



# **2004 Performance Accountability Report Maryland Public Colleges and Universities**

## **VOLUME 1**

**November 2004**

**MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION**

**John J. Oliver, Jr., Chairman**

**Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman**

**Joann A. Boughman**

**Anne Osborn Emery**

**Ilona Modly Hogan**

**Alicia Coro-Hoffman**

**Kevin M. O'Keefe**

**Emmett Paige, Jr.**

**Sherman L. Ragland, II**

**Justin M. Towles**

**Mario VillaSanta**

**Calvin W. Burnett**  
**Secretary of Higher Education**

**Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.**  
**Governor**

**Michael S. Steele**  
**Lt. Governor**

*TABLE OF CONTENTS*

Executive Summary.....p. 1

An Overview of the Accountability Process.....p. 9

Assessment and Recommendations.....p. 17

Cost Containment Activities.....p. 31

Targeted Indicators and Campus Response: Community Colleges.....p. 43

Targeted Indicators and Campus Response: Four-Year Institutions.....p. 73

One Page Profiles.....p. 97



**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1988 Higher Education Reorganization Act established an accountability process for public colleges and universities in Maryland. The law requires the governing boards of these institutions to submit annual performance accountability reports to the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The Commission, in turn, must review these reports and present them with its assessment and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly. Maryland's state-aided independent colleges and universities have submitted periodic reports on a voluntary basis for the last three years. However, the 2002 Update to the *Maryland Plan for Postsecondary Education* urged these institutions to make their process more compatible to the one used by the four-year campuses.

The reporting requirements of the public two- and four-year campuses are different as a result of major changes approved by the Commission in 2000. However, the framework of key indicators with benchmarks was retained.

The community colleges use 29 standard "mission/mandate" driven performance measures. These indicators are categorized as follows: accessibility and affordability, learner-centered focus for student success, diversity, support of regional economic and workforce development, effective use of public funding, and community outreach and service. The model for the public four-year campuses follows the structure of the Managing for Results program of the Department of Budget and Management in which each institution develops a set of goals, objectives, and performance measures. This approach replaced standardized indicators that the Commission used in the past. The Commission acted in response to a request from the budget committees of the General Assembly to merge its performance accountability report with the MFR process. Both the community colleges and the public four-year campuses strongly supported these changes.

The Commission staff reviewed the institutional performance accountability reports submitted by each public college and university and prepared a consolidated report. This document represents the ninth report presented to the Commission since the introduction of the indicator system. The report appears in two volumes:

### Volume 1

- an overview of the history and major features of the accountability process.
- the assessment of the Commission regarding the outcome of the year's accountability effort by the public campuses.
- an examination of cost containment activities at the public campuses.
- the responses of the public colleges and universities to questions raised by the Commission about their progress toward benchmarks on selected indicators and objectives.
- one-page profiles for each public college and university containing a short campus description and data and benchmarks on key indicators.

## Volume 2

- a short institutional assessment prepared by each public institution and unedited by the Commission staff on its progress toward meeting its benchmarks for the various indicators (community colleges) and objectives for the various goals (four-year institutions). The community college report also contains a narrative about how each campus is serving its local jurisdiction.
- a complete set of the trend data and benchmarks for each of the indicators used by the community colleges and a complete set of the goals, objectives, and performance measures adopted by each public four-year institution along with trend data and benchmarks for the measures.
- a listing of each indicator, along with the source and operational definition. The community colleges used a standard set of measures, while the public four-year colleges and universities have both common and campus-specific indicators and thus separate lists of definitions.
- guidelines for benchmarking.
- the formats for the institutional performance accountability reports of the public campuses.

Under the accountability process, the governing boards have responsibility for monitoring student learning outcomes and minority achievement. The Commission receives reports every three years from the public campuses regarding progress in these areas. The Commission received a status report on minority achievement in September 2002 and minority achievement action plans in 2003. The latest student learning outcomes assessment reports, which examined the impact which these activities have had on the improvement of education, were presented to the Commission in November 2004. The Commission's funding guidelines process for public four-year colleges and universities includes its own accountability component. Campuses are expected to perform at least at the level of selected peers on a set of outcomes-oriented performance measures. University System of Maryland has 16 measures, Morgan State University has 14, and St. Mary's College of Maryland has 23. The Commission presented reports to the General Assembly in each of the past three years examining the comparative performance of the USM campuses and Morgan on the indicators. These reports are provided separately to the performance accountability report.

### **Commission Assessment of the Institutional Performance Accountability Reports**

This set of reports marks two-thirds of the way to the year in which the public colleges and universities are expected to meet their benchmarks, and the performance of institutions is becoming apparent. The Commission asks campuses to respond to questions about measures and benchmarks about which they have been lagging behind their goal. Institutions provided an explanation of their performance and/or a description of actions they had taken or planned to take, and most campuses supplied responses even when answers were optional. The accountability process that was introduced in 2000 has matured, as reflected by the continuity in the indicators used by the community

colleges and the objectives employed by the public four-year institutions. The use of common templates for the purpose of supplying trend data and preparing the institutional assessment, as well as the strong cooperation of the public institutions, continues to make accountability reporting a smooth process.

Following are the major conclusions which the Commission staff has drawn from the reports:

### *Community Colleges*

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were exceedingly good. In general, the quality of the reports was uniformly high across the two-year sector.**

Each campus prepared a complete report following the prescribed format. The institutional analyses of nearly all colleges contained a detailed discussion of how they had performed in the various "mission/mandate" driven categories. The descriptions of community impact and outreach were similarly extensive.

**Although the community colleges are performing well on most indicators as measured by the data, trends in several areas raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring. These include recruitment of minority faculty and staff, transfer and graduation patterns (especially for minorities), licensure exam passing rates, and the enrollment of noncredit students.**

While many community colleges experienced progress in the past year toward their benchmarks in the hiring of minority faculty and administrative/professional staff, others remain short of their goals. Most of the campuses identified factors that had hindered their efforts and described actions they are taking to ensure non discrimination in hiring. While the four-year transfer and graduation rate of new full-time students rose by a full percentage point in the last cohort to 32.2 percent, it remains considerably below the levels of 10 years ago. In addition, a huge gap persists between minorities and other students. Many colleges discussed the steps that they have taken to improve transfer and graduation rates. The passing rate on certain licensure examinations related to health programs trailed the benchmarks at six community colleges. These institutions provided explanations for their performance and, in some cases, described steps being taken to boost future scores. Noncredit, continuing education enrollments fell in the past year at nearly half of the community colleges, including two of the largest. Campuses explained that training contracts with employers and hours at extension sites were cut due to institutional budgetary constraints.



**Maryland community colleges are engaged in an extensive variety of impact and outreach efforts in their respective service areas.**

All colleges provided considerable detail about their involvement in their local jurisdictions. These undertakings can be categorized as economic and workforce development activities, public school partnerships, and community partnerships.

### **Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

**The accountability reports submitted by the public four-year colleges and universities, while generally satisfactory, varied widely in the amount and quality of the detail and analysis provided in their institutional assessment. Readers can observe these differences in Vol. 2 of the report.**

Most reports contained all of the required components, including goals and/or objectives in the general areas of accountability and on the specific subjects of retention and graduation, minority enrollment and achievement, and postsecondary student outcomes. Exceptional reports, which serve as models, were prepared by University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Maryland College Park, and University of Maryland University College.

**The public four-year colleges and universities appear to be progressing well toward their objectives in most cases. However, there are several areas in which at least some institutions seem to be having difficulty: graduates in critical workforce shortage areas, fundraising, and facility renewal.**

The gap between the supply of and demand for teachers and nurses is acute in Maryland as well as nationwide. The number of teacher candidates prepared by Maryland colleges and universities is lower than it was six years ago, and the number of nurses graduating from the State's campuses will fall short of satisfying the projected openings. Seven of the public four-year campuses were experiencing difficulty meeting their benchmarks with respect to producing more teachers and nurses. These institutions offered a variety of perspectives on their performance. Campuses that were lagging in their goals related to funds raised in annual private giving and dollars allocated to facility renewal tied their performance to the weak economy and State budget cuts respectively.

### **Cost Containment – All Public Colleges and Universities**

**Reporting on cost containment and internal reallocation activities was comprehensive and detailed at nearly all institutions.**

All but one public institution provided detailed descriptions and specific dollar amounts showing how they have reduced waste, improved the overall efficiency of their operations and achieved cost savings. For the first time and at the request of the Commission, the individual campuses of the University System of Maryland submitted

descriptions of their activities. The cost containment efforts can be categorized as savings related to staffing, reductions in overhead, transferal of expenses, encouragement of competition, and academic program savings. These ventures, as reported by the public campuses, saved \$92.0 million in FY 2004.





**AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS**

**INTRODUCTION**



## HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

The 1988 Higher Education Reorganization Act established an accountability process for public colleges and universities in Maryland. The law, §11-304 through §11-308 of the Annotated Code, requires the governing boards of these institutions to submit to the Maryland Higher Education Commission a performance accountability plan and annual reports on the attainment of the goals in this plan. The Commission has responsibility for approving the plans as well as for reviewing the reports and presenting them, with its recommendations, to the Governor and the General Assembly. Maryland's state-supported independent institutions are not covered by the accountability law but have submitted periodic reports to the Commission on a voluntary basis, including the last three years. One of the objectives in *Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education 2000* is to "embrace a comprehensive system of accountability that recognizes the needs of all stakeholders while respecting the finite nature of public resources and the fiscal constraints of students and families." The aim was reinforced in the 2002 Update to the State Plan, which also calls on the state-aided independent institutions to make their accountability reports more compatible with the process used by the public four-year sector.

Prior to 1996, Maryland public colleges and universities were required to submit the following to the Commission:

- A student learning outcomes assessment plan and annual reports to measure whether student performance goals were being achieved.
- Annual comprehensive financial plans, which were intended to demonstrate how productively and effectively each institution was using state-provided resources.
- Annual minority achievement reports, which supplied information about each institution's progress in the recruitment and retention of minority students, faculty and professional staff.

Separate reporting on the different facets of accountability was necessary in the beginning so that critical issues could be identified. However, these three reports did not provide state leaders with clear measures to judge whether or not higher education institutions were being accountable, they consumed a great deal of institutional time and resources, they did not link accountability with budget and planning, and they focused more on process than outcomes.

