



Report on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward The 55% Completion Goal

December 2016

2016 JCR p. 126

Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr.
Governor

Boyd K. Rutherford
Lt. Governor

Maryland Higher Education Commission

Anwer Hasan, Chairman

Sandra L. Jimenez, Vice-Chair

Vivian S. Boyd

Joseph DeMattos, Jr.

John Holaday

Russell V. Kelley

Peri J. Kelsey, Student Commissioner

Ian MacFarlane

Donna M. Mitchell

Joel Packer

Rizwan A. Siddiqi

John W. Yaeger

James D. Fielder, Jr., Ph.D.
Secretary

**Report on Best Practices and Annual
Progress Toward the 55% Completion Goal
2016 JCR p. 126**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Data on Progression and Graduation	2
Maryland’s 55% Degree Attainment Model.....	3
State and Institutional Goals and Targets	4
Best Practices	5
Conclusion	6
APPENDIX A - TABLES	7
APPENDIX B – INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS	16
Introduction	17
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	18
Carroll Community College.....	19
Wor-Wic Community College.....	23
PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	26
Frostburg State University	27
Towson University.....	31
University of Baltimore	33
University of Maryland University College	37
Morgan State University.....	39

Introduction

The 2016 Joint Chairmen's Report issued the following charge to the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC):

The committees understand that in order to meet the State's goal to have at least 55% of Maryland's residents age 25 to 64 holding at least one degree credential by 2025, accurate and timely information on degree progression and best practices is needed to ensure that the State is on track to meet the goal. The committees request that the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) annually collect and analyze student- and transcript-level data on progression, graduation, and other relevant metrics from each public institution of higher education, including community colleges and regional higher education centers. MHEC should submit a report by December 15 each year that analyzes the data and shows each institution's progress toward the State and institutional goals in 2025. The report should also include a summary of best practices and findings on the effectiveness of institutions' programs, as well as any concerns regarding lack of progress or best practices that are not being implemented by institutions.

In addition, the committees request that MHEC, in collaboration with the Governor's Prekindergarten-20 Council, convene a biennial Summit on Completion that provides a forum for representatives of all segments of education (including K-12), economic and workforce development, and other stakeholders to share best practices on college completion that are underway in Maryland and hear from experts on best practices in other states that may be replicated in Maryland. A summary of the summit should be included in the annual report on best practices and progress toward the 55% goal.

This is a slightly modified version of a similar charge first issued in 2012. In light of this mandate, this report aims to do the following:

- Discuss student progression and graduation in the state;
- Provide a brief overview of the degree attainment model developed to set degree targets for reaching the 55% goal;
- Report progress towards the established targets leading to achievement of the 55% goal; and
- Provide a brief summary regarding institutional best practices.

Additional information on the degree attainment model referenced in this report can be found in the 2014 Best Practices report. The 2014 report also provided a summary of the Statewide College Completion Summits which took place in January 2013 (FY 2013) and November 2014 (FY 2015).

The next Statewide College Completion Summit will be held in spring 2017 (FY 2017). Information on the outcomes of this summit will be included in the 2017 Best Practices report.

Data on Progression and Graduation

Each year, MHEC publishes two reports discussing progression and graduation metrics at four-year colleges and universities and at community colleges. The principal metrics used for four-year institutions are the first-to-second-year retention rate and the six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time students. Both of these rates are at or near record-high levels. The six-year graduation rate for the 2009 cohort is 66.1%, the highest six-year graduation rate on record. This rate is 2.4 percentage points higher than the rate for the 2008 cohort, which is the highest year-to-year increase in the graduation rate on record. The second-year retention rate for the cohort entering in 2014 is 83.8%, the second highest retention rate in the last 20 years. The only higher retention rate was 85.1%, achieved by the previous year's cohort. A statewide table of retention and graduation rates since 1994 appears in Table 1, on page 8. Institutional tables and other data and analysis can be found in the full report published on the Commission website.¹

For community colleges, the principal metrics are the four-year rates of persistence, transfer to a four-year institution, and graduation for full-time students. These rates are aggregated into a *success rate*. The success rate increased from 43.7% for the cohort entering in 1999 to a peak of 48.7% for the cohort entering in 2007. For the 2011 entering cohort, the success rate was 44.8%, a 1.1 percentage point decline from the 2010 cohort. This rate has declined by nearly four percentage points in the past four cohorts. A statewide table of persistence, transfer, and graduation rates appears in Table 2 on page 9.

Another important analytical tool for community colleges is the Degree Progress Analysis report. This tool was developed to account for the large number of part-time students at community colleges who are not captured in metrics that focus on full-time students. The Degree Progress Analysis examines students who complete at least 18 credit hours within their first two years of enrollment, and identifies students as successful if they have graduated, transferred to a four-year institution, or are still enrolled with a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or better. Graduation and transfer rates for the Fall 2010 entering cohort declined slightly, from 49.2% for Fall 2009 entrants to 48.3%. This represents the fourth consecutive year for which the graduation and transfer rate for all students has declined. The most recent Degree Progress Analysis table appears in Table 3, on pages 10-11. Additional data and analyses, including institutional tables for all community colleges, can be found in the full Retention, Graduation, and Transfer Report.²

The charge from the committees requests information on the contributions of regional higher education centers (RHECs) to progression and completion. These entities are not themselves institutions of higher education, but serve local communities by hosting classes offered by

¹ Maryland Higher Education Commission, September 2016. "Retention and Graduation Rates at Maryland Four-Year Institutions," Archived at <http://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/AnnualReports/2016retgrad4yr.pdf>.

² Maryland Higher Education Commission, September 2016. "Retention, Graduation, and Transfer Rates at Maryland Community Colleges," Archived at <http://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/AnnualReports/2016RetGradTransCCs.pdf>.

multiple institutions of higher education in convenient locations. The RHECs do not report any student-level data directly to MHEC. Instead, the institutions operating at the RHECs include their data together with that of students on the main campus. Therefore, there are no existing student-level data on the contributions of RHECs as such.

Maryland's 55% Degree Attainment Model

In response to the Joint Chairmen's charge, in 2012 MHEC developed a model that set initial state and institution degree targets to reach the goal of 55% of adults holding degrees by 2025.³ The model was revised in 2014 to reflect additional input from Maryland colleges and universities as well as additional information on migration patterns within the State and increased degree output at independent colleges and universities in Maryland. A summary of the model's targets for degrees appear below. Complete details about the initial and revised models are provided in the 2012 and 2014 Best Practices reports.

According to the revised model, Maryland will need a total of 1,828,420 individuals (55% of 3,324,400) to hold at least an associate degree. MHEC estimated that in 2025, 903,511 persons aged 25 to 49 who held associate degrees in 2010 will have aged 15 years, but will still be in the target group (between ages 25 to 64).⁴ Thus, Maryland will need to have 924,909 additional degree holders between 2010 and 2025 to meet the State's goal. Almost all Marylanders with degrees will come from one of the following three main sources: (1) public institutions of higher education, (2) independent and other private institutions of higher education, and (3) migration of individuals from other states and nations who already hold college degrees.

- *Public institutions:* In total, MHEC established that the target for the number of associate and baccalaureate degrees needed from public institutions for the whole period is 608,032. This represents an average annual increase of 2.0% in the number of degrees awarded.
- *Independent and other private institutions:* The model expects independent institutions to contribute 105,805 graduates to the State's degree completion total. This represents an annual average growth rate of 1.7% between 2015 and 2025. The model expects no increase from other private institutions, and so this sector is expected to contribute 6,762 degrees through 2025. The total degree production from the independent and other private sectors for the whole period is projected to be 112,567.
- *Migration from other states and nations:* Using U.S. Census data from 2012, it was determined that Maryland has an estimated annual net migration gain of 18,968 persons aged

³Maryland Higher Education Commission, December 2014, "Report on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward the 55% Completion Goal". http://www.mhec.maryland.gov/publications/research/AnnualReports/2014BestPracProgressCompletionGoal_020615.pdf

⁴ This number is an estimate based on the percentage of Marylanders ages 25-49 within the 25-64 age group (65%), and that percentage multiplied by the number of Marylanders ages 25-64 with a degree. This model assumes a flat rate of degree attainment across age brackets and recognizes that this number is only an estimate.

25 to 64 holding an associate degree or higher.⁵ If this estimate remains constant, migration from other states will provide Maryland an additional 303,488 degree holders by 2025.

Taken together, the contributions from migration to Maryland, public, independent, and other private institutions, minus estimated mortality, will provide 965,578 of the degree holders needed, exceeding the 55% degree attainment goal by more than 40,000 degrees.

The figures included in this report provide a blueprint based on conservative estimates to enable the State to achieve the 55% degree attainment goal. These figures can also be used to gauge progress toward that goal. Table 4, on page 12, shows a matrix with annual targets for each public institution.

Next year, the Degree Attainment Model will be assessed by Commission staff. This assessment will include an analysis of the degree award trends and the underlying assumptions of the model. Should any adjustments to the model be needed, they will be described in full detail in the 2017 report and applied in subsequent editions of this report.

