



Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis

University System of Maryland

Morgan State University

St. Mary's College Of Maryland

March 2010

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

Kevin M. O’Keefe, Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Joann A. Boughman

Eyituoyo Ebigbeyi

Mark R. Frazer

Patrice Alexander Ficklin

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

Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Performance Measures for University System of Maryland and Morgan State University	4
St. Mary’s College of Maryland Quality Profile	4
Tables	
Table 1. University System of Maryland Performance Measures	6
Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures	7
Table 3. St. Mary’s College of Maryland Performance Measures	8
Peer Performance Analysis	
Bowie State University	10
Coppin State University	12
Frostburg State University	15
Salisbury University	19
Towson University	21
University of Baltimore	24
University of Maryland, Baltimore	27
University of Maryland Baltimore County	30
University of Maryland, College Park	33
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	38
University of Maryland University College	43
Morgan State University	46
St. Mary’s College of Maryland	49
Appendix A. Peer Performance Selection Methodology for USM Institutions	56
Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Core Performance Measures: USM	57
Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution Specific Performance Measures: USM	61
Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: Morgan State Univ.	67
Appendix E. Operational Definitions for Performance Measures: St. Mary’s College	69

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. 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.

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 includes 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 also discussed. Each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers; these institutional responses are also 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.

Assessing Institution Performance

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. In instances where an institution's performance was materially below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will be taking to improve performance.

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 ¹	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
2. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. % African American of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second-year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
5. Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
6. Six-year graduation rate: African American	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
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 ²			SW ²				SW Law Med Dent.				
10a.											
10b.						Law					
10c.											
10d.											
11. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Total R&D expenditures ⁵								•	•	•	•
13. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty ⁵	•							•	•	•	•
14. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures ⁵								•	•	•	•
15. # of faculty awards per 100 faculty						•	•	•	•	•	•
16. Institution-specific measures	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

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

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

³ Comparable peer data are not available. Data for USM institutions.

⁴ University of North Carolina System's schools will be used for peer comparison

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

⁶ Social Work

Table 2. Morgan State University Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines

Measure ¹	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 ²	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

¹ For all measures, the most recent data available was used .

² STEM stands for science, technology, engineering and mathematics disciplines

Table 3. St. Mary's College of Maryland Performance Measures for Quality Profile

Measure¹
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

¹For all measures, the most recent data available was used .

Peer Performance Analysis

Bowie State University

Bowie State University meets or exceeds its peers' performance on eight of nine core performance measures. Bowie's incoming freshmen SAT scores for the 25th – 75th percentiles are slightly higher than last year's scores (800-950) and are comparable to a peer average of 798-980. The percentages of all minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates surpass peer averages by large margins. Bowie's second-year retention rate (74 percent) is higher than last year's rate and is 7.7 percentage points higher than the peer average. The six-year graduation rate increased from 36.8 percent to 41.3 percent this year and is 10.9 percentage points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for all minorities, as well as that of African Americans, continue to exceed peer averages. Bowie reports a 95 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams, slightly lower than last year's rate but still 4.0 points above the peer average.

The university is slightly below peer performance on one core measure. At three percent, the university's undergraduate alumni giving rate is 2.3 percentage points below the peer average.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance and yield rates, and Research and Development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. The percent of full-time faculty holding terminal degrees increased to 92 percent (comparisons can't be made to peers on this measure since half did not report data). Bowie's average acceptance rate is 46 percent, making it more selective than peers, which have a 57 percent acceptance rate. The yield rate (percent of students who accept enrollment offers) has dropped to 36 percent and is 13.3 points lower than peer rates. R&D expenditures per full-time faculty have dropped and are \$18,629 million below the peer average.

Commission staff commends Bowie on improving retention and graduation rates, as well as on the increase in percent of faculty with a terminal degree. Bowie is asked to comment on the fact that its average undergraduate alumni giving rate remains below the peer average.

Institution's Response

Even though the percent of alumni giving is below Bowie's peers, the total dollars received from alumni has jumped from \$100,899 in FY 2004 to \$441,602 in FY 2009. Bowie has undertaken a number of approaches to grow alumni giving. For example, a comprehensive communication/solicitation plan including both mail and "phone" appeals served as the basis for the increase in our alumni participation rate. All alumni were contacted and invited to invest in Bowie State as opposed to the smaller or selected groups used in the past. Additionally, a professional "telemarketing firm" was contracted to facilitate our "phone" appeal. Relations were strengthened with the Bowie State University National Alumni Association that contributed to the increase as well.

**Bowie State University
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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.	800-950	93.8%	90.2%	74%	41.3%	41.4%	41.8%	95%
Alabama A&M U.	790-950	96.7%	96.1%	67%	32.5%	32.9%	32.8%	100%
Alabama State U.	690-830	NA	NA	59%	21.0%	21.3%	21.2%	100%
Auburn U., Montgomery	870-1030	34.3%	30.9%	57%	23.5%	19.3%	18.8%	94%
California State U., Bakersfield	800-1040	51.1%	5.5%	76%	44.5%	42.8%	25.0%	97%
Columbus State U.	860-1100	40.4%	34.0%	71%	29.5%	28.2%	29.7%	95%
Indiana U., Southeast	840-1040	9.2%	5.8%	63%	31.7%	7.7%	0.0%	94%
New Jersey City U.	790-950	61.2%	19.2%	75%	34.5%	33.9%	28.1%	94%
Norfolk State U.	790-940	91.9%	88.9%	64%	32.4%	32.7%	32.9%	80%
Prairie View A & M U.	750-940	94.6%	88.3%	65%	36.8%	36.8%	37.3%	76%
Sul Ross State U.	NA	68.2%	5.0%	NA	17.8%	18.9%	14.3%	80%
Average of Peers	798-980	60.8%	41.5%	66%	30.4%	27.5%	24.0%	91%

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	BSU institution-specific indicators			R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)
		% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate	Yield rate	
Bowie State U.	3%	92%	46%	36%	\$12,564
Alabama A&M U.	NA	71%	49%	54%	\$51,985
Alabama State U.	4%	65%	42%	29%	\$10,920
Auburn U., Montgomery	4%	NA	91%	52%	NA
California State U., Bakersfield	5%	NA	48%	37%	\$8,294
Columbus State U.	11%	78%	60%	64%	NA
Indiana U., Southeast	8%	73%	87%	66%	NA
New Jersey City U.	5%	84%	32%	50%	NA
Norfolk State U.	NA	NA	68%	37%	\$28,345
Prairie View A & M U.	1%	NA	40%	55%	\$56,427
Sul Ross State U.	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$31,184
Average of Peers	5.4%	74%	57%	49%	\$31,193

NA - Data not available

Coppin State University

Coppin State University exceeds the performance of its peers on two of ten core performance measures. The percentages of all undergraduates that are minority, as well as the percentage African American, are well above peer averages.

Coppin under-performs the peer average on seven core measures. Coppin's 25th and 75th percentile SAT scores of 800-890 are below the peer average of 856-1027. The second-year retention rate decreased to 63 percent compared to a peer average of 65 percent. The six-year graduation rate for all students fell from 18.2 percent to 15.9 percent, less than half the peer average of 32.1 percent. In addition, minority student graduation rates declined to 16.1 percent, 12.4 points below the peer average. African American student graduation rates declined to 16.2 percent, compared to a peer average of 29.8 percent. Coppin's teacher licensure exam pass rates dropped from 100 percent to 90 percent, 8.9 percent below the peer average. Coppin's nurse licensure exam pass rates dropped from 87 percent to 64 percent, 22.9 points below the peer average. Coppin did not provide data for one of its core measures: undergraduate alumni giving rates.

Coppin has five institution-specific indicators: percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance and yield rates, student to faculty ratio and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student (FTE). Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide information that offers an institutional profile in comparison to selected peers. For example, approximately 53 percent of full-time faculty at Coppin holds a terminal degree, compared to a peer average of 65 percent. 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 (22.3 compared to the peer average of 19.3). State appropriations per FTE are \$1,707 above the peer average.

The Commission staff asks Coppin to comment on the measures on which it under-performs its peers: SAT scores of its freshman class, retention and graduation rates, and teacher licensure exam pass rates. Coppin is also asked to provide data on undergraduate alumni giving rates.

Institution's Response

The Vice President for Enrollment Management has developed a 5-year strategic enrollment plan for the University with a special emphasis on recruiting high ability students that will increase the SAT scores of CSU freshman class.

The strategic enrollment plan will also place special emphasis on student persistence-to-graduation. Among the clearly articulated goals (for which there will be built in accountability) are: Piloting a Student Success Initiative aimed at male students (3 sub-cohorts of 15 students will be selected to participate in the project which is two semesters in duration and includes a learning community, service learning component, and peer-mentoring); persistence goals for freshmen and special programs; and outreach programs for underprepared students.

The inclusion of Student Success Coaches within the Office of Enrollment Management to assist students in resolving any issue related to their university experience will assist Coppin students in meeting some critical benchmarks. Additionally, we will be revising our advisement model to better serve each cohort of students. A Center for Student Success and a Center for Adult Learning will be established to serve the needs of two very different cohorts of students here at Coppin.

Additionally, we will explore reorganizing our summer programs to give many more of our students the opportunity to complete developmental course work during the summer. If this goal is met, we could significantly shorten the length of time to degree in a relatively truncated period.

Coppin State's School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). CSU will continue to maintain high standards of excellence in both initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation teacher programs. Our goal is to increase our teacher licensure pass rate to 100%, which was the rate achieved in the 2008 peer performance report.

**Coppin State University
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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.	800-890	87.9%	87.3%	63%	15.9%	16.1%	16.2%	90%	64%
Albany State U.	850-970	93.5%	92.8%	78%	50.2%	50.4%	50.4%	NA	92%
Alcorn State U.	790-950	93.2%	92.3%	68%	38.8%	39.4%	39.6%	100%	NA
Augusta State U.	890-1070	33.9%	27.4%	66%	20.8%	16.2%	11.8%	98%	88%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	NA	93.9%	93.2%	57%	21.9%	22.3%	22.7%	100%	NP
Henderson State U.	870-1150	24.2%	20.4%	60%	33.1%	30.3%	31.3%	100%	72%
Louisiana State U., Shreveport	NA	26.8%	21.9%	60%	NA	12.8%	9.1%	100%	NP
Nicholls State U.	950-1070	22.8%	18.2%	66%	33.6%	18.5%	16.8%	100%	90%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	850-1040	51.6%	28.3%	70%	33.4%	39.9%	48.1%	93%	80%
Virginia State U.	790-940	94.3%	94.1%	73%	39.3%	39.4%	39.5%	100%	100%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	55.3%	3.2%	54%	17.7%	15.7%	28.6%	NA	NA
Average of Peers	856-1027	59.0%	49.2%	65%	32.1%	28.5%	29.8%	99%	87%

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	CSC institution-specific indicators		
		% of F-T faculty with terminal degrees	Acceptance rate	Yield rate
Coppin U.	NA	53%	36%	30%
Albany State U.	5%	NA	29%	43%
Alcorn State U.	2%	62%	59%	15%
Augusta State U.	5%	65%	53%	78%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	5%	70%	47%	NA
Henderson State U.	7%	63%	66%	50%
Louisiana State U., Shreveport	NA	NA	76%	NA
Nicholls State U.	8%	55%	84%	64%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	15%	74%	86%	47%
Virginia State U.	10%	NA	58%	40%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average of Peers	7.2%	65%	62.0%	48%

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

Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University meets or exceeds average peer performance on seven of ten core performance measures. Minority student enrollment as a proportion of total undergraduate enrollment (26.1 percent) is 13.2 percentage points above the peer average and African Americans as a percent of total undergraduates (21.9 percent) is 16.7 percentage points above the peer average. Both have increased since last year. The university's six-year graduation rate has improved to 47.6 percent, comparable to its peer average. Six-year graduation rates of minorities (38.8 percent) and African Americans (39.8 percent) are both down from 2008 rates but remain equal to or higher than peer averages (the minority rate is equivalent to the average while that of African American students is 3.0 points higher). Frostburg's teacher licensure exam pass rate is 97 percent, equal to the peer average. The BSW Social Work licensing exam pass rate improved from 82 percent to 100 percent (no comparable peer data). The alumni giving rate is 12 percent, 2.4 percentage points above the peer rate

The university performs below the average of its peers on two core measures. Freshman SAT scores in the 25th to 75th percentile are 870-1060 compared to a peer average of 899-1099. The second-year retention rate is 71 percent, 3.9 percentage points below the peer average.