As a result, a new performance accountability system for public higher education was adopted by the Commission in 1996. The three required reports were replaced by a single institutional performance accountability report. The heart of this report was a series of key indicators that responded to concerns commonly expressed by legislators and a set of benchmarks. "Benchmark" refers to the multi-year desired outcome for each

indicator that the institution sets for itself. The benchmark must be achievable, indicative of progress, based on the performance of similar institutions where possible, and reflective of funding. Although each institution prepared its own benchmarks, campuses were encouraged to collaborate with those with similar missions.

In 2000, the Commission approved major revisions in the accountability process for both the public two- and four-year institutions. These changes came about for different reasons and were pursued on separate tracks. As a result, the accountability reporting requirements for the community colleges and public four-year institutions are now different, although the structure of benchmarked indicators has been maintained. This is the fourth year for the current accountability approach.

### **Community Colleges**

The core of the community college accountability report is a set of 29 performance measures that these institutions describe as “mission/mandate” driven. These indicators were developed by a community college workgroup and were refined as a result of discussions with staff from the Commission, the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), and the Department of Legislative Services (DLS). These indicators are standard across all community colleges. Campuses may include additional campus-specific measures if they wish. The standard indicators are organized on the basis of six categories:

- Accessibility and affordability
- Learner-centered focus for student success
- Diversity
- Support of regional economic and workforce development
- Effective use of public funding
- Community outreach and service

The community colleges’ institutional performance accountability report to the Commission contained a short description of the campus mission, four years of data and a benchmark for each indicator, a listing of budget initiatives, a description of cost containment activities, an institutional self-assessment, and a discussion of the manner in which the colleges are serving their communities.

### **Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

In the 2000 General Assembly session, the budget committees adopted “narrative” that asked the Commission to create a single document that incorporated the elements of both its performance accountability report and the Managing for Results program of the DBM. This task was undertaken in conjunction with DBM, DLS, and representatives of the public four-year institutions and their governing boards.

The model that was agreed to by all parties was designed to streamline the process, reduce duplicative reporting for the campuses, and provide a more efficient means for

policymakers to determine how well the public four-year campuses are doing. The major component of the new accountability process is that the Managing for Results framework, in which each campus develops a set of goals, objectives and performance measures, has replaced the standardized set of indicators that were used by the Commission in the past. This approach was strongly desired by the institutions. Even though the process provides campuses with a great deal of flexibility, the Commission expects the inclusion of objectives that encompass the general areas of performance accountability: quality, effectiveness, access, diversity and efficiency. In addition, campuses are asked to include specific objectives dealing with graduation and retention, post graduation outcomes, and minority enrollment and achievement. Other requirements may be imposed by DBM.

The institutional performance accountability report for the public four-year institutions included a short mission description; a set of institutionally-defined goals, objectives, and performance measures along with operational definitions for each measure; four years of data and a benchmark for each measure; a campus self-assessment; and a description of cost containment activities. For the first time, each of the institutions of University System of Maryland (USM) prepared a separate cost containment narrative at the request of the Commission.

### **The Commission's Consolidated Accountability Report**

This document represents the ninth accountability report submitted to the Commission since the adoption of the system using benchmarked indicators/objectives. Volume 1 presents an overview of the accountability process, the assessment of the Commission of the reports of the public campuses, Commission observations about institutional performance on selected indicators/objectives and the responses of the colleges and universities, an examination of cost containment activities at the campuses, and one-page profiles containing data and benchmarks on key indicators.

Volume 2 is a series of appendices. For each community college, it contains a short description prepared by each institution and unedited by the Commission staff on its progress on the performance indicators in each "mission/mandate" area, a discussion of how well it is serving its community, and a complete set of trend data and benchmarks for each indicator. For each public four-year institution, it contains a short description prepared by each institution and unedited by the Commission staff on its progress toward achieving its goals, objectives and performance measures; a listing of its goals, objectives and performance measures; and a complete set of trend data for each performance measure. For both types of campuses, it includes the operational definitions and sources for the performance measures used by the community colleges and each public four-year institution, guidelines for benchmarking the indicators, and the formats for the institutional performance accountability reports of the community colleges and four-year institutions.



## **Continued Monitoring of Student Learning Outcomes and Minority Achievement**

The Commission has retained the option of seeking periodic reports on these topics. The Commission will receive reports every three years from the governing boards of the public campuses regarding progress in these areas. Progress reports on the status of minority achievement and undergraduate student learning outcomes were presented to the Commission in September 2002 and November 2004 respectively. As a follow-up to the minority achievement report, the public colleges and universities which made limited or no progress toward benchmarks on one or more of the common performance measures submitted action plans to the Commission detailing their strategies for attaining their objectives. The most recent student learning outcomes assessment reports examined the impact which campus activities have had on the improvement of learning and teaching related to the five general education competencies examined in accreditation reviews by Middle States Association for Higher Education: written and oral communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

## **Accountability Component of Funding Guidelines Process**

In 1999, the Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the institutions of USM and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison among 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 their respective Maryland institution to inform resource questions and assess performance.

The funding guidelines process includes an annual accountability component. Each applicable Maryland institution selected 10 "performance peers" from their list of "funding peers." The Commission, in consultation with representatives from USM, Morgan State University, DBM, and DLS, identified a set of comprehensive, outcomes-oriented performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. There are 16 measures for USM and 14 for Morgan. Institutions compare themselves annually to their performance peers on as many of the measures as they are able to collect data.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above the level of their performance peers on most indicators. Further, institutional performance will be assessed within the context of the state's accountability process. The Commission will examine four years of trend data and benchmarks on each indicator. Institutions are expected to make progress toward achieving their accountability benchmarks. If an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the campus must submit a report to the Commission identifying 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 accountability indicators.

St. Mary's College of Maryland participates in the peer performance comparison even though it does not take part in the funding guidelines process. St. Mary's has selected 12 current peers and six aspirational peers. St. Mary's 23 performance measures are similar to those chosen by the other public four-year institutions and reflects its status as the State's only public baccalaureate liberal arts college.

The Commission has presented reports to the General Assembly in the past three years examining the performance of these institutions on these indicators as compared to those of their accountability peers. These reports have been submitted separately to the performance accountability report, and this practice will be continued.





**ASSESSMENT  
AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS**



## ASSESSMENT OF THE MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

This is the fourth set of reports that Maryland's public colleges and universities have submitted since the accountability process was revised in 2000, and it represents two-thirds of the way to the year in which institutions are expected to meet their established benchmarks (2006). The extent to which the public campuses have been successful at achieving their goals is beginning to emerge. The Commission continues to make specific assessments about the performance of individual campuses on measures and objectives. Institutions are asked to address lack of progress or to continue to monitor their situation. The questions raised by the Commission and the responses of the colleges and universities appear later in this report. The campuses' answers consisted of an explanation of their performance and/or a description of corrective actions that have been taken or are planned. Most institutions gave responses even when reporting was optional. This year's assessment will continue the practice of making sector-level analyses of objectives and measures where trends in the data suggest difficulties.

Consistency has been achieved in the indicators used by the community colleges and the objectives by the public four-year institutions, which is a reassuring development considering the maturity of the process. In the past year, there were no changes in the "mission/mandate driven" measures on which the community colleges are evaluated and very few in the objectives submitted by the four-year campuses for accountability and MFR purposes. The use of common templates by the two- and four-year institutions for recording performance measure data and agreement on a standard format for narrative information contributed substantially to the ease of the process for all parties. Overall, accountability reporting in the State has proceeded efficiently, thanks largely to the cooperation of the campuses, Maryland Association for Community Colleges, and the USM Office. All signs indicate that this strong collaboration will continue in the future.

These are the major conclusions that emerged from this year's accountability process:

### Community Colleges

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were exceedingly good. In general, the quality of the reports was uniformly high across the two-year sector.**

Each college prepared a complete report and followed the prescribed format. The most important part of the report was the institutional assessment section in which campuses discussed the trends in the past four years on the performance indicators and their progress toward their benchmarks. Nearly all institutions provided detailed and frank analyses of how well their colleges had done in each of the "mission/mandate" driven areas, with many integrating information about academic and financial trends at their institutions. The colleges responded to the questions raised by the Commission regarding

their performance on certain indicators, and they cited actions they have taken to achieve the benchmarks they set for their measures. Finally, the community colleges provided extensive descriptions of the ways in which they are serving their communities.

**Although the community colleges are performing well on most indicators as measured by the data, trends in several areas raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring. These include recruitment of minority faculty and staff, transfer and graduation patterns (especially for minorities), licensure exam passing rates, and the enrollment of noncredit students.**

#### Minority Faculty and Staff

Racial diversity among full-time faculty and administrative/professional staff continues to be an area of attention for Maryland community colleges, as it has in previous accountability reports. There are encouraging signs. Many two-year institutions have demonstrated progress in the past year toward their benchmarks in this area. Several noted that the addition of just a few employees would enable them to reach their benchmark, and others observed that they recently made progress by hiring additional minority faculty and managerial staff. Other campuses, however, have been less successful and remain considerably short of their goals. Among the factors that had thwarted efforts to attract minority candidates were the impact of budgetary constraints on new hiring, stiff competition for minority scholars and professionals, a limited number of qualified minority applicants in the college's geographical area, the lack of competitive salaries, and the small number of vacancies due to low turnover at their institution.

Nearly all of the institutions indicated that they continue their efforts to include minorities in the interview pool for positions and ensure non discrimination in hiring. Many of the institutions described proactive techniques that they have employed to expand the recruitment of minority faculty and staff.

Among the actions were expanded advertising and greater distribution of job announcements, links with minority communities, search committee efforts, and human resource department actions. Specific examples included the placement of notices in national and minority publications, the inclusion of minorities on search committees, diversity training for search committee members and human resources staff, attendance at job fairs at historically black colleges and universities, mailings to minority contacts, development of ties with minority organizations, and academic department minority hiring plans. Institutions also pointed to initiatives they described in their *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

#### Transfer and Graduation Rates

The four-year transfer and graduation rate of full-time community college students has been repeatedly flagged in past accountability reports. The four-year rate of new full-time community college students was 32.2 percent in the most recent cohort – an increase

of one percentage point over the previous cohort but considerably below the levels of 10 years ago.

