

# **SALISBURY UNIVERSITY**

## **2008 Institutional Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission**

**Submitted September 2008**

**Prepared by the Office of University Analysis, Reporting, & Assessment**

### **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 premier comprehensive Maryland public university, offering excellent, affordable education in undergraduate liberal arts, sciences, pre-professional and professional programs, including education, nursing, social work, and business, and a limited number of applied graduate programs. Our highest purpose is to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world.

Salisbury University cultivates and sustains a superior learning community where students, faculty, and staff engage one another as teachers, scholars, and learners, and where a commitment to excellence and an openness to a broad array of ideas and perspectives are central to all aspects of University life. Our learning community is student-centered; thus, students and faculty interact in small classroom settings, faculty serve as academic advisors, and virtually every student has an opportunity to undertake research with a faculty mentor. We foster an environment where individuals make choices that lead to a more successful development of social, physical, occupational, emotional, and intellectual well being.

The University recruits exceptional and diverse faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students from across Maryland, the United States, and around the world, supporting all members of the University community as they work together to achieve the institution's goals and vision. Believing that learning and service are vital components of civic life, Salisbury University actively contributes to the local Eastern Shore community and the educational, economic, cultural, and social needs of our State and nation.

# INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

## Overview

The 2007-08 academic year for Salisbury University (SU) has been a year of multi-faceted growth for the institution. Freshmen applications and enrollment increased by more than 11% this year. The university enrolled 1,150 first-time freshmen, an increase of 117 over the 2006-2007 first-time freshmen enrollment. With this came a more diverse first-time freshmen cohort than the previous year, including larger percentages of students classified as American Indian or Asian/Pacific Islander. Additionally, the institution admitted its first pilot cohort of test-optional (i.e., SAT and ACT) students, marking another area of growth within the institution. SU has expanded its admission philosophy to more holistically evaluate applicants using a range of criteria. Preliminary results revealed that the students admitted under the test-optional pilot performed similarly to their test submitted peers. A final significant addition to SU's campus is the new Teacher Education and Technology Center. This new facility will provide state-of-the-art classrooms, labs, and studios allowing SU to advance teaching and learning.

SU is also expanded its reach by offering degree programs at other Maryland campuses. For instance, students can earn a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work (BSW), Master of Social Work (MSW), Master of Elementary Education, or Master of Middle/Secondary Education from SU through the Eastern Shore Higher Education Center (ESHEC) located at Chesapeake College. SU students can also earn a BSW or MSW from the University System of Maryland at Hagerstown (USMH) or Cecil College. Additionally, SU recently received MHEC approval to offer its renowned Master of Business Administration (MBA) program at ESHEC and will be accepting applications in fall 2008. Also beginning in 2008, SU will offer its nationally accredited Bachelor of Science program in respiratory therapy at the Universities at Shady Grove (USG). The successful expansion of SU's student body, physical campus, admission policy, and program offerings are all signs that the university flourished in 2007-08. Accompanying this growth, 2008 has been a year in which SU has garnered much national recognition of its reputation as an exceptional comprehensive university.

- *U.S. News & World Report* again selected SU as one of America's top 10 public comprehensive universities in the North. This is the 11<sup>th</sup> consecutive year that the university has earned this honor.
- For the 9<sup>th</sup> consecutive year, SU was designated by *The Princeton Review* as one of "The Best 366 Colleges" in the U.S.
- *Kaplan Newsweek* named SU as one of "America's 371 Most Interesting Schools" for the 4<sup>th</sup> year in a row.
- *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* magazine named SU as one of the top "100 Best Values in Public Colleges."
- *Selection site for the 22<sup>nd</sup> National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR, the second time in a decade that SU has been bestowed this honor*

## Accountability Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

Currently, the Key Goals and Objectives identified in the "Managing for Results" (MFR)

document compliment SU’s 2004-2008 Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives. Additionally, this report identifies how SU’s Key Goals and Objectives and Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives relate to the five goals for postsecondary education identified in the “2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education.” In addition to MFR-specific data, there are a number of additional indicators and qualitative efforts that are related to SU’s progress towards the Key Goals and Objectives. To determine how effectively SU is progressing towards meeting the 2009 MFR Key Goals and Objectives, data relevant to each objective will be described in subsequent sections of this report. While SU is making continual progress towards these objectives, the institution is also immersed in the development of updating the Institutional Strategic Plan Goals for 2009-2014. The institution looks forward to sharing the results of this process in the 2009 MFR.

