

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

2002 Institutional Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission

Submitted July 2003; Updated September 2003

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, & Accountability

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.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Quality

Despite an initial FY 2003 State budget allocation that was virtually no-growth over FY 2002 and a subsequent mid-year reduction of nearly 8%, Salisbury University continues its transformation as an outcomes-oriented institution. The University prioritizes quality and access goals in support of the *2000 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education* and affirms academic excellence as the defining institutional attribute.

Throughout the 1990s and into this decade, 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 Maryland. Achievements include: the highest 4- and 6-year graduation rates in the USM for 16 and 8 consecutive years, respectively; average 6-yr graduation rates that are higher than our performance peers and aspirational peers; and, for seven years, regional and national recognition by numerous publications including *America's Best Colleges* (*U.S. News and World Report*) and *The Best 351 Colleges* (*The Princeton Review*). Additionally, in the 2003 and 2004 editions of *America's Best Colleges*, SU was ranked as a top tier institution for both public and private universities in the North Region.

Enrollment growth of 13.1% in the past three years, high demand by graduating high school seniors, and increasingly limited classroom space have combined to give Salisbury University the highest selectivity in the USM. At approximately 50%, the applicant to acceptance selectivity is also higher than the average of both its performance and aspirational peers.

One year after graduation, approximately 30% of SU alumni enroll in graduate or professional study while 96% are employed. In a given year, 96% to 98% of SU graduates rate their overall quality of education received as satisfactory or very satisfactory. Further, a highly valued characteristic of the academic programming for SU alumni, current, and future students is the student-faculty ratio of 17:1—a ratio lower than the average of SU peers.

Eight academic programs are accredited with specialized agencies. These accreditations are earned through the continuous demonstration of excellence according to national standards. Because these programs produce graduates in deficit career areas for Maryland, they are essential to SU's mission. However, with some allied health programs approaching instructional costs of \$20,000 per Full-time Equivalent Student (FTES), they carry heavy expenses. Additionally, Teacher Education accreditation bears significant new costs in meeting the Professional Development School standards, while both Teacher Education and Business (NCATE and AACSB accreditation, respectively) maintain rigorous standards of educational performance. Contributing academic benefit to the institution at extra financial cost, these programs drive the market salaries of faculty higher while obligating vital reassigned time in order to pursue valuable research, scholarship, and service activities.

Access and Outputs

Salisbury University continues to focus its enrollment on highly qualified, motivated first-time freshmen. New freshman enrollment for Fall 2002 was 900, with a composite SAT score of 1,050 and 1,210 at the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively, and an average high-school GPA of over 3.4. At just under 5,300 applicants, these students were admitted from the largest applicant pool ever to apply to SU. The University increased its selectivity to 50%—the most stringent ever—in order to accommodate an equal number of transfer students and to operate within the current enrollment capacity that is constrained by insufficient classroom space and 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 2.5%, making the 3-year growth more than 13% and a Fall 2002 headcount that was just over 6,850 students.

Several significant highlights are indicative of the University's ongoing success and continuing challenges in enhancing student access and diversity:

- for a second consecutive year SU enrolled the largest freshman minority class in institutional history;
- in Fall 2002, SU enrolled the largest *percentage* of freshman African-American students in institutional history;
- for a second consecutive year SU increased African-American freshman *and* transfer enrollment;
- in Fall 2002, SU surpassed the retention rate benchmark for minority undergraduates;
- for a second consecutive year SU achieved the retention rate benchmark for African-American undergraduates;
- the percentage and number of African-American undergraduates increased for a second consecutive year to 8.4%. Although this is a modest .6% growth, it represents a tangible increase of 10% in the number of African-American undergraduates in one year and 19% since Fall 2000; and,
- the number of minority undergraduates continues to increase and now represents 12.6% of the total undergraduate population. Institutional projections for Fall 2003 estimate growth in the African-American and minority undergraduate populations to 9.1% and 13.2%, respectively—levels that are near or achieve targeted benchmarks.

To absorb the 8% FY 2003 mid-year budget reversion, the University eliminated 15 administrative and staff positions, including 2 positions that directly supported the University's diversity initiatives. Although efficiencies are being realized, the reorganization established a discouraging precedent with the population the positions were intended to serve. Moreover, SU's ability to maintain the momentum is threatened by additional State budget reductions.

