



# **Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis**

**University System of Maryland**

**Morgan State University**

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

**March 2009**

## MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

Kevin M. O’Keefe, Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Joshua Ackerman

Joann A. Boughman

Mark R. Frazer

Anwer Hasan

Leronia A. Josey

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> .....	
<b>Background</b> .....	
<b>Performance Measures for University System of Maryland and Morgan State University</b> .....	
<b>St. Mary’s College of Maryland Quality Profile</b> .....	
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures .....	
Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures .....	
Table 3. St. Mary’s College of Maryland Performance Measures .....	
<b>Peer Performance Analysis</b>	
Bowie State University .....	
Coppin State University .....	
Frostburg State University .....	
Salisbury University .....	
Towson University .....	
University of Baltimore .....	
University of Maryland, Baltimore .....	
University of Maryland Baltimore County .....	
University of Maryland, College Park .....	
University of Maryland Eastern Shore .....	
University of Maryland University College .....	
Morgan State University .....	
St. Mary’s College of Maryland .....	
<b>Appendix A. Peer Performance Selection Methodology for USM Institutions</b> .....	
<b>Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Core Performance Measures: USM</b> .....	
<b>Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution Specific Performance Measures: USM</b> .....	
<b>Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: Morgan State Univ.</b> .....	
<b>Appendix E. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: St. Mary’s College</b> .....	

## **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 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 more reflective of each institution's role and mission.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators and also assessed performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. 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 demonstrating 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 base 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 was 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 year, MHEC staff updated peer groups for institutions participating in the funding guidelines to account for changes over time, including a recent major revision to the Carnegie Classification system.

To select the new peers, public four-year colleges and universities within the same Carnegie Classification as the Maryland institution were run through the variations used in the peer selection model. The peer selection process entails running statistical “clusters” of peer institutions for each Maryland college or university. Peers are selected using a least-squares selection process. A number of variables are used to select candidates for the funding peer groups. Five variations are used for most institutions and consist of variables including enrollment; composition of the student population by race, full-or part-time status and level in which enrolled; funding per FTE; degrees awarded by discipline; and institutional distances from an urban center. An additional variation (Variation IVA) is also used for each Historically Black Institution to provide a list that is not too heavily populated with other HBIs. This variation consists of total headcount, part-time students as a percent of total and baccalaureate degrees as a percent of total degrees. The 20 institutions closest to the Maryland institution in each variable are chosen as peers, for a total of 50 to 60 peer institutions.

This performance accountability report summarizes the performance of Maryland public four-year institutions in comparison with their funding peers. The presidents of each Maryland institution, except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University, select ten performance peers from their list of funding peers. The presidents base 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.

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 2009 represents the ninth year the funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. As funding guidelines continue to evolve, so too does the assessment of institutional performance.

#### Data Availability

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 always 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. 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 many 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. These differences make comparisons difficult.

#### Assessing Institution Performance

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Commission staff also assess institutional performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. In instances where an institution's performance was below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will be taking to improve performance. An exception was made for an institution demonstrating 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.

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

There are fifteen core performance 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. Appendix B lists the operational definitions for each core performance 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.

### **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, the comparison group for St. Mary's includes private institutions.

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 St. Mary's 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. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. % 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	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	
9. Pass rate on nursing licensure exam		•		•	•		•				
10. Pass rates on other licensure exams <sup>2</sup>											
10a.			SW <sup>2</sup>				SW				
10b.						Law	Law				
10c.							Med				
10d.							Dent.				
11. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Total R&D expenditures <sup>5</sup>							•	•	•	•	
13. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty <sup>5</sup>	•						•	•	•	•	
14. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures <sup>5</sup>							•	•	•	•	
15. # 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> Comparable peer data are not available. Data for USM institutions.

<sup>4</sup> University of North Carolina System's schools will be used for peer comparison

<sup>5</sup> For institutions other than UMB, peer's medical R&D expenditures will be excluded.

<sup>6</sup> Social Work

**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 Quality Profile**

---

**Measure<sup>1</sup>**

---

*QUALITY / SELECTIVITY*

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

*RETENTION, GRADUATION AND ACCESS*

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

*EFFICIENCY/ RESOURCES*

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 of nine core performance measures. The percentages of all minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates greatly well surpass peer averages. Bowie's second-year retention rate is the same as last year's rate (72 percent) and is 3.1 percentage points higher than the peer average. While the overall six-year graduation rate dropped by almost one point to 36.8 percent this year, it is 5.9 percentage points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for all minorities, as well as that of African Americans, dropped slightly, but both continue to exceed peer averages. Bowie reports a 98 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams, nine points higher than last year's rate and 5.6 points above the peer average.

The university is slightly below peer performance on two core measures. After rising over the past two years, Bowie's incoming freshmen SAT scores for the 25<sup>th</sup> – 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles dropped back to 2005 levels and are lower than its peers: 800-930 compared to a peer average of 808-984. At five percent, the university's undergraduate alumni giving rate is 1.3 percentage points below the peer average.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate and yield rate. Seventy-eight percent of full-time faculty holds terminal degrees, an increase of three percentage points over last year (comparisons can't be made to peers on this measure since a majority did not report data). Bowie's average acceptance rate is 44 percent, making it more selective than peers, which have a 71 percent acceptance rate. The yield rate (percent of students who accept enrollment offers) remains unchanged from last year (42 percent) and is 6.7 points lower than peer rates. Research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty have dropped somewhat and are \$4.4 million below the peer average.

Commission staff commends Bowie for its significant improvement on teacher licensure exam pass rates. It asks Bowie to comment on the declining SAT scores of its freshman class and the drop in R&D expenditures per full-time faculty. Bowie should also comment on the fact that its average undergraduate alumni giving rate remains below the peer average.

### **Institution's Response**

#### SAT Scores

In attempting to meet its goals to offer access to a quality and affordable education for a diverse clientele, Bowie State University offers a comprehensive summer program which provides unique opportunities for those students who fall short of our admissions criteria, but who show academic promise as exemplified through their high school academic efforts. These students are admitted to the University when they successfully pass modules in English, reading, math and science. While the yield from this program has historically been around 80 percent, their subsequent admittance to the University has had a negative impact on the SAT score of our freshman class. It should be noted that the University is making strides to improve these rates. As of fall 2008, the SAT scores show an average increase (verbal & math) from 870 to 882 and a percentile increase from 800-930 to 800-950.

### R&D Expenditures

The decrease in R&D expenditures listed appears to be caused by the expiration of awards or grants over the past years. BSU recently reorganized and expanded its Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) under the leadership of Dr. Joan Langdon. With our new renovation/reorganization, the University has more than doubled its square footage and has also increased its staff. We anticipate that our new ORSP office and operation will serve to encourage our faculty and staff to become more active in applying for grants and that they will also become more competitive upon applying for some of the newer awards now available through the University System of Maryland.

### Alumni Giving Rates

The current number of alumni who give to Bowie State University has increased to more than 1700. While there was a decrease during the reported years of 2005 and 2007, the University realized an increase in 2008. This is largely attributable to the leadership of our new University President, Dr. Mickey L. Burnim. This new number represents an increase of 10 percent to our alumni base. Last year (2008), the University met and exceeded its target of \$1.5 million by June 30, the end of our fiscal year.

**Bowie State University**  
**Peer Performance Data, 2008**

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
Bowie State U.	800-930	93.2%	89.7%	72%	36.8%	37.0%	36.8%	98%
Alabama A&M U.	780-910	95.8%	95.1%	69%	33.5%	33.6%	33.7%	98%
Alabama State U.	690-900	97.8%	97.4%	63%	28.8%	29.1%	29.0%	88%
Auburn U., Montgomery	870-1030	35.3%	31.5%	NA	28.8%	23.0%	23.4%	98%
California State U., Bakersfield	810-1050	54.0%	8.2%	78%	41.5%	38.4%	18.6%	97%
Columbus State U.	890-1110	39.3%	33.4%	71%	33.8%	32.8%	31.7%	97%
Indiana U., Southeast	840-1050	8.0%	4.9%	64%	28.8%	NA	NA	94%
New Jersey City U.	870-970	60.3%	18.6%	74%	32.2%	27.4%	25.7%	95%
Norfolk State U.	790-940	91.5%	88.5%	66%	29.6%	29.6%	29.7%	80%
Prairie View A & M U.	740-930	95.7%	89.7%	66%	37.6%	38.0%	38.1%	84%
Sul Ross State U.	NA	68.8%	4.5%	NA	14.6%	18.0%	4.5%	93%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>808-984</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>92%</b>

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	BSU institution-specific indicators			
		% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)
Bowie State U.	5%	78%	44%	42%	\$13,363
Alabama A&M U.	NA	NA	43%	43%	\$54,871
Alabama State U.	11%	65%	99%	26%	\$10,920
Auburn U., Montgomery	4%	NA	98%	60%	\$0
California State U., Bakersfield	5%	NA	NA	37%	\$7,733
Columbus State U.	11%	74%	57%	59%	\$0
Indiana U., Southeast	7%	73%	88%	69%	\$0
New Jersey City U.	5%	83%	49%	49%	\$0
Norfolk State U.	NA	NA	71%	42%	\$22,077
Prairie View A & M U.	1%	NA	60%	53%	\$53,408
Sul Ross State U.	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$28,774
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>\$17,778</b>

NA - Data not available

## **Coppin State University**

Coppin State University exceeds or matches the performance of its peers on six of ten core performance measures. The percentages of all minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates are well above peer averages. Although the second-year retention rate dropped from 67 percent to 65 percent since 2007, it matches that of peers. Coppin's teacher and nursing licensure exam pass rates improved substantially over last year's performance and both top peer averages: teacher licensure rates increased to 100 percent, while nursing licensure pass rates improved to 87 percent. The average alumni giving rate held steady at seven percent, just above that of peers.

Coppin under-performs the peer average on four core measures. Coppin's 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentile SAT scores of 790-900 are below the peer average of 868-1035. The six-year graduation rate for all students was 18.2 percent, a two point drop from last year's rate and 12.8 points below the peer average (Coppin used a different set of peers for comparison last year, and although its graduation rate was below that peer average, it wasn't down by as much). In addition, minority student graduation rates fell this year by 2.1 points to 17.6 percent, 10.4 points below the peer average. African American students' graduation rates are down 1.4 points, 9.3 points below the peer average.

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 selected peers. For example, approximately 55 percent of full-time faculty at Coppin holds terminal degrees, which is 15.3 percentage points below its peer average. Coppin's acceptance rate is lower than that of peers, making it more selective. Yield rates are also lower than peer averages. Coppin's student to faculty ratio is higher than its peer average (20.8 compared to the peer average of 16.0). State appropriations per FTES are \$1.9 million above the peer average.

The Commission staff commends Coppin for this year's significant improvement on teacher and nursing licensure exam pass rates. The university should comment on the decline in SAT scores of its freshman class, as well as its continuing drop in graduation rates. Coppin should also comment on the fact that it is under-performing peers on percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees and yield rate

### **Institution's Response**

Coppin State University (CSU) average SAT scores had remained relatively flat in the past years (849 in 2006 and 850 in 2007). Even though CSU SAT score is lower than its peers, as an institution whose mission is to serve first-generation students, the University is exploring different strategies to provide access to students whose SAT scores are low but have relative high school GPA.

Turning around the declining graduation rates is the immediate institutional priority of CSU. Administrative realignment has been achieved with the hiring of a new Vice President for



Enrollment Management. Several initiatives have been taken to help increase retention and graduation rates. In August 2008, CSU signed as an institutional member of the Foundation of Excellence in the First College Year headed by Dr. John Gardner of the Policy Center on the First Year of College. Participation in this selective program will provide CSU important feedback useful to the University as it plans and implements programs and initiatives to increase student retention and graduation rates.

CSU plans to create a *Center for Student Success* that includes all university units that directly support the success of first- and second- year students, including academic advising, Academic Resource Center, the First and Second Year College, University Honors College, and TRIO Programs.

In order to improve teaching and learning, CSU will continue to recruit high caliber faculty in order to increase the percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees. While the percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees is 55 percent, retirement and resignation are contributing factors for the decline. CSU will continue to monitor this indicator.

