

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

2002 Institutional Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission



July 2002

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY 2002 INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

Mission Statement

Salisbury University is a leading regional comprehensive university emphasizing undergraduate liberal arts, sciences, pre-professional/professional programs, and select, mostly applied, graduate programs. The University attracts academically capable students primarily from Maryland, and promotes and supports applied research, diversity initiatives, targeted outreach programs, K-16 partnerships, cultural events, and civic engagement in all aspects of community life. Salisbury University prepares graduates to become productive members of society and the workforce, to pursue careers in a global economy, and to meet the State's workforce needs. (*Summary of Approved Mission Statement: Salisbury University, 2000*)

Institutional Assessment

In Fiscal Year 2002, Salisbury University accelerated its transformation as an outcomes-oriented organization, focusing with greater vigor on the qualities and outcomes that are best demonstrated in SU's Managing For Results (MFR) and are primary goals of many of Maryland's agencies that possess a stake in the mission of Salisbury University. The University continues to prioritize access and production goals in support of the *2000 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education* and places equal emphasis on the outcomes, qualities, and efficiencies that attest to a university's true performance. Chief among these emphases, but noteworthy even though they are not discussed in the annual accountability report, are the student learning outcomes that are the core of any educational enterprise.

Salisbury University should successfully achieve or has already attained many of its accountability goals targeted in the MFR, including but not limited to:

- Increased graduation and retention rates,
- Growth in the diversity portrait of our higher education workforce,
- Growth in the diversity portrait of the student body,
- Growth in the number of teacher education, nursing, and information technology graduates,
- Increased the number of teacher education graduates employed in Maryland,
- Greater undergraduate satisfaction with preparation for graduate school, and
- Increased the percentage of undergraduate students satisfied with their preparation for employment.

Salisbury University continues to focus its enrollment on highly qualified, motivated first-time freshmen. New freshman enrollment for Fall 2001 was 943, with a composite SAT score of 1,030 and 1,200 at the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively, and an average high-school GPA of over 3.4. At just under 5,000 applicants, these students were admitted from the largest applicant pool ever to apply to SU. The University increased its selectivity to 52%—the most stringent ever—in order to limit freshman growth and to operate within the current enrollment capacity that is constrained by insufficient classroom space, insufficient facilities surge space, and adequate resources to hire additional faculty as well as to construct new and larger facilities on a timely cycle. Even with greater selectivity, the University's enrollment grew an additional 4%, making the two-year growth more than 10% and a Fall 2001 headcount that was just under 6,700

students.

Simultaneously, the University responded to President Dudley-Eshbach's diversity initiatives, enrolling the largest freshman minority and African-American class in institutional history, increasing freshman African-American enrollment by 177% over the previous year, and boosting the retention rate of African-American and minorities to 88% and 78%, respectively. Last year, the University modified its entrance criteria to consider other factors in admissions besides the heavily weighted SAT and GPA scores. This was motivated by the University's emphasis to improve educational access to a broadly diverse community, and particularly students of underrepresented groups. As a result, while African-Americans represented just over 3% of the incoming freshman class in Fall 2000, in Fall 2001, African-American students represented over 9% of the incoming freshman class. This trend will continue in Fall 2002, and although enrollment of first-time freshmen is increasingly selective, the University remains committed to an open access policy admitting all students who successfully complete and transfer coursework from accredited community colleges.

In Fall 2001, the percentage of African-Americans in the total undergraduate population reversed its downward trend from previous years and increased to 7.8%. Although this indicates a modest .4% growth as a percentage of the total undergraduate population, it represents a tangible increase of 8.2% in the number of African-American undergraduates and was critical in terminating the downward spiral of previous years. More dramatic growth will be realized as each freshman class progresses from year-to-year and the number of African-American students represent a larger portion of each class and, therefore, of the whole population. Simultaneously, a more dramatic increase occurred in the growth of total minorities who now represent 11.6% of the total undergraduate population, and, if weighted for the number of international students, would account for 12.2% of the total undergraduate population. Simply put, Salisbury University has made access and diversity the highest priority and is achieving its goals even without the additional funding incentives afforded other institutions with similar needs.