Frostburg includes two institution-specific indicators and exceeds peer averages on both. Student-faculty ratio at Frostburg is 17 to 1 versus a peer average of 18 to 1. Eighty-five percent of Frostburg's faculty has terminal degrees compared to 84 percent of peers.

Commission staff commends Frostburg on its success in continuing to increase enrollment diversity, as well as on the strong improvement in the BSW Social work licensing exam pass rate to 100 percent. Frostburg should comment on its decreasing second-year retention rate and the fact that SAT scores of the entering class are slightly below those of its peers.

Institution's Response

Second-year Retention Rate

The slight decrease in the average (4-yr) second-year retention rate of Frostburg State University's (FSU) undergraduate first-time student cohort from 72% in 2008 to 71% in 2009 is partly attributed to an increase in voluntary withdrawals and appears, for the most part, to be anomalous. The University recognizes that further improvements to its student persistence efforts are required. As detailed in the *Institutional Achievement Gap Report*, FSU anticipates that the following new initiatives and a continued emphasis on current strategies will result in the enhancement of the retention rate.

As cited in Frostburg's 2009 accountability report, the *Closing the Achievement Gap* Task Force has been established to identify strategies to address retention and graduation rates of underrepresented groups at the University. These strategies include identifying students most at academic risk; identifying particular "gatekeeper courses," majors, and periods of student careers where student academic problems most often occur; reengineering programs and courses designed to improve students' entry-level skills in reading, writing, and mathematics; identifying what successful students do and modeling support services according to their behavior; and

developing specific programs and strategies to sustain the University's success in second-year retention into subsequent years. In addition, the University has joined the Pell Institute Retention Initiative and will use its consultation services to develop more detailed analyses of student outcomes and pressure points that help explain differences in student access.

The University's existing strategies, such as the Learning Communities program, are specifically designed to enhance student academic performance and second-year retention. Now in its twelfth year, the Learning Communities program allows first-year students to explore an academic major, life skill, or topic by enrolling in thematically linked courses. Learning communities also help students establish support networks with peers, faculty, and University staff. Fifty-one learning communities were offered in fall 2008. Student satisfaction surveys continue to show that acquiring study skills was an important aspect of the learning community experience.

Further student retention efforts include FSU's Phoenix Program, which provides an alternative for students who face mid-year dismissal following their first semester at the University. Low-performing students are placed in an Introduction to Higher Education course during the spring semester where they receive intensive support and assistance in improving their academic records. As of spring 2009, a total of 272 students have participated in the Phoenix Program.

Frostburg's student retention activities also include Student Support Services, an educational office that works specifically with first-generation, low income, and/or disabled students. Its Programs for Academic Support and Study (PASS) provide individual and group tutoring in a wide range of subjects along with personal instruction through the University's Writing Center.

In addition, the Center for Advising and Career Services works to encourage campus engagement and provide students with strategies to address change and overcome obstacles to their academic success. The Center provides individualized essential support to transfer, undeclared, and underrepresented students.

SAT Scores of FSU's Entering Class

Frostburg State University is committed to creating an environment that enhances student learning. The University serves the needs and interests of a diverse student population and provides a rich network of connections between faculty and students. Frostburg continues to attract students with strong academic credentials who are committed to successfully completing a baccalaureate degree.

First-time applicants to the University are granted admission based on high school grade point average (GPA), performance on the SAT, completion of a college preparatory program, optional letters of recommendation, and an optional admissions essay. While FSU acknowledges that its first-time students have SAT scores that are slightly below those of its peers, the University also recognizes that combined SAT percentiles are but one reflection of an applicant pool. Frostburg has achieved great success in serving students with high school GPAs that are stronger than their SAT scores.

Over the last three years, FSU's first-time students have maintained a high school GPA in the range of 3.04 to 3.10 (See Table 1).

Table 1
First-time Student
Average High School GPA and SAT Percentiles

	Average High School GPA	SATC 25 th	SATC 75 th
Fall 2008	3.10	870	1060
Fall 2007	3.07	860	1060
Fall 2006	3.04	870	1060

Data Source: P409 Student Research Population File

**Frostburg State University
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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 ^{1,2}	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
Frostburg State U.	870-1060	26.1%	21.9%	71%	47.6%	38.8%	39.8%	97%	100%	12%
Bridgewater State C.	930-1120	10.0%	5.6%	76%	50.9%	39.4%	44.6%	95%	NA	7%
Clarion U. of Penn.	840-1060	7.6%	5.8%	74%	52.2%	39.3%	38.2%	96%	NA	14%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	890-1060	12.1%	4.9%	79%	53.6%	48.5%	48.6%	95%	NA	14%
Indiana U., South Bend	840-1060	12.8%	6.5%	64%	26.0%	24.2%	5.7%	97%	NA	8%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	960-1160	12.7%	6.8%	76%	45.9%	39.1%	38.1%	99%	NA	11%
Rhode Island C.	850-1060	15.8%	6.0%	77%	46.1%	32.0%	32.3%	96%	NA	9%
Sonoma State U.	920-1110	20.4%	2.1%	77%	49.5%	41.3%	35.3%	100%	NA	1%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	955-1140	10.9%	4.5%	80%	54.1%	45.5%	48.0%	98%	NA	12%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	935-1145	8.3%	2.8%	75%	49.3%	43.8%	56.3%	97%	NA	14%
Western Connecticut State U.	870-1070	18.1%	6.9%	71%	40.5%	32.8%	21.3%	99%	NA	6%
Average of Peers	899-1099	12.9%	5.2%	75%	46.8%	38.6%	36.8%	97%	NA	9.6%

University	FSU institution-specific indicators	
	FTES per full-time faculty	% of faculty with terminal degrees
Frostburg State U.	17	85%
Bridgewater State C.	20	89%
Clarion U. of Penn.	21	86%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	20	79%
Indiana U., South Bend	15	68%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	18	82%
Rhode Island C.	21	91%
Sonoma State U.	21	88%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	16	86%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	14	86%
Western Connecticut State U.	16	86%
Average of Peers	18	84%

NA - Data not available

⁽¹⁾ 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.

⁽²⁾ Indicates the percentage of first-time examinees who passed the Bachelor's level exam during the 2009 testing cycle.

Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds its peers on eight of ten core performance indicators. Entering freshmen SAT scores in the 25th-75th percentile range are among the highest in the peer group (1040-1210 compared to peer group average of 979-1162). Salisbury's percentages of minority and African American undergraduate students are 17.4 percent and 11.6 percent respectively; both exceed peer averages. The second-year retention rate has risen to 82 percent, almost three percentage points higher than the peer average. Salisbury's overall six-year graduation rate of 69.1 percent is 11.4 percentage points above the peer average. Minority and African American graduation rates have improved since last year. The minority rate is 62.2 percent (up from 53.3 percent), while that of African Americans is 57.1 percent (up by one point). Both rates remain above peer averages: 18.1 points higher for all minority students and 15.1 points for African American students. Salisbury's pass rate on nursing licensing exams rose from 90 percent to 95 percent this year; compared to a peer average of 87 percent. The average alumni giving rate increased by two points to 14 percent, putting Salisbury 4.6 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 94 percent pass rate, although up two points from last year, still falls short of the peer average of 97 percent.

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 FTE. Salisbury is more selective than its peers with an acceptance rate of 56 percent compared to a peer average of 64 percent. Eighty-two percent of Salisbury faculty holds a terminal degree, equivalent to the peer average. The student-faculty ratio is 15.3 to 1, better than the 18.6 to 1 peer average. The average high school GPA for entering freshmen of 3.5 is just above the average. And while Salisbury's state appropriations per FTE increased to \$5,021, it remains below the peer average by \$2,427 per FTE.

Commission staff commends Salisbury on maintaining diversity and improving retention and graduation rates. In the past, the university has described initiatives to improve teacher licensure exam pass rates; the Commission requests an update in view of Salisbury's continuing under-performance relative to peers.

Institution's Response

Salisbury University is pleased that the pass rate for the PRAXIS II increased by 2 percentage points, to 94%, from the previous year. This marks the third consecutive year at Salisbury University that these pass rates increased. During the 2008-09 academic year (AY), the Professional Education unit implemented a new graduation requirement for students seeking their degree in a Professional Education area. Beginning with students graduating from the Professional Education program in spring 2010 and after, students must pass the PRAXIS II in order to graduate with recommendation for certification. This will result in a teacher licensure pass rate of 100% for Salisbury University. However, the rates provided on the 2009 Peer Performance report are based on data from graduates during AY 2006-07. As such, it will take four more Peer Performance reporting cycles for the 100% PRAXIS II pass rate to be displayed for Salisbury University.

**Salisbury University
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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
Salisbury U.	1040-1210	17.4%	11.6%	82%	69.1%	62.2%	57.1%	94%	95%
Bloomsburg U. of Penn.	930-1110	10.7%	6.6%	81%	65.5%	53.4%	51.2%	93%	94%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	960-1160	12.7%	6.8%	76%	45.9%	39.1%	38.1%	99%	85%
Millersville U. of Penn.	960-1150	12.2%	6.9%	81%	61.7%	40.1%	38.3%	99%	No program
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1070-1240	11.3%	5.4%	84%	67.2%	56.3%	55.2%	98%	91%
Northern Iowa, U. of	990-1190	5.9%	2.8%	82%	63.0%	46.3%	43.8%	NA	No program
Sonoma State U.	920-1110	20.4%	2.1%	77%	49.5%	41.3%	35.3%	100%	84%
Southeast Missouri State U.	950-1150	10.3%	8.0%	70%	50.5%	41.2%	42.7%	93%	94%
SUNY, C. at Oswego	1040-1180	9.6%	3.8%	78%	56.9%	45.2%	47.4%	96%	No program
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	955-1140	10.9%	4.5%	80%	54.1%	45.5%	48.0%	98%	73%
SUNY, Fredonia	1010-1190	7.7%	2.9%	85%	63.0%	32.7%	20.0%	98%	No program
Average of Peers	979-1162	11.2%	5.0%	79%	57.7%	44.1%	42.0%	97%	87%

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	SU institution-specific indicators			Total state appropriation/FTEs
		Acceptance rate	% of faculty with terminal degrees	Ratio of FTEs to FTEF	
Salisbury U.	14%	56%	82%	15.3	\$5,021
Bloomsburg U. of Penn.	12%	61%	86%	19.7	\$4,664
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	11%	66%	82%	17.7	\$8,455
Millersville U. of Penn.	9%	57%	93%	20.2	\$5,328
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	11%	58%	86%	19.1	\$9,166
Northern Iowa, U. of	13%	80%	71%	17.4	\$8,498
Sonoma State U.	1%	73%	88%	21.3	\$8,332
Southeast Missouri State U.	6%	88%	78%	19.3	\$5,578
SUNY, C. at Oswego	10%	50%	82%	19.3	\$7,692
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	12%	47%	86%	16.0	\$7,784
SUNY, Fredonia	9%	56%	80%	16.4	\$8,980
Average of Peers	9.4%	64%	83%	18.6	\$7,448

NA - Data not available
NP - No program

Additional Notes:

⁽¹⁾ 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.

⁽²⁾ 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 in 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%.

⁽³⁾ 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 report on a testing period of one year, but the start and end dates of that annual report period varies. All, however, include part of 2008.