State and Institutional Goals and Targets

Table 5, on the following page, provides an overview of actual degree awards for each of the three institutional sectors for the academic years between 2010 and 2016. This table indicates that undergraduate degree awards are ahead of the target levels. Rates have progressively increased over the last five years with an average growth rate of 5%, and the 55% degree attainment goal remains well within reach. Overall, institutions are ahead of the current degree attainment target by almost 30,000 degrees, but the rate of degrees awarded varies by sector.

Tables 6 and 7, on pages 13 and 14, provide detailed information for each public community college and four-year institution, as well as targets for the entire period. Table 8, on page 15, shows targets for all sectors for the full period (including independent and other private institutions). These tables are updated annually and reflect the State's progression toward the 55% goal.

⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, 2012. 2010-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) Three Year Public Microdata Sample (PUMS). http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data_documentation/pums_data/

Table 5. Target and actual undergraduate degrees awarded, 2009-2010 through 2015-2016

Institutional Sector		2009-2010 (baseline)	2010- 2011	2011- 2012	2012- 2013	2013- 2014	2014- 2015	2015- 2016
Community Colleges	Target		11,386	11,614	11,846	12,083	12,325	12,571
	Actual	11,163	12,637	13,852	14,269	14,541	15,133	15,139
	+/-		1,251	2,238	2,423	2,458	2,808	2,568
Four-Year Institutions	Target		21,887	22,325	22,771	23,227	23,691	24,165
	Actual	21,458	22,735	24,331	25,136	25,606	27,365	29,156
	+/-		848	2,006	2,365	2,379	3,674	4,991
Independent Institutions	Target		6,281	6,469	6,663	6,863	6,225	6,136
	Actual	6,098	22,735	6,303	6,442	6,395	6,572	6,907
	+/-		16,454	-166	-221	-468	347	771
Other Private Institutions	Target		668	668	668	416	334	334
	Actual	668	694	372	233	443	231	231
	+/-		26	-296	-435	27	-103	-103
<i>Annual Total</i>	<i>Target</i>		40,222	41,076	41,949	42,589	42,575	43,207
	<i>Actual</i>	39,387	58,801	44,858	46,080	46,985	49,301	51,433
	<i>+/-</i>		18,579	3,782	4,131	4,396	6,726	8,226
Cumulative Total	Target		79,609	120,685	162,634	205,223	247,798	291,005
	Actual	39,387	98,188	143,046	189,126	236,111	285,412	336,845
	+/-		18,579	22,361	26,492	30,888	37,614	45,840

Best Practices

For the 2016 reporting cycle, institutions were asked to submit reports only if their programs and strategies (1) were newly implemented in the past year; (2) had been discontinued since the last reporting cycle; or (3) had been adopted from other institutions in the State.

Seven institutions submitted materials. Appendix B of this report contains the institutional narratives as submitted to MHEC, presented unedited by Commission staff. Additional information on the institutions' best practices can be found in the 2014 and 2015 Best Practices reports.

In addition, a comprehensive compilation of institutions' best practices can be found in a supplemental appendix of the 2014 Report on Best Practices, which is posted on the MHEC

website.⁶ The supplement includes an index indicating specific institutional practices reflecting common themes that arose from an analysis of the submissions. This thematic index can assist institutions and other interested readers in discovering which institutions are using practices effectively in each area.

Conclusion

Maryland remains on track to achieve the 55% completion goal by 2025. Maryland colleges and universities continue to exceed the targets established by the model. Institutions continue to pursue a wealth of programmatic initiatives, some of which are supported and coordinated by MHEC. These initiatives reflect the commitment of the State of Maryland and colleges and universities to improve student success, and to ensure that Maryland has a well-educated citizenry. The growth in the number of degrees awarded suggests that these initiatives are having a positive impact on degree attainment.

⁶ Maryland Higher Education Commission, December 2014, “Report on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward the 55% Completion Goal - Appendix”.
http://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Documents/Research/2014Studies/2014_Best_Practices_Appendix.pdf

APPENDIX A - TABLES

Trends in Retention and Graduation Rates
MARYLAND PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
 All Students

Percent enrolled at original campus or graduated from **any** campus after:

Cohort	N	One Year	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years		Five Years		Six Years	
					Enrolled	Graduated	Enrolled	Graduated	Enrolled	Graduated
1994	10,078	78.9	66.6	61.7	31.2	26.1	8.5	49.6	3.4	56.7
1995	10,717	80.5	68.1	63.6	29.6	29.9	8.8	51.6	3.7	58.4
1996	11,066	80.3	69.7	64.7	30.0	30.4	8.4	53.0	3.5	59.3
1997	11,612	81.8	70.7	66.4	29.3	33.0	8.2	54.8	3.3	61.1
1998	12,154	81.9	70.7	66.7	30.4	32.5	8.1	55.4	3.3	62.1
1999	12,037	81.7	71.8	67.8	29.1	34.2	7.9	56.4	3.1	62.6
2000	12,319	81.5	71.9	68.0	27.8	35.9	7.4	57.9	2.8	64.0
2001	13,454	82.6	72.0	68.2	25.7	37.9	6.3	58.5	2.6	64.2
2002	13,165	81.1	70.9	67.5	25.3	38.3	6.7	58.8	2.7	64.3
2003	13,250	81.3	71.3	67.9	25.0	39.0	6.6	59.2	2.9	64.7
2004	13,610	80.8	70.8	66.6	25.3	38.7	6.9	58.5	3.0	64.1
2005	13,788	79.8	69.4	66.1	22.8	40.2	6.8	58.2	3.2	63.3
2006	14,492	78.5	68.7	65.5	24.8	37.4	7.2	55.8	2.9	61.6
2007	14,799	81.0	70.5	67.5	25.0	38.9	6.9	58.3	2.9	63.8
2008	15,100	80.8	70.9	66.8	25.2	38.4	6.9	58.3	2.8	63.7
2009	14,666	81.5	72.3	69.0	24.7	40.6	6.7	60.5	2.7	66.1
2010	14,262	82.0	72.3	68.9	25.0	40.5	7.0	59.8		
2011	13,735	82.5	73.4	70.6	24.6	42.5				
2012	13,566	82.8	74.8	70.3						
2013	13,745	85.1	76.0							
2014	14,074	83.8								

* Cohort sizes include UMUC in the total.

Source: MHEC Enrollment and Degree Information Systems

Trends in Retention, Graduation and Transfer Rates for Maryland Community Colleges
All Students
Statewide Count
1993-2013

Cohort	N	Two Years			Three Years			Four Years		
		Still Enrolled	Graduated/ Did Not Trans.	Transferred to 4 Year	Still Enrolled	Graduated/ Did Not Trans.	Transferred to 4 Year	Still Enrolled	Graduated/ Did Not Trans.	Transferred to 4 Year
1993	10,692	36.2%	2.2%	12.9%	18.0%	6.9%	20.7%	10.6%	9.3%	24.2%
1994	10,436	35.5%	2.1%	12.6%	17.4%	6.7%	20.2%	10.3%	8.6%	23.6%
1995	11,336	35.8%	2.3%	13.1%	18.1%	6.4%	21.0%	10.1%	8.7%	24.4%
1996	10,905	35.1%	2.7%	12.7%	17.6%	6.3%	20.4%	9.7%	8.2%	23.9%
1997	11,420	36.2%	2.8%	12.9%	18.1%	6.5%	20.1%	11.3%	8.5%	23.8%
1998	11,770	35.0%	2.1%	12.2%	19.1%	5.8%	19.4%	12.0%	8.2%	22.9%
1999	12,492	35.5%	2.3%	13.1%	18.9%	6.3%	20.2%	11.5%	8.6%	23.6%
2000	12,303	37.3%	2.0%	13.5%	19.3%	6.5%	21.0%	11.9%	8.6%	25.4%
2001	12,919	36.9%	2.2%	13.0%	19.2%	6.1%	21.9%	10.9%	8.5%	25.4%
2002	13,978	37.5%	2.3%	13.8%	19.8%	6.5%	21.2%	11.3%	8.9%	25.3%
2003	14,491	37.5%	2.3%	14.4%	19.5%	6.2%	22.3%	11.0%	8.7%	26.3%
2004	14,527	37.2%	2.6%	13.9%	19.5%	6.4%	21.7%	11.9%	9.2%	25.7%
2005	14,454	37.0%	2.5%	14.6%	20.1%	6.1%	22.3%	12.9%	8.9%	26.0%
2006	15,752	36.2%	2.2%	15.6%	20.7%	6.0%	23.0%	12.4%	8.4%	27.1%
2007	16,307	38.6%	2.3%	14.3%	21.8%	6.1%	22.3%	12.9%	9.2%	26.6%
2008	16,418	40.1%	2.3%	12.3%	22.1%	6.4%	19.9%	13.0%	9.4%	24.1%
2009	18,071	38.5%	2.6%	12.7%	20.6%	6.5%	20.3%	11.6%	9.4%	24.3%
2010	17,621	38.8%	2.5%	12.7%	20.8%	6.2%	20.7%	12.0%	9.0%	24.9%
2011	16,746	36.8%	2.5%	12.1%	20.1%	6.6%	19.5%	11.7%	9.4%	23.7%
2012	15,909	37.5%	2.8%	13.8%	19.7%	7.0%	22.0%			
2013	15,339	37.3%	3.0%	14.2%						

