

REPORT ON THE WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2018-2019



Submitted to the Board of Regents Committee on Education Policy and Student Life
November 5, 2019

Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Office of the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance

REPORT ON THE WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

Academic Year 2018-2019

SUMMARY

Key findings of this year's report include:

- Overall, total credit hours produced by faculty is keeping pace with total student enrollment. In the five years since 2013-14, USM enrollment has increased by 1.5% and USM total credit hours produced has increased by 1.4% (see Table 2).
- Full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty account for 66% of all credit hours produced (up 2% from last year), with part-time and other faculty accounting for 29% and 6% respectively (see Table 3).
- However, over the five years since 2013-14, credit hours produced by tenured/tenure track faculty is down - 4.9% while credit hours produced by full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty is up by 24.2%.
- The number of credits produced by part-time faculty (adjuncts, etc.) is down by -3.9% for the same period (see Table 3). The number of part-time faculty employed by the institutions has decreased by -2.37% from 2017-2018 and by -0.38% from 2013-2014 (see Table A-4).
- The number of bachelor's degrees awarded continues to increase. There was USM record 20,255 bachelor's degrees awarded in the most recent year, 236 more than last year and 780 more than five years earlier (see Table 4).
- Four-year graduation rates have improved this year to the best performance since this measure was first tracked (see Table 5a). Six-year graduation rates have also increased (see Table 5b).
- Faculty publication and scholarship continue at high levels (see Table 7) and faculty secured over \$1.46 billion in research funding, representing a 2.63% gain over last year (Table 8).

INTRODUCTION

An annual report has been provided to the University System of Maryland (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 2018-2019.

Governing Policies

The USM policies governing faculty workload are designed to ensure maximum accountability, while providing individual campuses high levels of flexibility to deploy faculty in the most effective and efficient way possible. The primary USM Board of Regents policy governing faculty workload is II-1.25 POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES.¹

The main purpose of this policy is to promote optimal performance by the USM institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other stakeholders and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance, particularly as it relates to faculty work. However, since this policy was initially developed in 1994, the nature of faculty work related to instruction has evolved to include much more than just classroom teaching. As a result, the “course unit” metric reported previously was requiring an increasing number of exemptions and workarounds to establish equivalencies with the various academic innovations our institutions are embracing. This policy was, therefore, amended in June 2019 to improve reporting accuracy and coverage, align with current practice, and incentivize policy goals around student success by eliminating the course unit metric and rely, instead, on credit hours to measure teaching productivity.

This year’s report (AY 2018-2019) is the first of a 3-year transition between reports generated under the earlier policy and reports that will reflect the format of the new policy. It reflects the move away from reporting course units to reporting credit hours produced instead. It does not yet, however, incorporate teaching data from UMB, UMGC, UB’s School of Law, UB’s Merrick School of Business, SU’s Perdue School of Business, TU’s College of Business & Economics, and any other departments and colleges that had been exempted from previous year’s reports. Data on instruction from those institutions/divisions will be included starting with next year’s report. Further, as the institutions’ data collection capacities become more sophisticated, this report will incorporate additional measures to illustrate the extent to which faculty are meeting standard workload expectations with respect to their contributions to student success, as well as their disciplines, and the institution/system.

Definitions²

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.

- *Credit Hours*: Courses are measured in credit hours based on time in classroom (for example, three hours of class contact each week multiplied by the total students enrolled in a course). The sum of the credit hours from all classes taught by an individual faculty member is used as a key metric of faculty instructional productivity.
- *Course Exceptions*: Faculty members are excused from specific teaching duties for a variety of reasons. These may include research, instruction-related assignments, administrative and service duties, sabbaticals, or illness. Exceptions are applied in various calculations to illustrate the work activities of faculty and to determine whether institutions are meeting their instructional workload goals.
- *Full-time Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty*: This includes all persons (except department chairs) holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty. In addition to teaching, tenured and

¹ 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.

² Definitions for purposes of this report may vary somewhat from definitions used in the institutions’ data collection process.

tenure-track faculty are also responsible for a large portion of the central faculty missions on campus including service and research.

- *Full-time, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty:* This includes all full-time instructional faculty who are not on the tenure track. Unlike tenured/tenure-track faculty, these individuals' primary responsibility is for teaching and other duties in support of instructional activity.
- *Core Instructional Faculty:* When combined, full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty make up an institution's core instructional 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:* This category reflects all other faculty, including department chairs, full-time non-tenure track research or public service faculty, and teaching assistants.

