

Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis

University System of Maryland

Morgan State University

St. Mary's College Of Maryland

December 2005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background.....	2
Refining Funding Guidelines.....	2
Performance Measures.....	3
Assessing Institution Performance.....	3
Data Availability.....	4
St. Mary’s College of Maryland Quality Profile	4
Peer Performance Analysis	
Bowie State University	11
Coppin State University.....	15
Frostburg State University	19
Salisbury University.....	23
Towson University.....	27
University of Baltimore	31
University of Maryland, Baltimore.....	35
University of Maryland Baltimore County	39
University of Maryland, College Park	43
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	47
University of Maryland University College	51
Morgan State University.....	53
St. Mary’s College of Maryland	57
Appendix A. Methodology for Selecting Performance Peers at the University System of Maryland Institutions.....	63
Appendix B. University System of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators.....	65
Appendix C. Morgan State University Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators	75
Appendix D. St. Mary’s College of Maryland Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators.....	79

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 questions and assess performance.

Included in the funding guidelines process is an annual performance accountability component. Each applicable Maryland institution selects 10 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 16 measures for USM institutions and 14 for Morgan. These indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and include indicators for which data are currently available. In some instances, institutions added specific indicators that were more reflective of the institution's role and mission.

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

St. Mary's College of Maryland participates in the performance assessment process despite the fact that it does not participate in the funding guidelines. St. Mary's has selected twelve current peers and six aspirant peers on which to base performance. The 26 performance measures are similar to those chosen for the other four-year public institutions and also reflect St. Mary's role as the State's only public liberal arts college.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution, Morgan State University and St. Mary's College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. The report includes a discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability. In addition, each institution will be 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.

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.

One critical component in determining whether the State's higher education institutions are performing at the level of their funding peers is performance accountability. To compare performance, the presidents of each Maryland institution (except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University) selected ten performance peers from their list of funding peers. The presidents based this selection on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives. The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only 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 and institutions classified as Doctoral/Research Universities – Extensive institutions. Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. Appendix A lists the criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

Refining Funding Guidelines

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

Fiscal year 2006 represented the sixth year the funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. As funding guidelines continue to evolve, so too does the assessment of institutional performance. This report contains the sixth comprehensive assessment of the performance of each USM institution, the fifth for Morgan State

University and the fourth for St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's) in comparison to their performance peers. A discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability follow.

Performance Measures

There are 16 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 more 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 student and employer satisfaction rates. 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 indicator.

There are 14 performance measures for Morgan State University (see Table 2). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, student and employer satisfaction rates, and the passing rate on the Praxis II examination (an assessment that measures teacher candidates' knowledge of the subjects that they will teach). Appendix C lists the operational definitions for Morgan's indicators.

Assessing Institution Performance

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

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

Data Availability

It was difficult to obtain nationally comparable outcome-based performance measures. To the extent possible, the measures identified for peer comparisons use data that are verifiable and currently available from national data systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, and *U.S. News and World Report*. Although the National Center for Education Statistics is currently in the process of designing methods to gather outcome-based indicators, many of these data are not readily available. For example, peer data are not available for alumni giving, graduate satisfaction, employers' satisfaction, 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 its 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 examination, research suggests that comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another. Since each state independently determines the level of performance required for teacher certification, this indicator is useful only for comparing institutional performance to other Maryland institutions.

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

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

St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile

St. Mary's College of Maryland's general fund appropriation is determined by a statutory formula and not through the funding guideline process. However, the college expressed interest in providing a set of institutions for the purpose of assessing its performance as the State's only public liberal arts college. Due to its unique characteristic as a public,

liberal arts college offering only Baccalaureate degrees, St. Mary's is categorized as a Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts institution. 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 26 performance measures for St. Mary's College of Maryland including many descriptive indicators (see Table 3). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, faculty salaries, student/faculty ratio, and library holdings. Appendix D details the operational definitions.

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

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students ¹	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
2. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. % African American of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second-year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
5. Six-year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
6. Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
7. Six-year graduation rate: African American	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
8. Pass rate on Praxis II or teacher licensure exam	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
9. Pass rate on nursing licensure exam		•			•		•				
10. Pass rates on other licensure exams ²											
10a.			SW				SW				
10b.						Law	Law				
10c.							Med				
10d.							Dent.				
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.

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

Measure ¹	Comparison Group
1. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
2. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
4. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
7. Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	National Peers
8. Graduate/professional school going rate	National Peers
9. Satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	National Peers, if available, otherwise appropriate Maryland institutions
10. Satisfaction with job preparation	National Peers, if available, otherwise appropriate Maryland institutions
11. PRAXIS II pass rate	National Peers, if available, otherwise appropriate Maryland institutions
12. Summary measure of employer satisfaction	National Peers, if available, otherwise appropriate Maryland institutions
13. Alumni giving	National Peers, if available, otherwise appropriate Maryland institutions
14. Percent growth in grants and contracts expenditures	National Peers

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

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

Measure ¹
1. Amount in total Research spending
2. Percent of faculty with terminal degrees
3. Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank
4. Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank
5. Average SAT scores of entering freshmen
6. 25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen
7. Acceptance Rate
8. Yield Ratio
9. Second-year retention rate
10. Average six-year graduation rate
11. Percent African American students of first-year students
12. Total headcount enrollment
13. Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment
14. Percent full-time undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
15. Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
16. Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates
17. Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal grants
18. E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student
19. Average alumni giving rate
20. Tuition and fees revenues a percent of E&G expenditures
21. Ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time faculty
22. Academic library holdings
23. Academic library titles per full-time equivalent student

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

Peer Performance Analysis

Bowie State University

Bowie State University exceeds the performance of its peers on a number of performance measures. The university's six-year graduation rate exceeds the average of its peer institutions. Its second-year retention rate is also higher than the peer average. The percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution significantly exceeds the peer average. These student populations also have higher six-year graduation rates.

The university reports a 95 percent pass rate on the Praxis exam, an improvement over last year's rate. The university's alumni giving rate has dropped to the peer average.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate, yield rate (enrollment rate), and research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. The university's percent of faculty with terminal degrees remains at 66 percent for 2005, slightly below the peer average. The university's average acceptance rate has improved to 64 percent, however the yield rate dropped to 42 percent and is below the peer average. The university's level of expenditures for research and development per full-time faculty rose by \$2 million from the previous year, but is below the peer average. In this case, however, only five of its peers reported expenditures in this area.

Commission staff notes that Bowie has achieved almost complete reporting for this year's data. This is a significant improvement over prior year submissions.

Institution's Response

Bowie State University's strategy to significantly improve its performance relative to its national peer has continued. However, there are a few areas in which we have intensified our efforts to meet or exceed our national peers. More specifically, the four institution-specific indicators have taken priority in our improvement efforts that are below our national peers are:

Alumni giving rate

The office of alumni relations and the entire development office have developed several initiatives designed to improve institutional performance in this area relative to our national peers. Among the more promising are:

- Encouraging each graduating senior to provide an alumni donation as a gift to the university upon graduation. This effort is a part of an overall class gifts project.
- Organized more graduation anniversary class associations with a major objective to provide a monetary gift to the university as a collective.
- Promote the development of a pre-alumni council as a means of cultivating the seeds of an expanded annual giving program for the future alumni.

The university expects that these and our strategic initiatives will enable the university to meet or exceed the mean amongst our national peers in the area of Alumni giving.

Percent of faculty with terminal degree

Percent of full-time faculty is 68 percent. However we have intensified our recruitment of new terminal degreed core faculty. To date, we were very successful in the recruitment of new faculty for the fall 2005 semester. The percentage of new faculty with terminal degrees exceeded 85 percent. Already, prospective new hires exceed 95 percent. Consequently, we are anticipating a significant improvement on this measure.

New Student Recruitment Yield rate

Bowie's resulting yield rate is 42 percent, as indicated in the peer performance data. Even though we are below our target of 50 percent it is an improvement. Our intensified initiatives to significantly improve this measure include:

- Increase institutional aid to facilitate increased financial aid packages for needy students.
- Seek alternative sources of housing address to strong demand for housing.
- Implement expanded and earlier placement test opportunities for new students.
- Technical improvements to the application module components in the PeopleSoft system

Expenditures for research and development per full-time faculty

The university has made improvements in the facilitation of grant writing for full-time faculty. Included in this initiative are incentives that will encourage more faculty grant writing. In addition, our faculty recruitment efforts are targeted to senior faculty with substantial granting writing portfolios and junior faculty with research and grant writing goals. We expect that our efforts will yield positive returns that meet or exceed the mean of our national peers.

**Bowie State University
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	BSU institution-specific indicators			Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
				Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Acceptance rate	Yield rate			
Bowie State U.	800-930	92.2%	89.1%	73%			37.3%	37.5%	95%
Auburn U., Montgomery	830-1105	36.5%	33.0%	NA			30.7%	31.2%	NA
California State U, Bakersfield	810-1080	48.6%	7.1%	78%			42.3%	38.1%	99%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	NA	93.0%	92.4%	59%			29.1%	29.2%	46%
Columbus State U.	870-1090	37.3%	31.3%	68%			24.6%	23.7%	95%
Georgia C. & State U.	1040-1197	11.3%	8.8%	75%			26.5%	28.9%	99%
New Jersey City U.	830-1000	61.7%	19.6%	72%			30.8%	33.8%	98%
Prairie View A & M U.	710-920	95.5%	91.6%	69%			36.9%	36.7%	84%
Sul Ross State U.	NA	64.6%	4.4%	51%			16.3%	22.7%	69%
Virginia State U.	750-920	97.4%	96.1%	72%			38.4%	38.3%	100%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	51.3%	2.8%	55%			12.1%	0.0%	98%
Average of Peers	834-1045	59.7%	38.7%	67%			28.8%	28.3%	88%

University	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	% of faculty with terminal degree	BSU institution-specific indicators		
			Acceptance rate	Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)
Bowie State U.	9%	66%	64%	42%	\$20,239
Auburn U., Montgomery	13%	82%	NA	95%	NA
California State U, Bakersfield	7%	73%	59%	39%	\$21,449
Cheyney U. of Penn.	6%	55%	62%	NA	NA
Columbus State U.	11%	69%	71%	64%	NA
Georgia C. & State U.	8%	81%	62%	70%	NA
New Jersey City U.	NA	79%	52%	49%	\$1,405
Prairie View A & M U.	11%	69%	98%	50%	\$50,900
Sul Ross State U.	5%	63%	73%	NA	\$9,011
Virginia State U.	9%	80%	66%	35%	\$38,551
Western New Mexico U.	NA	88%	100%	NA	NA
Average of Peers	8.8%	74%	71%	57%	\$24,263

NA - Data not available

* Scores not reported because there are fewer than 10 test takers.

Coppin State University

Coppin State University's performance on a number of indicators meets or exceeds its peer average. Compared to its peers, Coppin State University has the third highest second-year retention rate. Although the rate has fallen slightly, it remains above the average of its peers. In addition, the percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peer average. In terms of the institution's effectiveness in preparing teaching and nursing students, Coppin's percentage of students passing the certification exams are above the peer averages and have improved over last year. The university's average undergraduate alumni giving rate is also above the peer average.

Conversely, the university underperforms the average of its peers on SAT scores for entering freshmen. Furthermore, Coppin's six-year graduation rates have slipped from 28.3 percent in 2004 to 21.7 percent in 2005 for all students, from 28.1 percent in 2004 to 21.5 percent in 2005 for minority students, and from 28.1 percent in 2004 to 21.8 percent in 2005 for African American students, while its peers have not progressed in this area.

The university added five institution-specific indicators: percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate, yield rate, student to faculty ratio, and the state appropriation per full-time equivalent student. Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. For example, approximately 58 percent of full-time faculty at Coppin hold terminal degrees, which is below the peer average. Furthermore, the acceptance and yield rates are both lower than the respective peer averages. Coppin has a higher student to faculty ratio than the majority of its peers. Compared to its peers, Coppin has a lower state appropriation per FTE student.

