

# **Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis**

**University System of Maryland**

**Morgan State University**

**St. Mary's College Of Maryland**

**December 2007**

**MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION**

Kevin M. O’Keefe, Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Victor E. Bernson, Jr.

Joann A. Boughman

Anwer Hasan

Leronia A. Josey

Joshua L. Michael

James G. Morgan

Nhora Barrera Murphy

Emmett Paige, Jr.

Chung K. Pak

Paul L. Saval

James E. Lyons, Sr.  
Secretary of Higher Education

Martin O’Malley  
Governor

Anthony G. Brown  
Lt. Governor

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	1
<b>Background</b> .....	2
<b>Refining Funding Guidelines</b> .....	2
<b>Performance Measures for University System of Maryland and Morgan State University</b> .....	3
<b>Assessing Institution Performance</b> .....	3
<b>Data Availability</b> .....	3
<b>St. Mary’s College of Maryland Quality Profile</b> .....	4
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures .....	6
Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures .....	7
Table 3. St. Mary’s College of Maryland Performance Measures.....	8
<b>Peer Performance Analysis</b>	
Bowie State University .....	10
Coppin State University .....	14
Frostburg State University .....	17
Salisbury University.....	20
Towson University.....	26
University of Baltimore .....	29
University of Maryland, Baltimore.....	32
University of Maryland, Baltimore County .....	35
University of Maryland, College Park .....	38
University of Maryland Eastern Shore .....	42
University of Maryland University College .....	49
Morgan State University .....	52
St. Mary’s College of Maryland .....	55
<b>Appendix A. Peer Performance Selection Methodology for USM Institutions</b> .....	61
<b>Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Core Performance Measures: USM</b> .....	63
<b>Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution Specific Performance Measures: USM</b> .....	67
<b>Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: Morgan State Univ...</b>	73
<b>Appendix E. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: St. Mary’s College</b> ..	75



## Executive Summary

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics. These funding peers are compared to the Maryland institutions to inform resource allocation and to assess performance.

An annual performance accountability component is included in the funding guidelines process. Each applicable Maryland institution selects ten performance peers from their list of funding peers. The Commission, in consultation with representatives from the University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services, identified a set of comprehensive, outcome-oriented performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. There are fifteen core performance measures for USM institutions and fourteen for Morgan. These indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and include indicators for which data are currently available. In addition, USM institutions use institution-specific indicators which are more reflective of each institution's role and mission.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed their performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance was below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will take to improve. An exception was made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

St. Mary's College of Maryland participates in the performance assessment process despite the fact that it does not participate in the funding guidelines. St. Mary's has selected twelve current peers and six aspirant peers on which to compare performance. The thirty performance measures are similar to those chosen for the other four-year public institutions but also reflect St. Mary's role as the State's only public liberal arts college.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution, Morgan State University and St. Mary's College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. Performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability are discussed. In addition, each institution is given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are included in the analysis section.

## **Background**

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted funding guidelines, a peer-based model designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions (i.e. funding peers) that are similar to the Maryland institution (i.e. home institution) in mission, size, program mix, enrollment composition, and other defining characteristics. These funding peers are then compared and contrasted with the Maryland institution.

This performance accountability report summarizes the performance of Maryland public four-year institutions in comparison with selected funding peers. To compare performance, the presidents of each Maryland institution, except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University, selected ten performance peers from their list of funding peers. The presidents based this selection on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives. The University of Maryland, College Park is measured against its *aspirational* peers - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. For the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), composite peers are used to recognize UMB's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as Specialized – medical schools and medical centers and institutions classified as very high research activity institutions. Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. Appendix A lists the criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

## **Refining the Funding Guidelines**

In fiscal year 2002, for the first time, the Commission provided a report to the General Assembly on the University System of Maryland's performance relative to their performance peers. The budget committees expressed concern that this report was not comprehensive because the performance indicators did not place enough emphasis on outcome and achievement measures. The Commission, in consultation with a workgroup composed of representatives from the University System of Maryland (USM), the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), the Department of Legislative Services (DLS) and Morgan State University (MSU), identified a set of performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers and developed a method to assess institutional performance.

Fiscal year 2008 represents the eighth year the funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. As funding guidelines continue to evolve, so too does the assessment of institutional performance. This report contains the eighth comprehensive assessment of the performance of each USM institution, the seventh for Morgan State University and the sixth for St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's) in comparison to their performance peers. A discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability follow.

## **Performance Measures for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University**

There are fifteen core performance measures and institution-specific measures for the USM institutions (see Table 1). Not all institutions are required to provide data on all of the measures. There are separate sets of indicators for Maryland's comprehensive institutions and for the research universities. Furthermore, institutions have the flexibility to add specific indicators that are reflective of their role and mission. The indicators include retention and graduation rates, and outcome measures such as licensure examination passing rates, the number of faculty awards, and degree awards in disciplinary fields of State workforce interest. All indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and reflect statewide policy goals. Appendices B (core measures) and C (institution-specific measures) list the operational definitions for each indicator.

There are fifteen performance measures for Morgan State University (see Table 2). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, doctoral degree awards to women and African Americans, STEM bachelor degree awards to African Americans, percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, research expenditures, alumni giving and the passing rate on the Praxis or NES teacher licensure exams (an assessment that measures teacher candidates' knowledge of the subjects that they will teach). All indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and reflect statewide policy goals. Appendix D lists the operational definitions for Morgan's indicators.

### **Assessing Institution Performance**

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed institutional performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. In general, institutions were expected to make progress towards achieving their benchmarks established within MFR. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution is required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception will be made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within MFR.

Each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section of this report.

### **Data Availability**

It was difficult to obtain nationally comparable outcome-based performance measures. To the extent possible, the measures identified for peer comparisons use data that are verifiable and currently available from national data systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, and *U.S. News and World Report*. Some outcomes data are not readily available.

For example, peer data are not available for alumni giving and passing rates on several professional licensure examinations. In cases where data are not available through national data systems, Maryland institutions obtained data either directly from their peer institutions or compared their performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification.

It should be noted that for one measure, the pass rate on the Praxis II teacher licensure examination, comparisons of pass rates across state lines are difficult to interpret because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another. Since each state independently determines the level of performance required for teacher certification, this indicator is most useful when used to compare institutional performance to other Maryland institutions.

In addition, there are subtle differences between the operational definitions found in this analysis and the definitions used in MFR for several performance indicators. For example, in this analysis, the second-year retention rate and the six-year graduation rate measure the proportion of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduate students who either returned to or graduated from the same college or university. In addition, the graduation data used in this analysis are based on the Federal Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), a federal initiative that collects data required by the Student Right-to-Know Act of 1990. In contrast, MFR captures students who re-enroll or graduate from the same institution as well as those students who transfer to any Maryland public four-year institution. Because of these subtle differences, it was not possible to assess institutional performance on retention and graduation within the context of MFR.

Despite the overall difficulties in obtaining nationally comparable performance measures, institutions were expected to take appropriate steps to collect data on all performance measures. In the analysis section of this report, institutions were asked to identify the actions that they are taking to collect data.

### **St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile**

St. Mary's College of Maryland's general fund appropriation is determined by a statutory formula and not through the funding guideline process. However, the college expressed interest in providing a set of institutions for the purpose of assessing its performance as the State's only public liberal arts college. Due to its unique character as a public, liberal arts college, St. Mary's is categorized as a Baccalaureate Colleges – Arts & Sciences institution under the 2005 Carnegie Basic classification. Of the approximately 163 institutions in this category, only a small number of institutions are public. Therefore, along with a small group of public institutions with a liberal arts mission, private institutions are included in St. Mary's comparison group.

St. Mary's peer group includes twelve current peers and six aspirant peers. The aspirant peers represent those institutions that St. Mary's aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Of the twelve current peers, four are public. All of the aspirant peers are private institutions.

The college used the following attributes to identify similar institutions: size, minority enrollment, distribution of bachelor's and master's degrees awarded, distribution of degrees awarded by broad discipline area, proportion of part-time students, location, tuition and fees, and



revenue and expenditure data. In addition, St. Mary's examined additional factors to select its peers, including: the academic attributes of new freshmen, the proportion of graduates pursuing graduate or professional education, the existence of a senior project requirement; and the value of the institution's endowment. St. Mary's chose performance measures that mirrored those chosen by the other State public institutions as well as measures that reflect the college's particular role in the State's system of higher education.

There are thirty separate performance measures to assess quality, selectivity, retention, graduation, access, efficiency and resources for St. Mary's College of Maryland (see Table 3). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, faculty salaries, student/faculty ratio, and library holdings. Appendix E details the operational definitions.

**Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines**

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students <sup>1</sup>	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
2. Percent minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. Percent African American of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second-year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
5. Six-year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
6. Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
7. Six-year graduation rate: African American	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
8. Pass rate on teacher licensure exam, Praxis II <sup>2</sup>	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
9. Pass rate on nursing licensure exam							•				
10. Pass rates on other licensure exams <sup>2</sup>							•				
10a.			SW				SW				
10b.					Law		Law				
10c.							Med				
10d.							Dent.				
11. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Total R&D expenditures <sup>3</sup>							•	•	•	•	•
13. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty <sup>3</sup>	•						•	•	•	•	•
14. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures <sup>3</sup>							•	•	•	•	•
15. Number of faculty awards per 100 faculty						•	•	•	•	•	•
16. Institution-specific measures	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

<sup>1</sup> Institutions have the option of using the 25th and 75th percentile of SAT score for entering freshmen.

<sup>2</sup> For some licensing examinations, overall Maryland passing rate may be the appropriate reference rather than the peer institutions

<sup>3</sup> For institutions other than UMB, peer's medical R&D expenditures will be excluded.

**Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines**

Measure <sup>1</sup>	Comparison Group
1. Percent students on federal grants	National Peers
2. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
4. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
7. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
8. Number of doctorates awarded to women	National Peers
9. Number of Doctorates awarded to African Americans	National Peers
10. Number of Bachelor's in STEM awarded to African Americans <sup>2</sup>	National Peers
11. Percent full-time faculty with terminal degree	National Peers
12. Research expenditures	National Peers
13. Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) over base of the previous year	National Peers
14. Alumni giving most current year available	National Peers
15. Pass rate on the Praxis II or NES, teacher licensure exam	National Peers, Maryland Institutions

<sup>1</sup> For all measures, the most recent data available was used .

<sup>2</sup> STEM stands for science, technology, engineering and mathematics disciplines

**Table 3. St. Mary's College of Maryland Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines**

<b>Measure<sup>1</sup></b>
<b><i>QUALITY / SELECTIVITY</i></b>
1. Amount in total Research spending
2. Percent of faculty with terminal degrees
3. Average salary of full-time Professors
4. Average salary of full-time Associate Professors
5. Average salary of full-time Assistant Professors
6. Percentile of full-time Professors
7. Percentile of full-time Associate Professors
8. Percentile of full-time Assistant Professors
9. Average SAT scores of entering freshmen
10. 25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen
11. Acceptance Rate
12. Yield Ratio
<b><i>RETENTION, GRADUATION AND ACCESS</i></b>
13. Second-year retention rate
14. Average six-year graduation rate
15. Percent African American students of first-year students
16. Total headcount enrollment
17. Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment
18. Percent full-time undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
19. Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
20. Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates
21. Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal grants
<b><i>EFFICIENCY/ RESOURCES</i></b>
22. E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student
23. Average alumni giving rate
24. Tuition and fees revenues a percent of E&G expenditures
25. Ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time faculty
26. Library book volumes
27. Library subscriptions
28. Full-time library staff
29. Full-time library staff with MLS degree
30. Library book volumes per FTES

<sup>1</sup> For all measures, the most recent data available was used .

# **Peer Performance Analysis**

## Bowie State University

Bowie State University exceeds its peers' performance on seven out of nine core performance measures. The percentages of all minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates significantly exceed the peer averages by 33.5 and 51.7 percentage points respectively. Bowie's second-year retention rate is 5.1 percentage points higher than the peer average and the overall six-year graduation rate of 37.6 percent is 6.2 percentage points above the peer average. The average six-year graduation rate for all minorities is 37.6 percent and 38.1 percent for African American students. Both these graduation rate results exceed the peer averages. In fact, Bowie is ranked third in graduation rates for African Americans and third in the overall six-year graduation rate.

Bowie's incoming freshmen SAT scores for the 25<sup>th</sup> – 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles compare well with peers. Bowie reports averages of 985-1189 compared to peer averages of 859-1047. Bowie's scores have risen over the past two consecutive years (800-930 for the 2005 report, 877-989 for the 2006 report and 985-1189 for the current reporting period). Three peer institutions had missing data in this category.

The university is below the peer average on two performance measures. Bowie reports an 89 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams, which represents two consecutive years of declining pass rates (93 percent for the 2006 report and 95 percent for the 2005 report). Bowie's current pass rate is 6.8 percentage points below its peers. The average pass rate for all Maryland higher education institutions reporting on this measure was 96 percent and the Statewide Managing for Results (MFR) goal is 96 percent. The university's alumni giving rate is 2.1 percentage points below the peer average.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate, yield rate, and research and development (R & D) expenditures per full-time faculty. It is below the peer average for three of these measures. Seventy-five percent of full-time faculty holds terminal degrees, an increase of seven percentage points from the prior year. Bowie has reduced the gap between itself and the peer average from 10 points in the prior year to only four points below the peer average for the current reporting period. Three peer institutions did not have data for this measure.

Bowie is more selective than its peers. The university's average acceptance rate (the percent of student applicants who are offered enrollment) was 46 percent and 23.3 percentage points below the peer average. The yield rate (students who accept enrollment offers) was 42 percent, down five percentage points from the prior year, and 15 percentage points below the peer average. The university's R & D expenditures per full-time faculty were \$14,839 which was similar to the prior year amount of \$14,711. This expenditure level was \$7,155 above the peer average. However, for this measure, five peers reported \$0 expenditures and three had missing data.

Bowie should comment on declining teacher licensure exam pass rates and efforts underway to improve them. Bowie has improved its six-year graduation rates and compares favorably with peers. It should comment on the success of recently implemented programs that have contributed to student success. For example, last year, Bowie mentioned programs such as a

revamped Freshman Seminar and plans for a stronger centralized advising center. Commission staff notes that Bowie institutional research staff have reduced the amount of missing data in its peer comparisons but that it should continue to strive for 100 percent data completion.

## **Bowie State University's Response**

### ***Teacher licensure***

Currently, the method of calculating teacher licensure does not represent the true statistic for the determination of a teacher licensure passage rate. The mean statistic includes PRAXIS I scores for *Pre-Professional students* along with PRAXIS I and PRAXIS II scores for students who are admitted to the *Professional Teacher Preparation program* (upper level). Therefore, the composite mean statistic representing teacher licensure passage rate is determined by averaging three component values when ideally it should be determined by averaging only two component values.

Teacher licensure for the State of Maryland and many other states is contingent upon passage of PRAXIS II and graduation from an approved *Professional Teacher Preparation program*. Current standards for NCATE accredited degree programs require passage of PRAXIS I to gain admissions to the *Professional Teacher Preparation program*. There are individuals (*Pre-Professional Students*) who are not successful in passing PRAXIS I. Therefore, they are not admitted to *Professional Teacher Preparation programs*.

The PRAXIS I scores of those non-admitted students should not be included in the calculation of the teacher licensure passage rate. However, the PRAXIS I scores of students who do not gain admissions to the *Professional Preparation program* are included along with the PRAXIS I scores of those students who are admitted.

To complete a *Professional Teacher Preparation program*, a student must pass PRAXIS II, complete all coursework and field experiences successfully. Consequently, the student is awarded the bachelor's degree and is eligible for initial teacher licensure.

A more accurate assessment of teacher licensure passage rates should be based on averaging the PRAXIS I and PRAXIS II scores of students who are admitted to the *Professional Teacher Preparation program*. If that were the case, Bowie State's teacher licensure passage rate would be higher than what has been reported. However, Bowie State will continue efforts to increase the first-time passage rate of our *Pre-Professional students* on the PRAXIS I examination.

### ***Retention and six-year graduation rates success***

During the last three years, Bowie State has implemented a number of initiatives that were designed to improve institutional retention rates and ultimately graduation rates. The most significant initiative was the strengthening of *First and Second Year Student Advisement*. In previous years, the average credit hour course load of the Bowie State student body was less than 12 semester hours. Essentially, the majority of the Bowie State's student population was part-time. Therefore, graduation rates were adversely impacted.

By instituting a more intense student advisement initiative that strongly encouraged student enrollment in 15 or more credit hours per semester, the average credit hour course load exceeded 12 semester hours (Fall 2006 and Fall 2007). The immediate effect of this initiative was an increase in second-year retention rates. We expect this trend to continue to the point that institutional graduation rates will be positively impacted.

Moreover, student advisement was structurally reorganized to create a single comprehensive unit that is now fully operational. In addition, the newly implemented Office of Central Advising has the responsibility for management of the revamped and successful Freshman Seminar program. Consequently, Bowie State has a one-stop center for student advising that is centrally located and managed.