MEASURES OF FACUTLY CONTRIBUTIONS TO STUDENT SUCCESS

Because student success is the central focus of our degree-granting institutions, the primary measure of instructional productivity in this report is expressed in terms of credit hours produced. Additional student outcomes with respect to enrollments and graduation rates are also presented here as a measure of the faculty's contributions to student success.

Credit Hour Measures

Production of credit hours is the prescribed measure in the revised policy on faculty workload for evaluating instructional activity and effectiveness of faculty. Credit hours are the sum of the course hours of all the students taking a class. For example, a 3-credit course with ten students produces thirty credit hours. The reported credit hours include instructional, research, and sabbatical course exceptions, as defined above.

Total Credit Hour Production by Institution

Total credit hour production per institution (includes all faculty types and instructional levels) over the academic years since 2013-14 is reported in Table 1, below. The number and percent of 1-year change since 2017-18 and the 5-year change since 2013-14 are also reported.

Table 1. One-year (2018-19 vs. 2017-18) and 5-year (2018-19 vs. 2013-14) Change in Total Credit Hours Produced

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	1-year change		5-year change	
							#	%	#	%
BSU	128,336	126,225	121,580	130,328	141,908	142,389	481	0.3%	14,053	11.0%
CSU	70,559	68,287	71,361	73,302	72,329	72,014	-315	-0.4%	1,455	2.1%
FSU	105,334	124,447	126,599	121,206	121,392	112,865	-8,528	-7.0%	7,531	7.1%
SU	199,966	208,478	200,511	205,456	209,529	207,673	-1,856	-0.9%	7,707	3.9%
TU	472,989	477,122	472,248	462,548	464,834	471,472	6,638	1.4%	-1,517	-0.3%
UB	66,675	66,374	65,189	63,592	58,362	49,534	-8,828	-15.1%	-17,141	-25.7%
UMBC	315,634	317,452	322,899	322,225	317,416	321,734	4,317	1.4%	6,099	1.9%
UMCP	845,244	854,228	853,867	895,625	887,875	889,605	1,730	0.2%	44,361	5.2%
UMES	113,696	115,829	115,731	103,346	93,939	83,779	-10,160	-10.8%	-29,917	-26.3%
Total	2,318,432	2,358,442	2,349,985	2,377,628	2,367,585	2,351,065	-16,520	-0.7%	32,633	1.4%

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Table 2, below, provides a general sense of whether the number of total credit hours produced by the institution is keeping pace with total enrollment. While there was virtually no change in overall USM fall headcount enrollment over the last year (0.0%) there was a slight drop in overall USM total credit hour production (-0.7%) between 2018-19 and 2017-18. However, over the last five years since 2013-14, overall USM fall headcount enrollment has increased by 1.5% and USM total credit hours produced has roughly paralleled that enrollment trend with a 1.4% increase. As can be seen in Table 2, however, fluctuations in enrollment and credit hour production for specific institutions has varied.

Table 2. One-year and 5-year Change in Fall Headcount Enrollment and Total Credit Hours Produced

	1-year change (2018-19 vs. 2017-18)		5-year change (2018-19 vs. 2013-14)	
	Enrollment	Total Credit Hours	Enrollment	Total Credit Hours
BSU	2.8%	0.3%	13.6%	11.0%
CSU	-5.4%	-0.4%	-19.1%	2.1%
FSU	-1.9%	-7.0%	-3.3%	7.1%
SU	-1.7%	-0.9%	-0.9%	3.9%
TU	1.0%	1.4%	1.9%	-0.3%
UB	-9.4%	-15.1%	-22.7%	-25.7%
UMBC	0.8%	1.4%	-1.0%	1.9%
UMCP	1.7%	0.2%	10.5%	5.2%
UMES	-8.5%	-10.8%	-24.3%	-26.3%
Total	0.0%	-0.7%	1.5%	1.4%

Sources: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload and USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Credit Hour Production by Faculty Type

Table 3 illustrates the degree to which different types of faculty are responsible for the production of credit hours. Core instructional faculty (tenured/tenure-track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty) account for 66% of all credit hours produced (up 2% from last year). Of note, overall tenured/tenure-track faculty and part-time faculty are producing fewer credit hours compared to five years ago (-4.9% and -3.9% respectively), while full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty are producing over 24% more. Specific institutions do differ from this trend.