As the data indicate, Salisbury University continues to make progress toward its faculty salary goals. Faculty salaries as a percentile of AAUP peers moved from the 80th to the 83rd percentile at the assistant professor level, from 60th to the 65th at the associate professor level, and from 69th to the 72nd at the level of professor. Despite the University's progress, continued growth in faculty and administrative salaries to reach and maintain market and regionally competitive levels cannot be achieved without additional annual resources. Such growth is essential to attract and retain the highest caliber workforce, including highly sought after minority faculty. Complicating this matter, employee benefits must be considered into the total compensation package. Although the University's current medical benefits surpass those of the majority of its peers, the current retirement contribution rate of 7.25%—a rate discussed in the Legislature two years ago but tabled and not revived—is well below that of many peers that provide institutional contributions of 9%, 10%, or more of total annual salary. Despite the struggle other institutions may have with funding in the current climate, the University does not believe the progress made to date will continue given present allocations and other mandatory initiatives.

Further complicating faculty and teaching initiatives, the percentage of core faculty teaching lower-division courses declined this year by 3 points to 50%—a trend not dissimilar to that experienced by most USM institutions. Put candidly, the level of resources necessary to hire faculty in adequate numbers to achieve our goal in this indicator cannot be accomplished without

significant additional State allocations. In this instance, and in every indicator where the University points to allocations as the primary impediment to progress, the University asserts that it has been doing and continues to do nearly everything possible to maximize efficiencies despite the fact that agreed-upon funding guidelines are not equitably followed. For instance, in an effort to maximize financial efficiencies and to utilize professional talents and resources external to the University, the institution employs many part-time faculty to teach physical activity courses that are a core requirement of undergraduate education. These faculty are often the best qualified to instruct particular activities, but, as adjunct faculty, their instructional load is excluded from core faculty calculations. Similarly, in other disciplines, such as in the health sciences, the University may employ local health professionals as adjunct faculty where the prudent use of local expertise has the result of lowering the percentage of lower-division courses taught by core faculty. In order to make progress with this indicator and to continue to advance salaries toward competitive levels, funding enhancements must be advanced.

Licensure and passing rates did not improve for either the Nursing Program or the Teacher Education program in 2001. In fact, the Nursing program continued its trend where it climbs to the upper 80% range one year only to return to just below 80% the next. The decline in licensure passing rates was comparable to other USM institutions and SU's licensure passing rates remained the highest of any public four-year institution in the State of Maryland. However, the Nursing Program will attempt to determine if there is a correlation between this trend and any internal factors. In addition, like many universities across the State, SU's Praxis scores experienced a 5-point decrease. According to the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the Praxis scores of 2000-2001 are "not comparable to the 1999-2000 pass rates" since most of those students took the National Teacher Exam (NTE) which has been replaced in favor of the more rigorous Praxis series. The University continues to expect that its students achieve the highest possible scores and passing rates.

Salisbury University continues to generate the highest 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates in the University System of Maryland. In 2001, the 6-year graduation rate of the 1995 cohort rose to 73.9%—an additional 3-point improvement over the 5-point gain of the previous cohort. Similarly, the 6-year graduation rate for African-Americans in the same cohort rose to 60.6%—the second highest in the USM. Although the University is particularly encouraged by the continuing increase in the graduation rates of its African-American students, the trend for this population has revealed large annual swings because of the low initial numbers within the cohort. The second-year retention rate of African-American students soared to 87.5% or 22 points greater than the previous cohort. Salisbury University has begun to change the institutional climate and is focusing upon diversity and access as the number one priority; still, the *retention* rates for these students have been susceptible to the same swings that have been experienced in the *graduation* rates for this population group. Not until the larger populations from the Fall 2001 and Fall 2002 classes begin to advance from year-to-year will the University have any true indication of the stability of this indicator. All other retention and graduation rates, excepting the 6-year graduation rates of minority students, continued to improve this year and easily represent one of the continuing success stories for SU. For well over a decade, no USM institution has matched our four-year graduation rates and for the seventh consecutive year, Salisbury University has earned the highest six-year graduation rate.

The University continues to pursue alternative funding opportunities. Through the extraordinary

efforts of a small but dedicated staff and increasing success by motivated faculty, the amount of grants and sponsored awards received annually continues to increase. Grants awarded in FY 2001 exceeded \$5,000,000. Although FY 2002 financials are not yet finalized, it is anticipated that the awards received in this fiscal year will exceed that amount. This level will surpass the University's targeted goal for the second consecutive year, which, given the variable nature of grants and sponsored funding, distinguishes this group of faculty and staff and benefits the entire campus. Like several other indicators, the targets will have to be reevaluated and balanced against the University's priorities.

