

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

**2005 Institutional Performance Accountability Report
to the Maryland Higher Education Commission**



July 2005

**Prepared by
The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, & Accountability**

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 provide specialized doctoral programs that uniquely serve regional areas of need.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Overview

In 2004, Salisbury University concluded the first complete cycle of the State of Maryland's Managing For Results and revised MHEC Accountability processes with mixed but predictable success. During this five-year cycle and representing a significant achievement for the University, 57% or 21 of the objectives were completed while progress was made in all but 18% of the objectives. Moreover, all of the goals were set at performance levels that required SU to pursue or maintain higher standards of growth and excellence, with progress made during a period of significant enrollment growth (+15%), dramatic State financial instability, and ongoing, external, unfunded expectations to maintain access, affordability, and quality in equal measure.

The "Institutional Assessment" section of the 2005 Accountability Report will highlight SU's progress and performance while simultaneously transitioning from one MFR and MHEC accountability reporting cycle to another. As such, the "Key Goals and Objectives" of the 2005 Accountability Report reflect the reporting emphases that are of greatest interest to Maryland's state agencies. Goals and benchmarks have been reviewed, redundancy eliminated, and the core objectives streamlined following Managing For Results guidelines. Although the University is operating according to a more extensive, dynamic strategic plan approved in 2004, its "Key

Goals and Objectives” featured in the 2005 Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission will emphasize the multiple core indicators mandated by MHEC and the Department of Budget and Management. References to objectives within the “Institutional Assessment” section cite the University’s previous “Key Goals and Objectives” which may or may not match the “Key Goals and Objectives” included within the 2005 report.

After a multi-year, collegial effort, Salisbury University finalized a new strategic plan in 2004. With 4 primary goals and nearly 40 core objectives, there is significant congruence between the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary education and SU’s mission-specific strategic initiatives. Similarly, the University’s recently revised Facilities Master Plan is congruent with its own strategic plan, mission, and long-term vision. The strategic plan emphasizes academic quality, student success, access, and regional partnerships. Foremost among SU’s strategic goals is “providing a quality undergraduate and graduate academic and learning environment that promotes intellectual growth and success”. Institutional goals are consistent with the principles that have been guiding the University since the economic downturn forced SU to reprioritize, increase efficiencies, minimize waste, and attempt to balance competing interests. The basic tenets guiding University decision-making are:

- Preserve and enhance academic quality;
- Maintain and enhance instructional programs;
- Make strategic use of resources; and,
- Maximize student success.

Academic Quality

Graduation and Retention: In the past 16 years, Salisbury University has advanced its academic standards and reputation, attaining levels of eminence that readily identifies SU as one of the premier public institutions in the Northeast. Achievements include: the 6th highest average 6-year graduation rate among comprehensive public master’s universities nationwide; average 6-yr graduation rates that are higher than the average of our institutional performance and aspirational peers; the highest 4-year graduation rates in the USM for 18 consecutive years; and the highest 6-year graduation rates in the USM for 9 out of the last 10 years. Since 2001, we have achieved our goal of maintaining a graduation rate of at least 70% annually (Former Objective 6.4; Current Objective 4.4)—a rate that is higher than anticipated and significantly better than the rates throughout the 1990’s. However, the University has had less success in achieving its goals relative to African-American and minority student graduation rates (Former Objectives 6.5 and 6.6, respectively; Current Objectives 4.5 and 4.6, respectively) nearing the goals of 61% but, at 60.6%, never quite achieving them.

The University has made specific efforts to improve the graduation rates of minority students by increasing the diversity of the freshman class, developing an emphasis on international education, creating and filling a new position, Director of International Education, and creating an Office of Diversity to complement the Office of Multiethnic Student Services. The Office of Multiethnic Student Services assists in monitoring, among other responsibilities, the progress of any student who may need special assistance in adapting to college life, while the Office of Diversity has been tasked to develop a variety of programs to promote diversity and enhance inclusiveness within the entire SU community. These efforts have had immediate impact on the retention of minority and African-American students (Former Objectives 6.3 and 6.2, respectively; Current Objectives 4.3 and 4.2, respectively) where, with both groups, the University achieved and surpassed its retention goals. Additionally, with the initial cohorts of minority and African-American students increasing by more than 2.5 times their pre-2001 levels, numerical stability has been brought to both cohorts. Small freshman minority and African-American cohorts had a significant affect on the variability of graduation rates within these groups and, since graduation rates are lagging indicators, stability and predictability will be realized once the 2001 cohorts begin to graduate. Retention goals for both cohort groups will be elevated and established at levels that are comparable to the entire student body, while graduation rate goals will be established at levels that are achievable and move all groups toward equilibrium. As a lagging indicator, it is expected that graduation rate parity across all groups will be achieved within 5 to 10 years.

Conversely, the retention goals for the entire freshman class (Former Objective 6.1; Current Objective 4.1)—a rate that consistently hovers in the mid 80% range—has yet to approach our goal of 87%. Although this goal was lofty, efforts to increase it have been stalled by workforce reductions in the Division of Student Affairs. Additionally, survey research (2004 HERI CIRP Freshman Survey) of our freshmen show that 10% of our entering freshmen arrive with the intention to transfer before graduation—a key informational item indicating that SU serves a vital preparatory role for students who transfer to other in- and out-of-state institutions that offer

professional programs, i.e. engineering, that SU does not. Attrition studies have been inconclusive and the University has committed a significant portion of new tuition dollars to need-based financial aid in an attempt to limit the impact of finances as a potential reason for attrition. Additionally, SU offers both experiential- and course-based orientation programs, as well as special orientation sessions for families of in-coming minority freshmen and transfer students before the start of the Fall semester. These efforts are intended to foster an environment that will ensure that Salisbury University is a welcoming place for all students, employees, and others who use our campus—a factor that is critical to retention.