Coppin has done an excellent job in eliminating missing data from its submission. For example, Coppin only has a maximum of four missing data in one measure, SAT scores. However, for the percentage of students passing the nursing exam, data are available for only four of Coppin's peer institutions while five peer institutions have no nursing program at all.

Institution's Response

The 2005 Peer Performance Report contains ten core performance measures common to all 11 peer institutions. Given the uniqueness of urban education, it is difficult to obtain common performance measures in this area from the University's institutional peers. In addition to the ten common core performance measures, CSU selected an additional five supplementary measures.

Overall, among the common core performance measures, the University has made incredible progress academically in these performance measures and will continue to maintain high standards of academic excellence in teaching, urban research, and public service. Coppin's performance meets or exceeds its institutional peers in six out of the

ten performance measures. Coppin State is close to meeting the peer average in the remaining four measures. Most striking, Coppin ranks first in passing rate in teacher licensure exams, ranks second in alumni giving rate and percentage of African American undergraduates, and ranks third in percentage of minority undergraduates, second-year retention rate, and passing rate on nursing licensing exam.

Perhaps most significant, while Coppin ranks second in FTE students per FT faculty, Coppin ranks ninth among its institutional peers in State appropriation per FTE student, about \$2,000 below the institutional peer average, and almost \$5,000 difference between Coppin and the highest state funded institution.

**Coppin State University
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

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.	750-1000	95.0%	94.4%	70%	21.7%	21.5%	21.8%	100%	89%
Alabama State U.	680-875	95.8%	95.5%	64%	21.2%	21.6%	21.6%	NA	NP
Alcorn State U.	780-955	91.2%	90.7%	72%	47.9%	47.8%	48.0%	100%	100%
Chicago State U.	830-915	93.6%	86.6%	NA	15.2%	15.2%	15.0%	100%	69%
Columbus State U.	870-1090	37.3%	31.3%	68%	24.5%	24.6%	23.7%	95%	82%
Fort Valley State U.	660-1200	95.1%	94.4%	73%	30.0%	30.0%	29.9%	78%	NP
New Jersey City U.	830-1000	61.7%	19.6%	72%	36.5%	30.8%	33.8%	98%	NP
New Mexico Highlands U.	NA	68.6%	4.2%	58%	18.3%	18.7%	25.0%	93%	NP
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	850-1030	48.7%	23.6%	69%	38.1%	38.9%	44.6%	88%	NP
St. Ross State U.	NA	64.6%	4.4%	51%	17.5%	16.3%	22.7%	69%	93%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	51.3%	2.8%	55%	14.7%	12.1%	0.0%	98%	NP
Average of Peers	786-1009	70.8%	45.3%	65%	26.4%	25.6%	26.4%	91%	86%
CSU institution-specific indicators									
Coppin U.	17%	58%	56%	39.3%	24.0	\$6,569			
Alabama State U.	NA	61%	37%	21.6%	20.9	\$5,824			
Alcorn State U.	5%	59%	22%	23.5%	18.0	\$8,285			
Chicago State U.	NA	NA	56%	26.3%	15.3	\$10,955			
Columbus State U.	11%	69%	71%	64.3%	26.5	\$5,687			
Fort Valley State U.	42%	66%	48%	58.1%	17.9	\$10,092			
New Jersey City U.	NA	79%	52%	48.9%	23.3	\$7,517			
New Mexico Highlands U.	11%	88%	100%	NA	20.3	\$9,586			
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	6%	72%	86%	49.5%	18.1	\$8,888			
St. Ross State U.	5%	NA	73%	NA	18.2	\$11,505			
Western New Mexico U.	NA	88%	100%	NA	18.8	\$7,870			
Average of Peers	13.3%	73%	64.5%	41.7%	19.7	\$8,621			

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

Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University's performance on a number of performance indicators meets or exceeds its peer average. The percentages of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution are well above its peer averages. The university is close to the average of its peers in the six-year graduation rate for all students and in second-year retention rates. Frostburg also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate, performing at the average of its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Frostburg has enrolled students with lower SAT scores in the past few years. It ranks below its peer average in the six-year graduation rate for minorities. However, the university shows improvement over last year. The university also reports improvement in both these measures in its Managing for Results report for FY 2005.

Frostburg has two institution-specific indicators: student-faculty ratio and percent of faculty with terminal degrees. The university's student-faculty ratio is slightly more favorable than its peer average. Also, Frostburg reports that 74 percent of its faculty had terminal degrees, slightly lower than the peer average of 81 percent. This is also a drop from last year's level of 80 percent for this indicator.

On professional licensure examinations, Frostburg continues to have a high proportion of students passing the teacher licensing exam and is above the peer average. Many of Frostburg's peer institutions, however, use alternative certification tests. Also, the number of Frostburg students passing the social work licensing exam is now at 100 percent. Last year, the university explained that only two of its peers offer a comparable program. It also clarified that since the pass rate dropped from 100 percent to 83 percent from 1999 to 2000, the pass rate has risen steadily each year back to 100 percent in 2004.

Institution's Response

As an access institution, Frostburg State University (FSU) 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.

Consistent with its Institutional Plan, the University's goal is to enroll students with a combined SAT score at or above the national and state average.¹ Table 1 shows FSU's combined SAT 25th and 75th percentile trends as compared to its Performance Peers. In the fall of 2004, the University's 25th percentile SAT score declined for the first time in five years for enrolled first-time degree-seeking students. The 75th percentile scores for these students have continued to increase over the same period. Overall, FSU's 25th and 75th SAT percentiles have kept pace with the Performance Peers.

¹ Institutional Plan, Academic Year 2005-2006

Table 1 Frostburg State University SAT Combined Performance Peers Comparison 25th and 75th Percentiles				
Year	Frostburg State University		Performance Peers Average	
	25 th	75 th	25 th	75 th
Fall 2004	910	1110	934	1119
Fall 2003	940	1100	928	1116
Fall 2002	930	1090	918	1107
Fall 2001	910	1090	909	1105
Fall 2000	870	1080	914	1106

Data Source: Peer Performance Data Submissions

Minority achievement continues to be an area of emphasis for the University. As was recently stated in the 2005 FSU Minority Achievement Report, “Frostburg State University is committed to creating an institutional environment in which diversity is encouraged and valued.”²

The University’s Minority Achievement Plan incorporates, supports, and carefully monitors several programs and initiatives designed to enhance the diversity of the campus and promote success among minority students. These initiatives and strategies have helped to attract minority students to the University. Currently, minority students represent 18.9 percent of the total Fall 2005 undergraduate enrollment, with African Americans accounting for 14.8 percent of the undergraduate student population.

The University has completed a review of its strategies to improve the retention and graduation rates of all FSU students. As part of this review, the most effective initiatives currently in place at the University were identified for continuance, including the Learning Community program, its award-winning community service and leadership programs, and the academic support and monitoring programs located in the Division of Student and Educational Services (Student Support Services, Programs for Academic Support and Studies, and the Diversity Center).

These combined efforts have helped the University to increase the overall retention of African Americans and other minorities by more than 11.4 percent (from 63.5 percent in FY 2004 to 74.9 percent in FY 2005).³ The graduation rate of African-American students has also increased from 35.0 percent in FY 2003 to 38.7 percent in FY 2004, and the rate for all minority students has increased from 34.7 percent in FY 2003 to 39.1 percent in FY 2004.⁴

² Minority Achievement Progress Report, May 2005

³ Based on the percentage of first-time full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who re-enrolled at Frostburg State University one year after matriculation, as reported by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

⁴ Based on first-time full-time degree-seeking undergraduates who graduated from Frostburg State University within six years of matriculation, as reported by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

The Fall 2003 percentage of faculty with terminal degrees is a reflection of faculty attrition and a reduction in state appropriations. In FY 2004, state appropriations to the University were significantly reduced, resulting in the need to hire full-time non-tenure track faculty to replace core faculty who had left the institution. Most of these full-time non-tenure track faculty did not hold terminal degrees. The percentage of faculty with terminal degrees for Fall 2004 has increased to 85.1 percent, which will be reflected in the next reporting period.

**Frostburg State University
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

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)	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	
											FSU institution-specific indicators
	FTEs per full-time faculty	% of faculty with terminal degrees									
Frostburg State U.	910-1110	16.6%	12.6%	73%	51.5%	39.1%	38.7%	97%	100%	12%	
California U. of Penn.	890-1060	6.2%	5.1%	74%	44.7%	38.8%	36.5%	84%	NA	6%	
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	890-1070	9.0%	3.9%	73%	48.9%	36.6%	22.0%	89%	NA	19%	
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	970-1150	11.4%	6.1%	78%	49.5%	36.5%	29.3%	96%	NA	14%	
Sonoma State U.	920-1120	17.8%	1.9%	80%	47.8%	45.4%	43.8%	96%	NA	1%	
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	1000-1150	8.5%	2.6%	72%	47.2%	37.3%	41.7%	96%	NA	17%	
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	960-1120	11.3%	5.0%	77%	58.9%	52.0%	33.3%	97%	NA	17%	
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	960-1180	6.6%	1.8%	74%	45.5%	38.3%	46.9%	97%	NA	13%	
Western Carolina U.	920-1110	8.9%	5.3%	70%	48.9%	39.2%	41.8%	95%	NA	11%	
Western Connecticut State U.	870-1070	15.3%	5.6%	69%	36.5%	29.1%	25.4%	100%	NA	6%	
Winthrop U.	960-1160	30.1%	27.3%	76%	54.9%	59.2%	61.2%	100%	NA	21%	
Average of Peers	934-1119	12.5%	6.5%	74%	48.3%	41.2%	38.2%	95%	NA	12.5%	
University	FSU institution-specific indicators										
Frostburg State U.	21	74%									
California U. of Penn.	24	67%									
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	NA	72%									
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	21	80%									
Sonoma State U.	29	95%									
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	25	82%									
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	21	90%									
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	18	80%									
Western Carolina U.	20	79%									
Western Connecticut State U.	23	85%									
Winthrop U.	21	81%									
Average of Peers	23	81%									

Notes:
(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.

NA - Data not available

Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its performance indicators. The university attracts highly qualified, new freshmen ranking first among its peers on the SAT exam. The percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution are above the peer averages. In addition, Salisbury performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. The university has one of the highest second-year retention rates for all students, the highest six-year graduation rate for all students, and is above the peer average in the six-year graduation rate for minority students.

The university underperforms in alumni giving, reporting a rate of 9 percent that is below the peer average. This is also well below the 17 percent level reported in 2003, when the university's rate exceeded the peer average.

Salisbury selected five institution-specific indicators: acceptance rate; percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first-professional or other terminal degree; student-faculty ratio; average high school grade point average of first-time freshmen; and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student. Compared to its peers, Salisbury is more selective. The university's acceptance rate is 52 percent compared to the peer average of 73 percent. Salisbury's focus on enrolling high quality students is also evidenced by the average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen. For the entering class, the average high school GPA is 3.5, which is above the peer average of 3.2. In addition, Salisbury's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In terms of faculty quality, Salisbury performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. Eighty-two percent of Salisbury's faculty hold terminal degrees compared to its peer average of 85 percent. However, efforts to attract more tenure-track faculty have resulted in an improvement in this area over the last two years. In addition, Salisbury receives the second lowest state appropriation per full-time equivalent student, a level that is well below the peer average.

On professional licensure examinations, Salisbury has a fairly high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam, although it is somewhat below the peer average. Many of Salisbury's peer institutions, however, use alternative certification tests. Performance on the nursing licensing exam rose from 77 percent in 2003 to 88 percent in 2005. It is now above the peer average.

Institution's Response

The Commission's analysis is accurate and perhaps the most balanced in recent years. The University continues to rank highest in 5 of the 15 listed indicators and 2nd in 2 more. Additionally, the analysis fairly discusses the difficulties associated with peer comparisons and teacher licensure pass rates, and recognizes the improvement in our nursing licensure pass rates.

