



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: November 17, 2015

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, the results indicate serious challenges to meeting the Board’s workload goals. Key findings include:

- Tenure Track Faculty fell below overall workload policy expectations at 6 of 9 institutions detailed in this report,
- 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 (7.0 courses per faculty member),
- Semester credit hour production has remained relatively stable in the last year but has fallen over the last five years,
- Outcomes remain strong with degrees awarded and 4 year graduation rate rising, and
- USM levels of grants and other research awards rose 6% and rose over 1.2 billion dollars for the first time in 4 years.

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 17, 2015

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joann Boughman
Joseph F. Vivona

301-445-1992
301-445-1923

jboughman@usmd.edu
jvivona@usmd.edu

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

Academic Year 2014-2015



**Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy and Student Life
November 17, 2015**

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

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY ACADEMIC YEAR 2014-2015

SUMMARY

Key findings of this year's report include:

- Tenure Track Faculty fell below overall workload policy expectations at 6 of 9 institutions detailed in this report (see table 1)
- Tenure Track Faculty at the Comprehensive Universities as a group averaged 7.0 Course Units per faculty member. On average, the Research institutions exceeded their requirement this year with an average of 5.7 Course units (see table 1)
- Core faculty (including all full-time instructional faculty) fell below expectations at 7 of 9 institutions detailed in this report (see table 2)
- Including critical exceptions, Tenured/Tenure-track faculty met expectations at 7 of 9 institutions, and when all instructional exceptions are included all institutions exceeded the workload expectations. (see table 3)
- Average credit hours produced per faculty member remained stable in the current year, although they have declined somewhat in recent years (see Table 4 and 5).
- Total bachelor's degrees awarded continues to rise rapidly with 276 more degrees awarded in the most recent year than last year and more than 1,800 above the level of 5 years earlier (see table 8)
- Time to degree and completion of degrees in 4 years remain at excellent levels, reflecting continued improvement in efficiency of student matriculation. (see table 9 and 10)
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels with nearly 650 books and more than 12,000 refereed articles published in 2014-2015 (see Table 11)
- Faculty secured 1.2 billion dollars in research funding, an increase of 6% from last year's figure (See Table 12)

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY ACADEMIC YEAR 2014-2015

INTRODUCTION

An annual report has been provided to the 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 2014-2015.

Governing Policies

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. The primary policy governing faculty workload is: USM Board of Regents 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 and 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 Regents' E&E 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 exceptions of UMB, UMUC, UB's School of Law, and departments and colleges for whom the standard would violate accreditation standards.

Measures and Definitions

For purposes of uniformity 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** – 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. A course unit is recorded equally for courses of all types and enrollment levels.
- **Semester Credit Hours** – Courses are measured in semester credit hours (or simply credit hours) based on time in classroom (e.g. 3 hours of class contact) multiplied by the total students enrolled in a course. The sum of the semester credit hours from all of the 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 including: research, instruction-related assignments, administrative and service duties, for sabbaticals, and for reasons of health or illness. When calculating

whether institutions are meeting their instructional workload goals exceptions are applied in various configurations to illustrate the work activities of faculty.

Type of faculty:

- Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty – This includes all persons (except the department chair) 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 – In this report all other categories of faculty are treated together and include Department Chairs, Non-Tenure Track Research or Public Service Faculty, and Teaching Assistants.

These categories vary from terminology used in the reporting process. Technical notes on faculty categories in reporting and additional information on the faculty complement for USM institutions can found in the appendices of this report.

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 semester credit hours delivered both per member and overall. Additionally, various student outcomes 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 USM Board of Regents as well as institutional policies. This report addresses how well the institutions meet the Board's expectations which are expressed in terms of course units, each of which is the equivalent of teaching a 3 hour course. On average at Research institutions (UMCP and UMBC), each faculty member is expected to teach 5.5 course units per year. At comprehensive institutions, it is expected that the average number of course units taught is expected to be 7.5 per year. UMB and UMUC are not covered under the Regent's policy, and productivity measures are not included for these institutions. Course unit productivity requirements are separately measured and presented for the Tenured/Tenure-track faculty and Core faculty groups.