Trends Influencing Performance Accountability

Although it is a thorny topic and applicable to many institutions, the most significant issue affecting Salisbury University's attainment of our accountability goals is both inequitable and insufficient State funding allocations. According to the MHEC peer analysis in Fall 2001, Salisbury University was funded at \$1,697 per full-time equivalent student (FTES) below its funding peers. This amount would equate to an additional \$8,800,000 in state appropriations annually if the University were to be funded at the average peer funding level per FTES. What is more, these levels represent the gap between SU and our performance peers during the peak of the State's funding initiatives to higher education and prior to the FY 2002 budget adjustments. Further, for FY 2003, Salisbury University received an appropriation that placed it at 75% of the funding guideline while the average for the USM was 83% and one institution was funded at over 110% of the guideline level.

In the 2002 Edition of *America's Best Colleges* (2001, U.S. News and World Report), Salisbury University was ranked 10th in the "Top Public Schools: Universities-Master's" in the North Region. Including all public and private universities in the same region, SU was ranked 46th out of 167. However, in a key category, "Financial Resources Rank," the University was ranked 164th out of 167. This category measured one thing: "the average spending per full-time equivalent students on instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, and operations and maintenance during the 1999 and 2000 fiscal years." Out of 167 institutions in the North Region, and utilizing a standardized federal reporting database as the source, U.S. News and World Report ranked Salisbury University's financial resources at just four places from the bottom. This has significant implications for the University in achieving any accountability goal or to maintain success in those areas it has already met performance aspirations. For instance, the number of economically disadvantaged students receiving financial aid cannot be increased without additional resources directed exclusively to scholarship and grant opportunities.

Although a reordering of priorities may allow for additional internal reallocations to focus on specific initiatives, State funding allocations that are imbalanced among Maryland institutions and below that of funding peers will inevitably influence those indicators in which we currently surpass our own expectations and those of the State. Guideline funding has failed to produce the guideline dollars designated, and the University's funding continues to lag behind all traditional four-year institutions in the USM. The University has prioritized its accountability goals according to State needs and meets with great success on a majority of indicators, and yet, the State of Maryland underfunds the guidelines and fails to reward success. Minimum funding thresholds are necessary to sustain superior performance across a full array of initiatives, and given the high performance standards already achieved by SU, it would be appropriate and

prudent for the USM and the State of Maryland to fund its institutions equitably according to its own guidelines.

Accountability Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

Attachment A: Salisbury University Managing For Results (MFR).

Attachment B: Operational Definitions for the Salisbury University MFR.

Cost Containment

Included as a separate submission by the USM.

ATTACHMENT A:

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY
Managing For Results (MFR)

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Salisbury University (SU) serves the State of Maryland by providing undergraduate liberal arts, sciences, pre-professional and professional programs, and select, mostly applied, graduate programs.

MISSION

Salisbury University is a regional comprehensive university emphasizing undergraduate liberal arts, sciences, pre-professional and professional programs, and select, mostly applied, graduate programs. The University creates a superior, active, and engaged relationship between academic programs, the faculty, staff, and students and unites diverse and highly qualified faculty and staff in serving academically capable students from both the Western and Eastern Shores of Maryland and other states and nations. Salisbury University prepares its graduates to pursue careers in a global economy and for meeting the State's workforce needs. The University promotes and supports applied research, diversity initiatives, targeted outreach programs, K-16 partnerships, cultural events, and civic engagement in all aspects of community life. Salisbury University recognizes excellence, student-centeredness, learning, community, civic engagement, and diversity as the fundamental values on which it is founded and upon which it serves the State of Maryland.

VISION

Salisbury University will continue as a premier regional university that is recognized nationally for excellence by its peers and regionally for its commitment to model programs in civic engagement. Undergraduate research, service learning, international experiences, and co-curricular activities will continue to enrich the traditional academic curriculum and enable students to connect research to practice theory to action. The University will provide graduates who will be recruited by the best employers and graduate schools, and who will contribute to the economic vitality of the State and the Nation. The University will continue to enhance the quality of life for its students, the State, and the region, and will explore opportunities to provide doctoral programs in areas of need.

KEY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1. Provide quality undergraduate/graduate education.