National Acclaim: Although not a specific accountability objective but a distinction nonetheless that makes use of a number of objective indicators to establish subjective rankings, for nine years, Salisbury University has garnered regional and national recognition from numerous publications including America's Best Colleges (*U.S. News and World Report*) and The Best 361 Colleges (*The Princeton Review*). Additionally, in the 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 editions of America's Best Colleges, SU was ranked as a “top tier” institution for both public and private universities in the North Region. Although the U.S. News ranking system is extremely subjective and the topic of much criticism, the criteria or indicators used to establish the rankings, like the MFR and MHEC performance indicators, are largely objective.

Alumni Satisfaction: Salisbury University alumni report a high level of satisfaction with their preparation for graduate or professional school, a goal (Objective 1.3) we have surpassed on many occasions. Satisfaction levels have ranged from 96% to 100% throughout the reporting cycle and, given the methodology, these levels are statistically equivalent. Although the University surveys alumni annually, we were forced to postpone our survey of the 2001-02 class until 2004 when we simultaneously surveyed the 2002-03 class. Surveying the 2001-02 class two years after graduation as opposed to one year after graduation—the norm for our accountability reporting—provided some interesting comparisons. For consistency's sake, we cannot use the 2002 cohort's data in the accountability report. However, one year after graduation approximately 27% of SU alumni enroll in graduate or professional study. The percentage increases to 35% after two years. Two-year post-graduation data reveal a higher percentage attending law and medical school, a lower percentage of teachers employed in the teaching profession, and solicited more thoughtful commentary regarding our own, institution-specific General Education questions.

Salisbury University alumni also report a high level of satisfaction with their preparation for employment, a goal (Objective 1.4) we surpassed in 2004 with a 98% satisfaction rating. However, this satisfaction level was significantly higher than the goal of 94% and our typical rates that had hovered between 92-94% for all of the previous years. It is unknown whether this is an anomalous spike in satisfaction levels or whether these levels represent the beginning of a new trend and the realities of a (currently) friendly employment market. As the University revisits this objective for the new accountability and MFR cycle, we are carefully reviewing our future goals to balance both higher expectations and realistic performance levels—particularly against objectives that are based upon survey results that have a margin of error of 11 points and an accountability review process that focuses its assessment primarily on institutional declines and lack of progress. While perhaps pointed, this is a significant issue since our own institutional effectiveness model is, by design, focused on Continuous Quality Improvement where the assurance of learning thrives best in an environment that is collegial, supportive of success, and equally supportive in helping to foster growth in areas of need. This is a model that Maryland higher education has yet to champion fully.

Although unsuccessful in maintaining a 98% satisfaction rating with the overall quality of education (Former Objective 1.5; Current—not included), alumni have typically rated the University between 96%-97% throughout the first MFR cycle. These satisfaction levels are statistically equivalent to our goal and, although we will no longer include this objective in order to comply with MFR guidelines, this indicator remains important to the University. In fact, it has become critical that we refine our survey research to determine the specific, as opposed to general, perceptions our students have regarding the educational experience at SU. This includes significant issues related to advising, course availability, skill preparation for employment, critical thinking competencies, classroom engagement, and other core educational competencies and academic support issues that are at the heart of a comprehensive educational experience. This also explains one of the motivating factors behind our survey research that includes the Alumni Survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement, the CIRP Freshman survey, and, in future years, will include additional study utilizing such instruments as Noel Levitz' Student Satisfaction Survey™, the HERI College Student Survey, and various internally designed surveys.

Accreditations and Licensure: Eight academic programs are accredited with specialized agencies while a ninth, the educational program in music, will undergo a self-study site visit with the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) in 2005. The Teacher Education programs will undergo a self-study site visit by the

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) during the 2005-06 academic year. Concurrently, SU has commenced an institutional self-study and will host a self-study site visit by a team representing the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in February 2006. Specialized and regional accreditation reviews are more rigorous than at any time in history and require evidence along a continuum of quantitative, qualitative, and curricular measures that demonstrate institutional or programmatic Continuous Quality Improvement according to the stated mission of the institution or program. Some of these measures are included in SU's MFR and accountability reports. For instance, Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 established performance goals relative to the pass rates of the nursing licensure exam (by nursing graduates) and the teacher licensure exam (by teacher education graduates), respectively. The University's academic programs have had mixed results with these goals. The pass rates for the teacher education exam were set during a transition year between the National Teacher Exam (NTE) and the Praxis II exam. Results on the percentage of students that passed the Praxis II exam (the first time) were 4 to 5 percentage points lower than those who passed the NTE exam. With our goal targeted to increase from 96% to 98% under the NTE and with three years of Praxis II pass rates at 91%-92%, the University is pleased, albeit somewhat surprised by our most recent pass rate of 96%. This surge is indicative of higher admission standards, better student preparation, and elevated accreditation and graduation requirements that, unfortunately, are negatively affecting enrollments in Teacher Education. Nursing licensure exam pass rates have risen dramatically from a low of 77% in 2003 and have climbed for two consecutive years to 88%, approaching the goal of 90%. As stated on previous occasions, teaching aids have been purchased to enhance instruction and entrance criteria have been raised to elevate the threshold before which a student is permitted to enter the Nursing program. Further, the faculty have become more proactive—in a discipline that is already extensively hands-on—and are identifying at risk students early in the program, targeting them for additional educational assistance. Finally, it should be noted that the licensure pass rates are indicative of those who pass the test the first time they take it. The rates provide no indication of those who pass after additional attempts.