Table 3. Percentage of Credit Hours Produced by Faculty Type and 5-Year Percent Change (2018-19 vs. 2013-14)

	Tenured/Tenure Track		Full-time Non-Tenure Track Instructional		Part-time		Other	
	% of total	% 5yr change	% of total	% 5yr change	% of total	% 5yr change	% of total	% 5yr change
BSU	35%	-8.2%	16%	4.1%	44%	31.6%	5%	58.0%
CSU	56%	1.0%	2%	-21.9%	35%	6.0%	7%	2.7%
FSU	62%	13.5%	12%	16.6%	20%	-8.4%	6%	-9.3%
SU	54%	2.7%	21%	19.5%	20%	1.5%	4%	-25.4%
TU	37%	-2.8%	27%	6.5%	34%	-1.9%	1%	-15.1%
UB	43%	-12.9%	14%	-10.4%	40%	-38.8%	3%	-24.5%
UMBC	30%	-9.2%	31%	14.0%	35%	4.8%	5%	-8.7%
UMCP	36%	-8.7%	31%	56.3%	24%	-7.2%	9%	-7.5%
UMES	49%	-12.7%	23%	-31.4%	24%	-43.2%	4%	-2.2%
Overall	40%	-4.9%	26%	24.2%	29%	-3.9%	6%	-7.5%

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: Other faculty (including department chairs, non-tenure-track research or public service faculty, and teaching assistants) account for 6% of the credit hours produced.

Average Credit Hour Production for Core Instructional Faculty

Table 4, which reports average credit hour production for all core instructional faculty, indicates that USM average credit hours produced has increased slightly with three of the nine institutions producing more credit hours in 2018-19 as compared to 2017-18. Overall credit hour production is down slightly, however, for the five-year period since 2013-14.

Table 4. Trends in Average Credit Hours Generated by All Core Faculty

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
BSU	573	422	475	482	410	438
CSU	298	311	313	306	295	330
FSU	477	476	482	411	418	397
SU	565	528	537	518	529	518
TU	427	442	434	419	420	414
UB	407	402	380	377	384	367
UMBC	497	465	475	482	470	456
UMCP	542	521	517	525	509	567
UMES	701	615	637	585	671	655
USM Average	499	465	472	456	456	460

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Instructional 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, Baltimore in the faculty workload report each year. UMB applies a different set of standards for judging faculty instructional workload that are more appropriate for its professional schools. UMB reports that 95% of all core faculty met or exceeded the institution's standard faculty instructional workload. When compared to previous years, this represents a consistent level of attainment.

Student Outcomes

While credit hours are one measure of faculty production, student outcomes --such as number of degrees awarded and graduation rates-- are also useful indicators of faculty contributions to student success. While an increase or decrease in the number of degree recipients can reflect a number of factors such as the institution's growth in enrollment and their level of success in retaining students to graduation, students' ability to graduate in a timely fashion is also dependent on the efficiency and productivity of the faculty, the quality of advising, and the appropriateness of course offerings.

The number of graduating students has risen in recent years and is at the highest level yet achieved by the USM. Table 5 displays the number of degree recipients at USM institutions for the last five years. USM also continues to see overall progress in student time-to-degree. Table 6a illustrates changes in the four-year graduation rates and Table 6b documents changes in the six-year graduation rates. Although graduation rates reflect only part of the larger picture (and transfers are not included), they are a useful measure of student success.

Table 5. Trends in the Undergraduate Degrees Awarded (FY 2014 to FY 2019)

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
BSU	741	801	832	713	781	826
CSU	478	416	464	421	399	378
FSU	1011	1,032	964	1,060	1,027	1,078
SU	1899	1,935	1,982	2,026	1,873	1,805
TU	4291	4,422	4,428	4,628	4,609	4,619
UB	665	694	721	755	711	615
UMBC	2250	2,432	2,521	2,572	2,578	2,658
UMCP	7279	7,166	7,253	7,292	7,559	7,768
UMES	585	577	574	514	482	508
Overall	19,199	19,475	19,739	19,981	20,019	20,255

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Table 6a. Four-Year Graduation Rate by Entering Year

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
BSU	13%	15%	16%	16%	17%	18%
CSU	6%	9%	9%	12%	12%	12%
FSU	23%	27%	29%	27%	27%	27%
SU	49%	50%	50%	52%	49%	49%
TU	44%	45%	46%	45%	47%	49%
UB	12%	8%	15%	17%	18%	22%
UMBC	34%	36%	40%	39%	42%	43%
UMCP	65%	63%	66%	66%	65%	69%
UMES	17%	20%	22%	21%	21%	15%
All USM	43%	44%	46%	46%	47%	48%