The University's modified entrance criteria have enhanced its diversity, selectivity, and academic profiles. However, in order to improve educational access to a broadly diverse community, and particularly students of underrepresented groups, financial aid dollars must be available in sufficient awards to meet students' financial needs. Although the University is targeting an additional \$400,000 to need-based financial aid, these dollars will be insufficient to compete for qualified underrepresented students and for providing the type of financial aid awards necessary to limit financial hardship.

As stated previously, graduation rates easily represent one of the continuing success stories for Salisbury University. In 2002, the 6-year graduation rate for the 1996 cohort was 71.8%—a 2-point decline from the previous year but still above the benchmark and significantly above our peers. As predicted last year, the 6-year graduation rate for African-Americans in the same cohort declined to 55%—still the third highest in the USM. Although the University remains encouraged by 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 cohorts. These rates will not stabilize until the larger 2001 cohort completes college.

Workforce Diversity

Salisbury University continues to make gains in the diversification of its workforce. The number of women in full-time executive/managerial positions has increased to 41%, a growth of 9 points in 5 years that significantly surpasses the benchmark. Likewise, the number of African-American men in full-time executive/managerial positions increased to 9.1%, a growth of 3 points in 5 years that surpasses the benchmark of 9%. The number of women full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty increased to 37%, just 1 point short of the benchmark. However, the number of male full-time tenure/tenure-track African-American faculty declined by .3 points reversing several years of growth. This decline was due to the University's inability to hire any new African-American faculty despite searches that included diverse applicant pools. In a situation applicable to most SU academic programs and not limited to race, the University is less able to offer salaries, benefits, and workloads that are competitive and appealing to new PhDs in the academic market.

As the data indicate, Salisbury University has begun to spiral backward in a vital academic objective—faculty salary levels. Faculty salaries as a percentile of AAUP peers fell from the 83rd to the 72nd percentile at the assistant professor level, from 65th to the 62nd at the associate professor level, and from 72nd to the 67th at the level of professor. Market and regionally competitive salaries cannot be achieved without an additional \$1,700,000 annually—a staggering amount that is nonetheless essential to attract and retain the highest caliber workforce, including minority faculty. Despite the struggles other institutions are having in the current fiscal climate, the AAUP data clearly indicate that other states are continuing to fund annual salary increases. As a result, Salisbury University will slide farther behind its Carnegie peers and become less attractive to faculty from all backgrounds.

Finally, despite the University's best efforts to achieve its benchmark of 67%, the percentage of core faculty teaching lower-division courses has been unable to surpass 56%. In the three years prior to the reversions, SU was able to add 39 new tenured/tenure-track faculty positions. However, to achieve this objective fully, the University would need to hire an additional 18 tenured/tenure-track faculty at a salary and benefits cost of \$1,150,000 annually. The level of funding necessary to hire faculty in adequate numbers to achieve this benchmark cannot be accomplished without significant additional State allocations or alternative resources.

University-Specific Responses to MHEC Questions

Objective 1.6: Increase the proportion of lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty from 56% in 1998 to 67% in 2004. The goal for this objective was established during a period when the State of Maryland was attempting to fund the University at a level consistent with the MHEC funding guidelines. However, after the latest budget reversions, Salisbury University's funding is significantly below its previous high of 83% of the guideline.

The University remains committed to this objective in principle with an additional 23% of lower-division courses taught by full-time, non tenure-track faculty on renewable contracts. As stated previously, SU has already added 39 new tenured/tenure-track faculty positions, while an additional 18 positions at a cost of \$1,150,000 are needed to achieve the benchmark. Given the current resource allocation, the reduction in State financial support, fixed cost increases, physical size limitations of SU classroom spaces, the elimination of 15 staff positions in order to absorb FY 2003 budget reversions, and future revenue reductions, Salisbury University will not achieve this benchmark.

Objective 2.4: The annual number of SU graduates in Teacher Education will increase from 233 in 1999 to 285 in 2004. Lacking adequate facilities and space to expand its 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. Had the project moved readily through the queue, the complex would have opened in Fall 2002 or 2003 and the Teacher Education program expanded. However, planning money was not approved for the TETC until FY 2004. Assuming the project remains on schedule, the TETC may open by Fall 2007. Until that time, enrollments and graduates are limited by facilities capacities.