**Coppin State University**  
**Peer Performance Data, 2008**

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
Coppin U.	790-900	86.9%	86.3%	65%	18.2%	17.6%	17.9%	100%	87%
Albany State U.	840-960	94.3%	93.7%	79%	42.3%	42.5%	42.5%	NA	100%
Alcorn State U.	780-950	91.7%	91.0%	70%	45.3%	45.6%	45.7%	100%	87%
Augusta State U.	860-1070	33.6%	27.1%	66%	22.8%	17.6%	15.7%	99%	82%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	NA	94.7%	94.0%	59%	29.2%	29.3%	29.6%	100%	NP
Henderson State U.	950-1140	22.6%	19.6%	60%	27.7%	24.5%	24.7%	100%	80%
Louisiana State U., Shreveport	950-1110	26.8%	21.4%	58%	21.8%	15.7%	14.5%	100%	NP
Nicholls State U.	910-1070	22.6%	18.1%	65%	25.8%	13.3%	12.4%	100%	81%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	840-1020	51.3%	27.5%	69%	37.6%	38.0%	44.2%	96%	92%
Virginia State U.	810-960	95.6%	94.5%	72%	42.6%	42.5%	42.7%	91%	80%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	52.5%	3.7%	52%	15.3%	11.3%	0.0%	NA	86%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>868-1035</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>49.1%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>86%</b>

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	CSC institution-specific indicators				
		% of F-T faculty with terminal degrees	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	FTE students per F-T faculty	State appropriation per FTE student
Coppin U.	7%	55%	46%	33%	20.8	\$9,483
Albany State U.	NA	62%	NA	51%	19.5	\$6,260
Alcorn State U.	4%	65%	59%	23%	15.4	\$8,246
Augusta State U.	4%	66%	52%	76%	16.9	\$5,356
Cheyney U. of Penn.	4%	67%	56%	NA	15.8	\$7,839
Henderson State U.	8%	93%	60%	37%	7.2	\$6,150
Louisiana State U., Shreveport	NA	NA	79%	35%	18.7	\$5,016
Nicholls State U.	9%	56%	87%	67%	18.7	\$5,413
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	7%	66%	84%	45%	15.6	\$11,037
Virginia State U.	10%	87%	78%	33%	16.5	\$9,024
Western New Mexico U.	NA	NA	100%	NA	15.5	\$11,540
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>72.8%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>\$7,588</b>

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

## Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University exceeds average peer performance on seven of ten core performance measures. Minority student enrollment as a proportion of total undergraduate enrollment (23.7 percent) is 11.4 percentage points above the peer average and African Americans as a percent of total undergraduates (19.6 percent) is 14.5 percentage points above the peer average. Both have increased by three percentage points over the past year. The university's six-year graduation rate remains steady at 47 percent, slightly higher than its peer average of 46.1 percent. Six-year graduation rates of minorities (44.1 percent) and African Americans (50.0 percent) are both up from 2007 rates and are higher than peer averages (the minority rate is 1.4 points higher than the average while that of African American students is 16.5 points higher). Frostburg's teacher licensure exam pass rate is 99 percent, three points above the peer average. The BSW social work licensing exam is 82 percent (can't be compared because peer rates are not available). The alumni giving rate has increased to 13 percent from 10 percent in 2007 and is now 2.9 percentage points above the peer rate.

The university performs below the average of its peers on two core measures. Frostburg has enrolled students with lower SAT scores in recent years with current SAT scores in the 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile at 860-1060 in comparison to the peer average of 900-1102. The second-year retention rate is 72 percent, 2.8 percentage points below that of its peers.

Frostburg includes two institution-specific indicators. On one, student-faculty ratio, it compares favorably to its peers: 19 to 1 versus a peer average of 22 to 1. On the other measure, it underperforms the peer average: 84 percent of Frostburg's faculty has terminal degrees compared to 88 percent of peers.

Commission staff commends Frostburg on increasing enrollment diversity and the improvement in the graduation rate of African Americans as well as that of all minorities. Frostburg should comment on the decreasing second-year retention rate and the fact that SAT scores of the entering class are slightly below those of its peers. It should also comment on its percentage of faculty with terminal degrees being below peer average. In terms of missing data for MSW social work licensure exam pass rates, the Commission recognizes that the university has exhausted its efforts to obtain the data this year without success.

### Institution's Response

The decrease in Frostburg State University's retention rate is partially attributed to an increase in the number of academic dismissals and voluntary withdrawals of first-time undergraduate students who were initially enrolled in the 2004 cohort. Regardless, the second-year retention rate has been consistent over the last four reporting periods.

<b>Frostburg State University</b>					
	<b>2002 cohort</b>	<b>2003 cohort</b>	<b>2004 cohort</b>	<b>2005 cohort</b>	<b>Average<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Second-year Retention Rate</b>	70%	74%	71%	72%	72%

Data Source: Maryland Higher Education Commission<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Average second-year retention rate is based on data from fall 2002 to fall 2005.

Frostburg continues to monitor and improve upon strategies that enhance the retention rate of all its students. These strategies include the University's expanded Learning Community Program, which links students in a set of courses that explore a common theme, career path, and/or potential major; the Phoenix Program, which provides intensive support for those students facing dismissal following their first semester; the Center for Advising and Career Services, which combines services that together provide essential support for undecided students; and the University's academic support services and monitoring programs offered through the Office of Student Support Services that include tutoring, math support, study groups, peer mentoring, academic advising, career development, and assistance with the financial aid process.

Frostburg continues to attract students with strong academic credentials who are committed to successfully completing a baccalaureate degree. Consistent with its Mission<sup>3</sup>, the University places a great emphasis on providing access to higher education for qualified Maryland residents. However, it must also maintain a balance between this goal and the level of academic preparation of its applicants. The University grants admission on the basis of high school grade point average (GPA), SAT performance, completion of a college preparatory program, optional letters of recommendation, and an optional admissions essay. Although Frostburg's first-time students have SAT scores that are slightly below those of its peers, the University recognizes that combined SAT percentiles are but one reflection of an applicant pool. The University has achieved great success in serving students with high school GPAs that are stronger than their SAT scores.

The University has been experiencing an increase in retirements of senior faculty. As these faculty members retire, there has also been a rise in the number of junior faculty appointments who are in the process of finishing the requirements for their terminal degree. Frostburg has had great success in recruiting talented young faculty who then complete the terminal degree as a condition of their eligibility for promotion and tenure.

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on the percentage of first-time full-time undergraduates who re-enrolled at Frostburg State University one year after matriculation, as reported by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

<sup>3</sup> Frostburg State University. Mission Statement. 2005. <http://www.frostburg.edu/about/missionstatement.htm>.

**Frostburg State University  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

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>	undergraduate alumni giving rate
Frostburg State U.	860-1060	23.7%	19.6%	72%	47.0%	44.1%	50.0%	99%	82%	13%
Bridgewater State C.	910-1110	9.8%	5.4%	76%	50.6%	44.1%	46.3%	95%	NA	10%
Clarion U. of Penn.	840-1050	7.0%	5.2%	74%	52.5%	31.9%	35.2%	93%	NA	14%
Penn.	880-1060	11.8%	4.7%	77%	52.3%	35.0%	32.4%	94%	NA	13%
Indiana U., South Bend	830-1050	12.5%	6.8%	65%	25.3%	12.5%	13.3%	98%	100%	9%
Mass. U. of, Dartmouth	960-1140	12.6%	6.7%	76%	48.2%	40.5%	35.4%	98%	NA	11%
Rhode Island C.	860-1080	14.0%	5.7%	77%	44.9%	27.7%	22.2%	95%	NA	10%
Sonoma State U.	920-1120	19.6%	2.3%	79%	50.8%	50.7%	41.7%	99%	NA	1%
Plattsburgh	950-1150	11.1%	4.8%	77%	51.0%	37.7%	44.2%	97%	NA	11%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	950-1160	7.6%	2.4%	76%	48.3%	22.2%	36.4%	97%	NA	15%
Western Connecticut State U.	900-1100	17.5%	6.6%	71%	36.7%	25.0%	27.9%	97%	NA	7%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>900-1102</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>46.1%</b>	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>10.1%</b>

University	FSU institution-specific indicators	
	FTES per full-time faculty	% of faculty with terminal degrees
Frostburg State U.	19	84%
Bridgewater State C.	27	90%
Clarion U. of Penn.	23	93%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	20	79%
Indiana U., South Bend	20	68%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	21	86%
Rhode Island C.	20	91%
Sonoma State U.	28	99%
Plattsburgh	21	91%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	16	91%
Western Connecticut State U.	24	88%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>88%</b>

**NA - Data not available**

<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 graduates.

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

## Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds its peers on nine of ten core performance indicators. Entering freshmen SAT scores in the 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile range are among the highest in the peer group (1030-1200 compared to peer group average of 970-1160). Salisbury's percentages of minority and African American undergraduate students are 17.0 percent and 11.3 percent respectively; both exceed peer averages. The second-year retention rate has been the same for the past three years: 81 percent, which is two percentage points higher than the peer average. Salisbury's overall six-year graduation rate of 69.9 percent is two percentage points above the peer average. Minority and African American graduation rates have declined since last year. The minority rate is 53.3 percent (down from 57.6 percent), while that of African Americans is 56.3 percent (down from 60 percent). Despite the drop, both rates remain above peer averages: 7.8 points higher for all minority students and 14.6 points for African American students. The average alumni giving rate increased by three points to 12 percent, putting Salisbury 2.4 points above peers on this measure.

The university compares unfavorably to peers on one core performance measure: pass rate on teacher licensure exams. The university's 92 percent pass rate, although up slightly, still falls short of the peer average by five points.

Salisbury's pass rate on nursing licensing exams rose from 83 percent to 90 percent this year. However, comparisons to peers cannot be made because 40 percent have no nursing program.

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 55 percent compared to a peer average of 62 percent. Eighty percent of Salisbury faculty holds a terminal degree, lower than the peer average of 87 percent. The student-faculty ratio is 16.5 to 1, better than the 18.8 to 1 peer average. The average high school GPA for entering freshmen of 3.4 is just above the average. And while Salisbury's state appropriations per FTE increased over last year's amount, it remains below the peer average by \$2,158 per FTE.

Commission staff commends Salisbury on improving diversity and overall graduation rates. The university has described previously some of the initiatives to improve teacher licensure exam pass rates; the Commission requests an update in view of Salisbury's under-performance relative to peers. Salisbury should also comment on the declining percent of faculty holding a terminal degree and total state appropriations per FTES, both of which are below peer averages.

### **Institution's Response**

#### Teacher Licensure Pass Rate:

Salisbury University's pass rate for the PRAXIS II, 92 percent, represents a 1 percent increase from the previous year. This marks the second consecutive year this pass rate has increased. In 2006, the University implemented a number of initiatives (e.g., mapping of PRAXIS content to curriculum, PRAXIS workshops, optimal timing of taking the PRAXIS, etc.) to move current

rates closer to our peer average, 97 percent. Moreover, beginning with May 2010 graduates, Salisbury University will require students seeking a professional education degree to pass the PRAXIS II prior to their graduation. This will result in a teacher licensure pass rate of 100 percent.

It is noteworthy that Maryland requires examinees to attain certain scores on the PRAXIS II to achieve teacher licensure, while several of SU's peers do not use the PRAXIS II as their teacher licensure examination. Thus, comparability (i.e., difficulty, reliability, validity, etc.) of the exams and pass rates among these institutions is questionable. Additionally, those states that do require the PRAXIS II may have lower cut scores or have different PRAXIS sections associated with passing the exam than Maryland. As a result, it is virtually impossible to compare pass rates of Salisbury University students to those of our peers.

#### Declining Percent of Faculty Holding a Terminal Degree:

The percentage of Salisbury University faculty holding a terminal degree declined for fiscal 2007 from 82 percent to 80 percent. Averaged over the past five years, Salisbury University has been funded at only 80 percent of the MHEC funding guideline. This adversely impacts the University's ability to attract and retain faculty. For instance, in fiscal 2007, Salisbury faculty salaries were at the 57<sup>th</sup>, 56<sup>th</sup>, and 77<sup>th</sup> percentiles for professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively; far below the USM Board of Regents 85<sup>th</sup> percentile target of the AAUP average salaries for Master's II-A institutions. This is even more disconcerting when this data is compared to last year's, where faculty salaries were at the 62<sup>nd</sup>, 59<sup>th</sup>, and 74<sup>th</sup> percentiles. SU has lost ground at the senior ranks and improved slightly at the assistant level due to market pressure.

In fiscal 2006, approximately 30 searches for tenure track faculty were conducted to fill fiscal 2007 positions. Due to the delayed release of funds for enrollment growth searches, 13 of the searches were postponed until spring 2006. This delay put the University at a disadvantage in job market because well-qualified potential applicants likely accepted positions with other institutions earlier in the academic year. Indeed, 7 of these 30 positions, or 23 percent, were not filled with tenure track faculty.

#### State Appropriations per FTES:

In fiscal 2007, Salisbury received \$4,957 per FTES from the state as compared to an average state appropriation of \$7,115 for its peers. Among its peers, Salisbury University has the second lowest state appropriation per FTES, or an average shortfall of \$2,158 per FTES. With an FTES headcount of 6,643, Salisbury falls \$14.3 million dollars below the peer average in terms of its state appropriation.

This underfunding has put a serious financial strain on the University. Perhaps of greatest concern is the effect on Salisbury's ability to fund need-based financial aid. Indeed, Salisbury students' average debt load in fiscal 2007 increased almost \$2,500 to \$18,330. As noted in the response to question 2, this underfunding may also be impacting the University's efforts to attract and retain well-qualified faculty and staff. Moreover, Salisbury is finding it increasingly difficult to adequately staff many support operations.