Faculty: As the data indicate, Salisbury University has fallen behind in a vital academic input and objective—faculty salary levels (Former Objective 5.6; Current—not included). In three years, faculty salaries as a percentile of AAUP peers have fallen from the 65th to the 58th percentile at the associate professor level. However, after declining dramatically for two consecutive years, assistant professors rebounded in FY 2005 from the 66th to the 76th percentile, while full professors rebounded slightly from the 64th to the 68th percentile. At all three ranks, the goal has been established at the 85th percentile. Market and regionally competitive salaries cannot be achieved without an additional \$1,780,000 annually—a staggering amount that is nonetheless essential to attract and retain the highest caliber instructional workforce. Perhaps more telling is a comparison against our Performance Peers—comparisons that are used annually in the MHEC Peer Performance review. Although we surpass our Performance Peers on a multitude of quantitative and subjectively qualitative factors, at the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor SU is at the 90th, 40th, and 60th percentiles, respectively. Despite the struggles other institutions in other states are having in the current fiscal climate, the AAUP data convincingly indicate that many states have continued their commitment to higher education while Maryland has lagged behind. As a result, Salisbury University will become less attractive to faculty from all backgrounds, and we have experienced increasing difficulty in securing commitments from top faculty applicants.

There are additional examples of academic quality that highlight SU's continuing distinction and pursuit of excellence, including the following:

- SU and Wicomico County Public Schools are partnering in an \$814,000 federal grant to make history come alive for area children. Working together on this three-year Teaching American History grant is SU's Nabb Research Center for Delmarva Research and Culture, the History and Education departments, and Blackwell Library to provide in-service training, summer institutes, and resources for area teachers;
- Last year, two SU professors received the highest honor given to faculty by the University System of Maryland – the Regents' Faculty Award for Excellence;
- Through a collaborative effort between ODU, SU, IBSi, MIST, and Wallops Island, a biological experiment put together by Henson School faculty members and their student researchers was launched and retrieved on a sub-orbital flight from Wallops Island;
- SU has formed a team to develop a program that will mentor and tutor students in their efforts to earn prestigious national and international fellowships and scholarships; and,
- To strengthen the writing skills of all SU students, the University is opening a “writing for excellence center” in Fall 2005.

Maryland Workforce Initiatives and Partnerships

Nursing: The University has had mixed success with its objectives and goals relative to critical workforce initiatives and partnerships. Perhaps its greatest single success lies in crucial input/output indicators, i.e. growth in nursing enrollments and nursing graduates. In the past five years, nursing enrollment has exploded, doubling from 198 to 403 students. Undoubtedly much of this growth is due to market opportunities associated with a severe shortage nationally of nurses wherein the demand for nurses, unlike that for teachers, has been met by correspondingly high salary levels. A survey of our alumni two years after graduation revealed that nurses, on average, earned the highest salaries of all graduates including those working in IT, computer science, and business careers. After approaching our goal (Former Objective 2.5; Current—not included) of 60 graduates for three consecutive years, in 2004, our graduation numbers surged past our goal to 80. Although SU will continue to remind our audiences that it has no control over the life choices of its graduates once it has provided the discipline-specific and general education competencies our graduates need to be successful, similar success has been achieved with the number of nurses indicating Maryland as their place of employment. With a goal (Former Objective 3.5; Current Objective 2.3) set at 43 and the number of graduates surging, an estimated 44 nurses were employed in Maryland (from the 2003 graduating class) while a survey of the class of 2004 reveals a preliminary 64 nurses employed in Maryland.

Teacher Education: Teacher Education enrollments have remained virtually constant—with a few notable exceptions—with a corresponding trend in the number of graduates (Former Objective 2.4; Current—not included) throughout the five-year cycle. A significant but anomalous spike in Teacher Education graduates occurred in 2003 after several years of relative stability, reflecting the growth that was anticipated because of student interest in a new Teacher Education and Technology Complex (TETC). Realizing that its facilities were dated and deteriorating, as well as of a lower quality when compared to many of the elementary and secondary schools in which our graduates intern, SU first proposed a new TETC in 1998. With the assumption that this building would open by 2002 or 2003, student enrollment increased accordingly. However, years of delay have forced this building to a 2008 opening, dramatically affecting teacher recruitment. Students are keenly aware of the quality of facilities and the sub-standard classroom environment of the current SU Teacher Education facilities. Additionally, during this period, accreditation and licensure standards have tightened and the State has suspended the HOPE Teacher Scholarships with a resultant negative affect on the number of students who pursue a Teacher Education degree. These factors have trickled through to teacher employment. When compared against 2001 levels, 16% more SU Teacher Education graduates are employed in Maryland (Former Objective 3.1; Current Objective 2.1) one-year after graduation. However, this is a 10% decline from our high in 2003. The University expects this trend to begin to reverse once the new TETC opens in 2008, with an increase in the number of Teacher Education graduates employed in Maryland recovering as early as 2009.