In order to provide a more comprehensive view of their performance, the community colleges added another indicator: "six-year transfer/graduation rate of all students." In addition, community colleges have the option of reporting this information for students who had enrolled at a Maryland independent or an out-of-state institution, based on campus-generated figures. The Commission is currently able to track students only within the public higher education sectors. However, the six-year graduation/transfer rate statistics have proved to be lower than many two-year institutions had expected. In addition, only Anne Arundel Community College provided information about transfer rates for other than Maryland public campuses in the past two reports. Anne Arundel reported that the inclusion of transfers from Maryland independent and out-of-state institutions improved the four-year rate of full-time students by 6.6 percent in each of the last two cohorts. Several other community colleges indicated that they planned to supply this information in future reports.

Further, transfer and graduation rates provide important, but narrowly defined, measures of success at community colleges. In recent years, community colleges have expanded their missions, enrolling increasing numbers of students with goals other than earning a credential or transferring. Thus, these rates do not capture the full range of student outcomes at two-year institutions. Conversations continue between the Commission and the two-year institutions about the best way to report entry goals of community college students at matriculation. All community colleges currently collect this type of data about new students.

Many colleges described actions that they had initiated to improve transfer and graduation rates. These included changes in staffing, the introduction and enhancement of student support programs, instructional interventions, curricula changes, articulation efforts and expanded data collection. Specific examples include learning community projects to help at-risk students, expanded academic advising and personal counseling, enhanced tutorial services, transfer information counseling, exploration of a mechanism for tracking transfer students outside of public higher education in Maryland, academic monitoring of students with deficiencies, the creation of student development and English as a Second Language courses, faculty and staff training in academic advising, revised general education programs in math and English, creation of an academic advising manual and web page, teaching of academic success skills, intervention programs at new student orientation and throughout the freshman year experience, and establishment of an online retention system.

Both the four- and six-year graduation and transfer rates of minority students represent even a greater accountability issue for the community colleges than for all undergraduates, and this subject has been raised repeatedly in previous reports with respect to all minorities and to African-Americans in specific. The graduation and transfer rate of minority students, both after four and six years, has continually and substantially lagged that of other students. However, there are preliminary grounds for



optimism. The rate for African American students in the most recent cohort rose by almost a full percentage point to 19.2 percent, the highest level since 1991.

Several institutions described steps that they have taken to increase the graduation and transfer rate of minorities beyond those that have been implemented for all students. These included the re-establishment of a task force on the recruitment and retention of African-American men, a "closing the gap" project aimed at eliminating the difference between the achievement of African-Americans and whites, minority mentors, and prejudice reduction seminars. Many campuses also pointed to initiatives that they described in their *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

### Licensure Exam Pass Rates

All but one community college established benchmarks for the success of their graduates on licensure examinations related to medical and health services programs at their institution. At six campuses, the passing rate on certain tests lagged behind the campus goal. These results are important, because they affect the number of individuals who qualify for jobs in high demand occupations. In a number of cases, colleges reported that scores on subsequent exams had enabled them to meet their benchmark. Several campuses offered explanations for their current level of performance including a toughening of exam questions to reflect tightened occupational credentials, fluctuations caused by a small number of test-takers, the impact of a drop in departmental grading scales on student preparation, changes in instructional staff, lower program admissions standards, and delays in test-taking. Institutions described actions that they were taking to improve the passing rate, such as discussions with licensure exam administrators regarding the best methods to prepare students, encouragement to graduates to take tests promptly after graduation, training for faculty, student internships, development of a study guide, curriculum evaluation and revision, and tightening of program admissions and grading standards.

### Enrollment of Noncredit Students

Noncredit, continuing education enrollments constitute a sizable portion of the clientele of community colleges. The numbers of these students, which can fluctuate widely and are sensitive to the economy, did not keep pace between 2002 and 2003 with credit enrollments at most of Maryland's two-year institutions. While the number of students enrolled in credit courses rose by more than 2,600 or by 2.3 percent, state-eligible noncredit full-time equivalent enrollments fell by over 600 or by 2.9 percent. Noncredit enrollments experienced a one-year decline at seven of the 16 community colleges, including two of the largest (Anne Arundel Community College and Community College of Baltimore County). Campuses tied the drop in noncredit enrollments to their fiscal situation, noting that training contracts with employers and hours at extension sites have had to be reduced due to institutional budget cuts.

**Maryland community colleges are engaged in an extensive variety of impact and outreach efforts in their respective service areas:**

Community colleges were asked by the staff of the General Assembly to prepare a narrative in their accountability report about the manner in which they are serving their communities. All of the colleges described these activities in considerable detail and demonstrated the depth and breadth of their commitment to serving the citizens and employers of their jurisdictions. The community college outreach efforts can be organized into three categories: economic and workforce development activities, public school partnerships, and community partnerships. Examples of each of these:

Economic and Workforce Development Activities

- Allegany College of Maryland participated in a Workforce Development Summit effort to create a government to business resource guide, web site and workshop to connect local firms to government and educational resources.
- Baltimore City Community College worked with area health care organizations to determine the industry's employee needs and to help meet them by enhancing its allied health programs and expanding workforce training.
- Community College of Baltimore County won a \$3 million grant to develop a Maryland Center for Manufacturing Educational Excellence that will increase the number of manufacturing technicians.
- The Miller Small Business Resource Center at Carroll Community College expanded to serve entrepreneurs and small business owners with individual assistance and group seminars.
- Cecil Community College's Job Start program provides pre-employment and life skills workshops and services, including individual and group counseling, van transportation, employment follow-up, and out-of-product expenses.
- The Entrepreneur and Leadership Center at College of Southern Maryland offers programs and services with an emphasis on developing more technology-competitive businesses.
- The Technical Innovation Center at Hagerstown Community College fosters the growth of new businesses by providing access and advanced technologies, business development resources, and collaborative opportunities.
- Harford Community College has partnered with the Harford County Electrical Contractor Association for over 10 years to offer a four-year electrical apprenticeship program.
- Montgomery College's workforce development/continuing education unit has the largest apprenticeship program in Maryland with 562 registered apprentices in the areas of air conditioning contracting, electrical contracting, and steamfitters and pipe fitters.

### Public School Partnerships

- Community College of Baltimore County won national recognition for its College Readiness Program, a partnership with Baltimore County Public Schools and The College Board to impact the preparedness of high school students who are below the top 20 percent in class standing and who are behind in the skills needed for postsecondary education.
- Through Chesapeake College's Dual Enrollment Program, area high school and home-schooled students can earn college credits at its Wye Mills campus, the Cambridge Center, the Center for Allied Health in Easton, or at their school.
- Garrett College partnered with the Garrett County Board of Education on a grant program that uses adventure recreation as an intervention tool for hard-to-control junior high school youth.
- The Student Leadership Hagerstown Program at Hagerstown Community College brings students leaders from high school in contact with college counterparts for the purpose of providing a smooth transition into higher education.
- Howard Community College and Howard County Public Schools have co-sponsored a career information series, providing high school students with hands-on exercises, speakers, campus tours, and workshops.
- Montgomery College's Academy of Finance, a nationally-recognized program, allows high school students who attend three Montgomery County public schools to take finance-related courses at their schools that are transferable for college credit.
- Prince George's Community College's annual career fair for senior high school students drew approximately 1,300 participants.
- Wor-Wic Community College has a partnership with area businesses and the boards of education in Wicomico, Worcester and Somerset counties to provide technical skill-building courses in the local public high schools.

### Community Partnerships

- Allegany College of Maryland is collaborating with Americorps and the Allegany County Volunteer Center on a web site to enhance recruitment of student volunteers for community work.
- Anne Arundel Community College enrolls 2,217 county residents in its Kids in College and Gifted and Talented programs for county youth.
- Baltimore City Community College's adult and community education programs are the largest literacy providers in Baltimore City. More than 300 free pre-GED, GED, English as a Second Language, and youth empowerment courses are offered at 88 sites.
- Carroll Community College formed a collaborative effort with Carroll County law enforcement agencies to provide professional development to law enforcement personnel serving municipalities and college campuses.

- The “Kids in Kollege” summer camp sponsored by Cecil Community College provides 100 children each week with four weeks of classes focusing on the development of creative thinking, teamwork and hands-on experience.
- The Office of Adult Services at Frederick Community College and the Housing Authority of the City of Frederick continue their partnership, Project ALIVE, to assist families who reside in public housing to achieve educational and employment goals leading to self-sufficiency.
- Garrett College collaborated with the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services to develop Jump Start, a program intended to reduce recidivism among youthful offenders.
- Howard Community College, in conjunction with Howard County Public Schools and Maryland Humanities Council, hosted a series of educational events to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

### Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities

**The accountability reports submitted by the public four-year colleges and universities, while generally satisfactory, varied widely in the amount and quality of the detail and analysis provided in their institutional assessment. Readers can observe these differences in Vol. 2 of the report.**

Most reports included all the required components: a short mission statement; goals and/or objectives in all of the general areas of accountability and on the specific subjects of retention and graduation, minority enrollment and achievement, and postsecondary student outcomes; an institutional assessment; four-years of trend data for performance measures that reflect each objective; responses to Commission questions about performance on specific objectives; and cost containment information.

Exceptional reports were prepared by University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Maryland College Park, and University of Maryland University College. These reports serve as models for other public four-year institutions.

Goals and objectives related to diversity continue to be absent from the submission of University of Maryland Baltimore in spite of concerns expressed last year by Commissioners. UMB, which has a good record in the area of minority student recruitment, has made the following argument:

“The legal landscape of admissions decision-making is not settled for UMB or generally. The Supreme Court has held that racial quotas in admissions are not legal, even though race can be a factor in decision-making directed to attaining a student body with sufficient diversity to meet educational objectives. Currently, benchmarks and percentage-based measures are highly questionable.”

No other public four-year institution shares UMB's position. Moreover, UMB prevailed in every aspect of the lawsuit that prompted the University to adopt this stance in the first place.

For the past two years, Morgan State University's report did not address a question posed by the Commission staff related to the number of partnerships with Baltimore City schools.

**The public four-year colleges and universities appear to be progressing well toward their objectives in most cases. However, there are a few areas in which at least some institutions seem to be having difficulty: graduates in critical workforce shortage areas, fundraising, and facility renewal.**

Unlike the community colleges, which have standardized indicators, the four-year institutions have much more flexibility to set individualized goals, objectives and performance measures. Therefore, generalizations are not as easy to make as with the two-year colleges. However, these are the category of objectives in which the largest number of campuses appear to be lagging in attainment. All of these have been cited in previous accountability reports.