Objective 3.1: Increase the estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed as teachers in Maryland from 145 in 1999 to 200 in 2004. See Objective 2.4 above. Additionally, SU Teacher Education graduates are recruited from across the nation. Our graduates' life choices are influenced by the income levels and community appeal offered by Maryland localities. While many Maryland communities are attractive, they are not as financially competitive as other regions. As a result, the opportunities provided by non-Maryland communities provide a powerful incentive to relocate.

Objective 3.6: Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU from 52.1 percent in 2000 to 55 percent in 2004. The same factors described in Objective 1.6 above also influence this objective, and the trend

mirrors SU's place in the funding guidelines and its eroding State resources. In essence, Salisbury University students are financially supplementing the education of students at other MD institutions. As an example, St. Mary's has a nearly identical percentage of economically disadvantaged students but receives more than \$3,500 *more per student* from the State of Maryland than does Salisbury University. Nevertheless, because the University is committed to access, over \$400,000 of the new monies generated from tuition increases approved by the USM Board of Regents is devoted to need-based financial aid.

Objective 4.5: Increase the proportion of African-American undergraduates from 8% in 1998 to 10% in 2004. Salisbury University's percentage of African-American undergraduates increased to 8.4% in 2002 and is projected to increase to 9.1% in 2003. Although the benchmark may not be achieved by 2004, this objective is beginning to show progress because of President Dudley-Eshbach's diversity initiatives. The objective has been negatively impacted by limited financial aid resources as described in Objective 3.6 above. Additionally, in order to respond to the FY 2003 budget reversion, 15 positions have been or are being eliminated through reorganizational efficiencies. Two of these positions directly supported minority and diversity initiatives. Those responsibilities will be absorbed by other individuals or offices.

Objective 4.6: Increase the proportion of minority undergraduates from 10.4% in 1998 to 13.0% in 2004. In Fall 2002, Salisbury University increased its percentage of minority undergraduates to 12.6%. By Fall 2003, minority enrollment is projected to reach 13.2% surpassing the benchmark.

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. Salisbury University exceeded the campaign goal of \$18.5 million in Fiscal Year 2000. The gifts, pledges, and endowments totaled over \$22.5 million. Of this total, a major component, approximately \$6.5 million, was in the form of real property and a museum collection—the Ward Museum. Title to these assets was transferred to the University.

The assets reported previously for this objective reflected only earnest dollars deposited directly into endowed accounts. Although this objective is complete, the data will be updated to reflect total gifts instead of endowed gifts.

Objective 5.4: Allocate expenditures on facility renewal from .8% in 1999 to 2% in 2005. The amount necessary to accomplish this objective would be approximately \$1,200,000, or approximately the annual instructional cost of the SU Nursing program. The goal for this objective was externally not institutionally driven and is not achievable given the current fiscal realities and priorities.

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. Because of the competitive hiring of several academic deans, progress has been made to nearly the benchmark level. However, 15 administrative and staff positions have been or are being eliminated in order to respond to the FY 2003 budget reversions. Additional reductions are pending with no funded salary increases in both FY 2003 and FY 2004. Despite comparable deficits in other states, the majority of states continue to allocate funds for employee salary increases. As a result, not only will SU fail to achieve this objective, but also the University will begin to reverse all gains.

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. The objective is being reworded to: the six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen *will be at least 70% annually through 2004.*

Trends Influencing Performance Accountability

According to the Fall 2002 MHEC peer analysis, Salisbury University was funded at \$1,923 per FTES below its funding peers. This amount would equate to an additional \$13,300,000 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 before the FY 2003 budget reversions. Currently, Salisbury University's percentage of guideline funding has plummeted to below 60% with a dollar equivalent of \$19,000,000 below the MHEC guidelines. With this substantial funding gap, Salisbury University will be unable to maintain competitive performance against those same peers, let alone achieve institutional objectives for access and academic quality.