**Bowie State University Peer Performance Data, 2007**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
<b>Bowie State U.</b>	<b>985-1189</b>	<b>93.6%</b>	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>89%</b>
Auburn U., Montgomery	870-1070	35.3%	31.2%	NA	30.0%	29.1%	27.7%	100%
California State U,	870-1100	51.4%	7.5%	77.0%	37.5%	33.3%	22.2%	98%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	NA	95.0%	94.3%	60.0%	34.3%	34.8%	34.6%	100%
Columbus State U.	890-1100	39.5%	34.0%	71.0%	28.0%	25.2%	26.7%	99%
Georgia C. & State U.	1030-1200	9.5%	6.5%	79.0%	44.3%	51.6%	53.6%	100%
New Jersey City U.	820-1000	59.7%	19.2%	74.0%	38.1%	36.0%	30.7%	91%
Prairie View A & M U.	780-940	95.4%	90.3%	67.0%	31.3%	31.4%	31.4%	76%
Sul Ross State U.	750-920	65.8%	4.2%	48.0%	22.9%	16.4%	11.1%	96%
Virginia State U.	NA	97.1%	95.9%	72.0%	40.7%	40.8%	41.0%	100%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	52.8%	3.5%	54.0%	7.4%	5.0%	20.0%	98%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>859-1047</b>	<b>60.2%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>66.9%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>29.9%</b>	<b>95.8%</b>

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate				BSU institution-specific indicators			
	alumni giving rate	% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)	
<b>Bowie State U.</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>\$14,839</b>	
Auburn U., Montgomery	7.0%	80.0%	98.0%	95.0%	98.0%	95.0%	\$0	
California State U,	5.0%	88.0%	49.0%	27.0%	49.0%	27.0%	\$28,525	
Cheyney U. of Penn.	7.0%	62.0%	56.0%	NA	56.0%	NA	\$0	
Columbus State U.	9.0%	76.0%	64.0%	65.0%	64.0%	65.0%	\$0	
Georgia C. & State U.	6.0%	75.0%	60.0%	53.0%	60.0%	53.0%	\$0	
New Jersey City U.	5.0%	NA	54.0%	56.0%	54.0%	56.0%	NA	
Prairie View A & M U.	8.0%	NA	60.0%	67.0%	60.0%	67.0%	NA	
Sul Ross State U.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$25,266	
Virginia State U.	10.0%	81.0%	83.0%	35.0%	83.0%	35.0%	NA	
Western New Mexico U.	NA	91.0%	100.0%	NA	100.0%	NA	\$0	
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>79.0%</b>	<b>69.3%</b>	<b>56.9%</b>	<b>69.3%</b>	<b>56.9%</b>	<b>\$7,684</b>	

NA - Data not available

## Coppin State University

Coppin State University exceeds its peers' performance on three out of ten core peer performance measures. These include the percentage of minority undergraduates (22.5 percentage points above the peer average), the percentage of African American undergraduates (48.1 percentage points above the peer average) and the second-year retention rate (3.2 percentage points above average).

Coppin performs below the peer average on seven out of ten core measures. Coppin's 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile SAT scores of 770-910 were somewhat below the peer average, 797-1016. The six-year graduation rate for all students was 20.2 percent or 5.8 percentage points below the peer average. Coppin's six-year graduation rate fell almost six percentage points below its prior year rate. Minority student graduation rates were five percentage points below the peer average and African American students' graduation rates were 2.8 percentage points below the peer average. African American six-year graduation rates are falling after two years of improving rates. Coppin's teacher licensure pass rate which was 95 percent for the prior reporting period fell to 81 percent, well below the State MFR target of 96 percent. In addition, pass rates were 15.2 percentage points below the peer average. The pass rate for nursing licensure exams is 17.5 percentage points below the average of the two peers reporting on this measure. Two peers had missing data and six peers do not have nursing programs. Coppin's nursing exam pass rate fell from 82 percent in the prior reporting period to the current level of 75 percent. The university is closing the gap between its alumni giving rate and that of its peers. The university's average undergraduate alumni giving rate was only 3.9 percentage points below the peer average with seven out of ten peer institutions reporting on this measure.

Coppin has five institution-specific indicators: percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate, yield rate, student to faculty ratio, and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student (FTES). Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide information that offers an institutional profile in comparison to the selected peers. For example, approximately 58 percent of full-time faculty at Coppin holds terminal degrees, which is 13 percentage points below its peer average. Coppin's acceptance and yield rates are both lower than the respective peer averages (-20.1 and -12.1 percentage points respectively). Coppin's student to faculty ratio is higher than its peer average by 5.7 FTES per full-time faculty (24.1 compared to the peer average of 18.4). State appropriations per FTES are \$3,212 below the peer average. The current reporting period shows an increase in the gap between Coppin and its peers on the appropriations per FTES measure. The funding gap was only \$2,767 the prior year.

Coppin continues to work toward elimination of missing data from its submission. It should continue these efforts in order to make the best possible performance assessment against its selected peers. It is also important to note that only four of ten peers have nursing programs and two of those had missing data. Given the State's critical workforce interest in nursing graduates, Coppin should identify additional peers with nursing programs for this one measure to better gauge its performance against similar nursing programs. Coppin should comment on the decline in teacher licensure exam pass rates and efforts underway to improve and stabilize these. Coppin should comment on the effectiveness of various programs implemented to improve six-year graduation rates and the role that resources play in supporting improved graduation rates.

## **Coppin State University's Response**

Coppin State University's immediate priority is to improve our freshman second-year retention rate and six-year graduation rates. A new campus-wide Enrollment Management team is being composed and will be meeting regularly to assess current retention programs and strategies, and recommend new initiatives and best practices to improve retention and graduation rates.

However, we do have serious concerns about the methodology and modeling analysis used to select our performance peers. Most of our current peer institutions are not similar to Coppin State University in terms of mission, value and core vision. It is important to point out that Coppin State University is an urban historically black university and only one of our ten peer institutions (Chicago State University) truly meets and fits an urban university setting. Coppin State University thus exceeds Chicago State University on six out of eight core peer performance measures, including retention and graduation rates. Coppin State University will collaborate with the University System of Maryland Office to select new peer institutions with similar mission, size, percent of African American undergraduates, student charges, percent of undergraduates receiving Pell grants, student life, degree conferred by level, faculty profile, etc. We believe selecting new peers will eliminate missing peer data for nursing graduates.

In 2006, Coppin State's School of Education received re-accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE cited no official areas for improvement relative to their standards. CSU will continue to maintain the high standards of excellence in both initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation teacher programs. The decline in the teacher licensure exam pass rate is the first in three years, and this is being investigated by the School of Education.

Coppin State University Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
<b>Coppin U.</b>	<b>770-910</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	<b>75.0%</b>
Alabama State U.	680-870	98.1%	97.8%	68.0%	22.9%	22.9%	22.9%	100.0%	NP
Alcorn State U.	780-950	91.2%	90.5%	70.0%	43.6%	43.8%	43.9%	100.0%	NA
Chicago State U.	870-950	93.0%	84.7%	57.0%	15.8%	15.7%	15.1%	99.0%	NA
Columbus State U.	890-1100	39.5%	34.0%	71.0%	28.0%	25.2%	26.7%	99.0%	100.0%
Fort Valley State U.	690-1210	96.4%	95.8%	75.0%	25.1%	25.5%	25.4%	100.0%	NP
New Jersey City U.	820-1000	59.7%	19.2%	74.0%	38.1%	36.0%	30.7%	91.0%	NP
New Mexico Highlands U.	NA	75.0%	5.2%	51.0%	21.3%	21.8%	0.0%	87.0%	NP
Pembroke	850-1030	50.9%	25.7%	70.0%	34.9%	35.0%	25.3%	92.0%	NP
Sul Ross State U.	NA	65.8%	4.2%	48.0%	22.9%	16.4%	11.1%	96.0%	NP
Western New Mexico U.	NA	52.8%	3.5%	54.0%	7.4%	5.0%	20.0%	98.0%	85.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>797-1016</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	<b>46.1%</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>22.1%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>92.5%</b>

  

University	CSC institution-specific indicators		
	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	% of F-T faculty with terminal degrees	FTE students per F-T faculty
<b>Coppin U.</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>24.1</b>
Alabama State U.	NA	60.0%	NA
Alcorn State U.	7.0%	64.0%	19.2
Chicago State U.	7.0%	64.0%	15.8
Columbus State U.	9.0%	76.0%	23.7
Fort Valley State U.	37.0%	NA	NA
New Jersey City U.	5.0%	NA	NA
New Mexico Highlands U.	6.0%	NA	NA
Pembroke	5.0%	69.0%	17.8
Sul Ross State U.	NA	NA	15.6
Western New Mexico U.	NA	91.0%	NA
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>70.7%</b>	<b>18.4</b>

  

University	Yield rate	Acceptance rate	State appropriation per FTE student
<b>Coppin U.</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>\$6,104</b>
Alabama State U.	29.2%	67.0%	\$7,410
Alcorn State U.	29.7%	68.0%	\$7,924
Chicago State U.	37.1%	51.0%	\$10,507
Columbus State U.	64.7%	64.0%	\$5,614
Fort Valley State U.	57.5%	54.0%	\$9,899
New Jersey City U.	56.0%	54.0%	\$8,830
New Mexico Highlands U.	NA	78.0%	\$12,284
Pembroke	48.3%	86.0%	\$9,896
Sul Ross State U.	NA	NA	\$11,091
Western New Mexico U.	NA	100.0%	\$9,706
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>46.1%</b>	<b>69.1%</b>	<b>\$9,316</b>

NA - Data not available  
 NP - No program  
 NR - No requirement

## **Frostburg State University**

Frostburg State University exceeds average peer performance on four out of ten core performance measures. Frostburg's minority student enrollment as a percentage of total undergraduate enrollment is 7.1 percentage points above the peer average. The percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments is 9.8 percentage points above the peer average and increased over the prior year from a proportion of 14.8 percent to 16.6 percent. African American students' six-year graduation rates continued to improve. Nearly forty-six percent of African American students graduated within six-years of enrollment which exceeded the peer average by 4.4 percentage points. This is an increase over Frostburg's prior year graduation rate of 36.4 percent. Frostburg's 99 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams is two percentage points above their peers' average and exceeds the State's MFR goal of 96 percent.

The university performs below the average of its peers on five out of the ten core measures. Frostburg has enrolled students with lower SAT scores in the past few years with current SAT scores in the 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile at 860-1070 in comparison to the peer average of 931-1129. The average second-year retention rate is 2.7 percentage points below that of its peers and has remained at 73 percent for the past three years. The overall six-year graduation rate is slightly below the peer average (one percentage point) and has declined for three consecutive years to the current level of 47 percent for all students although gains for African American students have been good as noted in the prior paragraph. Frostburg has a slightly lower minority student six-year graduation rate than its peers (1.2 percentage points). Frostburg's average undergraduate alumni giving is only one percentage point below peers and has remained consistent for the past two years.

No peer performance data was provided for pass rate on social work licensure exams for the second consecutive year. The Association of Social Work Boards no longer makes this information available. There was no other missing data in the report.

Frostburg compares favorably with peers on its two institution-specific indicators: student-faculty ratio and percent of faculty with terminal degrees. The university's student-faculty ratio is 19 to 1 compared to a peer average of 22 to 1 and 86 percent of its faculty had terminal degrees which is three percentage points above the peer average.

Maryland Higher Education Commission staff commends the university on its increase in six-year graduation rates for African American students. Commission staff understand that Frostburg places emphasis on both high school GPA and SAT scores for admission and notes that despite lower incoming SAT scores, the university compares favorably with peers on overall six-year graduation rates. Frostburg should comment on the availability of social work licensing exam pass rates and should suggest alternative measures.

### **Frostburg State University's Response**

Frostburg State University would like to commend the Commission staff on its excellent work in the preparation of the peer performance analysis.

*Availability of social work licensing exam pass rates*

Since the submission of the peer performance data in August of 2007, Frostburg has obtained its social work licensing exam pass rates for the 2006 testing year. The University should be able to continue to collect the pass rate data from the Association of Social Work Boards Pass/Fail Summary and continue to use the data for internal evaluation.

The pass rate data for the 2006 testing year increased two percent over testing year 2005. Despite continuing small numbers of examinees, the data validates that the Social Work program successfully prepares graduates to succeed in their profession. The institutional pass rate compares favorably to the national pass rate for first-time examinees. (See Table 1).

**Table 1**  
**Frostburg State University Bachelor of Social Work Examination Pass Rate**

Pass	13	9	8	4	9
<b>Fail</b>	2	1	0	1	2
<b>Total</b>	15	10	8	5	11
<b>Pass Rate</b>	87%	90%	100%	80%	82%
<b>National Pass Rate</b>	84%	82%	81%	79%	78%

*Association of Social Work Boards, 'Association of Social Work Boards School Pass/Fail Summary', Examination: Basic, 2007.*

Frostburg continues to make every effort to collect pass rate data from its peers. Annually, each peer institution is contacted and a request is made for comparable social work licensing exam pass rate data. However, Frostburg's current performance peers report that they do not collect or archive licensure pass rate data.

*Suggest alternative measures*

As reported previously, Frostburg offers three programs that produce licensure pass rate data; two are currently included in the peer performance data. The third program is not included because it is not part of the agreed-upon core performance measures and would require the University to track licensure pass rate results for the CPA examination. The adoption of this licensure examination as a peer performance measure would not result in useful data given that: 1) students are not required to complete the examination as part of the program; 2) students are not required to report the results to the institution; 3) students normally take the exam subsequent to obtaining professional employment; and 4) standards for satisfactory performance on the exam greatly differ from state to state.

**Frostburg State University Peer Performance Data, 2007**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in BSW social work licensing exam <sup>1,2</sup>	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
<b>Frostburg State U.</b>	<b>860-1070</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>NA<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>10.0%</b>
California U. of Penn.	890-1060	7.2%	5.8%	76.0%	43.0%	37.3%	41.5%	94%	NA	7.0%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	900-1080	10.6%	4.2%	76.0%	48.8%	30.9%	23.4%	93%	NA	14.0%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	930-1160	12.1%	6.6%	77.0%	50.7%	36.9%	36.8%	100%	NA	12.0%
Sonoma State U.	940-1140	19.5%	2.2%	82.0%	48.2%	43.9%	26.1%	100%	NA	1.0%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	1000-1160	9.5%	3.0%	77.0%	50.7%	45.9%	55.3%	97%	NA	17.0%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	950-1130	11.4%	4.9%	77.0%	52.9%	51.3%	36.0%	96%	NA	14.0%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	950-1170	7.5%	2.4%	75.0%	44.4%	37.3%	41.7%	97%	NA	14.0%
Western Carolina U.	930-1110	9.2%	5.4%	71.0%	47.4%	47.9%	53.1%	96%	NA	9.0%
Western Connecticut State U.	860-1100	16.7%	6.1%	71.0%	34.1%	34.6%	35.5%	100%	NA	6.0%
Winthrop U.	960-1180	30.9%	27.6%	75.0%	59.8%	64.2%	65.8%	97%	NA	16.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>931-1129</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>48.0%</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>11.0%</b>

**FSU institution-specific indicators**

University	FTES per full-time faculty	% of faculty with terminal degrees
<b>Frostburg State U.</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>86.0%</b>
California U. of Penn.	25	63.0%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	22	78.0%
Dartmouth	21	85.0%
Sonoma State U.	28	100.0%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	25	82.0%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	21	81.0%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	17	88.0%
Western Carolina U.	17	76.0%
Western Connecticut State U.	24	91.0%
Winthrop U.	20	84.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>82.8%</b>

NA - Data not available

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Passing rates for peers are not available from any of the following sources, all of which were contacted: peers, state social work organizations, and the national social work organization. This applies to BSW.

<sup>2</sup>Indicates the percentage of first-time examinees who passed the Bachelor's level exam during the 2006 testing cycle.

<sup>3</sup>School Pass/Fall Summary Reports which had been collected from the Association of Social Work Boards are no longer available because of an agreement with the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners

## Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds its peers on seven out of ten core performance indicators and is at the peer average for one measure. Entering freshmen SAT scores in the 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile range are among the highest in the peer group (1020-1190 compared to peer group average of 940-1142). Salisbury's percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students is 16.1 percent and 10.6 percent respectively which exceeds the peer averages by 2.8 and 6.6 percentage points. The second-year retention rate is 3.5 percentage points higher than the peer average and equal to the prior year's retention rate of 81 percent. Salisbury's overall six-year graduation rate of 69 percent is a remarkable 18.4 percentage points above the peer average. Minority and African American graduation rates are 57.6 percent and 60 percent respectively and substantially higher than the peer averages by 15.1 percentage points for all minority students and 21.3 percentage points higher for African American students. In addition, the minority and African American student graduation rates are over 10 percentage points higher than the rates reported for the prior year. The university performs at the peer level on the average alumni giving rate (nine percent for Salisbury and 8.8 percent for the peer average.)

The university underperforms peers in two core performance measures. Pass rates on teacher licensure exams rose by two percentage points over the past two years. However, they still remain 7.7 percentage points below the peer average of 99 percent. More importantly, the university's 91 percent pass rate falls short of the 96 percent MFR State goal. Nursing licensure exam pass rates rose from 73 percent to 83 percent for the current reporting period. The performance gap between Salisbury and its peers' average narrowed to three percentage points (11.8 percentage points below the peer average for the prior reporting period). It is important to note that the comparison group on this measure was small because four of ten peers do not have nursing programs and two institutions did not have available data.