# Salisbury University

## Peer Performance Data, 2008

University	SAT 25th- 75th percentile	% 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
Salisbury U.	1030-1200	17.0%	11.3%	81%	69.9%	53.3%	56.3%	92%	90%
Bloomsburg U. of Penn.	920-1100	10.2%	6.6%	81%	63.4%	37.3%	30.6%	94%	80%
Mass., U. of, Dartmouth	960-1140	12.6%	6.7%	76%	48.2%	40.5%	35.4%	98%	84%
Millersville U. of Penn.	950-1150	12.6%	7.0%	81%	63.3%	49.2%	53.8%	97%	NP
N.Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1060-1240	11.0%	5.4%	85%	65.1%	56.3%	64.4%	99%	92%
Northern Iowa, U. of	990-1190	5.8%	2.6%	81%	67.1%	52.0%	46.3%	NA	NP
Sonoma State U.	920-1120	19.6%	2.3%	79%	50.8%	50.7%	41.7%	99%	96%
Southeast Missouri State U.	910-1150	11.0%	8.7%	70%	49.3%	38.4%	36.1%	92%	86%
SUNY, C. at Oswego	1030-1170	9.7%	3.8%	77%	52.0%	51.0%	50.0%	97%	NP
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	950-1150	11.1%	4.8%	77%	51.0%	37.7%	44.2%	97%	NA
SUNY, Fredonia	1010-1190	7.4%	2.7%	85%	62.4%	42.0%	14.3%	97%	NP
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>970-1160</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>57.3%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>88%</b>

University	undergraduate alumni giving rate	SU institution-specific indicators				
		Acceptance rate	% of faculty w terminal degrees	Ratio of FTEs to FTEF	Average HS GPA	Total state appropriation/FTEs
Salisbury U.	12%	55%	80%	16.5	3.4	\$4,957
Bloomsburg U. of Penn.	12%	60%	86%	19.7	3.3	\$4,627
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	11%	67%	86%	17.5	3.1	\$7,953
Millersville U. of Penn.	9%	56%	95%	20.2	NA	\$5,499
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	11%	62%	86%	19.8	3.7	\$8,439
Northern Iowa, U. of	13%	78%	80%	17.4	NA	\$7,939
Sonoma State U.	1%	69%	99%	21.0	NA	\$8,160
Southeast Missouri State U.	7%	69%	79%	19.9	3.2	\$5,386
SUNY, C. at Oswego	12%	52%	83%	20.0	3.3	\$6,900
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	11%	54%	91%	16.7	3.1	\$7,891
SUNY, Fredonia	9%	54%	80%	15.6	3.4	\$8,357
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>\$7,115</b>

NA - Data not available

NP - No program

### Additional Notes:

<sup>(1)</sup> Southeast Missouri State and University of Northern Iowa prefer the ACT exam over the SAT when considering admissions applications. ACT ranges were converted to SAT ranges.

<sup>(2)</sup> Pass rates on teacher licensure exams are not comparable since teacher licensure laws vary from state to state. The examination used, the cut rates, and where students are on their academic programs when they take the examination varies. The University of Northern Iowa requires passage of a licensure examination prior to graduation so their pass rates will always be 100%.

<sup>(3)</sup> NCLEX-RN exam pass rates for University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth (MA), UNC-Wilmington (NC), Sonoma State (CA), Southeast Missouri State (MO), Bloomsburg University (PA) were obtained from the respective state board of nursing Websites. All are reported on a fiscal years basis running from July 1 to June 30 except for Pennsylvania whose reports runs October 1 to September 30. Pass rates for SUNY-Plattsburgh were not available.



## **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> percentiles scores of 1010-1160 are above last year's and compare favorably with the peer average of 925-1142. The percentage of African American undergraduate students attending the institution increased to 11.3 percent this year, 1.6 percentage points above the peer average. Although Towson's second-year retention rate dropped from 85 percent to 83 percent, it remains above the peer average of 77 percent. The overall six-year graduation rate jumped from 56.3 percent to 63.6 percent and is 12.1 points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rates for all minorities increased by 12.3 points in one year: at 65.2 percent, it is a full 18.1 points above the peer average. For African American students, the six-year graduation rate rose by over 10 points to 64.9 percent, 20.3 points over the peer average.

Towson performs below the average of its peers on three core measures. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams (95 percent), while having improved, is 3.7 points below the peer average. Pass rates on nursing licensure exams are 9.6 percentage points below the average. The alumni giving rate is just under the peer average.

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 a peer average of 25 percent. The student/faculty ratio of 18 to 1 is about the same as the peer average of 17 to 1. Towson is more selective than its peers, with an acceptance rate of 69 percent compared to a peer average of 76 percent.

Commission staff commends Towson on greatly improved graduation rates, especially of minority and African American students. Towson should comment on its below-average pass rates for teacher and nursing licensure exams. It should also comment on other measures for which its performance does not meet peer averages: percent minority of all undergraduates, average alumni giving rate and percent residential students.

### **Institution's Response**

#### Teacher Licensure Exam

Institution specific characteristics make many of our peer institutions unique with respect to teacher licensure exam pass rates and therefore not comparable to pass rates at Towson University. For example, Portland State University and California State University, Sacramento offer initial teacher education certification only at the graduate level. This population of students is different from that of Towson in that they have already achieved a bachelor's degree. Unlike Towson, Ball State University requires passing Praxis II as a graduation requirement, thereby automatically achieving the 100 percent pass rate.

As a result of their annual review of assessment data, several Towson University Education programs instituted revisions to improve pass rates. For example, the Mathematics Department instituted a Praxis II review and preparation program and the Kinesiology Department reviewed

the content of several teacher education courses to ensure that the Praxis II-tested content was fully addressed.

### Nursing Licensure Exam

Like many institutions with Nursing programs, Towson has had a substantial change in its faculty composition. Between 2004 and 2007 three Nursing faculty members retired while student enrollment increased by over 77 percent. As of Fall 2007, the Department had six tenured nursing faculty and 18 non-tenure-track faculty, 14 of whom were hired as full-time faculty as of Fall 2005 or after. The retirements of experienced faculty, hiring of new faculty with less teaching experience, and the shortage of Nursing faculty with doctorates in the state of Maryland, may have contributed to inconsistent strategies in preparing students for the NCLEX-RN exam.

We expect the rates to improve with faculty hires, increased student selectivity, individualized student support, and revised curriculum. Three Nursing faculty members with doctorates were added in the 2008-2009 academic year. The Nursing department investigated variables related to success on the NCLEX test with the intention of selecting applicants most likely to be successful in this rigorous nursing program. The department is also reviewing academic policies related to student admission and progression. We intend to increase the faculty and/or staff time allocation to monitor outcomes of student performance on the Educational Resources Inc. (ERI) tests and to develop individualized remediation activities where necessary. Another significant measure directed at improving NCLEX performance includes implementation of the substantially revised curriculum in response to the National Council's new "Test Plan," which forms the basis for the national test.

### Minority Enrollment

Two of the Towson University's new peer institutions, California State U., Sacramento and U. of Massachusetts, Boston, have very large minority enrollments. These institutions are located in regions with extremely large minority populations. The percent minority for these institutions skews the average for the peer group. Towson University undergraduate percent minority increased 4.1 percent between fall 2002 and fall 2008; from 14.9 to 19.0 percent. We expect that trend to continue as we pursue our access and retention efforts and we are confident that the university's percent minority will ultimately exceed the peer average.

### Alumni Giving Rate

In the last decade, Towson University enrollment increased by more than 5,000 students. During this time graduation rates improved significantly. Each year, the number of new graduates joining the ranks of Towson alumni therefore increased. While the dollar amount of alumni giving has increased, the giving rate has not yet caught up.

The gradual economic downturn has presented an additional challenge in our efforts to maintain and increase alumni giving participation.

The university continues to enhance its efforts to engage the growing alumni population and educate them on the importance of giving back to the institution. Fundraising messages now consistently appear in a variety of publications, including, but not limited to, the alumni

magazine, which is sent to all alumni of record three times per year. The advancement staff has developed a segmentation strategy for restricted solicitations to support the academic colleges and various university programs, which they anticipate will translate into increased giving among alumni. Additionally, efforts to acquire new donors include incorporating new technology such as soliciting through electronic communication and utilizing social networking sites to educate and encourage philanthropic support from alumni.

### Residential Students

Towson University as part of its strategic plan is increasing on-campus housing. This plan includes building up to five phases of housing as a public-private venture. Phase I opened in Fall 2008 with 668 new beds and Phase II is planned to open with an additional 652 new beds in Fall 2010. Additional phases of housing will be added based on enrollment. These new beds will increase the percentage of residential students and allow the university to meet the increased demand for housing due to enrollment growth.

**Towson University**  
**Peer Performance Data, 2008**

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
Towson U.	1010-1160	18.2%	11.3%	83%	63.6%	65.2%	64.9%	95%	83%
Ball State U.	940-1150	9.8%	6.9%	78%	57.4%	50.9%	48.7%	99%	98%
California State U., Sacramento	840-1080	41.1%	7.1%	79%	42.1%	39.3%	30.4%	100%	95%
East Carolina U.	930-1120	20.4%	15.5%	78%	56.4%	52.7%	56.0%	96%	95%
Eastern Michigan U.	870-1110	23.7%	18.4%	74%	39.9%	31.0%	30.0%	100%	NA
James Madison U.	1050-1230	11.2%	3.9%	92%	79.8%	71.9%	65.3%	99%	96%
Massachusetts, U. of, Boston	880-1120	36.0%	15.3%	71%	35.8%	36.2%	30.8%	97%	80%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	960-1150	23.7%	14.4%	77%	49.8%	52.9%	51.1%	100%	95%
Northern Iowa, U. of	990-1180	5.8%	2.6%	81%	67.1%	52.0%	46.3%	NA	None
Portland State U.	920-1170	18.9%	3.3%	67%	37.2%	40.5%	42.1%	100%	None
Western Kentucky U.	870-1110	12.3%	9.6%	73%	49.2%	44.1%	45.7%	97%	89%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>925-1142</b>	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>51.5%</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>93%</b>

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	TU institution-specific indicators		
		% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
Towson U.	7%	23%	18/1	69%
Ball State U.	14%	38%	17/1	79%
California State U., Sacramento	2%	5%	20/1	62%
East Carolina U.	5%	24%	20/1	76%
Eastern Michigan U.	3%	16%	18/1	79%
James Madison U.	9%	37%	16/1	63%
Massachusetts, U. of, Boston	5%	NA	15/1	63%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	7%	26%	14/1	73%
Northern Iowa, U. of	13%	38%	16/1	78%
Portland State U.	5%	12%	16/1	91%
Western Kentucky U.	17%	31%	18/2	91%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>17/1</b>	<b>76%</b>

NA - Data not available

## University of Baltimore

The University of Baltimore's (UB) primary mission is to provide upper division bachelors, masters, and professional degrees. As such, it uses a slightly different set of performance measures than other University System of Maryland institutions.

UB outperforms the peer average on three of five core performance measures. Minority undergraduate students comprise 41.4 percent of enrollments which is 11.4 percentage points above the peer average. The university ranks second among peers in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments (34.8 percent) and is 21.1 percentage points above the peer average. Proportions of both minority and African American students have increased substantially over last year's figures. In addition, UB reports 1.8 awards per 100 full-time faculty members, comparing favorably to a peer average of 1.1.

The average alumni giving rate at UB is 4.0 percent, less than half of what it was last year and 7.1 points below the peer average.

None of the selected peer institutions has a law school, thus, there is comparative peer data for one core measure: pass rate for first-time test takers of the law licensing exam. UB had a 75 percent pass rate for the reporting period which was a significant improvement over last year's rate of 65 percent. Given the lack of comparative data, it is helpful to compare UB's pass rate to Maryland's other public law school at the University of Maryland, Baltimore, which reports an 88 percent pass rate for the same reporting period.

UB 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 \$2.9 million, ranking second among peers in this category. It is 8.5 points above the peer average in percent of part-time faculty.

Commission staff notes the strong increase in enrollment diversity at UB. While recognizing marked improvement in Law licensure pass rates over the past two years, Commission staff again suggests that UB permanently add peers with law schools to enable comparisons. UB should comment on the drop in the undergraduate alumni giving rate.

### **Institution's Response**

In recent years the University of Baltimore Alumni Association has greatly increased the number of undergraduates who are asked to contribute. In the past only a small portion of the total number of undergraduate alumni had been actively solicited to give to the university. As a result of this larger solicitation the number of undergraduate alumni giving has increased but not as of a percentage of the larger number asked to give. In addition, recently, many undergraduate alumni have indicated their willingness to contribute but that they felt, due to the economic uncertainty of these times, that they were unable to do so at this time. The university alumni association intends to increase its funding raising efforts and is confident that as economic conditions improve so will the undergraduate alumni giving rate.

**University of Baltimore  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in LAW licensing exam	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)
Baltimore, U. of	41.4%	34.8%	75%	4%	1.8
Auburn University-Montgomery	35.3%	31.5%	no law school	4%	1.1
Citadel Military College of South Carolina	14.8%	7.0%	no law school	36%	0.6
Governors State University	43.9%	35.1%	no law school	NA	0.0
New Jersey City University	60.3%	18.6%	no law school	5%	1.2
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	46.5%	4.6%	no law school	7%	1.3
University of Houston-Clear Lake	34.9%	7.9%	no law school	NA	1.1
University of Illinois at Springfield	18.1%	11.5%	no law school	9%	2.8
University of Michigan-Dearborn	19.2%	10.0%	no law school	8%	0.0
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	9.5%	4.4%	no law school	13%	2.0
Western Connecticut State University	17.5%	6.6%	no law school	7%	1.0

**Average of Peers**

**30.0%**      **13.7%**      **11.1%**      **1.1**

UB institution-specific indicators	
Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty

Baltimore, U. of	\$4,933,546	52.8%
Auburn University-Montgomery	\$208,566	43.0%
Citadel Military College of South Carolina	\$418,274	NA
Governors State University	\$1,548,553	47.0%
New Jersey City University	\$0	63.7%
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	\$11,563,452	36.7%
University of Houston-Clear Lake	\$1,240,713	53.4%
University of Illinois at Springfield	\$1,576,375	36.9%
University of Michigan-Dearborn	\$2,867,000	39.3%
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	\$480,838	18.5%
Western Connecticut State University	\$665,382	59.8%

**Average of Peers**

**\$2,056,915**      **44.3%**

NA - Data not available

Note: 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

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 out performs peers on five core performance measures. UMB enrolls a higher percentage of minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates than peer average by 10.2 and 14.0 percentage points, respectively. Pass rates on nursing and dental licensure exams (93 percent and 99 percent, respectively) are both above national averages by five points (peer averages are not available so UMB provided national averages for comparison). The pass rate on the social work licensing exam (77 percent) is also better than the national average (73 percent). Total R&D expenditures in Medicine grew substantially over the past year and are \$14.6 million above the peer average. Total R&D expenditures in Medicine per fulltime medical faculty are also higher than the average, by \$73.8 million. The average annual percent growth rate in federal R&D expenditures in Medicine more than doubled in one year and is 5.6 percent over the peer average.