Note: 2011 data have been updated to include a corrected submission from Cecil College
Source: MHEC Enrollment and Degree Information Systems

**DEGREE PROGRESS FOUR YEARS AFTER INITIAL ENROLLMENT
MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

College	Year of Fall Entering Class	Entering Class	Analysis Cohort*	ALL STUDENTS		COLLEGE READY			DEVELOPMENTAL COMPLETERS			DEVELOPMENTAL NON-COMPLETERS		
				Graduation/Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**
Allegany+	2006	832	590	40.2%	53.4%	239	54.8%	67.8%	107	49.5%	68.2%	244	21.8%	32.8%
	2007	916	691	64.3%	76.0%	290	73.4%	84.1%	103	64.1%	82.5%	298	55.4%	65.8%
	2008	897	643	60.5%	74.5%	173	78.0%	86.1%	192	62.0%	84.4%	278	48.6%	60.4%
	2009	1,030	764	52.0%	66.1%	92	75.0%	91.3%	326	62.9%	83.1%	346	35.5%	43.4%
	2010	939	561	57.2%	72.9%	76	68.4%	81.6%	291	66.0%	84.5%	194	39.7%	52.1%
Anne Arundel	2006	3,166	2,197	52.7%	69.0%	608	66.6%	78.8%	873	60.5%	82.2%	716	31.4%	44.6%
	2007	3,323	2,337	53.5%	76.3%	564	70.6%	85.6%	1,005	62.7%	91.7%	768	28.9%	49.2%
	2008	3,192	2,330	50.6%	73.1%	562	67.4%	86.1%	959	58.8%	87.9%	809	29.0%	46.5%
	2009	3,257	2,476	50.2%	73.7%	585	68.7%	86.2%	999	58.7%	88.5%	892	28.6%	49.0%
	2010	3,267	2,443	50.5%	72.0%	564	71.5%	85.5%	1,009	57.2%	87.2%	870	28.9%	45.2%
Baltimore City	2006	1,204	673	31.6%	52.2%	93	31.2%	45.2%	162	37.7%	82.7%	418	29.3%	41.9%
	2007	1,176	735	37.6%	55.8%	39	61.5%	69.2%	197	48.7%	83.8%	499	31.3%	43.7%
	2008	1,213	714	37.7%	55.3%	26	50.0%	73.1%	188	43.1%	80.3%	500	35.0%	45.0%
	2009	1,417	928	35.5%	51.3%	99	57.6%	72.7%	201	43.3%	72.6%	628	29.5%	41.1%
	2010	1,281	817	34.0%	50.8%	60	60.0%	75.0%	257	40.1%	75.5%	500	27.8%	35.2%
Baltimore County	2006	3,763	2,480	42.9%	65.7%	470	57.7%	74.9%	1,016	51.8%	84.4%	994	26.8%	42.4%
	2007	4,164	2,802	42.1%	66.0%	477	53.0%	74.8%	1,144	53.3%	85.5%	1,181	26.8%	43.4%
	2008	3,982	2,779	41.6%	65.4%	415	54.5%	73.0%	1,226	50.9%	84.4%	1,138	26.9%	42.2%
	2009	4,870	3,416	39.9%	60.7%	459	53.2%	70.2%	1,377	50.7%	81.8%	1,580	26.6%	39.4%
	2010	5,529	3,413	39.6%	60.2%	527	61.7%	76.9%	1,337	48.7%	80.8%	1,549	24.1%	36.9%
Carroll	2006	795	587	57.9%	75.1%	93	81.7%	92.5%	359	64.9%	83.6%	135	22.9%	40.7%
	2007	873	626	58.8%	79.3%	104	72.1%	90.4%	390	68.7%	91.8%	162	26.4%	42.0%
	2008	818	627	56.5%	76.4%	85	72.9%	84.7%	388	67.3%	89.9%	151	20.5%	38.4%
	2009	989	759	58.6%	76.4%	133	75.9%	85.7%	446	67.0%	88.6%	180	25.0%	39.4%
	2010	940	737	57.7%	73.1%	128	73.4%	85.9%	439	67.4%	85.4%	170	20.6%	31.8%
Cecil	2006	542	278	44.2%	63.7%	75	60.0%	82.7%	88	56.8%	80.7%	115	24.3%	38.3%
	2007	620	357	48.5%	68.6%	117	67.5%	89.7%	107	57.9%	86.0%	133	24.2%	36.1%
	2008	704	418	43.5%	54.3%	130	68.5%	77.7%	133	42.9%	57.1%	155	23.2%	32.3%
	2009	765	441	44.7%	54.4%	163	63.2%	73.0%	126	48.4%	54.8%	152	21.7%	34.2%
	2010	568	328	31.7%	40.5%	84	44.0%	52.4%	112	42.9%	53.6%	132	14.4%	22.0%
Chesapeake	2006	653	386	41.2%	65.5%	76	64.5%	81.6%	204	44.6%	75.5%	107	17.8%	34.6%
	2007	640	417	44.8%	77.5%	75	64.0%	80.0%	229	51.5%	85.2%	113	18.5%	60.2%
	2008	646	420	49.8%	72.9%	118	66.9%	85.6%	182	52.7%	86.3%	120	28.3%	40.0%
	2009	756	479	50.5%	69.9%	109	69.7%	82.6%	289	52.2%	77.6%	115	28.7%	40.9%
	2010	763	479	48.9%	67.8%	107	67.3%	85.0%	234	50.9%	76.5%	138	31.2%	39.9%
College of S. MD	2006	1,970	992	55.6%	76.6%	495	63.8%	82.2%	403	52.1%	76.2%	94	27.4%	48.9%
	2007	2,106	1,041	51.5%	74.5%	589	59.1%	78.1%	356	44.9%	74.4%	96	29.3%	53.1%
	2008	2,322	1,202	51.8%	77.4%	774	56.2%	79.7%	334	49.1%	81.4%	94	25.5%	43.6%
	2009	2,039	1,093	54.1%	76.5%	641	59.8%	80.0%	357	48.7%	77.6%	95	35.8%	48.4%
	2010	1,942	1,018	53.2%	75.8%	617	59.2%	78.8%	315	46.7%	78.4%	86	34.9%	45.3%
Frederick	2006	1,456	787	62.4%	82.6%	239	75.7%	83.3%	460	60.4%	88.3%	88	36.7%	51.1%
	2007	1,697	1,023	65.4%	76.9%	297	82.5%	86.9%	621	63.8%	79.9%	105	26.5%	61.0%
	2008	1,790	1,036	73.9%	78.7%	334	78.1%	79.6%	609	74.4%	81.1%	93	55.9%	60.2%
	2009	1,812	1,021	65.7%	78.5%	379	80.5%	85.0%	538	62.3%	81.4%	104	29.8%	39.4%
	2010	1,749	1,016	65.3%	79.2%	434	80.2%	87.8%	494	57.9%	77.7%	88	33.0%	45.5%