Salisbury selected five institution-specific indicators: acceptance rate; percentage of full-time faculty with a terminal degree; student-faculty ratio; average high school grade point average of first-time freshmen and state appropriations per FTES. Salisbury is more selective than its peers with an acceptance rate of 57 percent compared to a peer average of 68 percent. Salisbury continues to receive national recognition as one of the nation's best public comprehensive universities which no doubt encourages a large number of both in-state and out-of-state students to apply for admission. Eighty-two percent of Salisbury faculty holds a terminal degree which is slightly above the peer average of 81 percent. The student-faculty ratio is 17.1 to 1 compared to the peer average of 18.6 to 1. The average high school GPA for entering freshmen of 3.5 compares favorably to the 3.2 average for the peer group. Salisbury's appropriations per FTES rose from \$4,199 to \$4,359. The State appropriation per FTES slipped from the prior year's \$1,758 below the peer average to \$2,216 below the peer average and the peer average rose from \$5,957 to \$6,485 in the current reporting period.

The Commission staff notes the strong improvement in six-year graduation rates for Salisbury students and encourages the university to comment on efforts that have had positive impact in this area. Salisbury should comment on its ongoing efforts to improve teacher licensure and nursing licensure exam pass rates given the critical importance of these graduates to the State's workforce needs. As noted in the prior year's report, several steps have been taken to assist



students in this area and the full benefit of these efforts may not yet be fully realized. The university may wish to consider adding additional peers for comparison for the nursing licensure measure only since the comparison group is very small. Finally, Salisbury should comment on the differential in State appropriations per FTES in contrast to its peers and the subsequent impact on tuition and mandatory fees across the peer group.

## **Salisbury University's Response**

### ***Teacher licensure pass rate***

The teacher education pass rate of 91 percent given in this report is for academic year 2004-2005. In 2006, SU implemented measures to improve this pass rate, which were described in SU's 2006 response to the Commission. Since there is a two-year delay in reporting pass rates, the earliest that the effects of these efforts could be observed in a Peer Performance Analysis would be in the 2009 report where data for the 2007-2008 academic year will be reported.

Maryland requires passage of Praxis II for teacher licensure. Only one of SU's peers used Praxis II as the teacher licensure examination in 2004-2005; the others use different examinations which may or may not be comparable. So it is at best difficult to sensibly compare an SU pass rate on Praxis II to a peer average across several different tests. Additionally, different states have different "cut rates" by which passing and failing are determined, thus further complicating comparability.

However, SU's pass rate on Praxis II compares favorably to the three other Maryland public institutions, which, like SU, do not require passage of Praxis II as a condition for graduation. SU has the second highest pass rate in this group with the highest being 93 percent. The other Maryland public institutions require passage of Praxis II as a condition for graduation, resulting in a virtually 100 percent pass rate.

### ***Nursing licensure exam pass rate***

Nursing licensure exam pass rates have continued to rise from 73 percent in FY 2005 (July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005) to 83 percent in FY 2006 to 90 percent in FY 2007. These pass rates represent the number of students who pass the exam the first time. While SU does not have solid data on the pass rate for those who take the exam at least once, anecdotal evidence suggests that students have a very high second time pass rate.

The nursing licensure pass rate of 83 percent given in the *2007 MHEC Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis* is for FY 2006. Preliminary data for FY 2007 indicates the pass rate will be in the 90's. Our faculty continues to examine the curriculum and areas in which the students appear to miss the most questions on the NCLEX-RN exam. The department also provides assessment testing to help students identify their weak areas, and supports tutoring/review activities for students.

### ***Teacher licensure pass rates***

When second attempts are considered, the SU pass rate on the teacher licensure exam is nearly 100 percent. Our data on second attempts is tracked by graduation date. In May 2006, 55 out of 60 students passed the first time and 4 out of 5 passed on the second attempt, leading to a pass rate of 98.3 percent. In December, 2006 all 17 students passed the first time, a pass rate of 100 percent. In May 2007, 47 out of 50 passed the first time and 2 out of 3 passed the second attempt, resulting in a pass rate of 98 percent.

### ***Six-year graduation rates***

The success that SU has had with its six-year graduation rate is attributable to a number of factors, some academic and some social. What follows is a sketch of some specific activities that we believe leads to student success:

Many students actually have an edge as they enter SU due to their work in high school. Historically 25 to 35 percent of incoming freshmen receive AP credit for at least one course. This group of students comes to SU already having successfully completed University level courses and should have an easier time making the transition from high school to the university. However, the number and percentage of students who are admitted with AP credit seems to be declining which may mean more support may be required for incoming students to maintain the six-year graduation rate.

SU has a mandatory advising system. Students must consult with an advisor before registering for courses in the regular academic year. When students declare a major, they are immediately assigned to a faculty advisor in their major. Students who have not yet declared a major are advised by professional advisors who have been identified by the National Academic Advising Association as the most effective advisors, in many ways, for such students. Moreover, students have access 24-7 via GullNet to advising reports which include documentation of their progress toward completing their major and their progress toward completing degree requirements. However, SU is beginning to see stress on its Advising System due to enrollment growth financially supported only "at the margins." For example SU has grown by 585 students since 2002 while the number of professional academic advisors has remained constant.

Department chairs track historic demand for courses and plan schedules based on that demand. In addition, the enrollment management team tracks demand for courses during pre-registration and alerts deans and chairs of unforeseen pressure on offerings who then attempt to make adjustments, by adding sections, reassigning faculty from low demand sections to high demand sections, etc. In addition, academic advisors work with students who are having difficulty completing a schedule of courses by helping students see alternative options such as enrolling in a section offered at a different time of day or finding a different course that can be taken and still keep them on track toward completion of their degree.

Our faculty is committed to student success. Teaching undergraduates is the primary focus of the faculty. Nearly all have terminal degrees and only a handful of courses are taught by graduate teaching assistants. Faculty developed and support the SU Student Research Symposium, an annual event where students at all levels present their research findings to the campus community. In 2008, instead of hosting its own Student Research Symposium, SU will

be hosting the 22<sup>nd</sup> National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR<sup>®</sup>) where SU students as well as students from across the country will be presenting their research. SU also hosted NCUR<sup>®</sup> in 1998.

SU makes use of its Winter and Summer terms to keep students on track. To do this effectively means that students, who are in academic difficulty during a regular term, need to receive their final grades from the Registrar and letters indicating probation status from Academic Affairs before the very next Winter term or Summer term begins. This is difficult to do, since the time between the end of a regular term and the beginning of the next Summer or Winter term is short and requires a coordinated effort on the part of faculty and staff to make it happen.

Student Affairs provides a wide variety of support services for students which we believe lead to the high graduation rate. SU has revamped its Freshmen Orientation Experience to set the tone for academic excellence from the very beginning. SU has a peer mentor program to assist transition of minority students to college life. Students, especially resident freshmen, are invited to participate in academic learning communities set up in campus dormitories and directed by faculty. Traditionally, a high number of students work on campus. This offers students the opportunity to better connect with the campus which is especially important, since SU has housing for only 25 percent of its students on campus. Business and Finance as well as the Financial Aid office spend a good deal of time with students who are having difficulty making ends meet.

To sum up, the culture of the campus is to support student success. SU recognizes that student success requires the attention of all facets of the University; it's not compartmentalized in say the faculty, Student Affairs, the advising system, etc.

### ***Impact on tuition and fee differential in State appropriations per FTES***

Among its peers Salisbury University has the second highest tuition and mandatory fees per FTES and the second lowest appropriation per FTES. In FY 06, Salisbury received \$4,359 per FTES from the State compared to a peer average of \$6,485, and tuition and mandatory fees at Salisbury were \$5,865 compared to a peer average of \$4,781 per FTES.

The impact can be measured in a number of ways, but all point to a greater burden of the cost of education being borne by students and their families. Students at Salisbury pay \$1,084 more in tuition and fees than the average student at a peer institution. Another way to view the data is for each State dollar appropriated, students at Salisbury pay \$1.35 in tuition and mandatory fees as compared to an average \$0.74 in tuition and fees per State dollar at the peer institutions. Lastly, at Salisbury tuition and mandatory fees account for 57 percent of the cost of education while the average at the peer institutions is 42 percent.

The total State appropriation and tuition plus mandatory fees at Salisbury is \$10,224 per student compared to a peer average of \$11,266 or a shortfall of \$1,042 per student. With an FTES headcount of 6,324, this shortfall amounted to about 6.6 million dollars. This is 6.6 million dollars that SU does not have to support academic excellence, which impacts student success and achievement. For example, Salisbury University is struggling to find funding for an Academic Achievement Center, a facility where undergraduates can seek help in improving their academic

performance. Such centers are common among institutions like SU and in fact exist on several System campuses. Such a center will become increasingly important for SU to both maintain its graduation rates and to close the achievement gap. As another example, in FY06 Salisbury faculty salaries were at 62<sup>nd</sup>, 59<sup>th</sup>, and 74<sup>th</sup> percentiles (Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor) instead of the BOR target of 85<sup>th</sup>. This makes it increasingly difficult for SU to compete with its peers for quality faculty. Similarly, SU is finding it increasingly difficult to fill vacant administrative positions.

The impact of the tuition and fee differential in State appropriations per FTES relative to peers results in higher costs for students at SU than students at peer institutions, and at the same time further stresses an academic delivery and support system that is stretched thin.

Salisbury University Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
<b>Salisbury U.</b>	<b>1020-1190</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>83%</b>
Central Washington U.	880-1100	18.3%	2.5%	78.0%	51.6%	44.4%	35.7%	NA	NP
Eastern Illinois U.	910-1110	11.9%	7.8%	80.0%	60.6%	45.9%	45.5%	99%	NP
Humboldt State U.	930-1170	20.7%	3.8%	77.0%	44.9%	45.8%	45.2%	100%	83%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	930-1160	12.1%	6.6%	77.0%	50.7%	36.9%	36.8%	100%	86%
Wilmington	1060-1210	10.2%	5.2%	85.0%	63.5%	48.7%	53.0%	98%	96%
Northern Michigan U.	950-1140	5.1%	1.4%	73.0%	34.6%	22.6%	17.6%	100%	NA
Sonoma State U.	940-1140	19.5%	2.2%	82.0%	48.2%	43.9%	26.1%	100%	79%
SUNY, C. at Oswego	1030-1180	10.2%	3.8%	77.0%	54.3%	50.0%	66.1%	95%	NP
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	950-1130	11.4%	4.9%	77.0%	52.9%	51.3%	36.0%	96%	NA
Western Oregon U.	820-1080	13.2%	1.6%	69.0%	44.5%	35.3%	25.0%	100%	NP
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>940-1142</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>86%</b>

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	SU institution-specific indicators				Total state appropriation/FTEs
		Acceptance rate	% of faculty with terminal degrees	Ratio of FTEs to FTEF	Average HS GPA	
<b>Salisbury U.</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>\$4,359</b>
Central Washington U.	5.0%	76.0%	86.0%	NA	3.2	\$5,138
Eastern Illinois U.	10.0%	78.0%	70.0%	16.2	3.0	\$4,472
Humboldt State U.	5.0%	69.0%	80.0%	NA	3.2	\$10,158
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	12.0%	74.0%	85.0%	17.4	3.0	\$7,498
Wilmington	10.0%	61.0%	87.0%	20.8	3.6	\$7,244
Northern Michigan U.	7.0%	84.0%	65.0%	23.4	NA	\$5,357
Sonoma State U.	1.0%	66.0%	100.0%	NA	3.1	\$8,072
SUNY, C. at Oswego	14.0%	56.0%	83.0%	19.5	3.3	\$6,107
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	14.0%	62.0%	81.0%	16.7	3.0	\$6,950
Western Oregon U.	10.0%	55.0%	72.0%	16.1	3.2	\$3,849
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>80.9%</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>\$6,485</b>

NA - Data not available  
NP - No Program

## **Towson University**

Towson University exceeds average peer performance on six out of ten core performance measures. Towson's SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores of 970-1170 compare favorably with the peer average of 907-1113. The percentage of African American undergraduate students (10.9 percent) attending the institution is above the peer average by 2.6 percentage points. Towson is ranked first in second-year retention rates with 85 percent retention compared to a peer average of 79 percent. The overall six-year graduation rate is 6.9 percentage points above the peer average. Towson's six-year graduation rates for all minorities (52.9 percent) and for African American (54.7 percent) students increased a second consecutive year and are 9.9 and 14.5 percentage points above their respective peer averages.

The university performs below the average of its peers on three core performance measures. Towson enrolls a lower proportion of minority students than its peers (10.1 percentage points below the peer average). However it is important to note that peers include three California State and one Texas institution that have exceptionally large Hispanic enrollments. Towson remains second among peers in African American enrollments. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 93 percent which is 3.3 percentage points below the peer average and three percentage points below the State MFR target of 96 percent. Pass rates in nursing licensure exams were 4.8 percentage points below the peer average and were lower compared to the prior year (82 percent current year pass rate; 87 percent past reporting period). It is important to note that the peer comparison group is only five as five of the peers do not have nursing programs. The alumni giving rate is slightly below the peer average by .7 percentage points and Towson's alumni giving rate continues a trend of modest increase for the second consecutive year.

Towson selected three institution-specific indicators: percent of undergraduates who live on campus; student-faculty ratio; and acceptance rate. Twenty-three percent of Towson's students live on campus compared to an average of 28 percent for the peer group. The student/faculty ratio of 18 to 1 is just below the peer average of 19 to 1. Towson's acceptance rate is 64 percent compared to a peer average of 69 percent.

Towson should comment on pass rates for teacher and nursing licensure exams. The university may want to include the progress made toward improving Math pass rates on the teacher licensure exam based on the Math department's plan to implement a test-preparation course per last year's performance accountability report. Given the State's strong interest in nursing graduates and nursing workforce shortage issues, Towson may wish to identify an additional set of peers for this one measure with the goal of better gauging the competitiveness of its nursing program to similar programs. Only half of their current performance peers have a nursing program.

### **Towson University's Response**

#### ***Teacher licensure exam***

Our most recent Praxis results for 2005-2006 show an improved institutional pass rate of 95 percent, which compares favorably to the state pass rate of 94 percent. The Praxis results for

Math show improvement as well. In 2005-2006, the pass rate was 100 percent for both Math Content and Math Pedagogy.

### *Nursing licensure exam*

The competitiveness of Towson's nursing program should be measured against comparable programs in Maryland since boards of nursing in other states set different minimum scores for passing.

Three other Maryland public four-year institutions, Coppin State University, Salisbury University, and the University of Maryland, Baltimore, have nursing programs. The average passing rate for these institutions is 81.7 percent. Towson's rate, at 82.0 percent, is slightly above that average and 4 percent higher than the Maryland Board of Nursing acceptable pass rate of 78 percent.

Fluctuation in Towson's pass rates may be related to the numbers of students who choose to sit for the NCLEX exams out-of-state. The results for out-of-state exams takers are not included in Maryland's reporting of pass rates. Fifteen of 107 graduates in these takers sat for NCLEX in 8 other states, while only 3 in the prior year took the exam out-of-state.

We expect the rates to improve. Due to the competitive nature of the nursing program and the massive numbers of applicants, we are better able to select applicants most likely to be successful on NCLEX performance. Other measures directed at improving NCLEX performance include revising the curriculum in response to the National Council's newly implemented "Test Plan" which forms the basis for the national test.

**Towson University Peer Performance Data, 2007**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
<b>Towson U.</b>	<b>970-1170</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>
California State U., Fresno	820-1080	50.5%	5.4%	83.0%	43.3%	37.4%	28.2%	92.0%	75.0%
California State U., Northridge	810-1080	50.1%	8.5%	76.0%	36.5%	33.7%	21.9%	99.0%	NP
California State U., Sacramento	860-1090	41.9%	7.2%	79.0%	40.8%	34.4%	28.2%	100.0%	92.0%
Eastern Illinois U.	910-1110	11.9%	7.8%	80.0%	60.6%	45.9%	45.5%	99.0%	NP
Montclair State C.	920-1110	34.3%	10.3%	83.0%	58.3%	54.4%	56.1%	97.0%	NP
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	980-1170	22.9%	14.4%	77.0%	48.7%	49.6%	49.0%	96.0%	97.0%
Texas State U., San Marcos	980-1160	28.9%	5.0%	76.0%	52.1%	49.8%	54.3%	96.0%	NP
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	970-1150	13.6%	8.6%	84.0%	59.4%	52.1%	52.4%	94.0%	84.0%
Western Illinois U.	910-1070	12.6%	6.9%	77.0%	55.4%	43.1%	38.7%	97.0%	NP
Western Kentucky U.	NA	11.2%	9.1%	74.0%	39.0%	29.5%	27.4%	93.0%	86.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>907-1113</b>	<b>27.8%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>86.8%</b>

  

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	TU institution-specific indicators		
		% Resident Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
<b>Towson U.</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>18/1</b>	<b>64.0%</b>
California State U., Fresno	3.0%	6.0%	20/1	65.0%
California State U., Northridge	2.0%	NA	23/1	75.0%
California State U., Sacramento	1.0%	5.0%	23/1	47.0%
Eastern Illinois U.	10.0%	43.0%	16/1	78.0%
Montclair State C.	6.0%	27.0%	17/1	54.0%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	7.0%	26.0%	15/1	78.0%
Texas State U., San Marcos	12.0%	23.0%	24/1	76.0%
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	9.0%	31.0%	16/1	49.0%
Western Illinois U.	11.0%	55.0%	17/1	72.0%
Western Kentucky U.	16.0%	32.0%	19/1	92.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>19/1</b>	<b>68.6%</b>

NA - Data not available  
NP - No program



## University of Baltimore

The University of Baltimore's (UB) primary mission is to provide upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional degrees. As such, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rates, and average high school grade point averages for incoming freshmen. Instead, it uses graduate student achievement and faculty quality measures.