The university compares unfavorably to peers on two core measure. Although the pass rate on the law licensure exam improved by eight points to 88 percent, it remains slightly below the peer average of 90 percent. In addition, the pass rate on the medical licensure exam (95 percent) is below the national average by one point.

The university selected three institution-specific indicators for which data is available: percent minority students enrolled, total headcount enrollment, and percent graduate and first-professional students enrolled. UMB total enrollment is 34.3 percent minority compared to a peer average of 30.6 percent. Its total headcount enrollment of 5,884 is over 16 thousand less than the peer average; UMB has the second- lowest number of students enrolled. Graduate and first- professional enrollments make up 87.4 percent of total headcount, 40.8 percentage points higher than the peer average.

UMB did not supply data for its alumni giving rate and is asked to do so.

### **Institution's Response**

Peer performance measures for the University of Maryland, Baltimore are primarily related to three areas: research activity; student outcomes; and diversity. Despite increased competition for federal research dollars, grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) rose by 8 percent to \$164 million in fiscal 2008. Catholic Relief Services and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation funded two-thirds of the nearly \$75 million received from foundations, doubling the fiscal 2007 level of support. Corporate-sponsored projects, numbering in the hundreds, surpassed prior year funding levels by 44 percent.

Pass rates for UMB students taking licensure exams in law improved in 2008 compared to 2007. 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, and remain above the peer averages for all measures.



**University of Maryland, Baltimore  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams					Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	% growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law	Dental	Social Work				
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	42.8%	27.7%	93%	95%	88%	99%	77%	NA	\$324,208	\$300,750	17.6%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	34.9%	28.9%	90%		no law school			10%	\$222,625	\$187,237	10.6%
California, U. of, San Francisco	NA	NA			no law school			NA	\$726,412	\$431,874	12.8%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	48.6%	8.7%			no law school			6%	\$175,815	\$205,152	16.7%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	23.9%	6.3%			97%			17%	\$273,961	\$193,612	13.9%
N. Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	23.0%	10.9%	93%		87%			23%	\$149,437	\$117,114	6.0%
Connecticut, U. of					87%						
Texas, U. of, Austin					89%						
Virginia, U. of					91%						
national			88%	96%			94%	73%			
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>			<b>90%</b>			<b>14.0%</b>	<b>\$309,650</b>	<b>\$226,998</b>	<b>12.0%</b>

University	UMB institution-specific indicators				
	Medicine resrch. grants per Basic Res. faculty	Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount enrollment	Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headct.
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore			34.3%	5,884	87.4%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	Data		29.7%	16,246	31.5%
California, U. of, San Francisco	no longer collected		39.0%	2,999	100.0%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	by AAMC		40.8%	25,747	34.9%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor			22.7%	41,042	34.8%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill			20.7%	28,136	31.6%
<b>Average of Peers</b>			<b>30.6%</b>	<b>22,834</b>	<b>46.6%</b>

NA - Data not available

Note: 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 seven of thirteen core performance measures. It compares favorably on SAT 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles scores of 1090-1280 compared to the peer average of 1010-1230. The percentage of minority undergraduate students (41.7 percent) exceeds the peer average by 15.5 percentage points. African American students comprise 16 percent of undergraduate enrollment, more than double the peer average. Although falling from last year's levels, the university's six-year graduation rates for minority and African American students exceed peer averages by 0.7 and 9.6 points, respectively. UMBC ranks third in average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures, 7.5 percentage points above the peer average. At 4.5 awards, UMBC exceeds the peer average for awards per 100 full-time faculty members by 1.8 points.

UMBC underperforms peers on six core measures. The institution has an 82 percent second-year retention rate, just below the peer average. The overall six-year graduation rate is 56.2, 5.2 percentage points below the peer average. UMBC's pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 96 percent (a drop of three points from last year), just under the peer average. UMBC reports the lowest percentage of alumni giving (five percent) among its peers; the peer average is over three times higher. Although R&D expenditures have increased, the total is \$49.3 million below the peer average. Total R&D expenditures per fulltime faculty have dropped over the past year and are also below the peer average.

UMBC chose five institution-specific indicators: 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. The university continues to rank first in information technology bachelors degree awards. It has a higher than average ratio of FTE students to full-time faculty (21.1:1 compared to 19.4:1) and is ranked third in federal R&D expenditures per full-time faculty, over \$34,000 per full-time faculty above the peer average. On two measures (ratio of license agreements per million in R&D expenditures and invention disclosures per million in R&D expenditures), UMBC ranks sixth out of seven institutions responding.

Commission staff commends UMBC on its increasing diversity. UMBC should comment on the following measures for which its performance is below that of peers: second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rate, pass rate of teacher licensure exams, average undergraduate alumni giving rate, total R&D expenditures and total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty.

### **Institution'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. Our second-year retention rate improved to 84.6 percent and 87.4 percent for the fall 2006 and 2007 cohorts, respectively. These improvements should be reflected in positive increases in the three-year average rate reported in U.S. News and World Report America's Best Colleges, the source for the peer

comparison figures. 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.

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. The program enrolled 47 students in its first year, 2007, and enrollment has already grown to 112 students in fall 2008. The Erickson School of Aging Studies has also launched an innovative interdisciplinary baccalaureate program in *Management of Aging Studies* that combines studies of aging, service delivery, and public policy related to our aging population. As with the retention rate, we have seen internal improvements in our six-year graduation rates and anticipate that they will be reflected in future U.S. News reporting.

#### Pass Rate of Teacher Licensure Exams

UMBC’s teacher education programs require students to pass the licensure examinations in order to be considered “program completers.” This requirement was instituted several years ago and should, in principle, yield 100 percent pass rates for the peer comparison data. Pass rates less than 100 percent in the Title II reports may result from differences between first and final attempts on the Praxis tests or other administrative issues.

#### Alumni Giving Rate

UMBC’s Alumni giving rate is a product of two factors: a campus that is only 42 years old, with a comparatively small alumni base, and limitations on resources to staff the alumni office. In the past two years, UMBC has made a commitment to enhance alumni operations. In 2007 three new gift officers were added to the staff in the Office of Institutional Advancement and alumni contributors 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, and as of June 30, 2007 more than \$75 million had been committed. The university is also enhancing communication with its alumni through a redesigned Web site (<http://retrievernet.umbc.edu>) and a new UMBC Magazine.

#### 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 has remained at 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 UMBC ranks 3<sup>rd</sup> on its institution-specific indicator of Federal R&D Expenditures per full-time faculty member.

**University of Maryland Baltimore County  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

University	SAT 25th-75th percentile	% 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
UMBC	1090-1280	41.7%	16.0%	82%	56.1%	56.2%	58.4%	96%	5%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	1070-1300	12.5%	4.8%	83%	55.5%	47.2%	44.4%	100%	20%
Riverside	910-1170	75.0%	7.4%	86%	63.6%	64.4%	60.9%	99%	7%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1020-1260	40.4%	2.6%	89%	69.6%	66.6%	53.6%	100%	15%
Clemson U.	1120-1310	10.3%	7.2%	88%	75.1%	69.3%	67.6%	94%	27%
Mass.,U. of, Amherst	1030-1240	16.2%	4.7%	84%	65.7%	56.8%	54.3%	96%	13%
Mississippi State U.	950-1220	23.7%	20.9%	81%	57.9%	48.3%	48.5%	98%	12%
New Jersey Institute Tech.	1030-1230	47.3%	10.0%	82%	54.5%	58.0%	41.2%	NA	20%
Main	1030-1220	17.4%	4.1%	80%	59.0%	49.7%	39.6%	100%	17%
Rhode Island, U. of	950-1170	12.4%	4.8%	80%	56.9%	46.3%	40.2%	95%	11%
Wyoming, U. of	990-1180	6.7%	0.9%	75%	55.7%	48.8%	37.5%	92%	13%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1010-1230</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>55.5%</b>	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>

University	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UMBC institution-specific indicators				
					Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures	Ratio of FTE students/ F-T instr. faculty	Fed R&D expend. per FT faculty	Rank in ratio of license agreemts. to \$Mil. R&D
UMBC	\$65,718	\$166,797	17.8%	4.5	1	6	21.1	\$113,782	6
Arkansas, U. of, Main	\$99,271	\$146,634	7.6%	1.9	6	4	18.0	\$47,158	3
Riverside	\$122,235	\$205,092	26.6%	3.6	5	NA	25.4	\$94,648	NA
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	\$114,126	\$226,891	25.5%	4.6	7	NA	28.3	\$131,988	NA
Clemson U.	\$176,785	\$208,719	2.6%	1.6	3	5	14.7	\$64,558	5
Massachusetts, U. of, Amherst	\$132,866	\$134,889	7.7%	5.6	4	NA	19.1	\$69,199	NA
Mississippi State U.	\$184,510	\$212,569	9.1%	1.8	9	3	17.9	\$108,256	4
New Jersey Institute Tech.	\$77,583	\$262,993	10.5%	2.9	2	1	17.2	\$120,302	1
Main	\$96,602	\$112,197	10.0%	1.4	8	2	18.8	\$43,012	2
Rhode Island, U. of	\$66,104	\$110,173	0.4%	1.5	10	7	19.1	\$71,880	7
Wyoming, U. of	\$80,474	\$152,125	3.3%	2.0	11	NA	15.0	\$43,267	NA
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$115,056</b>	<b>\$177,228</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>\$79,427</b>	<b>NA</b>

NA - Data not available

## University of Maryland College Park

The University of Maryland College Park is measured against its aspirational peers: institutions which, as the State's flagship public institution, it seeks to emulate in reputation and quality. The university meets or exceeds the peer average on five 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 1210-1360 compares favorably to the group average of 1196-1400. UMCP enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates (13.0 percent), exceeding the peer average by 6.9 percentage points. Pass rates on teacher licensure exams continue to reach 100 percent, matching peers' rates. Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty is \$11.2 thousand above the peer average. UMCP reports 5.5 awards per 100 full-time faculty members, equivalent to the peer average.

UMCP falls below the peer average on eight core measures. While it enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates, it is 4.1 percentage points below the peer average for all minorities as percent of enrollment. Though increasing by one point to 93 percent this year, second-year retention rates are 2.6 percentage points below the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for all undergraduates (80 percent) and all minority undergraduates (76 percent) have improved for three consecutive years, but both rates remain below peer averages of 86.2 and 82.0 percent, respectively. The six-year graduation rate of African American students is unchanged from last year (69 percent), but is also slightly below the peer average. The university's 14 percent alumni-giving rate is 2.4 percentage points below the peer average. Total R&D expenditures, while up, are \$48.2 million below the peer average. UMCP's 2.6 percent average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures is below the peer average of 4.4 percent.

UMCP 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 81 graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 compared to a peer group average of 106. UMCP's number of programs ranked in the top 15 is well below the peer average of 85. Although slowing, the university continues to outpace its peers in the percent change in faculty memberships in national academies with 8.3 percent growth compared to 6.8 percent growth for the peer average. The number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures matches the peer average of 32. Once again, UMCP ranks first in the number of degrees awarded to African American students (630), exceeding the peer average by 307 degrees.

UMCP is to be commended for its success in achieving a 100 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams and for its increasing diversity in terms of African American undergraduates. The university should comment on the following measures for which its performance is below that of peers: percent minority of all undergraduates, second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rates (for all as well as for minority and African American students), undergraduate alumni giving rate, total non-medical R&D expenditures, growth in federal R&D expenditures,

number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation and the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation.

## **Institution's Response**

### Minority Enrollment

To understand this measure more fully, it is important to compare the University against individual peer institutions. When evaluating the percentage of minority students enrolled, UM enrolls a lower percentage of minorities than UCLA or Berkeley (57 percent each). Each of these institutions enrolls a much higher percentage of Asian students than UM reflecting the demographics in California. UM enrolls more minority students (33 percent) than IL, MI, and NC, whose minority enrollment percentages range from 23 percent to 27 percent. However, UM enrolls twice the proportion of African American students (13 percent) when compared with its peers (averaging 6.1 percent). Finally, it should be noted that UM graduates more African American students than any of our peers.

### Retention Rate

While the average second year retention rate for the University of Maryland is below the peer average, the retention rate at the University has grown steadily by one percentage point for all students and two percentage points for African American students between 2006 and 2007. Between 2007 and 2008, the University has increased the overall retention rate by one percentage point (to 94 percent) for all students and by five percentage points (to 95 percent) for African American students. We believe these changes are the result of student success initiatives that were implemented over the last few years. As we continue on a path towards greater student success, we hope to achieve an overall retention rate of 95 percent to be comparable with our peers.