In the course of their normal work, 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); departmental 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. These are recognized through assigned course exceptions that excuse individual faculty members from classroom teaching. These 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 (Table 1 and 2) display the Average Course Units Taught per Faculty member over the last 5 years. Table 1 shows that data for tenured/tenure-track faculty. During the 2014-2015 academic year, tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM comprehensive institutions taught an average of 7.0 course units while the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the USM research institutions taught an average of 5.7 course units. In 2014-2015, 6 of 9 USM institutions reported a level of instructional productivity for their tenured/tenure-track faculty members below the Regent’s expectation. This is the poorest level of performance against the standard by USM institutions since the initial adoption of the increased standard in 2004-2005.

Table 1 -Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2010-2011 thru 2014-2015)

	Course Units per FTEF					
	FTEF (14-15)	AY 14-15	AY 13-14	AY 12-13	AY 11-12	AY 10-11
BSU	144	7.2	7.6	7.6	7.5	8.2
CSU	124	7.5	7.8	8.0	8.3	8.1
FSU	189	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.5
SU	257	6.9	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.6
TU	470	6.5	6.7	6.8	7.0	7.1
UB	68	6.4	7.0	6.2	6.6	6.8
UMBC	321	7.1	6.5	6.6	6.8	6.6
UMCP	1,203	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.9
UMES	135	7.6	7.7	7.9	7.6	7.7
Comprehensives Avg.	1,387	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.4	7.5
Research Avg.	1,525	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.9	6.0

When all core instructional faculty (tenured/tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track instructional faculty) are included only 2 institutions met expectations. Table 2 shows the average course units taught by these two groups of full-time instructional faculty combined. In AY 2014-2015, the total course units taught by tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty averaged 7.1 at the comprehensive institutions and 5.8 at the research institutions.

Table 2 – Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Core Faculty (2010-2011 thru 2014-2015)

	Course Units per FTEF					
	FTEF (14-15)	AY 14-15	AY 13-14	AY 12-13	AY 11-12	AY 10-11
BSU	216	7.3	7.8	8.0	7.7	8.3
CSU	130	8.1	8.5	9.0	9.0	9.0
FSU	229	7.4	7.3	7.4	7.4	7.5
SU	334	7.1	7.3	7.4	7.8	7.7
TU	748	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4	7.7
UB	84	6.9	7.3	6.4	6.5	7.8
UMBC	451	7.2	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9
UMCP	1,441	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.8
UMES	194	7.2	7.4	8.1	7.6	8.1
Comprehensives Avg.	1,935	7.1	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.9
Research Avg.	1,892	5.8	5.9	5.9	5.9	6.1

When course exceptions are included in the calculation of course units for an institution, the results are significantly different. Table 3 shows that with the inclusion of core work activities of research and non-course based instruction (along with sabbatical to pursue scholarship), 7 of 9 meet expectations and all institutions substantially increase their workload result. When all exceptions (including departmental administration and service work) are used the difference is even greater and it is worth noting that some of the institutions that perform most poorly in this year's measures have the highest workload.

Table 3 – Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty with Exceptions (2014-2015)

	FTEF	Research, Instruction, Sabbatical exceptions included		
		No Exceptions included	Research, Instruction, Sabbatical exceptions included	All Exceptions included
BSU	144	7.2	7.7	9.6
CSU	124	7.5	7.7	8.7
FSU	189	7.4	8.9	10.8
SU	257	6.9	8.4	11.3
TU	470	6.5	7.2	11.3
UB	68	6.4	7.1	13.6
UMBC	321	7.1	7.8	10.6
UMCP	1,203	5.3	7.9	12.6
UMES	194	7.6	9.1	10.0
Comprehensives Avg.	1,446	7.0	7.9	10.6
Research Avg.	1,525	5.7	7.8	12.0

Credit Hour Productivity 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 semester credit hours (SCH). Credit hours are the sum of the course hours of all the students taking a class. For example, a 3 credit course with 10 students produces 30 semester credit hours.

Average Credit Hour Generation per Faculty

Table 4 displays the average semester credit hours (SCH) generated over the past three years by tenured/tenure-track faculty. Per past practice, this measure includes instructional, research and sabbatical exceptions. In 2014-2015, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions semester credit hour productivity varied considerably but remained within 5% of the 2013-14 totals at 6 of 9 institutions. Table 5 includes full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members and reflects this same trend at 6 of 9 institutions. However, this masks a general downward trend in average semester credit hours produced. Only 2 of 9 institution's average SCH is greater than the average of the preceding 4 years for tenured/tenure-track faculty, and only 3 of 9 met that criteria for core faculty.