#### Number of Graduates in Critical Workforce Shortage Areas

The imbalance between the supply of and demand for teachers and nurses is perhaps the most acute of all occupational fields in Maryland and nationwide. The Maryland State Department of Education estimates that school systems will need to hire 12,000 new teachers by 2006. However, the number of teacher candidates prepared by Maryland colleges and universities dropped from 2,653 in 1998-1999 to 2,319 in 2002-2003. Occupational projections prepared by the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation forecast nearly 15,000 openings for registered nurses in Maryland through 2010. The number of new nurses currently produced by colleges and universities in the State will not satisfy this demand, and alternative sources may not prove to be adequate.

All of the four-year institutions which offer programs in teacher preparation and/or nursing have accountability objectives measuring their performance in contributing to the supply of these professionals. Seven institutions were identified in the current report as facing a challenge to meet their goals related to producing greater numbers of teachers and nurses:

Bowie:

- A 75 percent pass rate on all three categories of Praxis I by 2004
- An increase in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded in nursing from 34 to 46 by 2004.

Frostburg:

- An increase in the number of teacher education graduates employed in Maryland public schools from 109 to 120 by 2005.
- An annual increase in the number of completers from the undergraduate teacher program from 142 to 150 in 2005.

Salisbury:

- An increase in the estimated number of nursing graduates employed as nurses in Maryland from 36 to 43 in 2004.

Towson:

- An increase in the estimated number of graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland from 54 to 65 in 2004.
- An increase in the number of graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 420 to 475 in 2004.

UMBC:

- An increase in the number of graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 74 to 115 in 2004.

UMES:

- An increase in the passing rate on the Praxis II from 59 to 80 percent in 2004.

Morgan:

- An increase in the number of partnerships with Baltimore City public schools from 25 to 50 by 2005.

Each university offered an different perspective on its performance in its institutional assessment. With respect to the Praxis I, Bowie noted that the pass rate in the most recent year showed progress in all three categories of the test and expressed optimism that its objective would be met. With regard to the number of undergraduate degrees in nursing, Bowie observed in last year's accountability report that enrollment in its nursing program had increased 85 percent since the department began a generic program allowing the admission of students without previous nursing training. However, this has not seemed to stem the decline in the number of graduates.

Frostburg commented that, despite a steady increase in its teacher preparation enrollments during the past few years, the introduction of the Masters of Arts in Teaching degree option has given candidates an alternative path to certification and reduced the number who would have entered and completed its undergraduate teacher program. Frostburg believed that the large percentage (85 percent) of its interns who were placed in a Maryland Professional Development School in 2004 would encourage more graduates to seek teaching positions in Maryland public schools. Frostburg also

cited the impact of the Maryland Teacher Scholarship, but no new applications are being accepted for this award.

Salisbury noted that enrollments in its undergraduate nursing program had surged to record levels as a result of the completion of two buildings, and it predicted that the number of graduates (and those obtaining employment in the field) would rise accordingly. However, Salisbury cautioned that its nursing graduates respond to job openings across the region, and that Maryland's communities and health care facilities must be personally attractive and financially competitive to recruit them.

Towson expressed optimism that the employment of its nursing graduates in Maryland would rise in the future because of increases in the capacity of the nursing program. Towson also reported that the nursing faculty have taken initiatives to try to increase the pass rate of graduates on the nursing licensing examination. This includes changes in the criteria for admission to the program and research into ways to channel additional support and preparation to vulnerable students. With respect to the placement of teacher preparation graduates in Maryland public schools, Towson noted in last year's institutional accountability report that enrollment in these programs were rising and that the University offered special scholarships to attract and retain students. Nonetheless, Towson remains far from its objective.

UMBC linked the decline in the number of its graduates hired by Maryland public schools to several factors: the elimination of its Urban Teacher Education Program which had attracted many new students to the University, a higher academic standard for entry into internships than is required by many other institutions, the attraction of alternatives such as the resident teacher certification program, and the termination of the Maryland Teacher Scholarship Program.

UMES has changed its policy and now requires all students entering teacher education, regardless of the date of matriculation, to pass Praxis I and to pass Praxis II prior to beginning their internship. Previously, only those students who entered after fall 2000 had to meet this obligation. UMES predicted that the pass rates of its students on the Praxis exams will increase as a result of this action.

As mentioned above, Morgan's institutional accountability reports in each of the past two years have not addressed the Commission's questions regarding its objective to increase the number of partnerships it has with Baltimore City schools. While the number of these partnerships has risen from 30 to 41 during the past five years, Morgan remains short of its goal.

#### Fundraising from Outside Sources

Several campuses have continued to make little progress toward or have remained far from their objectives with respect to funds raised in annual private giving. These institutions generally remained committed to their benchmarks. Fundraising struggles

were tied to the lingering softness in the national economy and a corresponding decline in private philanthropy.

### Facility Renewal

Many colleges and universities continued to lag considerably behind their objective on the proportion of funds allocated to facility renewal at their institutions. The campuses expressed concern that they were falling behind in investments in infrastructure but indicated that these funds had to be diverted to cover other expenses in the face of the State budget cuts and current fiscal realities and priorities. The objective was deemed not achievable given these circumstances.

### Cost Containment – All Public Colleges and Universities

**Reporting on cost containment and internal reallocation activities was comprehensive and detailed at nearly all institutions.**

The public institutions were asked to report on significant cost containment actions adopted by the campus and the level of resources saved. Campuses were instructed that the information on cost containment had to include “detailed ways in which the institution has reduced waste, improved the overall efficiency of their operations, and achieved cost savings.” Dollars amounts had to be attached to each specific effort. Examples were provided to demonstrate the type of reporting desired by the Commission staff.

Because of the interest in cost containment activities by members of the Commission and by legislators and their staff, a summary of the institutions’ endeavors in this area is included in this report. Outlined were specific cost containment actions taken by each of the campuses of University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, St. Mary’s College of Maryland, and all 16 community colleges.

The cost containment reporting in the current accountability cycle was commendable. All but one institution provided detailed descriptions and specific dollar amounts associated with their cost containment and internal reallocation activities. Hagerstown Community College was the only campus not to attach specific dollar amounts to its cost containment examples. **Cost containment efforts by Maryland’s public colleges and universities saved a total of \$92.0 million in FY 2004.** The cost containment activities can be categorized into five areas:

- Savings related to *staffing*, such as reductions in positions, a delay or freeze in filling job openings, employee furloughs, cuts in cost-of-living and merit raises, the hiring of part-time faculty for vacancies in full-time faculty, greater use of adjunct



faculty, reductions in the cost of employee health insurance, restrictions on travel expenses, cuts in staff development and training, and credit card initiatives.

- Reductions in *overhead*, through such efforts as energy management and conservation programs, cuts in utility expenditures, administrative reorganization, deferred equipment and vehicle purchases and facility improvements, the use of web capabilities and other technologies to reduce printing and mailing expenses, cuts in membership dues and publication subscriptions, and facilities efficiencies.
- *Transferal of expenses* by means of the use of in-house resources and staff rather than contractors, selected outsourcing of services when economical, partnerships with private companies, collaborative agreements with other collegiate institutions, reliance on pro-bono help and in-kind donations of technology, and the securing of grants to fund faculty positions,
- The encouragement of *competition*, including aggressive contracting and bidding and participation in statewide contracts to purchase computer equipment and other merchandise at discount.
- *Program savings*, including program and office eliminations, course cutbacks (cancellations, reductions in sections and increases in class size), the discontinuation of some special events, and the use of distance learning technologies.



**COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES**



## **COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

### **Allegheny College of Maryland**

Cost containment initiatives adopted by Allegheny College of Maryland included budget reduction for supplies, materials, and travel.

The College reduced costs by changing to a health self-insurance plan with a third-party administrator, converting to dental self-insurance for FY 2005, increasing deductibles and removing coverage for physical damage for vehicles five years or older, controlling telecommunication costs by implementing several cost saving measures, and utilizing State contracts in the acquisition of new copiers for its satellite centers. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$350,709.

### **Anne Arundel Community College**

The College initiated several cost saving strategies: contract savings for equipment, extension of the PC replacement cycle, negotiated positions savings, renegotiated procurement contract, lapsing positions as a strategy, AV equipment contract negotiations, supplies contracts renegotiations and cuts, travel contracts and cuts, energy contract consortium savings, and power plant efficiencies. In FY 2004, the College saved \$5,075,247 through cost saving initiatives.

### **Baltimore City Community College**

Baltimore City Community College saved \$2,903,500 by reducing waste and improving efficiency. BCCC reduced waste by reinvigorating a recycling program, increasing the number of distance learning courses, combining the mailing of brochures and promotional materials, and reducing printing costs by simplifying and consolidating printed materials and brochures. Improved efficiency was achieved by using in-house resources rather than outside consultants in a number of cases: adopting a new web site, expanding in-house professional development and continuing education for faculty and staff thereby reducing travel and conference costs, terminating one of three preventive maintenance (PM) contracts and transferring some PM activities in-house, conducting about 70 percent of corrective maintenance in-house, reducing the number of PM paint contract jobs by 90 percent, reducing contracting of major plumbing repairs by 40 percent, conducting in house selected major construction projects such as Kiddie Kollege and the Dietetic Lab Upgrade, conducting physical inventory in-house with some contractual staff assistance, hiring in-house architect as project engineer, and conducting minor design projects in-house.

### **Carroll Community College**

Carroll Community College controls or avoids costs by using adjunct faculty to respond to enrollment growth, maintaining a contract with Carroll County government for building and grounds maintenance, receiving rebates from Baltimore Gas and Electric for thermal storage facility, using the Maryland State Collection Agency to collect receivables deemed uncollectable by the College, using college staff rather than a contractor to run network and phone lines, awarding college employees half the normal merit increment rather than full increment and providing no cost-of-living increase, outsourcing cafeteria services at no cost to the college, and purchasing technology and development of software jointly with other institutions of higher education. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$1,026,000.

### **Cecil Community College**

In FY 2004, Cecil implemented \$203,000 of cost saving by reducing part-time staff hours, eliminating positions, reducing positions, eliminating of non-essential events, and canceling Maryland On-Line Service.

