



**DIVISION of ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**  
**Office of the Provost and Vice President**

---

DATE: September 16, 2019

TO: Emily A.A. Dow, Ph.D.  
Assistant Secretary of Academic Affairs

FROM: Nancy S. Niemi, Ph.D.  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Objection to Capital Technology University New Academic Program Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Aviation Professional Pilot

---

Dear Dr. Dow:

It has come to our attention that Capitol Technology University (CTU) has filed a proposal to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in Aviation Professional Pilot. Currently, UMES is the only university in the state of Maryland to offer a four-year degree program for professional pilots. CTU acknowledges both the program at UMES and the similarities in the existing and proposed programs. They cite the following four reasons as evidence that duplication of programs is reasonable:

1. Extremely high demand for professional pilots by the military and industry for the foreseeable future
2. Capitol Technology University's FAA Part 141 approved pilot training school is 163 miles away and three hours driving time from UMES' flight school on the Eastern Shore
3. Significant institutional differences between both universities (e.g., public versus private, low cost versus high cost, large versus very small student populations, Eastern Shore flight school versus Northwestern Montgomery County flight school, etc.)
4. Different target student populations (i.e., UMES mostly draws students from various parts of Maryland, Delaware, and Eastern Shore Virginia while Capitol Tech plans to target international students who travel to the U.S. specifically for pilot training at the Washington International Flight Academy)

We believe that the duplication of programs is not reasonable and would have a significant negative impact on the program at UMES. We will address the items listed above in sequence.

1. There is no question about the market demand for pilots. CTU has done a great job of outlining that demand, and we do not dispute the data provided. However, UMES has never turned away a qualified candidate for our Professional Pilot program, and has no need to do so in the foreseeable future. Our program is not at capacity in any of the required inputs and will not be for many years to come. We could certainly absorb the student numbers projected by CTU in Table 1. We would also contend that the majority of those students would chose to attend UMES instead of CTU if the CTU program does not exist.

2. While Capital Technology University has noted that the distance of their proposed program from UMES allows for the reasonableness of program duplication, we strongly object to that premise. Over the last 5 years, the UMES Aviation Science program has enrolled 147 unique students. None have been denied entry to the Professional Pilot program. Of those 147, 86% (N=127) are in-state. Of those Maryland students, only 35% (N=44) are from the Eastern Shore. The majority (56%, N=83) of Aviation Science students enrolled at UMES come from Maryland's Western Shore. From these numbers it is clear that allowing the duplication of a Professional Pilot program in Maryland would substantially and irrevocably harm the Aviation Science program at UMES.

Additionally, the Washington International Flight Academy (WIFA) is the FAA Part 141 approved pilot training school. Its physical location in no way suggests that it is attracting students from a different location than UMES, or that students are attending WIFA in preference to UMES. CTU does acknowledge that not all students attending WIFA would go on to matriculate in a baccalaureate program. CTU does not provide any student demographic data from WIFA. They also do not provide any information about the likelihood that any students enrolled at WIFA who might be considering a baccalaureate program would only attend such a program if it were located at CTU.

3. While there are significant differences in the structures of the two Universities as noted by CTU, no evidence is provided to suggest that the differences would lead to some students who want to pursue a baccalaureate program for professional pilot choosing to go to another state rather than attend UMES. Justification for allowing CTU to develop a competing program to the existing one at UMES would seem to require identification of actual students who would choose to go to CTU who would reject an equivalent program at UMES.
4. While it is true that UMES does not currently admit international students into the Professional Pilot program, UMES has plans in place to change this restriction. Currently, UMES has FAA Part 141 Ground School certification. UMES intends to hire a Chief Flight Instructor and certify its flight school under FAA Part 141. Subsequent to that action, UMES will include the Professional Pilot program with its many other Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVIS) approved programs. In the absence of any data from WIFA regarding the numbers of foreign students who intend to remain in the United States to earn a baccalaureate degree in Professional Pilot, it is difficult to see why a new program is required for a very specific group of students. If the projections provided by CTU in Table 1 include domestic students who could qualify to be students at UMES, then the duplication of programs would definitely have an adverse effect on the program at UMES.

We respectfully request that you consider our objections to CTU Proposed Program, and we appreciate your time.

C: Heidi M. Anderson, President, UMES  
Antoinette Coleman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, USM  
Latasha Wade, PharmD., Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Operations and Strategic Initiatives, UMES  
Kate Brown, Ph.D., Interim Dean, School of Business and Technology, UMES

