

Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis

University System of Maryland

Morgan State University

St. Mary's College Of Maryland

December 2007

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

Kevin M. O’Keefe, Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Victor E. Bernson, Jr.

Joann A. Boughman

Anwer Hasan

Leronia A. Josey

Joshua L. Michael

James G. Morgan

Nhora Barrera Murphy

Emmett Paige, Jr.

Chung K. Pak

Paul L. Saval

James E. Lyons, Sr.
Secretary of Higher Education

Martin O’Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Table of Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

Background

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

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

Refining the Funding Guidelines

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

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

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

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

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

Assessing Institution Performance

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

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

Data Availability

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

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

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

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

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

St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile

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

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

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

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

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

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

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students ¹	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
2. Percent minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. Percent African American of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second-year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
5. Six-year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
6. Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
7. Six-year graduation rate: African American	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
8. Pass rate on teacher licensure exam, Praxis II ²	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•
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 ³							•	•	•	•	•
13. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty ³	•						•	•	•	•	•
14. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures ³							•	•	•	•	•
15. Number 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 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. Percent students on federal grants	National Peers
2. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
4. Second-year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
7. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
8. Number of doctorates awarded to women	National Peers
9. Number of Doctorates awarded to African Americans	National Peers
10. Number of Bachelor's in STEM awarded to African Americans ²	National Peers
11. Percent full-time faculty with terminal degree	National Peers
12. Research expenditures	National Peers
13. Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) over base of the previous year	National Peers
14. Alumni giving most current year available	National Peers
15. Pass rate on the Praxis II or NES, teacher licensure exam	National Peers, Maryland Institutions

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

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

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

Measure¹
<i>QUALITY / SELECTIVITY</i>
1. Amount in total Research spending
2. Percent of faculty with terminal degrees
3. Average salary of full-time Professors
4. Average salary of full-time Associate Professors
5. Average salary of full-time Assistant Professors
6. Percentile of full-time Professors
7. Percentile of full-time Associate Professors
8. Percentile of full-time Assistant Professors
9. Average SAT scores of entering freshmen
10. 25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen
11. Acceptance Rate
12. Yield Ratio
<i>RETENTION, GRADUATION AND ACCESS</i>
13. Second-year retention rate
14. Average six-year graduation rate
15. Percent African American students of first-year students
16. Total headcount enrollment
17. Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment
18. Percent full-time undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
19. Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
20. Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates
21. Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal grants
<i>EFFICIENCY/ RESOURCES</i>
22. E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student
23. Average alumni giving rate
24. Tuition and fees revenues a percent of E&G expenditures
25. Ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time faculty
26. Library book volumes
27. Library subscriptions
28. Full-time library staff
29. Full-time library staff with MLS degree
30. Library book volumes per FTES

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

Peer Performance Analysis

Bowie State University

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bowie State University's Response

Teacher licensure

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

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

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

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

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

Retention and six-year graduation rates success

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

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

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

Bowie State University Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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

NA - Data not available

Coppin State University

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

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

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

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

Coppin State University's Response

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

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

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

Coppin State University Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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

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

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

Frostburg State University

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

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

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

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

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

Frostburg State University's Response

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

Availability of social work licensing exam pass rates

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

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

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

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

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

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

Suggest alternative measures

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

Frostburg State University Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in BSW social work licensing exam ^{1,2}	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
Frostburg State U.	860-1070	20.6%	16.6%	73.0%	47.0%	41.8%	45.9%	99%	NA³	10.0%
California U. of Penn.	890-1060	7.2%	5.8%	76.0%	43.0%	37.3%	41.5%	94%	NA	7.0%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	900-1080	10.6%	4.2%	76.0%	48.8%	30.9%	23.4%	93%	NA	14.0%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	930-1160	12.1%	6.6%	77.0%	50.7%	36.9%	36.8%	100%	NA	12.0%
Sonoma State U.	940-1140	19.5%	2.2%	82.0%	48.2%	43.9%	26.1%	100%	NA	1.0%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	1000-1160	9.5%	3.0%	77.0%	50.7%	45.9%	55.3%	97%	NA	17.0%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	950-1130	11.4%	4.9%	77.0%	52.9%	51.3%	36.0%	96%	NA	14.0%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	950-1170	7.5%	2.4%	75.0%	44.4%	37.3%	41.7%	97%	NA	14.0%
Western Carolina U.	930-1110	9.2%	5.4%	71.0%	47.4%	47.9%	53.1%	96%	NA	9.0%
Western Connecticut State U.	860-1100	16.7%	6.1%	71.0%	34.1%	34.6%	35.5%	100%	NA	6.0%
Winthrop U.	960-1180	30.9%	27.6%	75.0%	59.8%	64.2%	65.8%	97%	NA	16.0%
Average of Peers	931-1129	13.5%	6.8%	75.7%	48.0%	43.0%	41.5%	97%	NA	11.0%

FSU institution-specific indicators

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

NA - Data not available

Notes:

¹Passing 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.