Information Technology: Information Technology (IT) programs have experienced growth and decline that mirrors the national employment market. The University surpassed its goal of 80 graduates in 2002 with a total of 88 IT graduates (Former Objective 2.3; Current—not included). Since that peak, increased competition for IT-related jobs has had a negative affect on recruitment and the number of IT graduates. After three consecutive years where the number of IT graduates averaged 82, the number of IT graduates has declined to 61. Although this is a substantial decrease and reflects market forces even among institutions, it still represents a significant 39% increase over the number of graduates in 2000. Likewise, the estimated number of IT graduates employed in Maryland one year after graduation (Former Objective 3.2; Current Objective 2.2) surged to 59 in 2004—a level significantly over the goal of 45. Preliminary data for 2005 reveal a decline in this number to somewhere in the mid-30s, even as we enhance this objective to include ALL graduates employed in IT-related fields and not simply IT graduates. The expanded definition is long overdue as the market diversifies and attracts people with a broad liberal arts and sciences background as well as competencies in an IT specialty. The results from this objective also provide evidence of the difficulty of assessing this indicator through survey research. In our most recent survey collection, alumni responded at a rate in the mid-30% range after three separate mailings, each at some expense. With a 30% response rate and an 11% margin of error, it is difficult to provide reliable and valid results with the desired confidence levels.

Additional examples of SU's efforts to address Maryland workforce initiatives and partnerships include:

- Of the students who persist, SU graduates fully 75% in 4 years and over 95% in 5 years;
- 95% of SU graduates are employed one year after graduation (Former Objective 3.4; Current Objective 2.4) with 74% of those employed in Maryland or the D.C. and Northern VA suburbs;
- At a measured pace, the University continues to expand its course offerings at the Eastern Shore Higher Education Center;
- Our Institute for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE) launched the Presidential Citizen Scholar Program with funding from the USM's Wilson H.

Elkins Professorship, which was awarded in July 2004 to two SU professors. This new program is a multi-faceted, yearlong civic engagement experience that will prepare students to become future community leaders. Students who complete the requirements of this program will receive a certificate and distinctive recognition as “Presidential Citizen Scholars.” Based on its first year success, the Elkins Professorship was again awarded to the Executive Directors of PACE to be used to expand the programs; and,

- Some of Maryland’s most highly regarded educational organizations have honored SU graduates as the best in their fields this past year. Aaron Deal (’93) earned the 2004 Maryland Teacher of the Year Award. Patricia Adkins (’91) was Maryland’s 2004 Assistant Principal of the Year. Alumna Penny Makuchal (’91) was Maryland’s School Nurse of the Year and was named as one of America’s 39 top teachers by *USA Today*.

Educational Access

Freshmen and Transfer Students: Salisbury University continues to focus its enrollment on highly qualified, motivated first-time freshmen and transfer students. New freshman enrollment for Fall 2004 was 986, with a composite SAT score of 1,040 and 1,200 at the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively, and an average high-school GPA of over 3.45—input levels that far surpass our Performance Peers. Salisbury has responded to Maryland’s college access needs by increasing undergraduate enrollment by 830 students since 1999 and, as the campus demographics shift, now has 940 more full-time undergraduates that it did 5 years ago. Additionally, over the course of an academic year, the University accepts nearly as many transfer students as it does first-time freshmen. Although facilities capacities are constrained by insufficient classroom space, nighttime usage rates could be increased to accommodate additional undergraduate enrollments. However, financial resources have become a limiting factor in hiring the additional faculty and support personnel necessary to serve students during non-traditional hours and, with faculty teaching loads already at an all time high, there is little opportunity to add to the heavy loads of our current instructional faculty.

Diversity and Financial Aid: The University achieved and surpassed both its goals in growing a more diverse student body (Former Objectives 4.5 and 4.6; Current Objectives 3.1 and 3.2) in order to enhance the educational experience of all students as well as to reflect better the diversity of our region. This effort has always been challenged by the proximity of an Historically Black Institution that struggles with diversity nearly as much as SU. Moreover, for a number of years, Salisbury University has had among the lowest annual per student scholarship dollar amounts and highest loan amounts of any USM institution. Historically, inadequate state funding and relatively low tuition levels have been the cause of this dubious distinction. Simply put, because of our revenue situation, Salisbury University is unable to package financial assistance at levels comparable to what is offered by our peer institutions. However, despite the limitations and in order to address the financial needs of our students, we have increasingly dedicated more funds to institutional aid and, further, more of those funds have been earmarked for need-based scholarships. Over the past five years, SU has tripled its allocation of institutional funds for student assistance.

Similarly, SU has increased the number of African-American students enrolled by 49% (from 416 in Fall 2000 to 621 in Fall 2004) and more than doubled the number of Hispanic students enrolled (from 60 in Fall 2000 to 146 in Fall 2004). We have done this through special programs in selected high schools on the Western Shore, increased marketing efforts, and through the expansion of our institutional scholarship programs. The efforts discussed earlier in international education, as well as that of the Office of Diversity, have played a role in increasing retention. As a result, not only have we enrolled a more diverse class every year since 2001, but also we have retained a more diverse class. By the Fall 2005 semester, SU expects the largest minority representation in institutional history with over 16% minority and nearly 11% African-American students. When compared with enrollment percentages of 11% minority and 8% African-American students merely five years ago and given our 15% enrollment growth, these trends are significant.