The University of Baltimore outperforms the peer average on four of five core performance measures. Minority undergraduate students comprise 35.7 percent of enrollments, which is 2.3 percentage points above the peer average. The University of Baltimore is ranked second among peers in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments at 30.4 percent of enrollments and is 19.4 percentage points above the peer average. The average alumni giving rate is nine percent or 2.2 percentage points above the peer average. Four of ten peers are missing data on this measure. Awards per 100 full-time faculty were 2.6 compared to a peer average of 1.5. Two peer institutions had missing data on this measure.

The selected peer institutions do not have a law school. The University of Baltimore (UB) provides no comparative peer data for the core performance measure, pass rate for first-time test takers for the law licensing exam. The university had a 65 percent pass rate for the reporting period which was a significant improvement over the prior year rate of 57 percent. Given the lack of comparative data provided by the university, it is helpful to compare UB's pass rate to Maryland's other public law school at the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) which reports an 80 percent pass rate for the same reporting period. In addition, UB's pass rate can be compared to the jurisdictional pass rate of 74 percent for Maryland as reported in the *ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law School, 2008 Edition*. The University of Baltimore lags behind these performance rates but has made marked improvement over the prior year.

The university selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. The University of Baltimore exceeds the peer average for research expenditures by \$2.5 million and is ranked second in this category. It is 9.7 percentage points above the peer average in percent of part-time faculty.

The University should comment on its continuing efforts to improve pass rates on the law licensure exam and may want to report on the pass rate for its second time test takers if this adds to a better understanding of its overall program success. The university began implementing new support programs in Spring 2005 as a result of an internal task force's recommendations for improving passing rates. Commission staff suggested that UB permanently add additional peer comparisons on this one measure in last year's performance accountability report. Washburn University of Topeka, North Carolina Central University and the University of Maine School of Law at the University of Southern Maine are funding peers who have law schools and could provide data against which to compare UB's law program outcomes. The Commission again recommends that UB incorporate these institutions on the law licensure pass rate measure on a permanent basis. The Commission staff note that the University of Baltimore has admitted its first freshman class in twenty-five years. Appropriate peer performance measures should be added to UB's performance indicators to reflect this change in enrollments.

## **University of Baltimore’s Response**

The MHEC staff requested that UB add the bar passage rate for three schools to UB’s Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis. Here is the data requested.

Washburn University	81%
North Carolina Central	81%
University of Maine at Southern Maine	83%

The data comes from the *ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2008*.

Additionally, “The Commission staff note that the University of Baltimore has admitted its first freshmen class in twenty-five years. Appropriate peer performance measures should be added to UB’s performance indicators to reflect this change in enrollments.” The next submission to the Commission will include a performance measure for second-year retention rate when the data becomes available for the first time. Latter additional peer performance measures for six-year graduation rate – all undergraduates, six-year graduation rate - all minority undergraduates, and six-year graduation rate – all African American undergraduates will be added as the data becomes available.

University of Baltimore Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in LAW licensing exam <sup>1</sup>	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate		Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UB institution-specific indicators	
				%	rate		Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty
<b>Baltimore, U. of</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>\$4,677,252</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	
California State U., Bakersfield	51.4%	7.5%	NP	5.0%	0.5	\$3,154,674	NA	
California State U., San Marcos	37.9%	3.5%	NP	2.0%	2.0	\$670,326	52.0%	
Governors State U.	44.6%	37.2%	NP	NA	0.0	\$1,063,576	51.2%	
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	31.5%	6.7%	NP	NA	2.2	\$1,213,977	55.7%	
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	16.1%	10.2%	NP	NA	3.0	\$1,300,571	37.2%	
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	19.0%	9.5%	NP	7.0%	0.4	\$1,866,000	40.1%	
New Jersey City U.	59.7%	19.2%	NP	5.0%	NA	\$10,186	61.7%	
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	19.2%	8.3%	NP	NA	NA	NA	40.7%	
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	45.7%	3.9%	NP	6.0%	1.8	\$9,441,204	44.5%	
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	9.2%	4.0%	NP	16.0%	1.9	\$555,334	20.1%	
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>		<b>6.8%</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>\$2,141,761</b>	<b>44.8%</b>	

NA - Data not available

NP - No program

<sup>1</sup> Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers.

## University of Maryland, Baltimore

The University of Maryland, Baltimore's (UMB) peer institutions reflect the university's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified in the 2005 Carnegie Basic classifications as *Research- very high activity* and *Specialized – medical schools and medical centers*. The university's unique mission and educational structure must be taken into account when reviewing peer comparisons.

UMB outperforms peers on seven core performance measures. UMB enrolls a higher percentage of minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates than the peer average by 14.9 and 15.9 percentage points respectively. Passing rates on nursing, medical and social work licensure exams exceed the peer averages by five, one and four percentage points respectively. Average alumni giving was 9.6 percentage points higher than the peer average. Total R & D medical expenditures per full-time medical faculty exceeds the peer average by \$12,037.

The university underperforms peers on three core performance measures. UMB's pass rate on law licensure exams is 11 percentage points below the peer average of 91 percent which also includes the addition of the University of Connecticut, University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Virginia for this one performance measure. UMB's pass rate of 80 percent is higher than the overall State pass rate of 74 percent as reported in the *ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law School, 2008 Edition* and exceeds the University of Baltimore pass rate of 65 percent. UMB has \$49.1 million less in total medical research expenditures than the peer average although it is important to note that the peer average is skewed dramatically upward by one institution's expenditures (University of California, San Francisco - UCSF). UCSF is the only peer classified as *Specialized – medical school or medical centers*. UMB is ranked third on this measure and exceeds the peer average by \$48.9 million if UCSF is removed from the calculation. UMB's average annual percent growth in federal R & D medical expenditures was 8.3 percent and seven percentage points below the peer average of 15.3 percent.

The university selected six institution-specific indicators: total medicine R & D spending, medicine research grants per basic research faculty; medicine research grants per clinical faculty, percent of minority students enrolled, total headcount enrollment, and percentage of graduate and professional students enrolled. No data was supplied for medicine research grants per basic research faculty and per clinical faculty. Per UMB, the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) no longer reports this data per research and clinical faculty. AAMC only reports aggregated data now.

Total medicine R & D spending was \$31.7 million below the peer average although UMB is third highest among peers on this measure. UMB's total enrollment is 33.5 percent minority compared to a peer average of 31.5 percent. Its total headcount enrollment of 5,636 is 16,742 less than the peer average and it has the second smallest number of students enrolled. Graduate and first professional enrollments as a percent of total headcount are 36.7 percentage points higher than the peer average.

The University of Maryland, Baltimore should comment on the current climate for research funding and pass rates on the law licensure exam which is below that of its peers. Commission

staff notes that the University is considering the addition of appropriate measures for future reports to replace medicine research grants per basic research faculty and per clinical faculty since this data is no longer available.

### **University of Maryland, Baltimore's Response**

Peer performance measures for the University of Maryland, Baltimore are primarily related to three areas: research activity; student outcomes; and diversity. UMB continues to adapt to a tightening of funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH), even though NIH and other federal funding sources, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, still contributed almost \$260 million toward all contracts and grants in fiscal year 2007. Vaccine development and homeland defense helped keep federal investment in research at UMB robust, complemented by grants from private sources like the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and from 150 corporations.

Pass rates for UMB students taking licensure exams in nursing and law improved in 2007 compared to 2006. Data on peer licensure exam outcomes are often unavailable due to restrictions on sharing results enforced by the testing agencies or peer institutions. In these instances, national results are often available. Minority and African American enrollments at UMB continue to increase for most measures, and remain above the peer averages for all measures.

University of Maryland Baltimore Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams			Social Work	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law <sup>2</sup>					
<b>Maryland, U. of, Baltimore</b>	<b>41.3%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>					<b>\$243,517</b>		<b>8.3%</b>	
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	36.0%	30.2%	NP				\$210,668		13.6%	
California, U. of, San Francisco <sup>1</sup>	0.0%	0.0%	NP				\$684,829		19.9%	
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	49.3%	8.7%	NP				\$157,764		21.3%	
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	24.3%	6.7%	97%				\$264,077		13.3%	
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	22.4%	10.8%	83%				\$145,786		8.5%	
Connecticut, U. of			90%							
Texas, U. of, Austin			90%							
Virginia, U. of			96%							
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>91%</b>				<b>\$292,625</b>		<b>15.3%</b>	

University	UMB institution-specific indicators				
	Total medicine R&D spending (000s)	Medicine resch. grants per Basic Res. faculty	Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount as % of total headct.
<b>Maryland, U. of, Baltimore</b>				<b>33.5%</b>	<b>85.8%</b>
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham				30.9%	31.9%
California, U. of, San Francisco				41.9%	100.0%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago				41.2%	39.1%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor				23.4%	36.2%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill				20.3%	38.2%
<b>Average of Peers</b>				<b>31.5%</b>	<b>49.1%</b>

NA - Data not available  
 NP - No program

<sup>1</sup> The University of California San Francisco enrolls only graduate students.

<sup>2</sup> Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers. The following universities are added for comparison with bar passing rates only: Connecticut; Texas, Austin; and Virginia.

## University of Maryland, Baltimore County

The University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) exceeds the average of its peers on eight of thirteen core performance measures. It compares favorably on SAT 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles scores of 1080-1300 compared to the peer average of 1017-1231. The percentage of minority undergraduate students (40 percent) exceeds the peer average by 17 percentage points. African American students comprise 15 percent of undergraduate enrollments compared to a peer average of 6.6 percent. Furthermore, the university's six-year graduation rates for minority and African American students exceed the peer averages by 2.1 and 6.4 percentage points respectively. UMBC's pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 99 percent, which exceeds the peer average of 97.3 percent as well as the State MFR goal of 96 percent. The currently reported passing rate is an improvement of 6 percentage points over the prior reporting period. UMBC is ranked third in average annual percent growth in federal R & D expenditures at 22.9 percent or 7.7 percentage points above the peer average. UMBC exceeds the peer average for awards per 100 full-time faculty by 2.6 and ranks first among its peers for the current reporting period.

UMBC underperforms peers on five core performance measures. The institution has an 82 percent second-year retention rate which is below the peer average by 1.9 percentage points. The overall six-year graduation rate is 5.7 percentage points below the peer average although it outperforms peers in minority student graduation rates as noted above. The university's total R & D expenditures are over \$68 million below the peer average and \$40,000 below the peer average for R & D expenditures per full-time faculty. UMBC reports the lowest percentage of alumni giving (five percent) among its peers; the peer average is 15.9 percent. UMBC is a relatively young institution in comparison to its peers and does not yet have the alumni base to match its more established peers.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators that include: rank in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology, rank in the ratio of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R & D expenditures, student-to-faculty ratio, federal R & D expenditures per full-time faculty, and rank in the ratio of license agreements to R & D expenditures in millions. UMBC continues to rank first in information technology bachelor's degree awards and invention disclosures per million in R & D expenditures. Four peers have missing data on the latter. UMBC has a higher ratio of FTE students to full-time faculty; 20.3 to 1 compared to the peer average of 19.6 to 1 but this is a slight improvement over the previous year. UMBC is ranked third in federal R & D expenditures per full-time faculty and nearly \$27,000 per full-time faculty above the peer average for this measure. It ranks second in the ratio of license agreements per million in R & D expenditures and is up from its 5<sup>th</sup> place ranking during the prior reporting period.

UMBC has good success in promoting timely graduation for minority students. It should comment on its continuing efforts through first-year programs and enhanced advising reported in the prior year's report that contribute to this success. In addition it should comment on efforts underway to improve the overall six-year graduation rates for all students.

## **University of Maryland, Baltimore County's Response**

### ***Retention and graduation rates***

Student retention and graduation rates are important indicators that UMBC takes very seriously and that the institution has worked vigorously to improve. The university has undertaken several academic initiatives designed to increase student engagement, which is known to affect student persistence. *First Year Seminars* have provided an opportunity for students to study stimulating special topics with full-time faculty in small classes that emphasize active learning. Student "success" seminars, offered as small companion seminars to many freshman courses, emphasize study skills, time management, academic integrity, and other topics that promote student engagement and success. The *New Student Book Experience*, engages the entire campus community in selection of the each year's book and in the small-group discussions that are held with new students at the opening of the fall semester. This initiative has been broadened to include continuing discussion of the book in freshman classes, and the author or another featured speaker are invited to campus to make a presentation and meet with students. Analyses conducted by the Office of Institutional Research suggest that these programs are having a significant effect on retention and this fall UMBC's second-year retention rate improved to 84.5 percent, a significant increase over the 82.0 percent rate reported last year.

Since many students leave UMBC to pursue majors in fields that UMBC does not offer, the university has also focused on broadening its academic program base. The most recent addition is a baccalaureate program in *Media and Communication Studies*, which builds on our strengths in these two areas. Last spring, the Erickson School of Aging Studies launched an innovative interdisciplinary baccalaureate program that combines studies of aging, service delivery, and public policy related to our aging population.

### ***R & D expenditures***

UMBC has continued its growth in R & D expenditures and ranks very favorably among its peers on the measures that take the university's size into account. For example, UMBC ranks lowest on total R & D expenditures, but has moved up to 6<sup>th</sup> in total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty member. Average annual percent growth over 5 years is the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest of our peers, and, as noted above, UMBC ranks 3<sup>rd</sup> on its institution-specific indicator of federal R & D expenditures per full-time faculty member.

### ***Alumni giving rate***

In 2007 three new gift officers were added to the staff in the Office of Institutional Advancement and alumni numbers and dollars rose in the fiscal year ending June 30. UMBC is in the sixth year of a seven year campaign to raise \$100 million. As of June 30, 2007 more than \$75 million had been committed. While much has been accomplished in the overall fundraising program, limited resources have not allowed for the development of a robust communications program aimed at alumni. Nevertheless, progress is being made.



University of Maryland Baltimore County Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	SAT 25th/75th %tile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
<b>UMBC</b>	<b>1080-1300</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>59.3%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
Arkansas, U. of, Main	1030-1260	11.9%	4.6%	83.0%	56.4%	49.1%	46.7%	100.0%	21.0%
California, U. of, Riverside	950-1200	73.8%	7.1%	85.0%	65.3%	65.6%	55.0%	100.0%	6.0%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1050-1270	38.4%	2.6%	88.0%	70.1%	68.5%	69.2%	100.0%	17.0%
Clemson U.	1120-1310	9.9%	6.9%	89.0%	75.1%	73.3%	73.5%	95.0%	22.0%
Delaware, U. of	1100-1290	14.4%	5.8%	93.0%	76.4%	68.0%	60.0%	100.0%	26.0%
Mississippi State U.	950-1220	23.2%	20.5%	81.0%	55.8%	44.1%	44.7%	94.0%	14.0%
Oklahoma State U., Main	1030-1220	17.2%	4.1%	80.0%	59.2%	49.1%	40.2%	100.0%	19.0%
Rhode Island, U. of	970-1160	12.7%	5.1%	80.0%	55.8%	47.4%	42.4%	90.0%	12.0%
SUNY, Albany	1020-1200	21.3%	8.4%	84.0%	61.6%	58.9%	60.0%	97.0%	9.0%
Wyoming, U. of	950-1180	6.9%	1.2%	76.0%	57.6%	48.5%	44.4%	NA	13.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1017-1231</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>83.9%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>53.6%</b>	<b>97.3%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>

University	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Rank in ratio				Ratio of FTE students/ F-T instr. faculty	Fed R&D expend. per FT faculty	Rank in ratio license agreements to \$mil. R&D
				Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures	FTE students/ F-T instr. faculty			
<b>UMBC</b>	<b>\$58,467</b>	<b>\$149,532</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>\$110,939</b>	<b>2</b>	
Arkansas, U. of, Main	\$98,138	\$142,229	12.2%	1.9	4	3	16.3	\$48,545	1	
California, U. of, Riverside	\$119,549	\$201,941	31.1%	3.0	2	NA	26.2	\$85,981	NA	
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	\$105,617	\$217,767	28.0%	4.9	7	NA	27.3	\$128,456	NA	
Clemson U.	\$172,224	\$208,756	15.6%	1.8	3	5	15.0	\$66,960	5	
Delaware, U. of	\$110,339	\$109,572	19.6%	2.9	6	6	16.6	\$74,202	6	
Mississippi State U.	\$174,147	\$193,712	11.6%	1.6	8	4	17.0	\$93,341	4	
Oklahoma State U., Main	\$95,946	\$121,297	10.1%	1.4	5	7	18.9	\$45,714	3	
Rhode Island, U. of	\$59,660	\$93,389	0.0%	1.7	9	2	18.8	\$64,366	7	
SUNY, Albany	\$259,708	\$466,262	13.5%	3.2	11	NA	24.6	\$186,609	NA	
Wyoming, U. of	\$76,700	\$144,991	10.8%	2.8	10	NA	15.6	\$48,272	NA	
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$127,203</b>	<b>\$189,992</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>2.5</b>			<b>19.6</b>	<b>\$84,245</b>		

NA - Data not available

## University of Maryland, College Park

The University of Maryland, College Park is measured against its aspirational peers, institutions that as the State's flagship public institution, it seeks to emulate in reputation and quality. The university compares favorably or exceeds the peer average on six out of thirteen core performance measures for the current reporting period. The university's new student SAT 25<sup>th</sup> - 75<sup>th</sup> percentile score range of 1170-1370 compares favorably to the group average of 1192-1394. UMCP enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates (12.9 percent) and exceeds the peer average by 6.7 percentage points. Pass rates on teacher licensure exams hit 100 percent, the same as all its peers and above the Maryland MFR goal of 96 percent. The university's faculty showed an increase in research productivity with total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty \$12,758 above the peer average and an increase of \$24,111 per faculty member over its prior year rate. The average annual percentage growth in federal R & D expenditures of 8.8 percent was above the peer average of 7.3 percent and UMCP was ranked second in this category. The institution's 5.4 awards per 100 full-time faculty was similar to the peer average (5.2).