The percentage of faculty with terminal degrees remains our most pressing concern and is intricately linked to our next-to-last ranking in state appropriations per full-time equivalent student—a rate that indicates funding at \$1,400 less per full-time equivalent student (FTES) than the average of our peers. This deficit directly impacts our ability to hire and retain, among other critical initiatives, full-time, tenured/tenured-track faculty. The rate per full-time equivalent student disguises the true impact of our funding—a level when calculated by our FTES indicates that our funding is more than \$8 million below that of the average of our peers. These are annual deficits that, like deferred maintenance, tend to have a cascading negative impact on performance. As a result, our ability to attract and retain the highest qualified faculty is challenged by resource limitations. The University has responded with a strategic plan that places the highest priority into hiring terminally degreed faculty exclusively into the tenured/tenure-track ranks, increasing faculty salaries to improve our AAUP peer comparisons while simultaneously improving faculty retention, and decreasing the number of non-tenured track faculty positions. Currently, the percentage of tenured or tenure-track faculty who are terminally degreed is well over 90 percent. The University’s target is to increase the overall percentage of terminally degreed faculty to at least 90 percent.

**Salisbury University
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile (1)	% 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 (2)	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam (3)
Salisbury U.	1040-1200	15.0%	9.8%	82%	67.4%	42.2%	42.2%	91%	88%
Central Washington U.	880-1100	15.1%	2.0%	75%	52.7%	43.0%	57.1%	NA	no program
Eastern Illinois U.	915-1070	9.9%	6.3%	80%	59.5%	45.7%	45.0%	98%	no program
Humboldt State U.	940-1180	17.2%	3.0%	75%	44.4%	34.4%	50.0%	99%	89%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	970-1150	11.4%	6.1%	78%	49.5%	36.5%	29.3%	96%	91%
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1020-1200	9.0%	4.5%	83%	59.2%	56.9%	51.8%	97%	74%
Northern Michigan U.	915-1105	5.0%	1.7%	71%	47.5%	34.3%	60.0%	100%	NA
Sonoma State U.	920-1120	17.8%	1.9%	80%	47.8%	45.4%	43.8%	96%	92%
SUNY, C. at Oswego	1020-1170	10.0%	3.8%	78%	56.3%	39.1%	40.3%	93%	no program
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	960-1120	11.3%	5.0%	77%	58.9%	52.0%	33.3%	97%	NA
Western Oregon U.	880-1090	12.0%	1.6%	71%	31.0%	29.7%	36.4%	100%	no program
Average of Peers	942-1131	11.9%	3.6%	77%	50.7%	41.7%	44.7%	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	Average HS GPA		
Salisbury U.	9%	52%	82%	16	3.5	\$4,242	
Central Washington U.	7%	84%	90%	21	3.2	\$4,511	
Eastern Illinois U.	9%	78%	76%	16	NA	\$4,577	
Humboldt State U.	22%	67%	82%	20	3.1	\$9,754	
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	14%	71%	80%	18	3.1	\$5,762	
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	10%	54%	84%	21	3.7	\$5,811	
Northern Michigan U.	12%	84%	NA	25	3.0	\$5,417	
Sonoma State U.	1%	84%	95%	21	3.2	\$7,527	
SUNY, C. at Oswego	14%	57%	83%	19	3.3	\$4,740	
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	17%	60%	90%	18	3.0	\$5,282	
Western Oregon U.	11%	94%	81%	16	3.3	\$3,328	
Average of Peers	11.7%	73%	85%	19.5	3.21	\$5,671	

NA - Data not available

Notes:

- (1) Eastern Illinois and Northern Michigan University prefer ACT over SAT scores when considering admissions applications. ACT ranges were converted to SAT ranges.
- (2) Teacher licensure laws vary from state to state. The Praxis II exam may be required at different times in a student's education. Northern Michigan and Western Oregon Universities require passage of the exam prior to graduation. therefore pass rates will always be 100%. The state of Washington does not require the Praxis II exam for licensing its teachers.
- (3) NCLEX-RN exam pass rates for University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth (MA), UNC-Wilmington (NC), Sonoma State (CA), Humboldt State (CA) were obtained from the respective state board of nursing websites.

Towson University

Towson University compares favorably to its peers on the majority of its performance indicators. The university ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and tied for first for the 75th percentile. The percentage of African American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peer average. In addition, Towson performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rates for all groups, including minority and African American students. The university is first in six-year graduation rate for all minorities, tied for first in average second-year retention rate, second in six-year graduation rate for African Americans, and third in overall six-year graduation rate.

The university performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of minorities enrolled as undergraduate students. However, according to the MFR, this percentage has increased slightly over the last six years, from 14.4 percent in 1998 to 15.9 percent in 2005. Furthermore, a closer analysis of Towson's peer institutions reveals that five of these institutions enroll a high proportion of Hispanic students, somewhat skewing the average. Towson's pass rate for the nursing exam is 72 percent in 2005. However, most of the peer rates declined in this indicator. Nevertheless, Towson is still below the peer average of those few peers with nursing programs. The university is slightly below the average of its peers in the pass rate for the Praxis II exam. The institution reports a 94 percent pass rate, while the peer average is 96 percent.

Towson selected three institution-specific indicators: percent of undergraduates who live on campus; student-faculty ratio; and acceptance rate. Compared to its peers, Towson is more selective. Towson's acceptance rate is 52 percent in 2005, which is lower than the peer average of 65 percent. In addition, roughly a quarter of Towson's undergraduate students reside on campus and Towson's student-faculty ratio is slightly lower than the peer average.

Institution's Response

The percent minority among undergraduates at Towson University has improved in each of the last three years and increased by a whole percentage point, from 15.9 percent to 16.9 percent, between fall 2004 and fall 2005. We expect continued increases in representation of minority students among undergraduates as we continue to emphasize achievement (high school and transfer grade-point-averages) over test scores in the admissions process and as we implement new admissions and financial aid initiatives.

Our research shows that financial aid increases retention and graduation rates of minority students. We have significantly increased spending on institutional need-based financial aid and we are confident that this too will have a positive impact on access and retention.

The acceptance rates included in the 2005 Peer performance Analysis are fall 2003 data. Towson University's acceptance rates for fall 2004 and fall 2005 were 67 percent and 65 percent respectively.

Towson's small class sizes are part of its appeal to students who look for "large school choices ... and small school personal attention." The university seeks to maintain an optimum student-faculty ratio that will maintain efficiency and cost-effectiveness while ensuring a quality classroom experience. Accordingly, Towson's student-faculty ratio may increase but it is not necessarily the university's intention to raise it above the peer average.

The Towson University Department of Nursing implemented an Action Plan in response to the 72 percent pass rate on the NCLEX-RN in the year 2003-2004. The plan, which includes a comprehensive testing program offered by Educational Resources Incorporated (ERI), is designed to identify students who need remediation or extra attention in coursework. Once identified, a remediation plan is developed for the student and must be completed before the student is allowed to progress.

The Action Plan is working. The pass rate for first time candidates increased to 87 percent for the 2004-2005 academic year. The required pass rate for Maryland RN Schools was 77.60 percent and the average pass rate for all U.S. schools was 86.15 percent. Towson achieved the 2nd highest pass rate in Maryland for baccalaureate degree programs. We will continue to collect data on factors believed to influence pass rates.

As part of an annual assessment system, the university now provides Praxis II results to each academic program for which a Praxis II test is required (Biology, History, English, etc.). The departments review their curriculum and course content in light of student performance in the subject-area sections of the Praxis II exam and make adjustments to improve student preparation.

About 25 percent to 30 percent of Praxis II test-takers, whose scores are included in the Towson University percentage, earned their bachelors degrees elsewhere and attended Towson only to complete the state teacher certification requirements. The subject area sections of the Praxis II measure competency in material covered in courses taken at their baccalaureate institutions. These sections do not evaluate the effectiveness of the educational experience at Towson. The university now informs these students of the areas of content covered on the various Praxis II tests so that they can review.

As a result of these changes, we expect Towson's pass rate on the 2004-2005 Praxis II to exceed the average of its peers.

**Towson University
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

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	TU institution-specific indicators			
										Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
Towson U.	990-1170	15.9%	10.1%	83%	56.5%	44.8%	47.1%	94%	72%				
California State U., Fresno	820-1080	47.1%	4.9%	76%	46.3%	42.7%	29.7%	94%	83%				
California State U., Northridge	810-1060	49.0%	8.3%	73%	32.2%	27.0%	18.5%	100%	No nursing program				
California State U., Sacramento	840-1090	40.0%	5.8%	77%	39.2%	35.1%	26.1%	98%	78%				
Eastern Illinois U.	915-1070	9.9%	6.3%	80%	59.5%	45.7%	45.0%	98%	No nursing program				
Monclair State C.	930-1130	32.0%	10.3%	83%	55.8%	50.2%	51.2%	100%	No nursing program				
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	970-1160	23.2%	15.1%	76%	49.1%	44.3%	44.9%	94%	72%				
Texas State U., San Marcos	970-1150	26.6%	4.9%	76%	46.4%	42.5%	45.7%	94%	No nursing program				
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	980-1140	12.7%	8.1%	83%	59.1%	46.8%	46.1%	86%	86%				
Western Illinois U.	915-1105	12.0%	6.8%	75%	55.3%	40.1%	43.3%	100%	No nursing program				
Western Kentucky U.	875-1070	11.0%	8.8%	75%	43.4%	28.4%	28.9%	93%	93%				
Average of Peers	903-1106	26.4%	7.9%	77%	48.6%	40.3%	37.9%	96%	82%				
Towson U.	7%	2.4%	17/1	52%									
California State U., Fresno	2%	2%	18/1	70%									
California State U., Northridge	2%	NA	22/1	NA									
California State U., Sacramento	3%	5%	21/1	52%									
Eastern Illinois U.	9%	46%	16/1	78%									
Monclair State C.	7%	25%	18/1	51%									
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	8%	27%	15/1	72%									
Texas State U., San Marcos	8%	22%	24/1	56%									
West Chester U. of Pennsylvania	10%	33%	18/1	46%									
Western Illinois U.	11%	52%	17/1	66%									
Western Kentucky U.	14%	30%	20/1	93%									
Average of Peers	7.4%	26.9%	19/1	65%									

NA - Data not available

University of Baltimore

Due to the University of Baltimore's (UB) mission to provide upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional degrees, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rates, and average high school grade point averages for incoming freshmen. Instead, it focuses on graduate student achievement and faculty quality. Overall, the university exceeds the performance of its peers on every indicator. The percentages of African American and minority undergraduate students attending the institution are above the peer averages.

The university reports an improved undergraduate alumni-giving rate in 2005. Compared to its peers, the institution exceeds the peer average on this indicator. It should be noted however, that only half of the peer institutions provide data for alumni giving. In addition, the university is strong in the number of awards per full-time instructional faculty. It significantly exceeds the average of its peers in this indicator.

The university selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. For both indicators, the university's performance exceeds its peer averages. UB reports the second highest expenditures for research and ranks seventh in the percentage of part-time faculty with a level below the peer average.

The university reports a 67 percent passing rate on the law-licensing exam, a slight decrease from the prior year rate of 71 percent. Unfortunately, peer comparisons for this indicator are impossible, as the university has no performance peers that have a law school. However, there are three institutions within the university's funding peer group that do have law schools, Washburn University of Topeka, North Carolina Central University, and University of Southern Maine. UB should amend its report with the law exam pass rates of these three institutions. It is also worth comparing the bar exam pass rate to Maryland's other public law school at the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB). UB's pass rate trails UMB's significantly as UMB reports a pass rate of 78 percent in 2005. In its annual publication, *America's Best Graduate Schools*, U.S. News & World Report compares an institution's bar exam pass rate to that of the jurisdiction's overall passage rate. The jurisdiction listed is the state where the largest number of 2003 graduates took the state bar exam. Under this measure, UB's pass rate of 67 percent is slightly below the Maryland pass rate of 71 percent.

