



TOPIC: Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty, 2016-2017

COMMITTEE: Education Policy and Student Life

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: Tuesday, November 14, 2017

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 5.7 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,
- Outcomes improved with more with degrees awarded and improved 4-year graduation rate, and
- USM levels of grants and other research awards stood at nearly 1.3 billion dollars 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 14, 2017

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joann A. 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 2016-2017



**UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
of MARYLAND**

**Submitted to Board of Regents' Committee on Education Policy and Student Life
November 14, 2017**

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

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-2017

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, 4 of the 6 institutions below expectations showed some improvement this year (see table 1)
- Tenure Track Faculty at the Comprehensive Universities as a group averaged 7.0 Course Units per faculty member. 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 4 of 9 institutions detailed in this report (see table 2)
- Including critical exceptions, Tenured/Tenure-track faculty met expectations at 6 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, and near five year averages at most institutions (see Table 4 and 5).
- Total semester credit hour production has closely followed enrollment changes for the USM overall, but 4 of 9 individual institutions reflected significant differences between the two figures (see Table 6 and 7).
- Total bachelor's degrees awarded continues to grow with 242 more degrees awarded in the most recent year than last year and more than 1,200 above the level of 5 years earlier (see table 8)
- 4-year graduation rates, a key measure of efficient matriculation, have improved this year to the best performance since this measure was first tracked. (see table 9)
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels with nearly 700 books and nearly 15,000 refereed articles published in 2016-2017 (see Table 10)
- Faculty secured nearly 1.3 billion dollars in research funding representing a 6.5% gain over last year's figure (See Table 11)

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-2017

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 2016-2017.

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 be 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, 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 2016-2017 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 2016-2017, 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 level of performance by USM institutions is roughly equivalent with last year’s in terms of meeting the Regent’s standard although both research institutions improved to meet the standard this year.

Table 1 -Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (2012-2013 thru 2016-2017)

	FTEF (15-16)	Course Units per FTEF				
		AY 16-17	AY 15-16	AY 14-15	AY 13-14	AY 12-13
BSU	143	7.0	7.3	7.2	7.6	7.6
CSU	135	7.9	7.8	7.5	7.8	8.0
FSU	195	7.1	7.3	7.4	7.5	7.4
SU	247	7.3	7.2	6.9	7.2	7.3
TU	486	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.7	6.8
UB	69	6.7	6.6	6.4	7.0	6.2
UMBC	338	6.3	6.6	7.1	6.5	6.6
UMCP	1,175	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.5
UMES	130	7.1	8.1	7.6	7.7	7.9
Comprehensives Avg.	1,405	7.0	7.1	7.0	7.2	7.2
Research Avg.	1,513	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7

When all core instructional faculty (tenured/tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track instructional faculty) are included 5 of 9 institutions met expectations. Table 2 shows the average course units taught by these two groups of full-time instructional faculty combined. In AY 2016-2017, the total course units taught by tenured/tenure-track and full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructional faculty averaged 7.2 at the comprehensive institutions and 5.9 at the research institutions.

Table 2 – Trends in Average Course Units (CU) Taught by Core Faculty (2012-2013 thru 2016-2017)

	FTEF (16-17)	Course Units per FTEF				
		AY 16-17	AY 15-16	AY 14-15	AY 13-14	AY 12-13
BSU	193	7.6	8.0	7.3	7.8	8.0
CSU	142	9.3	9.0	8.1	8.5	9.0
FSU	232	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.3	7.4
SU	321	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.3	7.4
TU	758	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.3
UB	92	7.0	6.7	6.9	7.3	6.4
UMBC	470	6.5	7.0	7.2	6.9	6.9
UMCP	1,448	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.6
UMES	187	7.0	8.2	7.2	7.4	8.1
Comprehensives Avg.	1,924	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.4	7.5
Research Avg.	1,917	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.9	5.9

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 (2016-2017)