College	Year of Fall Entering Class	Entering Class	Analysis Cohort*	ALL STUDENTS		COLLEGE READY			DEVELOPMENTAL COMPLETERS			DEVELOPMENTAL NON-COMPLETERS		
				Graduation/ Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/ Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/ Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**	Head Count	Graduation/ Transfer Rate	Successful Persister**
Garrett	2006	296	207	69.6%	79.7%	73	93.2%	97.3%	91	62.6%	80.2%	43	44.3%	48.8%
	2007	324	213	69.5%	78.9%	83	77.1%	89.2%	82	74.4%	85.4%	48	48.0%	50.0%
	2008	301	200	73.5%	86.5%	94	79.8%	95.7%	71	67.6%	83.1%	36	66.7%	66.7%
	2009	353	265	55.8%	64.5%	65	72.3%	84.6%	136	60.3%	69.9%	64	29.7%	32.8%
	2010	315	256	68.8%	80.1%	26	88.5%	96.2%	176	71.6%	86.9%	54	47.1%	50.0%
Hagerstown	2006	788	522	64.2%	79.9%	158	85.4%	94.9%	236	69.1%	87.3%	128	29.0%	47.7%
	2007	823	567	61.6%	80.8%	174	76.4%	92.0%	248	62.1%	87.1%	145	43.0%	56.6%
	2008	933	671	59.2%	75.9%	180	80.0%	90.6%	298	64.4%	87.6%	193	31.6%	44.0%
	2009	939	660	59.1%	79.1%	148	70.9%	87.2%	357	66.4%	89.1%	155	31.0%	48.4%
	2010	1,076	703	50.8%	71.3%	113	75.2%	90.3%	356	60.4%	86.0%	234	24.4%	39.7%
Harford	2006	1,410	933	59.7%	76.1%	294	74.5%	86.4%	412	64.1%	85.7%	227	32.5%	45.4%
	2007	1,564	1,054	55.4%	78.5%	336	73.5%	92.0%	493	57.6%	86.6%	225	23.6%	40.4%
	2008	1,590	1,114	54.9%	77.6%	337	73.0%	90.2%	515	58.6%	88.9%	262	24.4%	39.3%
	2009	1,666	1,217	55.8%	76.7%	393	72.5%	90.3%	535	62.1%	85.6%	289	21.5%	41.5%
	2010	1,719	1,207	59.7%	80.0%	434	74.0%	89.9%	549	61.2%	88.5%	224	28.6%	39.7%
Howard	2006	1,559	1,126	57.1%	78.5%	335	71.0%	86.9%	425	66.4%	92.2%	366	33.6%	54.9%
	2007	1,551	1,111	56.2%	76.1%	308	76.3%	86.7%	450	59.6%	88.2%	353	34.3%	51.6%
	2008	1,766	1,314	54.2%	73.4%	392	64.0%	80.4%	455	60.7%	82.9%	467	39.6%	58.2%
	2009	1,855	1,390	53.1%	70.4%	413	68.8%	80.6%	476	61.8%	84.9%	501	31.9%	48.3%
	2010	1,880	1,414	49.6%	73.7%	389	67.4%	85.9%	485	60.8%	91.3%	540	26.9%	49.1%
Montgomery	2006	5,674	4,040	52.9%	75.1%	1,801	62.1%	81.1%	740	51.1%	87.2%	1,499	42.7%	62.0%
	2007	4,281	3,059	54.3%	80.1%	1,150	69.7%	88.8%	1,324	52.9%	85.7%	585	27.2%	50.4%
	2008	3,889	2,722	51.3%	73.3%	562	70.1%	85.8%	1,240	60.8%	87.0%	920	27.1%	47.3%
	2009	4,196	3,052	52.1%	75.0%	580	70.9%	88.1%	1,362	65.7%	90.3%	1,110	25.6%	49.5%
	2010	4,324	3,202	49.8%	75.1%	806	68.5%	87.1%	1,874	47.9%	78.4%	522	28.0%	45.0%
Prince George's	2006	1,922	703	48.2%	77.4%	337	52.5%	83.4%	224	45.1%	79.9%	142	42.9%	59.2%
	2007	2,100	1,255	39.0%	64.5%	134	60.4%	75.4%	446	54.9%	89.9%	675	24.2%	45.5%
	2008	1,831	1,145	39.7%	62.8%	126	46.8%	67.5%	605	52.7%	86.2%	414	29.3%	45.8%
	2009	2,490	1,560	39.6%	64.6%	184	59.2%	71.7%	483	54.5%	89.6%	893	27.4%	49.6%
	2010	2,830	1,666	37.3%	62.2%	203	54.2%	73.9%	548	49.6%	87.2%	915	26.1%	44.7%
Wor-Wic	2006	735	476	48.7%	67.2%	64	67.2%	85.9%	215	66.0%	89.8%	197	23.8%	36.5%
	2007	776	483	42.7%	72.5%	64	64.1%	85.9%	215	51.6%	91.6%	204	26.6%	48.0%
	2008	860	569	44.8%	71.2%	77	75.3%	88.3%	261	54.8%	90.4%	231	23.4%	43.7%
	2009	967	601	45.1%	64.6%	55	72.7%	89.1%	297	57.9%	86.2%	249	23.7%	33.3%
	2010	948	594	45.3%	63.5%	66	69.7%	83.3%	293	57.3%	81.9%	235	23.4%	34.9%
TOTAL++	2006	26,765	16,977	51.4%	71.7%	5,450	64.3%	81.0%	6,015	56.8%	84.1%	5,513	32.7%	48.9%
	2007	26,964	17,801	51.5%	73.7%	4,801	68.4%	84.9%	7,410	57.1%	85.1%	5,590	29.6%	47.4%
	2008	26,734	17,904	50.8%	71.4%	4,385	66.3%	82.5%	7,656	56.3%	82.1%	5,861	32.1%	49.1%
	2009	29,401	20,122	49.2%	69.0%	4,498	67.2%	82.3%	8,271	58.7%	84.6%	7,353	27.7%	44.3%
	2010	30,070	19,854	48.3%	69.2%	4,634	67.6%	83.4%	8,769	53.9%	82.3%	6,451	26.8%	41.2%

** Successful Persister is defined as students who completed at least 30 credit hours with a GPA of 2.00 or better, who have graduated and/ or transferred, or who are still enrolled at the institution

+ Some years of Allegany data have been obtained from sources not including the National Student Clearinghouse.

++ Totals reflect summation of cohort data as reported by the colleges, and derived percentages based solely on the reporting institutions. These may provide an "indication" or estimate of the statewide community college success levels, but should not be relied upon as a completely accurate measure at the statewide level.

Sources: Student Information System, National Student Clearinghouse Enrollment Search and Degree Verify, MHEC Transfer Student System, data provided by individual institutions

Table 4. Degree targets for public institutions, by institution (2.0% annual growth)

Institution	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	Total
COMMUNITY COLLEGES																	
Allegany College of Maryland	572	583	595	607	619	632	644	657	670	684	697	711	725	740	755	770	10,662
Anne Arundel Community College	1,336	1,363	1,390	1,418	1,446	1,475	1,505	1,535	1,565	1,597	1,629	1,661	1,694	1,728	1,763	1,798	24,902
Baltimore City Community College	411	419	428	436	445	454	463	472	482	491	501	511	521	532	542	553	7,661
Carroll Community College	466	475	485	495	504	515	525	535	546	557	568	579	591	603	615	627	8,686
Cecil College	190	194	198	202	206	210	214	218	223	227	232	236	241	246	251	256	3,541
Chesapeake College	230	235	239	244	249	254	259	264	269	275	280	286	292	298	303	310	4,287
College of Southern Maryland	822	838	855	872	890	908	926	944	963	982	1,002	1,022	1,042	1,063	1,085	1,106	15,321
Community College of Baltimore County	1,703	1,737	1,772	1,807	1,843	1,880	1,918	1,956	1,995	2,035	2,076	2,117	2,160	2,203	2,247	2,292	31,743
Frederick Community College	682	696	710	724	738	753	768	783	799	815	831	848	865	882	900	918	12,712
Garrett College	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110	112	115	117	119	122	124	127	129	1,789
Hagerstown Community College	442	451	460	469	478	488	498	508	518	528	539	550	561	572	583	595	8,239
Harford Community College	611	623	636	648	661	675	688	702	716	730	745	760	775	790	806	822	11,389
Howard Community College	675	689	702	716	731	745	760	775	791	807	823	839	856	873	891	908	12,582
Montgomery College	1,919	1,957	1,997	2,036	2,077	2,119	2,161	2,204	2,248	2,293	2,339	2,386	2,434	2,482	2,532	2,583	35,769
Prince George's Community College	690	704	718	732	747	762	777	793	808	825	841	858	875	893	910	929	12,861
Wor-Wic Community College	318	324	331	337	344	351	358	365	373	380	388	395	403	411	420	428	5,927
Sub-Total	11,163	11,386	11,614	11,846	12,083	12,325	12,571	12,823	13,079	13,341	13,608	13,880	14,157	14,441	14,729	15,024	208,070
FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS																	
Bowie State University	606	618	630	643	656	669	682	696	710	724	739	753	769	784	800	816	11,295
Coppin State University	378	386	393	401	409	417	426	434	443	452	461	470	479	489	499	509	7,046
Frostburg State University	768	783	799	815	831	848	865	882	900	918	936	955	974	993	1,013	1,034	14,315
Salisbury University	1,661	1,694	1,728	1,763	1,798	1,834	1,871	1,908	1,946	1,985	2,025	2,065	2,107	2,149	2,192	2,235	30,960
Towson University	3,625	3,698	3,771	3,847	3,924	4,002	4,082	4,164	4,247	4,332	4,419	4,507	4,597	4,689	4,783	4,879	67,567
University of Baltimore	516	526	537	548	559	570	581	593	605	617	629	642	654	668	681	694	9,618
University of Maryland - Baltimore	379	387	394	402	410	418	427	435	444	453	462	471	481	490	500	510	7,064
University of Maryland - Baltimore County	1,915	1,953	1,992	2,032	2,073	2,114	2,157	2,200	2,244	2,289	2,334	2,381	2,429	2,477	2,527	2,577	35,694
University of Maryland - College Park	6,569	6,700	6,834	6,971	7,110	7,253	7,398	7,546	7,697	7,851	8,008	8,168	8,331	8,498	8,668	8,841	122,441
University of Maryland - Eastern Shore	463	472	482	491	501	511	521	532	542	553	564	576	587	599	611	623	8,630
<i>University of Maryland - University College</i>	3,365	3,432	3,501	3,571	3,642	3,715	3,790	3,865	3,943	4,021	4,102	4,184	4,268	4,353	4,440	4,529	62,721
Morgan State University	772	787	803	819	836	852	869	887	905	923	941	960	979	999	1,019	1,039	14,390
St. Mary's College of Maryland	441	450	459	468	477	487	497	507	517	527	538	548	559	570	582	594	8,220
Sub-Total	21,458	21,887	22,325	22,771	23,227	23,691	24,165	24,648	25,141	25,644	26,157	26,680	27,214	27,758	28,313	28,880	399,962
Statewide Total	32,621	33,273	33,939	34,618	35,310	36,016	36,737	37,471	38,221	38,985	39,765	40,560	41,371	42,199	43,043	43,904	608,032

Totals for University of Maryland - University College include both associate and baccalaureate degrees.

Table 7. Target and actual undergraduate degrees awarded, four-year colleges and universities.