The university falls below the peer averages on seven core performance measures. While UMCP enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates, it is four percentage points below the peer average for percentage of total minority enrollments. Second-year retention rates fall 3.6 percentage points below the peer average of 96 percent. The university's six-year graduation rates for all undergraduates, all minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates have improved for two consecutive years. The graduation rates for all undergraduates, all minorities and African Americans are 79, 76 and 69 percent respectively. However, the university underperforms its peers on these measures by 7.2 percentage points on overall graduation rates, seven percentage points for minority graduation rates and four percentage points for African Americans. The university's 14 percent alumni-giving rate is 2.4 percentage points below the peer average. The university made some progress in closing the gap between itself and its peers in total R & D expenditures. These expenditures rose by \$28.6 million from the prior year, narrowing the expenditure gap to \$47.3 million below the peer average from a gap of \$73.2 million in the prior reporting period.

The University of Maryland, College Park has five institution-specific indicators: the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation; the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation; the percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies; the number of invention disclosures reported per \$100 million in total R & D expenditures; and the number of degrees awarded to African American students. The university has essentially maintained its performance in number of graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 (81 in 2004 and 80 in 2005) compared to a peer group average of 106. UMCP's number of programs ranked in the top 15 fell from 60 to 53 over the prior year and is well below the peer average of 87. The university continues to outpace its peers in the percent change in faculty memberships in national academies with forty percent growth compared to ten percent growth for the peer average. The number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R & D expenditures increased slightly over the prior year but remained 4 disclosures below

the peer average of 39. The university ranks first in the number of degrees awarded to African American students exceeding the peer average by 313 degree awards.

The University of Maryland, College Park should comment on continuing efforts to improve six-year graduation rates for all students and minority students in particular. The university is encouraged to share student success program assessment results. The Commission staff note the strong full-time research faculty productivity evidenced by the increase in total R & D expenditures and expenditures per 100 full-time faculty in this performance report. The university is to be commended for its success in achieving a 100 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams.

### **University of Maryland, College Park's Response**

The University continues to increase the graduation rates for minorities, African American students, and all students at a faster rate than our peers. The difference between UM and its peers in 2007 was 7 percentage points for all students and minority students and 4 percentage points for African American students. In 2004, the difference in the graduation rates between UM and its peers was 14, 15, and 13 percentage points for these three groups, respectively. Minorities and African American students have increased their graduation rates by more than 10 percentage points in the last 5 years.

To achieve this success, the University has implemented recruitment, retention, and student success initiatives. The University's recruitment agenda includes programs targeted to attract students of color. Many of the pre-freshman programs serve dual purposes, in that they not only give new students assistance but also expose them to disciplines that traditionally have less diversity, such as science and engineering. For example, the Center for Minorities in Science and Engineering in the School of Engineering has been very successful in serving both current and prospective students. The Pre-College Program in the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies is a federally funded TRIO Program which provides education services to low-income and/or first-generation college-bound students in an effort to overcome economic, social, and cultural barriers that impede the pursuit of higher education. The University intends to explore opportunities to expand and replicate these programs.

Some of the recruitment strategies involve expanding and capitalizing upon the University's pre-existing involvement in surrounding communities. As an example, the University has recently expanded the Maryland Incentive Awards Program. This program combines service to the community, and support and assistance to high school students in largely minority communities, with an open door to a first-class university. The program not only provides deserving students with a college education, but also focuses on citizenship skills such as leadership, critical thinking, and character development. The one-year retention rate for students participating in the Baltimore Incentive Awards Program is 86 percent. Preliminary statistics for the first-year cohort of the BIA show a 6-year graduation rate of 78 percent. Because of the program's success, the University has instituted a similar program in Prince George's County, a local community for the University.

The undergraduate retention policies and programs were established with the goal of enhancing student success. These initiatives call for each degree program to build four-year graduation templates and plans for advising interventions in order to assure that students are on track to timely graduation.

In addition to recruitment and retention, the University is actively examining strategies to narrow the gap between in student success between all students and African American students and all minorities. The results of these initiatives will not come to fruition for another several years.

University of Maryland College Park Peer Performance Data, 2007

University <sup>1</sup>	SAT 25th/75th %ile <sup>5</sup>	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Fall 2000 cohort			Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
					Six-year graduation rate <sup>2</sup> all minorities <sup>2</sup>	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans <sup>2</sup>	Six-year graduation rate in faculty member- ships in national academies <sup>3</sup>		
<b>Maryland, U. of, College Park</b>	<b>1170-1370</b>	<b>33.2%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>79.0%</b>	<b>76.0%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>
California, U. of, Berkeley	1220-1450	56.3%	3.5%	97.0%	89.0%	89.0%	73.0%	100.0%	14.0%
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1170-1410	56.9%	3.0%	97.0%	89.0%	89.0%	78.0%	100.0%	14.0%
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1140-1340	26.2%	6.8%	92.0%	82.0%	76.0%	68.0%	100.0%	14.0%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1220-1380	24.3%	6.7%	96.0%	87.0%	82.0%	71.0%	100.0%	17.0%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1210-1390	22.4%	10.8%	96.0%	84.0%	79.0%	75.0%	100.0%	23.0%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1192-1394</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>

  

University	UMCP institution-specific indicators								
	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures <sup>2</sup>	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	Total R&D expenditures (000s) <sup>4</sup>	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty <sup>4</sup>	# grad level colleges/pgrms/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/pgms/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member- ships in national academies <sup>3</sup>	# of invention disclosures per \$100M in total R&D <sup>6</sup>	Number of degrees awarded to African-American students
<b>Maryland, U. of, College Park</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>\$354,244</b>	<b>\$266,951</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>636</b>
California, U. of, Berkeley	4.8%	7.8	\$492,239	\$351,851	130	114	2%	24	220
California, U. of, Los Angeles	5.9%	4.6	\$223,127	\$129,424	115	89	4%	37	226
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	7.4%	4.7	\$471,709	\$262,937	87	66	1%	45	396
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	6.3%	5.7	\$526,527	\$270,569	129	111	11%	53	389
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	12.3%	3.3	\$294,353	\$256,182	69	55	32%	38	385
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>\$401,591</b>	<b>\$254,193</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>323</b>

<sup>1</sup> Most data are current as of Fall 2006. Invention disclosures are for FY05. Rankings, faculty awards, and faculty memberships in national academies are for 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Graduation rate data extracted from the annual CSRDE Student Retention Report, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Average increase in memberships of 3 academies (AAAS, NAE, and NAS), equally weighted in the percent change for each academy.

<sup>4</sup> All R&D expenditures (federal and total) for science and engineering exclude medical sciences and non-science and engineering disciplines. Data are for FY 2006.

<sup>5</sup> SAT scores for Illinois and Michigan come from U.S. News and are converted from the reported, combined ACT scores; conversion uses an SAT-to-ACT conversion table. Scores for other peers are from NCES.

<sup>6</sup> Invention disclosures per R&D expenditures include the medical sciences for peers. These data are for FY05. Sources: AUTM for Maryland, Michigan, & North Carolina; Institutional Technology Transfer Illinois provided their data to IRPA.

## University of Maryland Eastern Shore

The University of Maryland Eastern Shore outperforms the peer group on six out of twelve core performance measures. UMES exceeds its peer average in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments by 2.7 percentage points. The university's six-year graduation rate for all undergraduates (41.8 percent), all minority undergraduates (42.7 percent) and African American undergraduates (43.1 percent) exceed the peer averages by 4.2, 5.3 and 7.7 percentage points respectively. Furthermore, UMES' six-year graduation rates held steady across these categories while the peer average declined over the prior year. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams reached 100 percent and was up from 83 percent the prior year. This pass rate was above the current peer average by 3.4 percentage points and exceeds Maryland's Managing for Results goal of 96 percent. UMES exceeds the average peer performance in total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty by \$13,085; however six out of 10 institutions had missing data in this measure.

The university falls below the average peer performance on one half of the core performance measures. The university's freshmen SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores are 730-920 compared to the peer average of 788-998. Minority undergraduate enrollments (83.5 percent) are three percentage points below the peer average. Average second-year retention rates fall 4.7 percentage points below the peer average of 73 percent. The average alumni giving rate is 6.4 percentage points below the peer average but UMES has begun closing this gap by increasing the giving rate from three percent in the prior year to eight percent. The university's total R & D expenditures rose by \$108,000 but remain at \$1.9 million below the peer average. Average annual percent growth in federal R & D expenditures is three percentage points below the peer average.

The university reports three institution-specific indicators: percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, information technology degrees as a percent of total bachelor degrees awarded, and student loan default rate. UMES reports that 62 percent of full-time faculty members hold a terminal degree, a slight increase from the previous year. Six of ten peers had missing data on this measure making a peer comparison difficult. The university remains slightly above the peer average in the percent of undergraduate information technology degrees awarded (.8 percentage points). The student loan default rate rose from 4.3 percent to 6.5 percent but is 1.5 percentage points below the peer average default rate of eight percent.

The Commission staff commends UMES on its marked improvement in teacher licensure exam pass rates and the efforts made to ensure student success in this area over the past three years. UMES was successful in submitting nearly complete peer performance data last year but there was a substantial amount of missing data on two measures this year. UMES should strive to ensure complete peer data so that performance comparisons can be made. UMES should comment on continuing efforts and targeted programming underway to improve graduation rates for all student groups. While it exceeds the average of its peers on these measures, UMES should continue its progress toward being ranked first among peers on these three measures. As noted in the prior year's report UMES estimates that fifty percent of its students are the first in their families to attend college, an important student constituency on the Eastern Shore that UMES continues to serve.

## **University of Maryland Eastern Shore's Response**

The 2007 Peer Performance analysis is a fair reflection of the accomplishments, challenges and opportunities for the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) during this reporting period. UMES' performance in terms of its six-year graduation rates for various student categories remains strong. For example, its six-year all minority graduation rate is surpassed by only two (Albany State University and South Carolina State University) of its 10 peers. Although both its R & D expenditure annual growth rate and the total R & D expenditure fell below the averages for its peers, its total expenditure has consistently surpassed at least four (Albany State University, Fort Valley State University, North Carolina University of Pembroke, and South Carolina State University) of its peers over the past four years (i.e., 2004-2007). UMES' performance also remains strong in the number of IT graduates with bachelor's degrees that account for 4.6 percent of all degrees at this level, compared to the average of 3.8 percent for its peers, in spite of the continuing decline of job opportunities in this field. In addition, over the past four years UMES has maintained a trend of loan default rate ranging between 4.3 percent (2006) and 9.0 percent (2005), that is lower than the average of its peers (i.e., between 7.5 percent and 10.7 percent) for the same period. The PRAXIS II success rate of 100 percent has transformed UMES' education program from being placed on probation in 2004 to being a high achiever.

Strong performance is also evident in the area of access and diversity in higher education. UMES continues to make a significant contribution to the State in these areas and continues to reach out to first-generation college students, maintaining a commitment to the representation of this group. Based on a recent quick survey of entering freshmen for the fall of 2006, over 50.0 percent of these students were first generation students. In addition, 89 percent of UMES students received financial aid of one form or another, and the total enrollment for Fall 2006 of 4,130 was the highest for UMES during its entire history.

The analysis reveals a number of areas in which the University has faced or continues to face challenges including the alumni giving rate, second-year student retention rates, six-year graduation rates, SAT scores for admissions, R & D expenditures, percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, and data for peers for total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty. These areas are reviewed briefly in the sections that follow.

### ***Alumni giving rate***

The alumni giving rate of 8.0 percent for the reporting year is indeed low when compared to the average rate (14.6 percent) for peers. Considering that in the previous report (2006) the alumni giving rate for UMES was 3 percent, the increase to 8 percent (i.e., an increase of more than 160 percent) is a significant accomplishment. The recently instituted measure of utilizing more effective strategies for tracking alumni and, with improved staffing and communication with alumni, as well as making use of a regularly updated alumni database are responsible for much of this desired change, albeit still below the performance of peers. UMES intends to continue strategies that have contributed to this change. Specific effective strategies include (1) annual mailings to alumni by the Office of Alumni; (2) holding of an annual alumni phone-a-thon; and (3) frequent communication with alumni through reunions, chapter meetings, and special alumni events. In addition, the Office of Alumni will continue to establish new alumni chapters

aggressively in different parts of the U.S. It is hoped that as alumni become more engaged/re-engaged with their alma mater, the alumni giving rate will continue to rise at an even faster rate.

### ***Retention and graduation rates***

In the Managing for Results (MFR) report, UMES is projecting a significant increase in its graduation rate. As already observed, this rate was above the average for the peers for the reporting period. However, to maintain its current position, let alone continuing to increase, UMES' retention rate needs to increase significantly. Currently, the decline in retention rate continues to be the single most important issue that needs urgent attention by UMES. At 68 percent, the retention rate for the reporting period is clearly below the average for peers (72.7 percent). UMES is using *Access and Success* funds to strengthen the role of counselors and mentors to provide tutorial assistance to help students. The retention problem continues to be aggravated by financial limitations of students as confirmed by the proportion of the student population (89 percent) that receives financial aid of one form or another and/or the limited availability of need-based aid. The declining trend in retention is also related to the 30 percent increase in tuition over the past few years that has made it less attractive for out-of-state students to come to UMES (i.e., from 32 percent in 2003 to 24 percent in 2006). Consequently, this has had an adverse impact on UMES' tuition revenue and institutional aid.

The University has established an Enrollment Management Committee to monitor retention efforts. In addition, the University recently undertook a retention study to identify factors that need to be specifically targeted to enhance the retention rate. This study, an Odds-Ratio analysis, revealed that increased performance by students as measured by their spring GPA significantly increases their chances of returning for the next fall (i.e., an increase of one point in GPA increases the likelihood of a student's retention by 553 percent). Similarly, the likelihood of a student's persistence is 46 percent higher if financial needs are being met based on this study's findings.

In the effort to increase its second-year retention rate, UMES has conducted both internal and external audits of its current retention strategies and identified policies and procedures that have a negative impact on student satisfaction. In addition, UMES has identified courses that have a high failure rate, known as "killer courses" (e.g., Math 101, Math 109, and Environmental Science 101) and has established appropriate intrusive intervention strategies for these courses. UMES has also developed a process for identifying, monitoring, and tracking "at-risk" students (students with grades of "D" and "F" at midterm) and introduced intrusive programs for this targeted population. After a careful analysis of the learning community strategy for improving student persistence and learning, UMES hopes to reintroduce this strategy in the fall of 2008, using the lessons learned. UMES also plans to continue the process of collecting data on student progression, retention, and attrition and implementing "best practice" strategies for problem areas identified by audits. UMES continues to be proactive in its efforts to provide advising services to students enrolled in freshman seminars. UMES will also utilize strategies for recruiting back stop outs and providing developmental advising to its students.

In addition, effective Fall 2007; UMES has strengthened its retention initiative by appointing an Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs with retention responsibilities. Building on the



*Access and Success Initiative*, funded by the Maryland Higher Education Commission, a strengthened Center for Access and Academic Success will be reestablished to enable UMES to undertake activities that will not only enhance access to postsecondary education but also to improve the retention and graduation rates of all students. The academic support activities of the Center for Access and Academic Success will be complemented by a recently established Writing Center. An interim director for this center has been appointed, the building is being refurbished, computers have been purchased, and tutors, committed to supporting student success, will be selected to implement the center's activities beginning Spring 2008.

### ***Fulltime faculty with terminal degrees***

UMES has full-time faculty of which 62 percent hold a terminal degree, a slightly higher percentage than reported in the 2006 Peer Performance Measures Report. UMES believes that the following factors have a negative influence on the number of its faculty who hold terminal degrees: (1) limited number of minority faculty nationally who possess terminal degrees in high demand areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; (2) difficulty in attracting faculty to a rural community such as Salisbury/ Princess Anne; and (3) limited number of tenure-track lines available to UMES. In order to increase the number of faculty with terminal degrees, UMES is committed to hiring only faculty for tenure-track positions who have terminal degrees in their discipline. Also UMES will continue to institute a policy that ensures that vacant full-time faculty positions are filled by eligible candidates with a terminal degree in specific teaching disciplines.