	FTEF	No Exceptions included	Research, Instruction, Sabbatical	All Exceptions
			exceptions included	included
BSU	143	7.0	9.0	12.8
CSU	135	7.9	8.0	8.8
FSU	195	7.1	7.6	9.1
SU	247	7.3	8.7	10.5
TU	486	6.6	7.1	11.1
UB	69	6.7	7.2	12.2
UMBC	338	6.3	7.1	10.4
UMCP	1,175	5.5	7.6	12.1
UMES	130	7.1	12.0	19.6
Comprehensives Avg.	1,405	7.0	8.0	11.0
Research Avg.	1,513	5.7	7.4	11.6

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 2016-2017, tenured/tenure-track faculty members at USM institutions semester credit hour productivity varied considerably but remained within 5% of the 2015-16 totals at 8 of 9 institutions. Table 5 includes full-time non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty members and reflects this same trend at 7 of 9 institutions. Over the longer term, there has been a general downward trend in average semester credit hours produced. 5 of 9 institution's average SCH have declined over the five-year period for tenured/tenure-track faculty, and for core faculty 6 of 9 institutions semester credit hours declined.

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

Institution	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013
BSU	463	454	402	547	446
CSU	308	316	316	299	291
FSU	401	472	480	505	496
SU	522	522	530	561	560
TU	396	402	423	406	422
UB	366	379	375	410	366
UMBC	350	359	346	357	345
UMCP	412	405	420	445	470
UMES	604	638	684	742	708

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

Institution	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013
BSU	482	475	422	573	479
CSU	306	313	311	298	283
FSU	411	482	476	477	492
SU	518	537	528	565	536
TU	419	434	442	427	440
UB	377	380	402	407	381
UMBC	482	475	465	473	469
UMCP	525	517	521	547	553
UMES	585	637	615	701	733

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 (2012-2013 through 2016-2017)

	Enrollment	Total SCH
BSU	4.6%	2.0%
CSU	-18.6%	11.7%
FSU	4.7%	-5.3%
SU	1.1%	-2.9%
TU	1.7%	-1.9%
UB	-8.8%	6.4%
UMBC	0.0%	6.3%
UMCP	4.9%	4.3%
UMES	-12.3%	-14.0%
USM	1.0%	1.7%

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. The growth of full-time non-tenure track faculty remains the most significant trend in the use of faculty for instruction.

**Table 7 – Percentage of Credit Hours Produced by Type of Faculty
(Current, Change Trends 2012-2013 to 2016-2017)**

	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	39%	16%	42%	3%	-3.3%	-10.0%
CSU	56%	3%	34%	7%	27.3%	18.2%
FSU	60%	14%	22%	4%	-5.7%	-2.0%
SU	53%	17%	22%	8%	-4.2%	-7.5%
TU	39%	27%	33%	2%	0.2%	6.4%
UB	37%	15%	46%	3%	5.6%	14.0%
UMBC	33%	31%	31%	5%	-1.9%	14.8%
UMCP	39%	24%	29%	8%	-7.0%	6.3%
UMES	45%	26%	25%	4%	-8.9%	-5.5%
USM	41%	23%	30%	5%	-3.3%	4.3%

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 degree recipients at USM institutions for the last 5 years.

Table 8 – Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Awarded (FY 2013-2017)

Institution	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
BSU	713	832	801	741	739
CSU	421	464	416	478	409
FSU	1,060	964	1,032	1,011	969
SU	2,026	1,982	1,935	1,899	1,872
TU	4,628	4,428	4,422	4,291	4,147
UB	755	721	694	665	670
UMBC	2,572	2,521	2,432	2,250	2,230
UMCP	7,292	7,253	7,166	7,279	7,192
UMES	514	574	577	585	514
Total	19,981	19,739	19,475	19,199	18,742

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 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. In recent years, the system overall has seen progress in this area. Table 9 illustrates changes in the four-year graduation rates which, although only a part of the graduation rate picture (transfers are not included), are a useful measure of efficiency of matriculation and speed to degree.