### **Chesapeake College**

Significant cost containment actions adopted by Chesapeake College in FY 2004 included reduction in adjunct faculty costs, use of technology in support of efficient and cost effective operations through its online student information system, and the use of the institution website rather than a traditional mailing to display the fall 2004 credit course schedule. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$56,000.

### **Community College of Baltimore County**

The cost containment and revenue enhancement measures included a hiring freeze, reduction in conferences and meetings budgets, and major changes to the organizational structure by combining the presidents' offices at Essex and Dundalk. This resulted in improved coordination of class schedules, student services and departmental activities between the two campuses. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$700,000.

### **Frederick Community College**

Significant cost containment or re-allocation actions adopted by Frederick Community College in FY 2004 included reduction of hourly staffing costs, delayed hiring, operation expense reductions in support of funding cuts, and a hiring freeze. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$301,621.

### **Garrett College**

Significant cost containment actions adopted by Garrett College in FY 2004 included reducing general contracted services, retiree benefits, bad debt, interest expenses, professional development, Quality of Work Life budget, Business/Technology adjuncts, and individual discretionary accounts. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$142,000.

### **Hagerstown Community College**

Hagerstown Community College did not identify specific cost containment activities nor did it provide dollar amounts saved. The College gave examples of reallocation and reorganization as a result of its planning process, including the consolidation of the services of the Job Training Institute into one office and staff and the centralization of some office support services into single vendor contracts.

### **Harford Community College**

The ways in which Harford Community College reduced waste, improved the overall efficiency of their operations and achieved cost savings in FY 2004 include competitive bids for ground maintenance, continued outsourcing of the College's security operations/staff, the employment of part-time hourly staff to replace full-time vacancies, closing buildings and operations over three-day weekends throughout the year, and the hiring of visiting professors for non tenure-track faculty positions. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$125,000.

### **Howard Community College**

The initiatives adopted by the College in FY 2004 include reductions in furniture and equipment, budget reductions for professional development and travel, elimination of positions, reduction in contracted services, and reduction in dues and subscription budgets. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$515,700.

### **Montgomery College**

Montgomery College adopted a number of initiatives to contain costs in FY 2004. The College has delayed hiring essential replacement personnel, cut college-wide printing costs, placed all publications through an aggressive bid process, continued to move documents to a web format, made all financial aid application materials available on the web reducing printing and mailing costs, created partnerships, purchased software and PCS through a statewide contract, purchased over 4,000 software licenses this year at educational pricing rates, received discounts with the College's primary hardware PC vendor, continued to expand its outreach efforts to the business community by expanding its procurement web services, and negotiated additional services from the

College's distance learning provider. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$4,165,000.

### **Prince George's Community College**

Cost containment initiatives include reorganization of accounting areas, continued use of grant funding to fund faculty positions, and limited hiring in all areas. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$605,000.

### **College of Southern Maryland**

The significant cost containment actions adopted by the institution in FY 2004 focused on using internal resources rather than outside consultants. These included coordinating office moves and renovations for the College through its Physical Plant Department in lieu of an outside contractor, preparing an indirect cost rate proposal for the institution internally rather than using an accounting firm, using a contracted programmer rather than purchasing an off-the-shelf product, conducting the College's Facilities Survey in-house instead of utilizing a contractor, and utilizing in-house staff for the fiscal year 2004 snow/ice removal instead of using a contractor. The College also engaged in competitive bidding and accepted donations of software. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$547,995.

### **Wor-Wic Community College**

During FY 2004, cost containment measures implemented include delayed lease/purchase of copier to piggyback onto a Montgomery County re-negotiated contract, deferred replacement of one vehicle in the motor pool, elimination of nine faculty positions from the budget, the placement of auditing services out on bid instead of automatic renewal of the current auditor, cancellation of an order for new classroom chairs, changes to the medical plan for employees, and the use of a State contract for the first time to purchase office supplies. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$496,367.

## **PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

### **Bowie State University**

Bowie State University cost containment initiatives include delayed hiring; competitive contracting; use of internal services and resources in lieu of outside contractors and resources, such as in-house printing, in-house architectural staff, and use of on-line media for printing and circulation of campus telephone directory; increased class sizes for the majority of the courses in the Department of Business, selected courses in Social Work and Sociology, and all sections of the general education courses for entering freshmen in the fall; and use of online placement testing which eliminates the need to hire readers to evaluate student performance. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$3,482,000.

### **Coppin State University**

Specific cost containment initiatives taken by Coppin State University include human resources reductions, furlough of employees, and reduction in advertising and publication costs. The University has used statewide contracts as a vehicle to reduce costs where appropriate. An example of this type of purchase would be the Microsoft software and McAfee Antivirus software purchases. The current USM system wide Cedar consulting agreement has saved the institution a sizable amount in the costs of implementation of the PeopleSoft integrated system. The initiatives above resulted in a FY 2004 savings of \$1,359,048.

### **Frostburg State University**

Frostburg State University engaged in a number of initiatives including elimination of positions, a hiring freeze, delayed hiring of essential personnel, reduction in contractual support staff, merger of housekeeping staff from three shifts to one, purchase of its own telephone switch, reduction of the number of course sections, reduction in the number of part-time faculty, and reduction of operating expenditures across all divisions.

Frostburg has increased efforts to generate revenue through the use of its facilities during non-peak times. The University has partnered with the community allowing for the use of the University's debit card at local businesses. The University engages in collaborative partnerships with local, state, and federal agencies, as well as other USM institutions, in order to bring programs to the campus that would otherwise not be affordable.

These initiatives have resulted in a savings of \$2,722,000.



## **Salisbury University**

Savings and cost containment efforts for FY 2004 include continued collaboration with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore on two dual degree programs, use of multi-functioning machines, reduction of paper usage and office time through the use of one-card for inter-department paper, continued use of total energy management system, implementation of call-in maintenance service requests, a hiring freeze and delays, and use of web-time sheets. These cost containment initiatives resulted in savings of \$2,724,094.

## **Towson University**

The following actions were taken to contain costs and provide greater efficiency in operations for FY 2004: 26 state-supported positions were eliminated; contingent positions were not renewed; motor vehicle replacement was cancelled; travel budgets were reduced; interactive voice response lines were replaced with web applications; campus publications, advertising and postage were reduced; and land and structure expenditures were reduced.

Towson University has continued to examine its business processes to achieve greater efficiencies. This year, services were reduced in the Administration Building Postal Center and reusable boxes for campus moves were purchased. The campus Office of Technology Support was reorganized to provide decentralized support and staff positions were distributed across campus.

Efficiencies were gained through the consolidating or canceling class sections with low enrollment, expanding the use of technology of web-based timesheets to students and contingent staff, placing on line the Employee's Safety Handbook and implementing electronic sign up for safety classes, eliminating disposal costs by working with the Department of Energy to take ownership of radioactive materials, and collaborating with other academic institutions for a paper contract. Savings were also achieved through the procurement of a new long-distance telecommunications contract.

These initiatives result in a total savings of \$7,188,000.

## **University of Baltimore**

University of Baltimore has achieved cost savings through budget reductions, credit card availability, effectiveness and efficiency initiatives, and outsourcing. Savings were realized through the reassignment of staff and realignment of responsibilities. The elimination of 28.5 full-time state supported positions resulted in savings of their associated salary and fringe benefits. The utilization of credit cards for small

purchases, reduced course offerings in the Business School, and the outsourcing of copier contracts resulted in additional cost savings.

Revenue enhancements include pouring rights competitive contract directed to student support services; ground rents for athletic field use by area schools, conferences, and the golf driving range; partnership for parking services; and rent from properties owned by the University.

Strategic reallocations were implemented for funds for academic facilities renewal, the enhancement of Information Technology initiatives and PeopleSoft implementation, sabbatical and buyout savings to new and existing programs, and partnering with Collegis to deliver distance learning.

University of Baltimore achieved savings in FY2004 totaling \$5,426,000.

### **University of Maryland, Baltimore**

University of Maryland Baltimore cut expenses in virtually every school and unit. These cuts typically involved elimination of positions for managerial and support staff as these became vacant with resultant rearrangement of duties, targeted savings in utilities and other operating expenses, cutbacks in library and information technology expenditures, layoffs in certain administrative areas both centrally and in the schools, and departmental reorganizations to improve efficiency and reduce overhead.

These initiatives result in a total savings of approximately \$5,639,000.

### **University of Maryland Baltimore County**

Initiatives taken to contain or avoid costs included reduction in positions, reduced spending for part-time salaries, development of partnerships, reallocation of existing student services staff and operating budget to support campus academic initiatives, phase out of an existing graduate program, combined services and utilized funding from outside sources, and applied technology in marketing Professional and Special Programs.

The cost cutting actions and cost avoidance activities resulted in \$6.3 million in savings. Many of the initiatives also resulted in new revenue sources of tuition and sponsored funding for UMBC.

### **University of Maryland, College Park**

The University achieved efficiencies through better business practices, consolidation and technology.

Examples of results through improved business practices: a negotiated discount on moving contracts, sale of the marketing rights on an athletic facility, privatization of the bookstore, indirect cost recoveries from increased contract and grant activity, avoidance of debt costs on student residential housing through the use of public-private partnerships, generated lease revenues on student residential housing, streamlined facilities management operations through the elimination of 25 positions (18 through lay-offs) and reduction of operating budget, and purchase of surplus items versus new items.

By combining operations providing similar services, UMCP achieved economies of scale and streamlined operations by eliminating the office of Commuter Affairs and distributed services among several other departments, adjusted dining service hours of operations and locations, and consolidated graduate and undergraduate applications processing functions.

Improved use of technology resources lowered utility costs; implemented improved anti-virus protection; and achieved savings in the Office of Information Technology through the reduction of five positions, delays in filling 12 vacancies, and cuts in operations.

The cost containment initiatives resulted in savings of \$30,225,772.

### **University of Maryland Eastern Shore**

The University of Maryland Eastern Shore implemented several cost saving efforts in FY 2004. At the onset of the year, the University strategically deferred maintenance on facilities, reduced staff, delayed hiring, restricted spending, and sought partnerships with other entities that would allow continued and sustained growth and infrastructure expansion. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$2,085,000.

