UMES	202	8	176	77	92	310	8.8	\$17,629,598
<i>Research</i>								
UMB	1,810	259	5,609	810	2,301	3,790	10.2	\$500,912,032
UMBC	456	61	583	157	358	1,268	6.2	\$74,026,763
UMCP	2,036	332	5,262	1,084	356	7,048	35.0	\$479,069,009
UMCES								\$23,783,962
Total USM	6,259	786	13,049	2,931	4,846	14,367	13.5	\$1,139,764,598

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey (all categories except External Grants and Contracts), 2012 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 2013-2014. The data indicate that USM's Research institutions are successfully meeting the goals set by Regents' policy. Comprehensive institutions have, as a group, faced a greater challenge in meeting the goals, particularly with measures which do not consider appropriate exemptions. When a limited set of exemptions are considered only one institution did not meet its targets. Many of these challenges are predictable and institutions are likely to be able to improve against targets over time.

The results of faculty activity continue to be strong. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded continued to rise rapidly in the past year. Students continue to move through the system rapidly with a low time to an undergraduate degree and improved 4 year graduation rates. Non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) remains at a very high level. Finally, external research funding showed a small increase of 2% at over 1.1 billion dollars in the last year, the first increase in two years.