Objective 1.1 Increase the annual pass rate of nursing program graduates who take the nursing licensure exam from 79% in 1999 to 90% by 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Quality:	Nursing (NCLEX) exam pass rate	87%	79%	88%	79%	89%	90%

Objective 1.2 Increase the annual pass rate of teacher education program graduates who take the teacher licensure exam from 96% in 1999 to 98% by 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Quality:	Teaching (NTE or PRAXIS II) pass rate	96%	96%	96%	91%	91%	92%

Objective 1.3 The proportion of SU graduates who are satisfied with their level of preparation for graduate or professional school will increase from 96% in 1998 to 98% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Quality:	Satisfaction w/preparation for graduate school	95%	98%	100%	7/30/02	98%	98%

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 1.4 The proportion of SU graduates who are satisfied with their level of preparation for employment will increase from 92% in 1998 to 94% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Quality:	Satisfaction w/preparation for employment	92%	93%	93%	7/30/02	93%	93%

Objective 1.5 Through 2004, the proportion of University graduates who are satisfied with the overall quality of education will be maintained at no less than the 98% level attained in 2000.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Quality:	Undergraduate satisfaction w/educational quality	N/A	98%	96%	7/30/02	97%	98%

Objective 1.6 Increase the proportion of lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty from 56% in 1998 to 67% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Quality:	Percent of lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty	50%	53%	50%	7/30/02	50%	50%

Goal 2. Prepare graduates to become productive members of society and the workforce.

Objective 2.1 Through 2004, the proportion of employers who are satisfied with employees who were SU graduates will be maintained at the 98% level attained in 2001.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Employer satisfaction w/SU grads	N/A	N/A	97.8%	N/A	97.8%	98%

Objective 2.2 Maintain or increase the fiscal year 1999 ratio of the median salary of SU graduates to the median salary of the civilian work force with bachelor's degrees. The ratio in fiscal year 1999 was .74.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Ratio of the median salary of SU graduates (one year after graduation) to the average salary of the civilian workforce w/bachelor's degrees	.74	.73	.74	8/31/02	.74	.74

Objective 2.3 The annual number of SU graduates in information technology (IT) fields will increase from 48 in 1999 to 80 by 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Output:	Number of IT graduates	48	44	78	7/30/02	95	104

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 2.4 The annual number of SU graduates in Teacher Education will increase from 233 in 1999 to 285 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Output:	Number of Teacher Education graduates	233	197	229	7/30/02	250	260

Objective 2.5 The annual number of SU graduates in Nursing will increase for 48 in 1999 to 60 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Output:	Number of Nursing graduates	48	37	55	7/30/02	58	60

Objective 2.6 The annual number of SU baccalaureate recipients will increase from 1,169 in 1999 to 1,310 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Output:	Number of baccalaureate recipients	1,169	1,056	1,285	7/30/02	1,310	1,310

Goal 3. Promote educational, economic, cultural, and social development in the State and the region.

Objective 3.1 Increase the estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed as teachers in Maryland from 145 in 1999 to 200 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Outcome:	Estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed in MD as teachers	145	121	141	7/30/02	175	175

Objective 3.2 Increase the estimated number of IT graduates employed in IT related fields in Maryland from 26 in 1999 to 45 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Outcome:	Estimated number of IT graduates employed in MD in an IT field	26	21	17	7/30/02	45	48

Objective 3.3 Increase the estimated annual number of SU graduates employed in Maryland from 785 in 1999 to 876 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Actual	Survey Est.	Survey Est.
Outcome:	Estimated number employed in in MD one-year after graduation	785	746	729	7/30/02	860	880

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 3.4 Maintain or increase the percent of graduates employed one-year after graduation. In 1999, 95% of SU graduates were employed.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
		Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Performance Measure Percent employed one-year after graduation	95%	94%	96%	7/30/02	95%	95%

Objective 3.5 Increase the estimated number of Nursing graduates employed as nurses in Maryland from 36 in 1999 to 43 in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
		Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Performance Measure Estimated number of Nursing graduates employed in MD as nurses	36	35	27	7/30/02	38	38

Objective 3.6 Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU from 52.5% in 2000 to 55.0% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Performance Measure Percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU	N/A	52.5%	50.8%	40.9%	50.0%	50.0%

Goal 4. Broaden access to and diversity in higher education.