Table 4 – Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Institution	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011
BSU	402	547	446	526	461
CSU	316	299	291	263	343
FSU	480	505	496	496	503
SU	530	561	560	606	557
TU	423	406	422	402	425
UB	375	410	366	404	381
UMBC	346	357	345	363	371
UMCP	420	445	470	491	500
UMES	684	742	708	448	896

Table 5 – Trends in the Average Credit Hours Generated by All Core Faculty

Institution	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011
BSU	422	573	479	561	506
CSU	311	298	283	255	382
FSU	476	477	492	494	498
SU	528	565	536	615	560
TU	442	427	440	425	449
UB	402	407	381	419	496
UMBC	465	473	469	456	474
UMCP	521	547	553	568	572
UMES	615	701	733	542	789

Total Semester Credit Hour production

Although the average SCH per faculty member is useful, the figure does not clearly answer the question as to whether the faculty are teaching enough to meet the demands of students for courses to complete degree programs. An analysis of the growth of student enrollment and the aggregate credit hour production can provide a general sense of whether teaching is keeping pace with enrollment growth. With some exceptions, Table 6 suggests that semester credit hour production has roughly kept pace with enrollment growth.

Table 6 – Change in Fall Headcount Enrollment and Total Credit Hours (2010-2011 through 2014-2015)

	Enrollment	Total SCH
BSU	2.1%	-4.2%
CSU	-17.6%	-17.7%
FSU	3.2%	-4.8%
SU	4.4%	2.7%
TU	2.0%	3.5%
UB	-1.2%	17.4%
UMBC	8.5%	7.1%
UMCP	-0.1%	-0.4%
UMES	-5.7%	-3.7%
USM	1.1%	0.8%

The degree to which tenured/tenure-track and other core faculty are responsible for this total production is illustrated in Table 7. Overall, core faculty account for roughly 2/3 of all credit hours generated by the institutions with substantial variation among institutions. Although the University of Baltimore is an exception, most institutions have shifted teaching duties to full-time non-tenure track faculty while the share taught by tenured/tenure track faculty has declined somewhat. This presumably represents the latter group focusing more heavily on upper-division and graduate level teaching which typically generate fewer credit hours per class.

Table 7 – Percentage of Credit Hours Produced by Type of Faculty (Current, Change Trends 2010-2011 to 2014-2015)

	Tenured/ Tenure Track	FT Non- tenure track	Part- time	Other	5 Year Change in % taught by Tenured/ Tenure-track faculty	5 Year Change in % taught by Core faculty
BSU	43%	26%	28%	4%	-7.5%	-0.3%
CSU	56%	2%	34%	7%	-7.6%	0.1%
FSU	61%	15%	18%	6%	-1.5%	4.6%
SU	53%	19%	21%	6%	2.2%	-2.2%
TU	38%	27%	33%	2%	-1.4%	1.8%
UB	35%	11%	52%	2%	10.9%	-5.3%
UMBC	32%	29%	34%	5%	-9.2%	-1.9%
UMCP	40%	20%	30%	9%	-9.3%	-0.7%
UMES	48%	21%	27%	4%	12.5%	4.1%
USM	42%	22%	30%	6%	-4.5%	-0.1%

Student Outcomes

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. 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 8 reports the degrees recipients at USM institutions for the last 5 years.

Table 8 – Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Awarded (FY 2011-2015)

Institution	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
BSU	801	741	739	688	683
CSU	416	478	409	460	379
FSU	1,032	1,011	969	892	850
SU	1,935	1,899	1,872	1,787	1,709
TU	4,422	4,291	4,147	4,101	3,948
UB	694	665	670	625	631
UMBC	2,432	2,250	2,230	2,140	1,905
UMCP	7,166	7,279	7,192	7,043	6,987
UMES	577	585	514	627	506
Total	19,475	19,199	18,742	18,363	17,598

Source: Degree Information System

As part of the Effectiveness and Efficiency efforts implemented by the USM Board of Regents, improving student time-to-degree was identified as a major academic initiative. The most recent graduating class maintained a very rapid time-to-degree through the present year. 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 9 presents the time to degree of the two most recent graduating classes. Table 10 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 measures point to continued success at efficiently moving students through USM institutions.