<b>MHEC GOAL</b>	<b>SU GOAL</b>	<b>MFR OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL INDICATORS</b>
Quality and Effectiveness	The University will enhance an academic and learning environment that promotes intellectual growth and success.	1.1-1.4 4.1-4.6	AI.8
Access and Affordability	The University will foster inclusiveness as well as cultural and intellectual pluralism.	3.1-3.3	AI.3-AI.8
Diversity	The University will foster inclusiveness as well as cultural and intellectual pluralism.	3.1-3.3	
A Student-Centered Learning System	The University will advance a student-centered environment.	1.2 2.1	
Economic Growth and Vitality	The University will utilize strategic collaborations and targeted community outreach to benefit the University, Maryland, and the region.	1.1-1.4 2.1-2.5	AI.1-AI.2 AI.8

**Quality & Effectiveness**

Given the changing demographics of the state of Maryland, it is imperative that the institution create an infrastructure to support a more diverse population of students in the coming years. The

University has increasingly emphasized its diversity initiatives and demographics—both of which are readily affirmed in the University’s trends and benchmarks. SU continues to increase its diversity. Fall 2007 marked the most ethnically diverse student population in SU’s history. Minority students now make up approximately 17% of SU’s student body. Additionally, in 2007-08 the University served minority students through several initiatives.

- Pre-matriculation Program- included mentorship and orientation activities to assist students of color acclimate to campus life.
- Early Warning Program- monitored students’ academic progress to ensure that those that students that needed additional assistance could receive it in a timely manner.
- Center for Student Achievement- began operation in fall 2008 and serves as a central location for academic resources, support, and advising.
- Math Assessment- development and implementation of a pilot program for fall 2008 for all incoming first-year students.

One common method for evaluating institutional “success” has been graduation and retention rates. It should be emphasized that these rates provide only indirect evidence about student success, and provide little information about how much learning and/or development occurred while a student was enrolled at SU. However, retention and graduation rates do provide information about institutional ability to successfully maintain and move students through the pipeline. By comparing retention and graduation rates across multiple years for minority students, the University will have some evidence of the impact of its diversity initiatives. The relevant rates for SU are provided in Objectives 4.1-4.6.

### Retention and Graduation

The second-year retention rate declined slightly from fall 2005 to fall 2007 for first-time, full-time freshmen. At 84% in fall 2007, the second-year retention rate for the 2008 MFR (Objective 4.1) is slightly below the 85% goal established for 2009. For the second consecutive year, the first-time, full-time freshmen retention rate has declined. The entering students in fall 2006 cohort had lower incoming SAT scores and high school grades than the 2005 cohort, which is likely related to the drop in the second-year retention rate reported. Additionally, data collected from the 2006 cohort during their incoming freshmen year, indicated that approximately 8% of them anticipated they would transfer to another college before graduating from SU (2006 HERI CIRP Freshman Survey). That subgroup that never intended on staying at SU may be revealing itself in this lower second-year retention rate. However, the current second-year retention rate is in the typical range that has consistently hovered in the mid 80’s.

Concurrently, one standard of success for the SAT test-optional policy initiated in fall 2007 requires the retention rates of students admitted without submitting an SAT score, to be as high as those students who submitted SAT scores. Second-year retention rates for the test-optional students were similar to that reported for students admitted using the standard policy, 81% and 83%, respectively. These 2008 rates are also comparable to previous second-year retention rates for first-year SU students entering in fall 2006 and returning in fall 2007, prior to the implementation of test-optional pilot program, 81%

Objectives 4.2 and 4.3 provide additional information regarding second-year retention with a special focus on African American and minority students. For 2008, second-year retention increased 4% from the previous year for SU's African American students. Approximately, 87% of African American students were retained until their second year, marking the highest second-year retention rate achieved for this group since 2002. Additionally, this year's rate exceeded the 2009 second-year retention rate goal of 85%. Results were equally positive for minority students at SU. Second-year retention rates for minority students increased by 2% this year, to a rate of 84%. It is anticipated that SU will be able to achieve its goal of 85% for the 2009 reporting year.

Since 2004, SU has achieved its goal to maintain a graduation rate of at least 73% annually (Objective 4.4)—with a current rate of 75%. The 2008 rate surpasses the original goal of 73% set in 2004. When compared to other institutions, SU's average six-year graduation rates are the highest among our performance peers, and the second highest rate in the USM.

Progress towards our graduation goals for African American (Objective 4.5) and minority (Objective 4.6) students were mixed. Compared to 2007 rates, the University experienced a decline in six-year graduation rates for African American students, 58% compared to 63%. It should be noted that SU's population of African American students increased by more than 160%, or 54 students, from the cohorts used to calculate the 2007 to 2008 rates. The University was cautious regarding its 2006 achievement since the initial size of the African-American and minority cohorts has only now reached a level that provides a degree of stability and predictability. However, early indications are that the benchmark levels may have been established at prematurely high levels that correlated with anomalous spikes from smaller cohort years.