Objective 4.1 Increase the proportion of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty who are women from 36% in 1998 to not less than 38% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Performance Measure Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent women	35%	34%	34%	36%	37%	38%

Objective 4.2 Increase the proportion of full-time executive/managerial staff that are women from 32% in 1998 to 35% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Performance Measure Full-time executive/managerial staff: percent women	28%	33%	38%	39%	39%	39%

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 4.3 Increase the proportion of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty who are African-American from 5% in 1998 to 6% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent African-American	3.8%	3.7%	4.4%	5.4%	5.8%	6.0%

Objective 4.4 Increase the proportion of full-time executive/managerial staff that are African-American from 6% in 1998 to 9% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Full-time executive/managerial staff: percent African-American	6.4%	7.9%	8.7%	8.7%	9.0%	9.0%

Objective 4.5 Increase the proportion of African-American undergraduates from 8% in 1998 to 10% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Percentage of African-American undergraduates	8.6%	8.0%	7.4%	7.8%	8.2%	9.0%

Objective 4.6 Increase the proportion of minority undergraduates from 10.4% in 1998 to 13.0% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Percentage of minority undergraduates	11.4%	10.8%	10.6%	11.6%	12.4%	13%

Goal 5. Increase revenue from alternative sources and maximize the efficient use of State resources.

Objective 5.1 From a level of \$12.7 million in 1999, in the Campaign for Maryland raise \$18.5 million for Salisbury University by 2002.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Dollars (millions) raised in Campaign for MD	\$12.73	\$15.48	\$14.68	7/30/02	\$16.00	\$18.50

Objective 5.2 Increase annual private, federal, and state grants and sponsored research dollar awards (excluding scholarship and financial aid awards) from \$2.0 million in 1998 to \$4.0 million by 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Private, State, and Federal dollar awards for grants and sponsored research (millions)	\$2.37	\$3.22	\$5.07	7/30/02	\$4.50	\$4.50

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 5.3 Maintain current annual operating budget savings rate of 2% through efficiency and cost containment measures.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Efficiency:	Annual operating budget savings rate	2.0%	2.0%	1.1%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Objective 5.4 Allocate expenditures on facility renewal from .8% in 1999 to 2% in 2005.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Efficiency:	Percentage of annual state appropriation spent on facility renewal	.8%	.9%	1%	.8%	.7%	.7%

Objective 5.5 Increase annual University fund-raising from \$1.9 million in 1998 to \$2.4 million in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Outcome:	Annual giving (millions)	\$2.04	\$1.34	\$2.27	7/30/02	\$1.70	\$1.90

Objective 5.6 Increase the salary levels of University faculty as a percentile of AAUP peers at the ranks of assistant, associate, and professor from 68th, 53rd, and 65th, respectively in 1999 to the 85th percentile by 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Faculty salary as a %ile of AAUP peers						
	Assistant	68 th	72 nd	80 th	83 rd	83 rd	80 th
	Associate	53 rd	53 rd	60 th	65 th	65 th	63 rd
	Professor	65 th	65 th	69 th	72 nd	72 nd	69 th

Objective 5.7 Increase the proportion of administrative staff who earn salaries that are at or above the 60th percentile of CUPA peers from 33% in 2000 to 55% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Input:	Proportion of administrative staff salaries at or above 60 th %ile of CUPA peers	N/A	33%	38%	7/15/02	40%	40%

Goal 6. Improve retention and graduation rates.

Objective 6.1 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen will increase from 86.5% in 1998 to 87.0% in 2004.

		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	Performance Measure	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Est.
Output:	2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: all students	84.9%	84.0%	84.4%	86.0%	86.5%	87%

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

RB29.00 SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 6.2 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time African-American freshmen will increase from 75% in 1998 to 78% in 2004.

Output:	Performance Measure	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Est.	2004 Est.
	2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: African-American students	68.8%	78.0%	65.8%	87.5%	78.0%	78.0%

Objective 6.3 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 76% in 1998 to 80% in 2004.

Output:	Performance Measure	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Est.	2004 Est.
	2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: minority students	70.3%	77.4%	74.2%	78.4%	79.0%	80.0%

Objective 6.4 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen will increase from 65.2% in 1998 to 70% in 2004.