Institution		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	Total
Bowie State University	Target		618	630	643	656	669	682	696	710	724	739	753	769	784	800	816	11,295
	Actual	606	683	688	739	741	801	833										
	+/-		65	58	96	85	132	151										
Coppin State University	Target		386	393	401	409	417	426	434	443	452	461	470	479	489	499	509	7,046
	Actual	378	379	460	409	478	416	465										
	+/-		-7	67	8	69	-1	39										
Frostburg State University	Target		783	799	815	831	848	865	882	900	918	936	955	974	993	1,013	1,034	14,315
	Actual	768	850	892	969	1,012	1,032	1,014										
	+/-		67	93	154	181	184	149										
Salisbury University	Target		1,694	1,728	1,763	1,798	1,834	1,871	1,908	1,946	1,985	2,025	2,065	2,107	2,149	2,192	2,235	30,960
	Actual	1,661	1,709	1,787	1,872	1,899	1,935	2,040										
	+/-		15	59	109	101	101	169										
Towson University	Target		3,698	3,771	3,847	3,924	4,002	4,082	4,164	4,247	4,332	4,419	4,507	4,597	4,689	4,783	4,879	67,567
	Actual	3,625	3,948	4,103	4,147	4,291	4,422	4,638										
	+/-		251	332	300	367	420	556										
University of Baltimore	Target		526	537	548	559	570	581	593	605	617	629	642	654	668	681	694	9,618
	Actual	516	631	625	670	665	694	721										
	+/-		105	88	122	106	124	140										
University of Maryland - Baltimore	Target		387	394	402	410	418	427	435	444	453	462	471	481	490	500	510	7,064
	Actual	379	359	340	337	337	333	399										
	+/-		-28	-54	-65	-73	-85	-28										
University of Maryland - Baltimore County	Target		1,953	1,992	2,032	2,073	2,114	2,157	2,200	2,244	2,289	2,334	2,381	2,429	2,477	2,527	2,577	35,694
	Actual	1,915	1,905	2,140	2,230	2,250	2,432	2,630										
	+/-		-48	148	198	177	318	473										
University of Maryland - College Park	Target		6,700	6,834	6,971	7,110	7,253	7,398	7,546	7,697	7,851	8,008	8,168	8,331	8,498	8,668	8,841	122,441
	Actual	6,569	6,987	7,043	7,192	7,279	7,166	7,253										
	+/-		287	209	221	169	-87	-145										
University of Maryland - Eastern Shore	Target		472	482	491	501	511	521	532	542	553	564	576	587	599	611	623	8,630
	Actual	463	506	627	514	585	577	574										
	+/-		34	145	23	84	66	53										
University of Maryland - University College	Target		3,432	3,501	3,571	3,642	3,715	3,790	3,865	3,943	4,021	4,102	4,184	4,268	4,353	4,440	4,529	62,721
	Actual	3,365	3,555	4,280	4,631	4,715	6,197	7,158										
	+/-		123	779	1,060	1,073	2,482	3,368										
Morgan State University	Target		787	803	819	836	852	869	887	905	923	941	960	979	999	1,019	1,039	14,390
	Actual	772	813	902	976	922	933	902										
	+/-		26	99	157	86	81	33										
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Target		450	459	468	477	487	497	507	517	527	538	548	559	570	582	594	8,220
	Actual	441	410	444	450	432	427	529										
	+/-		-40	-15	-18	-45	-60	32										
Sub-Total	Target		21,887	22,325	22,771	23,227	23,691	24,165	24,648	25,141	25,644	26,157	26,680	27,214	27,758	28,313	28,880	399,962
	Actual	21,458	22,735	24,331	25,136	25,606	27,365	29,156										
	+/-		848	2,006	2,365	2,379	3,674	4,991										

Totals for University of Maryland - University College include both associate and baccalaureate degrees.

APPENDIX B – INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

Introduction

This appendix is a supplement to the 2016 *Report on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward the 55% Completion Goal*. For the 2016 report, public colleges and universities were asked to submit materials only if their programs and strategies (1) were newly implemented in the past year; (2) had been discontinued since the last reporting cycle; or (3) had been adopted from other institutions in the State.

As noted in the report narrative, a more detailed appendix of institutional best practices can be found in the 2014 *Report on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward the 55% Completion Goal*. It is indexed and organized within the fifteen common themes that emerged from an analysis of the best practices. This resource may help educators identify and adopt practices that can be transplanted to their campuses.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Carroll Community College

**MHEC Best Practices Report
Carroll Community College
October, 2016**

Introduction

In order to meet the state of Maryland's goal to have at least 55 percent of Maryland's residents age 25-64 holding at least one credit credential by 2025, timely information about degree progression and best practices is needed to ensure that the state and its colleges are on track to meet the goal. This report from Carroll Community College has been submitted to the Maryland Higher Education Commission fulfill the requirement that annually, data on progression, graduation and other relevant results be collected and analyzed to demonstrate progress toward the state and institutional goals in 2025.

For the 2016 Best Practices report, Carroll Community College highlights new initiatives adopted and implemented in FY16 and/or for fall of FY17. These new initiatives have been identified for enhanced development and to further support the creation of new instructional programs and partnerships to launch over the next five years. Efforts will coalesce in a manner which helps our students progress through their educational journey to degree completion.

1. Areas of Study and Milestone Advising

- a. When students reach any of 3 credit milestones (15, 30 or 45 completed credits), they are required to meet with an academic advisor or faculty mentor. The first year for new students is considered the year of "**Getting Started.**" Students are encouraged to understand their college responsibilities and learn the related regulations and procedures. During the first 15 credits, the "**Discovery**" phase, students identify their interests, skills and values to assist in formulating goals. They better understand their personal academic strengths and weaknesses to narrow down major areas of interest. Within the 30 credits, "**Finding Your Path,**" students identify a major that is compatible with their interests, skills and values; review and modify the educational plan as needed; and access information to help plan for transfer to a four-year college if desired. Within the 45 credit timeframe, "**Looking Ahead,**" students define their exit plan from the college, whether that is graduation, employment or transfer. In the "**Moving On**" phase by 60 credits, students make the transition out of Carroll Community College. During each of the milestone advising appointments, students have specific objectives related to each phase within the parameters of the number of credits underway. Students are not permitted to register for the subsequent semesters until they attend their milestone checkpoint appointment. One of the main objectives is for students with 30 credits to 'declare' their degree program. Students who have made a degree choice by 30 credits will have better direction and more focus on degree completion.
- b. **Faculty Advising Pilot Program-** This year, Carroll Community College is adding a faculty advising model as a pilot program. Ten faculty members, within different departments, have been assigned 15 students each within their degree program or department. They work with students and schedule the students' milestone advising appointments. Faculty advisors will follow the same direction/curriculum to which the academic advisors adhere, (see below), with targeted focus on degree completion.
- c. **Assigned Academic Advisors-** In order to support the holistic philosophy behind Areas of Study, each area will have dedicated academic advisors. Advisors within the area will

have more knowledge about the academic plans for the degrees within the program, and will also have transfer and career information for that area. For instance, students in an Education degree will only see a specific advisor, who will be well-versed in academics, transfer and careers within that particular area. Presently, academic advisors see all students and are expected to know the specifics for every degree program, but also all of the transfer and career advice. By creating 'expert' assigned advisors, students will have the opportunity to see the same advisor for their entire time at Carroll Community College leading up until completion and that advisor will have the opportunity to gain specific knowledge about career and transfer topics within the area.

2. Degree Planning

Fully implemented last fiscal year, degree planning continues to establish an individualized academic plan through the college's **Student Planning Software**. This is a module in the Ellucian student information system that Carroll Community College utilizes. Degree planning allows students to confirm or change their initial area of study choice. Then it populates a degree plan with an initial program of four, full-time semesters (two years). Students may then change the number of semesters, if needed. All degree-seeking students create an academic plan for degree completion.

3. Academic Success Coaching

- a. **The Academic Success Coaching** program continues to offer individual and group coaching opportunities for students. In the fall of 2015, 30 students attended group coaching sessions, four classes participated in group coaching and 11 coaches met with 25 individuals for coaching. In the spring of 2016, specific groups were formed, including a group that centered on stress management, one that focused on meditation and one that focused on LGBT topics. The success of those sessions precipitated the growth of group coaching. This year, we have group coaching around those same topics listed above, but also groups surrounding health/fitness, women's health issues, nursing students support, etc.

4. One Step Away Completion Program and Incentives for Completion

- a. The One-Step-Away incentive to complete grant has been extended for another year. Advising staff members have initiated contact with students in the fourth cohort.
- b. To date, 28% of the eligible students have been contacted and 50% of those students have participated in the program. Of the thirty- six degree-eligible students, eighteen received their associate's degree. The remaining eighteen did not respond to communications sent by the advising staff. There were 411 near-completers identified, with 107 of those students responding to communications. Twenty- eight degrees were awarded from this cohort. Some students from this group are still in progress.

New Program Initiatives

In fall, 2016, an Instructional Plan Development Workgroup convened for the purpose of engaging the instructional areas of the college in researching and prioritizing new or expanded instructional programs to support enrollment growth over the next five years. The group included key team members from Academic and Student Affairs and Continuing Education and Training. Its goal was to make recommendations to the President and Executive Team for inclusion in strategic planning and budget development.