Additionally, the decline in the six-year graduation rate for African American students is largely attributable to the dramatic decrease in the percentage of students from that subgroup that transferred and graduated from another Maryland public institution in 2008. Specifically, for the 2007 cohort, 9% of African American students that graduated within six years actually started at SU but then transferred and graduated from another Maryland institution. For the 2008 cohort, the comparable rate was only 2%. As such, SU actually graduated a larger percentage of African American students from its own campus for the 2008 cohort, 56%, when compared to the 2007 cohort, 53%.

When six-year graduation rates for minority students at SU were examined, results revealed a 3.6% increase from the 2007 rates (Objective 4.6). Overall, 62% of minority students graduated within six-years of entering the institution. It is believed that the minority achievement initiatives instituted during the 2007-08 academic year positively influenced graduation rates for this subgroup. It is hoped that by continuing with these initiatives during the 2008-09 academic year that we will meet our 2009 goal of achieving a six-year minority student graduation rate of 63%.

#### Accreditations and Licensure:

An additional indicator of the quality and effectiveness of SU can be determined by the ability of the university and its program to obtain and maintain national accreditations. Several academic programs are accredited with specialized agencies:

- Salisbury University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

(MSCHE);

- the Teacher Education programs completed a rigorous self-study and site visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and MD Education Department in November 2005;
- the Social Work program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE);
- the programs in Music successfully earned their initial accreditation with the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM);
- the Franklin P. Perdue School of Business is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB);
- the program in Exercise Science successfully earned its initial accreditation with the Committee on Accreditation for the Exercise Sciences (CoAES) through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs;
- the program in Clinical Laboratory Sciences/Medical Technology successfully continued its accreditation with the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS);
- the Nursing programs are accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE);
- the program in Environmental Health Sciences successfully continued its accreditation with the National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council (NEHSPAC);
- the two programs in the Department of Chemistry were certified by the American Chemical Society Committee on Professional Training (ACS-CPT);
- the program in Athletic Training successfully continued its accreditation with the Joint Review Committee on Education Programs in Athletic Training (JRC-AT) through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs and the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE); and,
- the Respiratory Therapy program was awarded continuing accreditation in May 2007 from the Committee on Accreditation for Respiratory Care (CoARC) through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs.

Additionally, Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 were established as performance goals to help determine the effectiveness of the nursing and teacher education programs at SU. Effectiveness for these goals is measured as pass rates of the nursing licensure exam (NCLEX, by nursing graduates) and the teacher licensure exam (PRAXIS, by teacher education graduates). The University increased its pass rate on the NCLEX (Objective 1.1) by 7% in 2008. This is the second consecutive year where rates have increased. With a 90% pass rate, nursing students have met the 2009 established goal. These increases can be largely attributed to the concentrated efforts (e.g., curriculum reform, tutoring, NCLEX review course, etc.) initiated by the nursing program in 2006 to increase its pass rates.

At 94%, the pass rate for the PRAXIS increased by 2% from the previous year. This marks the

second consecutive year of pass rates increased, and the University is moving closer towards its 2009 97% goal. In 2006, the University implemented a number of initiatives (e.g., mapping of PRAXIS content to curriculum, PRAXIS workshops, optimal timing of taking the PRAXIS, etc.) to move current rates closer to the benchmark.

#### Alumni Satisfaction:

The satisfaction of SU graduates can also be used as an indicator of the effectiveness of the University's academic programs. Specifically, satisfaction with preparation for graduate or professional school (Objective 1.3) and employment (Objective 1.4) are examined on an annual basis. Historically, satisfaction levels have ranged from 97% to 100% for these objectives. For the 2008 data, students that graduated in August/December 2006 and January/May 2007 were surveyed. The results revealed that approximately 100% and 99% of those responding to the survey indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for graduate/professional school and employment, respectively. Both of these results surpass the 2009 goals set by SU.

#### Faculty:

Though not an explicit MFR objective, the faculty is critical to SU's success as an institution, and competitive salaries allow the University to attract and retain the best instructors. Collectively in 2006-2007, SU faculty contributed 4,200 workday-equivalents of public service, wrote almost 2,500 letters of reference on behalf of our students, and spent nearly 2,500 hours preparing for or in theatrical productions. These activities are above and beyond faculty efforts spent educating our students in the classroom. Unfortunately, this commitment does not translate to increased compensation for our faculty. SU continues to fall farther behind in its faculty salary levels. Since FY 2002, faculty salaries as a percentile of AAUP peers have fallen from the 72<sup>nd</sup> percentile to the 58<sup>th</sup> percentile for professors, from the 65<sup>th</sup> to the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for associate professors and from the 83<sup>rd</sup> to the 76<sup>th</sup> percentile for assistant professors. Compared to the USM average weighted percentile across all ranks of 79, SU's average weighted percentile is at 62, 17 percentile points lower.