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

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

Salisbury University

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

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

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

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

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

Salisbury University's Response

Teacher licensure pass rate

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

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

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

Nursing licensure exam pass rate

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

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

Teacher licensure pass rates

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

Six-year graduation rates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact on tuition and fee differential in State appropriations per FTES

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

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

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

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

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

Salisbury University Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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.	9.0%	57.0%	82.0%	17.1	3.5	\$4,359
Central Washington U.	5.0%	76.0%	86.0%	NA	3.2	\$5,138
Eastern Illinois U.	10.0%	78.0%	70.0%	16.2	3.0	\$4,472
Humboldt State U.	5.0%	69.0%	80.0%	NA	3.2	\$10,158
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	12.0%	74.0%	85.0%	17.4	3.0	\$7,498
Wilmington	10.0%	61.0%	87.0%	20.8	3.6	\$7,244
Northern Michigan U.	7.0%	84.0%	65.0%	23.4	NA	\$5,357
Sonoma State U.	1.0%	66.0%	100.0%	NA	3.1	\$8,072
SUNY, C. at Oswego	14.0%	56.0%	83.0%	19.5	3.3	\$6,107
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	14.0%	62.0%	81.0%	16.7	3.0	\$6,950
Western Oregon U.	10.0%	55.0%	72.0%	16.1	3.2	\$3,849
Average of Peers	8.8%	68.1%	80.9%	18.6	3.2	\$6,485

NA - Data not available
NP - No Program

Towson University

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

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

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

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

Towson University's Response

Teacher licensure exam

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

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

Nursing licensure exam

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

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

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

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

Towson University Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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

NA - Data not available
NP - No program

University of Baltimore

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

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

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

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

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

University of Baltimore's Response

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

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

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

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

University of Baltimore Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

NA - Data not available

NP - No program

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

University of Maryland, Baltimore

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland, Baltimore's Response

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

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

University of Maryland Baltimore Peer Performance Data, 2007

University	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams			Social Work	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine
			Nursing	Medical	Law ²					
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore	41.3%	27.2%			80%	22.0%	\$243,517		8.3%	
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham	36.0%	30.2%	NP		NP	8.0%	\$210,668		13.6%	
California, U. of, San Francisco ¹	0.0%	0.0%	NP		NP	10.0%	\$684,829		19.9%	
Illinois, U. of, Chicago	49.3%	8.7%	NP		NP	6.0%	\$157,764		21.3%	
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	24.3%	6.7%	97%		97%	15.0%	\$264,077		13.3%	
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	22.4%	10.8%	83%		83%	23.0%	\$145,786		8.5%	
Connecticut, U. of			90%		90%					
Texas, U. of, Austin			90%		90%					
Virginia, U. of			96%		96%					
Average of Peers	26.4%	11.3%			91%	12.4%	\$292,625		15.3%	

University	UMB institution-specific indicators					
	Total medicine R&D spending (000s)	Medicine resch. grants per Basic Res. faculty	Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty	% minorities of total enrollment	Total headcount enrollment	Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headct.
Maryland, U. of, Baltimore				33.5%	5,636	85.8%
Alabama, U. of, Birmingham				30.9%	16,561	31.9%
California, U. of, San Francisco				41.9%	2,943	100.0%
Illinois, U. of, Chicago				41.2%	24,644	39.1%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor				23.4%	40,025	36.2%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill				20.3%	27,717	38.2%
Average of Peers				31.5%	22,378	49.1%

NA - Data not available
 NP - No program

¹ The University of California San Francisco enrolls only graduate students.

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

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland, Baltimore County's Response

Retention and graduation rates

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

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

R & D expenditures

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

Alumni giving rate

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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

NA - Data not available

University of Maryland, College Park

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

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland, College Park's Response

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

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland College Park Peer Performance Data, 2007

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

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

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

² Graduation rate data extracted from the annual CSRDE Student Retention Report, 2006.

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

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

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

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

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

University of Maryland Eastern Shore's Response

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

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

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

Alumni giving rate

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

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

Retention and graduation rates

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

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

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

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