Table 9 – Undergraduate Time-to-Degree in Years

	Graduating Year	
	2015	2014
BSU	4.9	4.8
CSU	5.8	5.8
FSU	4.2	3.7
SU	4.0	3.9
TU	4.1	4.0
UMBC	4.1	4.5
UMCP	4.4	4.3
UMES	4.2	4.1
All USM	4.8	4.9

Source: Degree Information System

Table 10 – 4-Year Graduation Rate

	Entering Year				
	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
BSU	13%	12%	8%	14%	11%
CSU	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%
FSU	23%	23%	21%	24%	19%
SU	49%	47%	46%	49%	50%
TU	44%	44%	41%	39%	38%
UB	12%	9%	17%	19%	n/a
UMBC	34%	35%	33%	35%	37%
UMCP	65%	65%	63%	61%	59%
UMES	17%	14%	19%	14%	14%
All USM	43%	43%	40%	40%	39%

Source: Degree Information System, Enrollment Information System

Note: 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 at Baltimore in our faculty workload report each year. UMB applies a different 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.

SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND SERVICE PRODUCTIVITY

Table 11 is a summary of the scholarship and service activity of the USM faculty from degree-granting institutions (including UMB). Data show that in AY 2014-2015, USM faculty published nearly 650 books and over 12,000 peer-reviewed articles and made or participated in more than 14,000 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 11 – Scholarship and Service of the USM Faculty* AY 2014-2015

	# of Books Published	# of Refereed Publications	# of Non-Ref. Publications	# Creative Activities	Professional Present.	Days in Pub. Service per FTEF
<i>Comprehensive</i>						
BSU	3	69	30	34	121	9.9
CSU	1	94	59	35	56	15.8
FSU	13	153	76	347	156	11.1
SU	12	214	89	152	353	6.8
TU	66	793	402	1,258	868	12.4
UB	7	134	145	23	100	6.5
UMES	11	153	113	162	331	6.8
<i>Research</i>						
UMB	276	5,531	723	2,455	3,876	10.2
UMBC	36	672	166	328	1,381	6.2
UMCP	224	4,693	5,744	199	2,414	21.8
Total USM	649	12,506	7,547	4,993	9,656	14.1

Source: Faculty Non-instructional Activity Survey

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

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 12 records the level of external funding received by USM institutions, as reported by each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs. In AY 2014-2015, the USM was awarded over 1.2 billion dollars in external awards. This represents a significant increase of approximately 6% or 3

million dollars. Despite these substantial gains, over the last five years, extramural funding award levels have been essentially flat.

Table 12 – Faculty Research Awards, FY 2011-2015

	FY 2015	FY 2014	FY 2013	FY 2012	FY 2011
<i>Comprehensive</i>					
BSU	\$8,786,813	\$7,532,576	\$18,362,456	\$17,514,819	\$18,414,542
CSU	\$6,815,776	\$7,669,565	\$7,407,877	\$9,982,044	\$8,561,642
FSU	\$6,975,842	\$3,578,720	\$3,029,217	\$3,110,178	\$2,834,786
SU	\$4,882,812	\$5,019,735	\$2,987,992	\$6,317,079	\$3,414,321
TU	\$17,729,843	\$14,447,113	\$24,633,441	\$24,084,837	\$30,252,411
UB	\$7,399,317	\$6,095,525	\$6,303,025	\$5,252,275	\$5,571,603
UMES	\$21,224,282	\$17,629,598	\$18,049,275	\$19,293,079	\$23,314,434
<i>Research</i>					
UMB	\$497,918,281	\$500,912,032	\$478,826,984	\$524,909,562	\$587,353,266
UMBC	\$71,134,098	\$74,026,763	\$74,485,997	\$69,157,727	\$79,969,483
UMCP	\$545,633,305	\$479,069,009	\$463,030,131	\$500,189,610	\$468,377,525
UMCES	\$24,508,834	\$23,783,962	18,758,142	22,888,109	unavailable
Total USM	\$1,213,009,203	\$1,139,764,598	\$1,115,874,537	\$1,202,699,319	\$1,228,064,013

Source: Annual Extramural Awards Survey "Total Less other USM"

SUMMARY

This report provides summary data for USM for the academic year 2014-2015. The data indicate that USM's Research institutions are struggling to successfully meet the goals set by Regents' policy. Comprehensive institutions have, as a group, faced a greater challenge in meeting the goals, but for the first time this year UMCP also missed its Regent's mandated expectation. When a limited set of exceptions are considered, only two institutions did not meet its targets. The average credit hour production figures also suggest some decline in total time spent in instruction by tenured/tenure track faculty over the last five years. Increases in total credit hours during that period have been absorbed by other core faculty and by part-time faculty.