Table 9 – 4-Year Graduation Rate

	Entering Year				
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
BSU	16%	15%	13%	12%	8%
CSU	9%	9%	6%	5%	4%
FSU	29%	27%	23%	23%	21%
SU	50%	50%	49%	47%	46%
TU	46%	45%	44%	44%	41%
UB	15%	8%	12%	9%	17%
UMBC	40%	36%	34%	35%	33%
UMCP	66%	63%	65%	65%	63%
UMES	22%	20%	17%	14%	19%
All USM	46%	44%	43%	43%	40%

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 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. 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 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 2016-2017, USM faculty published nearly 700 books and almost 15,000 peer-reviewed articles and made or participated in nearly 20,000 professional presentations and creative activities. The average USM faculty member spent approximately 11 days in public service to business, government, schools, and non-profit organizations.

Table 10 – Scholarship and Service of the USM Faculty* AY 2016-2017

	# of Books Published	# of Refereed Publications	# of Non-Ref. Publications	# Creative Activities	Prof. Present.	Days in Pub. Service per FTEF
<i>Comprehensive</i>						
BSU	3	44	80	37	168	9.7
CSU	1	94	59	35	56	14.5
FSU	9	98	49	268	161	9.0
SU	37	297	96	273	66	12.2
TU	74	958	346	1,128	820	13.8
UB	11	102	135	35	77	8.0
UMES	10	149	55	175	276	6.0
<i>Research</i>						
UMB	234	5,814	1,085	879	4,180	9.6
UMBC	76	775	117	276	1,398	5.7
UMCP	226	6,617	1,556	397	9,127	24.3
Total USM	681	14,948	3,578	3,503	16,329	11.28

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 11 records the level of external funding received by USM institutions, as reported by each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs. In AY 2016-2017, the USM was awarded nearly 1.3 billion dollars in external awards. This represents a 6.5% change from the AY 2015-2016 after annual growth of less than 1% over the last five years.

Table 11 – Faculty Research Awards, FY 2013-2017

	FY 2017	FY 2016	FY 2015	FY 2014	FY 2013
<i>Comprehensive</i>					
BSU	\$8,750,023	\$7,988,546	\$8,786,813	\$7,532,576	\$18,362,456
CSU	\$7,765,864	\$5,850,572	\$6,815,776	\$7,669,565	\$7,407,877
FSU	\$7,818,382	\$3,279,980	\$6,975,842	\$3,578,720	\$3,029,217
SU	\$5,760,833	\$4,584,488	\$4,882,812	\$5,019,735	\$2,987,992
TU	\$10,439,414	\$16,789,859	\$17,729,843	\$14,447,113	\$24,633,441
UB	\$10,582,279	\$7,729,907	\$7,399,317	\$6,095,525	\$6,303,025
UMES	\$19,728,418	\$17,827,443	\$21,224,282	\$17,629,598	\$18,049,275
<i>Research</i>					
UMB	\$553,170,320	\$494,477,177	\$497,918,281	\$500,912,032	\$478,826,984
UMBC	\$92,193,683	\$76,215,884	\$71,134,098	\$74,026,763	\$74,485,997
UMCP	\$509,225,382	\$554,177,223	\$545,633,305	\$479,069,009	\$463,030,131
UMCES	\$24,739,098	\$24,815,908	\$24,508,834	\$23,783,962	18,758,142
Total USM	\$1,292,254,826	\$1,213,736,987	\$1,213,009,203	\$1,139,764,598	\$1,115,874,537

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

SUMMARY

This report provides summary data for USM for the academic year 2016-2017. The data indicate that some USM institutions were able to improve their performance over the 2015-2016 year, but most remain below the Regents' policy target. However, when allowed exceptions are considered most institutions meet target levels, reflecting the assignment of tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty to a wide variety of tasks on campus. The average credit hour production figures for tenured/tenure-track faculty is largely stable, and institutions have successfully increased total credit hours through use of non-tenure track full-time faculty.