Output:	Performance Measure	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Est.	2004 Est.
	6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: all students	68.6%	65.6%	70.6%	73.9%	71.0%	72.0%

Objective 6.5 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time African-American freshmen will increase from 43.2% in 1998 to 61.0% in 2004.

Output:	Performance Measure	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Est.	2004 Est.
	6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: African-American students	60.8%	51.9%	60.4%	60.6%	55.0%	58.0%

Objective 6.6 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 55% in 1998 to 61% in 2004.

Output:	Performance Measure	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Est.	2004 Est.
	6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: minority students	59.7%	52.8%	60.6%	57.1%	58.0%	61.0%

ATTACHMENT B:

**Operational Definitions for
The Salisbury University MFR**

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
1.1	1.4	Quality	FY99: 97-98 grads FY00: 98-99 grads FY01: 99-00 grads FY02: 00-01 grads	Percent of nursing program graduates passing the NCLEX-RN licensing examination	Maryland Board of Nursing Website <i>www.mbon.org/education/nclexrn_stats.html</i>	The number of undergraduate nursing bachelor degree recipients who passed the NCLEX-RN exam divided by the total number of Nursing bachelor degree recipients who took the exam.
1.2	1.2	Quality	FY 99: Test period 10/1/97 through 9/30/98 FY 00: Test period 10/1/98 through 9/30/99 FY 01: Test period 10/1/99 through 9/30/00 FY 02: Test period 10/1/00 through 9/30/01	Percent of undergraduate and MAT students who passed Praxis II or the National Teachers Exam (NTE), if applicable during the transition period.	Praxis II/NTE results from Educational Testing Service (ETS) through SU Education Department	The number of teacher education bachelor and MAT degree recipients who passed the Praxis II exam (or NTE if applicable), divided by the total number of teacher education bachelor degree and MAT degree recipients who took the Praxis II (or NTE).
1.3	4.7	Quality	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Student satisfaction with education received for graduate or professional school	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation and who rated their preparation for advanced education as excellent, good or fair (adequate). (Uncertain responses included in the denominator for 2001 data).
1.4	4.6	Quality	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Student satisfaction with education received for employment	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients employed full-time within one year of graduation and who rated their education as excellent, good, or fair (adequate) preparation for their job. (Uncertain responses included in the denominator for 2001 data).

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
1.5		Quality	FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Undergraduate satisfaction with educational quality	Salisbury University-specific question on MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of respondents to the alumni survey who responded 'very satisfied', or mostly satisfied', or 'more satisfied than dissatisfied', or 'satisfied'
1.6		Quality	Fiscal year basis	Lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty	Salisbury University's Faculty Workload Report to the USM	Lower-division student credit hours taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty and department chairs divided by the total of all lower-division student credit hours taught. Lower-division = 100 and 200 level courses.
2.1	1.5	Outcome	Only one year available, 2001 survey of FY 2000 baccalaureate degree recipients	Employers' satisfaction with Salisbury University graduates	Schaefer Center Survey of Alumni/Employer satisfaction	Frequency on affirmative responses to question #4: "Based on your experience with SU graduates, would you hire graduates from SU again?"
2.2	2.2	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Ratio of median salary of Salisbury University graduates one-year after graduation to the median salary of the U.S. civilian work force with bachelor's degree	SU salary data: MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates US salary data: US Census Bureau/Bureau of Labor Statistics Current Population Survey (CPS)	Self-explanatory. Methodology: survey year matches CPS sample year. Salisbury University data are collected by the alumni survey question on annual salary and calculated using median of grouped data computation, divided by the median salary of US residents 25 years of age and older who have a bachelor's degree (from CPS Website).

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
2.3	1.3	Output	Fiscal year basis	Number of students graduating from Information Technology (IT) baccalaureate programs	SU Fact Books with reference to Degree Information System, DRF files '02, '01, '00, '99	Undergraduate degree recipients whose degree in maj1, maj2, or maj3 was Information Systems Management (ISMN) or Computer Science (COSC). Also selected anyone who had a COSC track, COSC concentration, COSC minor, or ISMN minor. (Frequencies run in SPSS for '02.)
2.4	1.2	Output	Fiscal year basis	Number of students graduating from Teacher Education programs	SU Fact Books with reference to Degree Information System, DRF files '02, '01, '00, '99	Undergraduate degree recipients whose degree in maj1, maj2, or maj3 was Elementary Education (ELED) or who graduated with a track in Secondary Education (SCED). (Frequencies run in SPSS for '02.)
2.5	1.4	Output	Fiscal year basis	Number of students graduating from baccalaureate Nursing program	SU Fact Books with reference to Degree Information System, DRF files '02, '01, '00, '99	Undergraduate degree recipients whose degree in maj1, maj2, or maj3 was Nursing (NURS). (Frequencies run in SPSS for '02).
2.6	1.1, 2.1	Output	Fiscal year basis	Number of students graduating from all baccalaureate programs	SU Fact Books with reference to Degree Information System, DRF files '02, '01, '00, '99	Undergraduates who received a baccalaureate degree. This would include frequencies on variables 'degree' and 'degr2'. (Frequencies run in SPSS for '02.)