Despite the modest salary increases the past few years, the AAUP data convincingly indicate that many states have continued their commitment to their higher education workforce while Maryland lags behind and, at salary increases of 4 - 4.5% annually, the gap will continue to widen.

#### **Access, Affordability, and Diversity**

The next two MHEC postsecondary education goals focus on promoting accessibility, affordability, and diversity. SU has been designated by the Board of Regents as one of three "enrollment growth institutions" within the USM. As a result, in 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years SU has provided access to more students from diverse backgrounds, while still being affordable. Objectives 3.1-3.3 focus on meeting these goals.

#### Capacity:

SU continues to focus its enrollment growth on both highly qualified, motivated first-time freshmen and transfer students. For fall 2007, applications to SU were up 12% from last year; approximately 6,593 applications were received for 1,150 freshmen seats. With an average

composite SAT score, 1,120, and an average high school GPA of 3.50 the academic background of new freshmen admitted fall 2007 surpassed that of the 2006 cohort of first-time freshmen. SU was able to respond to MHEC's access goals by increasing undergraduate enrollment by 150 students this year while still maintaining the academic rigor of its first-time freshmen class. Overall, the campus now has 1,550 more undergraduates, a 29% increase, than it did 10 years ago.

#### Diversity:

One positive side effect of increasing enrollment and accessibility has been the growing number of minority students on SU's campus (Objectives 3.1 and 3.2). The University is committed to meeting the demands of the ever-increasing diverse Maryland and national population. As high school graduates come from more diverse backgrounds, SU hopes to accommodate these students and enhance the educational experience of all students in our region. During fall 2007, SU increased its enrollment of African American and minority undergraduate students for the third consecutive year. With a .5% growth in African American students, SU is just shy of its 2009 goal of 12%. Additionally, 17.4% of SU's enrollment is composed of minority students, again showing progress towards the 2009 goal of 18%. Over a 10 year period, SU has increased the enrolled number of African-American students by 81% (from 461 in fall 1997 to 835 in fall 2007) and more than doubled the enrolled number of Hispanic undergraduate students (from 54 in fall 2000 to 179 in fall 2006). It has done this through enhanced interaction in selected high schools on the Western Shore, increased marketing efforts, and through the expansion of institutional scholarship programs, as well as, expanded efforts by the Office of Multiethnic Student Services.

SU is committed to closing the Achievement Gap and is focusing on measures to improve retention and graduation rates for minority students. These include:

- additional focus on math and science courses in which minority students have historically failed at higher rates than majority students;
- adequately placing students in math and science courses matched to their ability by implementing the pilot phase of a math assessment for all first-time incoming freshmen; and
- implementing more intentional and early semester advising to help guide students to resources and/or alternative course that will enhance their academic experience.

#### Alternative Delivery Approaches and Technology:

In addition to increasing undergraduate enrollment, SU has focused on expanding accessibility by offering several of its renowned programs at other Maryland higher education campus. By collaborating with USG, USMH, Cecil College, and ESHEC, the University will be able to provide opportunities to students that might not otherwise be able to attend classes on SU's main campus. In fall 2008, SU will offer a BS degree in Respiratory Therapy at USG and begin accepting applications for the MBA program at ESHEC. Additionally, students can earn a BSW and/or an MSW from SU at ESHEC, Cecil College, and USMH, and a Bachelor's in Elementary Education, a Master of Elementary Education, or Master of Middle/Secondary Education from SU through the ESHEC located at Chesapeake College. These successful partnerships will assist

the state in meeting its demand to train highly qualified teachers, social workers, business professionals, and healthcare professionals and grant students access to programs that may have been previously unavailable in those regions.

Additionally, SU has engaged in several efforts to explore alternative delivery methods that would maximize efficiency and learning while educating students. As part of the USM Course Redesign Initiative being led by the, SU has redesigned its introductory biology course. Actual seat time has been reduced and consequently faculty time has been reduced through the use of technology. Preliminary data from the pilot run in spring 2008 indicates that student performance was the same or better in the redesigned course. Secondly, the Fulton School of Liberal Arts has revised its entire catalog of offerings to offer courses using a 4-credit rather than a 3-credit model. The revision allows for increased student engagement in the courses through out-of-classroom activities such as service learning, international experiences, higher level critical thinking exercises (analysis, synthesis, evaluation). Overall seat-time in these courses is generally reduced to allow students time to engage fully in these alternate activities.