### ***Low undergraduate minority percentage and SAT scores***

During the last five years, UMES has strived to grow its first-time, full-time new student cohort and its overall enrollment. UMES has been very successful with its mission of providing "access" as confirmed by the increase in enrollment from approximately 3,644 in 2002 to 4,130 in 2006. Recently, the university has reemphasized the notion that growth in enrollment must be balanced with quality. Also, consistent with its mission of providing access to a diverse student population, UMES' enrollment continues to reflect a significant number of non-minority and foreign students (i.e., in the fall of 2006 there were 9.0 percent white and 3.1 percent foreign undergraduate students). Considering that diversity is an important part of its mission, a difference of 3 percent with the peer average makes UMES more diverse than its peers and is in accordance with the mission.

The freshman SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores of 730-920 are, however, lower than the peer average of 788-998. UMES has implemented several strategies aimed at gradually increasing the average SAT scores for the first-time student cohorts. These strategies include: (1) increasing the pool of honor students (students with a minimal combined new SAT score of 1650); and (2) establishing and implementing an early admissions protocol that includes a process for awarding scholarships to students who might not qualify for the honors programs, but who present SAT scores that are higher than the current average SAT for honors of 1517.

To ensure a sufficient pool of good quality of new students, the Division of Student Life and Enrollment Management has obtained names and contact information from the College Board of

6,000 African American Maryland residents who are current high school seniors, with a High School of GPA 2.80 or above; a combined new SAT score of 1400 and above; are among the top 10 percent of their class; and selected based on pre-determined majors. The implementation of this new initiative will involve close collaboration between the Divisions of Student Life and Enrollment Management and Academic Affairs. A process for this new initiative is in place and includes the following components:

1. College Board data of 6,000 Maryland resident high school seniors who meet the criteria will be shared with UMES academic departments, for follow-up on a weekly basis (Fall 2007 )
2. Weekly reports and updates on admitted students will be shared with academic departments for follow-up beginning Fall 2007-Fall 2008.
3. New scholarship dollars will be allocated to attract, recruit, and enroll qualified African American students in STEM, Health, and other majors.
4. Tri-County College Fair will continue to be hosted by UMES on a regular basis. This fair attracts hundreds of potential students to the campus and an excellent student recruitment tool for UMES. The sixth such fair was held on November 15, 2007.

The University has dedicated \$400,000 in scholarship funds for recruiting these high performing students.

#### ***Total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty***

The University's total R & D expenditures rose by \$108,000 but remained at \$1.9 million below the peer average during the reporting period. Unfortunately 60 percent of the data for average annual percent growth in federal R & D expenditures for this indicator were not available this year. Therefore, it is not possible to make a reliable comparison with the performance of peers on this indicator. An increase in research and development expenditures not only enhances UMES' national reputation as a contributor to the creation/development of new knowledge, but it also provides students with opportunities to learn how to conduct sound research while still in college. Therefore, the University is committed to providing educational services that attract and support economic development initiatives and will continue to initiate new research and development activities that will facilitate sustained economic development, while addressing environmental issues critical to the Eastern Shore and the State of Maryland. To assist faculty in developing their grantsmanship skills, UMES will continue to offer new faculty workshops to enhance their capacity to write winning grants. Currently, the university is reconstituting a Research Council that will explore ways to enhance the R & D efforts.

#### ***Unavailable data for per full-time faculty R & D expenditure and faculty with terminal degrees***

It is worth noting that for three years prior to the current reporting period; UMES has provided almost 100 percent of the Peer Performance data. Unfortunately, peers did not choose to respond to some items in surveys by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide. Since these and any other surveys are voluntary, depending on a limited number sources will always present a challenge to University providing complete data. Therefore, the

University plans to propose the inclusion of other sources of data in the future, such as IPEDS and the peers themselves as alternative fall-back positions.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate		Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate		Total R&D expenditures (000s)
				graduation rate	retention rate					giving rate	giving rate	
<b>Maryland, U. of, Eastern</b>	<b>730-920</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>81.2%</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>\$5,568</b>		
Alabama A&M U.	780-950	95.5%	94.9%	69.0%	32.0%	32.3%	32.4%	100.0%	39.0%	\$16,075		
Albany State U.	850-980	95.4%	94.8%	81.0%	44.4%	44.8%	44.7%	100.0%	NA	\$1,402		
Alcorn State U.	780-950	91.2%	90.5%	70.0%	43.6%	43.8%	43.9%	100.0%	7.0%	\$5,754		
California State U., Fort Valley State U.	870-1100 690-1210	51.4% 96.4%	7.5% 95.8%	77.0% 75.0%	37.5% 25.1%	33.3% 25.5%	22.2% 25.4%	98.0% 100.0%	5.0% 37.0%	\$6,190 \$2,497		
North Carolina A&T State U.	790-990	94.1%	92.1%	NA	39.5%	40.5%	40.6%	100.0%	12.0%	\$22,719		
North Carolina, U. of, Prairie View A&M U.	850-1030 780-940	50.9% 95.4%	25.7% 90.3%	70.0% 67.0%	34.9% 31.3%	35.0% 31.4%	25.3% 31.4%	92.0% 76.0%	5.0% 8.0%	\$0 \$11,681		
South Carolina State U. Virginia State U.	740-910 750-920	97.9% 97.1%	97.3% 95.9%	73.0% 72.0%	46.8% 40.7%	46.8% 40.8%	47.1% 41.0%	100.0% 100.0%	7.0% 10.0%	\$3,796 \$5,048		
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>788-998</b>	<b>86.5%</b>	<b>78.5%</b>	<b>72.7%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	<b>96.6%</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>\$7,516</b>		

  

University	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	UMES institution-specific indicators		
		Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	% of full-time faculty with terminal degrees	IT degrees as % of all bachelor's degrees
<b>Maryland, U. of, Eastern</b>	<b>\$51,556</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>
Alabama A&M U.	NA	14.0%	47.0%	6.0%
Albany State U.	NA	18.0%	NA	5.1%
Alcorn State U.	\$47,554	-7.2%	64.0%	1.0%
California State U., Fort Valley State U.	\$28,525 NA	69.6% 0.6%	NA NA	1.3% 7.1%
North Carolina A&T State U.	\$77,805	10.7%	NA	2.7%
North Carolina, U. of, Prairie View A&M U.	\$0 NA	0.0% 2.9%	69.0% NA	2.4% 0.7%
South Carolina State U. Virginia State U.	NA NA	6.0% -5.2%	NA 81.0%	5.4% 6.5%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$38,471</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>65.3%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

NA - Data not available

## University of Maryland University College

There are very few peer indicators for the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) due to its unique status as Maryland's public university for distance education and nontraditional students. UMUC's target population is working adults and it enrolls a high percentage of part-time students. In addition, the university's indicators reflect unique characteristics associated with distance education. Therefore, the university does not have traditional core performance measures such as SAT scores for incoming freshmen, six-year graduation rates, or licensure pass rates. Its established core measures are the percentage of minority students, the percentage of African American enrollments and the average alumni giving rate. In addition, UMUC's peer group consists of mostly traditional public university campuses. There are some private online universities such as the Western Governors University and the University of Phoenix with which UMUC competes for worldwide students, but these institutions are private not-for-profit entities and do not provide good comparisons for funding purposes.

The university outperforms its peers on one of three core performance measures. African American enrollments comprise 31.6 percent of total enrollments and are 13.3 percentage points above the peer average.

The university performs below peer average on two core measures. The university undergraduate population is 42 percent minority which is 1.6 percentage points below the peer average. The average undergraduate alumni giving rate is three percent or 5.4 percentage points below the peer average.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators: the number of African American graduates in information technology; the percentage of undergraduate students over age 25; the number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business; the number of stateside online courses; and the number of worldwide online enrollments. The university significantly exceeds peers' performance on all of these indicators. There are 206 information technology degrees awarded to African Americans compared to a peer average of 11. Eighty-one percent of undergraduates are age 25 or older compared to 31.9 percent for the peer average. UMUC awarded 1,552 post baccalaureate degrees in technology and management which is an increase of 71 over the prior reporting period. UMUC exceeds the peer average on this measure by 1,378 degrees. It offers 688 stateside online courses compared to an average of 155 by its peers. Four out of ten peers had missing data on this important distance education measure. The university's worldwide online enrollments increased by an impressive 62,190 registrations and greatly exceed the peer average of 5,309. Four out of ten peers had missing data on this measure.

The University of Maryland University College should comment on the dramatic growth in worldwide online registrations and is commended for its increase in both enrollments and the number of stateside course offerings. Given the importance of distance education for UMUC's academic program delivery, the Maryland Higher Education Commission recommends that the university strive to improve data collection from peers on the online related institution specific measures. In addition, UMUC might consider voluntarily reporting available statistics for

private not for profit online institutions such as Western Governors University or the University of Phoenix for the institution specific distance education measures. These institutions would not be considered funding peers and their performance comparisons would be for general performance information only. This is not a dissimilar situation from St. Mary's College of Maryland, where its unique status as Maryland's public liberal arts college encourages performance comparison to private liberal arts colleges. St. Mary's voluntarily provides comparative data with private institutions that it has selected as peers. UMUC's unique status as Maryland's primary public distance education provider puts it in competition with private distance education providers and suggests that this comparison would be useful as well.

### **University of Maryland University College's Response**

Under the leadership of Dr. Susan Aldridge, UMUC is committed to leading the industry in the development and implementation of the next generation of distance education. UMUC's students and faculty expect the University to be innovative in the use of education technology. As such, we are committed to developing new approaches to advance distance education and assist students in overcoming obstacles that stand in the way of their degree completion. UMUC must keep an eye to the future and remain at the forefront of education technology in order to retain its leadership position in distance education.

UMUC will continue to collect data from its peers, and agrees that additional data from for-profit online providers (University of Phoenix) would provide an interesting comparison. However, the private sector, more often than not, views such data as proprietary and does not release this information freely.

University of Maryland University College Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	% minority of all undergraduates		% African American of all undergraduates		Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate		# of African American IT graduates		% of ugrads 25 and older		# post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.		# stateside online courses		# worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
College Hills	42.0%	74.4%	31.6%	28.0%	3.0%	206	81.8%	1,552	688	177,516					
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	57.2%	84.7%	11.8%	32.6%	10.0%	31	48.7%	112	162	4,019					
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	49.8%	45.3%	8.8%	13.6%	3.0%	25	25.2%	778	NA	NA					
CUNY Hunter C.	44.6%	22.8%	17.6%	37.2%	NA	4	43.7%	36	73	5,184					
CUNY Queens C.	22.9%	21.8%	12.3%	14.4%	7.0%	5	29.5%	0	NA	NA					
Eastern Michigan U.	44.6%	22.9%	14.4%	37.2%	3.0%	2	27.5%	60	NA	NA					
Governors State U.	22.9%	21.8%	12.3%	14.4%	7.0%	10	69.8%	264	263	13,471					
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	21.8%	12.6%	6.9%	12.3%	7.0%	12	19.3%	233	204	3,192					
Southern Connecticut State U.	12.6%	43.6%	18.3%	8.4%	11.0%	3	16.3%	77	145	3,213					
Western Illinois U.						3	12.2%	72	81	NR					
<b>Average of Peers</b>						<b>11</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>5,309</b>					

NR - Non-Respondent  
 NA - Data not available

<sup>1</sup> Data for UMUC specific indicators taken from IPEDS Peer Analysis System.

## **Morgan State University**

Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. The university submitted two new measures and removed one measure from the previous year for the current reporting period. The new measures are percentage of students receiving federal grants and the number of doctorates awarded to women. The measure, percent change in the number of doctorates awarded, was removed. These changes were made without prior discussion with Maryland Higher Education Commission staff.

Morgan State University's performance exceeds the peer average on eight of fifteen core performance measures. Fifty percent of students receive federal grants which is 12 percentage points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for African Americans (41 percent) is 4.5 percentage points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for all minority students is 1.6 percentage points higher than the peer average. Morgan State awards more doctorates to women (22) and African Americans (29) than the peer averages of 18.1 and 6.2 respectively. Two of the twelve peers do not have doctoral programs and could not be compared on this measure. The University awarded 145 bachelor's degrees in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) areas to African Americans which was down from the previous year's level of 202. Nonetheless, Morgan awarded significantly more STEM bachelor's degrees than its peer average of 64.2. Total R & D expenditures of \$28 million topped the peer average by \$5.9 million. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams was 100 percent for the second consecutive year and exceeded the peer average by 3.1 percentage points. Morgan State continues to surpass the State's MFR goal of 96 percent on this measure.

Morgan State University underperformed its peers on seven performance measures. The second-year retention rate for all entering freshmen (-6.3 percentage points), African American entering freshmen (-1.9 percentage points) and all minority entering freshman (-3.7 percentage points) were below peer averages. The six-year graduation rate for all students was five percentage points below the peer average of 47 percent. The university reports that 80 percent of all full-time faculty hold terminal degrees compared to a peer average of 86.6 percent. Morgan's R & D expenditures increased by three percent in comparison with a peer average increase of 7.8 percent.

Morgan State University should comment on the addition of two new performance measures and the deletion of one performance measure in the current year report especially in light of recommendations the prior year to work with MHEC on the development of new performance measures. In addition, the university should comment on promising practices implemented to improve six-year graduation rates. Although Morgan is already above its peer averages on minority and African American student graduation rates, there is a statewide interest in closing the gap between minority and majority student graduation rates. Morgan State is commended for presenting a full complement of peer data in the current year report. In the past, there had been missing peer data and Morgan's efforts to rectify this problem are appreciated. The Commission staff also notes that Morgan's teacher licensure exam rates continue to surpass its peers and commends Morgan on its ongoing 100 percent pass rate for this important State workforce priority.



## **Morgan State University's Response**

The University generally agrees with MHEC's assessment of the 2007 peer performance data. We are pleased that we compare favorably to our peers in graduation rates for African Americans; the production of African American doctorates; and degrees awarded in the sciences, engineering and mathematics to African Americans. We are working for continual advancement in these areas of critical need.

Over 90 percent of Morgan's first-time, full-time freshmen are African American. As we improve our graduation rates for African American students, our graduation rates for all students will improve. Currently, given the academic and economic background of our students, our graduation rates for all students fall where expected. There are a number of initiatives on campus to improve graduation rates. The University has begun using the Accuplacer placement examination which allows us to more appropriately place freshmen in English and mathematics courses that serve as a foundation for successful program completion. Additionally, the University offers the PACE program (Pre-Freshmen Accelerated Curriculum in Engineering) and the Access Success program which provide additional support to students. The retention and graduation rates for these programs are higher than the University's overall rates. Increasingly, however, we are finding that finances are a major factor in the retention and graduation of our students. Campus survey results as well as results from the National Survey of Student Engagement indicate that our students frequently work 20 or more hours per week while attending full-time. Research also has shown that reliance on adjunct faculty has an unfavorable impact on student retention and graduation. Currently, adjunct faculty comprises 40 percent of the University's faculty. As we receive funding to hire full-time regular faculty, we anticipate that student retention and graduation will improve because of better advising, smaller class size, and increased faculty student interaction in and out of class.

The new performance measures of the percentage of students receiving federal grants and the number of doctorates awarded to women were added as measures of access. Access is one of the goals of the 2004 Maryland Plan for Postsecondary Education. Providing access to higher education for a wide range of students including those who may be economically disadvantaged has always been a part of the University's mission. The percent change in the number of doctorates awarded was removed in order to accommodate the access measures. We regret that timing did not allow us to discuss these changes with MHEC staff beforehand.

Morgan State University Peer Performance Data, 2007

	Fall 2004 Entering Freshman Class		Fall 1999 Entering Freshmen		# of Doctorates		# of Doctorates		# of Bachelor's		% Full-Time Faculty With Terminal Degree
	Second Year Retention Rates		Six-year graduation rates		Awarded to		Awarded to		In STEM to		
	All	Minority <sup>1</sup>	All	Black	Black	Minority <sup>2</sup>	Blacks	Blacks	Blacks	Blacks	
<b>Morgan State University</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>80%</b>			
University of Alabama- Huntsville	20%	77%	44%	50%	10	2	22	91%			
Florida A& M University	39%	82%	45%	45%	8	13	186	80%			
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	23%	76%	51%	38%	0	0	7	85%			
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	16%	70%	46%	30%	42	1	17	95%			
Michigan Technological University	23%	80%	59%	25%	9	1	7	88%			
Oakland University	20%	71%	45%	30%	42	3	8	92%			
Jackson State University	95%	71%	38%	38%	18	24	128	75%			
The College of New Jersey	13%	95%	83%	63%	NP	NP	7	86%			
CUNY - City College	56%	79%	35%	29%	NP	NP	71	88%			
North Carolina A & T University	61%	69%	40%	41%	5	5	168	86%			
Tennessee State University	48%	72%	50%	52%	28	13	140	96%			
Texas A & M University - Kingsville	42%	61%	28%	28%	19	0	9	77%			
<b>Peer Average</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>75.3%</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>36.5%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>86.6%</b>			

  

	FY 2005 Research Expenditures	% Change in Research Expenditures	% Alumni Giving	PRAXIS or NES % Passing 2004-2005
<b>Morgan State University</b>	<b>\$28,028,014</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>100%</b>
University of Alabama- Huntsville	\$42,234,860	7%	6%	100%
Florida A& M University	\$27,002,744	-17%	10%	100%
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	\$27,365,000	12%	11%	100%
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	\$27,365,000	12%	14%	96%
Michigan Technological University	\$31,408,000	13%	17%	100%
Oakland University	\$6,738,080	2%	6%	100%
Jackson State University	\$25,464,269	5%	5%	97%
The College of New Jersey	\$6,224,000	34%	9%	98%
CUNY - City College	\$29,041,332	1%	19%	96%
North Carolina A & T University	\$19,791,019	17%	12%	100%
Tennessee State University	\$12,778,292	-5%	3%	98%
Texas A & M University - Kingsville	\$10,153,546	13%	9%	78%
<b>Peer Average</b>	<b>\$22,130,512</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>97%</b>

NA - Data not available  
**NP - No program**

<sup>1</sup> Fall 2005 Cohort

<sup>2</sup> Source: Education Trust

## St. Mary's College of Maryland

As previously described, St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's), Maryland's public four-year liberal arts college, is not required to participate in the Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Accountability Report and does so voluntarily. The institution has two sets of peers: Twelve peers that reflect the college's current mission and six peers that reflect the aspirations of the college. Of the twelve current peers, four are public institutions and the remainder are private. All six aspirant peers are private institutions.