The Workgroup began by developing a screening tool to evaluate a number of ideas generated from department program reviews and CET planning sessions. After dividing into smaller research groups, individuals discussed initial ideas with appropriate stakeholders (program chairs, directors, community members, etc.) and formulated reports utilizing research data such as demand for programs, job availability and funding resources, target markets and a cost/benefit analysis. Throughout the process, the group identified three categories for consideration: potential new programs, programs requiring expansion and strategies for continued development.

New programs in Digital Fabrication, Robotics, and Entrepreneurship were identified for consideration. Digital Fabrication is considered to be the wave of the future. This degree will have applications in healthcare, manufacturing, and art. A Robotics program will draw students who are interested in cutting-edge technology that has uses in many areas. Entrepreneurship programs assist those looking to be small business owners to become successful. All of these new programs will attract students to Carroll and will help make them productive members of society. Recently approved by MHEC is the AAS Cybersecurity Program. This program has an enrollment of 84 students for fall, 2016. Pending approval at MHEC are an AS in Biology and an AAS in Entertainment Technology.

Conclusion

The practices highlighted by Carroll Community College in this report reflect a variety of new and growing initiatives to assist students in their efforts to complete their degrees. The college has worked diligently to identify barriers to completion and to innovatively implement solutions to challenges inherent in improving degree completion rates. As evidenced in this report, Carroll Community College has supported students so that they are on track and well-prepared to attain degree goals. Indeed, the challenge of student persistence and ultimately, graduation, has been addressed through proactive efforts reflecting the commitment of Carroll Community College to ensure successful completion over the long term.

In 2009, the Commission established a goal of 9,102 associate degrees awarded by Carroll Community College by 2024-25. From 2009-10 to date, the college has awarded 4,107 degrees—or 45 percent of the goal. Thus the college is right on pace to meet the goal by 2024-25.

Wor-Wic Community College

Wor-Wic Community College

FY2016 Best Practices and Annual Progress toward the 55% Completion Goal

Wor-Wic Community College (WWCC) is engaged in a number of strategies and practices that impact state and institutional 2025 degree completion goals. As directed in the September 19th memo from Dr. Fielder, we are only providing information on new programs/strategies and the discontinuation of initiatives since the last submission.

➤ **I AM WISE**

Description: The Inspiring African-American Women in Science Technology Engineering and Math (I AM WISE) Program was developed to ensure that WWCC's STEM and general studies majors with STEM-focused career goals are aware of the variety of career options available. Participants received support services to help them persist and graduate or transfer to a four-year institution.

Update: This grant-funded program was completed and has been discontinued. Given that the average GPA of participants increased from 2.97 compared to the average 2.57 GPA of all WWCC students, and considering that 95% of program participants finished the academic year in good standing, we are searching for opportunities to apply the same strategies used in the grant. Cost is the greatest barrier, particularly the incentives (gift cards, etc.) utilized to reward program completion.

➤ **Reverse Transfer Agreements**

Description: WWCC established a Reverse Transfer Program with Salisbury University (SU), beginning fall 2012. Two ADAPTS grants that focused on facilitating the reverse transfer process were managed by the Registrar's office. The first ADAPTS grant helped to complete transcript evaluation for students who transferred credits back from SU to WWCC. The second ADAPTS grant helped to establish a Reverse Transfer Program between WWCC and the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore (UMES).

Update: The Reverse Transfer MOU with UMES ended in the summer of 2015. There was no interest on the part of UMES in renewing the Reverse Transfer agreement with Wor-Wic due to a) lack of staffing at the University to provide this ongoing service; b) their concerns regarding decreased retention rates that could result from degree conferral at another institution; and c) their interpretation of FERPA and the guidelines associated with releasing a student's information to a third-party.

A total of 6 degrees were awarded to students who relocated or changed their academic path between August 2015 and June 2016. With new academic and student affairs leadership at UMES, Wor-Wic has reopened discussion in the hope of eventually renewing our Reverse Transfer agreement.

➤ **Wicomico Economic Impact Scholarship (New Initiative)**



Description: At the end of FY16, the Wicomico County Council approved the Wicomico Economic Impact Scholarship (WEIS) allowing new Wicomico County

high school graduates and Maryland High School Diploma completers within the last year to attend Wor-Wic Community College for free. The program utilizes a last dollar funding model, so all participants must first apply for financial aid to determine if Pell grants and/or other sources of funding will cover tuition and fees. The program eliminates a major cost barrier for students and has an intensive focus on retention and completion.

To qualify for free tuition and fees, a student must have been a Wicomico County resident for two years, have completed all high school graduation requirements, and have an annual family income of \$75,000 or less. In order to receive the scholarship, a student must register for 12 credits per semester and maintain a 2.0 GPA each semester they are enrolled. The program cohort includes all students that meet WEIS eligibility requirements whether or not they utilize funds provided by the county. A total of 84 students are in the first WEIS cohort.

Intensive interventions are being employed with this cohort including mandatory orientation, mandatory advising, prohibition on dropping courses without advisor permission, biweekly meetings between students and WEIS coaches and periodic interaction between WEIS coaches and faculty regarding student progress.

PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Frostburg State University

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY
BEST PRACTICES AND ANNUAL PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING THE 55% COMPLETION GOAL
Report - October 2016

The following is an update to the report submitted by Frostburg State University (FSU) in September 2015, and a response to MHECS's request to submit a report if, and only if, the institution has either:

- I. Implemented new programs or strategies since the last submission; or
- II. Discontinued initiatives since the last submission because of data-validated results.

I. New Programs or Strategies:

Since the last submission of this report, FSU incorporated two new practices with the purpose of facilitating students' success and, therefore, increasing students' retention and completion rates.

1. **Scheduling Assistant (College Scheduler):** In spring 2016, FSU implemented College Scheduler to assist students and advisors in developing schedules for the next academic term. The *Scheduling Assistant* is a third-party, online platform that is designed to streamline registration by automating the schedule planning process, and to assist students and advisors develop schedules for the next academic term. The product is *College Scheduler* from Civitas and is linked in real-time to our student information system (PAWS). Students can access the *Scheduling Assistant* via their PAWS accounts and can easily input preferred courses, block off breaks for life's obligations, and instantly generate optimized schedules. Courses can be entered from the students' planners in PAWS or individually directly into the Assistant. Courses in which students may already be enrolled are automatically loaded into the Assistant from PAWS. Students can choose the schedule that best allows them to balance their academic, extracurricular, and personal preferences and responsibilities. The selected schedules can be "sent" to PAWS for students to complete the registration process. Advisors have access in the *Scheduling Assistant* to view the schedules students create and can guide students in course selections and identifying other obligations to schedule around. Advisors working with new freshmen are also given permission to add courses to the students' schedules in the Assistant.

The impact of this practice in accomplishing the 55% Completion goals will be measured by the following three outcomes:

- a. Students using *Scheduling Assistant* will register for more credit hours than comparable, propensity-score-matched students who did not employ the Assistant.
 - **Target Audience:** All students
 - **How Measured:** The number of credits registered by students using the Scheduling Assistant will be compared to the number of credits registered by a comparable, propensity-score-matched group of students who did not use the Assistant.
 - **Results:** Our predictive analytic software is not up and running, so we cannot develop propensity scored matches. However, preliminary findings from our

freshmen registration event in the summer of 2016, during which the Scheduling Assistant was used for the first time, suggest the Assistant may be contributing to the desired outcome. There was a rise in the average number of registered credits by participating freshmen to 15.43 from 15.07 the previous year.

b. Freshmen using *Scheduling Assistant* will be retained at a greater rate than comparable, propensity-score-matched freshmen who did not employ the Assistant.

- **Target Audience:** First-time freshmen
- **How Measured:** The retention of freshmen using the Scheduling Assistant will be compared the retention rate of a comparable, propensity-score-matched group of freshmen who did not use the Assistant.
- **Results:** Our predictive analytic software is not up and running, so we cannot develop propensity scored matches.

c. Students using *Scheduling Assistant* regularly (at least three terms) will have a greater graduation rate than comparable, propensity-score-matched students who did not employ the Assistant regularly.

- **Target Audience:** All students
- **How Measured:** The graduation rate students using the Scheduling Assistant regularly (at least three terms) will be compared the graduation rate of a comparable, propensity-score-matched group of students who did not use the Assistant regularly.
- **Results:** Our predictive analytic software is not up and running, so we cannot develop propensity scored matches.

2. **Success Caches Pilot Project:** Frostburg State University and the Division of Student Affairs have engaged in a one-year pilot project for incoming freshmen with Fidelis, a Learning Relationship Management (LRM) company. LRM features a technology platform to facilitate connections between students and faculty/staff mentors (referred to as "success coaches"). The initial goals of the project include: amplifying enrollment yield through entrance coaching, reducing first-year attrition through mentoring, and creating a quality freshmen experience focused on student engagement, well-being, and strong connections.

The philosophy behind LRM Success Coaching is consistent with research from the 2014 Gallup-Purdue Index Report on college graduates, finding associations between positive college experiences and later well-being, including better workplace engagement. Most importantly, the research discovered a strong relationship among college graduates who report "thriving" in their personal and professional lives with having a collegiate experience with an academic mentor who "cared about them as a person, made them excited about learning, and encouraged them to pursue their dreams." Additionally, the concept of students developing a meaningful relationship with a mentor/coach is consistent with Frostburg State University's commitment to provide students with unique experiences that build professional competencies and may lead to exceptional internship and career opportunities.