Towson University

Towson University exceeds average peer performance on six out of ten core performance measures. Towson's SAT 25th-75th percentiles scores of 990-1150 compare favorably with the peer average of 929-1143. The percentage of African American undergraduate students attending the institution increased to 11.7 percent this year, 1.8 percentage points above the peer average. Towson's second-year retention rate remains at 83 percent, compared to a peer average of 77 percent. The overall six-year graduation rate rose from 63.6 percent to 66.2 percent and is 16.1 points above the peer average. The six-year graduation rates for all minorities increased by over one point to 66.7 percent, which is 21.6 points above the peer average. For African American students, the six-year graduation rate increased 69.9 percent, 28.4 points over the peer average.

Towson performs below the average of its peers on four core measures. The percent minority of all undergraduates, while having increased to 19.0 percent, remains slightly below the peer average. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams (96 percent), while having improved, is 2.1 points below the peer average. The pass rate on nursing licensure exams dropped to 76 percent which is 16 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-five percent of Towson's students live on campus, comparable to the peer average. 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 60 percent compared to a peer average of 76 percent.

Commission staff commends Towson on its steadily improving graduation rates, especially of minority and African American students. Towson should comment on its below-average pass rates for teacher and nursing licensure exams.

Institution's Response

Teacher Licensure Exam

Institution-specific characteristics and requirements make 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, Western Kentucky, East Carolina, Eastern Michigan, James Madison, and UNC Charlotte require passing Praxis II either as a graduation requirement or before the institutions recommend a candidate for licensure, thereby ensuring higher pass rates. The current policy of the Towson University Teacher Education Executive Board does not require successful completion of the respective certification-specific Praxis II exams as a graduation requirement, nor as a prerequisite before Towson submits completers of a Maryland Approved Program to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). (However, MSDE requires that applicants for state teacher certification must pass certification-specific Praxis II

exams before granting a certificate). The Teacher Education Executive Board is reviewing its current policy regarding Praxis II exams.

Nursing Licensure Exam

Though our passing rate for AY 2009 was lower in comparison to peer performance, our nursing licensure passing rate was above the standard established by the Maryland Board of Nursing and we are recognized in good standing. Peer performance is primarily only relevant to the state in which the nursing program resides because regulatory standards and requirements frequently vary among states. We expect our pass rates in the state of Maryland to continue to improve with faculty hires and program stabilization, increased student selectivity, individualized student support, and implementation of the revised undergraduate curriculum. We identified variables related to success on the NCLEX-RN© examination and are implementing faculty-approved revisions to academic policies governing student admission and progression. We were awarded a 1.18 million dollar grant through the *Who Will Care Initiative*/Maryland Institute of Education, beginning AY 2010. A component of this grant will assist us in hiring two Retention Success Specialists to support individualized student learning/remediation needs; monitor student performance on the Total Testing Series (changed from Educational Resources, Inc. to Evolve Testing Series in AY 2010); and enhance student preparation for the nursing licensure examination. Another significant measure directed at improving NCLEX-RN© performance includes implementation of the substantially revised undergraduate curriculum. The revisions are being completed in response to the amended standards for baccalaureate education promulgated by the nursing education accrediting body, the Commission for the Colleges of Nursing Education, and in response to the National Council for State Boards of Nursing's revised "Test Plan," which forms the basis for the NCLEX-RN© examination. Our planned timeline for implementation of the revised curriculum is AY 2011-2012.

**Towson University
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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 icensure exams	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam
Towson U.	990-1150	19.0%	11.7%	83%	66.2%	66.7%	69.9%	96%	76%
Ball State U.	940-1150	10.2%	6.9%	77%	59.4%	49.4%	47.3%	99%	94%
California State U., Sacramento	840-1080	41.6%	7.0%	79%	41.5%	37.3%	29.5%	100%	93%
East Carolina U.	920-1100	19.5%	14.9%	78%	54.3%	54.3%	56.1%	97%	96%
Eastern Michigan U.	870-1110	25.0%	19.4%	73%	35.7%	22.4%	20.5%	100%	NA
James Madison U.	1050-1230	11.6%	4.0%	92%	82.4%	75.3%	66.4%	100%	90%
Massachusetts, U. of Boston	870-1110	37.0%	15.3%	72%	33.3%	32.6%	28.6%	98%	88%
North Carolina, U. of Charlotte	960-1150	24.6%	15.2%	77%	50.6%	53.8%	50.8%	97%	91%
Northern Iowa, U. of	990-1190	5.9%	2.8%	82%	63.0%	46.3%	43.8%	NA	NA
Portland State U.	920-1170	19.3%	3.0%	67%	33.7%	39.1%	33.3%	100%	NA
Western Kentucky U.	NA	13.0%	10.1%	73%	47.3%	40.2%	39.2%	92%	92%
Average of Peers	929-1143	20.8%	9.9%	77%	50.1%	45.1%	41.6%	98%	92%

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	TU institution-specific indicators		
		% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
Towson U.	6%	25% ¹	18/1	60%
Ball State U.	13%	42%	16/1	72%
California State U., Sacramento	2%	4%	21/1	67%
East Carolina U.	7%	26%	20/1	84%
Eastern Michigan U.	3%	16%	18/1	75%
James Madison U.	9%	36%	16/1	64%
Massachusetts, U. of Boston	5%	NA	16/1	61%
North Carolina, U. of Charlotte	6%	27%	15/1	75%
Northern Iowa, U. of	13%	38%	17/1	80%
Portland State U.	5%	12%	19/1	91%
Western Kentucky U.	16%	31%	18/1	95%
Average of Peers	7.9%	26%	17/1	76%

NA - Data not available

¹ Includes university owned and affiliated housing

University of Baltimore

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

UB outperforms the peer average on three of five core performance measures. Minority undergraduate students comprise 41.7 percent of enrollments which is 8.6 percentage points above the peer average. The university ranks second among peers in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments (34.3 percent) and is 19.2 percentage points above the peer average. In addition, UB reports 1.9 awards per 100 full-time faculty members, comparing favorably to a peer average of 1.3.

The average alumni giving rate at UB is 6.0 percent, up from last year but still 3.4 points below the peer average.

None of the selected peer institutions has a law school, thus, there is no comparative peer data for one core measure: pass rate for first-time test takers of the law licensing exam. UB had a 74 percent pass rate for the reporting period, one point below last year's pass rate. 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 84 percent pass rate for the same reporting period.

UB selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. It exceeds the peer average for research expenditures by \$4.0 million, ranking second among peers in this category. Almost 55 percent of the university's faculty is part-time, 6.1 points above the peer average.

Commission staff asks UB to comment on its below-average undergraduate alumni giving rate and its below-average proportion of full-time faculty.

Institution's Response

The most recent report of the average undergraduate (2-yr) undergraduate alumni giving rate for the University of Baltimore is 6% vs. 9.4% for its peers. This discrepancy is largely due to the data reported by one of the ten schools: the Citadel's reported rate is 28% while the average for the other nine schools is only 6.3%. The Citadel's rate is in fact an extreme outlier that distorts the average and makes the use of this particular statistic problematical. A better measure would be the median undergraduate alumni giving rate which is 7% for the ten peer schools. Using the median, the gap between UB and its peers is only 1%.

The peer performance indicator "% part-time faculty" is based on a simple headcount of full and part-time faculty that fails to measure accurately the role of the full-time faculty in instruction at the university. At UB, though full-time faculty make-up only 45 % of the total headcount, they teach over 68% of its credit hours. Most part-time faculty members at UB are working professionals who teach one or two classes a year in areas in which they have specific expertise,

particularly in UB's graduate and first-professional programs. At UB, 54% of the students are in the graduate and first-professional programs.

Though the commission staff did not ask the university to respond about the passing rate in the law licensing exam it is worth noting that the most recent results show a bar passage rate of 83% by first time test takers from the university, compared to the 74% reported (in this report).

**University of Baltimore
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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	41.7%	34.3%	74%	6%	1.9
Auburn University-Montgomery	34.3%	30.9%	no law school	4%	1.2
Citadel Military College of South Carolir	15.2%	7.4%	no law school	28%	0.6
Governors State University	44.1%	35.2%	no law school	NA	0.0
New Jersey City University	61.2%	19.2%	no law school	5%	NA
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	48.1%	5.0%	no law school	6%	NA
University of Houston-Clear Lake	38.5%	8.9%	no law school	NA	1.5
University of Illinois at Springfield	18.7%	11.9%	no law school	9%	3.5
University of Michigan-Dearborn	19.6%	10.5%	no law school	8%	0.4
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	NA	NA	no law school	NA	2.0
Western Connecticut State University	18.1%	6.9%	no law school	6%	0.9
Average of Peers	33.1%	15.1%		9.4%	1.3

	UB institution-specific indicators	
	Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty
Baltimore, U. of	\$6,338,123	54.9%
Auburn University-Montgomery	\$217,794	NA
Citadel Military College of South Carolir	\$345,925	NA
Governors State University	\$1,301,708	44.3%
New Jersey City University	\$0	64.5%
Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi	\$12,704,422	39.9%
University of Houston-Clear Lake	\$1,016,346	52.6%
University of Illinois at Springfield	\$1,832,356	82.0%
University of Michigan-Dearborn	\$4,645,000	39.6%
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	\$559,100	18.7%
Western Connecticut State University	\$583,638	NA
Average of Peers	\$2,320,629	48.8%

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 matches or out- performs peers on seven core performance measures. UMB enrolls a higher percentage of minority undergraduates and African American undergraduates than peer average by 9.7 and 12.9 percentage points, respectively. Pass rates on nursing and dental licensure exams (89 percent and 97 percent, respectively) are both above national averages by three points (peer averages are not available so UMB provided national averages for comparison). Pass rates on medical licensure exams (95 percent) match national rates, while pass rates on social work licensure exams (77 percent) are four points higher than national rates. Total R&D expenditures in Medicine per fulltime medical faculty dropped to \$267,799 but remain higher than the average, by \$36,811. The average annual percent growth rate in federal R&D expenditures in Medicine was cut in half this year, from 17.6 percent to 8.1 percent, making it comparable to the peer average.

The university compares unfavorably to peers on three core measure. The pass rate on the law licensure exam declined to 84 percent, which is below the peer average of 91 percent. UMB's average alumni giving rate is 10 percent, five points below the peer average. Total R&D expenditures in Medicine dropped to \$287 million, \$45 million below the peer average.

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 34.9 percent minority compared to a peer average of 30.8 percent. Its total headcount enrollment of 6,156 is over 16 thousand less than the peer average. Graduate and first- professional enrollments make up 87.7 percent of total headcount, more than twice the peer average.

UMB is asked to comment on below-average performance on the following measures: the Law licensure exam pass rate, the undergraduate alumni giving rate, and the total R&D expenditures in Medicine

Institution's Response

As usual, the National Institutes of Health continues to be the largest source of funding, but the largest individual grant awarded to UMB for fiscal year 2009 was from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to support work with HIV/AIDS patients in Nigeria. This grant contributes to the significant globalization of UMB's activities and an increase in funding for international projects from less than \$15 million five years ago to nearly \$100 million in fiscal year 2009.

Although bar exam pass rates are available for peer institutions, the difficulty of the bar exam differs among states, and thus pass rates cannot be used to compare the performance of law students sitting for the bar in different states. Compared to 2005, the pass rate for UMB students taking the Maryland bar exam has improved more than for graduates of any other peer institution taking the bar exam in their respective state, from 78% to 84%.

The University of Maryland, Baltimore has a small number of undergraduate students, and all undergraduate programs are upper division only, meaning that UMB is not the only higher education institution that graduates may have relationships with as alumni. Over the past five years this statistic has varied considerably.

