



REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2016 2017



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 I esaged 7.0 Course e xceptions, Te

REPORT ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

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

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.

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%
<u>USM</u>	<u>1.0%</u>	<u>1.7%</u>

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%

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

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, and

* B

and

A

A

A

A

TeA en *oks heitio

Table 11 – Faculty Research Awards, FY 2013 2017

	FY 2017	FY 2016	FY 2015	FY 2014	FY 2013
<i>Comprehensive</i>					
BSU					

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%