Institution's Response

In UB's original submission there was no comparable data available for the peer performance indicator "Passing rate in Law Licensing exam" because none of the university's current peers have law schools. In lieu of this data the commission requested that university report on the bar passage rate of first-time takers of the exam from three schools that are not current peers but who are in UB's peer funding group. In addition the commission suggested that the UB's first-time passage rate should be compared to that of all who took the exam in Maryland at same time. The table below presents that

comparison for UB and the three institutions that not current peers but who are in the university's peer funding group. The data is presented in the following table.

University of Baltimore Institutional Response (Continued)

Law School	Bar Passage Rate of First Time Test Takers*								
	Summer 2003		Winter 2004		Total				
	University bar passage rate	Jurisdiction bar passage rate	University bar passage rate as percent of Jurisdiction bar passage rate	University bar passage rate	Jurisdiction bar passage rate as percent of Jurisdiction bar passage rate	University bar passage rate	Jurisdiction bar passage rate as percent of Jurisdiction bar passage rate		
University of Baltimore School of Law	65%	73%	89%	70%	62%	113%	67%	71%	94%
University of Maine School of Law	69%	73%	94%	33%	68%	48%	64%	71%	90%
North Carolina Central School of Law	68%	78%	87%	86%	64%	134%	70%	76%	92%
Washburn University School of Law	78%	81%	96%	80%	85%	94%	78%	83%	94%

*Source: ABA/LSAC, The Official Guide to ABA Approved Law School, 2005 Edition

**University of Baltimore
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

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	38.0%	32.8%	67%	10%	3.14
California State U., Bakersfield	48.6%	7.1%	no law school	7%	1.84
California State U., San Marcos	34.7%	3.0%	no law school	3%	1.04
Governors State U.	42.9%	36.2%	no law school	NA	0.00
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	29.5%	7.2%	no law school	NA	1.92
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	12.8%	8.4%	no law school	NA	1.39
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	17.7%	7.9%	no law school	5%	1.67
New Jersey City U.	61.7%	19.6%	no law school	NA	0.43
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	15.0%	6.4%	no law school	NA	NA
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	42.3%	2.8%	no law school	6%	2.33
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	9.9%	4.3%	no law school	14%	1.67

Average of Peers

31.5%

10.3%

7.0%

1.37

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

Baltimore, U. of	\$4,933,400	54.2%
California State U., Bakersfield	\$62,294	61.1%
California State U., San Marcos	\$53,266	89.9%
Governors State U.	\$1,122,751	100.0%
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	\$1,134,437	59.4%
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	\$1,480,112	89.3%
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	\$2,145,000	42.3%
New Jersey City U.	\$7,853	62.1%
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	NA	39.2%
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	\$6,562,097	13.7%
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	\$461,353	17.2%
Average of Peers	\$1,447,685	57.4%

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 by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Compared to its peer institutions, the university shows a wide range of performance. The university's unique structure permits only a few generalizations.

The percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution are above the peer averages.

Using available data, it appears that UMB has slipped in performance of its students that pass licensing exams. Approximately 84 percent of nursing students passed their licensing exam, dropping from 91 percent in 2004. This falls short of University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill's and the University of Illinois, Chicago's reported pass rates of 92 percent respectively. UMB reports a 93 percent pass rate for the medical exam, the same level as in 2004, but slightly below the 2003 rate of 96 percent. The institution reports that 78 percent of law students passed their exam, down from 85 percent in the previous year. Peer institutions, plus the University of Connecticut, the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Virginia that were added for comparison, report a 91 percent average pass rate on this particular exam. UMB's pass rate of 78 percent is also higher than the jurisdictional pass rate of 71 percent for Maryland as reported in *America's Best Graduate Schools 2006*, published by U.S. News & World Report. The university's pass rate for the dental examination is 80 percent for 2005, a significant drop from 99 percent in 2004 and the 100 percent rate that was reported for 2003. Finally, UMB reports a pass rate of 64 percent for Social Work for 2005. This is above the national rate of 62 percent, but below the rates of 66 percent and 86 percent reported in 2004 and 2003, respectively.

The university selected six institution-specific indicators: total medicine R&D expenditures; medicine research grants per basic research faculty; medicine research grants per clinical faculty; percent of minority students enrolled; total headcount enrollment; and percentage of graduate and professional students enrolled. These data show that UMB's school of medicine has the second highest level of research grants per basic research faculty and research grants per clinical faculty. Although the remaining institution-specific indicators are primarily descriptive indicators, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. Compared to its peers, UMB has the second lowest total headcount enrollment and ranks second in the percentage of graduate and professional student enrollment. In addition, the university has the third highest percent of minorities of total enrollment and is above the peer average. UMB has the third highest medicine R&D spending and second highest medicine research grants per FTE faculty. The level for 2005 is \$24.3 million higher than in 2004.

Institution's Response

Using measures of research activity, UMB's performance compared to peer institutions has improved in many areas. In terms of total medicine R&D spending reported through the Association of American Medical Colleges, UMB ranked 3rd in 2005, up from 5th in 2004. In terms of grants per basic research faculty in medicine, UMB moved from 4th to 2nd, and now surpasses the peer average. The average annual rate of growth in federal research expenditures at UMB continues to be double-digit, and was second only to the University of Illinois, Chicago, a school with a much smaller funding base for 2005.

The National Council of State Boards of Nursing raised the passing score for the NCLEX, resulting in a decreased passing rate for many schools including the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The required passing rate for Maryland schools for the reported time frame was 77.6 percent, so the UMB School of Nursing was above the required rate.

The pass rates for UMB students taking licensing exams in medicine and social work are above the national averages. Although the exam score for UMB dentistry students is less than the score for the University of Alabama, Birmingham, it should be noted that Alabama's score was the highest among all dental schools for this year.

**University of Maryland, Baltimore
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams						Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law	Dental	Social Work					
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	40.2%	26.3%	84%	93%	78%	80%	64%	37%	\$237,817	\$249,808	12.3%	
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	36.9%	32.2%	88%		no law school	85%		5%	\$179,415	\$157,520	8.0%	
California, U. of, San Francisco	NA	NA	NA		no law school		No social work prog.	21%	\$581,024	\$367,504	8.1%	
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	50.3%	8.9%	92%		no law school			3%	\$145,433	\$165,453	24.0%	
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	25.2%	7.6%	92%		95%			14%	\$244,181	\$163,114	10.2%	
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	20.7%	10.9%	92%		85%			25%	\$145,126	\$120,337	11.6%	
Connecticut, U. of					88%							
Texas, U. of, Austin					93%							
Virginia, U. of					93%							
Average of Peers	33.3%	14.9%	91%	Natl. rate = 92%	91%	Natl. rate = 80%	Natl. rate = 62%	13.6%	\$259,036	\$194,786	12.4%	

University	Total medicine R&D spending (thousands)	Medicine research grants per basic Research faculty	UMB institution-specific indicators			
			Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount enrollment	Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headcount
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	\$171,387	\$235,033	\$172,171	33.2%	5,602	83.1%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	\$143,334	\$132,658	\$123,886	31.4%	16,693	31.5%
California, U. of, San Francisco	\$354,247	\$508,430	\$193,818	44.9%	2,754	99.7%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	\$69,412	\$136,159	\$60,563	42.1%	24,865	37.8%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	\$184,135	\$219,776	\$111,905	23.9%	39,533	37.2%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	\$76,752	\$148,292	\$45,691	19.1%	26,878	38.5%
Average of Peers	\$165,576	\$229,063	\$107,173	32.3%	22,145	48.9%

NA - Data not available
 Note: Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers.
 The following universities are added for comparison with bar passing rates only: Connecticut; Texas; Austin; and Virginia.

University of Maryland Baltimore County

The University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) exceeds the performance of its peers on the majority of its indicators. In terms of quality of new freshmen, the University ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and 75th percentile. The percentage of minority and African American undergraduate students attending the institution are far above the peer averages. Furthermore, the university's six-year graduation rates for minority and African American students exceed the peer averages. Comparisons of faculty quality and research are favorable for the university. It ranks first in the total number of awards per full-time instructional faculty and, over the last five years, had the highest average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures.

The university, however, performs below the average of its peers on several performance measures. UMBC's second-year retention rate is slightly below the peer average. The university is also below the average of its peers in the six-year graduation rate. Despite efforts by the university to improve this indicator, it has improved only slightly over the past three years. The university has the lowest total amount of research and development expenditures received from federal, state, industry and other sources, but this level has risen by 18 percent in 2005. UMBC has shown improvement in total research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty, moving from tenth place in 2003 to eighth in 2005. In both instances, the university falls below the average of its peers on these indicators. However, the university has increased its R&D expenditures from \$19.8 million in FY 1998 to \$42.9 million in the most recent year.

UMBC reports the second lowest percentage of alumni giving among its peers. The university's 7 percent alumni giving rate is substantially lower than its peer average, and has remained flat from the last year.

The university selected three 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, and student-to-faculty ratio. Among the university's institution-specific indicators, UMBC ranks first in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology and ranks first in the ratio of invention disclosures to research and development expenditures. The university has the fifth highest student-to-faculty ratio, and is above the peer average.

Finally, the university has improved in terms of teacher preparation, reporting a pass rate on teacher licensing exams of 94 percent in 2005, up from 86 percent in 2004.

Institution's Response

Student retention and graduation rates are important indicators that UMBC takes very seriously and that the institution is working vigorously to improve. The university has expanded the number of certificate and degree programs available and has undertaken several academic initiatives designed to increase student engagement, which is known to

affect student persistence. Among the latter are *First Year Seminars*, student “success” seminars, the *Faculty Mentor Program*, the *Make UMBC Yours* campaign, the *First Year Council* (a peer mentor model initiated by student leaders), the *New Student Book Experience*, and the *First Year Leaders* program, which places upperclassmen in residence halls as a resource for first year students.

UMBC has continued its considerable 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 8th in Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty member. Particularly noteworthy is the university’s performance on federal R&D expenditures. Average annual percent growth over 5 years is the highest of our peers, and UMBC ranks 3rd on its institution-specific indicator of Federal R&D Expenditures per full-time faculty member. The university also ranks 1st among its peers on another institution-specific indicator: the ratio of license agreements to millions of dollars in R&D.

UMBC is a young institution and, until recently, campus efforts in, and resources for, fundraising have focused more on maximizing funds through corporate and foundation philanthropy rather than through alumni giving. These efforts have been successful in generating substantial restricted funding sources: UMBC’s first capital campaign raised \$66 million, exceeding our \$50 million goal. UMBC lacks the staffing and resources to significantly increase efforts to cultivate alumni. New initiatives, such as starting an alumni magazine and creating departmental clusters of alumni professionals and faculty to cultivate alumni support, will depend on the availability of new resources. Nevertheless, the UMBC Alumni Association, in partnership with the Office of Institutional Advancement, is developing new approaches to engagement of alumni and is fostering the university’s relationship with them.