Research and development expenditures in medicine reported for fiscal year 2007 (the data point utilized for the 2009 Peer Performance analysis) are lower due to a 12% decline in federal support compounded by a 30% drop in expenditures funded by state sources compared to the previous year. Although lower levels of funding from these sources continued for fiscal year 2008, overall expenditures in medicine recovered somewhat due to increased support from industry and institutional sources.

**University of Maryland, Baltimore
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams				Social Work	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law	Dental					
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	42.0%	26.1%	89%	95%	84%	97%	10%	\$287,081	\$267,799	8.1%	
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	33.6%	27.1%					11%	\$243,376	\$205,902	4.9%	
California, U. of, San Francisco	NA	NA		no law school			18%	\$791,663	\$454,456	12.6%	
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	48.6%	8.6%		no law school			7%	\$183,983	\$203,746	12.2%	
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	23.5%	6.3%		93%			18%	\$275,750	\$165,219	9.6%	
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	23.6%	10.9%		86%			23%	\$167,194	\$125,615	5.1%	
Connecticut, U. of											
Texas, U. of, Austin											
Virginia, U. of											
National			86%	96%	91%	94%	73%				
Average of Peers	32.3%	13.2%			91%		15.3%	\$332,393	\$230,988	8.9%	

University	UMB institution-specific indicators				Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headct.
	Medicine resrch. grants per Basic Res. faculty	Medicine Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount enrollment	
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore			34.9%	6,156	87.7%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham			28.6%	16,149	33.5%
California, U. of, San Francisco			41.3%	2,998	100.0%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago			40.9%	25,835	34.8%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor			22.0%	41,028	0.0%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill			21.4%	28,567	31.7%
Average of Peers			30.8%	22,915	40.0%

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) meets or exceeds the average of its peers on seven of thirteen core performance measures. It compares favorably on SAT 25th and 75th percentiles scores of 1090-1280 compared to the peer average of 1014-1227. UMBC's percentage of minority undergraduate students (42.9 percent) exceeds the peer average by 15.8 percentage points. African American students comprise 16.7 percent of undergraduate enrollment, more than double the peer average. UMBC's average second-year retention rate increased to 83 percent over the past year, equal to the peer average. The university's six-year graduation rate for African American students increased to 59.7 percent and exceeds the peer average by 7.2 points. UMBC ranks second in average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures—at 13.7 percent, it is over double that of the average peer growth rate. In addition, UMBC boasts an average of 3.8 awards per 100 full-time faculty, compared to a peer average of 2.8.

UMBC underperforms peers on six core measures. Although the overall six-year graduation rate rose by three points over the past year to 59.4 percent, it is 3.4 percentage points below the peer average. The six-year graduation of minorities dropped to 53.3 percent, 2.4 percentage points below the peer average. UMBC's pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 93 percent (a drop of three points from last year) and is 4.4 percentage points below the peer average. It also 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 \$55.7 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 ranks second on invention disclosures per million in R&D expenditures. It has a higher than average ratio of FTE students to full-time faculty (21.1:1 compared to 19:1) and is ranked third in federal R&D expenditures per full-time faculty, over \$87,000 per full-time faculty above the peer average. On ratio of license agreements 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: six-year graduation rate of all students and minorities, 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

Graduation Rates

Student retention and graduation rates are important indicators that UMBC takes very seriously and that the institution has worked vigorously to improve. *First Year Seminars*, student

“success” seminars, the *New Student Book Experience*, Living-Learning communities, and enhancements to freshman advising have all been implemented to promote student success and 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. One recent addition is a baccalaureate program in *Media and Communication Studies*, which builds on our strengths in these two areas. From an initial enrollment of 47 in 2007, this program has grown to 169 majors in fall 2009. Although the impact of these efforts on graduation rates takes several years to emerge, UMBC’s graduation rate has improved markedly from 53.3% in our 2004 report to 59.4% in 2009. The average for our peer institutions rose from 60.8% to 62.8% over the same period.

Over the past several years, graduation rates for African-American students and for minority students have generally exceeded the graduation rates for UMBC students overall. This year, the graduation rate for African-American students was 59.7%, which was comparable to the rate of 59.4% for all students. For minority students, however, the rate fell from 56.2% last year to 53.3% this year. This change appears to reflect a decline in the graduation rate for Asian students, which the university is currently investigating.

R&D Expenditures

UMBC has continued its growth in R&D expenditures and ranks very favorably among its peers on the measures that take the university’s size into account. For example, UMBC ranks lowest on Total R&D expenditures, but remains 6th (at the median) in Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty member. UMBC ranks 3rd on its institution-specific indicator of Federal R&D Expenditures per full-time faculty member. The rate of growth has slowed over the last 4 years, which is consistent with the trend for our peer institutions.

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% pass rates for the peer comparison data. Pass rates less than 100% 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 43 years old, with a comparatively small alumni base, and limitations on resources to staff the alumni office. In the past three 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 final year of a seven year campaign to raise \$100 million, and as of October 31, 2009 alumni had committed over \$2.9 million toward their \$3 million goal for the Campaign. The university has also enhanced communication with its alumni through a redesigned Web site (<http://retrievernet.umbc.edu>) and a new *UMBC Magazine*, which was launched in winter 2009 to connect alumni to the campus of today. The magazine is distributed in hard copy and is also available online (<http://www.umbc.edu/magazine>).

**University of Maryland Baltimore County
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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
UMBC	1090-1280	42.9%	16.7%	83%	59.4%	53.3%	59.7%	93%	5%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	1070-1260	13.0%	4.8%	83%	57.6%	50.9%	44.6%	100%	19%
California, U. of, Riverside	920-1170	76.1%	7.8%	86%	64.3%	64.6%	74.2%	99%	8%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1020-1250	42.1%	2.6%	89%	71.5%	70.7%	66.3%	100%	12%
Clemson U.	1130-1320	10.4%	7.2%	89%	79.5%	70.4%	68.5%	94%	28%
Massachusetts, U. of, Amherst	1050-1260	16.9%	4.9%	83%	69.0%	61.5%	56.3%	98%	12%
Mississippi State U.	950-1220	24.6%	21.7%	82%	59.9%	49.0%	46.7%	96%	12%
New Jersey Institute Tech.	1030-1240	49.7%	10.0%	81%	55.5%	58.2%	43.3%	NA	21%
Oklahoma State U., Main	1030-1220	17.9%	4.2%	80%	59.8%	52.1%	47.0%	100%	16%
Rhode Island, U. of	950-1140	13.2%	4.9%	80%	57.9%	41.1%	45.0%	98%	10%
Wyoming, U. of	990-1190	6.8%	1.0%	75%	52.5%	38.8%	33.3%	92%	11%
Average of Peers	1014-1227	27.1%	6.9%	83%	62.8%	55.7%	52.5%	97%	14.9%

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	\$66,968	\$163,337	13.7%	3.8	1	2	21.4	\$120,637	6
Arkansas, U. of, Main	\$101,109	\$149,349	6.8%	1.9	6	7	17.9	\$54,677	2
California, U. of, Riverside	\$125,562	\$208,922	16.0%	2.8	4	NA	25.1	\$91,033	NA
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	\$124,856	\$245,297	21.5%	5.3	7	NA	27.6	\$133,996	NA
Clemson U.	\$209,733	\$239,969	2.6%	2.1	3	5	15.4	\$60,894	3
Massachusetts, U. of, Amherst	\$135,950	\$137,462	5.3%	5.9	5	NA	19.3	\$69,593	NA
Mississippi State U.	\$200,982	\$295,997	7.9%	1.3	10	3	18.2	\$157,052	5
New Jersey Institute Tech.	\$88,699	\$309,056	10.0%	3.6	2	1	17.4	\$144,007	1
Oklahoma State U., Main	\$97,083	\$109,698	4.0%	1.2	9	4	18.3	\$40,456	4
Rhode Island, U. of	\$68,147	\$112,454	1.0%	1.1	8	6	20.8	\$76,297	7
Wyoming, U. of	\$74,490	\$137,182	3.3%	2.6	11	NA	14.3	\$42,168	NA
Average of Peers	\$122,661	\$194,539	7.8%	2.8	NA	NA	19.4	\$87,017	NA

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 exceeds the peer average on four out of thirteen core performance measures for the current reporting period. UMCP enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates (13.1 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 are \$292,837, about \$20 thousand above the peer average. UMCP's 5.8 percent average annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures is over twice the 2.1 percent peer average.

UMCP falls below the peer average on nine core measures. The university's new student SAT 25th - 75th percentile score range of 1190-1360 compares unfavorably to the group average of 1196-1406. While it enrolls the highest percentage of African American undergraduates, it is 6.9 percentage points below the peer average for all minorities as percent of enrollment. Second-year retention rates are three percentage points below the peer average. The six-year graduation rate for all undergraduates (81.8 percent) and all minority undergraduates (77.0 percent) have improved for four consecutive years, but both rates remain below peer averages of 86.9 and 83.0 percent, respectively. The six-year graduation rate of African American students dropped from 69.0 to 67.7 percent, which is 4.3 points below the peer average. The university's 14 percent alumni-giving rate is 2.6 percentage points below the peer average. Total R&D expenditures, while up, are \$51.4 million below the peer average. UMCP reports 4.6 awards per 100 full-time faculty members, compared to a peer average of 5.2.

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 68 graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 compared to a peer group average of 97. UMCP's number of programs ranked in the top 15 (48) is well below the peer average of 83. The university continues to outpace its peers in the percent change in faculty memberships in national academies with 14.3 percent growth compared to 8.7 percent growth for the peer average. The number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures is just about equal to the peer average of 32. Once again, UMCP ranks first in the number of degrees awarded to African American students (680), exceeding the peer average by 359 degrees.

UMCP is to be commended for its success for once again achieving a 100 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams and for its increasing diversity in terms of African American undergraduates. The university is asked to 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, 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% 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 (33.9%) than the University of Illinois, the University of Michigan, and the University of North Carolina, whose minority enrollment percentages range from 23% to 27%. However, UM enrolls more than twice the proportion of African-American students (13.1%) when compared with the peer average (6.2%). Finally, it should be noted that UM also graduates more African-American students than any of our peers.

Retention Rate

The average second-year retention rate for the University of Maryland (93%) is below the peer average (96%). Our retention rate has fluctuated over the past several years, although trending upward overall. As we approach an asymptotic limit of a 100% retention rate, yearly fluctuations in our progress are to be expected. Over time, however, we have been able to close the gap by one percentage point. Though our current rate (93.2%) is a slight decline from last year, we do not believe this represents a trend. We believe our long-term gains are the result of student success initiatives that were implemented over the last few years. The strategic plan sets a goal of a 94% retention rate in five years and 96% in ten years, which will achieve comparability with our peers.

Six-Year Graduation Rates

For the University: The University has set ambitious goals to increase its graduation rates. The strategic plan calls for graduation rates to increase to at least 83% in five years and 86% in ten years. Further, in its Managing for Results report, the University set a University goal of an 80% graduation rate in 2009. In 2009, the University eclipsed that goal with a graduation rate of 81.7%.

For all minorities: For all minorities our goal has been to increase the graduation rate from 66% to 73%. As of fall 2009, the graduation rate for all minorities is at 76.4%, exceeding the MFR goal.

For African-American students: The rate for African-American students was expected to increase from 57% to 64% over the past five years. As is the case for all minorities, the graduation rate for African American students has also exceeded our 2009 goal and is now at 70.4%.