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
3.1	1.2	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed in Maryland as teachers	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of ELED bachelor degree recipients (maj1, maj2, or maj3 = ELED -or- track = SCED) who responded to the survey, are working in MD, and are working as teachers, of all teacher education graduates responding to the survey, multiplied by the total number of teacher education bachelor degree recipients.
3.2	1.3	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Estimated number of Information Technology (IT) graduates employed in Maryland in an IT field	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of IT bachelor degree recipients (maj1, maj2, or maj3 = ISMN or COSC -or- track = COSC, concentration = COSC, or minor = COSC or ISMN) who responded to the survey, are working in MD, and are working in an IT field of all IT graduates responding to the survey, multiplied by the total number of IT bachelor degree recipients.
3.3	1.1	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Estimated number of graduates employed in Maryland one year after graduation.	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of all bachelor degree recipients who held full- or part-time jobs in Maryland within one year of graduation of all bachelor's degree recipients working full- or part-time, multiplied by the total number of bachelor's degree recipients from the same year.

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
3.4	1.1	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Employment rate of graduates	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of bachelor degree recipients who held full- or part-time jobs within one year of graduation.
3.5	1.4	Outcome	FY 99: 97-98 grads FY 00: 98-99 grads FY 01: 99-00 grads FY 02: 00-01 grads	Estimated number of Nursing graduates employed in Maryland as a health professional	MHEC follow-up survey of recent graduates	The percentage of NURS bachelor degree recipients (maj1, maj2, or maj3 = NURS) who responded to the survey, are working in MD, and are working as a health professional of all Nursing graduates responding to the survey, multiplied by the total number of Nursing bachelor degree recipients.
3.6	3.7	Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	% of economically disadvantaged students attending SU	Common Data Set (refer to US News and World Report, SU submissions)	Number of degree-seeking undergraduate students, both full- and part-time, who applied for financial aid and who were determined to have financial need (from line H2c of the Common Data Set) divided by the total number of degree-seeking undergraduates (line H2a).
4.1		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent women	From SU Fact Books; MHEC Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Employee Data System file M1563YYXQ.dat:13	The number of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty who are women divided by the total number of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
4.2		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Full-time, executive/managerial staff: percent women	From SU Fact Books; MHEC Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Employee Data System file M1563YYXQ.dat:13	The number of women who are full-time and whose employment classification is executive/managerial (IPEDS Employment Classification Scheme) divided by the total number of full-time executive/managerial employees.
4.3		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent African-American	From SU Fact Books; MHEC Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Employee Data System file M1563YYXQ.dat:13	The number of African-American full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty divided by the total number of full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty.
4.4		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Full-time, executive/managerial staff: percent African-American	From SU Fact Books; MHEC Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Employee Data System file M1563YYXQ.dat:13	The number of African-Americans who are full-time and whose employment classification is executive/managerial (IPEDS Employment Classification Scheme) divided by the total number of full-time executive/managerial employees.
4.5	3.2	Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Percentage of African-American undergraduates	From SU Fact Books; source is Enrollment Summary Statistics, Job NMIS 350, Prog MISN400	Total African-American undergraduates divided by the total number of undergraduates excluding students of unknown ethnicity.