University of Maryland Baltimore County
Peer Performance Data: 2005

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	1120-1320	37.8%	14.5%	82%	54.6%	57.9%	56.8%	94%	7%
Arkansas, U. of, Main	1035-1255	12.2%	5.3%	82%	48.3%	39.4%	30.9%	100%	21%
California, U. of, Riverside	940-1190	72.0%	6.6%	85%	64.2%	64.6%	64.4%	100%	5%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1030-1260	35.7%	2.5%	87%	65.4%	63.4%	55.8%	100%	18%
Clemson U.	1110-1300	9.9%	6.9%	89%	72.1%	65.0%	61.0%	92%	25%
Delaware, U. of	1100-1280	13.3%	6.0%	89%	74.0%	67.7%	63.6%	98%	25%
Mississippi State U.	955-1220	22.5%	19.8%	80%	57.5%	45.8%	43.4%	94%	18%
Oklahoma State U., Main	1035-1220	16.2%	3.9%	82%	58.3%	50.8%	45.4%	100%	12%
Rhode Island, U. of	990-1190	11.5%	4.3%	80%	55.8%	43.1%	35.6%	86%	16%
SUNY, Albany	1030-1230	21.4%	8.0%	84%	65.8%	60.6%	62.6%	94%	18%
Wyoming, U. of	955-1185	6.5%	1.0%	76%	56.7%	43.9%	33.3%	NA	12%
Average of Peers	1018-1233	22.1%	6.4%	83%	61.8%	54.4%	49.6%	96%	17.0%

UMBC institution-specific indicators

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.)	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 agreements, to \$Mil. R&D
UMBC	\$42,906	\$111,155	34.2%	4.86	1st	1st	21.9	\$88,508	1st
Arkansas, U. of, Main	\$82,277	\$120,996	13.5%	1.30	2nd	3rd	18.0	\$39,810	3rd
California, U. of, Riverside	\$109,712	\$198,036	14.2%	3.38	3rd	NA	24.9	\$69,480	NA
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	\$78,448	\$175,499	5.6%	3.30	5th	NA	27.1	\$85,488	NA
Clemson U.	\$151,182	\$180,840	24.5%	2.42	3rd	6th	16.8	\$74,215	5th
Delaware, U. of	\$100,706	\$99,512	21.3%	2.68	8th	2nd	17.1	\$68,669	7th
Mississippi State U.	\$159,014	\$184,044	18.2%	1.00	6th	7th	13.2	\$90,631	4th
Oklahoma State U., Main	\$99,969	\$115,571	12.2%	2.28	7th	4th	22.5	\$42,785	2nd
Rhode Island, U. of	\$59,992	\$100,154	9.9%	2.18	9th	5th	18.5	\$81,147	6th
SUNY, Albany	\$120,655	\$212,795	24.9%	3.59	11th	NA	23.5	\$134,106	NA
Wyoming, U. of	\$55,577	\$108,975	2.9%	3.21	10th	NA	16.2	\$39,167	NA
Average of Peers	\$101,753	\$149,642	14.7%	2.53	NA	NA	19.8	\$72,550	NA

NA - Data not available

University of Maryland, College Park

The University of Maryland, College Park is measured against its aspirational peers - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Therefore, College Park is not yet performing at the peer level on many indicators. One indicator where it compares favorably is in the SAT 25th to 75th percentile, one of the highest among its peers. The university is in the middle of its peers, but still below average, in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. According to the MFR, College Park's goal was to increase the proportion of minority undergraduate students to 35 percent in 2004. However, the proportion is only 32 percent as reported for 2005. It should be noted however, that the percentage of minorities enrolled at College Park is higher than the non-California institutions and the university has the highest percentage of African American undergraduate students enrolled.

Compared to its peers, the university has the lowest retention and graduation rates. The university has shown steady improvement in all areas except the six-year graduation rate of African Americans. In preparing teacher candidates, the university reports a pass rate of 96 percent. This represents an improvement from last year's rate of 91 percent, but is lower than the average of the peer group. The university's 16 percent alumni-giving rate is equal to its peer average for 2005, but lower than the level attained in 2004.

College Park has lost some ground compared to its peers in research and development (R&D) expenditures in 2005. The university's annual percent growth of federal R&D expenditures has slipped from 17.7 percent in 2004 to 8.4 percent in 2005. Although College Park's total R&D expenditures are slightly below the peer average, this level is higher than R&D expenditures at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and the University of California, Los Angeles.

College Park has five institution-specific indicators: the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation; the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation; the percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies; the number of invention disclosures reported per \$100 million in total research and development expenditures; and the number of degrees awarded to African American students. College Park has improved in the number of graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 from 62 programs in 2004 to 67 programs ranked in 2005. The university also improved the number of programs ranked in the top 15 in the nation from 43 in 2004 to 49 in 2005. The university continues to report the highest number of degrees awarded to African American students.

As further evidence of its aspiration to reach its peers, College Park ranks first in the percentage increase in the number of Maryland faculty members holding membership in one of the national academies. The university improved in the number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures and is above the peer average.

Institution's Response

The University has made significant improvements in graduation rates. While our peers have increased graduation rates over the past 5 years by 5 percentage points, the University of Maryland has increased rates by 10 percentage points over the same time period. University-wide graduation rate is expected to exceed 80 percent by 2008. The University implemented an undergraduate retention program with the goal of enhancing student success. This multifaceted program includes a statement of expectations of progress toward a degree, a change in classification of students to reflect raised expectations, new policies on withdrawal and leave of absence, and a new policy on academic probation and dismissal. Across the board, these policies were devised to increase expectations of student performance. Further efforts were directed to developing new advising and program planning models intended to complement the 2002 actions. These new initiatives call for each degree program to build four-year graduation templates and plans for advising interventions in order to assure that students are on track to timely graduation. We are seeing the impact of our earlier actions and expect even more improvement as later actions take effect.

The University has established an objective to narrow the gap between the overall graduation rate and the graduation rates for African-American students. We are improving our graduation rates for minorities and African American students at a faster rate than our peers. More recent data are reported in the MFR, which shows that UM has increased the minority graduation rate from 65 percent to 70 percent, while the graduation rate of African American students has increased from 57 percent to 67 percent. These data will be reported in the 2006 Peer Performance Report.

The five-year average of the annual percentage growth in federal R&D expenditures for the University has been above all of its peers for several years. In 2004, the University had an unusually high year with 7 percentage points above the peer average. In 2005, the University reported being 2 percentage points below the peer average. This recent drop can be attributed to changes in federal funding patterns. As a result, the University will move to broaden funding options.

There is a national trend for teacher-training programs to require students to pass teacher licensure examinations as part of the program graduation requirements. These policies are being phased in at UM and take effect as students enter the programs. The results of these policies will become evident as students under the old policies graduate. Once all students admitted to the program under the old graduation requirements have cleared the system, the pass rate will increase to 100 percent.

**University of Maryland, College Park
Peer Performance Data: 2005**

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile (3)	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Fall 1998 cohort (per CSRDE Student Retention Report)			Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s) (2)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty (2)
					Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans				
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1180-1340	32%	12%	92%	73%	65%	57%	96%	16%	\$321,899	\$237,564
California, U. of, Berkeley	1190-1440	56%	4%	96%	87%	85%	72%	100%	15%	\$462,063	\$339,752
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1160-1410	57%	3%	96%	87%	86%	71%	100%	16%	\$266,190	\$156,952
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1145-1335	26%	7%	92%	80%	74%	58%	100%	12%	\$482,932	\$271,921
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1185-1380	25%	8%	96%	87%	78%	69%	100%	14%	\$535,873	\$285,951
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1190-1390	21%	11%	95%	81%	73%	70%	98%	25%	\$245,416	\$224,946
Average of Peers	1174-1391	37%	6%	95%	84%	79%	68%	100%	16%	\$398,495	\$255,904

UMCP institution-specific indicators

University	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	# grad level colleges/pgms/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/pgms/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member- ships in national academies (1)	# of invention disclosures per \$100M in total R&D (4)	Number of degrees awarded to African American students
California, U. of, Berkeley	7.2%	7.7	127	113	3.8%	20	246
California, U. of, Los Angeles	4.4%	4.7	109	87	2.4%	14	241
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	10.9%	5.9	86	62	-5.9%	30	379
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	14.7%	5.5	125	107	1.9%	33	369
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	13.4%	3.7	75	56	2.4%	22	399
Average of Peers	10.1%	5.5	104	85	0.9%	24	327

Notes:

Graduation rate data extracted from the annual CSRDE Student Retention Report, June 2005 (dt. 7/13/05).

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) R&D total EXCLUDES expenditures in medical science.
- (3) SAT scores for Illinois and Michigan come from U.S. News and are converted from ACT scores; all other scores are from NCES.
- (4) Although R&D total excludes expenditures in the medical sciences, invention disclosures include those in the medical sciences. Data sources: AUTM (UM, Michigan, & UNC), obtained from the Institutional Technology Transfer Offices for UC and Illinois.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

In many cases, the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) compares favorably to its peers. The university's six-year graduation rate for all students and the six-year graduation rates for all minorities and for African Americans exceed the peer averages and have risen since 2004. However, UMES's second-year retention rate remains at a level below the peer average. The university is below the peer average in 25th and 75th percentile on the SAT. It should also be noted that because its peers also have large minority populations, UMES currently is close to the average of its peers in the percentage of minority and African American undergraduates attending the institution.

In terms of faculty and research efforts, UMES reports a slightly lower, but still positive, average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures than last year and is above the peer average. However, it reports lower levels of total research and development expenditures and total research and development expenditures per full-time faculty over last year. The university reports an improved performance in teacher preparation. The university's passing rate on the Praxis II exam rose from 31 percent in 2004 last year to 45 percent this year. However, this level is only one-half of the level of the peer average. The university's alumni giving rate is not only significantly below the peer average, but is lower than the eight institutions reporting this indicator.

The university reports three institution-specific indicators: percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, information technology degrees as a percent of total bachelor degrees, and loan default rate. UMES reports a level of full-time faculty with terminal degrees that is below the peer average. The university is above the peer average in level of undergraduate IT degrees awarded. The university is below the average peer loan default rate.

The university reports almost 100 percent of data in this report, as it did last year. This is a significant improvement over past years.

Institution's Response

The analysis is a fair representation of the performance of the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) based upon the peer performance data for 2005. UMES' performance in terms of the graduation rate continues to be strong and its six-year graduation rate is surpassed slightly by only two of its 10 peers. Its Research and Development expenditure annual growth rate of 22.9 percent, though lower than the last reporting year's, continues to be strong, surpassing the average growth rate for its peers and exceeding the average rates of six of them. UMES' performance is particularly strong in the number of IT graduates where it is a leader among its peers. In addition, UMES has a lower loan default rate than the average of its peers.

Strength is also evident in the area of access and diversity in higher education. UMES continues to make a significant contribution to the state in these areas and continues to

reach out to first-generation college students, maintaining a commitment to representation of this group. Based on a recent quick survey of entering freshmen for the fall of 2005, over 50 percent of these students are first generation students. A significant number of such students may be under-prepared and may enter college with lower SAT scores compared to their peers. However, because of its commitment to providing opportunities to high quality education to diverse populations, UMES nurtures these students and provides support for them to succeed.

The analysis reveals a number of areas in which the University has faced or continues to face some challenges. First, in the area of alumni giving the low rate of 3.0 percent for the reporting year is indeed low compared to the rates by UMES' peers. UMES recently instituted a more effective way of tracking alumni and, with improved staffing and communication with alumni, as well as making use of a regularly updated alumni database; UMES is beginning to see positive changes in alumni giving. For example, the rate of alumni giving for fiscal year 2005 was 15 percent. UMES plans to continue to increase alumni giving in the future through use of innovative strategies for fundraising including improved and regular communication.

Second, the analysis shows that UMES' passing rate in the PRAXIS II exam was low in two successive years of 2004 (31 percent) and 2005 (45 percent). When it was realized that students were experiencing difficulties in meeting certification requirements for PRAXIS II, UMES instituted more sound screening procedures for entry into the teacher preparation program. In addition, more effective academic support services including advising and tutoring to enhance student success as well as financial support for students who need such support have been implemented. These improvements will result in an increase in the pass rate in PRAXIS II to 83 percent for the 2006 peer performance reporting period.

Third, UMES is paying a great deal of attention to the retention issue. It is using Access and Success funds to strengthen the role of counselors and mentors to provide tutorial assistance to help students. In part, the retention problem is aggravated by financial limitations. The declining trend in retention is related to the 30 percent increase in tuition over the last two years. In addition, the decrease in out-of-state enrollment from 30 percent to 24 percent has significant adverse impact on tuition revenue and enrollments. A committee of Vice Presidents has been set up to conduct a thorough investigation of the retention problem and to recommend long-term solutions to turn the trend around. This investigation will include a reexamination of the minimum composite SAT score for admission and thus also address the question of UMES' less favorable average in 25th and 75th percentile scores on the SAT in comparison to its peers.