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Note: Percentages reflect graduation anywhere in USM for all First-time Full-time Freshmen

Table 6b. Six-Year Graduation Rate by Entering Year

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
BSU	37%	44%	41%	42%	46%	46%
CSU	18%	19%	20%	23%	21%	25%
FSU	55%	61%	55%	56%	57%	57%
SU	72%	74%	74%	76%	71%	74%
TU	70%	73%	72%	74%	75%	72%
UB	48%	38%	36%	34%	41%	44%
UMBC	66%	65%	66%	65%	68%	71%
UMCP	85%	86%	86%	85%	86%	87%
UMES	41%	37%	42%	42%	44%	46%
All USM	66%	69%	68%	70%	70%	72%

Source: USM Institutional Research Information System (IRIS)

Note: Percentages reflect graduation anywhere in USM for all First-time Full-time Freshmen

MEASURES OF FACULTY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THEIR DISCIPLINES AND SERVICE

Table 7, below, is a summary of the scholarship and service activity of the USM faculty from degree-granting institutions (including UMB). During the 2018-2019 academic year, USM faculty published 674 books and over 12,500 peer-reviewed articles. Faculty also participated in over 14,000 professional presentations and creative activities combined. The average USM faculty member spent almost twelve days in public service to businesses, government, schools, and non-profit organizations.

Table 7. Scholarship and Service of the USM Faculty (Academic Year 2018-2019)

	Number of Books Published	Number of Refereed Publications	Number of Non-Refereed Publications	Number of Creative Activities	Number of Professional Presentations	Days in Public Service per FTEF
Comprehensive						
BSU	1	42	44	25	110	10.29
CSU	1	94	59	35	56	16.02
FSU	14	114	77	238	189	10.2
SU	30	312	140	152	483	12.97
TU	59	702	312	1165	775	11.0
UB	9	131	54	16	89	7.2
UMES	16	123	85	145	283	10.77
Research						
UMB	267	5324	898	901	3784	9.39
UMBC	22	697	137	302	1343	6.4
UMCP ³	255	5,249	1,734	1,939	6,907	24.3
Overall	674	12788	3540	4918	14019	11.9

Source: USM Report on Faculty Teaching Workload

Note: Includes tenured/tenure track, department chairs, and full-time non-tenure track instructional and research faculty from all departments for the entire institution.

External Funding

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 8 records the level of external funding received by USM institutions, as reported by each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs. Throughout the 2017-2018 academic year, the USM was awarded over \$1.46 billion in external awards. This represents a 2.63% increase from the 2017-2018 academic year.

³ Because UMCP is implementing a new faculty activity reporting application, they were unable to provide this data in time for this report. Therefore, the data reported here are from the 2017-18 Faculty Workload report.

Table 8. External Funding per Institution (FY 2014 – FY 2019)

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Comprehensive						
BSU	\$7,484,576	\$8,786,813	\$7,988,546	\$8,750,023	\$10,025,960	\$9,870,789
CSU	\$6,909,264	\$6,815,776	\$5,850,572	\$7,765,864	\$6,524,176	\$8,250,738
FSU	\$3,051,879	\$6,975,842	\$3,279,980	\$7,818,382	\$2,041,543	\$3,564,730
SU	\$4,954,735	\$4,882,812	\$4,584,488	\$5,760,833	\$5,141,941	\$8,032,505
TU	\$14,311,642	\$17,729,843	\$16,789,859	\$10,439,414	\$12,953,604	\$14,724,204
UB	\$5,877,016	\$7,399,317	\$7,729,907	\$10,582,279	\$13,698,053	\$14,813,294
UMES	\$17,421,188	\$21,224,282	\$17,827,443	\$19,728,418	\$15,601,754	\$16,750,307
UMGC	\$53,091,189	\$51,321,961	\$52,172,670	\$51,111,131	\$54,782,797	\$57,041,537
Research						
UMB	\$499,223,928	\$497,918,281	\$494,477,177	\$553,170,320	\$664,599,070	\$664,120,371
UMBC	\$67,231,628	\$71,134,098	\$76,215,884	\$92,193,683	\$77,180,308	\$79,741,464
UMCP	\$475,232,842	\$545,633,305	\$554,177,223	\$509,225,382	\$538,013,239	\$566,559,047
UMCES	\$22,903,823	\$24,508,834	\$24,815,908	\$24,739,098	\$26,833,197	\$21,424,116
Overall	\$1,177,693,710	\$1,264,331,164	\$1,265,909,657	\$1,301,284,827	\$1,427,395,642	\$1,464,893,102

Source: Annual Extramural Awards Survey, "Total Less Other USM"

SUMMARY

This report provided summary data on faculty workload for the University System of Maryland for the 2018-2019 academic year in the areas of faculty contributions to student success, their disciplines, and service activities.