#### Affordability:

While continuing to increase accessibility, SU has managed to retain its ranking as one of the top “100 Best Values in Public Colleges” by *Kiplinger’s Personal Finance* magazine in 2008. SU had affordability rankings of 62<sup>nd</sup> for in-state students and 49<sup>th</sup> for out-of-state students. This honor reflects both the affordability (e.g., tuition, fees, need-based and non-need-based aid and grants, etc.) and quality (e.g., academic rigor of the freshman class, admission, retention, and graduation rates, etc.) of the University.

While SU has been able to remain a “Best Value” this year, the rankings have slipped noticeably from the previous year, 12 places for in-state and 9 for out-of-state students. SU has historically been underfunded at the State level. When compared to other USM institutions, total state funding to SU per full-time equivalent student (FTES) were ranked last, more than \$3400.00 per FTES below the USM average. SU would need an additional \$23 million to be funded at the USM average. This coupled with the lower than USM average tuition and mandatory state fees collected by SU, has put the University at a great disadvantage.

In 2008, SU was able to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students by nearly 5%, to a total of 41.4% (Objective 3.3). We are still somewhat below our 2009 target of 46%. However, SU improved accessibility for minority and economically disadvantaged students in 2008, an impressive feat given the financial constraints that were faced. But, without additional monies, it is difficult to allocate extra funds to need-based scholarships and student initiatives to enhance retention.

#### University-Specific Response- Objective 3.3:

During the 2007 MFR cycle MHEC noted that the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending Salisbury has steadily fallen in the past three years from 42.4 percent to 36.8 percent. This would make it even more difficult for SU to meet its 2009 target of 46%. SU is committed to increasing the amount of institutional-based aid provided to its students, hopefully increasing economically disadvantaged student enrollment. The tuition freeze put SU at a greater disadvantage than other USM schools because its tuition and fees are considerably lower than other USM schools. Additionally, general fund support provided to SU has been historically low,

well below the USM and four-year Maryland public school averages. In fiscal year 2007, SU's general fund support per full-time equivalent student was approximately 45% of the USM and four-year Maryland public school average. As operating costs continue to increase, and state funding covering only 48% of these costs, SU struggles to keep pace with other Maryland public institutions. Each year these factors put SU further behind other system schools in terms of the amount of funds that can be directed toward need-based financial aid. This may deter students from attending the institution. However, during 2007-08, SU allocated 67% of institutional aid, to students with a demonstrated need. Additionally, for the 2008 reporting period, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students at SU increased to 41.4%. It is anticipated that the University will again increase this percentage for the 2009 reporting period, provided the State maintains its commitment to full funding as outlined in the State Plan for Higher Education.

### **Economic Growth and Vitality and A Student-Centered Learning System**

SU states in its mission that it is “our highest purpose is to empower our students with the knowledge, skills, and core values that contribute to active citizenship, gainful employment, and life-long learning in a democratic society and interdependent world.” In achieving this mission, SU gauges its success using a variety of performance measures (Objectives 1.1-1.4; Objectives 2.1-2.5). This includes alumni satisfaction with the education and preparation they received, student success on professional licensure and certification exams, number of graduates employed in the state, especially those in highly desired fields (i.e., teacher education, nursing, and information technology). In her congressional testimony this year, SU's president, Dr. Janet Dudley-Eshbach indicated that the University's impact on the local and regional economy exceeded \$425 million and added more than 3,000 local jobs in 2008.

Data was collected using an alumni survey to address Objectives 1.3, 1.4, 2.2-2.4. In general, the percentage of SU graduates satisfied with their level of preparation for graduate school (Objective 1.3) and employment (Objective 1.4), exceeded the 2009 goals set for SU. Historically, the percentage of SU graduates employed one-year after graduation (Objective 2.4) has been in mid-90s. Updated percentages using the 2006-2007 graduates revealed that 95% of those responding to an alumni survey were employed one year after graduation. This percentage meets our 2009 employment goal.

#### Nursing:

In the past ten years, the nursing program has experienced increased enrollment, more than doubling from 197 to 414 students. Undoubtedly, much of this growth is due to market opportunities associated with a severe national shortage of nurses. Based on pass rates for the NCLEX exam, the nursing program has progressively improved the level of preparation of its graduates over the past three years. With a current rate of 90%, an additional 17% of the nursing graduates are passing the exam in 2008 compared to 2006. SU has little control over where nursing graduates select to live and work once they graduate from SU and pass the NCLEX exam. As a result, it is especially challenging to control and estimate the annual number of nurses that are employed in the state of Maryland (Objective 2.3). When compared to the 2007 data, the estimated number of nurses employed in MD in 2008 increased slightly to 55. While the institution is making progress towards its 2009 goals of 70, the goal may be unrealistically high.