The University is clearly achieving success for all students. Although peer data are not available for the most current (2003) cohort comparisons, we know that UMCP rates have continued to

improve. Please note, however, that inclusive of the fall 2002 cohort, the UM graduation rate has increased by approximately twelve percentage points over the last six years; in addition, the fall 2003 cohort graduated at virtually the same rate. This growth rate exceeds that of our peers (approximately three percent.) Additionally, while the most comparable statistic for graduation rates for minority students is six percentage points below the peer average, the UM rate for all minorities has increased by thirteen percentage points over six years, while the peer average has only increased by four percentage points over the same period. The rate for African-American students was four percentage points below the peer average; but, again, the rate for African-American students has increased by twelve percentage points over the last six years, while the peer average has increased by only three percentage points. Looking at our most recent data for the fall 2003 cohort, the graduation rate for African-American students rose from 67.7% (for the fall 2002 cohort – the last date for which comparable statistics were available) to 70.4 percent for the fall 2003 cohort. Despite the lag behind the peer average rates, the University has made tremendous progress both in terms of increasing graduation rates for all students and in decreasing the gap between the UM graduation rates and the peer averages. University initiatives supporting the Chancellor’s goal of closing the achievement gap, coupled with strategies identified in the Strategic Plan to improve student success, are key factors that have achieved improved retention and graduation rates.

Alumni Giving Rate

The average two-year alumni giving rate for UM (14%) is below our peer average of 16%. 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 (23.6%). 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%), UCLA (14%), Michigan (18%), and Illinois (14%).

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 whom 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% 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

At 5.8%, UM’s average annual percent growth (5-yr) in federal R&D expenditures is second only to UNC (7.6%) among our peers. In 2008, UM increased its total R&D expenditures by 9.8% over 2007 and, at an average of \$292,837 per faculty member, exceeded the average total federal R&D expenditures per FT faculty members of our peers.

Due to challenges and uncertainties facing the federal research budget, the university continues to focus on expanding its non-federal funding sources. We continue to build partnerships with the commercial sector. For example, the University's master agreement and research partnership with Lockheed-Martin has already resulted in funding for a number of research task orders and the development of our first joint center proposal to Lockheed-Martin. We continue to build partnerships with other universities and academic institutions as well. In addition to our successful seed grant program with UMB which has resulted in new NIH-funded research projects, we just initiated a seed grant program with the Smithsonian Institution intended to strengthen faculty research partnerships in a number of areas spanning from the sciences to the humanities.

On the federal side, the University continues to acquire funding for its established large Centers, as well as for new centers such as the NSF-funded Physics Frontiers Center. On the partnership front, we recently developed an Alliance for Cancer Technology with the National Cancer Institute, Center for Cancer Research that will leverage each party's resources to facilitate collaborative research between and among researchers working at the interface between the life sciences, physical sciences and engineering, including the areas of biophysics, bioengineering and biocomputation; establish a program for qualified University graduate students to conduct research under the joint supervision of NCI/CCR investigators and University faculty, and serve as a multi-faceted model for government agencies and universities to work together to enhance and support research and training.

Graduate Program Rankings

A major goal of the Strategic Plan is to offer excellent graduate and professional programs that rank among the finest in the nation and the world. Through a consistent effort to improve academic offerings and recruit exceptional faculty, the University has been able to more than double the number of graduate programs nationally ranked in the top 15, from 22 in 1998 to 48 in 2009. In the same period, it has increased the number of programs ranked in the top 25 from 31 in 1998 to 68 in 2009. For both categories, the peer average has remained relatively stable over the same period of time. With the Strategic Plan's focus on improving and advancing graduate programs, the University expects to continue to increase the number of programs ranked. Among disciplines where the number of national programs is large, the University has set a goal of having 80% of those programs ranked in the top 25 by 2018.

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, 2009**

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 2008	
					Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans			Total R&D expenditures (000s) - non-med per FT faculty	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1190-1360	33.9%	13.1%	93%	81.8%	77.0%	67.7%	100%	14%	\$395,037	\$292,837
California, U. of, Berkeley	1200-1460	57.2%	3.5%	97%	89.6%	89.9%	76.8%	100%	14%	\$538,202	\$374,011
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1160-1410	57.0%	3.5%	97%	89.2%	88.5%	72.7%	99%	14%	\$243,717	\$132,816
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1190-1380	27.1%	6.7%	93%	82.0%	75.7%	64.8%	100%	14%	\$494,020	\$264,465
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1220-1380	23.5%	6.3%	96%	88.0%	81.0%	69.7%	100%	18%	\$607,645	\$306,562
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1210-1400	23.6%	10.9%	97%	85.7%	79.8%	75.8%	99%	23%	\$348,683	\$283,252
Average of Peers	1196-1406	37.7%	6.2%	96%	86.9%	83.0%	72.0%	100%	16.6%	\$446,453	\$272,225

University	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UMCP institution-specific indicators					Number of degrees awarded to African-American students
			# grad level colleges/pgrms/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/pgrms/ 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		
Maryland, U. of, College Park	5.8%	4.6	68	48	14.3%	31	680	
California, U. of, Berkeley	0.6%	7.1	123	118	1.0%	26	186	
California, U. of, Los Angeles	0.0%	4.3	111	90	11.6%	31	236	
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	0.2%	5.3	73	54	7.5%	42	445	
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	2.2%	5.7	115	106	6.5%	41	362	
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	7.6%	3.8	65	46	16.7%	22	376	
Average of Peers	2.1%	5.2	97	83	8.7%	32	321	

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 2008.
- (3) SAT scores for Illinois and Michigan are converted from the reported, combined ACT scores; the conversion is made using the College Board's ACT-to-SAT conversion table. The 25th/75th percentile scores for UMCP and all peers are from the NCEES Peer Analysis System (PAS).
- (4) Invention disclosures per R&D expenditures include the medical sciences for peers. These data are for FY07. Data sources: Institutional Technology Transfer Offices, Annual Reports for FY07 (same providers of AUTM data).

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

The University of Maryland Eastern Shore matches or exceeds its peer group on four out of twelve core performance measures. UMES exceeds its peer average in the percentage of African American undergraduate enrollments by 3.4 percentage points. The six-year graduation rate for African Americans increased by almost five points to 39.1 percent, equal to the peer rate. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams has reached 100 percent for the third consecutive year, higher than the peer average of 95 percent. Average undergraduate alumni giving rate is seven percent, matching the peer rate.

UMES falls below the average peer performance on two thirds of core performance measures. The university's freshmen SAT 25th-75th percentile scores are 742-900 compared to the peer average of 801-977. Minority undergraduate enrollments (84.1 percent) are 2.2 points below the peer average. Average second-year retention rates fell to 65 percent compared to a peer average of 71 percent. The average six-year graduation rate increased to 38.2 percent, just below the peer average of 39.3 percent. The average six-year graduation rate of minority students is also up (to 38.8 percent), 1.2 points below the average. Total R&D expenditures dropped to \$2.2 million, \$5.5 million below the peer average. Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty also fell—\$20,476 compared to an average of 37,097. The university's annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditures is down substantially, putting it 13.6 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, below the average of 74.0 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 8.7 percent and is 1.1 points above the peer average.

The Commission staff commends UMES for once again achieving a 100 percent pass rate on teacher licensure exams and its improvement on graduation rates. UMES should comment on the following measures for which its performance compares unfavorably to that of peers: freshmen SAT 25th-75th percentile scores, second-year retention rate, total R&D expenditures, total R&D expenditures per FT faculty, growth in federal R&D expenditures, and loan default rate.

Institution's Response

Freshman SAT Percentile Scores

The 25th/75th percentile scores for UMES freshman students of 742-900 are lower than the 801-977 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 for all citizens. Since student preparation before entering college is a critical factor affecting student success, UMES will continue to limit the number of admitted students with a minimum two-component composite SAT score below 850. In addition it will continue to implement the aggressive recruitment strategy of attracting top performing scholars attending high schools on the Del-Marva Peninsula by offering scholarships to eligible entering freshmen. For example, in the fall 2009 semester 38

student scholars were enrolled with combined verbal/math SAT scores, ranging between 900 – 1300.

Given the stiff competition for students with high SAT scores, increasing the cut score for freshmen will have adverse impact on freshmen enrollments in the short-term. To ensure a stable enrollment of incoming students, the University proposes to pursue an aggressive recruitment strategy for transfer students. Current plans include a proposal to hire a Transfer Student Recruiter and Coordinator to assist the Office of Admissions and Recruitment with this effort. Unfortunately, this strategy will have to wait until the budget situation for the State of Maryland, the University System of Maryland and UMES improves and the position of the recruiter is filled.

Second Year Retention Rate

The low average second-year retention rate continues to be the single most important issue that demands intrusive and ongoing attention by every operational unit, department, and division at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES). UMES President Thelma Thompson's inclusion of retention in the Institution's strategic priorities for all divisions and units underscores the importance the University attaches to this issue as well as its continued commitment to increasing the rate through a variety of strategies currently in place.

UMES has developed and implemented a process, which not only monitors and tracks first-to-second year retention rates, but also looks at first-to-second semester attrition in an effort to better understand, manage and positively impact retention. The second semester return rate and student academic performance as represented by the spring semester Grade Point Average (GPA) have a direct impact on second-year retention rate.

UMES has implemented a data-informed outreach program that assists students in preparing for academic success during the initial semester of enrollment and assists students in preparing for the subsequent semester. Students are assessed to determine their entry-level performance indicators, after which the appropriate interventions are provided to each student. These outreach activities include: (1) identification of "at-risk" student early in the semester, (2) increasing the number of advisor/advisee sessions per semester, (3) advisor training, (4) enhancing the advising outreach to students who did not pre-select courses for the upcoming semester, (5) usage of student success plans, and (6) SMARTHINKING (online 24/7) tutorial support. We are already noticing significant improvement in the second-year retention rate which has increased from 65% (2006 cohort), 66% (2007 cohort), to 70% (2008 cohort). If this trend holds, closing the achievement gap between our students and their peers may be well within our reach in the near future.

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 workshop 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 the 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.

It bears note that although the total research & development expenditure for FY 2008 is \$2,150,000, the actual R & D expenditure reported to the National Science Foundation was \$5,648,000. The lesser amount is reflected in the Peer Performance Measures (PPM) report because R&D expenditures funded by the Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, and Life Sciences (medical) are excluded from the PPM. The University will, therefore, continue to diversify its sources of funding and areas of research interest.

UMES minority undergraduate enrollments (84.1%) are 2.2% below peer average. The University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) considers diversity as a strength and not a weakness or challenge. Therefore, the fact that in the current report the undergraduate minority enrollment of 84.1% is less than the average for peers (86.3%) by 2.2% is perceived as a positive outcome on this indicator. UMES land-grant mission offers attractive academic programs which are unique to the region and the university. These programs attract non-African American students to UMES because they are not offered anywhere else on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The university also offers popular academic programs at extension sites such as the Universities at Shady Grove and Chesapeake College. These collaborative programs are offered at sites where Non-African-American students are in the majority. Consequently, these programs add to the racial and ethnic diversity of the campus.

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 FY 2005 to 8.7 in FY 2006). This gradual increase is reflective of the changing economic conditions of the global, national and state economies. According to a study by the Michigan State University Collegiate Employment

Research Institute (<http://www.higheredmorning.com/job-market-for-new-college-grads> December 4, 2009), job market prospects for recent graduates are grim and hiring for such graduates in 2009 dropped by about 40% and is likely to remain unchanged for 2010. 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 will continue to utilize its default management procedures to continually keep its cohort default rate to a minimum. These procedures include (1) offering in-person entrance counseling sessions for students who are unable to successfully complete the online process; and (2) sponsoring credit management seminars and workshops in an attempt to inform its students about the financial obligations of student loans. These financial aid workshops for students will continue to emphasize conservative borrowing and minimization of student loan debt. It is hoped that these measures will help to keep the cohort default rate under control as the economy recovers from the current recession.

