

Managing For Results 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						
Outcome as teachers	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}						
Outcome		.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.