FSU launched a pilot-project on the summer of 2016 for 200 randomly selected freshmen to participate in an important relationship with an LRM Success Coach (mentor). Faculty and staff "success coaches" were recruited to serve as a mentor for students in the LRM project, with the final goal of reducing first-year attrition by 10% among this population of students. Effectiveness of the project will be measured against a randomly selected control group of 200 freshmen students who matriculated at the same time. Each "Success Coach" agreed to serve as a mentor for a manageable number of students, building a positive relationship with each student and assisting the student with making connections across campus using the LRM technology

platform and face-to-face interactions with other faculty, staff, and students who may assist in their success. Faculty and staff who had a desire to mentor students, the willingness to participate in a very modest amount of training regarding the LRM technology platform, and the ability to engage students in making meaningful campus connections had the opportunity to become a success coach.

Although Frostburg State University remains steadfast in our commitment to our Success Coaching initiative as a completion strategy, we have already learned several lessons from our process. Particularly, we have learned the importance of having an early on-boarding process that provides student exposure to the coaching initiative early in the admission process. Additionally, specifically targeting populations of students who may be seeking additional support may provide a better venue to recruit engaged student participants rather than student participants who may not be interested in mentoring. Ideally, we will examine our results after the first semester and seek feedback from student participants and Success Coaches before evaluating our final one-year completion numbers at the end of the spring 2017 semester. Ultimately, our first-year retention numbers will demonstrate the final review of the program along with other quantitative and qualitative data.

II. Discontinued Initiatives

Since the last report submission, Frostburg State University discontinued one of its practices due to the termination of the sponsoring grant. The *Championship Forum* Initiative, sponsored by the Maryland College Access Challenge Grant, was discontinued in April 2016 —not because of data validated results, but for lack of funding.

For a fourth and final year, FSU was awarded a Maryland College Access Challenge Grant in the amount of \$30,153.00 to operate a program with the purpose of improving the persistence rate of Pell-awarded, academically at-risk male students. The program year ran from April 2015 to April 2016, and the target enrollment was 50 students.

The main components of the program, entitled *The Championship Forum*, were: intrusive advising with academic coaches, mandatory workshops covering financial literacy, learning strategies and personal growth topics, and weekly study hall sessions. Participants who fulfilled program requirements were eligible for stipends totaling \$550 for the three semesters of the program year.

For the semester of spring 2015, 42 continuing and new participants enrolled in the program; six (6) additional participants enrolled during the fall 2015 semester. For fall 2015, 92.9% (39 of 42) of participants were retained; and 87.5% (42 of 48) of participants returned for spring 2016. Two participants graduated in May 2016 and 37 returned for the fall 2016 semester, which represents a persistence rate of 81.2% (39 of 48).

MHEC was unable to provide the opportunity to apply for a fifth year of funding, so *The Championship Forum* program has been discontinued.

Towson University

Towson University Response to Joint Chairmen’s Report Request on Best Practices and Annual Progress Toward the State Completion Goal (Institutional Goals, Strategies & Initiatives Designed to Help Achieve the Goal)

Towson University, the state’s largest comprehensive institution with more than 22,000 enrolled students, is pleased to report on its progress and initiatives supporting the state’s 55% completion goal.

Progress Toward the Goal.

Towson University conferred 38,642 bachelor’s degrees in the most recent ten academic years.

Academic Year	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015*	2015-2016
Conferred Bachelor's Degrees	3,120	3,204	3,380	3,625	3,948	4,101	4,147	4,291	4,398	4,428

*2014-15 degrees were revised in September 2016.

Implementation of Initiatives Related to Goal.

MHEC sought to reduce institutional burden by focusing only on changes to related programs for the 2016 report. Towson University reports one new initiative since the last report submission.

The Towson University Mathematics Department launched a new developmental course, MATH 100 Foundations of Mathematical Reasoning, as part of the University System of Maryland’s Maryland Mathematics Reform Initiative (MMRI). The System received a four-year \$2.98 million First in the World (FITW) grant from the U.S. Department of Education for the implementation of MMRI to help liberal arts and social sciences students perform better in developmental mathematics. The USM initiative anticipates increased retention and graduation rates as a result of a curriculum that provides more "real world" statistical mathematics applications to the study of the liberal arts and social sciences than traditional remedial algebra courses.

Towson University’s MATH 100 course launched in Fall 2016 with eight sections enrolling a total of 179 students, 93% of capacity. The goals of the course are to streamline the path for developmental students, reduce by one semester their timeline for completion of statistics or liberal arts math (MATH 105), and address some of the non-cognitive factors that impact student completion and success, such as mindset or anxiety. The course description follows.

MATH 100 Foundations of Mathematical Reasoning

Designed to provide students the necessary mathematical knowledge and skills associated with quantitative literacy, which are needed for success in various Core courses other than those in a traditional STEM and algebra-intensive pathway. The topics for this course are both mathematical and contextual: Numeracy; Proportional Reasoning; Algebraic Competence, Reasoning, and Modeling; Probabilistic Reasoning to Assess Risk; Quantitative reasoning in personal Finance; and Quantitative reasoning in civic life.

University of Baltimore

University of Baltimore
2016 Update to Maryland Higher Education Commission
on Best Practices and Annual Progress toward the 55% Completion Goal

October 11, 2016

Based on ongoing assessment and feedback, the University of Baltimore has made two changes to its best practices since the 2015 Stride to 55 report submission. In support of retention, these changes are designed to increase enrollment by focusing on access, support, and completion.

1. Early College Initiatives

A. Increasing the number of enrolling students

In Fall 2014, UB partnered with Wes Moore's Bridge.Edu and the Community College of Baltimore County to create a program for CCBC freshmen, hosted on the UB campus. Our primary goal was to increase enrollment at UB and retention by inviting students to this program who fell below our admissions academic criteria for freshmen. The program ran two pilot years. Assessment determined that 14 out of 18 students completed in year 1, and 25 out of 35 students completed in year 2. Credits earned ranged from 3-12; 53% of students in year 1 and 43% in year 2 earned a GPA of 2.0 or greater. Matriculation from this program to UB was low: 14% in year 1 and 8% in year 2; moreover, the two students from year 1 who matriculated to UB stayed only for one semester and then stopped out. In addition, ROI such as administrative support time, space, and technological resources, were determined to be below a sustainable level. Generally, the resources invested were not returning the anticipated outcomes. Consequently, for these reasons we did not renew the partnership with Bridge.Edu for a third year.

B. New Initiatives

In Fall 2016, using what was learned from two years with the CCBC/Bridge.Edu program, UB implemented a new initiative in partnership with CCBC: Freshman Transition Program (FTP). The purpose of this program is to improve access by inviting students to this program who fall below our admissions academic criteria for freshmen. The goal is for 100% of FTP students to matriculate at UB in Fall 2017 with 12 to 24 transfer credits; with the exception of remedial coursework, all credits will be transferable to UB. In this first year, 30 students are enrolled in the program. The structure of the program is similar to the Bridge.Edu model, with CCBC running the courses on UB's campus. At the same time, retention efforts are already focused on students in this program: a very high level of student support is provided by UB, including orientation, admissions, career exploration, counseling, peer success coaching, and tutoring. To support transition to UB, placement support and academic advising will be provided by UB during March 2017's fall registration drive.

An additional retention effort in support of access is UB's B-Power program, a USM-funded initiative to increase enrollment and retention by expanding current College Readiness and Dual Enrollment programs as part of our Early College Initiatives programs. B-Power will run a College Readiness Academy in five Baltimore City Public Schools in Fall 2017 (up to 20 students at each school), with B-Power Dual Enrollment following in Spring 2017 at the same 5

schools (again up to 20 students at each school). The B-Power initiative will grow to 8-9 schools and 160-180 students in 2017-18 (Year 2). In Dual Enrollment, students will earn 3 college credits before they graduate from high school.

2. Pathways to and through the majors

A. Increasing the proportion of enrolled students who earn degrees

As part of revisions in 2013 to the General Education (GE) sequence, in Fall 2014 UB instituted a new sophomore seminar course required for every student with fewer than 45 credits. With sections offered by each college/school, this course was designed to be an introduction to the major while serving campus-wide essential GE learning goals through a sequence of Signature Assignments based on a Common Read. Sections were taught by faculty from disciplines as far-ranging as comparative literature, business entrepreneurship, digital communication, human sexuality, and computer science. Implementation of the course was not without its travails, as some programs struggled to integrate the GE student learning outcomes with their major student learning outcomes; some programs also found it difficult to integrate the Common Read, which had been selected through the faculty governance process, with their major content. Nevertheless, considerable faculty development opportunities were offered for faculty by our Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching, and Technology; by GE Council faculty members; and by our University Writing Program. Faculty development sessions focused on development of Signature Assignments which integrated skills such as information literacy, critical reading, and writing, with discipline-based content which could be thematically connected with the Common Read text.