### Current Peers

The college exceeds its current peers on fourteen measures and performs at the same level as the current peer average on two out of thirty total performance measures. Ninety-five percent of St. Mary's faculty holds terminal degrees, which is nine percentage points higher than the peer average. Average assistant professor annual salary is \$245 above the peer average of \$51,655. The college exceeds the peer average salary percentile rank for full-time, associate, and assistant professors by 1.4, 1.7 and 4.2 percentage points respectively. SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores of 1130-1300 compare favorably with the current peer average of 1131-1329. St. Mary's admissions acceptance rate is 10.4 percentage points higher than its current peer average. The yield on enrollment offers is slightly above the peer average by 1.4 percentage points. The average second-year retention rate is 1.8 percent percentage points above the peer average of 86 percent. St. Mary's six-year graduation rate increased from 72 percent to 80 percent in the current reporting period and exceeds the peer average of 72 percent. Nine percent of St. Mary's freshman class are African American, a 3.8 percentage point advantage over the peer average and minority students comprise 18 percent of St. Mary's total enrollments in comparison to 14 percent for peers. Ninety-six percent of St. Mary's undergraduates are full-time students, which is just above the peer average. St. Mary's reports 99.5 percent undergraduate enrollments for the current reporting period while the peer average is 98.6 percent. Seventeen percent of St. Mary's freshmen received federal grants compared to 16 percent for current peers. The student-faculty ratio of 12 to 1 meets the current peer average.

St. Mary's performance is lower than the peer group average on fourteen measures. The college's total research spending is \$461,265 below the peer average and it is ranked seventh on this measure. Average professor annual salary of \$82,700 is \$718 below the peer average. Average associate professor salary of \$61,400 is \$2,273 below the current peer average. St. Mary's entering freshmen had an average SAT score of 1215 compared to the current peer average of 1231. Total headcount enrollment (1,957) was below the peer average by 334 students. As a positive, tuition and fees at St. Mary's are substantially more affordable than its current peers. Its tuition and fees (\$11,418) are \$9,902 below the peer average. Eight out of twelve current peers are private institutions which must be taken into consideration on this measure. St. Mary's FY 2006 Education and General Fund (E&G) expenditures per FTE student was \$5,836 below peers. The alumni giving rate was 10.3 percentage points below peers. Tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures were six percentage points below peers. St. Mary's has fewer resources in its library by 284,594 books, serial back files and other paper materials and 1,282 fewer serial subscriptions than its peers. It has two fewer librarians, six fewer overall library staff and expends \$132 per FTES less than its peers on library expenses.

## **Aspirant Peers**

St. Mary's has set high standards as demonstrated by institutions such as Bates and Davidson in its aspirant peer group. St. Mary's exceeds the aspirant peer average on five of thirty measures and is equal to the peer average on one measure. The aspirant peers are more selective than St. Mary's. The average aspirant peer acceptance rate is only 34 percent compared to St. Mary's at 68 percent. Nine percent of St. Mary's students are African American in contrast to only five percent for the peers and the percent of minority enrollments exceeds the peer average by 2.8 percentage points. Seventeen percent of St. Mary's freshmen receive federal grants which is 7.4 percentage points above the peer average. St. Mary's, like its peers, primarily serves undergraduates.

The college scores below the peer average on twenty-two measures. Total research expenditures are \$1.2 million below the peer average. Faculty salaries for all ranks are below the aspirant peer group average (Assistant Professor, -\$8,000; Associate Professor, -\$12,883 and Professor, -\$18,533). The percentile ranks of faculty salaries at St. Mary's are also lower across all ranks by a range of 15.4 to 22.5 percentage points when compared with those of the aspirant peers. SAT scores for entering freshmen (1215) were 123 points below the aspirant peer average. The SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile range of 1130-1300 is below the aspirant peer average range of 1248-1428. St. Mary's yield rate on enrollment offers is 2.1 percentage points below the peer average. Average second-year retention and six-year graduation rates are 6.2 and 8.5 percentage points below the aspirant peer averages. St. Mary's has a lower percentage of full-time undergraduates (96 percent) compared to peers (99 percent). The good news for St. Mary's students is that tuition and fees are \$22,571 lower than the peer average.

In terms of resources, the college is below the aspirant peer average on every measure. These include FY 2005 E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student (-\$18,831), average alumni giving rate (-30 percentage points), tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures (-12.8 percentage points), student-faculty ratio (12 to 1 compared to aspirant peers at 9.8 to 1), number of book volumes in the library (-491,108), number of library subscriptions (-5,060), full-time library staff (-13), full-time library staff with a Master of Library Science (-4) and library expenditures per FTES (-\$777).

The Commission staff commends St. Mary's College of Maryland for continued excellence in providing an affordable liberal arts education to Maryland students that compares favorably to many private liberal arts institutions. Staff also notes the increase in six-year graduation rates over the prior reporting period and encourages St. Mary's to comment on effective strategies it has employed to improve graduation rates. The institution should comment on library resources which are well below current and aspirant peers as well as its continuing efforts to increase the percentage of full-time faculty.

## **St. Mary's College of Maryland's Response**

St. Mary's College of Maryland is pleased that MHEC has recognized that the College has met or exceeded our current peers on 16 of the 30 performance measures included in the most recent

peer analysis. While keeping average tuition \$9,902 below that of its current peers, the College has managed to hire and retain more faculty with terminal degrees, pay higher salaries to its associate and full professors, have higher year-to-year retention and graduation rates, and enroll a higher percentage of African American and minority students than its current peer institutions. A newly redesigned General Education curriculum, a greater emphasis on international education, an increase in the number of full-time faculty, and a greater enculturation of assessment and strategic planning will help ensure the progress of the College toward its goal of providing a high-quality liberal arts education to the residents of Maryland.

The College is proud to have two years of successive increases in its six-year graduation rate, surpassing its current peers by eight percentage points. Improvements in student advising and a greater emphasis on assessment have helped strengthen student retention through graduation. A greatly expanded athletics and recreation center, additional student housing, and a greater emphasis on extra-curricular activities have helped St. Mary's better accommodate the needs of its students, thereby contributing to student retention. In addition, recent increases in the number of full-time faculty have produced a more favorable student/faculty ratio, thereby enhancing the educational experience of our students.

Unfortunately, the College's library resources lag behind those of our current and aspirant peers. This problem is especially noteworthy given the College's emphasis on independent research (e.g., many of our students are engaged in independent research, including the culminating St. Mary's Project) and the remoteness of our campus from other academic and research libraries. However, our students and faculty have access to the University of Maryland library system through interlibrary loan and a sharing of resources. We recognize that this situation is not optimal and are always exploring ways to improve this important resource.

Finally, we note that the College has been successful in its efforts to increase the number of its full-time faculty, with the number of full-time faculty lines increasing from 121 in FY03 to a projected 136 in FY09. Such increases have a profoundly positive impact at the College, allowing greater student-faculty interaction, more opportunity for scholarly research, and driving down the Student/Faculty ratio to a level comparable to that of our peer institutions. The recent increases in the number of full-time faculty at St. Mary's have helped fuel the progress that the College has experienced as it strives to achieve its mission-statement goals.

**St. Mary's College of Maryland Profile and Peer Performance Data, 2007**

QUALITY / SELECTIVITY	Indicator	Current Peer Average	Aspirant Peer Average	All Peers Average	SMCM	Current Peers:						
						Beloit	College of Wooster	Colorado College	Connecticut College	Dickinson	Gettysburg	Guilford
Amount in total research spending, FY06 <sup>1</sup>		\$816,045	\$1,545,725	\$1,030,657	\$354,780	\$243,305	\$905,548	\$1,220,425	\$1,656,000	\$2,347,151	\$533,120	\$225,015
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2006 <sup>2</sup>		86%	96%	90%	95%	97%	97%	97%	89%	95%	92%	70%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '06 <sup>3</sup>												
Professor:		\$83,418	\$101,233	\$89,706	\$82,700	\$73,300	\$75,500	\$104,800	\$93,200	\$95,000	\$94,100	\$64,300
Associate Professor:		\$63,673	\$74,283	\$67,418	\$61,400	\$56,000	\$59,500	\$70,200	\$71,200	\$70,700	\$69,900	\$54,100
Assistant Professor:		\$51,655	\$59,900	\$54,565	\$51,900	\$46,800	\$48,800	\$59,200	\$56,200	\$56,700	\$56,900	\$43,000
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '06:												
Professor:		77.3% <sup>4</sup>	94.1% <sup>4</sup>	87.1% <sup>4</sup>	79%	60%	67%	94%	87%	88%	88%	38%
Associate Professor:		66.3% <sup>4</sup>	90.5% <sup>4</sup>	84.7% <sup>4</sup>	68%	46%	60%	85%	86%	86%	85%	38%
Assistant Professor:		66.9% <sup>4</sup>	90.8% <sup>4</sup>	83.7% <sup>4</sup>	71%	41%	54%	89%	83%	84%	85%	22%
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall '06 <sup>5</sup>		1231	1338	1258	1215	1270	1210	1310	1320	1285	1280	1130
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall '06		1131-1329	1248-1428	1160-1352	1130-1300	1160-1380	1100-1320	1220-1400	1250-1390	1200-1370	1210-1350	1020-1240
Acceptance Rate, Fall '06 <sup>7</sup>		57.9%	34.3%	50.0%	68.3%	67.1%	80.3%	37.5%	35.3%	42.9%	42.8%	56.1%
Yield Ratio, Fall '06 <sup>7</sup>		31.1%	34.5%	32.2%	32.5%	25.2%	24.7%	31.0%	33.3%	27.2%	31.9%	22.4%
<b>RETENTION AND GRADUATION</b>												
Average second year retention rate: Fall '02-'05 Cohorts <sup>2</sup>		86.3%	94.2%	88.9%	88.0%	92.0%	87.0%	92.0%	92.0%	91.0%	91.0%	72.0%
Six year graduation rate: '97-'00 Cohorts <sup>2</sup>		72.4%	88.5%	77.8%	80.0%	72.0%	73.0%	84.0%	86.0%	82.0%	80.0%	60.0%
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class <sup>6</sup>		4.8%	5.0%	4.9%	8.6%	3.7%	6.6%	2.2%	3.4%	5.9%	4.5%	10.5%
<b>ACCESS, Fall 2006</b>												
Total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>		2291	1811	2131	1957	1347	1861	2025	1886	2400	2520	2687
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>		14.2%	15.5%	14.7%	18.3%	9.1%	9.7%	15.9%	14.4%	14.1%	7.5%	29.0%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates <sup>6</sup>		94.5%	99.3%	96.1%	95.6%	100.0%	98.2%	100.0%	96.3%	98.8%	99.4%	82.8%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>		98.6%	100.0%	99.0%	99.5%	100.0%	100.0%	98.3%	99.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate <sup>7</sup>		\$21,320	\$33,989	\$25,279	\$11,418	\$28,350	\$30,060	\$32,124	NA	\$33,804	\$33,830	\$23,020
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY06 <sup>8</sup>		16%	10%	14%	17%	12%	13%	10%	9%	10%	9%	31%
<b>EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES</b>												
E&G expenditures in FY06 per FTES <sup>1</sup>		\$26,701	\$39,697	\$31,033	\$20,865	\$24,430	\$31,230	\$41,556	\$35,302	\$31,820	\$30,715	\$13,395
Average alumni giving rate (2006) <sup>2</sup>		29.3%	49.0%	35.8%	19.0%	40.0%	30.0%	33.0%	38.0%	40.0%	37.0%	18.0%
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures <sup>1</sup> (FY06)		53.8%	60.6%	56.1%	47.8%	58.2%	55.7%	51.5%	77.1%	69.2%	70.5%	74.1%
Student-Faculty Ratio (2006) <sup>2</sup>		11.8 to 1	9.8 to 1	11.2 to 1	12 to 1	12 to 1	11 to 1	10 to 1	10 to 1	12 to 1	11 to 1	15 to 1
Academic libraries, FY2004 <sup>9</sup>												
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials:		441,671	648,185	510,509	157,077	707,804	673,879	499,596	588,343	520,449	382,603	209,484
Current Serial Subscriptions:		4,111	7,889	5,370	2,829	1,579	6,326	2,567	4,235	1,011	4,340	1,372
Librarians:		8	10	9	6	5	7	9	11	9	12	6
Total Staff:		29	36	31	23	21	37	33	38	36	40	14
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):		\$924	\$1,569	\$1,139	\$792	\$922	\$935	\$1,264	\$1,438	\$1,011	\$1,236	\$357

<sup>1</sup> FY06 Finance Report, IPEDS Website  
<sup>2</sup> America's Best Colleges 2008, USN&WR  
<sup>3</sup> Academe, March-April 2007  
<sup>4</sup> Median reported for average  
<sup>5</sup> Midpoint of 25th to 75th percentiles, Fall '06, IPEDS Website  
<sup>6</sup> Fall Enrollment Report 2006, IPEDS Website  
<sup>7</sup> Institutional Characteristics 2006, IPEDS Website  
<sup>8</sup> Student Financial Aid FY06, IPEDS Website  
<sup>9</sup> Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website

*Current Peers, cont. :*

*Aspirant Peers*

Indicator	Current Peers, cont. :			Aspirant Peers						
	Southwestern	U of Mary Washington	U of Minn Morris	U of NC Asheville	Bates	Carleton	Davidson	F & M	Hamilton	Kenyon
<b>QUALITY / SELECTIVITY</b>										
Amount in total research spending, FY06 <sup>1</sup>	\$559,682	\$268,993	\$288,928	\$1,157,980	\$1,173,803	NA	\$2,163,447	\$2,801,688	\$1,316,000	\$273,687
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2006 <sup>2</sup>	98%	74%	46%	84%	93%	95%	98%	98%	97%	97%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '06 <sup>3</sup>										
Professor:	\$84,200	\$81,700	\$73,600	\$77,900	\$101,100	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$105,400	\$106,800	\$84,100
Associate Professor:	\$68,600	\$61,000	\$59,700	\$59,500	\$74,200	\$74,600	\$79,300	\$75,300	\$78,500	\$63,800
Assistant Professor:	\$51,000	\$48,800	\$48,200	\$52,600	\$59,400	\$65,700	\$59,000	\$62,400	\$58,900	\$54,000
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '06:										
Professor:	80%	77%	61%	72%	92%	94%	94%	94%	95%	80%
Associate Professor:	83%	66%	61%	60%	90%	90%	95%	91%	94%	75%
Assistant Professor:	67%	54%	50%	73%	89%	> 95%	89%	93%	88%	78%
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall '06 <sup>5</sup>	1230	1195	1230	1190	NA	1410	1345	1270	NA	1325
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall '06	1120-1340	1100-1290	1080-1380	1080-1300	NA	1330-1490	1250-1440	1180-1360	NA	1230-1420
Acceptance Rate, Fall '06 <sup>7</sup>	65.0%	70.0%	79.8%	62.7%	31.7%	31.6%	30.4%	45.7%	33.4%	32.8%
Yield Ratio, Fall '06 <sup>7</sup>	27.1%	31.2%	38.8%	31.8%	36.1%	35.7%	39.2%	28.3%	35.2%	32.8%
<b>RETENTION AND GRADUATION</b>										
Average second year retention rate: Fall '02-'05 Cohorts <sup>2</sup>	87.0%	86.0%	83.0%	79.0%	95.0%	97.0%	96.0%	91.0%	93.0%	93.0%
Six year graduation rate: '97-'00 Cohorts <sup>2</sup>	73.0%	75.0%	57.0%	54.0%	90.0%	93.0%	91.0%	81.0%	88.0%	88.0%
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class <sup>6</sup>	4.4%	3.6%	3.9%	2.8%	1.8%	4.6%	6.8%	6.0%	5.7%	5.1%
<b>ACCESS, Fall 2006</b>										
Total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>	1277	4873	1747	3497	1744	1958	1668	2030	1819	1648
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>	20.9%	13.5%	18.8%	6.9%	10.7%	22.4%	16.0%	13.6%	18.3%	11.8%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates <sup>6</sup>	98.3%	86.2%	90.3%	84.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.0%	99.1%	99.0%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment <sup>6</sup>	100.0%	86.0%	100.0%	99.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate <sup>7</sup>	\$23,650	\$6,084	\$10,312	\$3,811	NA	\$34,272	\$30,194	\$34,450	\$34,980	\$36,050
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY06 <sup>8</sup>	14%	6%	39%	15%	8%	18%	6%	9%	11%	8%
<b>EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES</b>										
E&G expenditures in FY06 per FTES <sup>1</sup>	\$ 33,083	\$ 11,836	\$ 19,901	\$ 18,486	\$ 38,192	\$ 41,819	\$ 39,423	\$ 38,309	\$ 42,937	\$ 37,502
Average alumni giving rate (2006) <sup>2</sup>	32.0%	26.0%	16.0%	7.0%	45.0%	64.0%	54.0%	39.0%	49.0%	43.0%
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures <sup>1</sup> (FY06)	44.2%	55.9%	30.7%	26.7%	81.2%	51.6%	46.4%	63.3%	56.9%	64.1%
Student-Faculty Ratio (2006) <sup>2</sup>	10 to 1	15 to 1	12 to 1	13 to 1	10 to 1	9 to 1	10 to 1	10 to 1	10 to 1	10 to 1
Academic libraries, FY2004 <sup>9</sup>										
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials:	333,384	366,938	199,208	387,513	676,988	694,536	611,926	499,575	598,077	808,005
Current Serial Subscriptions:	2,824	5,782	14,634	3,929	24,137	14,435	2,688	1,986	2,290	1,796
Librarians:	9	11	5	10	10	12	11	9	10	9
Total Staff:	28	34	14	35	35	37	32	34	49	29
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):	\$ 1,688	\$ 467	\$ 469	\$ 585	\$ 1,703	\$ 1,808	\$ 1,604	\$ 1,229	\$ 1,872	\$ 1,197

<sup>1</sup> FY06 Finance Report, IPEDS Website  
<sup>2</sup> America's Best Colleges 2008, USM&WR  
<sup>3</sup> Academic, March-April 2007  
<sup>4</sup> Median reported for average  
<sup>5</sup> Midpoint of 25th to 75th percentiles, Fall '06, IPEDS Website  
<sup>6</sup> Fall Enrollment Report 2006, IPEDS Website  
<sup>7</sup> Institutional Characteristics 2006, IPEDS Website  
<sup>8</sup> Student Financial Aid FY06, IPEDS Website  
<sup>9</sup> Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website

# Appendices



## **Appendix A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers at the University System of Maryland Institutions**

The process of selecting peers involved narrowing a long list of colleges and universities (approximately 3,600) to a medium-sized list (fewer than 250), then to a small group with key characteristics like those of the home institution (between 22 and 60). The institutions in the smaller group are termed funding peers. Ultimately, USM institutions were asked to choose 10 performance peers from their lists.