**University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

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	742-900	84.1%	81.5%	65%	38.2%	38.8%	39.1%	100%	7%	\$2,150
Alabama A&M U.	790-950	96.7%	96.1%	67%	32.5%	32.9%	32.8%	100%	NA	\$13,672
Albany State U.	850-970	93.5%	92.8%	78%	50.2%	50.4%	50.4%	NA	5%	\$1,331
Alcorn State U.	790-950	93.2%	92.3%	68%	38.8%	39.4%	39.6%	100%	2%	\$9,056
California State U., Bakersfield	800-1040	51.1%	5.5%	76%	44.5%	42.8%	25.0%	97%	5%	\$1,833
Fort Valley State U.	860-1020	97.7%	96.9%	78%	34.6%	34.4%	34.7%	NA	NA	\$2,610
North Carolina A&T State U.	790-980	93.4%	90.7%	69%	37.7%	38.5%	38.6%	100%	12%	\$23,918
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	800-1040	51.6%	28.3%	70%	33.4%	39.9%	48.1%	93%	15%	\$329
Prairie View A & M U.	750-940	94.6%	88.3%	65%	36.8%	36.8%	37.3%	76%	1%	\$12,019
South Carolina State C.	740-940	97.0%	96.3%	67%	45.0%	45.1%	45.1%	96%	8%	\$3,796
Virginia State U.	790-940	94.3%	94.1%	73%	39.3%	39.4%	39.5%	100%	10%	\$8,170
Average of Peers	801-977	86.3%	78.1%	71%	39.3%	40.0%	39.1%	95%	7.3%	\$7,673

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 with terminal degrees	IT degrees as % of all bachelor's degrees	Loan default rate
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	\$20,476	-12.9%	64%	3.1%	8.7%
Alabama A&M U.	\$51,985	-4.2%	71%	5.2%	7.8%
Albany State U.	\$10,734	-8.4%	NA	5.1%	8.2%
Alcorn State U.	\$75,467	9.3%	62%	4.3%	10.3%
California State U., Bakersfield	\$8,147	-6.3%	NA	1.4%	3.2%
Fort Valley State U.	\$28,065	-2.5%	NA	4.4%	7.3%
North Carolina A&T State U.	\$74,978	5.5%	NA	1.9%	8.9%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	\$1,982	NA	74%	0.1%	2.8%
Prairie View A & M U.	\$56,427	4.8%	NA	1.6%	11.4%
South Carolina State C.	\$20,857	5.9%	89%	3.4%	7.7%
Virginia State U.	\$42,332	2.1%	NA	5.9%	8.5%
Average of Peers	\$37,097	0.7%	74.0%	3.3%	7.6%

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 Americans make up 29.7 percent of the total; 16.7 percentage points above the peer average. The university performs below peer level on two core measures: the undergraduate population is 40.3 percent minority, which is 5.0 percentage points below the peer average. The average undergraduate alumni giving rate is two percent, compared to a peer average of 7.8 percent.

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 167 information technology degrees to African Americans compared to a peer average of four. Eighty-two percent of undergraduates are age 25 or older compared to a peer average of 28 percent. UMUC awarded 1,813 post- baccalaureate degrees in technology and management; the peer average is 33. It offers 752 stateside online courses compared to an average of 221. The university's worldwide online enrollments have increased to over 196,000, greatly exceeding the peer average of 6,552.

UMUC is asked to comment on declining percent of minorities of all undergraduates and its declining undergraduate alumni giving rate.

Institution's Response

UMUC enrolls more African-American students than any Maryland HBCU. Forty-percent of its students are minority and 30% African-American (see *MFR Objectives 3.1 and 3.2*). These percentages are somewhat lower than in the past because the number of students who decline to provide their ethnic/racial background has increased to 17%. If we were to calculate these percentages based on students for whom we know their race, the percentage minority becomes 48% and the percentage African-American 36%. The enrollment of African-American students in our online courses continue to increase (see *MFR Objective 5.2*), showing that UMUC does not have a technical divide among our students.

UMUC's diversity and accessibility extends to first-generation college students (40% of all our undergraduates); immigrants (16% of our undergraduates were born in a country other than the US); and to students whose first language was not English (11%).

In the term to term re-enrollment rate, there are no differences in the retention rate between African-American and other students. UMUC students typically work full time and complete

their program at a slower pace than traditional students and typically step out for personal/professional reasons.

The UMUC alumni giving rate has been unstable. UMUC's need to supplement its State appropriations and tuition revenues with philanthropic funds has become more acute because of the current worldwide fiscal crisis. UMUC has recently hired a new Vice President for Institutional Advancement and has re-built its fund-raising team. A priority is to increase alumni giving, a historically weak point at UMUC. The University was honored to be the recipient of \$6M from an anonymous donor to be used mostly on student financial aid. The recognition of the University's contributions by this donor is of great pride to all of us.

**University of Maryland University College
Peer Performance Data, 2009**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	# of African-American IT graduates	% of undergraduates 25 and older	UMJC institution-specific indicators			
						# of post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.	Number of stateside online courses	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)	
Maryland, U. of, University College	40.3%	29.7%	2%	167	81.7%	1,813	752	196,331	
Boise State U.	12.5%	1.4%	9%	0	38.5%	17	160	7,916	
California State U., Dominguez Hills	74.1%	27.4%	0%	0	41.6%	0	236	4,697	
California State U., Fullerton	56.6%	3.7%	3%	3	21.0%	152	464	15,540	
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	57.5%	10.2%	8%	14	25.1%	39	NA	NA	
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	86.2%	29.9%	6%	15	39.3%	6	156	2,170	
CUNY Hunter C.	51.6%	11.9%	15%	0	26.9%	0	NA	NA	
CUNY Queens C.	49.0%	8.9%	19%	0	25.7%	35	NA	NA	
Eastern Michigan U.	25.0%	19.4%	3%	1	27.9%	68	150	4,145	
Florida Gulf Coast U.	18.8%	4.3%	NA	1	16.7%	3	289	7,904	
Southern Connecticut State U.	21.9%	12.6%	7%	1	15.3%	5	94	3,493	
Average of Peers	45.3%	13.0%	7.8%	4	27.8%	33	221	6,552	

NA - Data not available

NR - Non-Respondent
NA - Data not available

Morgan State University

Morgan State University's performance meets or exceeds the peer average on six of fifteen core performance measures. Fifty percent of students receive federal grants, four percentage points above the peer average. Morgan State awards the same number of doctorates to women as peers (27) and over twice as many doctorates to African Americans (34) than the peer average. The university awarded 168 bachelors degrees in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) areas to African Americans, substantially more than the peer average of 65. The alumni giving rate has increased to nine percent, just higher than the peer average. The pass rate on teacher licensure exams is 100 percent for the fourth consecutive year, exceeding the peer average by 1.6 percentage points.

MSU has under-performed its peers on nine core measures. The second-year retention rate for all (68 percent), African Americans (67 percent) and minorities (67 percent) have improved, but each remains four percentage points below the peer average. Overall six-year graduation rates at Morgan have fallen to 38 percent, four points below the peer average. Six-year graduation rates for African American and minority students have remained steady at 38 percent, four points below the peer average. Eighty percent of all full-time faculty hold terminal degrees compared to a peer average of 85.9 percent. Research expenditures at Morgan are \$26 million, compared to a peer average of \$26.7 million. While Morgan's research expenditures have increased by one percent over the last year, research expenditures at peer institutions have grown by an average of 9.3 percent.

Commission staff commends Morgan on improving alumni giving rates as well as achieving four consecutive years of 100 percent pass rates on teacher licensure exams. Morgan is asked to comment on the following measures for which its performance is below that of peers: retention and graduation rates, the percent of faculty with a terminal degree, and the amount of research expenditures.

Institution's Response

The University generally agrees with MHEC's assessment of the 2009 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 we compare favorably to our peers in the number of doctorates awarded to women and African Americans, and in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in science and technology to African Americans. Additionally, we are striving for continued success in meeting the State's need for qualified teachers through our teacher education program and 100% pass rate on the PRAXIS teacher examination.

With regard to the University's retention and graduation rates, Morgan ranks in the upper third among public urban universities nationwide in its six year graduation rate for African Americans. Over 90% 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, including Honors, CASA Academy, Access Orientation, and Pre-Freshmen Accelerated Curriculum in Engineering (PACE), 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. Affordability is increasingly becoming 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 forty percent of our students frequently work 20 or more hours per week while attending Morgan full-time. In the recently released report “With Their Whole Lives Ahead of Them” by the Public Agenda Organization, having to work was the top reason for leaving college given by students. 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 39% 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.

The University is transitioning to a Doctoral/Research Intensive Institution. 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, 2009

Institution Name	% Students on Federal Grants	Fall 2007 Entering Freshman Class			Fall 2002 Entering Freshmen Six			# of Doctorates Awarded to Women	# of Doctorates Awarded to Blacks	# of Bachelor's In Stems to Blacks	% of Full Time Faculty with Terminal Degree	FY 2008 Research Expenditure	% Change in Research Expenditure	% Alumni Giving	PRAXIS or NES % Passing 2006-2007
		All	Black	Minority	All ²	Black ²	Minority ²								
Morgan State University	50%	68%	67%	67%	38%	38%	38%	27	34	168	80%	\$25,989,562	1%	9%	100%
University of Alabama in Huntsville	23%	77%	81%	82%	44%	41%	38%	5	0	30	91%	\$64,417,660	15%	5%	100%
University of Massachusetts-Lowell	22%	75%	74%	79%	44%	69%	45%	64	2	24	93%	\$32,961,000	9%	8%	100%
University of Massachusetts-Boston	50%	75%	75%	77%	33%	28%	31%	27	2	14	93%	\$27,361,000	12%	8%	98%
Michigan Technological University	23%	83%	N/A	N/A	64%	46%	61%	21	1	10	95%	\$51,214,000	20%	19%	100%
The University of West Florida	23%	73%	68%	70%	49%	51%	47%	19	4	6	81%	\$5,398,890	-13%	5%	100%
Jackson State University	65%	76%	76%*	76%*	36%	37%	37%	50	50	127	70%	\$29,721,702	5%	5%**	100%
South Carolina State University	71%	65%	64%	64%	45%	45%	45%	33	32	91	93%	\$8,672,003	-4%	7%	96%
North Carolina A & T State University	57%	72%	64%	48%	41%	42%	42%	2	2	150	92%	\$21,848,092	9%	10%	100%
Tennessee State University	69%	70%	78%	79%	40%	42%	42%	29	12	94	83%	\$14,344,030	35%	9%	100%
Texas A & M University-Kingsville	48%	61%	61%*	74%*	30%	24%	30%	25	0	2	75%	\$11,348,849	13%	4%	88%
Peer Average	45.5%	72.3%	71.3%	70.8%	42.2%	42.0%	41.3%	27	13	65	85.9%	\$26,661,526	9.3%	8.4%	98.4%

*2006 data

NA - Data not available

NP- No program

* Fall 2006 Cohort

² Source: Education Trust

**2008 data

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 or matches its current peers on 15 performance measures. Ninety-eight percent of St. Mary's faculty holds terminal degrees, five percentage points higher than the peer average. The college exceeds the peer average salary percentile rank for full-time professors by three percentage points. The average SAT score of entering freshmen is 1230, compared to the peer average of 1229. SAT 25th-75th percentile scores of 1130-1330 are equivalent to the current peer average of 1126-1333. St. Mary's accepts 55 percent of applicants, compared to a peer average of 56 percent, making the College slightly more selective. St. Mary's yield ratio is six percentage points above that of peers. The average second-year retention rate (89 percent) is above the peer average of 86 percent. St. Mary's six-year graduation rate decreased to 75 percent, just below the peer average of 76 percent. Eight percent of St. Mary's freshmen are African American, compared to a peer average of five percent. Minority students comprise 18 percent of St. Mary's total enrollments in comparison to 16 percent for peers. St. Mary's enrollment is made up of 99 percent undergraduates; 96 percent of St. Mary's undergraduates are full-time students—both figures are just above the peer average. The student-faculty ratio of 12:1 meets the current peer average. The library has over five thousand more serial subscriptions than the peer average. Finally, tuition and fees at St. Mary's are substantially less than that of peers: \$12,604 vs. the peer average of \$26,015 (most peer colleges are private institutions).