Additional examples of SU’s efforts to enhance educational access include the following:

- New scholarship funds have been earmarked for local high school and Wor-Wic Community College graduates to ensure that the children of our local citizens are financially able to attend Salisbury University;
- Salisbury faculty are collaborating with representatives from around the country in a \$2.6 million program funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts and Exxon/Mobil to help make the transition from two- to four-year post-secondary institutions easier for students;
- By academic year 2005-06, SU will have expanded need-based financial aid by over 700% since the 2000-01 academic year;

- By academic year 2005-06, SU will have expanded merit-based financial aid by 78% since the 2000-01 academic year;
- SU is pursuing alternatives related to enrollment management, time to degree, and on-line learning including additional offerings at the Eastern Shore Higher Education Center; and,
- The University has made considerable efforts to raise scholarship funds through the SU Foundation. Here, too, the amount of funds available for additional student financial aid has increased significantly over the past few years, growing to almost a half million dollars in AY 2004-05. However, SU remains well behind our peer institutions in terms of financial aid we can offer.

University-Specific Responses

(Former) Objective 2.3: The annual number of SU graduates in Information Technology (IT) fields will increase from 48 in 1999 to 80 in 2004. Although the number of IT graduates has declined the past two years, the University achieved or nearly achieved the benchmark in 2001, 2002, and 2003 and is graduating 39% more IT graduates today than it did in 2000. A recent decline in graduates is directly correlated with market options, market opportunity, and student career interest patterns that are strongly influenced by job availability in their major of choice. Many graduates are finding that they no longer need baccalaureate degrees in an IT-related discipline (as an example, the University has been hiring skilled IT staff who have two-year degrees or certifications in IT-related fields and four-year degrees in the liberal arts and sciences) to pursue careers in IT-related fields. Additionally, since the job market in IT-related disciplines has tightened from the boom of the 90's and the first years of the new decade, market savvy students continue to adjust their career goals. Salisbury University expects no major shifts in these trends and will continue to monitor these disciplines in response to Maryland's workforce initiatives. (Note: To conform with MHEC, DBM, and MFR guidelines that both prescribe and limit the number of MFR objectives, the University will no longer include Information Technology graduates as a Managing For Results/MHEC Accountability objective.)

(Former) Objective 2.4: The annual number of SU graduates in Teacher Education will increase from 233 in 1999 to 285 in 2004. With dated and deteriorating Teacher Education facilities and insufficient space to expand Teacher Education programs, the University submitted its program justification for a new Teacher Education and Technology Complex (TETC) in 1998. Objective 2.4 was developed in that context with enrollment growth following a plan that projected new facilities in Fall 2002 or 2003. However, TETC planning money was delayed until FY 2004, construction postponed, and the targeted opening deferred to Fall 2008 or Spring 2009. This has had a negative affect on Teacher Education enrollment. Further, accreditation mandates have amplified the requirements expected of Teacher Education students with an inverse affect on both enrollment and the number of graduates. Finally, despite the nationwide need for teachers it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit students to the teaching profession where teachers' pay and working conditions merge to create an environment that may be seen as unattractive to capable, well-intentioned, and hard working students interested in a teaching career. (Note: Salisbury University will continue to monitor these data as primary institutional outputs but, to conform to MHEC, DBM, and MFR guidelines that dictate and prescribe a limited, specific number of accountability objectives, the University will no longer include Teacher Education graduates as a Managing For Results/MHEC Accountability objective.)

(Former) Objective 3.2 (Current-Objective 2.2): Increase the estimated number of IT graduates employed in IT related fields in Maryland from 26 in 1999 to 45 in 2004. Salisbury University achieved this goal in 2004. However, because of fiscal and personnel resources limitations, SU was unable to include survey research updates in time for their inclusion in the 2004 Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission or in the MFR to the Department of Budget and Management. Despite our success, this indicator will fluctuate downward the next few years to mirror enrollment fluctuations discussed in 2.3. Additionally, given the changing nature of the market, i.e. the hiring of non-IT majors in IT-related careers, the University is augmenting this objective to include any graduate, regardless of major, who attains employment in Maryland in IT-related careers.

(Former) 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. The University has been troubled by the lack of success in this indicator despite efforts to achieve our benchmark. The limited number of African-American faculty nationally, keen competition for qualified faculty, high SU teaching load, expectations of scholarship and service coupled with a high teaching load, and declining institutional competitiveness with regards to salaries have all combined to make us less attractive to faculty of all races, let alone African-American faculty with outstanding credentials. In 2004, the University hired an Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for Diversity Initiatives with a mandate to facilitate the expansion of the University's diversity initiatives, including the hiring of minority faculty. However, many conflicting forces are at odds with this initiative. SU's eight-course a year standard is higher than the standard of many of our peers, yet the Board of Regents mandated an increased teaching load—a standard that is in opposition to many accrediting bodies which demand a six-course a year teaching load in order to ensure academic and program quality. Additionally, internally, SU has high expectations associated with student advising, institutional, departmental, and public service, curricular review, and professional scholarship that compete for faculty time. Salaries are decreasingly competitive against our peers and adjustments based upon race are unethical, detrimental to faculty morale, and illegal. Nevertheless, viewing this as an institutional priority, SU is committed to internal adjustments that will make SU more appealing to all faculty, including minority faculty. These adjustments include salary enhancements as resources permit and teaching load reassignments as opportunities avail. Finally, it should be noted that this remains an internal University

priority but, to conform to MHEC, DBM, and MFR guidelines that dictate a limited, specific number of accountability objectives, the University will no longer include this objective in its MFR.