The narrowing process proceeded as follows:

1. Only public universities were considered.
2. Institutions were categorized by Carnegie classification.
3. Six sets of variables were mathematically analyzed for each institution. Examples of these variables include:
  - Size
  - Student mix
  - Non-state revenues
  - Program mix
  - Location (urban vs. rural)

The analysis provided a comparatively short list of institutions, which are most like each USM institution. From the narrowed list, each USM institution then selected 10 performance peers based on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives.

Below is a list of top criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

### **Bowie**

- SATs and/or ACT profiles
- Academic mission
- Types of programs
- General academic reputation
- Comparable student communities served

### **Coppin**

- Program mix, especially teacher preparation
- Size
- Geographic location

### **Frostburg**

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Size
- Program mix
- Geographic location

**Salisbury**

- Size
- Program mix
- Mission

**Towson**

- Size
- Student mix
- Geographic location

**University of Baltimore**

- Program mix
- Size
- Urban setting

**University of Maryland, Baltimore County**

- Size
- Mission, emphasis on science and technology
- Minority mix
- Exclusion of institutions with medical schools

**University of Maryland Eastern Shore**

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Program mix
- Minority mix

**University of Maryland University College**

- Percentage of students over the age of 25
- Institution ranking
- Type of delivery formats used – especially on-line distance education programs

**Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Core Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland FY 2007**

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
1	SAT score 25 <sup>th</sup> /75 <sup>th</sup> %ile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2006. For UMCP, institutionally reported composite values.	For all incoming freshmen, composite SAT score. For peer institutions which report ACT scores, ACT scores are converted to SAT. If institutions report both scores, the test which the greater number of students took is reported. For peers, the composite scores are derived by adding the SATM and SATV for both the 25 <sup>th</sup> & 75 <sup>th</sup> %iles. For UMCP, the percentiles are computed against actual composite scores.	Fall 2006
2	Percent minorities of all undergraduates	IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 2006
3	Percent African American of all undergraduates	IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2006
4	Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2007 edition UMCP data from 2008 edition.	The percentage of first-year freshmen who returned to the same college or university the following fall, averaged over the first-year classes entering between 2001 and 2004. UMCP peers are for classes entering between 2002 and 2005.	2001-2004 data 2002-2005 data
5	Six-year graduation rate	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2005 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2007 edition.	Six-year graduation rate, 1999 cohort (Sum of students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted cohort)	2005 (1999 cohort) 2006 (2000 cohort) for UMCP

6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2005 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2007 edition.	Minorities include African American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race. (Sum of minority students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted minority cohort)	2005 (1999 cohort) 2006 (2000 cohort) for UMCP
7	Six-year graduation rate: African Americans	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2005 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2007 edition.	Self-explanatory. (Sum of African American students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted African American cohort)	2005 (1999 cohort) 2006 (2000 cohort) for UMCP
8	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Title II website, State Report 2006 for individual states ( <a href="http://www.title2.org">http://www.title2.org</a> )	Summary pass rates are reported. These are defined as the proportion of program completers who passed all tests they took for their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas (basic skills; professional knowledge & pedagogy; academic content areas; teaching special populations; other content areas; and performance assessments). An individual is counted as a pass in the summary rate if they pass all required tests for any area in which they were prepared.	2004-2005 test takers
9	Passing rate in nursing licensure exam	Peer institutions	Number of BSN graduates in the Class of 2006 who pass the NCLEX examination on the first attempt divided by the number of graduates who took the exam.	2006 graduates
10	Passing rates in other licensure exams			
10a	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2008 edition	Percentage of 2005 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 2005 and Winter 2006 and passed on their first attempt. Pass rates are reported only for the jurisdiction in which the school had the largest number of first-time takers.	2005 graduates
10b	Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	Number of pharmacy graduates in the Class of 2006 who passed the NAPLEX on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2006 graduates

10c	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions & the Maryland Board of Social Work Examiners (new for FY 2007)	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 2005 divided by number of graduates who took the exam. For FSU: number of BSW graduates in the calendar year 2006 who passed the LCSW examination on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2005  2006 graduates
10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2006 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2006 divided by number of graduates from Dental School Class of 2006.	2006 graduates
10e	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Number who pass the 2006 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2006
11	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2007 edition (If data unavailable from U.S. News, source used: Council for Aid to Education, 2006 Voluntary Support of Education, 2007.)  UMCP data from 2008 edition.	Average percent of undergraduate alumni of record who donated money to the institution. Alumni of record are former full- or part-time students with an undergraduate degree for whom the institution has a current address. Undergraduate alumni donors made one or more gifts for either current operations or capital expenses during the specified academic year. The alumni giving rate is the number of appropriate donors during a given year divided by the number of appropriate alumni of record. The rates were averaged for 2004 and 2005. UMCP data from 2005 and 2006.	2004 & 2005 average  2005 & 2006 average
12	Total R & D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAAUDE.	Expenditures on R & D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMBI & UMCES. UMB figures include R & D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . <i>UMCP also excludes expenditures in the non-science &amp; engineering disciplines.</i>	FY2005  UMCP data: FY 2006

13	Total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R & D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary Survey (faculty counts); AAMC (for medical faculty for UMB & peers). UMCP data from AAAUDE.	Expenditures on R & D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMBI & UMCES. UMB figures are R & D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . <i>UMCP also excludes expenditures in the non-science &amp; engineering disciplines</i> . Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from AAUP for institutions other than UMB. For UMB and peers, faculty are full-time medical faculty whose assignments are for instruction or research. For UMB, faculty counts are taken from AAMC figures.	FY2005  UMCP data: FY 2006
14	Average annual percent growth (5-yr.) in federal R & D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAAUDE.	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R & D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY2000 through FY2005. (Figures for UMBI are over 4-years.) Excludes federally financed expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures include federally financed R & D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . <i>UMCP also excludes expenditures in the non-science &amp; engineering disciplines</i> .	FY2000 – FY2005 (UMBI: FY 2001 – FY 2005)  UMCP data: FY 2006
15	Number of faculty awards per 100 faculty (5 yrs.)	USM data base (built from national publications and databases) & AAUP	The total number of awards per 100 full-time instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor over the 5-year period from 2003 through 2007. Awards counted: Fulbrights, Guggenheims, NEH fellowships, CAREER (Young Investigator) awards, and Sloan fellowships. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts.	2003 – 2007
16	Institution-specific measures			

**Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution Specific Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland 2007**

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
BSU				
1	percent faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition, 2006	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2005-2006 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2007 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2005 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2006	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2006
4	Total R & D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation and AAUP	Average dollars spent on R & D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per core faculty (full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty)	FY2005
CSU				
1	percent faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition, 2006	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2005-2006 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2007 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2005 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2006	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2006
4	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2006 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2006
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	<i>IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2006 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2005</i>	State appropriation divided by FTES. State appropriation is from the Finance Survey, and FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey. FTES is calculated as FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount.	FY2006 state appropriation, Fall 2005 (FY2006) enrollment

FSU							
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2006 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2006			
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition, 2006	The percentage of full-time who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	2005-2006 faculty			
SU							
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2007 edition	The ratio of admitted first-time, first-year, degree-seeking students to total applicants. Total applicants include students who meet all requirements to be considered for admission AND who were notified of an admission decision.	Fall 2005 freshmen			
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition, 2006	The percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	2005-2006 faculty			
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – Fall Enrollment & Fall Staff	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty.	Fall 2006			
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2005			
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2006 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2005	State appropriation divided by FTES. State appropriation is from the Finance Survey, and FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey. FTES is calculated as FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount.	FY 2006 state appropriation, Fall 2005 (FY 2006) enrollment			
TU							
1	percent undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007 edition	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2005 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2005			
2	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report, 2007 edition	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time instructional faculty. Undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants are not counted as faculty.	Fall 2005			
3	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2007 edition	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the number of freshmen admitted	Fall 2005 freshmen			



UB						
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, FY2006, Part C, line 02, col. 1	Total dollars expended for research			FY2006
2	percent part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Staff Counts, 2006; U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007	Percentage of instructional faculty who are not employed full-time			Fall 2006
UMB						
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire				FY 2005
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire				FY 2005
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire				FY 2005
4	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.			Fall 2006
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional			Fall 2006
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory			Fall 2006

UMBC						
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY2006 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer Engineering; Electrical, Electronics & Communication.			FY2006
2	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R & D expenditures	AUTM, National Science Foundation	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. Number of invention disclosures, no matter how comprehensive, counted by institution (AUTM) divided by \$million in R & D expenditures (NSF) from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources			FY2005
3	Ratio of FTE students/ FT instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey; IPEDS, Faculty Salary Survey	Ratio of FTE students (FT + 1/3 PT) to FT instructional faculty at all ranks for Fall 2006.			Fall 2006
4	Federal R & D expenditures per FT faculty	NSF, AAUP	Federally financed R & D expenditures per FT instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate professor & assistant professor.			FY 2005
5	Rank in ratio of license agreements to \$Mil. R & D	AUTM, Table 3	Self explanatory. Licenses & options executed.			FY 2005

UMCP	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation	National Research Council, <i>U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success</i>	Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation by one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 25 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.	Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area as of March 2007
2	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation	National Research Council, <i>U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success</i>	Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation in one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 15 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.	Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area as of March 2007
3	percent change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies	USM database	The percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in three national academies (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and National Academy of Sciences), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.	2003-2007
4	Number of invention disclosures per \$100M in R & D	Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), National Science Foundation (NSF)	The number of invention disclosures reported by the institution to AUTM, per each \$100 million in TOTAL research and development (R & D) expenditures reported for the institution by NSF.	FY 2005
5	Number of degrees awarded to African American students	IPEDS Completions survey via AAUDE	The number of undergraduate degrees awarded to African American students	Academic Year 2006

UMES							
1	percent faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2007, edition, 2006	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2005-2006 faculty			
2	IT degrees as percent of all bachelor's degrees	NCES, IPEDS, Completions, 2006	Bachelor's degrees in CIP codes 11.0101 through 11.9999 as a percentage of all bachelor's degrees awarded.	July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006			
3	Loan default rate	Peers	The students who fail to repay their education loans as required by the loan agreement as a percentage of all students who have taken such loans for the cohort year.	FY 2004			
UMUC							
1	Number of African Americans of all IT graduates	MAITI report for UMUC; IPEDS completion data for peer institutions	Number of graduates of IT (MAITI) undergraduate programs who are African American. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), and electrical engineering (CIP 14.10).	FY 2006			
2	percent of undergraduate students who are 25 and older	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Percent of undergraduate students who are older than 25 years of age	Fall 2006			
3	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields	IPEDS, Completions survey	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204).	FY 2006			
4	Number of statewide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2007			
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2007			

**Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: Morgan State University 2007**

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer Data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Data Used</i>
1. Percent students on federal grants	IPEDS, Morgan State University/MHEC Financial Aid System	The percentage of undergraduate students receiving federal grants	Academic Year 2004-2005
2. Second year retention rate of all students	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) – Enrollment Information System (EIS), Degree Information System (DIS).  IPEDS, US News and World Report, America’s Best Colleges 2004, Peer Institutions	The percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2004 cohort unless otherwise noted
3. Second year retention rate of African Americans	MHEC- EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	The percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking African Americans undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2005 cohort unless otherwise noted
4. Second year retention rate of minorities	MHEC- EIS, DIS, Peer Institutions	In this context, the term “minorities” refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.  The percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduate that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2005 cohort unless otherwise noted
5. Six-year graduation rate of all students	MHEC- EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Peer Institutions	The percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking undergraduates that graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort unless otherwise noted
6. Six-year graduation rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Peer Institutions	The percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking African American undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1999 unless otherwise noted

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Data Used
7. Six-year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC- EIS, DIS, IPEDS, Peer Institutions, Education Trust	In this context, the term “minorities” refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups. The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort unless otherwise noted
8. Number of Doctorates awarded to women	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS.	Self-explanatory	2006 Graduates
9. Number of Doctorates awarded to Blacks	IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions. MSU/MHEC DIS IPEDS	Self-explanatory	2006 Graduates
10. Number of Bachelor’s in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) awarded to Blacks	IPEDS	Number of Bachelor’s Degrees awarded to blacks in the following CIP codes: 01,03,04,1,1,14,15,26,27,40,41,51.	2006 Graduates
11. Percent Full-Time Faculty with terminal Degree	US New and World Report Ultimate College Guide 2006 Edition Peer Institutions	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctoral or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2006
12. Research Expenditures	IPEDS		Fiscal Year 2005
13. Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of previous fiscal year.	MSU Budget Office IPEDS Peer Institution	Self Explanatory	Fiscal Year 2004-2005
14. Alumni giving	MSU Development Office Peer institutions	Percent of Morgan’s graduates who made contributions to the University during a fiscal year. The base for deriving the percentage is the total number of graduates for whom good contact information is available.	Most current year available
15. PRAXIS or NES pass rate	MSU Department of Teacher Education Title II website ( <a href="http://www.title2.org">http://www.title2.org</a> )	Summary pass rates are reported. An individual is counted as a pass in the summary rate if he or she passed all required tests for any area in which he or she was prepared.	2004-2005 data

**Appendix E. Operational Definitions For Performance Indicators: St. Mary's College Of Maryland 2007**

	<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Date Used</i>
1	Amount in total research spending, FY 2006	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2006
2	Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degrees	US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Percentage of full-time faculty who hold a terminal degree	2008 edition
3	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Academe	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	March-April 2007
4	Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor)	Academe	Interpolated percentile of average full-time faculty salary as compared to national salaries	March-April 2007
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Midpoint of 25 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles	2006
6	25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	25 <sup>th</sup> – 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile SAT total scores of entering freshmen	2006
7	Acceptance rate	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2006 applicants who were admitted	2006
8	Yield ratio	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2006 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	2006
9	Second year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who re-enrolled the subsequent year	2008 edition

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Date Used</i>
10 Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Average six-year graduation rate for all students	2008 edition
11 Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	IPEDS enrollment report	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	2006
12 Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	2006
13 Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of minorities of the total enrollment with race known, non resident aliens are excluded	2006
14 Percent of full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time	2006
15 Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	2006
16 Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Annual tuition and fees for full-time in-state undergraduate student	2006
17 Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal government	IPEDS Student Financial Aid report	Percentage of full-time freshmen receiving federal grant aid	2006
18 E&G expenditures per FTES	IPEDS Finance report; IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	FY 2006 total education and general expenditures and transfers divided by Fall '05 FTE students	FY 2006
19 Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Percentage of solicited alumni who gave to an institution	2008



<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Date Used</i>
20 Tuition and fees revenue as percent of E&G expenditures	IPEDS Finance report	Current funds revenues from tuition and fees as a percent of FY 2006 total education and general expenditures and transfers	2006
21 Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty	2008 edition
22 Academic libraries	Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website	As provided on NCES website	FY2004