Additional indicators of performance examine the capacity and enrollment in the nursing program. During Fall 2008, the nursing program enrolled a slightly lower number of new students, this is likely due to the 4% decline in the number of program applicants. However, the total number of nursing undergraduate majors increased 8% this year from the previous year. Likewise, the number of nursing baccalaureate degree recipients increased this year by 12%. This provides further evidence of SU's commitment to producing quality graduates in the healthcare field.

#### University-Specific Responses- Objective 2.3:

Between 2005 to 2007 reporting schedule, the number of nursing graduates employed in Maryland increased from 57 to 71 and then decreased in 2007 to 54. As the number of out-of-state nursing students increases, it is not surprising that they return to their states of origin. SU encourages out-of-state students to apply for the MHEC non-resident nursing student tuition reduction and state aid program. This program provides nursing students with some tuition relief in exchange for working in MD as a nurse after graduation. However, SU does not set nursing salaries, which may be higher at healthcare agencies outside of Maryland. However, more nursing students graduated and a higher percentage passed the NCLEX exam for the 2007 reporting group, August/December 2005 and January/May 2006 graduates, as compared to the 2006 group, August/December 2004 and January/May 2005 graduates. The fact that fewer stayed in Maryland could be an indicator that these graduates were highly qualified and strongly recruited by out-of-state agencies.

Additionally, as the number of nursing graduates that respond to the alumni survey fluctuates each year, the reliability of the data reported is also affected. The data reported for the 2006 MFR were the result of a smaller sample of nursing respondents as compared to the 2005 and 2007 data. As a result, this smaller sample, approximately 30% smaller, may have presented unrealistically high numbers (i.e., spike) for the 2006 data. In fact, the number of nursing graduates employed in Maryland for the 2008 data is similar to the 2005 and 2007 rates, providing further evidence that the 2006 rate was uncharacteristic. Additionally, of those nursing graduates that responded to the alumni survey, in 2006 only 8% enrolled at SU as an out-of-state student compared to 11% for 2007. Since a greater percentage of the nursing graduates that responded to the survey in 2006 were Maryland residents when they entered SU, it is not surprising that the number employed in Maryland following their graduation was also higher than the numbers reported for 2007.

#### Teacher Education:

The number of degrees awarded varies by the specific Teacher Education program. An additional 6 students graduated with an Early Childhood Education degree, while 2 more graduated with a degree in Physical Education. However, Elementary and Health Education declined this year by 16 and 2 graduates, respectively. As the overall number of Teacher Education graduates decline, it is feasible that the number employed in the state of Maryland may also decline (Objective 2.1). This data will be available in July 2008. The University anticipates that this trend to begin to reverse once the new Teacher Education and Technology Complex opens in fall 2008. Additionally, we would expect an increase in the number of Teacher Education graduates employed in Maryland recovering as early as 2012 (Objective 2.1). However, the University has no control over the life choices of graduates once they are provided the discipline-specific and general education competencies they need to be successful. State

governments have not responded to market shortages as aggressively as has the private sector and teachers' salaries in Maryland are not as competitive as they are in some of the neighboring states. This, coupled with the escalation of housing costs in most metropolitan, urban, and desirable retirement destinations, including the Eastern Shore, have created market tensions that make other career options and/or locations more desirable. Toward the goal of increasing the number of Teacher Education graduates working in Maryland, the university has obtained a \$1.5 million grant focused on training and retaining K-13 Eastern Shore teachers. It is hoped that this grant will have a positive impact on progress toward meeting the 2009 goal for Objective 2.1.

#### Information Technology:

Information Technology (IT) programs have experienced growth and decline that mirrors the national employment market. The estimated number of graduates employed in the IT field in Maryland (Objective 2.2) can be largely a function of the market. In the previous three years the number of graduates employed in the IT field in Maryland has climbed, increasing 74%. Last year, SU fell just below its 2009 goal of 70. Unfortunately, there was a dramatic drop in this number for the current year. This may be due to the 44% decline in computer science degrees awarded during the 2006-07 academic year, representing the graduates surveyed to provide the 2008 MFR data. Additionally, there was a 25% decline in IT employees responding to the alumni survey this year, raising questions about the validity and reliability of this data.

### **COST CONTAINMENT**

Salisbury University remains committed to maximizing efficiency efforts by restructuring organizational processes, upgrading to new and more efficient technologies, embracing new technologies and methods, and containing costs. Savings and cost containment efforts allow the reallocation of resources to other critical initiatives and functions. In FY 2008, Salisbury University projects \$2.04 million dollars of funds available as a result of efficiency efforts. The University's efficiency efforts represent a 2.4% savings of the state supported budget. The following is a brief description of each effort and the cost savings/avoidance associated with each.