(Former) Objective 5.5: Increase annual University fundraising from \$1.9 million in 1998 to \$2.4 million in 2004. The over \$3 million indicated in 2003, an amount that carried us over our goal, represents a year when the University was the beneficiary of a few significant bequests. Since then, the University's annual fund-raising levels have returned to a more traditional and typical trend. As a comparison, all but two of Salisbury University's institutional peers experienced a decline in alumni giving rates in 2004 and total annual giving dollars have followed suit. Several internal and external events have played a significant role in SU's declines in annual giving. In 2003 and 2004, the Office of University Advancement experienced several leadership transitions, vacancies, and an organizational restructuring that included the hiring of a new VP for University Advancement and a new Director of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving. Additionally, external economic conditions have continued to hinder some of the University's fundraising efforts although these impacts appear to be diminishing. Leadership changes, while negatively affecting the University's short-term coordinated solicitation efforts, will have a positive long-term impact on the University's fundraising efforts.

The appointment of a new *Director of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving* has already begun to revitalize one University Advancement department and its solicitation efforts. Alumni giving in the first six months of FY 2005 is well ahead of last year's pace and, with the adoption of a new SU strategic plan, donations are being channeled toward specific University objectives and outcomes outlined in the plan, including scholarship, capital, and academic projects. Additionally, the University is currently in the "quiet phase" of a capital campaign that assesses and develops potential giving opportunities, the University's infrastructure to support fundraising initiatives, and identifies specific areas of need. Finally, it should be noted that this remains an internal University priority but, to conform to MHEC, DBM, and MFR guidelines that dictate a limited, specific number of accountability objectives, the University will no longer include this objective in its MFR.

(Former) Objective 5.7: Increase the proportion of administrative staff that earn salaries that are at or above the 60th percentile of CUPA peers from 33 percent in 2000 to 55 percent in 2004. The University's success or failure to reach this objective is directly dependent on the State of Maryland's commitment to higher education at Salisbury University and SU employees. In FY 2003, the University eliminated several senior and mid-level leadership positions that had a significant affect on our comparisons against our peers. The University has been able to influence this objective marginally through new appointments that can be filled only through the competitive hiring process that attracts highly qualified individuals. However, with only two salary increases in four years—increases that averaged 4% and did not keep pace with inflation or more importantly, other institutions' salary increases nationally—coupled with workforce reductions, the University's position against its peers has faltered dramatically. Although the objective is lofty, access, quality, and affordability cannot be maintained with equal success in times of strict budgetary limitations. Funds that would be available normally to channel into salaries are now siphoned to scholarship dollars and academic programs. Finally, it should be noted that this remains an internal University priority but, to conform to MHEC, DBM, and MFR guidelines that dictate a limited, specific number of accountability objectives, the University will no longer include this objective in its MFR.

(Former) Objective 6.5 (Current-Objective 4.5): The six-year graduation rates of Salisbury first-time, full-time African-American freshmen will increase from 43.2 percent in 1998 to 61.0 percent in 2004. From this objective's inception, the University predicted annual fluctuations in graduation rates that were based upon known trends and influenced by small initial cohorts. However, the "goal" for this objective was externally driven by a process that insisted on benchmarks set to the highest level ever achieved, even when current trends indicated those levels were not possible. Now, not only have the cohorts grown to levels that allow stability in the indicators, they also allow SU to engage in specific programming that attempts to reach parity in graduation rates across all student populations. The new benchmark established for 2009 is a realistic objective that will begin to approach those of other student groups and, by 2014 should be equivalent to them.

(Former) Objective 6.6 (Current-Objective 4.6): The six-year graduation rates of Salisbury first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 55 percent in 1998 to 61.0 percent in 2004. See explanation 6.5.

Funding Issues: Cost Containment and Efficiencies

Significant cost containment and efficiency efforts have continued as a direct result of State fiscal constraints and Salisbury University's own internal CQI efforts. The savings and cost containment efforts have resulted in the reallocation of resources to other critical initiatives and functions. The following represent highlights of those efforts for FY 2005:

Collaboration (\$139,000):

- Salisbury University continues to collaborate with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore in both academic programming and support services. The two universities participate in two dual degree programs (Biology-Environmental/Marine Science & Social Work-Sociology), sponsor a joint Master of Arts in Teaching, and employ several faculty and staff members as joint employees of both institutions. It is estimated that \$139,000 in salary/benefit costs are saved annually.

Use of Information Technology Equipment (\$20,000)

- SU uses multi-function machines (i.e., copiers that fax, scan, and print) to reduce the need for personal printers and other office machinery. This also creates economies of scale when ordering paper and other supplies for the machines. (\$18,000 in savings)
- SU uses “one-card” for inter-departmental transfers to reduce paper usage and office preparation time. (\$2,000 in savings)

Maintenance and Energy Conservation (\$277,222):

- SU uses a total energy management system to monitor and control energy management, yielding an average annual savings of 15%. (equating to approximately \$242,722).
- Call-in maintenance service requests provides an estimated annual savings of \$7,500.
- The University has continued to use an overall preventive maintenance program to improve the readiness level of institutional buildings and avoid unanticipated major maintenance needs. (\$27,000)

Contingent Labor Force (\$965,250)

- The University's state support Contingent II labor pool represents 29 full-time positions with a projected annual savings \$391,500. In addition, the University employs 42.5 full-time non-tenure track faculty at an additional savings of \$573,750 over a fully benefited position. This savings, however, will be significantly lowered when the University is able to reinstate its contingent conversion plan.

Hiring Freeze/delays (\$1,314,300)

- Due to fiscal constraints in the State and unavoidable, unfunded mandatory increases, the University imposed an internal hiring freeze prior to the state-mandated one. For most positions not frozen, a three to twelve month hiring delay was implemented. As a result of these actions, the University reallocated funds from both faculty and staff positions to meet its FY 2005 operating needs.

Web-time Sheets (\$3,000)

- SU uses “web-time” reporting for all non-swiper full-time faculty and staff, reducing the amount of paper timesheets purchased and manually processed. Estimated annual savings total \$3,000.