Although a reordering of priorities may allow additional internal reallocations to focus on specific initiatives, State funding allocations that are significantly below that of funding peers will inevitably influence those indicators in which SU currently surpasses its own expectations and those of the State. Guideline funding has failed to produce the guideline dollars

designated, and the University's funding has continually lagged behind all traditional four-year institutions in the USM. With State allocations to Salisbury University plummeting to less than \$4,300 per student, the University and its students are forced to support the high cost of academic programs that the State marginally subsidizes. In these extreme budget times, academic programs, including the vital allied health fields, must be reviewed for efficiencies and eliminated if they consume resources far in excess of the median program cost per student.

Guideline funding and tuition pricing data indicate that SU is behind its Maryland peers on virtually every level. However, on many performance indicators, SU equals or surpasses its sister institutions, and based on seat availability, SU is the most in-demand public institution in Maryland. 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 State of Maryland to fund its institutions equitably according to its own guidelines.

The perception that Salisbury University and higher education was richly funded during the late 90's and first years of the new decade are partially misleading and grossly shortsighted. Three years of double-digit increases hardly compensate for a decade of famine. Further, when funded "richly," Salisbury University has never been funded higher than 83% of the MHEC funding guidelines. Academic quality, access, and affordability cannot be maintained with equal success when resources are so dramatically and suddenly reduced. Although budget reductions may propel desirable and beneficial efficiencies, there is a threshold in which an "efficiency" initiates a genuine decline in quality, access, and service. That threshold has long since been crossed.

**MANAGING FOR RESULTS
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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Quality | Nursing (NCLEX) exam pass rate | 79% | 88% | 79% | 77% | 77% | 77% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Quality | Teaching (NTE or PRAXIS II) pass rate ^{1&2} | 96% | 96% | 91% | 92% | 92% | 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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| | | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | | |
| Quality | Satisfaction w/preparation for graduate school ³ | 98% | 100% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| | | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | | |
| Quality | Satisfaction w/preparation for employment ³ | 93% | 93% | 92% | 92% | 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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| | | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | | |
| Quality | Undergraduate satisfaction w/educational quality ³ | 98% | 96% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Objective 1.6 | Increase the proportion of lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty from 56% in 1998 to 67% in 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| Quality | Percent of lower-division student credit hours taught by by core faculty | 53% | 50% | 56% | 57% | 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.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| | Employer satisfaction w/SU graduates ⁴ | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | | |
| Outcome | | N/A | 97.8% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| | Ratio of the median salary of SU graduates(one year after graduation) to the average salary of the civilian workforce w/bachelor's degrees ³ | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | | |
| Outcome | | .73 | .74 | .79 | .79 | .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.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| Outputs | Number of IT graduates | 44 | 78 | 88 | 80 | 90 | 90 |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| Outputs | Number of Teacher Education graduates | 197 | 229 | 235 | 271 | 270 | 270 |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance Measures | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Estimated | 2005 Estimated |
| Outputs | Number of Nursing graduates | 37 | 55 | 54 | 56 | 58 | 58 |

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

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outputs Number of baccalaureate recipients | 1,056 | 1,285 | 1,283 | 1,345 | 1,310 | 1,315 |

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.

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | MSDE Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome Estimated number of Teacher education graduates employed in MD as teachers ³ | 121 | 141 | 176 | 181 | 185 | 185 |

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.

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome Estimated number of IT graduates employed in MD in an IT field ³ | 21 | 17 | 37 | 37 | 40 | 40 |

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

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome Estimated number employed in MD one year after graduation ³ | 746 | 729 | 872 | 872 | 880 | 880 |

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

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome Percent employed one-year after graduation ³ | 94% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |

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

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Performance Measures | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome Estimated number of Nursing graduates employed in MD as nurses ³ | 35 | 27 | 34 | 34 | 38 | 38 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Objective 3.6 | Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU from 52.5% in 2000 to 55.0% in 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU | 52.1% | 50.5% | 39.8% | 39.4% | 40% | 42% |