#### Efficiency Efforts:

- Collaboration with an Academic Institution (\$139,000)
  - Salisbury University continues its extensive collaboration with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. The two universities participate in two dual degree programs, sponsor a joint graduate degree, the 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 is saved annually.
- Business Process Reengineering (\$240,000)
  - From relying on an overall preventive maintenance program, to expanding use of both the one-card and pro-card and including the use of the Sallie Mae Tuition pay program, the University has been able to significantly reduce operating costs while enhancing its ability to serve its customers.
- Energy Conservation Program (\$350,000)
  - The combination of a campus wide total energy management system to monitor

and control energy management and the recent energy performance contract initiated with PEPCO Inc, have greatly enhanced the University's ability to offset some of the higher costs by reducing its demand.

- Redefinition of Work (\$909,000)
  - The University employs part-time faculty and staff and students to meet its employment demands. If these positions were covered by full-time benefited employees, the additional cost to the University would be substantial.
- Technology Initiative (\$113,000)
  - The use of e-mail as a principle source of written communication, web-time keeping in lieu of printed timesheets, and imaging in lieu of maintaining paper files are all examples of Salisbury University's use of technology to reduce operating costs and increase operational efficiency.
- E&E Workgroup focus (\$287,000)
  - The University has partnered with other system institutions in the procurement of electricity and natural gas. This bulk buying power has allowed the University better rates for greater periods of time.

## **Summary**

The current year has been an exciting one on SU's campus. There has been a great deal of growth that has allowed the University to increase accessibility and diversity. Concurrently, SU has been able to maintain and improve its reputation and national rankings acknowledging the University's progress towards meeting its quality, affordability, access, diversity, education, and economic impact initiatives. In 2008, SU made positive strides towards all but three of its Key Goals and Objectives. To improve subsequent performance on these three objectives, SU is currently implementing special initiatives. To improve second-year retention (Objective 4.1) and six-year graduation rates (Objectives 4.4, 4.5) SU will be opening a Student Achievement Center in fall 2008. This center will serve as a central location from which students can seek academic guidance and resources. Additionally, the implementation of a math assessment pilot in fall 2008 will also assist the University in identifying those students that may experience difficulty in math and science classes. Through the Student Achievement Center and additional intentional academic advising, students will be given assistance early and often. It is expected that these initiatives will improve retention and graduation rates in subsequent years.

## 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.

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Nursing (NCLEX) exam pass rate	88%	73%	83%	90%	90%	90%

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

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Teaching (PRAXIS) pass rate <sup>1</sup>	96%	91%	92%	94%	94.5%	95%

**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%.

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Estimated</b>	<b>Survey Estimated</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Satisfaction w/preparation for graduate school <sup>2</sup>	99%	99%	99%	100%	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.

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Actual</b>	<b>Survey Estimated</b>	<b>Survey Estimated</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Satisfaction w/preparation for employment <sup>2</sup>	97%	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%

**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.

	2005 MSDE Actual	2006 MSDE Actual	2007 MSDE Actual	2008 MSDE Actual	2009 MSDE Estimated	2010 MSDE Estimated
<b>Performance Measures</b>						
<b>Outcome</b> Estimated number of Teacher education graduates employed in MD as teachers <sup>3</sup>	163	164	143	157	152	160

**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.

	2005 Survey Actual	2006 Survey Actual	2007 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Actual	2009 Survey Estimated	2010 Survey Estimated
<b>Performance Measures</b>						
<b>Outcome</b> Estimated number of graduates employed in MD in an IT field <sup>2</sup>	31	46	54	17	59	60

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

	2005 Survey Actual	2006 Survey Actual	2007 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Actual	2009 Survey Estimated	2010 Survey Estimated
<b>Performance Measures</b>						
<b>Outcome</b> Estimated number of Nursing graduates employed in MD as nurses <sup>2</sup>	57	71	54	55	70	73

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

	2005 Survey Actual	2006 Survey Actual	2007 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Actual	2009 Survey Estimated	2010 Survey Estimated
<b>Performance Measures</b>						
<b>Outcome</b> Percent employed one-year after graduation <sup>2</sup>	96%	93%	95%	95%	95%	95%

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

<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2007 Actual</b>	<b>2008 Actual</b>	<b>2009 Estimated</b>	<b>2010 Estimated</b>
<b>Efficiency</b> Percentage of annual state appropriation spent on facility renewal <sup>4</sup>	.4%	.6%	1.1%	1.2%	.9%	.9%

**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.

<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2007 Actual</b>	<b>2008 Actual</b>	<b>2009 Estimated</b>	<b>2010 Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b> Percentage of African-American undergraduates <sup>5</sup>	10.3%	10.5%	11.0%	11.5%	12.0%	12.8%

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

<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2007 Actual</b>	<b>2008 Actual</b>	<b>2009 Estimated</b>	<b>2010 Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b> Percentage of minority undergraduates <sup>5</sup>	15.8%	16.2%	16.7%	17.4%	18.0%	18.5%

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

<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2007 Actual</b>	<b>2008 Actual</b>	<b>2009 Estimated</b>	<b>2010 Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b> Percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending SU <sup>6</sup>	42.4%	39.2%	36.8%	41.4%	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.