Additionally, the outcomes of faculty instructional activity continue to be strong. The number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded continued to rise. Students continue to move efficiently through most USM institutions as indicated by improved 4-year graduation rates. Non-instructional productivity (i.e., scholarship and service) remains at a very high level. Finally, external research funding rose to nearly 1.3 billion dollars in the last year.

**Appendix
Faculty Profile**

Faculty Profile

This appendix provides an overview of the faculty complement at USM institutions included in this report. In 2016-2017, the USM had a instructional complement of 7,414 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, AY 2016-2017

	Tenured/ Tenure Track	Full-time NTT Instructional	Part-time
BSU	137	82	222
CSU	123	12	132
FSU	219	40	128
SU	324	86	226
TU	596	309	747
UB	165	35	218
UMCP	1,427	417	634
UMBC	400	142	262
UMES	161	62	108
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	3,552	1,185	2,677

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty increased slightly from 3,546 to 3,552 from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017. This represents an increase of 6 tenure-track faculty members, or around .1%. Over the past five years, FTE students have risen by 1.5% with FTE tenure-track faculty rising 2.5% (excluding UMUC and UMB). Table 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 2011-12-AY 2016-17

	AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2011-12	1 Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track	5 Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track
BSU	137	148	161	-7.4%	-14.9%
CSU	123	119	130	3.4%	-5.4%
FSU	219	215	212	1.9%	3.3%
SU	324	327	302	-0.9%	7.3%
TU	596	598	588	-0.3%	1.4%
UB	165	168	147	-1.8%	12.2%
UMCP	1,427	1,410	1410	1.2%	1.2%
UMBC	400	399	372	0.3%	7.5%
UMES	161	162	142	-0.6%	13.4%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	3,552	3,546	3,464	0.2%	2.5%

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 2011-2012 through 2016-2017, the numbers increased by 269 or almost 30%. Table 3 provides a detailed breakout of these changes over the last five years.

Table A-3 - Full-Time Instructional Non-Tenure Track Faculty, AY 2011-12-AY 2016-17

	AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2011-12	1 Year Change in Full-time Instructional Non- Tenure Track	5 Year Change in Full-time Instructional Non- Tenure Track
BSU	82	72	64	13.9%	28.1%
CSU	12	11	22	9.1%	-45.5%
FSU	40	33	35	21.2%	14.3%
SU	86	87	35	-1.1%	145.7%
TU	309	300	255	3.0%	21.2%
UB	35	37	36	-5.4%	-2.8%
UMCP	417	437	289	-4.6%	44.3%
UMBC	142	138	116	2.9%	22.4%
UMES	62	70	64	-11.4%	-3.1%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	1,185	1,185	916	0.0%	29.4%

Part-time Faculty

Finally, part-time faculty continue to play an important role in instruction at USM institutions. The number of part-time faculty decreased (-3.7%) from 2015-2016 representing a sharper decline than the five-year trend. Part-time faculty numbers have fluctuated substantially during the last decade. Table 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 2011-12-AY 2016-17

	AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2011-12	1 Year Change in Part-time Faculty	5 Year Change in Part-time Faculty
BSU	222	234	184	-5.1%	20.7%
CSU	132	127	141	3.9%	-6.4%
FSU	128	133	122	-3.8%	4.9%
SU	226	241	223	-6.2%	1.3%
TU	747	780	828	-4.2%	-9.8%
UB	218	210	182	3.8%	19.8%
UMCP	634	641	629	-1.1%	0.8%
UMBC	262	292	254	-10.3%	3.1%
UMES	108	123	148	-12.2%	-27.0%
USM (w/o UMB or UMUC)	2,677	2,781	2,711	-3.7%	-1.3%