### Graduation Rate

The University has set ambitious goals to increase its graduation rates. UM graduation rates were projected to increase seven percentage points in five years. For all students, the goal was to increase the graduation rate from 73 percent in 2004 to 80 percent in 2009. As of Fall 2008, the University reached a graduation rate of 82 percent. For all minorities the goal was to increase the rate from 66 percent to 73 percent. As of Fall 2008, the graduation rate for minorities has reached 77 percent. The rate for African-American students was expected to increase from 57 percent to 64 percent over the same period. The graduation rate for African American students is now at 68 percent. The University is clearly achieving success for all students. With regard to peer comparisons, while our graduation rate for all students is six percentage points below the average of our peers, the UM's graduation rate has increased by ten percentage points over the last five years, while the peer average has only increased by two percentage points. Additionally, while the grad rate for minority students is six percentage points below the peer average, the UM rate for all minorities has increased by 12 percentage points over five years, while the peer average has only increased by three percentage points over the same period. The rate for African American students is only two percentage points below the peer average, but, again, the rate for African American students has increased by 13 percentage points over the last five years, while the peer average has increased by only two percentage points. Despite the lag

behind the peer average, the University has made tremendous progress both in terms of increasing the graduation rates for all students and in terms of decreasing the gap between the UM graduation rates and the peer averages.

Again, University initiatives supporting the Chancellor's goal of closing the achievement gap coupled with strategies developed by President Mote to improve student success are key factors that lead to improved retention and graduation rates.

#### Alumni Giving Rate

The average two year alumni giving rate for UM (14 percent) is below our peer average of 16 percent. This is in part due to the fact that the average is skewed by an unusually high giving rate for the University of North Carolina (23 percent). UNC has had the ambience and culture of an elite private university for many years. Maryland's giving rate is roughly on par with our other peers: UC Berkeley (14 percent), UCLA (14 percent), Michigan (17 percent), and Illinois (14 percent).

A significant factor that influences our annual giving rate is the fact that for the past decade Maryland has played "catch up" in improving its alumni records. In the last five years, we have found mailing addresses and other pertinent data on more than 50,000 alumni who previously we were unable to reach or did not know about. In addition, with the help of our Foundation Board of Trustees, we have launched an "Alumni Affinity Initiative." We are currently devising strategies geared toward engaging young alumni ("Millennials"). Young alumni represent 40 percent of our alumni constituency and have the lowest rate of giving. Maryland is examining new messages, the use of technology, and incentives to establish a model of engaging alumni.

As a result of these efforts, the size of our addressable alumni body is increasing substantially. Over the long term, this new alumni base will benefit Maryland in a host of ways, from increased giving to expanding volunteer assistance. We anticipate a boost in our giving rate over the next few years to become more competitive with UNC, and to exceed the giving rates of Berkeley, UCLA, Michigan, and Illinois.

#### Total R&D Expenditures

While UM is below the peer average for the average annual growth in federal R&D expenditures, we have seen a 9 percent growth in fiscal 2008 over fiscal 2007. Due to challenges and uncertainties facing the federal research budget, the University has increased its focus on expanding its non-federal funding sources. We are increasing our industrial funding and partnerships with the commercial sector. For example, the University has developed a master agreement and research partnership with Lockheed-Martin under which a variety of research task orders will be funded. On the federal side, the University has acquired funding for large centers (including interdisciplinary centers) such as the Office of Naval Research Center for Applied Electromagnetics, the Center for Advanced Study of Language (CASL), the DHS Center of Excellence for the Study of Terrorism and the Response to Terrorism, the Joint Quantum Institute, and the Maryland NanoCenter, which brings together cross-disciplinary scientists to meet important research challenges relating to nanotechnology. The NASA Center for Research and Exploration in Space Science and Technology (CRESST) is tasked to study neutron stars, black holes, and extremely hot gas throughout the universe; the NASA-funded Constellation

University Institutes Project (CUIP) funded involves 20 universities with UM as lead to develop technologies and analysis methods for future human space exploration. We continue to seek increased NIH funding (particularly in the areas of biotechnology, bioengineering, biophysics, bioprocessing, bioinformatics, and nanomedicine) and federal funding (for the improvement of laboratory animal care facilities). To that end, UMCP has formed a strong partnership with UMB through a seed grant program to foster research among interdisciplinary teams of investigators which has already resulted in joint proposals to NIH.

#### Grad Program Rankings

The University has been increasing the number of ranked programs over the past five years. UM has increased the number of programs ranked in the top 25 from 62 to 81 between 2004 and 2008; at the same time UM has increased the number of programs ranked in the top 15 from 43 to 52. For both categories, the peer average has remained relatively stable over the same period of time. With a new strategic plan in place, the University is focused on improving and advancing graduate programs, and expects to continue to increase the number of programs ranked.

The key to our excellent graduate programs are the excellent faculty. The University is very proud of its faculty who not only advance the research agenda for the University and the state, but also advance the academic programs offered to students. UM faculty are comparable to peers in the category of faculty awards.



**University of Maryland, College Park  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Fall 2001 cohort (per CSRDE IPEDS GRS)			Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	FY 2007	
					Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans			Total R&D expenditures (000s) - non-med	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1210-1360	33.4%	13.0%	93%	80.0%	76.0%	69.0%	100%	14%	\$359,760	\$264,724
Berkeley	1200-1450	57.1%	3.4%	97%	88.0%	87.0%	68.0%	100%	14%	\$497,957	\$357,985
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1180-1400	56.9%	3.3%	97%	90.0%	89.0%	76.0%	99%	14%	\$231,304	\$130,533
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1180-1380	26.7%	6.7%	92%	82.0%	74.0%	65.0%	100%	14%	\$467,478	\$252,827
Arbor	1220-1380	23.9%	6.3%	96%	88.0%	83.0%	71.0%	100%	17%	\$532,981	\$268,099
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1200-1390	23.0%	10.9%	96%	83.0%	77.0%	76.0%	100%	23%	\$310,037	\$258,364
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>1196-1400</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>\$407,951</b>	<b>\$253,562</b>

University	UMCP institution-specific indicators						
	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	# grad level colleges/pgrms/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member- ships in national academies	# of invention disclosures per \$100M in total R&D	Number of degrees awarded to African-American students
Maryland, U. of, College Park	2.6%	5.5	81	52	8.3%	32	630
Berkeley	2.3%	7.4	131	117	0.7%	28	220
California, U. of, Los Angeles	2.9%	5.6	109	87	1.6%	33	198
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	3.8%	5.3	84	64	6.0%	41	428
Arbor	4.4%	6.2	127	110	3.7%	36	394
Chapel Hill	8.6%	3.3	79	49	22.0%	22	375
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>323</b>

Note: Graduation rate data extracted from the annual CSRDE Student Retention Report, 2008.

Note: Maryland data NOT included in calculation of peer means.

(1) Average increase in memberships of 3 academies (AAAS, NAE, and NAS), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.

(2) All R&D expenditures (federal and total) for science & engineering exclude medical sciences and non-S&E disciplines. The data are for the fiscal year 2007.

(3) SAT scores for Illinois and Michigan come from U.S. News and are converted from the reported, combined ACT scores; the conversion is made using an SAT to ACT conversion table. Scores for all other peers are from NCES.

(4) Invention disclosures R&D expenditure include the medical sciences for peers. Data FY05 sources: AUTM for UMd, UMichigan, & UNC; Institutional Tech Transfer Office for UC (Berkeley and Los Angeles). U Illinois provided their data to IRPA

## University of Maryland Eastern Shore

The University of Maryland Eastern Shore outperforms the peer group on four out of twelve core performance measures. UMES exceeds its peer average in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments by 2.8 percentage points. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams has reached 100 percent for the second consecutive year, higher than the peer average of 95 percent. Average undergraduate alumni giving rate is eight percent, 1.1 points above the peer average. The university's total R&D expenditures per fulltime faculty decreased substantially but remains above the peer average.

UMES falls below the average peer performance on two thirds of core performance measures. The university's freshmen SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores are 730-900 compared to the peer average of 781-988. Minority undergraduate enrollments (83.9 percent) are 2.8 points below the peer average. Average second-year retention rates fell by two points to 66 percent compared to a peer average of 72 percent. The average six-year graduation rate dropped from 41.8 percent to 33.6 percent in one year; well below the peer average of 40.8 percent. The average six-year graduation rate of African American students is also down (to 34.2 percent), 5.3 points below the average. Total R&D expenditures dropped to \$4.1 million, \$3.3 million below the peer average. Average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures is down substantially, while that of peers has been rising, putting UMES 9.2 points below the peer average on this measure.

UMES has selected 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. The university reports that 64 percent of full-time faculty members hold a terminal degree, a slight increase from the previous year. This is below the average of 73.4 percent of the five peers reporting. The university remains at about the peer average in the percent of undergraduate information technology degrees awarded. The student loan default rate rose to 8.1 percent and is 1.2 points above the peer average.

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 should comment on the following measures for which its performance compares unfavorably to that of peers: freshmen SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores, percent minority of all undergraduates, second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rates (for all as well as for minority and African American students), total R&D expenditures, growth in federal R&D expenditures and loan default rate.

### Institution's Response

The analysis by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) reveals a number of areas in which UMES has faced or continues to face challenges including (1) freshmen SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores, (2) percent minority of all undergraduates, (3) second-year retention rate, (4) six-year graduation rates (for all as well as for minority and African American students), (5) total R&D expenditures, (6) growth in federal R&D expenditures and (7) loan default rate. These areas are reviewed briefly in the sections that follow.

### Freshman SAT Percentile Scores

The 25th /75th percentile scores for UMES freshmen students of 730-900 is lower than the 781-988 average of similar students at the ten peer institutions. This is in part due to the University's mission that includes increased access to higher education to all citizens. Since student preparation before entering college is a critical factor affecting student success, UMES is taking appropriate strategies to increase the 25th and 75th percentile scores of the freshman students it admits. Strategies implemented effective 2008-2009 academic year include: (1) purchasing names from the College Board of high school graduates with a minimum SAT two-component (i.e., Math and Verbal) composite score of 930 for recruitment purposes. (2) increased academic/faculty visibility during campus visits by prospective students and their parents, off-campus receptions, UMES Tri-County College Fair and SpringFest Open House to help recruit more better prepared students; (3) segmented mailings, e-mails and phone calls by academic departments and Office of Admissions and Recruitment to students with the highest academic potential as evidenced by high school grade point averages and standardized test scores; (4) increase the allocation of scholarship funds to first-time students who meet honors criteria of minimum GPA of 3.3 and minimum three component SAT score of 1650; and (5) minimize the number of admitted students with a minimum two component composite SAT score below 850 to ensure that UMES' SAT 25th percentile score is above that of peers. These measures, used in combination will significantly increase UMES' 25th and 75th percentile SAT scores.

### Percent Minority of All Undergraduates

UMES considers its slightly lower percentage of minority of undergraduate students (83.9 percent) compared to its peers (86.7 percent) as an indication of its commitment to diversity. Given the strong niche programs it offers including Hotel & Restaurant Management, Golf Management, Physician Assistant, Physical Therapy, Engineering Technology Management, Engineering, Aviation Science and Doctor of Pharmacy, it is clear that UMES continues to be an attractive destination institution for a significant number of non-African American students. This is consistent with an objective in Managing for Results that aims at maintaining an undergraduate enrollment of 25 percent non-African American students.

### Second Year Retention Rate

The decline in the average second-year retention rates continues to be the single most important issue that demands intrusive and ongoing attention by UMES and the Division of Academic Affairs, specifically. At 66 percent, the retention rate for the report period is clearly below the average for peers (72.7 percent). The University has established a retention committee to implement and monitor a campus-wide retention plan. In addition, the University is using the results of its retention self-study and external evaluation to implement specific strategies to enhance the retention rate. The following activities have either been recently initiated and/or revamped: (1) advising for freshmen students; (2) collection of data on progression, retention, and attrition; (3) summer bridge program; (4) recruiting stop-outs back to the university; (4) student mentor program; (5) creation of Writing Center, (6) establishment of mathematics laboratory and a reading/writing laboratory; (7) student mentors, and (8) establishment of a persistence laboratory. In addition, every academic department whose retention rate is below the average second year retention of peers (i.e., currently 72 percent) will include an objective on increasing its retention rate in its annual strategic operational plan.

### Graduation Rates

Entering freshmen student under-preparedness continues to pose a major threat to student success as measured by the second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. The activities for second-year retention rates will have direct impact on the six-year graduation rate. The activities established to have a direct impact on the six-year graduation rate are: (1) establish a learning community; (2) revamping systematic approach for developing course scheduling and course availability; (3) developing online degree audit; (4) enhance the quality of service training for all front-line support staff, faculty, and supervisors, and (5) redefining, monitoring and implementing student engagement activities. In addition, UMES will continue to leverage resources from a variety of sources (e.g. Title III, and MHEC) to provide focused academic support to students in need of strengthening their basic skills for success in college. It is hoped that all these strategies, used in combination will bring UMES' performance on the peer performance indicators of second-year retention and six-year graduation rates to the average of its peers or surpass it.

### Growth in Federal Research & Development Expenditures

Institutional financial support for research and development is limited, and recent cutbacks made by the State of Maryland will continue to exacerbate the already desperate financial situation. These adverse factors along with the increased use of intrusive retention strategies, which require increased faculty involvement in teaching, mentoring, and advising, tend to inhibit faculty's ability to engage effectively in research and research projects. These challenges notwithstanding, UMES continues to aspire to becoming a Doctoral Research University and therefore, needs to strengthen its research capacity and infrastructure to realize this goal.