Total Highlighted Cost Containment and Efficiencies: \$2,718,772

Trends Influencing Performance Accountability

For years, SU has identified State funding levels that are substantially below those of our peers as a significant obstacle to institutional performance. We have highlighted our place in the funding guidelines and equated that to corresponding real dollars ranging from \$7 million to \$9 million annually below the funding level of our peers. Although the State's financial commitment to the University has shown a modest rebound, funding levels remain significantly below the State of Maryland's own guidelines. The consequences of these deficit-funding levels span from the general to the specific. Inadequate State funding levels have resulted in higher tuition costs that hinder educational access for some segments of our society more than others. Deficit funding levels also mean we are unable to designate ample resources into faculty and staff salaries causing significant retention and competitive hiring implications and negatively affecting academic quality. Preventive maintenance is deferred, classroom upgrades are delayed, new academic equipment is postponed, teaching and work loads increase beyond acceptable limits, and academic quality slowly erodes. Although the affects are institution-wide, the nursing program provides perhaps the best example to describe the impact in more specific detail.

As noted earlier, the growth in the number of nursing majors has doubled in five years from 198 to 403. Salisbury University's Nursing Department has been struggling to meet the demands of this expansion and, as with other departments, budget cutbacks have limited faculty and support staff growth despite our success in meeting State demands for nursing graduates. During this time, faculty lines have increased by only two. This growth has come with a challenge that seriously threatens future accreditation evaluation—excessive use of part-time faculty and salary levels significantly below the American Nursing Council national average. Additionally, expanded enrollment has placed significant strain on clinical supervisory placements in the field. Ample field sites are difficult to identify in the predominantly rural area of the Eastern Shore where there are far fewer hospitals, clinics, and health agencies—and thus fewer placement opportunities—than exist in the more populous areas of the State. Further, in this year alone, SU had two nursing faculty resign to accept faculty appointments at other institutions who offered “significantly higher salaries.” Multiply those problems by a factor consistent with our growth and staffing and the breadth of the institutional problem becomes clear.

Although Teacher Education enrollment has remained stable, SU has seen an increase in secondary education teaching majors—a high need area, especially in the math and sciences—but our current education facilities are inadequate for training our students in teaching science to middle and high school students. It is an embarrassing reality that many students tell us that their high school labs were far superior to those in Caruthers Hall, a 1950's campus demonstration elementary school. Salisbury University prepares good—some would even say great—teachers. However, the affect of our Teacher Education facilities on the overall quality of that education is a significant deterrent to enrollment growth. Further, an external barrier to program expansion in Teacher Education is the MSDE requirement of creating Professional Development School (PDS) sites for all field training. It is a significant challenge for a university located in a predominately rural area of the state to establish the prescribed numbers of sites for our education majors. While we have been able to address these requirements by partnering with sites in all Lower and Upper Shore counties of the Eastern Shore as well as in Annapolis and Delaware, travel is a significant financial and time-usage burden for our faculty and students. All of these obstacles increase costs, hinder recruitment, and hinder success.

Salisbury University has grown substantially over the past five years and is prepared to grow more. It has identified areas of growth and the resources needed to accommodate that growth. However, academic quality will no longer be compromised for the sake of affordability or access and, with deficit funding levels as high as they are, even academic quality has begun to suffer. A few year ago there was discussion regarding performance-based funding. Now, not only is there no longer any mention of performance-based funding but also there are vast disparities between funding per student across USM institutions. Understandably, the funding differences are due, in part, to the variances in institutional mission. However, there remain clear disparities that appear to be disregarded. Establishing minimum funding thresholds would help to alleviate some of these disparities and, more importantly, allow SU to do what it does best—produce competent graduates who successfully enter Maryland's workforce in vital areas of need.

KEY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1. Provide a quality undergraduate and graduate academic and learning environment that promotes intellectual growth and success.

Objective 1.1 Increase the percentage of nursing graduates who pass on the first attempt the nursing licensure exam from 85% in 2004 to 90% in 2009.

		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Quality	Nursing (NCLEX) exam pass rate	79%	77%	85%	88%	88%	89%

Objective 1.2 Increase the percentage of teacher education graduates who pass the teacher licensure exam from 91% in 2004 to 97% in 2009.

		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Quality	Teaching (PRAXIS II) pass rate ¹	91%	92%	91%	96%	96%	96%

Objective 1.3 Through 2009, the percentage of SU graduates who are satisfied with their level of preparation for graduate or professional school will be no less than 98%.

		2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
		2001 Survey	2002 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey	2006 Survey	2007 Survey
Quality	Satisfaction w/preparation for graduate school ^{2,3}	100%	98%	100%	99%	99%	99%

Objective 1.4 Through 2009, the percentage of SU graduates who are satisfied with their level of preparation for employment will be no less than the 98% achieved in 2004.

		2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
		2001 Survey	2002 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey	2006 Survey	2007 Survey
Quality	Satisfaction w/preparation for employment ^{2,3}	96%	97%	98%	97%	98%	98%

Goal 2. Utilize strategic collaborations and targeted community outreach to benefit the University, Maryland, and the region.

Objective 2.1 The estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed as teachers in Maryland will increase from 163 in FY 2005 to 185 in 2009.

	2002 MSDE Actual	2003 MSDE Actual	2004 MSDE Actual	2005 MSDE Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Performance Measures						
	Estimated number of Teacher education graduates employed in MD as teachers					
Outcome	158	181	178	163	165	165

Objective 2.2 The estimated number of graduates employed in IT-related fields in Maryland will increase from 59 in 2004 to 70 in 2009.