### **University of Maryland University College**

UMUC provided illustrations of the approach it is taking to increasing efficiency, building capacity and improving quality independent of additional State resources: applying technology to the University's processes through the building of a Student Financial Aid Self-Help Web site and consolidating enrollment management and advising functions; achieving better use of university faculty by contracting nine-month teaching full-time faculty; outsourcing appropriate functions by expanding the library help desk to 24/7; focusing clearly on the University's core mission by closing residential campuses in Schwäbisch Gmünd and Mannheim, closing the Head Start program, closing Learning Market Place, and downsizing the office of Institutional Advancement; and expanding alternative revenue sources by expanding the Inn and Conference Center and growing out of state online enrollments.

Current year savings: \$4,015,000.

**Morgan State University**

Initiatives included abolition of positions, furlough days, reduction in contractual employees expenditures, a hiring freeze, operating reductions, reduced travel and training, transportation program, and frozen vehicle purchases. These cost containment initiatives resulted in savings of \$3,339,577.

**St. Mary's College of Maryland**

St. Mary's College of Maryland implemented cost containment initiatives including purchase of used rather than new trucks and a snow plow, use of in-house resources for construction and conversion rather than an outside contractor, and reduction of credit card fees. The cost containment initiatives resulted in savings of \$290,000.





**TARGETED INDICATORS  
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES**



**TARGETED INDICATORS AND CAMPUS RESPONSES  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

**ALLEGANY COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**

**Explanation Required**

*Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 7,479. But enrollments of noncredit students fell from 7,442 to 6,268 in the past year.

**Campus response:** Noncredit enrollment began to expand again after a one year decline.

*Percent of Students Transferring to Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of Allegany transfer program students who transferred to a Maryland public four-year institution fell to 13.2 percent in the most recent cohort – the lowest in the past four and far short of its benchmark of 22 percent.

**Campus response:** The percent of students transferring to Maryland public four-year institutions recovered from a steep decline the previous year but remained slightly below its benchmark value. The College is piloting the use of the National Student Loan Data System to track transfers to out-of-state institutions and hopes to begin reporting this supplementary information in next year's report. A new performance accountability initiative by the Maryland Association of Community Colleges may result in the College further upgrading to the National Student Clearinghouse enrollment verification system for tracking transfer success. Since such an unusually large percentage of Allegany students reside outside of Maryland, they are more likely to transfer to out-of-state institutions as well.

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate – National MLT Registry*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 91 percent. But the percentage of these students who have passed the licensure exam has fallen from 100 percent to 71 percent in the past three years.

**Campus response:** Pass rates on this exam improved in the most recent year to 88 percent.



### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Respiratory Therapy*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 91 percent. But the percentage of respiratory therapy students who passed the certification exam was 73 percent in the most recent year and the lowest rate in the past four years.

**Campus response:** The respiratory therapy exam has undergone substantive changes. The credentials for respiratory therapists changed from Certified Respiratory Therapy Technician to Certified Respiratory Therapist and the accrediting body changed the matrix to include higher level questions. Therefore, the benchmark for this program may no longer be realistic and may need to be revised downward in the future.

### **Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 1 percent. But it has had no minority full-time administrative/professional staff in any of the last four years.

**Campus response:** Detailed descriptions of plans made by the College to enhance minority employment can be found in the 2003 report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission, *Campus Action Plan for Minority Achievement*.

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 33.2 percent. But the four-year graduation rate of full-time minority students fell from 44.5 percent to 27.2 percent in the past two cohorts.

**Campus response:** The College saw improvement on this indicator. Caution should be used in interpreting these figures, however, because of the relatively small number of students included in each cohort. The College continues to take a proactive stance toward minority academic achievement and graduation/transfer success. In the near future, the College will (a) introduce a new English as a Second Language course to improve international student retention and success, (b) hold seminars and training for staff, faculty and students on reducing prejudice to be conducted by the Southern Poverty Law Center, (c) upgrade a newly introduced "Friday After 5: Welcome Back for Students" with multiple activities in downtown Cumberland as a way to make non local students comfortable with their new residence, and (d) conduct a Community Awareness Day in which local agencies set up tables and booths at the College to introduce students to services available in the community.

*Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 28.3 percent. But the six-year graduation rate of all minority students has fallen from 35.6 percent to 21.6 percent in the past three cohorts.

**Campus response:** Same as for previous measure.

## ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Anne Arundel has trailed its benchmark of 22 percent in three of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** The six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students jumped from 17.1 percent reported last year to 25.4 percent for the 1997 cohort. This rate is an all time high for the college and above that of our peers and community college system average.

## BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** While enrollments in workforce development contract training courses at Baltimore City more than tripled to 9,984 between FY 1999 and FY 2001, the number fell to 7,847 in FY 2002 – far short of the college’s benchmark of 15,000.

**Campus response:** The number of participants in contract training increased by 22 percent to 9,609 in the most recent year.

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate -- Emergency Medical Services*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City’s benchmark is 75 percent, but just 25 percent of the graduates who took the exam passed it in the most recent year.

**Campus response:** The Emergency Medical Services rate increased to 50 percent in the most recent year. This represents one of two graduates who took the exam, with one of the graduate’s results still pending.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Students*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City’s benchmark is 18 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has been less than 14 percent during the past three cohorts.

**Campus response:** Improving student retention has been the College’s number 1 strategic priority for over 10 years and the College has many activities underway to address student retention. To ensure that our students have the assistance they need to succeed in the classroom, our student support services have undergone substantial changes. The academic advisement reform committee has engaged in a college-wide review of student academic advisement needs. Innovations scheduled for fall 2004 include expanded opportunities for faculty/staff academic advisement training, the development of a better academic advisement process which includes a new academic advisement manual, and the creation of an advisement web page that will provide a self-directed process, thereby facilitating more self-directed learning.

### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its students has declined steadily from 22.8 percent to 15.1 percent in the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** Same as for previous measure.

### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate of Baltimore City's full-time minority students has increased from 11.0 percent to 13.2 percent in the past three cohorts. However, the college remains considerably far from its benchmark of 18.0 percent.

**Campus response:** Major initiatives underway to enhance these students' success include enhanced support services, the re-establishment of the Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of African American Males, and the other retention initiatives described above.

### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students has steadily declined from 21.1 percent to 13.0 percent during the last four cohorts.

**Campus response:** Same as for previous measure.

### *Percent of Expenditures on Instruction*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 50 percent, but instruction made up just 40.1 percent of its total expenditures in FY 2002 and the College has not approached its goal in any of the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** The total dollar expenditure on instruction increased by \$900,000 from \$17.3 million in FY 2002 to \$18.2 million in FY 2003. The corresponding percentage expenditure on instruction in the operating budget increased from 40.1 percent in FY 2002 to 40.6 percent in FY 2003.

### *Percent Minorities of Full-time Faculty*

### *Percent Minorities of Full-time Administrative/Professional Staff*

**Commission assessment:** These indicators lacked benchmarks in the 2003 report. The College must adopt benchmarks for these measures or explain their absence.

**Campus response:** Baltimore City Community College recognizes the importance of these indicators and benchmarking processes. However, based on the advice of counsel, we will not be submitting benchmarks for these indicators. The nature of our service population and that of our student population make establishing benchmarks for these indicators inappropriate.

## CARROLL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Carroll's benchmark is 9,000. While the noncredit student enrollment at Carroll rose between FY 1999 and FY 2001, the numbers slipped to 7,405 in FY 2002.

**Campus response:** At the time the College set the goal of 9,000 noncredit students as its annual unduplicated headcount benchmark, enrollment had averaged less than 6,800. Thus the College challenged itself to increase noncredit headcount over 30 percent. The trend has been for increasing enrollment in continuing education, though headcount did dip slightly in FY 2002. Annual unduplicated noncredit headcount reached an all-time high of 8,158 in FY 2003. The College remains committed to meeting the benchmark in 2004-2005.

#### *Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Carroll's benchmark is 2,800, but senior adult enrollments in noncredit courses have fallen steadily in the past three fiscal years from 2,516 to 2,184.

**Campus response:** At the time the benchmark of 2,800 was established, enrollment of seniors in noncredit courses was averaging less than 2,400 per year. The College set a goal of increasing senior enrollment 16 percent. Expansion exceeding this was not considered, since Maryland senior citizens are exempt from tuition by state law. Enrollment of seniors in noncredit courses has declined since FY 2000, partly due to more emphasis being placed on other priorities and partly due to staff turnover in the position responsible for seniors programming. The expectation is that senior enrollment will grow and meet the benchmark in FY 2005.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

Carroll's benchmark is 5.0 percent, but it has had no full-time minority faculty in three of the past four years.

#### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

Carroll's benchmark is 30 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students fell to 7.7 percent in the most recent cohort.

## CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Students*

**Commission assessment:** Cecil's benchmark is 27.8 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has declined steadily in the past four cohorts from 31.5 percent to 22.9 percent.

**Campus response:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time students surpassed the rates for the three preceding years, rising from a low of 22.9 percent for the 1997 cohort to 29.3 percent for the 1999 cohort. Transfers to out-of-state four year institutions are not accounted for, but they constitute viable financial and programmatic options for Cecil student transfers. Students' success, expressed in terms of transfer/graduation rates, is a high priority for the College. Commitment to this priority has been demonstrated through the recent implementation of the online retention system for all students. Not only is the College tracking academic progress, individualized interventions are made available to students who are experiencing difficulty. Early indications show that these interventions are producing positive improvements on student performance.

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

**Commission assessment:** Cecil's benchmark is 7.5 percent, but the proportion of minorities among its full-time faculty has fallen steadily in the past four cohorts from 8.3 percent to 5.1 percent.

**Campus response:** In fall 2003, the College reversed the declining percent of minority full-time faculty. Due to retirement and other organizational restructuring at the College, some full-time faculty positions were filled, which included an African American. Thus, the percentage of minority full-time faculty increased from 5.1 percent in fall 2002 to 7.9 percent in fall 2003.



## CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 27 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time minority students dropped to 20 percent in the most recent cohort - the lowest in the past four.

**Campus response:** The 1999 cohort was much higher at 24 percent and only three percent shy of its benchmark. The College anticipates future cohorts to show higher rates of graduation and transfer with the introduction of its SAIL (Success and Interactive Learning) program, which provides first-time full-time students with opportunities for student enrichment and assistance throughout the academic year.