In order to foster and support a broad array of research at UMES, a University Research Council was reestablished in the fall of 2007 by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Council's main responsibility is to provide advice on matters related to the conduct of research and scholarly activities on the University campus. To carry out its charge, the Council has identified the needs of the faculty / researchers which include facilities, equipment, services, compliance procedures, and other factors that affect research. Based on this baseline information, the University will seek new strategies that will provide support for: (1) building research capability including the ability to pursue competitive research grants; (2) investing in research infrastructure; and (3) honor release time commitments for faculty and other researchers. UMES continues to offer new faculty workshops on grantsmanship. Beginning with the fall 2009 new faculty cohort, all new faculty will be required to attend specialized workshops on grantsmanship. All new faculty in science, technology, engineering and mathematic disciplines (STEM) will be required to investigate, identify, and make application for at least one potential grant opportunity by May 22, 2010. Additionally, the University has approved and will implement a policy that provides incentives/motivation to faculty to engage in research and development activities.

### Loan Default Rate

UMES has worked diligently to keep its Cohort Default Rate (CDR) under control and for the most part has been successful in exceeding the performance of its peers for most of the reports since the adoption of this measure. However, with increased enrollments and decreases in federal and state grant funding, the number of borrowers defaulting on federal student loans has

increased slightly over the past few fiscal years (from 8.1 in fiscal 2005 to 8.7 in fiscal 2006). This gradual increase is reflective of the changing economic conditions of the global, national and state economies. In addition, the demographics of the typical student loan borrower at UMES generally results in students maximizing their annual limit to meet basic living expenses after tuition, fees, room and board. The retention efforts are also reflective in this increase.

UMES has default management procedures in place in an attempt to continually keep its cohort default rate to a minimum. These procedures include offering in-person entrance counseling sessions for students who are unable to successfully complete the online process. The Office of Student Financial Aid sponsors credit management seminars and workshops in an attempt to inform its students about the financial obligations of student loans. Financial Aid workshops for students emphasize conservative borrowing and minimization of student loan debt. It is hoped that these measures will help to keep the CDF under control.

**University of Maryland Eastern Shore  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

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)
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	730-900	83.9%	81.3%	66%	33.6%	33.7%	34.2%	100%	8%	\$4,059
Alabama A&M U.	780-910	95.8%	95.1%	69%	33.5%	33.6%	33.7%	98%	NA	\$14,431
Albany State U.	840-960	94.3%	93.7%	79%	42.3%	42.5%	42.5%	NA	NA	\$847
Alcorn State U.	780-950	91.7%	91.0%	70%	45.3%	45.6%	45.7%	100%	4%	\$6,593
California State U., Bakersfield	810-1050	54.0%	8.2%	78%	41.5%	38.4%	18.6%	97%	5%	\$1,740
Fort Valley State U.	680-1190	97.2%	96.7%	77%	36.0%	36.9%	37.2%	NA	NA	\$2,570
North Carolina A&T State U.	780-980	93.6%	91.2%	NA	38.0%	38.7%	38.6%	100%	12%	\$23,296
N. Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	840-1020	51.3%	27.5%	69%	37.6%	38.0%	44.2%	96%	7%	\$258
Prairie View A & M U.	740-930	95.7%	89.7%	66%	37.6%	38.0%	38.1%	84%	1%	\$11,376
South Carolina State C.	750-926	97.6%	97.0%	69%	53.9%	53.8%	53.8%	97%	9%	\$3,796
Virginia State U.	810-960	95.6%	94.5%	72%	42.6%	42.5%	42.7%	91%	10%	\$8,189
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>781-988</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>78.5%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>39.5%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>\$7,310</b>

University	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	UMES institution-specific indicators		
			% of full-time faculty w terminal degrees	IT degrees as % of all bachelor's degrees	Loan default rate
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	\$38,657	-5.9%	64%	3.2%	8.1%
Alabama A&M U.	\$54,871	-3.0%	NA	5.2%	6.0%
Albany State U.	\$6,831	-4.0%	62%	0.7%	7.3%
Alcorn State U.	\$54,942	-3.1%	65%	5.1%	2.7%
California State U., Bakersfield	\$7,733	16.2%	NA	2.0%	2.8%
Fort Valley State U.	\$27,634	1.3%	NA	1.8%	9.1%
North Carolina A&T State U.	\$73,028	6.1%	NA	6.7%	10.2%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	\$1,554	0.0%	66%	0.0%	2.9%
Prairie View A & M U.	\$53,408	6.5%	NA	3.4%	12.0%
South Carolina State C.	\$20,857	6.0%	87%	1.6%	7.8%
Virginia State U.	\$42,430	7.4%	87%	7.0%	8.1%
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>\$34,329</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>73.4%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>6.9%</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 non traditional students. UMUC's target population is working adults and it enrolls a high percentage of part-time students. Its core performance measures reflect this.

UMUC out-performs its peers on one of three core measures. African American enrollments comprise 29.4 percent of total enrollments and are 16.0 percentage points above the peer average. The university performs below peer level on one core measure: the undergraduate population is 39.5 percent minority, which is 5.2 percentage points below the peer average. UMUC did not provide data for one core measure: average undergraduate alumni giving rate.

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. It awarded 178 information technology degrees to African Americans compared to a peer average of five. Eighty-one percent of undergraduates are age 25 or older compared to a peer average of 28.5 percent. UMUC awarded 1,845 post baccalaureate degrees in technology and management; the peer average is 32. It offers 782 stateside online courses compared to an average of 186. The university's worldwide online enrollments have increased to over 189,000, greatly exceeding the peer average of 5,905.

UMUC is commended for its increase in both enrollments and the number of stateside course offerings. It should comment on declining percent of minorities of all undergraduates. UMUC should provide data on its undergraduate alumni giving rate.

### **Institution's Response**

The reported decline in African American and minority undergraduates is attributed to a significant increase (more than double) in 'missing' responses over the past three years. In Fall 2007, African American students made up 29 percent of all UMUC undergraduates with 'missing' students included in the base, and 36 percent when 'missing' is excluded. Likewise, minorities represent 40 percent of undergraduates including 'missing' students, and 48 percent excluding them. UMUC enrolls more African American students than any Maryland public university, including HBCUs.

There was no UMUC undergraduate alumni giving rate comparable in definition and source to the core measure supplied for our peers, resulting in the "Not Available" response. However, 4 percent of our undergraduate alumni donated to UMUC in this past fiscal year, which is an improvement over earlier years.

**University of Maryland University College  
Peer Performance Data, 2008**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (2-yr.)	UMUC institution-specific indicators				
			undergraduate alumni giving rate	# of African-American IT graduates	% undergraduates 25 and older	# post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.	Number of stateside online courses	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
Maryland, U. of, University College	39.5%	29.4%	NA	178	81.1%	1,845	782	189,605
Boise State U. Hills	12.1%	1.4%	9%	0	38.2%	26	159	10,290
California State U., Fullerton	74.8%	28.4%	0%	4	42.8%	0	166	3,721
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	56.2%	3.8%	3%	4	22.3%	141	395	12,855
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	57.4%	11.1%	9%	12	25.4%	37	NA	NA
CUNY Hunter C.	85.3%	32.6%	3%	15	42.1%	6	82	2,707
CUNY Queens C.	49.9%	12.4%	13%	4	28.1%	0	NA	NA
CUNY Queens C.	47.3%	9.0%	19%	4	26.2%	32	NA	NA
Eastern Michigan U.	23.7%	18.4%	3%	3	28.0%	73	137	3,438
Florida Gulf Coast U.	18.4%	4.5%	NA	1	16.5%	1	179	5,122
Southern Connecticut State U.	21.7%	12.1%	7%	2	15.5%	2	183	3,202
<b>Average of Peers</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28.5%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>5,905</b>

NA - Data not available

NR - Non-Respondent

NA - Data not available



## **Morgan State University**

Morgan State University's performance exceeds the peer average on one-third of fifteen core performance measures. Fifty-one percent of students receive federal grants which is 13 percentage points above the peer average. Morgan State awards more doctorates to African Americans (25) than the peer average of 11. The university awarded 177 bachelors degrees in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) areas to African Americans, down from the previous year but substantially more than the peer average of 105. Though below 2007 levels, Morgan's total R&D expenditures of \$25.8 million is \$2.2 million higher than the peer average. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 100 percent for the third consecutive year, exceeding the peer average by 2.8 percentage points.

MSU has under-performed its peers on ten core measures. The second-year retention rate for all (62 percent), African Americans (62 percent) and minorities (62 percent) have each dropped by seven points since 2007; each is well below the peer average. Overall six-year graduation rates at Morgan have fallen by six points to 40 percent, 4.9 points under the peer average. Six-year graduation rates for African American students have decreased by seven points to 38 percent, just under the peer average. For minority students, the graduation rate has also dropped to 38 percent, which is 2.2 points below peer rates.

MSU awarded 19 doctorates to women, six less than the peer average. Eighty percent of all full-time faculty hold terminal degrees compared to a peer average of 83.2 percent. While Morgan's R&D expenditures have shrunk by eight percent over the last year, its peers R&D expenditures have grown by an average 2.3 percent. The alumni giving percent is six percent, compared to a 10.2 percent peer average.

Commission staff commends Morgan on achieving three consecutive years of 100 percent pass rates on teacher licensure exams. Morgan should comment on the following measures for which its performance is below that of peers: declining retention and graduation rates (for all students as well as for minority and African American students), the number of doctorates awarded to women, the percent of faculty with a terminal degree, the drop in research expenditures and alumni giving rate.

### **Institution's Response**

The University generally agrees with MHEC's assessment of the 2008 peer performance data. We are pleased that we compare favorably to our peers with regard to providing access to economically challenged students as measured by the percentage of students receiving Pell grants. We also are pleased that our number of African American doctoral recipients and our number of African Americans in science and technology compare favorably with our peers. As a Carnegie doctoral research university, we are working for continued advancement in obtaining research and development funding. We also are working for continued success in meeting the State's need for qualified teachers through our teacher education program and pass rate on the PRAXIS teacher examination.

With regard to the University's retention and graduation rates, currently, Morgan ranks in the upper third among public urban universities nationwide in its graduation rate for African Americans. Over 90 percent of Morgan's first-time, full-time freshmen are African American. As we improve our retention and graduation rates for African American freshmen, our retention and graduation rates for all students will improve. The University offers a number of programs for special populations on campus which provide additional academic support to students. Campus research has shown that students who participate in these special programs, Honors, Access-Success, PACE (Pre-Freshmen Accelerated Curriculum in Engineering), have higher retention and graduation rates than non-participants. As we receive additional funding to expand these programs to more students, we would expect our retention and graduation rates to increase. Increasingly, however, we are finding that affordability is a major factor in the retention 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 Morgan full-time. Additionally the pre-college preparation and socio-economic profile of the Morgan student body are quite different from many of our peers, thereby influencing Morgan's relative success in retention and graduation. Additionally, research has shown that reliance on adjunct faculty also has an unfavorable impact on student retention and graduation. Currently adjunct faculty comprises 41 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 smaller class size, better advising, and more faculty student interaction in and out of class.

Currently, women comprise 64 percent of our doctoral enrollment. We anticipate that more women will complete doctoral degree requirements. We also anticipate an increase in the enrollment of women at the doctoral level as our doctoral program in Nursing becomes established.

As we receive funding to hire more full-time regular faculty we anticipate that the number of faculty with terminal degrees will increase as well as our expenditures in research and development as more full-time regular faculty will be eligible to apply for and receive grant funding.

**Morgan State University Peer Performance Data, 2008**

Institution Name	% Students on Federal Grants	Fall 2006 Entering Freshman Class Second Year Retention Rates of Cohorts			Fall 2001 Entering Freshmen Six Year Graduation Rates			# of Doctorates Awarded to Women	# of Doctorates Awarded to Blacks	# of Bachelor's In Stems to Blacks	% of Full Time Faculty with Terminal Degree
		All	Black	Minority	All	Black	Minority				
Morgan State University	51%	62%	62%	62%	40%	38%	38%	19	25	177	80%
University of Alabama in Huntsville	23%	77%	79%	79%	44%	49%	53%	5	0	20	91%
Florida A & M University	57%	82%	81%*	81%*	43%	43%	43%	17	25	166	80%
University of Massachusetts-Lowell	20%	75%	72%	72%	46%	39%	40%	64	2	25	96%
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	21%	76%	79%	78%	48%	35%	39%	0	0	9	86%
Michigan Technological University	23%	83%	N/A	N/A	61%	50%	50%	21	1	9	88%
Oakland University	17%	73%	60%	60%	44%	33%	34%	43	1	6	91%
Jackson State University	67%	76%	76%	76%	35%	36%	36%	50	50	108	70%
The College of New Jersey	14%	95%	92%	94%	86%	57%	66%	NP	NP	5	88%
CUNY City College	55%	79%	N/A	N/A	30%	26%	28%	NP	NP	86	87%
North Carolina A & T State University	54%	72%	59%	71%	39%	39%	39%	2	2	208	85%
Tennessee State University	36%	70%	71%	72%	40%	41%	29%	29	12	116	64%
Texas A & M University-Kingsville	57%	61%	61%	74%	32%	12%	30%	25	0	6	77%
<b>Peer Average</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>75.5%</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>73.7%</b>	<b>45.3%</b>	<b>38.2%</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>83.2%</b>

Institution Name	FY 2006 Research Expenditure	% Change in Research Expenditure	% Alumni Giving	PRAXIS or NES % Passing 2006-2007
Morgan State University	\$25,783,409	-8%	6%	100%
University of Alabama in Huntsville	\$56,019,612	33%	6%	100%
Florida A & M University	\$22,684,179	-16%	10%	100%
University of Massachusetts-Lowell	\$30,297,000	11%	10%	98%
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	\$17,787,000	-35%	19%	98%
Michigan Technological University	\$42,762,000	36%	17%	100%
Oakland University	\$6,622,356	-2%	6%	100%
Jackson State University	\$28,327,197	11%	5%	98%
The College of New Jersey	\$7,369,000	18%	10%	98%
CUNY City College	\$28,728,131	-1%	20%	92%
North Carolina A & T State University	\$20,070,031	1%	15%	100%
Tennessee State University	\$10,614,662	-17%	3%	98%
Texas A & M University-Kingsville	\$10,012,864	-1%	5%	82%
<b>Peer Average</b>	<b>\$23,621,342</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>97.2%</b>

NA - Data not available

NP- No program

\* 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 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 13 performance measures while matching peers on two. Ninety-seven percent of St. Mary's faculty holds terminal degrees, eight percentage points higher than the peer average. The college exceeds the peer average salary percentile rank for full-time professors by 1.3 percentage points. The average SAT scores of entering freshmen is 1230, compared to the peer average of 1226. SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile scores of 1120-1340 compare favorably with the current peer average of 1115-1324. St. Mary's is slightly less selective than its peers, with an admissions acceptance rate three points higher. The average second-year retention rate (89 percent) is above the peer average of 86 percent. St. Mary's six-year graduation rate increased from 80 percent to 83 percent in the current reporting period and significantly exceeds the peer average of 73 percent. Ten percent of St. Mary's freshmen are African American, twice the peer average. Minority students comprise 18 percent of St. Mary's total enrollments in comparison to 15 percent for peers. Ninety-six percent of St. Mary's undergraduates are full-time students, just above the peer average. Like its peers, St. Mary's enrollment is made up of 99 percent undergraduates. Thirty percent of St. Mary's freshmen received federal grants, double the proportion at peer colleges. The student-faculty ratio of 12:1 meets the current peer average. The library has over 13 thousand more serial subscriptions than the peer average. Finally, tuition and fees at St. Mary's are substantially less than that of peers: \$11,989 vs. the peer average of \$24,509 (most peer colleges are private institutions).