	2001 Actual 2001 Survey	2002 Actual 2002 Survey	2004 Actual 2004 Survey	2005 Actual 2005 Survey	2006 Estimated 2006 Survey	2007 Estimated 2007 Survey
Performance Measures						
	Estimated number of graduates employed in MD in an IT field ^{2,3}					
Outcome	32	40	59	31	41	49

Objective 2.3 The estimated number of Nursing graduates employed as nurses in Maryland will increase from 44 in 2004 to 70 in 2009.

	2001 Actual 2001 Survey	2002 Actual 2002 Survey	2004 Actual 2004 Survey	2005 Actual 2005 Survey	2006 Estimated 2006 Survey	2007 Estimated 2007 Survey
Performance Measures						
	Estimated number of Nursing graduates employed in MD as nurses ^{2,3}					
Outcome	27	34	44	57	63	65

Objective 2.4 Through 2009, the percentage of graduates employed one-year after graduation will be no less than the 95% achieved in 2004.

	2001 Actual 2001 Survey	2002 Actual 2002 Survey	2004 Actual 2004 Survey	2005 Actual 2005 Survey	2006 Estimated 2006 Survey	2007 Estimated 2007 Survey
Performance Measures						
	Percent employed one-year after graduation ^{2,3}					
Outcome	96%	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%

Objective 2.5 Increase expenditures on facility renewal from .5% in 2004 to .9% in 2009.

Performance Measures	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Efficiency Percentage of annual state appropriation spent on facility renewal ⁴	.9%	.5%	.5%	.5%	.6%	.7%

Goal 3. The University will foster inclusiveness as well as cultural and intellectual pluralism.

Objective 3.1 Increase the percentage of African-American undergraduates from 8.8% in 2004 to 12.0% in 2009.

Performance Measures	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Input Percentage of African-American undergraduates ⁵	7.8%	8.4%	8.8%	10.3%	11.0%	11.4%

Objective 3.2 Increase the percentage of minority undergraduates from 14.0% in 2004 to 18.0% in 2009.

Performance Measures	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Input Percentage of minority undergraduates ⁵	11.6%	12.6%	14.0%	15.8%	16.3%	16.8%

Objective 3.3 Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU from 40% in 2004 to 46% in 2009.

Performance Measures	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Input Percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU	39.8%	39.4%	40.9%	42.4%	43.0%	44.0%

Goal 4. Improve retention and graduation rates while advancing a student-centered environment.

Objective 4.1 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen will increase from 84.2% in 2004 to 85.0% in 2009.

Performance Measures	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
Output 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: all students ⁶	86.0%	85.2%	84.2%	84.3%	84.4%	84.6%

Objective 4.2 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time African-American freshmen will increase from 78.6% in 2004 to 85.0% in 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: African-American students ⁶	87.5%	77.9%	78.6%	83.6%	83.8%	84.0%

Objective 4.3 The second-year retention rates of SU first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 80.4% in 2004 to 85.0% in 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: minority students ⁶	78.4%	81.3%	80.4%	83.2%	83.6%	83.8%

Objective 4.4 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen will be at least 73% annually through 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: all students ⁶	73.9%	71.8%	73.0%	72.8%	73%	73%

Objective 4.5 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time African-American freshmen will increase from 53.3% in 2004 to 63.0% in 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: African-American students ⁶	60.6%	55.0%	53.3%	58.5%	59.0%	60.0%

Objective 4.6 The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 53.2% in 2004 to 63.0% in 2009.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: minority students ⁶	57.1%	55.5%	53.2%	60.6%	61.0%	61.5%

Additional Indicators⁷

		2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Estimated	2007 Estimated
AI.1. Performance Measures ⁸		2001 Survey	2002 Survey	2004 Survey	2005 Survey	2006 Survey	2007 Survey
Outcome	Median salary of SU graduates	\$32,410	\$32,014	\$33,853	\$34,711	\$35,300	\$36,000
	Ratio of the median salary of SU graduates (one year after graduation) to the average salary of the civilian workforce w/bachelor's degrees ^{2,3}	.74	.79	.81	.82	.82	.83

Notes to MFR

¹ PRAXIS II test results are reported on a cohort basis.

² Salisbury University annually surveys its baccalaureate degree recipients one-year after graduation. This survey cycle differs from MHEC's triennial alumni survey cycle. As a result, SU's data are updated annually and reflect the most recently surveyed classes. However, due to fiscal and personnel resource limitations, the 2003 survey of the 2001-02 baccalaureate degree recipients was delayed one year. Data gained from this cohort represents alumni responses two-years after graduation disqualifying their data for comparison purposes. As a result, data from the 2001-02 baccalaureate degree recipients have been omitted and the trend years rolled back as necessary to include three years of historical data.

³Because of fiscal and personnel resource limitations, SU was unable to include survey updates in time for their inclusion in the 2004 Performance Accountability Report and MFR. These data reflect those updates with the exception of the data describe in Note 2.

⁴Data provided by the USM.

⁵Percentages are based on headcounts as of fall census.

⁶Data provided by the MHEC.

⁷Additional Indicators are institutional measures that are important to external and internal constituents. They are indicative of institutional performance but are not driven by any institutional targets.

⁸ No performance goals is provided for this indicator. If SU produces more teachers and social work majors, the ratio will decrease; however, produce more nurses and IT majors and the ratio will increase. Competing interests make a performance target for this objective indistinct.