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate -- American Registry of Radiologic Tech*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 90 percent, but the passing rate on this exam dropped to 67 percent in FY 2002 from 100 percent in the previous two years.

**Campus response:** The FY 2002 rate included only three individuals, one of whom failed. The individual who failed subsequently re-tested and passed. It should also be noted that the FY 2003 rate was 100 percent.

## COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

### Explanation Required

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate - Veterinary Technology*

**Commission assessment:** CCBC's benchmark is 92 percent, but the passing rate of graduates on the veterinary technology exam has been 67 percent and 75 percent respectively in the past two fiscal years.

**Campus response:** For most of the licensure exams that CCBC provides in its performance accountability report, over 90 percent of the graduates pass these exams on their first attempt. The pass rate for the state exam for the Veterinarian Technician Board has, for the past several years, not been this high although the pass rate on the national exam has been in the 90 to 100 percent range each year. The CCBC Veterinarian Technician program director is currently working with the director of the Maryland State Veterinarian Board to discuss better ways to prepare students for the state technician exam. Under discussion are the development of a study guide for the test, improved test construction, and internships that would help students to prepare for the state exam.

## FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Frederick's benchmark is 9,357. While noncredit enrollment at the college rose between FY 1999 and FY 2001, it fell to 7,603 in FY 2002.

**Campus response:** In FY 2003, enrollment of noncredit students increased by 16 percent to 8,816 students. With the addition of many new courses of interest for the various continuing education programs, the College believes that the trend in increasing enrollment will continue.

#### *Percent Minority Student Enrollment*

**Commission assessment:** The proportion of minorities among Frederick's student body has fluctuated between 15 and 17 percent during the past four years. While these figures are above the minority composition in Frederick's service area population (11 percent), the college is shy of its benchmark of 19 percent.

**Campus response:** Frederick's minority student enrollment increased by 1 percent to 16 percent in FY 2003, still shy of its 19 percent benchmark. The College believes that this enrollment will continue to increase as the Hispanic population in Frederick County increases.

The College offers a number of programs aimed at strengthening the academic performance and retention of special populations. Students in two of these programs, Services for Students with Disabilities and the Multicultural Student Support Services (MSSS) program, have demonstrated retention rates that equal or exceed that of the general college population. Students participating in the Services for Students with Disabilities program demonstrated a 78 percent fall to spring retention rate during the FY 2003, while participants in the Multicultural Student Support Services program demonstrated an 80 percent fall to spring retention rate.

The Office of MSSS is designed to enhance the transition of minority students to higher education and provide support for those who choose to continue their education at Frederick. In the 2003 academic year, 64 students participated in the program and received mentoring. Three of them graduated and transferred and the other two transferred without earning a degree from Frederick.

The following are initiatives begun this year to increase diversity among students:

- Students can participate in the Black Student Union and International Students' Club as part of the Student Government Association.

- College employees participated in the Personal Assessment of the College Environment in October 2003. The results show that the College has a healthy, highly consultative environment. While pleased with these results, the College continues to look for ways to improve the climate. Minority scores were slightly lower, but still indicative of a highly consultative environment. The small number of persons of color surveyed requires great care in interpreting the results.
- Students were given a survey of campus climate and a survey of student engagement in spring 2004. Results are not yet back, but they will be used for continuous improvement and as baseline scores for the future.

Initiatives that the College continues in order to expand diversity on campus are:

- Diversity/multiculturalism is a performance indicator on the performance evaluation for administrators and support personnel.
- Diversity in the arts is presented in the musical lunch series, plays and art.
- The College offers a London Study Abroad program that provides an opportunity for Frederick students to study, live and work in London while experiencing cultural immersion and improving global awareness. Frederick also continues to encourage students to consider other study abroad opportunities. During International Education Week in November, Frederick brings representatives from Peace Corps, CIA, and the State Department to campus to discuss career opportunities.
- The College continues to network with minority communities.

### **Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

**Commission assessment:** Frederick's benchmark is 11 percent, but the proportion of minorities among its full-time faculty has not exceeded 8 percent during the past four years.

**Campus response:** Frederick continues to make efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and staff. The percentage of minorities in budgeted positions has increased from 8 percent to 11.2 percent in one year. Our county demographics reflect that approximately 12 percent of citizens are minority, but Frederick recruits nationally for most faculty positions and a few administration positions. Frederick continues to make efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and staff.

In addition to continually researching and utilizing minority recruitment sources, the College has moved to a web-based application system that has created a single, streamlined, documented procedure for all employee recruitment, application, and screening. The system provides the College with accurate and easily attainable figures on the diversity of the

applicant pool. A more diverse applicant pool should eventually lead to increased numbers of minorities hired.

The current diversity of the applicant pool is as follows for each of the groups listed:

- Adjunct faculty - 17 percent
- Benefited Faculty (4 positions) - 27 percent
- Benefited Administrators/Support - 19 percent
- Hourly - 18 percent
- Total - budgeted and hourly positions - 19 percent

The Human Resources Office recommends that all search committees include a person of color to put candidates at ease and demonstrate that FCC is an environment that welcomes candidates of color. The Diversity Director is a part of each faculty search committee and conveys the benefits of diversity to the committee as a participant in the process rather than as presenter in a professional development class. She has noted anecdotally there is considerable support among the faculty with whom she has served for increasing diversity.

The following are initiatives begun this year to increase diversity among faculty:

- The Office of Diversity has created an Internet site available to all staff and faculty offering a wide range of information such as: a multicultural calendar, articles on the benefits of diversity, diversity definitions, Diversity Committee information, and guidelines for completing the diversity portion of the performance evaluation.

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Frederick's benchmark is 41 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students has not exceeded 31 percent in any of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** Frederick has seen a 13 percentage point increase in the four year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students from the 1996 cohort (19 percent) to the 1999 cohort (32 percent) and is implementing initiatives through MSSS to improve this rate until the College reaches its benchmark of 41 percent.

#### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Frederick's benchmark is 33 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students has not come close to this level in the past four cohorts (fluctuating within a narrow range between 20 and 22 percent).

**Campus response:** Two endeavors are in place to increase the six-year transfer/graduation rate for minorities. One is the MSS mentoring program. All participating students are tracked and given needed support throughout their career at

Frederick. The program continues to develop effective steps to assist students with goal development and planning. The other program is Frederick's English for Speakers of Other Languages program, which has increased from one course in 1996 to six courses in fall 2003 and has a 4 percent increase in student enrollment in FY 2003.

## GARRETT COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Garrett's benchmark is 12 percent, but no minority students in the most recent cohort earned a community college credential or transferred to a public four-year institution.

**Campus response:** Due to the small number of minority students at Garrett, four-year and six-year minority transfer/graduation rates have fluctuated significantly from year to year. The 1995 indicator of 14.3 percent actually exceeded Garrett's benchmark. The small size of the minority student population and factors like athletic eligibility and transfer to out-of-state four year colleges, which are not reflected in Maryland transfer figures, influence year-to-year outcomes. The College Retention Task Force has formulated strategies for improving minority student retention and graduation rates including the use of learning communities, an "early warning" system for academic deficiencies, an athletic monitoring system, and Friday study sessions.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff*

**Commission assessment:** Garrett's benchmark is 2 percent, but there have been no minorities on its full-time administrative/professional staff in three of the past four years.

**Campus response:** Garrett has the lowest compensation scale in the State; it has a homogeneously white population; and its employee turnover is very low, reducing opportunities for new hiring. Given the current financial environment, this condition is not likely to change soon.

## HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Contract Training Courses Offered*

**Commission assessment:** Hagerstown's benchmark is 123. Although the number of workforce development course sections provided through contracts tripled between FY 1999 and FY 2001, offerings fell to 85 in FY 2002.

#### *Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** While the number of students in workforce development training courses at Hagerstown nearly tripled between FY 1999 and FY 2001, enrollments fell to 1,421 in FY 2002 - considerably below the college's benchmark of 2,000.

**Campus response:** The numbers for both of these indicators rebounded to such an extent in FY 2003 that the benchmarks established for 2005 were met (number of participants) or exceeded (number of courses). Reasons for the decline in FY 2002 were, in large measure, due to the impact of the September 11 tragedy on the local economy. In addition, a preliminary analysis of enrollment conducted as part of the College's planning process showed that some contract training programs ran with low enrollment or were not considered a sound investment of resources in terms of return on investment. These programs were eliminated.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff*

**Commission assessment:** Hagerstown's benchmark is 5 percent, but minorities have constituted no more than 2 percent of the institution's full-time administrative/professional staff in the past four years.

**Campus response:** The College is moving toward this benchmark by filling vacant positions with qualified minorities (3.5 percent).



## HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Professional/Administrative Staff*

**Commission assessment:** Harford's benchmark is 14 percent, but the percentage of minorities on its professional/administrative staff has dropped by more than half during the past three years from 16 percent to 8 percent.

**Campus response:** Harford's performance on this measure has varied from 14 percent in 1999, up to 16 percent in 2000, down to 11 percent in 2001, down to 8 percent in 2002, and up to 13 percent in 2003. The College has applied strategies to meet the benchmark such as aggressively advertising in a variety of discipline-specific publications as well as through media widely read by members of minority groups. These strategies will be continued. Our most recent figures indicate that we are within one percentage point of meeting the 2005 benchmark. We expect to sustain the progress toward this benchmark.

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Harford's benchmark is 30 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students has not been above 22 percent in any of the past four cohorts and was just 17 percent in the most recent period.

**Campus response:** It continues to be Harford's goal to have full-time minority students transfer and graduate at the same rates as that of all full-time students. For the first time, in 2003, the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students has exceeded the benchmark, at 31 percent.

In order to maintain and continue to progress on this benchmark, Harford's Student Development Division has many initiatives underway including:

- The formation of a retention work group in fall 2002 which addressed the following priorities:
  - Implement pilot mentoring program for minority students – implementation is planned for fall 2004.
  - Develop and implement a pilot follow-up program for students who withdraw from all courses – implemented for fall 2003 through spring 2004.
  - Encourage undeclared students to enroll in HD 103 (Career and Life Planning) –data indicate that taking the course improves student

success; therefore, undeclared students are now encouraged to enroll in this course.

- Develop a program to work with students on Academic Restriction – effective fall 2003 students on restriction have been enrolled in HD 110 and HD 103 as appropriate. The academic success of these students will be reviewed and the results may have implications for our current restriction policy.
- Eliminate late registration for students – a new procedure eliminating late registration was approved effective spring 2004.