St. Mary's performance is lower than the peer group average on 15 measures. The college's total research spending is \$381.5 thousand, less than half of the peer average. Average annual salaries of full, associate, and assistant professor are below the average by one-to-three thousand dollars. The admissions yield ratio was 34 percent, three points below the average. Total headcount enrollment (2,002) was below the peer average by 291 students. St. Mary's fiscal 2007 Education and General Fund (E&G) expenditures per FTE student was \$5,472 below peers. The alumni giving rate was 10 percentage points below peers. Tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures were eight points below peers. St. Mary's has fewer resources in its library by over 254 thousand books, serial back files, and other paper materials. It has two fewer librarians, two fewer library staff and expends \$106 per FTE 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 six of thirty measures. It has more faculty with terminal degrees (97 percent vs. 96 percent). Aspirant peers are more selective than St. Mary's, with an acceptance rate of 30 percent compared to St. Mary's 56

percent. Total headcount enrollment at St. Mary's is lower than peers by 180 students. Ten percent of St. Mary's freshmen are African American in contrast to only five percent for the peers, while 18 percent of total enrollment is minority compared to the peer average of 16 percent. Thirty percent of St. Mary's freshmen receive federal grants, three times higher than the peer average. St. Mary's, like its peers, primarily serves undergraduates. In addition, St. Mary's is significantly more affordable than its peers, with tuition and fees of \$11,989 vs. \$37,705.

The college scores below peers on 24 measures. Total research expenditures are only a third that of the peer average. Faculty salaries for all ranks are below the aspirant peer group average by ten-to-eighteen thousand dollars. SAT scores for entering freshmen (1230) were 131 points below the peer average. The SAT 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile range of 1120-1340 is below the aspirant peer average range of 1273-1449. St. Mary's yield rate is just below that of their peers. Average second-year retention and six-year graduation rates are both five points below the aspirant peer averages. St. Mary's has a lower percentage of full-time undergraduates (96 percent) compared to peers (99 percent).

In terms of resources, the college is below the aspirant peer average on every measure. These include fiscal 2007 Educational and General (E&G) expenditures per full-time equivalent student (-\$19,530), average alumni giving rate (-29 percentage points), tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures (-16 percentage points), student-faculty ratio (12:1 compared to aspirant peers at 10:1), number of book volumes in the library (-523,169), full-time library staff (-4), total library staff (-11) and library expenditures per FTES (-\$862).

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 with many private liberal arts institutions. Staff notes the continuing increase in retention and six-year graduation rates over past reporting periods. In previous reports, St. Mary's has commented on the fact that library resources have been well below current and aspirant peers; the institution should provide an update on this issue.

### **Institution's Response**

St. Mary's College of Maryland is pleased that MHEC has recognized that the College has met or exceeded its current peers on 15 of the 30 performance measures included in the most recent peer analysis. While keeping tuition \$12,520 below the rest of our current peers' average, the College has been able to recruit students with higher 25th- 75th percentile SAT scores (1120-1340 compared to 1115-1324), retain 89 percent of students from the first to the second year, and graduate 10 percent more students than our current peers (83 percent compared to 73 percent).

St. Mary's College continues to fulfill its goals of "enhancing accessibility, affordability, and diversity" through recruiting a diverse student body with 30 percent of the first-year students receiving federal grants. This is double the proportion receiving aid from current peer institutions and three times higher than our aspirant peer average. The College is also proud to have 18 percent of the total student body be minority students. This is also two percent higher than the aspirant peer average.

St. Mary's is encouraged to report that it meets or surpasses its aspirant peers on several measures. The College is \$25,716 lower in tuition and fees than the aspirant peers' average of \$37,705. Ten percent of the first-year class is African American at St. Mary's College, which is double the aspirant peer average of five percent.

A newly redesigned Core Curriculum, expanded student life facilities, such as housing and athletic facilities, and a greater emphasis on international and experiential education are some initiatives that shape how St. Mary's College progresses towards maintaining a high standard of excellence in providing a quality liberal arts education to the residents of Maryland.

MHEC has requested that the College provide an update on library resources. The College library continues to benefit from participation in the USMAI consortium (University System of Maryland and Affiliated Institutions). Faculty and students have access to a combined collection of over three million books which can be requested without staff intervention and which arrive on campus within five business days. Conventional interlibrary loan supplements the request process for books not owned by the consortium and for journals not available in print or online. There are over 85 research database licenses including several electronic reference tools (online encyclopedias), a streaming music library, full-text of newspapers including the historical New York Times, over 7,000 electronic books, and 20,000 journals available in full-text online. Students and faculty can access all of the library's electronic resources through a remote proxy server 24/7 from anywhere in the world.

The local, physical book collection continues to grow at a steady rate. An external review of the library in spring 2008 indicated that, although the volume per FTE count for St. Mary's is below our peers, ". . . there seems to be little faculty displeasure with the quality of the collections. . . . This figure (\$669,000 spent on library materials in fiscal 2007) compares more favorably with peers so it is likely that the library has sufficient quality in the recent additions to the collections". The print journal collection has dipped slightly below 1,000 as the library continues to transition to online licenses and subscriptions when possible and practical. Online access saves space and provides more ubiquitous access for users.

The Library Archives now offer access to digital collections of College materials and a database of student senior project information. An information literacy initiative was implemented with the new Core Curriculum which identifies information literacy as one of the four fundamental liberal arts skills to be developed over the four years of a SMCM education.

The College approved a new library faculty line for fiscal 2010. The search for a Reference/Instruction/Emerging Technologies librarian was deferred as a result of current budget concerns but this additional position will be added when budgets allow. Currently one of the library's primary concerns is the stability of the budgets used for annual licenses and subscriptions. In addition, the external review team noted the need to review use of space in the library in order to meet the demands of a larger student body and changes in learning styles and study space needs.

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND  
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, 2008**

Indicator	Current Peer Average	Aspirant Peer Average	All Peers Average	SMCM	Current Peers:					Current Peers, cont.:				
					Beloit	College of Wooster	Colorado	Connecticut College	Dickinson	Gettysburg	Guilford	South-western	U of Mary Washington	
<b>QUALITY / SELECTIVITY</b>														
Amount in total research spending, FY07 <sup>1</sup>	\$811,536	\$1,323,251	\$962,040	\$381,494	\$138,393	\$889,611	\$1,084,221	\$1,600,000	\$2,703,605	\$519,881	\$191,884	\$719,453	\$417,229	
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2007 <sup>2</sup>	89%	96%	91%	97%	94%	97%	94%	91%	N/A	84%	62%	98%	N/A	
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '07: <sup>3</sup>														
Professor:	\$87,845	\$105,033	\$93,912	\$86,474	\$74,400	N/A	\$111,900	\$99,900	\$98,800	\$97,700	\$67,600	\$85,500	\$84,800	
Associate Professor:	\$67,355	\$76,967	\$70,747	\$63,807	\$57,300	N/A	\$76,500	\$74,800	\$74,800	\$73,000	\$57,500	\$69,300	\$64,100	
Assistant Professor:	\$54,382	\$62,400	\$57,212	\$52,118	\$46,700	N/A	\$62,000	\$67,600	\$58,600	\$59,400	\$46,800	\$52,000	\$50,100	
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '07:														
Professor:	78.3% <sup>4</sup>	92.8% <sup>4</sup>	87.7% <sup>4</sup>	79.6%	55.8%	N/A	94.5%	89.3%	88.5%	87.7%	39.3%	78.3%	77.4%	
Associate Professor:	76.1% <sup>4</sup>	90.2% <sup>4</sup>	85.0% <sup>4</sup>	68.8%	43.6%	N/A	89.2%	87.1%	87.1%	85.0%	44.4%	80.5%	69.9%	
Assistant Professor:	79.5% <sup>4</sup>	89.7% <sup>4</sup>	80.7% <sup>4</sup>	62.9%	32.5%	N/A	88.3%	80.5%	82.3%	83.7%	32.9%	62.3%	52.5%	
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall '07 <sup>5</sup>	1226	1361	1253	1230	1295	1210	1310	1325	1280	1290	1115	1235	1190	
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall '07 <sup>5</sup>	1115-1324	1273-1449	1153-1352	1120-1340	1210-1380	1090-1330	1230-1390	1230-1420	1190-1370	1220-1360	990-1240	1130-1340	1090-1290	
Acceptance Rate, Fall '07 <sup>7</sup>	53%	30%	45%	56%	60%	74%	32%	38%	42%	36%	58%	67%	23%	
Yield Ratio, Fall '07 <sup>7</sup>	37%	35%	36%	34%	25%	23%	34%	30%	25%	32%	24%	29%	94%	
<b>RETENTION AND GRADUATION</b>														
Average second year retention rate <sup>2</sup>	86%	94%	89%	89.0%	90.2%	86.8%	93.2%	91.2%	91.0%	91.2%	73.8%	87.8%	86.0%	
Six year graduation rate <sup>2</sup>	73%	88%	78%	83.0%	79.0%	72.0%	83.0%	81.0%	93.0%	81.0%	58.0%	72.0%	75.8%	
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class <sup>6</sup>	5%	5%	5%	10%	5%	4%	2%	6%	4%	5%	10%	2%	3%	
<b>ACCESS, Fall 2007</b>														
Total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	2293	1822	2136	2002	1358	1777	2060	1884	2381	2492	2688	1294	4985	
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	15%	16%	15%	18%	12%	11%	15%	14%	15%	8%	29%	22%	15%	
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates <sup>g</sup>	94%	99%	96%	96%	97%	99%	99%	97%	99%	99%	84%	98%	86%	
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	99%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduat <sup>e</sup>	\$24,509	\$37,705	\$28,908	\$11,989	\$29,908	\$31,870	\$33,972	\$46,675	\$35,784	\$35,770	\$24,470	\$25,740	\$6,494	
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY07 <sup>8</sup>	15%	10%	13%	30%	12%	15%	9%	10%	9%	8%	20%	19%	8%	
<b>EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES</b>														
E&G expenditures in FY07 per FTES <sup>1</sup>	\$27,930	\$41,988	\$32,616	\$ 22,458	\$ 24,596	\$ 32,979	\$ 44,508	\$ 36,429	\$ 31,566	\$ 32,060	\$ 17,478	\$ 34,974	\$ 13,360	
Average alumni giving rate (2007) <sup>2</sup>	29%	48%	35%	19%	37%	30%	31%	38%	37%	36%	19%	30%	24%	
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures <sup>1</sup> (FY07)	53.6%	61.5%	56.2%	45.9%	60.3%	56.3%	54.2%	78.1%	73.7%	72.7%	61.1%	45.3%	50.1%	
Student-Faculty Ratio (2007) <sup>2</sup>	11.8 to 1	9.8 to 1	11.2 to 1	12:1	11:1	12:1	11:1	9:1	11:1	11:1	16:1	10:1	15:1	
Academic libraries, FY2006 <sup>9</sup>														
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials:	413,797	682,272	508,553	159,103	503,871		532,793	608,672	489,719	404,100	256,396	350,547	373,954	
Current Serial Subscriptions:	8,582	10,420	9,231	22,000	1,959		6,506	6,043	1,300	20,592	17,618	3,501	6,090	
Librarians:	9	11	10	7	5		10	11	10	13	6	9	11	
Total Staff:	27	36	30	25	21		29	30	38	30	17	28	35	
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):	\$ 930	\$ 1,686	\$ 1,196	\$ 824	\$ 975		\$ 1,470	\$ 1,397	\$ 906	\$ 986	\$ 373	\$ 1,709	\$ 472	