UMES is also taking interim remedial steps to improve student retention. These steps include monitoring student mid-term performance and requiring students with grades of "D" and "F" to participate in mandatory mentoring and tutoring. In addition, area directors are providing mentoring and tutoring services in all student dormitories. A combined freshman seminar is also provided twice each semester by faculty and staff to provide advising services to students. It is hoped that these short-term interventions and

recommended strategies by the Committee of Vice Presidents will transform the retention challenge into an opportunity for improving student learning and success.

Fourth, UMES has instituted a policy to ensure that in the future all vacant faculty positions will be filled by persons who hold terminal degrees. This will ensure an increased percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Peer Performance Data: 2005

University	SAT 25th/75th %tile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	730-930	77.2%	75.0%	70%	44.4%	45.4%	45.0%	45%	3%	\$5,124
Alabama A&M U.	780-915	94.7%	93.9%	70%	38.0%	38.3%	38.5%	NA	NA	\$36,856
Albany State U.	850-990	94.5%	93.7%	80%	32.7%	32.8%	32.9%	95%	NA	\$2,178
Alcorn State U.	780-955	91.2%	90.7%	72%	47.9%	47.8%	48.0%	99%	5%	\$7,192
California State U., Bakersfield	810-1080	48.6%	7.1%	78%	44.1%	42.3%	38.1%	99%	7%	\$4,397
Fort Valley State U.	660-1200	95.1%	94.4%	73%	30.0%	30.0%	29.9%	78%	42%	\$2,892
North Carolina A&T State U.	790-990	94.0%	92.2%	76%	44.0%	44.5%	44.9%	98%	10%	\$17,265
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	850-1030	48.7%	23.6%	69%	38.1%	38.9%	36.7%	88%	6%	\$0
Prairie View A&M U.	710-920	95.5%	91.6%	69%	37.1%	36.9%	48.1%	84%	11%	\$10,740
South Carolina State U.	760-940	98.0%	97.6%	77%	48.6%	48.4%	48.1%	78%	28%	\$3,225
Virginia State U.	750-920	97.4%	96.1%	72%	38.7%	38.4%	38.3%	100%	9%	\$7,209
Average of Peers	774-994	85.8%	78.1%	74%	39.9%	39.8%	40.0%	91%	14.8%	\$9,195
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	\$50,235	22.9%	61%	8.0%	9.0%					
Alabama A&M U.	\$152,929	37.7%	69%	7.5%	12.4%					
Albany State U.	\$15,125	34.4%	NA	3.7%	9.1%					
Alcorn State U.	\$58,000	9.4%	59%	0.9%	13.6%					
California State U., Bakersfield	\$21,449	67.8%	73%	1.5%	4.1%					
Fort Valley State U.	\$23,323	3.7%	66%	6.9%	11.1%					
North Carolina A&T State U.	\$62,104	-1.1%	72%	4.9%	12.2%					
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	\$0	0.0%	72%	2.6%	2.0%					
Prairie View A&M U.	\$50,900	-4.1%	69%	1.0%	17.1%					
South Carolina State U.	\$16,885	2.3%	86%	5.9%	5.1%					
Virginia State U.	\$38,551	29.9%	80%	2.0%	11.6%					
Average of Peers	\$43,927	18.0%	72%	3.7%	9.8%					

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 the unique nature of this institution. For example, the majority of students attending UMUC attend part-time which reflects the university's target population: working adults. In addition, the university's indicators reflect other unique characteristics such as the university's goal to serve students through distance education. Therefore, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate, and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen.

Overall, the university compares favorably to its peers. The percentage of African American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peer average. The university is at the peer average in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. The university's alumni-giving rate is lower than the peer average for 2005.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators: the percentage of African American graduates in information technology; the percentage of undergraduate students over the age of 25; the number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business; the number of worldwide online courses; and the number of worldwide online enrollments. The university significantly exceeds the performance of its peers on all of these indicators. Unique among these institution-specific indicators is the number of worldwide online courses and enrollments. Enrollments in these areas has increased significantly, by almost 17,000, from 2004 to 2005.

Institution's Response

University College is revising its peer data to reflect its new definition of alumni giving rate (now 11 percent) and changing the worldwide online course indicator to stateside (consistent with the MFR).

UMUC has no additional institutional response to this report.

University of Maryland University College
Peer Performance Data: 2005

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	UMUC institution-specific indicators				
				# of African American ¹⁾ IT graduates	% of undergraduates 25 and older	# of post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.	Number of worldwide online courses	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
Maryland, U. of, University College	43.0%	31.9%	3%	212	82.9%	1,239	728	143,544
California State U., Dominguez Hills	72.2%	27.2%	2%	4	48.9%	130	189	8,463
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	58.3%	13.7%	10%	44	26.4%	851	0	0
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	85.7%	34.1%	2%	36	46.3%	35	54	1,392
CUNY Hunter C.	52.4%	15.3%	17%	5	31.4%	0	NA	NA
CUNY Queens C.	45.5%	9.8%	17%	15	31.3%	65	0 ²⁾	0
Eastern Michigan U.	22.3%	17.4%	4%	9	NA	367	NA	NA
Governors State U.	42.9%	36.2%	NA	10	62.1%	117	57	1,825
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	23.2%	15.1%	8%	32	23.2%	310	66	1,000
Southern Connecticut State U.	21.4%	12.4%	10%	8	18.3%	48	NA	NA
Western Illinois U.	12.0%	6.8%	11%	3	13.6%	122	89	3,023
Average of Peers	43.6%	18.8%	9.0%	17	33.5%	205	76	2,243

NA - Data not available

Notes:

1) Bachelor's degrees

2) Utilize Blackboard LMS for student course management and "classroom enhancement," but no online-only or mostly online courses

Morgan State University

Morgan State University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its indicators. The university's six-year graduation rate for African American students is above the peer average. Moreover, the university's pass rate on the teacher certification examination is 100 percent. The rate has steadily risen over the past four years, marking an improvement in teacher preparation. It should be noted, however, that only three of Morgan's peers provide data for this indicator. Morgan also reports the highest graduate and professional school going rate and student satisfaction with job preparation. Furthermore, Morgan reports a small increase in research grant and contract activity over the prior year. Those peers reporting show an average decrease of 3 percent for this indicator.

Conversely, the university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Although they show improvement over 2004, the second-year retention rates for all students, minority students, and African American students are all below the peer averages. The six-year graduation rates for all students and minority students, while improving at Morgan in 2005, also lag behind the peer averages. Because Morgan's retention and graduation rates are improving, it indicates that their comprehensive campus-wide policies aimed at strengthening retention and graduation rates are beginning to show results.

Morgan's astronomical growth in doctoral production has dropped now that the institution has been awarding doctoral degrees for a few years. Morgan reports an increase of 13 percent in doctorates awarded from the prior year. This figure is lower than the peer average and represents a significant decrease from the previous year's level of 77 percent. However, this represents an actual level of 6 additional doctorate degrees awarded in 2004. Morgan performs below the peer average for percent of alumni giving for 2005 with only four peers reporting.

Morgan has several indicators that are subject to survey results, including student satisfaction with advanced studies and employment preparation. However, these surveys are not performed on a regular basis, therefore data are not available annually for review. Nevertheless, Morgan reports that 37 percent of its 2004 graduates moved on to postgraduate programs. The university also reports that 98 percent of graduates reported satisfaction with their preparation for graduate school, and 85 percent were satisfied with preparation for jobs. Furthermore, the university reports 100 percent employer satisfaction with Morgan 2004 graduates. The university should consider choosing new indicators of institution specific performance that would allow for readily available data and for a complete evaluation.

Likewise, it is difficult to compare the performance of Morgan relative to its peers due to the large number of missing data from its peers.

Institution's Response

Morgan collects more data to evaluate its performance than its peers and it probably will continue to be the case that it will have more data than the institutions to which it is being compared. However, if it is able to identify appropriate indicators for which more peer data is available, Morgan will utilize them in the future.

With respect to graduation rates, it should be stressed that for the most part its peer institutions do not have students with academic or demographic characteristics comparable to those of Morgan students. Morgan students are much more at risk than its average peer. However, because access for African-Americans of college age has lagged well behind population growth in Maryland, Morgan is one of the relatively few options in the state that is available for this large and growing segment of Maryland's population. A more appropriate metric is public urban universities in general. On this measure Morgan is well above average for students of all races and in the top tier for African-American students.

Morgan now ranks among the top twenty traditional campuses nationwide in the number of doctorates awarded to African Americans. In engineering doctorates, Morgan ranks fourth nationally. It ranks eighth in education and eleventh in health sciences. Maryland historically has awarded on average less than 5 percent of its doctorates statewide to African Americans. Due largely to Morgan's increased degree production, doctoral degrees awarded to African Americans were 60 percent higher in 2004 than just two years earlier. This represents the first progress the state has made on this measure in many years.

Morgan State University
Peer Performance Data: 2005

Institution	Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Class				Fall 1997 Entering Freshman Class Six-Year Graduation Rate				Spr '04 Graduates					
	Second-Year Retention Rate		Class Six-Year Graduation Rate		% Increase in Grad/Prof Doctorates from 2003		Going Rate		% With Job Preparation		PRAXIS Pass Rate '03 - '04	'04 Grad Employer Satisfaction	% of Alumni Giving	% Growth in Grants/Contracts
	All	African American	Minority	All	n	Minority								
Morgan State University	73%	73%	72%	42%	41%	47%	13%	37%	98%	85%	100%	100%	12%	7%
University of Alabama - Huntsville	76%	80%	80%	63%	53%	44%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida A&M University	82%	82%	82%	45%	45%	N/A	41%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	76%	78%	78%	50%	29%	37%	0%	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/A	*10%
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	76%	69%	66%	42%	33%	31%	39%	N/C	N/A	N/A	N/C	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan Technological University	81%	79%	75%	61%	35%	45%	11%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	18%	*3%
Oakland University	60%	N/A	62%	44%	28%	44%	47%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jackson State University	67%	N/A	N/A	37%	37%	37%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
The College of New Jersey	91%	91%	92%	82%	68%	70%	No Doctorates	20%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A
City University of NYC College	78%	N/A	N/A	33%	32%	N/A	10%	11%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10%	*-9%
North Carolina A&T University	73%	74%	74%	43%	43%	44%	45%	18%	N/A	N/A	100%	95%	25%	11%
Tennessee State University	78%	79%	N/A	46%	9%	N/A	-64%	31%	N/A	N/A	96%	29%	17%	-9%
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	44%	34%	45%	45%	32%	41%	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-12%
Peer Average	74%	74%	73%	49%	37%	44%	16%	19%	0%	81%	99%	62%	18%	-3%

Notes:
N/A - data not available
N/C - data not collected
*Based on FY03 and FY04 data

St. Mary's College of Maryland

As previously described, St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's) has two sets of peers: one set that reflects the college's current mission and one set that reflects the aspirations of the college. The college exceeds its current peers in a number of indicators. It surpasses the average of its current peers in both second-year retention rate and six-year graduation rate. St. Mary's is near or above the peer average for full-time faculty salaries. Further, St. Mary's students have higher SAT scores than the students of most of its peers. It also exceeds the average of both current and aspirant peers for percent of minorities in its student population, and African Americans in the first-year class. Additionally, St. Mary's has a higher percent of faculty with terminal degrees, surpassing the averages of both its current and aspirant peers.

St. Mary's has a selectivity rating of more selective in the current U.S. News and World Report *America's Best Colleges 2006* report, accepting a lower percentage of its applicants than the average of its current peers, and its yield rate is also greater. It should also be noted that St. Mary's tuition is less than half of the average of its peers for resident undergraduates, reflecting its public school status. Of the twelve current peers, four are public institutions. In a comparison of St. Mary's data to that of the public institutions only, St. Mary's ranks first in the majority of indicators, including: faculty salaries, percentage of full-time faculty, average SAT scores, and six-year graduation rates.