The course was assessed as part of GE with a Written Communications rubric in Spring 2015 using artefacts collected from sections across the colleges; results indicated that these students—at the halfway point between GE First-Year Composition and GE upper-division Writing—generally performed well compared with their performance of similar elements in the required GE writing courses. A majority of sophomore seminar students earned high scores in writing for Audience, Purpose, and Context; they also generally performed well in Surface Features. However, lower scores were indicated in the elements of Content Development and Use of Source Materials. Faculty feedback about the course continued to indicate the difficulties of integrating the GE skills, Common Read, and disciplinary content in a single course. GEC continued to encourage faculty to participate in faculty development to strengthen signature assignments. The following year, some schools/colleges were heavily resistant to offering and staffing sophomore seminar sections, based on the difficulties expressed by their faculty; as a result, Sophomore Seminar requirement has been terminated.

New Initiatives

Lessons learned from the implementation of sophomore seminar were brought to bear on 2016 reform of GE, which focused on progression and completion through ease of transfer. Emphasizing the importance of a process that includes faculty buy-in, the revised GE has instigated simplified pathways for both native and transfer students through GE: the new transfer-friendly GE course requirements consist of 38 credits which align with revised state requirements. These pathways support students' pathways through the majors with intentionality. Integration of GE skills and competencies with disciplinary content now happens via a series of Graduation Requirements (GRs). In a majority of programs, core major coursework now includes instruction and assessment of GRs in Technology Fluency, Information Literacy, Global Awareness & Diverse Perspectives, and Oral Communication. In other words, rather than identifying Sophomore Seminar as a singular locus for students'

integration of GE skills with major preparation; upper-division students not only have iterative opportunities to practice and apply their lower-division GE learning in the major coursework, but they also are able to integrate new competencies in disciplinarily appropriate ways. This curriculum piece is coordinated campus-wide by GE Council: it is assessed through GE Council in consultation with the major programs. The sequence of GE and GR instruction and assessment culminates in the required Capstone course in the major, which now also provides a clear locus for collaborative institutional efforts to integrate co-curricular activity

University of Maryland University College

University of Maryland University College
Update to MHEC for the Annual Progress Report Toward 55% Completion Goal
Submitted October 14, 2016

As requested in the Memorandum to the Segmental Advisory Council, dated September 19, 2016, the purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Maryland Higher Education Commission on new or discontinued activities related to degree completion initiatives since the institution's 2015 submission.

In 2015 UMUC reported to MHEC on a degree plan initiative implemented in support of student degree completion:

2015 JumpStart Report

In Fall 2013, UMUC launched the Jumpstart project - CAPL 101 "Creating Your Learning Plan" – created as part of the Breakthrough Model Incubator program funded by the Gates Foundation and Educause. CAPL 101 is a four-week online course that helps new students focus on their academic readiness and educational and life goals. Preliminary data show that the most consistent effect of CAPL 101 is a higher one-year retention rate, a higher rate of re-enrollment into the next consecutive term, and a higher successful course completion rate when compared to a control group. This course is now available to all new undergraduate students and continues to be evaluated.

A comprehensive study was conducted to examine the effectiveness of a specific set of outcomes for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and to evaluate the effects of CAPL 101. The summary of the findings suggests that student who successfully completed CAPL101 had similar outcomes to students who did not enroll in CAPL101. Additionally, the number of successfully and unsuccessfully completed credits were similar for those who successfully completed CAPL101 and those who did not enroll in CAPL101.

As a result of these findings CAPL101 was discontinued as a course offering for students in Fall 2016.

Morgan State University

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: Updates to the MHEC "Best Practices and Annual Progress toward the 55% Completion Goal" Report

While continuing to engage in its current best practices for student success, Morgan State University continues to embark on new initiatives to assist the state in reaching its 55% completion goal by 2025. This brief report will highlight six initiatives.

First, to further provide clear and accurate degree and program requirements to students in an easily comprehensible way, Morgan purchased a new comprehensive degree planning and auditing software in 2014, Degree Works by Ellucian. The benefits of investing in degree auditing software include: 1) enabling Morgan to accelerate degree audit approvals; 2) improving the overall quality of students'/near completers' experience through user friendly on-demand features like degree shopping; and, 3) providing a robust, scalable and configurable campus-wide solution that meets all requirements of the degree auditing process. Additional long-term benefits of degree auditing software include: students not wasting time and money on unnecessary courses; reducing students' stress level about graduating on time; providing advisors and evaluators with more time to provide insightful advice that supports better student outcomes; monitoring course demand and offering the right classes at the right time for near completers; and, integrating the software with the student information system (Banner) so that interactions with students are recorded so that we can see what they see in terms of degree monitoring and degree shopping. Degree shopping enables students to compare their progress in one degree program or major field of study at the institution to other degree programs or major fields of study at the institution so that students can make informed decisions as to how to progress and persist toward degree completion. During the Fall 2015 semester, eleven Degree Works trainings for faculty, staff, and administrators were conducted. In Spring 2016, four additional trainings were offered as "make-up" trainings. The Registrar will rely on Degree Works for student audits and degree conferral clearance for the December 2016 commencement. Degree Works will be available to students in 2017.

Second, in fall 2014, the University moved to a centralized advising model for all first-year freshmen. Under the supervision of the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success, the Center for Academic Success and Achievement (CASA) and the Office of Student Success and Retention (OSSR) utilize Starfish Retention Solutions to assist with the academic advising of all first-year freshman students. Departmental liaisons were identified to provide additional curriculum details and advising strategies for the CASA and OSSR staff. Holds were placed on every first-year student's account preventing them from making changes to their course schedule without consulting with an academic advisor first. Once first-year students earn at least 24 credits with a 2.0 minimum cumulative GPA and a declared major, they are reassigned to their departmental/faculty advisor for the balance of their matriculation. All of the notes from first-year advising meetings are saved in Starfish for faculty advisors to refer back to in subsequent advising meetings. Every student has an online advising folder through Starfish.

Third, in Fall 2015, Morgan launched a newly revamped Academic Recovery Program (ARP). The former ARP required students to enter into the program after they were academically dismissed from the institution; the revamped ARP assigns students to one of three different phases of ARP (Academic Probation, Academic Comeback, or Academic Dismissal) based on their cumulative GPA once they are eligible for dismissal. Students are able to transition between ARP phases as their cumulative GPA digresses or progresses. The new proactive ARP provides students with the opportunity to receive additional support before being

dismissed from the institution; these supports include mandatory workshops, required tutoring, routine meetings with the ARP Coordinator, and intrusive academic advisement.

Fourth, the University has now completed five semesters of Starfish Retention Solutions implementation (Spring 2014, Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015 & Spring 2016); after conducting 16 two-hour faculty/staff trainings with more than 275 participants, Morgan launched its campus-wide Starfish initiative in March 2014. Morgan's goal continues to be to resolve and/or clear as many flags as possible by following up by email, by phone, or in-person with an additional intervention with each student. A Spring 2015 analysis of Starfish from Spring 2014 through Spring 2015 by the Office Institutional Research at Morgan found that: 1) the majority of D's at mid-term were raised to C or better by the end of each semester; 2) the mean cumulative GPA of students with concern flags has been above 2.0, with about 75% of these students ending the semester with GPAs at or above 2.0; and, 3) results of the annual University Student Satisfaction Survey indicate that student satisfaction with advising increased from 2.4 to 2.6 on a scale of 0 (F) to 4 (A) from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015. Starfish Retention Solutions (by Hobsons) continues to operate as an invaluable, comprehensive, and transformative advising, tracking, and monitoring tool for Morgan State University.

Fifth, the Reclamation Initiative at Morgan State University is now in its 6th year of implementation. Having \$50,000 in micro-grants designated especially for students who have stopped-out at some point, and have earned 90+ credits with at least a 2.0 cumulative GPA, and have been officially audited by their dean or department for graduation is a targeted, strategic approach to increasing college completion rates at Morgan. Many Morgan students in their 5th and 6th year of college have already invested anywhere from \$42,000 to \$144,000 in loans to pay for their college education. Although 96% of Morgan's undergraduate student population receives some type of financial aid (grant, loan, scholarship, etc.) very few students get 100% of their tuition and fees paid by financial aid. Thus, many students work part-time or full-time to supplement their cost of attendance. Working in many instances leads to decreased progress toward degree completion while students report working more hours over time and get promoted on their jobs.

Finally, President David Wilson asked the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success, Dr. Kara Turner, to host a "deep dive" retreat for his cabinet, deans, chairs, and senior administrators. On March 30, 2016, Dr. Tim Renick, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success at Georgia State University, presented to this group of more than 75 campus leaders Georgia State's exciting and effective example of strategic, systemic, and evidence-based change. Dr. Renick's presentation set the tone for the introduction of a proposal for a new strategic campaign to increase Morgan State University's graduate rates: "The Morgan State 50 by 25 Initiative: Getting More Students Across the Finish Line", a campaign to increase Morgan's graduation rate to 50% by the year 2025. The new "50 by 25" Campaign is organized around three central themes: 1) Advising and Degree Planning; 2) Faculty Development and Course Redesign; and 3) Beyond Financial Aid (BFA). The "50 by 25" Campaign will include half-day, check-in meetings twice per year in April and November for the cabinet, deans, chairs, and senior administrators to report-out on their progress.