<sup>1</sup> FY07 Finance Report, IPEDS Website

<sup>4</sup> Median reported for average

<sup>7</sup> Institutional Characteristics 2007, IPEDS Website

<sup>2</sup> America's Best Colleges 2009, USN&WR

<sup>5</sup> Midpoint of 25th to 75th percentiles, Fall '07, IPEDS Website

<sup>8</sup> Student Financial Aid FY07, IPEDS Website

<sup>3</sup> Academe, March-April 2008

<sup>6</sup> Fall Enrollment Report 2007, IPEDS Website

<sup>9</sup> Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND  
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, 2008**

Indicator	U of Minn Morris	U of NC Asheville	VMI	Aspirant Peers:					
				Bates	Carleton	Davidson	F & M	Hamilton	Kenyon
<b>QUALITY / SELECTIVITY</b>									
Amount in total research spending, FY07 <sup>1</sup>	\$324,016	\$777,719	\$372,415	\$753,531	N/A	\$1,186,032	\$3,115,070	\$1,175,000	\$386,624
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2007 <sup>2</sup>	N/A	85%	98%	N/A	N/A	96%	97%	96%	N/A
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '07: <sup>3</sup>									
Professor:	\$75,900	\$84,000	\$85,800	\$106,500	\$108,700	\$108,100	\$107,300	\$113,100	\$86,500
Associate Professor:	\$61,100	\$65,500	\$67,000	\$77,200	\$77,400	\$83,000	\$77,500	\$81,400	\$65,300
Assistant Professor:	\$50,200	\$57,700	\$57,100	\$62,500	\$66,400	\$61,700	\$64,600	\$63,200	\$56,000
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '07:									
Professor:	60.0%	76.3%	78.8%	92.3%	>95%	92.9%	92.6%	>95%	79.7%
Associate Professor:	59.1%	72.9%	76.1%	90.0%	90.2%	94.6%	90.2%	>95%	72.5%
Assistant Professor:	52.8%	80.7%	79.5%	89.1%	>95%	87.8%	92.0%	90.3%	76.5%
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall '07 <sup>5,7</sup>	1170	1160	1130	N/A	1400	1353	N/A	N/A	1330
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall '07 <sup>7</sup>	1020-1320	1050-1270	1030-1230	N/A	1310-1490	1270-1436	N/A	N/A	1240-1420
Acceptance Rate, Fall '07 <sup>7</sup>	76%	71%	54%	30%	30%	28%	37%	28%	29%
Yield Ratio, Fall '07 <sup>7</sup>	42%	30%	50%	34%	35%	42%	30%	34%	34%
<b>RETENTION AND GRADUATION</b>									
Average second year retention rate <sup>2</sup>	85.0%	78.2%	81.5%	94.5%	97.0%	95.5%	91.5%	92.5%	93.5%
Six year graduation rate <sup>2</sup>	61.0%	54.0%	68.0%	89.0%	93.0%	92.0%	84.0%	88.0%	84.0%
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class <sup>8</sup>	2%	4%	7%	5%	5%	6%	5%	4%	4%
<b>ACCESS, Fall 2007</b>									
Total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	1686	3528	1378	1660	1986	1685	2105	1841	1656
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	19%	8%	13%	12%	22%	16%	15%	19%	13%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates <sup>g</sup>	92%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	98%	100%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment <sup>f</sup>	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduat <sup>h</sup>	\$9,331	\$4,045	\$10,048	\$46,800	\$36,156	\$31,794	\$36,480	\$36,860	\$38,140
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY07 <sup>8</sup>	35%	16%	13%	4%	14%	18%	8%	11%	7%
<b>EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES</b>									
E&G expenditures in FY07 per FTES <sup>1</sup>	\$ 19,903	\$ 18,579	\$ 28,732	\$ 39,254	\$ 42,837	\$ 43,330	\$ 40,358	\$ 47,229	\$ 38,917
Average alumni giving rate (2007) <sup>2</sup>	17%	8%	35%	43%	64%	54%	36%	47%	41%
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures <sup>1</sup> (FY07)	30.6%	27.1%	33.4%	86.7%	52.1%	44.6%	65.7%	53.9%	65.8%
Student-Faculty Ratio (2007) <sup>2</sup>	13:1	13:1	10:1	10:1	9:1	10:1	10:1	10:1	10:1
Academic libraries, FY2006 <sup>9</sup>									
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials:	206,447	394,609	430,662	668,122	744,589	626,359	696,220	617,080	741,261
Current Serial Subscriptions:	23,863	6,310	618	24,948	19,047	2,800	2,088	3,800	9,838
Librarians:	5	9	6	13	13	11	10	9	12
Total Staff:	14	34	18	34	37	30	35	45	37
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):	\$ 555	\$ 669	\$ 714	\$ 1,818	\$ 2,018	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,849	\$ 1,513

<sup>1</sup> FY07 Finance Report, IPEDS Website

<sup>2</sup> America's Best Colleges 2009, USN&WR

<sup>3</sup> Academe, March-April 2008



# **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 the institutions felt to be most relevant to their specific institutional objectives.

## Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Core Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland FY 2008

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
1	SAT score 25 <sup>th</sup> /75 <sup>th</sup> %ile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2007. 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 2007
2	% 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 2007
3	% African-American of all undergraduates	IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2007
4	Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America’s Best Colleges, 2008 edition. UMCP data from 2009 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 2002 and 2005.  UMCP peer data are for classes entering between 2003 and 2006.	2002-2005 data  2003-2006 data
5	Six-year graduation rate	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2006 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2008 edition.	Six-year graduation rate, 2000 cohort (Sum of students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted cohort)  2001 cohort for UMCP	2006 (2000 cohort)  2007 (2001 cohort) for UMCP
6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2006 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE	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	2006 (2000 cohort)  2007 (2001 cohort) for UMCP

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
		(Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2008 edition.	6 years/adjusted minority cohort)	
7	Six-year graduation rate: African-Americans	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2006 Graduation Rate Survey. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, 2008 edition.	Self-explanatory. (Sum of African-American students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted African-American cohort)	2006 (2000 cohort)  2007 (2001 cohort) for UMCP
8	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Title II website, State Report 2007 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.	2005-2006 test takers
9	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	Number of baccalaureate level nursing graduates taking the NCLEX examination in FY 07 who pass on the first attempt divided by the number of baccalaureate level nursing graduates taking the exam for the first time in FY 07.	FY 2007 test takers
10	Passing rates in other licensure exams			
10a	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2009 edition	Percentage of 2006 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 2006 and Winter 2007 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.	2006 graduates
10b	Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	Number of pharmacy graduates in the Class of 2007 who passed the NAPLEX on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2007 graduates

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
10c	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 2006 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.	2006 graduates
10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2007 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2007 divided by number of graduates from Dental School Class of 2007.	2007 graduates
10e	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Number who pass the 2007 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2007
11	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America’s Best Colleges, 2008 edition (UMCP data from 2009 edition). If data unavailable from U.S. News, source used: Council for Aid to Education, 2007 Voluntary Support of Education, 2008.	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 2005 and 2006.  UMCP data from 2006 and 2007.	2005 & 2006 average  2006 & 2007 average for UMCP.
12	Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAUDE.	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>	FY2006  FY2007 data for UMCP
13	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of	FY2006

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
		Survey (faculty counts), or, IPEDS (faculty counts for UMES & peers); AAMC (for medical faculty for UMB & peers). AAUDE data for UMCP.	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.	FY2007 data for UMCP
14	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAUDE	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY2001 through FY2006. 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> .	FY2001 – FY2006  FY2002-FY2007 for UMCP
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 2004 through 2008. Awards counted: Fulbrights, Guggenheims, NEH fellowships, CAREER (Young Investigator) awards, Sloan fellowships. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts.	2004 – 2008
16	Institution-specific measures			

### Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution Specific Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland 2008

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
<b>BSU</b>				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007.	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2006-2007 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2008 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2006 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2007	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2007
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)	FY2006
<b>CSU</b>				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2006-2007 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2008 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2006 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2007	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2007
4	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2007 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2007
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	<b>IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2007 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2006</b>	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 2007 state appropriation, Fall 2006 (FY 2007) enrollment

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
<b>FSU</b>				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2007 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2007
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007	The percentage of full-time who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	2006-2007 faculty
<b>SU</b>				
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2008 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 2006 freshmen
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007	The percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	2006-2007 faculty
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	<i>IPEDS Peer Analysis System – Fall Enrollment &amp; Fall Staff</i>	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty.	Fall 2007
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2006
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	<i>IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2007 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2006</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.	FY 2007 state appropriation, Fall 2006 (FY 2007) enrollment
<b>TU</b>				
1	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008 edition, 2007	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2006 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2006
2	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report, 2008 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 2006
3	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News, America's	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the	Fall 2006 freshmen



	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
		Best Colleges, 2008 edition	number of freshmen admitted	
<b>UB</b>				
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, FY 2007, Part C, line 02, col. 1	Total dollars expended for research	FY 2007
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position, 2006	Percentage of instructional faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 2006
<b>UMB</b>				
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2006
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2006
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2006
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 2007
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional	Fall 2007
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2007
<b>UMBC</b>				
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY 2007 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer	FY2007

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
			Engineering; Electrical, Electronics & Communication.	
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	FY2006
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 2007.	Fall 2007
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 2006
5	Rank in ratio of license agreements to \$Mil. R&D	AUTM, Table 3	Self explanatory. Licenses & options executed.	FY 2006
<b>UMCP</b>				
1	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation	National Research Council, <i>U.S. News</i> , <i>The Wall Street Journal</i> , <i>Financial Times</i> , <i>Business Week</i> , <i>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 2008
2	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation	National Research Council, <i>U.S. News</i> , <i>The Wall Street Journal</i> , <i>Financial Times</i> , <i>Business Week</i> , <i>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 2008
3	% change over five years in faculty	USM database	The percent change over five years in the number of	2004-2008

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
	memberships in national academies		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.	
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 2006
5	Number of degrees awarded to African-American students	IPEDS Completions survey via AAUDE	The number of undergraduate degrees awarded to African-American students	Fiscal Year 2007
<b>UMES</b>				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2008, edition, 2007	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2006-2007 faculty
2	IT degrees as % of all bachelor's degrees	NCES, IPEDS, Completions, 2007	Bachelor's degrees in CIP codes 11.0101 through 11.9999 as a percentage of all bachelor's degrees awarded.	July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007
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 2005
<b>UMUC</b>				
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 2007
2	% 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 2007
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),	FY 2007

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Source of peer data</b>	<b>Operational definition</b>	<b>Date to be used</b>
			computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204).	
4	Number of statewide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2008
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2008

## Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: Morgan State University 2008

### *MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS*

Measure	Source of peer Data	Operational definition	Data Used
1. Percent students on federal grants	IPEDS, Morgan State University/MHEC Financial Aid System	The percentage of undergraduate students receiving federal grants	Academic Year 2006-2007
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 2007, Peer Institutions	The percentage of first, full time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2006 cohort unless otherwise noted
2. 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 2006 cohort unless otherwise noted
3. 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 2006 cohort unless otherwise noted
4. 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 2001 cohort unless otherwise noted
5. 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	Fall 2001 unless otherwise noted

6. Six year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC- EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Peer Institutions	matriculation. 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 2001 cohort unless otherwise noted
---	---	---	--

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Data Used
7. Number of Doctorates awarded to women	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS. IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions.	Self-explanatory	2007 Graduates
8. Number of Doctorates awarded to Blacks	MSU/MHEC DIS IPEDS	Self-explanatory	2007 Graduates
9. Number of Bachelor’s in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) awarded to Blacks	IPEDS	Number of Bachelor’s Degrees awarded to blk in the following CIP codes: 01,03,04,11,14,15,26,27,40,41,51	2007 Graduates
10. Percent Full-Time Faculty with terminal Degree	US New and World Report Ultimate College Guide 2007 Edition Peer Institutions	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctoral or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2007
11. Research Expenditures	IPEDS		Fiscal Year 2007
12. Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of previous fiscal year.	MSU Budget Office IPEDS Peer Institution	Self Explanatory	Fiscal Year 2006-2007
13. 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
14. 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 counted as a pass in the summary rate if he or she passed all required tests for any area in which she was prepared.	2006-2007 data

### Appendix E. Operational Definitions For Performance Indicators: St. Mary's College Of Maryland 2008

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Amount in total research spending, FY 2008	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2008
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	2009 edition
3	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Academe	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank. (SMCM values were not published in this volume and have been calculated based on the rules in Academe.)	March-April 2008
4	Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank	Academe	Interpolated percentile of average full-time faculty salary as compared to national salaries	March-April 2008
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Midpoint of 25 <sup>th</sup> to 75 <sup>th</sup> percentiles of SAT Critical Reading and SAT Math	2007
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 (Critical Reading and Math) scores of entering freshmen	2007
7	Acceptance rate	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2007 applicants who were admitted	2007
8	Yield ratio	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2007 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	2007
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 enrolled in Fall '06 that re-enrolled the subsequent year	2009 edition
10	Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World	Average six-year graduation rate for all students	2009 edition

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
	Report, America's Best Colleges website	from the first-time, full-time degree-seeking student who enrolled in Fall '01	
11 Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	IPEDS enrollment report	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	2007
12 Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	2007
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	2007
14 Percent of full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time	2007
15 Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	2007
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	2007
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	FY 2007
18 E&G expenditures per FTES	IPEDS Finance report; IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	FY 2007 total education and general expenditures and transfers divided by Fall '06 FTE students	FY 2007
19 Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Percentage of solicited alumni who gave to an institution	2009 edition
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 2007 total education and general	2007



Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
21 Ratio of FTES to full-time equivalent faculty	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	expenditures and transfers Ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty	2009 edition
22 Academic libraries	Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website	As provided on NCES website	FY2006