Not surprisingly, St. Mary's does not yet reach the average of its aspirant peers on most of its qualitative indicators. In a few instances, however, St. Mary's does exceed its aspirant peers. St. Mary's yield rate is equal to the average of its aspirant peers. It has the highest percentage of African Americans of entering first-year students and the lowest tuition. Compared to its peers, the college also has one of the highest proportion of full-time freshmen receiving federal financial aid, which suggests that St. Mary's serves a large percentage of students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

St. Mary's fails to meet the averages of both its current and aspirant peers in a few categories. The institution lags behind its peers in the rate of alumni giving, ranking the third lowest among all 18 peers. Similarly, only four other institutions have lower E&G expenditures per full-time student. Only three peers have higher ratios of full-time students to full-time faculty.

Institution's Response

St. Mary's College of Maryland is pleased that MHEC has recognized the College's success in meeting or exceeding our peers on a number of measures. In particular, the College takes pride in its talented students, minority enrollment, retention and graduation rates, high proportion of graduating minority students, and superb faculty. That the College continues to offer a preeminent liberal arts education at a tuition substantially less than that of our private peers demonstrates the success of the College's mission in providing quality education to benefit the residents of Maryland. We will continue to actively promote scholarship and creativity by challenging our students to achieve academic excellence through close relationships with faculty, classroom activities, and experiential learning. Our faculty and staff understand and act to support diversity and access across the campus.

The average alumni giving rate of the College's private peers is higher than that of its public peers. It may be that alumni of public institutions need to become more aware of the critical role that private donations make in support of their alma maters, and the graduates of St. Mary's College are no exception. While the alumni giving rate at St. Mary's is lower than that of its private peers, it is typical (occurring at the median) of its public peer institutions. With increased efforts to inform our alumni about the importance of such donations and as our alumni continue to experience success resulting from an honors education, we expect continued and increased loyalty to St. Mary's College to be reflected in higher alumni giving rates.

The College is proud of the successes described by MHEC in providing a high quality education while keeping expenses at a minimum. During the past ten years, enrollment at St. Mary's has increased by 24 percent whereas the state grant per FTE student has fallen 3.3 percent on an unadjusted basis. If adjusted for inflation, the loss of purchasing power over this same period was 32.2 percent. Hence, in terms of actual purchasing power, the state grant per FTE student has decreased by 35.5 percent during the past 10 years. During these same years, a number of our fixed expenses have continued to rise at rates much higher than those of the College's inflator. Medical insurance and utility expenses, in particular, have squeezed spending away from core academic programs. The College eagerly anticipates building upon its records of success in serving the citizens of Maryland as additional funding becomes available.

The growth in student body experienced in recent years has not been matched by a similar growth in faculty lines. As a result, the College has hired additional part-time faculty in an effort to maintain the quality of its offerings. We are also attempting to use resources to create full-time visiting faculty lines where possible to avoid the use of adjuncts. It is our plan to move as quickly as possible toward having 90 percent of our courses taught by full-time faculty, as is the practice of our peers. The College has hired an additional three full-time faculty for the current, 2005-2006, academic year. In addition, our draft strategic plan envisions the hiring of five additional full-time faculty for the 2006-2007 academic year. In this way, the College hopes to reduce its Student / Faculty ratio to the overall level of its peer institutions.

**St. Mary's College of Maryland
Profile and Performance Indicators: 2005**

Indicator	Current			Current Peers:			Current Peers:					
	Peer Average	Aspirant Peer Average	All Peers Average	SMCM	Beloit	College of Wooster	Colorado	Connecticut College	Dickinson	Gettysburg	Guilford	
QUALITY / SELECTIVITY												
Amount in total research spending, FY04 ¹	\$741,624	\$951,659	\$811,636	\$498,828	\$15,847	\$679,753	\$728,836	\$1,419,000	\$3,897,952	\$660,327	\$48,383	
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2003 ²	91%	96%	93%	97%	98%	97%	93%	89%	96%	92%	74%	
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall 03 ³												
Professor:	\$75,442	\$89,683	\$80,189	\$74,700	\$72,400	\$71,900	\$89,400	\$82,900	\$83,600	\$87,200	\$55,700	
Associate Professor:	\$58,108	\$66,200	\$60,806	\$55,000	\$52,900	\$57,900	\$64,900	\$64,300	\$62,300	\$65,400	\$46,600	
Assistant Professor:	\$46,067	\$54,050	\$48,728	\$45,200	\$44,500	\$45,300	\$50,500	\$50,300	\$50,400	\$52,200	\$39,200	
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall 03:												
Professor:	78.4% ⁴	92.6% ⁴	84.8% ⁴	80.6%	76.7%	75.6%	91.5%	87.0%	87.5%	90.2%	28.5%	
Associate Professor:	80.1% ⁴	91.9% ⁴	85.7% ⁴	66.2%	56.4%	76.8%	90.0%	89.0%	85.7%	90.4%	27.4%	
Assistant Professor:	66.2% ⁴	90.3% ⁴	76.9% ⁴	61.3%	56.4%	62.1%	83.4%	83.0%	73.2%	86.9%	21.4%	
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall 03 ⁵	1225	1335	1258	1260	1260	1210	1265	1325	1280	1270	1130	
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall 03 ⁶	1127-1324	1246-1424	1162-1353	1160-1360	1160-1360	1090-1330	1180-1350	1250-1400	1190-1370	1200-1340	990-1270	
Acceptance Rate, Fall 03 ⁷	60%	35%	51%	55%	70%	72%	44%	34%	49%	46%	71%	
Yield Ratio, Fall 03 ⁷	33%	34%	33%	34%	25%	27%	32%	32%	25%	30%	26%	
RETENTION AND GRADUATION												
Average second year retention rate: Fall '99, '00, '01, '02 Cohorts ²	86%	93%	89%	87%	91%	88%	91%	91%	90%	89%	75%	
Six year graduation rate: 1997 Cohort ²	71%	87%	76%	75%	72%	68%	77%	87%	79%	75%	57%	
% African American students of entering FYS class ⁶	4%	5%	5%	8%	2%	5%	2%	6%	4%	4%	14%	
ACCESS, Fall 2003												
Total headcount enrollment ⁶	2210	1787	2069	1922	1339	1871	1968	1849	2276	2415	2101	
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment ⁶	12%	11%	12%	13%	9%	8%	15%	11%	8%	6%	23%	
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates ⁶	93%	99%	95%	94%	94%	98%	99%	95%	98%	99%	83%	
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment ⁶	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate ⁷	\$18,199	\$28,760	\$21,499	\$8,740	\$24,386	\$25,040	\$27,270	NA	\$28,615	\$28,424	\$19,020	
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY04 ⁸	16%	9%	14%	14%	15%	13%	14%	12%	11%	10%	26%	
EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES												
E&G expenditures in FY04 per FTE ¹	\$21,164	\$33,419	\$25,249	\$17,437	\$22,957	\$26,451	\$20,925	\$27,205	\$24,307	\$27,567	\$15,348	
Average alumni giving rate (2003) ²	31%	51%	38%	23%	43%	34%	35%	44%	42%	37%	23%	
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures ¹ (FY04)	47.7%	59.5%	51.6%	37.9%	50.6%	50.7%	55.8%	73.5%	63.6%	68.3%	43.4%	
Student-Faculty Ratio (2003) ²	12.3 to 1	10.0 to 1	11.5 to 1	13 to 1	11 to 1	12 to 1	9 to 1	10 to 1	13 to 1	11 to 1	16 to 1	
Academic libraries, Fall 2003 ⁹												
Book Volumes:	385,554	552,102	441,070	157,077	233,458	622,273	570,000	562,768	479,000	349,466	244,000	
Subscriptions:	2,747	2,427	2,641	1,601	1,636	1,195	2,328	2,050	12,500	2,600	900	
Full-time Staff:	17	25	19	15	7	20	NA	30	27	28	9	
Book volumes per FTEs FY2004:	201.6	309.6	237.6	84.8	196.0	336.2	290.8	313.9	212.4	145.6	129.9	

¹FY04 Finance Report, IPEDS Website

²America's Best Colleges 2003, USN&WR

³Academe, March-April 2004

⁴Median reported for average

⁵Midpoint of 25th to 75th percentiles, Fall 03

⁶Fall Enrollment Report 2003, IPEDS Website

⁷Institutional Characteristics 2003, IPEDS Website

⁸Student Financial Aid FY03, IPEDS Website

⁹American Library Directory, 58th edition, 2005-2006.

**St. Mary's College of Maryland
Profile and Performance Indicators: 2005**

Indicator	Current Peers, com.:					Aspirant Peers:							
	U of Maryland Washington	South-western	U of Minn Morris	U of NC Asheville	VMI	Bates	Carleton	Davidson	F & M	Hamilton	Kenyon		
QUALITY / SELECTIVITY													
Amount in total research spending, FY04 ¹	\$179,922	\$418,072	\$105,824	\$465,019	\$280,571	\$622,437	\$535,884	\$946,562	\$2,156,000	\$1,162,000	\$287,071		
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees, Fall 2003 ²	87%	88%	94%	88%	95%	95%	95%	99%	97%	91%	97%		
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank, Fall 03 ²													
Professor:	\$72,200	\$76,300	\$70,000	\$69,800	\$73,900	\$86,800	\$95,500	\$90,300	\$92,300	\$96,000	\$77,200		
Associate Professor:	\$53,900	\$62,300	\$53,900	\$52,000	\$60,900	\$67,000	\$67,500	\$67,500	\$64,800	\$71,500	\$58,900		
Assistant Professor:	\$40,800	\$46,900	\$41,500	\$44,800	\$46,400	\$52,600	\$59,600	\$55,200	\$53,900	\$53,900	\$49,100		
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank, Fall 03:													
Professor:	76.2%	81.8%	71.4%	71.0%	80.0%	90.0%	> 95%	92.0%	93.1%	> 95%	82.5%		
Associate Professor:	61.1%	85.7%	61.1%	52.2%	83.3%	91.7%	92.1%	92.1%	89.8%	> 95%	80.0%		
Assistant Professor:	30.3%	72.2%	34.5%	58.5%	70.2%	87.7%	> 95%	92.7%	90.3%	90.3%	80.6%		
Average SAT scores of entering freshman, Fall 03 ⁵	1225	1255	1155	1165	1165	NA	1390	1355	1265	1340	1325		
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen, Fall 03 ¹⁰	1140-1310	1150-1360	1015-1295	1060-1270	1100-1230	NA	1300-1480	1270-1440	1170-1360	1260-1420	1230-1420		
Acceptance Rate, Fall 03 ⁷	64%	66%	78%	73%	48%	30%	29%	27%	49%	34%	38%		
Yield Ratio, Fall 03 ⁷	31%	30%	45%	36%	51%	38%	35%	42%	26%	30%	32%		
RETENTION AND GRADUATION													
Average second year retention rate: Fall '99, '00, '01, '02 Cohorts ²	88%	87%	81%	78%	87%	94%	96%	96%	90%	93%	91%		
Six year graduation rate: 1997 Cohort ²	71%	73%	68%	51%	68%	89%	89%	89%	84%	87%	84%		
% African American students of entering FYS class ⁶	1%	3%	2%	3%	6%	5%	8%	6%	3%	6%	2%		
ACCESS, Fall 2003													
Total headcount enrollment ⁶	4792	1265	1861	3446	1333	1746	1930	1712	1923	1797	1613		
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment ⁶	12%	22%	15%	6%	12%	8%	19%	11%	9%	13%	8%		
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates ⁶	76%	98%	93%	79%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	99%	99%		
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment ⁶	88%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate ⁷	\$4,688	\$18,870	\$7,991	\$3,031	\$12,850	NA	\$28,527	\$25,903	\$28,860	\$30,200	\$30,310		
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY04 ⁸	9%	16%	41%	18%	10%	8%	15%	7%	8%	12%	5%		
EFFICIENCY / RESOURCES													
E&G expenditures in FY04 per FTE ¹	\$9,419	\$30,036	\$14,484	\$14,145	\$21,128	\$32,094	\$39,137	\$34,833	\$29,292	\$37,045	\$28,113		
Average alumni giving rate (2003) ²	26%	33%	13%	13%	27%	49%	66%	55%	37%	57%	44%		
Tuition and fees revenues as % of E&G expenditures ¹ (FY04)	51.3%	41.8%	23.9%	19.3%	30.1%	76.9%	49.0%	45.2%	64.4%	57.2%	64.2%		
Student-Faculty Ratio (2003) ²	17 to 1	10 to 1	14 to 1	13 to 1	12 to 1	10 to 1	9 to 1	11 to 1	11 to 1	9 to 1	10 to 1		
Academic libraries, Fall 2003 ⁹													
Book Volumes:	360,916	323,000	201,060	385,111	275,590	590,299	662,871	602,832	501,611	575,000	380,000		
Subscriptions:	2,341	2,598	598	3,498	725	2,508	1,626	2,797	1,833	2,500	3,300		
Full-time Staff:	11	10	10	27	6	NA	29	12	25	10	48		
Full-time Staff with M.L.S degree:	11	9	5	10	5	NA	12	11	9	10	13		
Book volumes per FTEs FY2004:	88.0	258.8	112.9	127.6	206.7	338.1	343.5	352.3	264.1	322.3	237.4		