While there are variations across institutions, production of credit hours is keeping pace with overall enrollment trends, suggesting there are sufficient numbers of courses available for students to graduate in a timely fashion. This is further substantiated by the fact that the number of degrees awarded continues to rise and four-year and six-year graduation rates continue to improve.

The data indicate that teaching responsibilities continue to shift, but less-so over to part-time faculty as is commonly thought and more-so over to full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty whose primary responsibility is for teaching.

At the same time, non-instructional productivity in the form of scholarship and service remained at a very high level. External research funding rose again in the last year to over \$1.46 billion in the last year.

APPENDIX A: FACULTY PROFILE

USM Faculty Complement

This appendix provides an overview of the faculty complement at USM institutions included in this report. In 2018-2019, the USM had an instructional complement of 7,576 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 (Academic Year 2018-2019)

	Tenured/ Tenure Track	Full Time Non-Tenure Track Instructional	Part-time	All Faculty
BSU	120	85	203	408
CSU	111	7	132	250
FSU	204	34	129	367
SU	346	98	236	680
TU	603	306	833	1742
UB	144	41	210	395
UMBC	397	145	291	833
UMCP	1379	463	772	2614
UMES	150	54	83	287
Overall	3,454	1,233	2,889	7,576

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty decreased slightly from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. Table A-2 displays the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of that category of faculty.

Table A-2. Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

	2013-2014	2017-2018	2018-2019	1-Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track	5-Year Change in Tenured/Tenure Track
BSU	153	126	120	-4.76%	-21.57%
CSU	128	112	111	-0.89%	-13.28%
FSU	214	208	204	-1.92%	-4.67%
SU	311	347	346	-0.29%	11.25%
TU	591	596	603	1.17%	2.03%
UB	167	153	144	-5.88%	-13.77%
UMBC	381	403	397	-1.49%	4.20%
UMCP	1377	1397	1379	-1.29%	0.15%
UMES	153	149	150	0.67%	-1.96%
Overall	3,475	3,491	3,454	-1.06%	-0.60%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

Full-time Non-Tenure Track Instructional faculty

The total number of full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty increased dramatically in recent years. In the period from 2013-2014 through 2018-2019, the numbers increased by 191 or about 18%. Table A-3 displays the number of full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of that category of faculty.

Table A-3. Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty

	2013-2014	2017-2018	2018-2019	1-Year Change in Non-Tenure Track	5-Year Change in Non-Tenure Track
BSU	75	87	85	-2.30%	13.33%
CSU	16	9	7	-22.22%	-56.25%
FSU	38	41	34	-17.07%	-10.53%
SU	98	87	98	12.64%	0.00%
TU	279	308	306	-0.65%	9.68%
UB	30	35	41	17.14%	36.67%
UMBC	127	147	145	-1.36%	14.17%
UMCP	317	431	463	7.42%	46.06%
UMES	62	60	54	-10.00%	-12.90%
Overall	1042	1205	1233	2.32%	18.33%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)

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 by -2.37% from 2017-2018 and by -0.38% from 2013-2014. Table A-4 displays the number of part-time faculty at each institution and the 1-year and 5-year percent change in number of part-time faculty.

Table A-4. Part-Time Faculty

	2013-2014	2017-2018	2018-2019	1-Year Change in Part-Time	5-Year Change in Part-Time
BSU	212	231	203	-12.12%	-4.25%
CSU	144	125	132	5.60%	-8.33%
FSU	140	141	129	-8.51%	-7.86%
SU	252	230	236	2.61%	-6.35%
TU	784	807	833	3.22%	6.25%
UB	233	233	210	-9.87%	-9.87%
UMBC	270	291	291	0.00%	7.78%
UMCP	715	803	772	-3.86%	7.97%
UMES	150	98	83	-15.31%	-44.67%
Overall	2,900	2,959	2,889	-2.37%	-0.38%

Source: USM Institutional Research Office (MHEC EDS)