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> year first-time, full-time retention rate: all students <sup>7</sup>	84.3%	87.4%	84.9%	83.6%	85.1%	85.7%

**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.

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> year first-time, full-time retention rate: African-American students <sup>7</sup>	83.6%	80.0%	83.0%	87.2%	87.5%	87.7%

**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.

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> year first-time, full-time retention rate: minority students <sup>7</sup>	83.2%	84.0%	82.0%	84.0%	85.5%	86.0%

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

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> 6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: all students <sup>7</sup>	72.8%	72.9%	75.1%	74.5%	75.1%	76.0%

**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.

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: African-American students <sup>7</sup>	58.5%	65.7%	62.5%	58.1%	63.0%	63.0%
<b>Output</b>						

**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.

	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
6-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time freshmen: minority students <sup>7</sup>	60.6%	63.7%	58.3%	61.9%	63.0%	63.0%
<b>Output</b>						

**Additional Indicators**<sup>8</sup>

**AI. Performance Measures**

<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>2005 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2006 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2007 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2008 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2009 Survey Estimated</b>	<b>2010 Survey Estimated</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Median salary of SU graduates	\$34,711	\$35,909	\$37,037	\$39,814	\$39,600	\$40,900
<b>Outcome</b>	Ratio of the median salary of SU graduates (one year after graduation) to the median salary of the civilian workforce w/bachelor's degrees <sup>2</sup>	.82	.83	.79	.84	.77	.77
<b>Input</b>	Number of applicants to the professional nursing program <sup>9</sup>	98	137	163	157	140	140
<b>Input</b>	Number of applicants accepted into the professional nursing program	93	107	88	88	110	112
<b>Input</b>	Number of applicants not accepted into the professional nursing program	5	30	75	69	30	28
<b>Input</b>	Number of applicants enrolled in the professional nursing program	88	86	88	82	88	90
<b>Input</b>	Number of undergraduate nursing majors <sup>9</sup>	428	421	418	453	425	427
<b>Output</b>	Number of baccalaureate degree recipients in nursing	78	84	68	76	66	78

**Notes to MFR**

<sup>1</sup> PRAXIS test results are reported on a cohort basis. The test period for 2008 is between 10/1/2006 and 9/30/2007.

<sup>2</sup> Salisbury University annually surveys its baccalaureate degree recipients one-year after graduation. Those surveyed for 2008 Actual graduated in August or December 2006, or January or May 2007. This survey cycle differs from MHEC's triennial alumni survey cycle. As a result, SU's data are updated annually reflecting the most recently surveyed classes.

<sup>3</sup>Actual 2008 data are reported from MSDE as of October 2007.

<sup>4</sup>Data provided by the USM. 2007 data was an estimated percentage but now represents the actual percentage. Actual 2008 data reflect the fiscal year beginning 7/1/2007 and ending 6/30/2008 and is currently only an estimated figure.

<sup>5</sup>Percentages are based on headcounts as of fall census. Actual data for 2008 reflects fall 2007 enrollment. The following information is provided in response to the 2008 request of the Joint Chairs for additional information on minority student enrollment. USM minority student enrollment, broken down by minority group for the two most recent fiscal years, was as follows: African American 11.0% in FY 07 and 11.5% in FY 08; Hispanic 2.7% in FY 07 and 2.5% in FY 08; Asian 2.6% in FY 07 and 2.8% in FY 08; Native American .4% in FY 07 and .6% in FY 08.

<sup>6</sup>Actual 2008 data are from fall 2007.

<sup>7</sup>Data provided by the MHEC. For second year retention rates, actual data for 2008 reports the number of students in the Fall 2006 cohort who returned in Fall 2007. For graduation rates, actual data for fall 2008 report the number of students in the Fall 2001 cohort who graduated by Spring 2007.

<sup>8</sup>Additional Indicators are institutional measures that are important to external audiences. They are not included as part of Salisbury University's Managing For Results and are not driven by any institutional targets because of offsetting goals. They are included for informational purposes only.

<sup>9</sup>Data presented in the final submission of 2007 Managing For Results were estimates, the actual numbers are presented now.