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. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent women ⁵ | 34% | 34% | 36% | 37% | 38% | 38% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Objective 4.2 | Increase the proportion of full-time executive/managerial staff that are women from 32% in 1998 to 35% in 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Full-time executive/managerial staff: percent women ⁵ | 33% | 38% | 39% | 41% | 42% | 42% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| 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. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Full-time, tenured/tenure-track faculty: percent African-American ⁵ | 3.7% | 4.4% | 5.4% | 5.1% | 5.2% | 5.3% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Objective 4.4 | Increase the proportion of full-time executive/managerial staff that are African-American from 6% in 1998 to 9% in 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Full-time executive/managerial staff: percent African-American ⁵ | 7.9% | 8.7% | 8.7% | 9.1% | 9.0% | 9.0% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Objective 4.5 | Increase the proportion of African-American undergraduates from 8% in 1998 to 10% in 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Percentage of African-American undergraduates ⁵ | 8.0% | 7.4% | 7.8% | 8.4% | 9.1% | 9.8% |

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

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Percentage of minority undergraduates ⁵ | 10.8% | 10.6% | 11.6% | 12.6% | 13.2% | 13.7% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome | Dollars (millions) raised in Campaign for MD ⁶ | \$21.35 | \$23.62 | \$25.47 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome | Private, State, and Federal dollar awards for grants and sponsored research (millions) | \$3.22 | \$5.07 | \$5.36 | \$4.47 | \$4.50 | \$4.50 |

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

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|-------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Efficiency | Annual operating budget savings rate ⁷ | 2.1% | 1.2% | 1.9% | 3.3% | 2.0% | 2.0% |

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

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|-------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Efficiency | Percentage of annual state appropriation spent on facility renewal ⁷ | .9% | 1% | .8% | .9% | .9% | .9% |

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

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Outcome | Annual giving (millions) | \$1.34 | \$2.27 | \$1.84 | \$3.26 | \$1.90 | \$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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--------------|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Faculty salary as a %ile of AAUP peers Assistant ⁷ | | | | | | |
| | Assistant | 72 nd | 80 th | 83 rd | 72 nd | 67 th | 63 rd |
| | Associate | 53 rd | 60 th | 65 th | 62 nd | 59 th | 56 th |
| | Professor | 65 th | 69 th | 72 nd | 67 th | 63 rd | 60 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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Input | Proportion of administrative staff salaries at or above 60 th %ile of CUPA peer | 33% | 38% | 53% | 62% | 48% | 42% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: all students ⁸ | 84.0% | 84.4% | 86.0% | 85.2% | 85.5% | 86.0% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: African-American students ⁸ | 78.0% | 65.8% | 87.5% | 77.9% | 78% | 78% |

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.

| | | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Performance Measures | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 2 nd year first-time, full-time retention rate: minority students ⁸ | 77.4% | 74.2% | 78.4% | 81.3% | 81% | 81% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Objective 6.4 | The six-year graduation rates of SU first-time, full-time freshmen will be at least 70% annually through 2004. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: all students ⁸ | 65.6% | 70.6% | 73.9% | 71.8% | 72% | 72% |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: African-American students ⁸ | 51.9% | 60.4% | 60.6% | 55.0% | 58% | 58% |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| | Performance Measures | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| | | Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual | Estimated | Estimated |
| Output | 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: minority students ⁸ | 52.8% | 60.6% | 57.1% | 55.5% | 57% | 57% |

Notes to MFR

¹Prior to 2002, the teacher certification exam taken for initial teacher certification was the National Teachers Examination (NTE). Beginning in 2002, the PRAXIS II became the exam by which all Maryland students are measured for purposes of initial teacher certification.

²PRAXIS II test results are reported on a cohort basis. Salisbury University includes Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree recipients with the baccalaureate degree recipients. At this time, there is no means of differentiating whether students who pass the exam graduated at the undergraduate or graduate level.

³Up until 2003, Salisbury University surveyed baccalaureate degree recipients on an annual basis and included the most current data in the MFR. The survey years reflect those data. Because a follow-up survey of baccalaureate degree recipients was not conducted in 2003, the 2002 survey results have carried forward to 2003.

⁴Based on the Schaefer Center survey of employers, the percentage of employers who said they would “definitely yes” or “probably yes” hire graduates of SU again. It is unknown when the employer satisfaction survey will be conducted a second time. No estimates are available.

⁵Percentages are based on headcounts as of Fall census.

⁶The Campaign for Maryland objective was surpassed in FY2000, and the objective terminated in FY2002. Reporting current data and future estimates no longer applies.

⁷Data provided by the USM.

⁸Data provided by the MHEC.