¹FY04 Finance Report, IPEDS Website

²America's Best Colleges 2003, USN&WR

³Academe, March-April 2004

Appendices

Appendix A. Methodology For Selecting Performance Peers At The University System Of Maryland Institutions

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

The narrowing process proceeded as follows:

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

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

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

Bowie

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

Coppin

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

Frostburg

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

Salisbury

- Size
- Program mix
- Mission

Towson

- Size
- Student mix
- Geographic location

University of Baltimore

- Program mix
- Size
- Urban setting

University of Maryland Baltimore County

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

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Program mix
- Minority mix

University of Maryland University College

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

APPENDIX B. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
Peer Performance Measures for Funding Guidelines, FY 2005

	<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Date to be used</i>
1	SAT score 25 th /75 th percentile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2004. For UMCP, institutionally reported composite values.	For all incoming freshmen, composite SAT score. For peer institutions that report ACT scores, ACT scores are converted to SAT. If institutions report both scores, the test that 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 percentiles. For UMCP, the percentiles are computed against actual composite scores.	Fall 2004
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 2004
3	% African American of all undergraduates	IPEDS Peer Analysis Website – Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	Fall 2004
4	Second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2005 edition	The percentage of first-year freshmen that returned to the same college or university the following fall, averaged over the first-year classes entering between 1999 and 2002.	1999-2002 data
5	Six-year graduation rate	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2003 Graduation Rate Survey, Dataset Cutting Tool. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, June 2005 edition.	Six-year graduation rate, 1997 cohort (Sum of students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted cohort) 1998 cohort for UMCP	2003 (1997 cohort) 2004 (1998 cohort) for UMCP
6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2003 Graduation Rate Survey, Dataset Cutting Tool. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, June 2005 edition.	Minorities include African American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race. (Sum of minority students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted minority cohort)	2003 (1997 cohort) 2004 (1998 cohort) for UMCP

7	Six-year graduation rate: African Americans	NCES, Peer Analysis Data System, 2003 Graduation Rate Survey, Dataset Cutting Tool. For UMCP: CSRDE (Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) via AAUDE, June 2005 edition.	Self-explanatory. (Sum of African American students graduating in 4 years, 5 years and 6 years/adjusted African American cohort)	2003 (1997 cohort) 2004 (1998 cohort) for UMCP
8	Pass rate on PRAXIS and teacher licensure exams	Title II website, State Report 2004 for individual states (http://www.title2.org)	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.	2002-2003 test takers
9	Pass rate on nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	Number of BSN graduates in the Class of 2004 who pass the NCLEX examination on the first attempt divided by the number of graduates who took the exam.	2004 graduates
10	Pass rates on other licensure exams	Peer institutions		
10a	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	For UMB: number of MSW graduates who passed the Licensed Graduate Social Work Exam in 2003 divided by number of graduates who took the exam. For FSU: number of BSW graduates in the Class of 2004 who passed the LCSW examination on the first attempt divided by number of graduates who took the exam.	2003 2004 graduates
10b	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2006 edition	Percentage of 2003 graduates who took the bar examination for the first time in Summer 2003 and Winter 2004 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.	2003 graduates
10c	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Number who pass the 2004 USMLE Step II on first attempt divided by number of examinees from the School of Medicine.	Class of 2004

10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	Number of DDS graduates in the Class of 2004 who pass their respective regional dental examination by December 31, 2004 divided by number of graduates from Dental School Class of 2004.	2004 graduates
11	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2005 edition (If data unavailable from U.S. News, source used: Council for Aid to Education, 2004 Voluntary Support of Education, 2005.)	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 2002 and 2003.	2002 & 2003 average
12	Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMBI & UMCES. UMB figures include R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> .	FY 2003
13	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary Survey (faculty counts); AAMC (for medical faculty for UMB & peers).	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMBI & UMCES. UMB figures are R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from AAUP for institutions other than UMB. For UMB and peers, faculty are full-time medical faculty whose assignments are for instruction or research. For UMB, faculty counts are taken from AAMC figures.	FY 2003
14	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY 1998 through FY 2003. 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> .	FY 1998 – FY 2003

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 2001 through 2005. 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.	2001 – 2005
16	Institution-specific measures			

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC PEER PERFORMANCE MEASURES: 2005

	<i>Measure</i>	<i>Source of peer data</i>	<i>Operational definition</i>	<i>Date to be used</i>
BSU				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005 edition, 2004	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2003
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2005 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2003
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2004	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2004
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)	FY2003
CSU				
1	% faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005 edition, 2004	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2003
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges 2005 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2003
3	Yield rate	NCES, IPEDS, Institutional Characteristics, 2004	Enrollees as percentage of freshman who were admitted	Fall 2004
4	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2004 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2004
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2004 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2003	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.	FY2004 state appropriation, Fall 2003 (FY2004) enrollment
FSU				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2004 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall, 2004
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005 edition, 2004	The percentage of full-time who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	Fall 2003

SU				
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2005 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 2003
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005 edition, 2004	The percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	Fall 2003
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 2004
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2005 edition	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2003
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2004 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2003	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.	FY2004 state appropriation, Fall 2003 (FY2004) enrollment
TU				
1	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005 edition, 2004	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2003 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2003
2	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report, 2005 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 2003
3	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News, America's Best Colleges, 2005 edition	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the number of freshmen admitted	Fall 2003
UB				
1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, FY2004, Part C, line 02, col. 1	Total dollars expended for research	FY2004
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position, 2004	Percentage of instructional faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 2004

UMB			
1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire	FY 2004
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire	FY 2004
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire	FY 2004
4	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Fall 2004
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Fall 2004
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Fall 2004
UMBC			
1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	FY2004
2	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures	AUTM, National Science Foundation	FY2003
3	Ratio of FTE students/ FT instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey; IPEDS, Faculty Salary Survey	Fall 2004
4	Federal R&D expenditures per FT faculty	NSF, AAUP	FY 2003
5	Rank in ratio of license agreements to \$ million R&D	AUTM	FY 2003

Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY2003 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer Engineering; Electrical, Electronics & Communication.

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

Ratio of FTE students (FT + 1/3 PT) to FT instructional faculty at all ranks for Fall 2004.

Federally financed R&D expenditures per FT instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate professor & assistant professor.

Self explanatory

UMCP				
1	Number 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
2	Number 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
3	Percent change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies	USM database	The percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in three national academies (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and National Academy of Sciences), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.	2001-2005
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 2003
5	Number of degrees awarded to African American students	IPEDS Completions survey via AAUDE	The number of undergraduate degrees awarded to African American students	Academic Year 2004
UMES				
1	Percent faculty with terminal degrees	U.S. News, Ultimate College Guide, 2005, edition, 2004	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2003
2	IT degrees as percent of all bachelor's degrees	NCES, IPEDS, Completions, 2004	Bachelor's degrees in CIP codes 11.0101 through 11.9999 as a percentage of all bachelor's degrees awarded.	July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004
3	Loan default rate	Peers	Students who fail to repay education loans per loan agreement as percentage of all students who have taken such loans for the cohort year.	FY 2002

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 2004
2	Percentage 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 2003
3	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields	IPEDS, Completions survey	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204).	FY 2004
4	Number of worldwide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2005
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2005

**APPENDIX C. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1 Second-year retention rate	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) – Enrollment Information System (EIS), Degree Information System (DIS).	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2004 cohort
2 Second-year retention rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2004 cohort
3 Second-year retention rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	<i>In this context, the term “minorities” refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i>	Fall 2004 cohort
4 Six-year graduation rate	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort
5 Six-year graduation rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1999 cohort
6 Six-year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	<i>In this context, the term “minorities” refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i>	Fall 1999 cohort

7	Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over 2003	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS. IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions.	Self-explanatory	May 2003-May 2004
8	Graduate/Professional school going rate	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Spring 2004 Graduates
9	Student satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation and who rated their preparation for advanced education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Spring 2004 Graduates
10	Student satisfaction with job preparation.	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients employed full-time within one year of graduation and who rated their education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Spring 2004 Graduates
11	PRAXIS II pass rate	HEA Title II: Aggregate and Summary Institution - Level Pass Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program. Peer Institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the State for licensure and the total pass rate. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	2003-2004 academic year

12	Employer satisfaction	MSU Survey Employers. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Average of nine dimensions of employers' rating of satisfaction with Morgan alumni. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Spring 2004 Graduates
13	Alumni giving	MSU Development Office. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland 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 Morgan graduates for whom <i>good</i> contact information is available <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Most current data available
14	Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of FY2001	MSU Budget Office. IPEDS Peer institutions.	Self-explanatory	From FY 2004-FY2005

**APPENDIX D. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Amount in total research spending, FY 2004	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2004
2	Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degrees	US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Percentage of full-time faculty who hold a terminal degree	Fall 2003
3	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Academe, March-April 2004 edition	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Fall 2003
4	Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank	Academe, March-April 2004 edition	Interpolated percentile of average full-time faculty salary as compared to national salaries	Fall 2003
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Midpoint of 25 th to 75 th percentiles	Fall 2003
6	25 th – 75 th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	25 th – 75 th percentile SAT total scores of entering freshmen	Fall 2003
7	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Percentage of fall 2003 applicants who were admitted	Fall 2003
8	Yield ratio	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Percentage of fall 2003 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	Fall 2003
9	Second year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who re-enrolled the subsequent year	Fall 1999 – Fall 2002
10	Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Average six-year graduation rate for all students	2000-2003 (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 freshman cohorts)
11	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	2003 IPEDS Fall enrollment report	Percent African Americans of entering first-year class	2003 (2003 cohort)
12	Total headcount enrollment	2003 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	Fall 2003
13	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	2003 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of minorities of the total enrollment with race known, non resident aliens are excluded	Fall 2003
14	Percent of full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	2003 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time	Fall 2003

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
15	Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	2003 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	Fall 2003
16	Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	2003 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Part D	Annual tuition and fees for full-time in-state undergraduate student	Fall 2002
17	Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal government	2003 IPEDS Student Financial Aid	Percentage of full-time freshmen receiving federal grant aid	FY 2003
18	E&G expenditures per FTES	2004 IPEDS Finance Report, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E	FY 2004 total education and general expenditures and transfers divided by FY 2004 annualized full-time equivalent students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15)	FY 2004, Fall 2003
19	Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Percentage of solicited alumni who gave to an institution	2003
20	Tuition and fees revenue as percent of E&G expenditures	2004 IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds revenues from tuition and fees as a percent of FY 2004 total education and general expenditures and transfers	FY 2004
21	Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2004 edition	Fall 2003 FTE students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15) divided by the number of fall 2003 full-time faculty	Fall 2003
22	Academic library holdings	American Library Directory, 58 th edition, 2005 - 2006	Number of titles, serial subscriptions, and audiovisual materials	Fall 2003
23	Academic library titles per FTES	American Library Directory, 58 th edition, 2005 – 2006, 2003 IPEDS Fall Enrollment report	Academic library titles per FTES	FY 2004