St. Mary's performance is lower than the peer group average on seven measures. The college's total research spending is \$259.2 thousand, less than half of the peer average. Average annual salaries of full, associate, and assistant professor range from one to four thousand dollars below the average. Total headcount enrollment (2,068) was below the peer average by 238 students. Thirteen percent of St. Mary's freshmen received federal grants, compared to 19 percent at peer colleges. St. Mary's fiscal 2008 Education and General Fund (E&G) expenditures per FTE student was \$6,752 below peers. The alumni giving rate was 11 percentage points below peers. Tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures were 4.5 points below peers. St. Mary's has fewer resources in its library by over 266 thousand books, serial back files, and other paper materials. It has two fewer librarians, five fewer library staff and expends \$121 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 seven of thirty measures. It has more faculty with terminal degrees (98 percent vs. 96 percent). Yield ratio is one point higher than that of peer's (36 percent). Total headcount enrollment at St. Mary's is higher than peers by 214 students. Eight percent of St. Mary's freshmen are African American

compared to six percent of peers, while 18 percent of total enrollment is minority compared to the peer average of 17 percent. Thirteen percent of St. Mary's freshmen receive federal grants, compared to ten percent of peer's. St. Mary's, like its peers, primarily serves undergraduates. In addition, St. Mary's is significantly more affordable than its peers, with annual tuition and fees \$27 thousand less.

The college scores below peers on seven measures. Total research expenditures are \$1.2 million below that of peers. Faculty salaries for all ranks are below the aspirant peer group average by ten-to-fifteen thousand dollars. SAT scores for entering freshmen (1230) were 125 points below the average. The SAT 25th-75th percentile range of 1130-1330 is below the aspirant peer average range of 1270-1444. Aspirant peers are more selective than St. Mary's, with an acceptance rate of 30 percent compared to St. Mary's 55 percent. Average second-year retention rates are six points below and six-year graduation rates are 14 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 but one (St. Mary's has more current serial subscriptions, by over 3,000). These include fiscal 2008 Educational and General (E&G) expenditures per full-time equivalent student (\$20,563 below), average alumni giving rate (-30 percentage points), tuition and fee revenues as a percent of E&G expenditures (-14 percentage points), student-faculty ratio (12:1 compared to aspirant peers at 10:1), number of book volumes in the library (-525,563), full-time library staff (-4), total library staff (-11) and library expenditures per FTES (-\$824).

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. St. Mary's has commented on the fact that library resources do not compare favorably to current and aspirant peers; the institution should provide an update on this issue. It is also asked to address the alumni giving rate which is well below that of peers.

Institution's Response

St. Mary's College of Maryland is pleased that MHEC has recognized that the College has met or exceeded our current peers on 15 of the 30 performance measures included in the most recent peer analysis. Additionally, the College has exceeded our aspirant peer averages for 7 out of 30 of the performance measures. We have kept our tuition \$13,411 below the rest of our current peers' average and \$27,120 below our aspirant peers' average. The College continues to fulfill its goal of "enhancing access, affordability, and diversity" through multiple targeted efforts. We have recruited a diverse student body with eight percent of St. Mary's first-year student population being African American (compared to a current peer average of five percent and an aspirant peer average of five percent). Minority students consist of 18 percent of the College's total enrollment (compared to a current peer average of 16 percent and an aspirant peer average of 17 percent). The percentage of St. Mary's first-year students receiving federal grants is three percentage points higher than the aspirant peer average (13 percent compared to 10 percent).

The College is also proud of its second-year retention rate of 89 percent, which is three percentage points higher than our current peers (89 percent compared to a current peer average of 86 percent). The continued implementation of the new Core Curriculum; expanded academic and student life offerings such as housing, athletic, and academic facilities; and a greater emphasis on international and experiential education are some of the initiatives that shape how St. Mary's College maintains a high standard of excellence in providing a quality liberal arts education to the residents of Maryland.

The Commission staff has requested that St. Mary's College of Maryland comment on two specific areas of interest (library resources and the alumni giving rate) which are listed below:

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 FY07) compares more favorably with peers so it is likely that the library has sufficient quality in the recent additions to the collections." The temporary loss of endowment funding in FY10 resulted in the completion of a project to review results of a two-year study of print journal use in the library. Faculty agreed to the cancelation of more than 400 print journal titles based on low usage and electronic availability. This action has allowed our monograph budget to remain relatively stable this year and also provided some new study space for students after periodical shelving was removed.

The library Archives provides access to digital collections of College materials and a database of student senior St. Mary's Project information. As part of the new Core Curriculum, an information literacy initiative was added, making it one of the four fundamental liberal arts skills to be developed over the four years of a St. Mary's education.

The College approved a new library faculty line for FY10. The search for a Reference/Instruction/Emerging Technologies librarian was deferred as a result of current budget concerns. One of the library's primary concerns remains 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.

The current average of alumni giving rates within all of St. Mary's 13 current and aspirant peer institutions is 28 percent. It should be noted that St. Mary's has set high standards within the group of the 13 peer institutions as only five of the current peers and none of the aspirant peers are public institutions. If the data is analyzed by including only the five public institutions, the average for this group is 20 percent and St. Mary's is just below that at 17 percent. The legacy of giving back to the institution has been historically lower in public institutions than private institutions. There has been a concerted effort at St. Mary's over the past several years to educate our alumni on the importance of giving back to the College. A number of new strategies have been initiated by the alumni and development offices at the College in an effort to increase the alumni giving rate.

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, November 2009**

Indicator	Current Peer Average		Aspirant Peer Average		All Peers Average		SMCM		Current Peers: College of				Guilford
	Beloit	Wooster	Colorado College	Connecticut College	Dickinson	Gettysburg	Beloit	Wooster	Colorado College	Connecticut College	Dickinson	Gettysburg	
QUALITY / SELECTIVITY													
Amount in total research spending, FY08	\$863,729	\$1,495,359	\$1,049,502	\$259,184	\$110,716	\$662,394	\$1,346,811	\$1,573,000	\$2,622,304	\$598,819	\$144,581		
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2008	93%	96%	94%	98%	96%	95%	90%	93%	92%	91%	83%		
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '08:													
Professor:	\$89,192	\$103,150	\$93,844	\$88,400	\$77,600	\$79,000	\$117,100	\$105,700	\$102,700	\$101,300	\$68,800		
Associate Professor	\$68,117	\$76,933	\$71,056	\$67,000	\$60,100	\$60,800	\$80,000	\$78,000	\$77,800	\$75,300	\$57,700		
Assistant Professor	\$56,525	\$63,850	\$58,967	\$52,100	\$49,400	\$52,100	\$64,500	\$61,800	\$61,100	\$61,400	\$48,700		
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '08:													
Professor:	72.3% ⁴	91.1% ⁴	77.2% ⁴	75.4%	54.6%	58.0%	93.9%	89.6%	87.5%	86.5%	34.6%		
Associate Professor	73.9% ⁴	87.7% ⁴	74.2% ⁴	70.1%	47.2%	50.1%	88.5%	86.3%	86.1%	83.3%	37.6%		
Assistant Professor	68.7% ⁴	86.6% ⁴	79.5% ⁴	50.3%	39.1%	50.3%	86.8%	82.1%	80.9%	81.4%	35.9%		
Average SAT scores of entering freshman (excluding writing), Fall '08	1229	1355	1271	1230	1260	1210	1315	1325	1290	1300	1110		
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen (excluding writing), Fall '08	1126-1333	1270-1444	1169-1365	1130-1330	1130-1390	1090-1330	1230-1400	1240-1410	1190-1390	1220-1380	1000-1220		
Acceptance Rate, Fall '08	56%	30%	47%	55%	63%	70%	26%	35%	44%	38%	60%		
Yield Ratio, Fall '08 ⁷	30%	35%	32%	36%	24%	19%	40%	30%	26%	33%	19%		
RETENTION AND GRADUATION													
Average second year retention rate ²	86%	95%	89%	89.0%	89.0%	87.0%	94.0%	91.0%	91.0%	91.0%	71.0%		
Six year graduation rate ²	76%	89%	80%	75.0%	78.0%	77.0%	87.0%	88.0%	84.0%	82.0%	58.0%		
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class ⁵	5%	6%	5%	8%	4%	12%	2%	4%	5%	6%	12%		
Total headcount enrollment	2306	1855	2156	2068	1388	1884	2026	1852	2388	2480	2641		
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	16%	17%	17%	18%	13%	13%	17%	16%	16%	10%	30%		
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates ⁶	94%	99%	96%	96%	95%	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	84%		
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	98%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	\$26,015	\$39,724	\$30,585	\$12,604	\$31,540	\$33,770	\$36,044	\$49,385	\$38,234	\$37,730	\$26,030		
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY08	19%	10%	16%	13%	14%	15%	7%	9%	11%	25%	60%		
EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES													
E&G expenditures in FY08 per FTES ¹	\$29,722	\$43,534	\$34,326	\$22,970	\$28,746	\$34,002	\$44,415	\$40,069	\$34,175	\$34,403	\$18,017		
Average alumni giving rate (2008) ³	28%	47%	34%	17%	36%	30%	29%	39%	36%	37%	19%		
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures (FY08)	51.9%	61.2%	55.0%	47.4%	53.5%	55.8%	54.7%	73.3%	73.5%	73.5%	63.3%		
Student-Faculty Ratio (2008) ²	11.8 to 1	9.8 to 1	11.2 to 1	12:1	11:1	12:1	10:1	9:1	10:1	11:1	15:1		
Academic libraries, FY2008 ⁴													
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials	428,374	687,429	514,725	161,866	492,925	297,194	540,276	852,557	501,043	416,595	259,507		
Current Serial Subscriptions:	11,185	13,840	12,070	16,890	1,144	20,425	26,233	6,266	2,451	9,275	21,294		
Librarians:	9	11	10	7	5	8	11	13	10	13	4		
Total Staff:	29	35	31	24	16	33	33	34	36	45	18		
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):	\$ 1,033	\$ 1,737	\$ 1,268	\$ 913	\$ 937	\$ 1,154	\$ 1,677	\$ 1,483	\$ 1,050	\$ 1,166	\$ 427		

¹ FY08 Finance Report, IPEDS Website
² America's Best Colleges 2010, USN&WR
³ Academe, March-April 2009
⁴ Median reported for average
⁵ Midpoint of 25th to 75th percentiles, Fall '08, IPEDS Website
⁶ Fall Enrollment Report 2008, IPEDS Website
⁷ Institutional Characteristics 2008, IPEDS Website
⁸ Student Financial Aid FY08, IPEDS Website
⁹ Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, November 2009**