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
4.6	3.1	Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Percentage of minority undergraduates	From SU Fact Books; source is Enrollment Summary Statistics, Job NMIS 350, Prog MISN400	The sum of all minority undergraduates, which includes the race/ethnicities of African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native American, divided by the total number of undergraduates excluding students of unknown ethnicity.
5.1	5.1	Outcome	Fiscal year basis	Funds raised through Campaign for Maryland	UMF	Campaign cumulative total as of the end of each FY.
5.2		Outcome	Fiscal year basis	Private, State, and Federal dollar awards for grants and sponsored research	SU Office of Grants and Sponsored Research Annual Reports	Total value of private, State, and Federal dollar awards for grants and sponsored research.
5.3	5.2	Efficiency	Fiscal year basis	Annual operating budget savings	<i>Efficiency Efforts of the USM</i> USM-provided	Detailed definition included in report. Efficiency includes specific actions resulting on cost savings; cost avoidance; strategic reallocation; and revenue enhancement. Total dollars saved through efficiency efforts (provided by USM) divided by state-supported budget.

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
5.4	6.2	Efficiency	Fiscal year basis	% of replacement cost expended in facility renewal and renovation	USM Office of Capital Budget USM-provided	Expenditures from operating and capital budgets on facility renewal and renovation as a percentage of the total replacement value.
5.5		Outcome	Fiscal year basis	Annual giving	Council for Aid to Education (CFAE) reports; Program ID LBA361	Current outright gifts at face value, excluding deferred gifts and gifts of property, buildings, and/or equity.
5.6		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Faculty salary as a percentile of AAUP peers: Assistant Associate Professor	AAUP percentile data USM-provided	SU faculty salary percentiles by rank compared by rank to other 4-year public institutions in Masters I Carnegie classification.
5.7		Input	FY 99: Fall 98 FY 00: Fall 99 FY 01: Fall 00 FY 02: Fall 01 FY 03: Fall 02 (est.) FY 04: Fall 03 (est.)	Proportion of administrative staff salaries at or above the 60 th percentile of College and University Professional Association (CUPA) peers	SU Budget Office	The number of full-time administrative staff that earns at or above the 60 th percentile of comparable CUPA positions divided by the total number of full-time administrative staff.
6.1	3.3, 3.4, 4.1	Output	FY 99: 1997 cohort FY 00: 1998 cohort FY 01: 1999 cohort FY 02: 2000 cohort FY 03: 2001 cohort (est.) FY 04: 2002 cohort (est.)	Second year retention rate: all students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who re-enrolled at any Maryland public four-year institution one year after matriculation.
6.2	3.3, 3.4, 4.1	Output	FY 99: 1997 cohort FY 00: 1998 cohort FY 01: 1999 cohort FY 02: 2000 cohort FY 03: 2001 cohort (est.) FY 04: 2002 cohort (est.)	Second year retention rate: African-American students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking African-American undergraduates who re-enrolled at any Maryland public four-year institution one year after matriculation.

Salisbury University

June, 2002

Template Objective		Indicator Type	Special Timeframe Issues	Indicator/Measure	Source	Operational Definition
SU	USM					
6.3		Output	FY 99: 1997 cohort FY 00: 1998 cohort FY 01: 1999 cohort FY 02: 2000 cohort FY 03: 2001 cohort (est.) FY 04: 2002 cohort (est.)	Second year retention rate: minority students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking minority undergraduates who re-enrolled at any Maryland public four-year institution one year after matriculation. Minority includes African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native American.
6.4	3.5, 3.6, 4.2	Output	FY 99: 1992 cohort FY 00: 1993 cohort FY 01: 1994 cohort FY 02: 1995 cohort FY 03: 1996 cohort (est.) FY 04: 1997 cohort (est.)	Six year graduation rate: all students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of all first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who graduated from any Maryland public four-year institution within six years of matriculation
6.5	3.5, 3.6, 4.2	Output	FY 99: 1992 cohort FY 00: 1993 cohort FY 01: 1994 cohort FY 02: 1995 cohort FY 03: 1996 cohort (est.) FY 04: 1997 cohort (est.)	Six year graduation rate: African-American students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of all African-American first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who graduated from any Maryland public four-year institution within six years of matriculation.
6.6		Output	FY 99: 1992 cohort FY 00: 1993 cohort FY 01: 1994 cohort FY 02: 1995 cohort FY 03: 1996 cohort (est.) FY 04: 1997 cohort (est.)	Six year graduation rate: minority students	EIS, DIS MHEC provided	The percentage of minority first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who graduated from any Maryland public four-year institution within six years of matriculation. Minority includes African-American, Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American.

Source abbreviations:

EIS - MHEC Enrollment Information System

DIS - MHEC Degree Information System

UMF - University of Maryland Foundation