However, the outcomes of faculty instructional activity continue to be strong. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded continued to rise 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 major rise of 6% to over 1.2 billion dollars in the last year.

**Appendix
Faculty Profile**

DRAFT

Faculty Profile

This appendix provides an overview of the faculty complement at USM institutions included in this report. In 2014-2015, the USM had a complement of 8,949 faculty. Table A-1 provides a detailed breakdown of these faculty by role (instruction or research), tenure status, and full or part time employment status.

Table A-1 – USM Faculty Profile, AY 2014-2015

	Tenured/ Tenure Track	Full-time NTT Instructional	Full-time NTT Research	Part-time
BSU	145	80	0	207
CSU	125	15	0	134
FSU	214	40	0	132
SU	325	91	0	243
TU	588	305	0	773
UB	170	37	0	221
UMCP	1,427	328	1414	652
UMBC	391	135	129	262
UMES	159	56	6	145
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	3,544	1,087	1,549	2,769

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty increased from 3,529 to 3,544 from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015. This represents an increase of 15 tenure-track faculty members, or around .4%. This closely corresponded to the increase of .5% in FTE students system-wide in the same period. Over the past five years, FTE students have risen by 1.5% with FTE tenure-track faculty rising 3.2% (excluding UMUC and UMB). Table A-2 provides a detailed breakout of changes in the tenured/tenure track faculty complement over the last five years.

Table A-2 - Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty, AY 2010-11-AY 2014-15

	AY 2014-15	AY 2013-14	AY 2010-11	1 Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track	5 Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track
BSU	145	153	169	-5.2%	-14.2%
CSU	125	128	136	-2.3%	-8.1%
FSU	214	214	208	0.0%	2.9%
SU	325	311	301	4.5%	8.0%
TU	588	594	591	-1.0%	-0.5%
UB	170	169	142	0.6%	19.7%
UMCP	1,427	1,420	1,368	0.5%	4.3%
UMBC	391	385	380	1.6%	2.9%
UMES	159	155	140	2.6%	13.6%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	3,544	3,529	3,435	0.4%	3.2%

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 2010-2011 through 2014-2015, the numbers increased by almost 200 or more than 20%. Table A-3 provides a detailed breakout of these changes over the last five years.

Table A-3 - Full-Time Instructional Non-Tenure Track Faculty, AY 2010-11-AY 2014-15

	AY 2014-15	AY 2013-14	AY 2010-11	1 Year Change in Full-time Instructional Non- Tenure Track	5 Year Change in Full-time Instructional Non- Tenure Track
BSU	80	75	60	6.7%	33.3%
CSU	15	16	21	-6.3%	-28.6%
FSU	40	38	37	5.3%	8.1%
SU	91	98	87	-7.1%	4.6%
TU	305	276	239	10.5%	27.6%
UB	37	28	40	32.1%	-7.5%
UMCP	328	274	245	19.7%	33.9%
UMBC	135	123	103	9.8%	31.1%
UMES	56	58	56	-3.4%	0.0%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	1,087	986	888	10.2%	22.4%

Part-time Faculty

Finally, part-time faculty continue to play an important role in instruction at USM institutions. The number of part-time faculty declined from 2013-2014 but has grown relatively slowly over the last five years. Table A-4 provides a breakdown of the change in this segment over the last five years.

Table A-4 – Part-time Non-Tenure Track Faculty, AY 2010-11-AY 2014-15

	AY 2014-15	AY 2013-14	AY 2010-11	1 Year Change in Part-time Faculty	5 Year Change in Part-time Faculty
BSU	207	212	171	-2.4%	21.1%
CSU	134	144	155	-6.9%	-13.5%
FSU	132	140	121	-5.7%	9.1%
SU	243	247	209	-1.6%	16.3%
TU	773	781	751	-1.0%	2.9%
UB	221	231	176	-4.3%	25.6%
UMCP	652	672	640	-3.0%	1.9%
UMBC	262	265	237	-1.1%	10.5%
UMES	145	148	132	-2.0%	9.8%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	2,769	2,840	2,592	-2.5%	6.8%