Indicator	Current Peers, cont.:					Aspirant Peers:					
	South-western	U of Mary Washington	U of Minn Morris	U of NC Asheville	VMI	Bates	Carleton	Davidson	F & M	Hamilton	Kenyon
QUALITY / SELECTIVITY											
Amount in total research spending, FY08	\$934,097	\$419,410	\$428,187	\$1,169,122	\$355,302	\$796,293	N/A	\$1,232,410	\$3,593,978	\$1,424,000	\$430,114
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2008	97%	98%	98%	86%	95%	90%	96%	97%	95%	97%	98%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall '08:											
Professor:	\$87,200	\$82,900	\$76,000	\$87,700	\$84,300	\$80,600	\$112,700	\$112,300	\$106,200	\$115,000	\$92,100
Associate Professor	\$70,300	\$65,700	\$63,100	\$67,800	\$60,800	\$65,100	\$81,200	\$85,000	\$77,300	\$84,900	\$68,100
Assistant Professor	\$54,700	\$53,400	\$52,400	\$61,000	\$57,800	\$59,800	\$68,600	\$62,400	\$66,300	\$67,700	\$58,300
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall '08:											
Professor:	74.0%	67.7%	50.8%	74.6%	70.5%	61.9%	92.3%	92.2%	90.0%	93.2%	79.8%
Associate Professor	76.2%	65.8%	57.3%	71.6%	50.1%	63.8%	89.9%	92.9%	85.5%	92.8%	72.1%
Assistant Professor	63.5%	57.0%	51.8%	80.7%	73.9%	78.3%	92.4%	83.2%	89.9%	91.5%	75.0%
Average SAT scores of entering freshman (excluding writing), Fall '08	1220	1200	1222.5	1160	1140	1345	1400	1364	1,310	\$1,375	1335
25th-75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen (excluding writing), Fall '08	1110-1330	1110-1290	1095-1350	1060-1260	1040-1240	1260-1430	1310-1490	1270-1458	1230-1390	1300-1450	1240-1430
Acceptance Rate, Fall '08	65%	71%	72%	76%	53%	29%	27%	26%	36%	28%	31%
Yield Ratio, Fall '08	28%	30%	35%	29%	49%	35%	36%	43%	29%	32%	32%
RETENTION AND GRADUATION											
Average second year retention rate ²	87.0%	85.0%	85.0%	78.0%	82.0%	95.0%	97.0%	96.0%	92.0%	94.0%	93.0%
Six year graduation rate ²	76.0%	76.3%	66.0%	60.0%	74.0%	89.0%	93.0%	94.0%	79.0%	91.0%	88.0%
% AfrAm students of entering FYS class ³	4%	2%	3%	4%	7%	7%	6%	8%	5%	5%	4%
Total headcount enrollment	1270	5084	1607	3629	1428	1776	1983	1668	2164	1872	1664
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	24%	17%	20%	8%	15%	15%	22%	16%	15%	19%	13%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	98%	85%	93%	81%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	98%	100%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	100%	83%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	\$27,940	\$6,774	\$10,006	\$4,174	\$10,556	\$49,350	\$38,046	\$33,479	\$38,630	\$38,600	\$40,240
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY08	17%	9%	27%	17%	11%	10%	14%	6%	7%	9%	13%
EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES											
E&G expenditures in FY08 per FTES ¹	\$ 35,274	\$ 14,596	\$ 21,952	\$ 19,451	\$ 31,562	\$ 41,590	\$ 44,653	\$ 43,604	\$ 42,314	\$ 48,795	\$ 40,246
Average alumni giving rate (2008) ¹	29%	22%	17%	9%	35%	43%	63%	54%	36%	47%	38%
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures (FY08)	44.9%	46.8%	25.0%	26.1%	32.8%	85.7%	54.2%	43.4%	67.0%	55.4%	61.8%
Student-Faculty Ratio (2008) ²	10:1	15:1	13:1	13:1	10:1	10:1	9:1	10:1	10:1	10:1	10:1
Academic libraries, FY2008 ³											
Books, Serial Back Files, Other Paper Materials	359,917	378,374	225,719	384,383	431,992	599,673	751,594	636,887	715,159	636,890	784,369
Current Serial Subscriptions:	1,467	7,948	30,019	7,246	448	41,099	22,035	4,847	2,202	1,900	10,958
Librarians:	9	12	5	10	6	12	14	9	10	11	11
Total Staff:	29	35	14	35	18	35	36	30	35	40	33
Total Library Expenditures per Person Enrolled (FTE):	\$ 1,923	\$ 551	\$ 627	\$ 653	\$ 751	\$ 1,998	\$ 2,015	\$ 1,645	\$ 1,251	\$ 1,886	\$ 1,625

¹ FY08 Finance Report, IPEDS Website

² America's Best Colleges 2010, USN&WR

³ Academe, March-April 2009

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 2009

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
1	SAT score 25 th /75 th %ile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2008. For UMCP, institutionally reported composite values.	Composite SAT scores for all incoming freshmen at each USM institution, including UMCP, were taken from the MHEC S-11 form by the USM IR office. 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 th & 75 th %iles.	Fall 2008
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 2008
3	% African-American of all undergraduates	IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2008
4	Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2009 edition. UMCP data from 2010 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 2003 and 2006. UMCP peer data are for classes entering between 2004 and 2007.	2003-2006 data for all USM institutions except UMCP 2004-2007 data for UMCP
5	Six-year graduation rate	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2008 Graduation Rate Survey.	Six-year graduation rate, 2002 cohort (Sum of students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted cohort)	2008 (2002 cohort) for all USM institutions
6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2008 Graduation Rate Survey.	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race. (Sum of minority students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted minority cohort)	2008 (2002 cohort) for all USM institutions
7	Six-year graduation rate: African-Americans	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2008	Self-explanatory. (Sum of African-American students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted minority cohort)	2008 (2002 cohort) for all USM institutions

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
8	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Graduation Rate Survey. Title II website, State Report 2008 for individual states (http://www.title2.org)	years/adjusted African-American cohort) 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.	2006-2007 test takers
9	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	Number of baccalaureate level nursing graduates taking the NCLEX examination in FY 08 who pass on the first attempt divided by the number of baccalaureate level nursing graduates taking the exam for the first time in FY 08.	FY 2008 test takers
10	Passing rates in other licensure exams			
10a	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2010 edition	Percentage of 2007 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 2007 and Winter 2008 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.	2007 graduates
10b	Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	Number of pharmacy graduates in the Class of 2008 who passed the NAPLEX on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2008 graduates
10c	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 2007 divided by number of graduates who took the exam. For FSU: number of BSW graduates in the calendar year 2007 who passed the LCSW examination on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2007 graduates
10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2008 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2008 divided by number of graduates	2008 graduates

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
10e	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	from Dental School Class of 2008. Number who pass the 2008 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2008
11	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2009 edition (UMCP data from 2010 edition). If data unavailable from U.S. News, source used: Council for Aid to Education, 2008 Voluntary Support of Education, 2009.	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 2006 and 2007.	2006 & 2007 average
12	Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAUDE.	UMCP data from 2007 and 2008. 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. UMCP also excludes expenditures in the non-science & engineering disciplines.</i>	2007 & 2008 average for UMCP. FY2007
13	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary Survey (faculty counts) or IPEDS (faculty counts for UMES); AAMC (for medical faculty for UMB & peers). AAUDE data for UMCP.	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMBI & UMCEs. UMB figures are R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science. UMCP also excludes expenditures in the non-science & 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	FY2007 FY2008 data for UMCP

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
14	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation; UMCP data from AAUDE	UMB, faculty counts are taken from AAMC figures. Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY2002 through FY2007. 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 & engineering disciplines</i> .	FY2002 – FY2007
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 2005 through 2009. 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.	FY2003-FY2008 for UMCP 2005 – 2009
16	Institution-specific measures			

Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Institution-Specific Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland 2009

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
BSU				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008.	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2007-2008 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2008	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2007 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2008	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2008
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)	FY2007
CSU				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2007-2008 faculty
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2009 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2007 freshmen
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2008	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2008
4	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2008; IPEDS, Faculty Salary Survey	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2008
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2008 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2007	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 2008 state appropriation, Fall 2007 (FY 2008) enrollment

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
FSU				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2008 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2008
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008	The percentage of full-time who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	2007-2008 faculty
SU				
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2009 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 2007 freshmen
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008	The percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	2007-2008 faculty
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – Fall Enrollment & Fall Staff	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty.	Fall 2008
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2007
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2008 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2007	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 2008 state appropriation, Fall 2007 (FY 2008) enrollment
TU				
1	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009 edition, 2008	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2007 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2007
2	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report, 2009 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 2007
3	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News, America's	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the	Fall 2007 freshmen

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
		Best Colleges, 2009 edition	number of freshmen admitted	
UB				
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, FY 2008, Part C, line 02, col. 1	Total dollars expended for research	FY 2008
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position, 2007	Percentage of instructional faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 2007
UMB				
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2007
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2007
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2007
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 2008
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional	Fall 2008
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2008
UMBC				
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY 2008 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer	FY2008

	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	FY2007
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 2008.	Fall 2008
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 2007
5	Rank in ratio of license agreements to \$Mil. R&D	AUTM, Table 3	Self explanatory. Licenses & options executed.	FY 2007
UMCP				
1	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation	National Research Council, U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success	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 2009
2	# of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation	National Research Council, U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success	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 2009
3	% change over five years in faculty	USM database	The percent change over five years in the number of	2005-2009

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
	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 2007
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 2008
UMES				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2009, edition, 2008	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	2007-2008 faculty
2	IT degrees as % of all bachelor's degrees	NCES, IPEDS, Completions, 2008	Bachelor's degrees in CIP codes 11.0101 through 11.9999 as a percentage of all bachelor's degrees awarded.	July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008
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 2006
UMUC				
1	Number of African-Americans of all IT graduates	MAITI report for UMUC; IPEDS completion data for peer institutions	Number of graduates of IT (MAITI) undergraduate programs who are African-American. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), and electrical engineering (CIP 14.10).	FY 2008
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 2008
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 2008

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date to be used
			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 2009
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2009

Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: Morgan state University 2009

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 2007-2008
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 2007 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 2007 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 2007 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 2002 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 matriculation.	Fall 2002 cohort unless otherwise noted

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Data Used
6. Six year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC- EIS, DIS, IPEDS, 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 undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 2002 cohort unless otherwise noted
7. Number of Doctorates awarded to women	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS.	Self-explanatory	2008 Graduates
8. Number of Doctorates awarded to Blacks	IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions. MSU/MHEC DIS IPEDS	Self-explanatory	2008 Graduates
9. Number of Bachelor's in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) awarded to Blacks	IPEDS	Number of Bachelor's Degrees awarded to blacks in the following CIP codes: 01,03,04,1,1,14,15,26,27,40,41,51	2008 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 a doctoral or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2008
11. Research Expenditures	IPEDS		Fiscal Year 2008
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 2007-2008
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 (http://www.title2.org)	Summary pass rates are reported. An individual is counted as a pass in the summary rate if he or she passed all required tests for any area in which he or she was prepared.	2007-2008 data

Appendix E. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: St. Mary's College Of Maryland 2009

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Amount in total research spending, FY 2009	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2009
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	2010 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 2009
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 2009
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Midpoint of 25 th to 75 th percentiles of SAT Critical Reading and SAT Math	2008
6	25 th – 75 th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	25 th – 75 th percentile SAT total (Critical Reading and Math) scores of entering freshmen	2008
7	Acceptance rate	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2008 applicants who were admitted	2008
8	Yield ratio	IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	Percentage of fall 2008 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	2008
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 '07 that re-enrolled the subsequent year	2010 edition

10	Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Average six-year graduation rate for all students from the first-time, full-time degree-seeking student who enrolled in Fall '02	2010 edition
11	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	IPEDS enrollment report	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class (only includes full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate students). This excludes the non-resident alien students as well as those whose race is unknown or who have selected 'two or more races' because it is unknown if one of those races is African-American. IPEDS has the new racial categories included in its data set and therefore this field will not match up exactly to the prior years because of the combinations of the old and new categories. The IPEDS identifier that has been used to obtain the African-American students was: "Black or African American/Black non-Hispanic total – derived".	2008
12	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	2008
13	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of minorities of the total enrollment (including graduate students) with race known. Those who have selected 'two or more races' have been included in the minority count. Non-resident aliens are excluded.	2008
14	Percent of full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time	2008
15	Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	2008
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	2008

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 2008
18	E&G expenditures per FTES	IPEDS Finance report; IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report	FY 2008 total education and general expenditures and transfers (minus auxiliary expenses) divided by Fall '07 FTE students	FY 2008
19	Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Percentage of alumni of record who gave to an institution during FY 2008. (Alumni of record are former full- or part-time students with an undergraduate degree from SMC and for whom the institution has a current address.)	2010 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 2008 total education and general expenditures and transfers. (For FASB institutions, it is the IPEDS field labeled 'tuition and fees' and for GASB it is 'tuition and fees after deducting discounts and allowances'.)	2008
21	Ratio of FTES to full-time equivalent faculty	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges website	Ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty	2010 edition
22	Academic libraries	Academic Libraries Survey, NCES website	As provided on NCES website	FY2008