Other initiatives underway at Harford:

- Student athlete progress report process has been updated to include more direct interaction between student and faculty, and intrusive advising for student athletes has been implemented by assigning an academic advisor to meet with all student athletes individually.
- Cross training of staff to provide both advising and career services and to meet the career and advising needs of students with disabilities has been ongoing and will continue.
- Training was held for the assistive technology team to better serve the needs of individuals with disabilities using the equipment.
- Increased the number of Supplemental Instruction sessions being held each semester.
- Worked with faculty to provide walk-in tutorial assistance for on-line transitional math courses beginning in spring 2002.
- Worked with faculty to provide tutorial assistance on a walk-in basis for CIS and Computer Science courses beginning in fall 2003.
- Developed and implemented the College Survival Conference in conjunction with nursing faculty during summer 2003. The conference addressed academic success skills for Nursing and English as a Second Language (ESL) students as well as the general student population.
- Staff members are working on a plan to transition ESL and GED students to credit-bearing courses for 2004.
- The Academic Division Deans will begin work in August 2004 on a Student Retention Subgroup to consider strategies for student retention. Faculty involvement is anticipated in fall 2004.

#### *Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Harford's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students was 15 percent in the most recent cohort and never above 19 percent in any of the past four.

**Campus response:** For the first time, in 2003, the six-year transfer/graduation rate of minority students has exceeded the benchmark, at 23 percent. With the Campus Action

Plan on Minority Achievement in place, Harford will continue to provide individualized academic support services to minority students and the retention work group will continue work on the action steps in order to maintain and continue progress on this indicator.

## HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

**Commission assessment:** Howard's benchmark is 23.0 percent, but the proportion of minorities on its full-time faculty dropped from 21.6 percent to 18.3 percent in the past year.

**Campus response:** While the proportion of minority full-time faculty decreased from 21.6 percent in fall 2001 to 18.3 percent in fall 2002, it increased to 18.8 percent in fall 2003 and remains at that level. Upon close examination of recently separated full-time faculty members, the College has identified the primary reason for separation of diverse faculty members as voluntary resignation for reasons beyond the College's control. The College has noted that one faculty member originally in the "other" ethnic category changed to the African American category after the fall 2003 submission of the College's Employee Data System information.

Among the strategies that Howard has implemented to increase faculty diversity are attending a greater number of job fairs (including those at historically black colleges such as Howard University), creating a link with the local NAACP so that association members are encouraged to apply for Howard jobs, and developing a relationship with the Howard County Public School system to share strategies for hiring diverse teaching staff. All full-time faculty vacancies are advertised nationally and in diverse publications such as *Hispanic Outlook* and *Black Issues*. The College has developed an enhanced diversity search committee training program, and College policy requires that a diversity committee member serves on every full-time faculty search. Of course without funding no new faculty can be hired so this measure may remain stationary for another year. It should be noted that the College has had significant success with recruitment of diverse part-time faculty, which increased from 21 percent in fall 2002 to 24 percent in fall 2003.

## PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Percent of Students Transferring to Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 50 percent. However, the college has remained far from its goal. Less than 30 percent of its transfer program students transferred to a public four-year college or university in the State within four years of matriculation in the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** The College did not address this issue in its report.

#### *Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

**Commission assessment:** While minority representation on Prince George's full-time faculty increased between 1999 and 2001, it dipped to 28 percent in 2002 – considerably short of the college's benchmark of 40 percent.

**Campus response:** Over the past five years, the percentage of minorities within the ranks of full-time faculty at Prince George's has grown from the lower twenties to what it is today, 31 percent. We currently have a five-year strategic goal, which underscores our commitment to have our faculty more closely mirror our student population. That goal is that 40 percent of our full-time faculty be a member of a traditionally underrepresented minority group. While our percentage had decreased slightly in fall 2002, a focused push to fill open faculty positions with qualified minority candidates puts us back on our way to fulfilling our goals by FY 2005. In FY 2003, each department was asked to submit an action plan to hire more minority faculty, and those plans have begun to take effect as can be seen by our increased percentages.

#### *Student Satisfaction with Job Preparation*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of fully-employed career program graduates who rated their job preparation as very good or good was 70 percent and 78 percent respectively in the last two follow-up surveys. However, this is distant from Prince George's goal of 100 percent satisfaction.

**Campus response:** Seventy-five percent of our graduates who responded to the most recent graduate follow-up survey reported the College's preparation for their job was either good or very good. We currently have no means of determining what this finding means. However, we are committed to raising this result to be consistent with the high ratings which employers give to the job preparation of their employees who had attended Prince George's.

### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Respiratory Therapy*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 90 percent, but just 40 percent of the graduates passed the exam in respiratory therapy in the most recent year.

**Campus response:** Although the College did not address this issue in its narrative, the statistics accompanying the report show that all of its graduates who took this exam in FY 2003 passed.

### **Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

#### *Second Year Retention Rate*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 73 percent. But the second year retention rate of its new full-time freshmen has not exceeded 60.5 percent in any of the past four cohorts, and it was 57 percent in the most recent one.

**Campus response:** For cohort 2002, the retention rate was the highest in the five-year assessment period, climbing to 61.1 percent, three percentage points higher than the previous cohort. This is encouraging, because it is evidence that the programs put in place beginning in 2002 in response to the increased focus on student success have begun to make an impact. If this is the case, we should begin to see the results of these efforts even further with an increase in the graduation and transfer rates four years out with the reporting cycle for 2004.

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Students*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 35 percent. However, the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has fallen steadily in the past three cohorts from 28.5 percent to 22.0 percent.

**Campus response:** For the current cohort, the four-year graduation and transfer rate has declined and is the lowest in the five-year assessment period. Nineteen and a half percent of those students who entered the College in 1999 had graduated or transferred to a Maryland public four-year institution by 2003. This represents a decrease from the previous cohort as well as from the cohorts five years before them. There are a number of reasons for this alarming trend. For Prince George's Community College, the top three issues that contribute to the decline in student success continue to be:

1. A longer period of stop-out behaviors on the students' part.
2. An increase in institutional resources devoted to developmental education.
3. Student goal achievement outside of traditional definitions of success.

The Institutional Performance Accountability Report submitted by Prince George's Community College in 2003 had detailed analyses pertaining to the reasons stated above. There are a number of approaches that we have undertaken over the past year that we hope will turn these trends around in the coming years. As a part of the College's newly implemented Strategic Governance System, the president has formed the Learning Centered College Committee, a decision making body comprised of faculty, staff, administrators and students charged with looking at the status of the learning environment at the college and making recommendations to the Strategic Planning Council as to what programs and services should be implemented in order to address our longstanding issues concerning student success. This committee worked for two years in conjunction with student services, instruction, and the office of planning and institutional research and compiled a report entitled, "Recommendations for Improving Transfer Trends." This report has gone to the president and will be presented to the strategic planning council in fall 2004. Among the recommendations are:

1. Redefine the transfer cohort as first-time, full-time students who
  - have selected a transfer curriculum;
  - have completed the new-student orientation and advising process by the 3rd week of their entering semester;
2. Establish a minimum reading placement score for entry into developmental courses. Identify and/or develop appropriate alternatives for applicants who do not achieve that minimum.
3. Petition the Maryland Higher Education Commission to include National Student Clearinghouse data when reporting transfer rates.
4. Establish a system of graduation/transfer audits to be conducted at 30 and 45 credits.
5. Re-establish a staffed Transfer Center in a specific location with widely communicated hours of operation and services offered.
6. Accept the General Education Task Force's recommendation to reduce the total number of credits required for graduation.
7. Increase faculty and staff involvement in graduation/transfer-related initiatives.

#### *Four-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of Full-Time Minority Students*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 33 percent. However, the College has been far from its goal with the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students dropping steadily in the past three cohorts from 24.7 percent to 19.7 percent.

**Campus response:** At Prince George's, the success rates of its minority students have been steadily declining. In 1996, the percentage of minority students who graduated or transferred to a Maryland public, four-year institution was 24.7 percent. For the most

scheduled during convenient daytime hours. Senior enrollments increased slightly (2 percent) from FY 2002 to FY 2003.

**Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 10 percent. But the proportion of its full-time faculty who are minorities was 6 percent in 2002 and 7 percent in the previous three years.

**Campus response:** Due to low turnover of faculty, the limited number of new faculty positions each year (three were approved last year), and the lack of qualified minority applicants, attempts to increase the percentage of minority faculty at the College have not been very successful. Gaining three more minority full-time faculty employees would enable Wor-Wic to meet its benchmark of 10 percent minority full-time faculty. With only three new faculty positions approved for next year, it is unlikely that the benchmark will be met.

*Percent Minorities of Full-Time Professional/Administrative Staff*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 10 percent. But Wor-Wic has achieved just half of its goal, reaching 5 percent in each of the past two years.

**Campus response:** The percentage of minority full-time administrative/professional employees increased to 7 percent this year. Hiring two more minorities in the next two years would allow the college to meet its benchmark of 10 percent. To increase the likelihood of minority applicants for administrative and faculty positions, the college has implemented its minority achievement action plan, which includes mailing administrative and faculty job postings to all members of the college's "Minority Friends" list and to publications and media that target minorities. Offering diversity training to employees and reviewing interview procedures with all supervisors are included in the college's action plans.



## WOR-WIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Second Year Retention Rate*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 68 percent, but the college's second year retention rate of new full-time students fell from 67 percent to 55 percent in the most recent cohort.

**Campus response:** The second year retention rate for first-time, full-time degree-seeking students is typically 60 percent or higher. Due to the move of the Eastern Shore Criminal Justice Academy to the college campus in fall 2001, 26 academy students were incorrectly reported as degree-seeking and the retention rate dropped to 55 percent for the 2001 cohort. If these students are removed from the 2001 cohort, the retention rate increases to 61 percent. Since fall 2002, students have been earning a law enforcement certificate upon completion of the academy program, causing the 2002 cohort retention rate to go back up to 60 percent.

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate - Registered Nurse*

**Commission assessment:** While the percentage of graduates who passed the exam for registered nurses increased from 90 percent to 94 percent between 1999 and 2001, the rate dropped to 71 percent in 2002. Wor-Wic's benchmark is 90 percent.

**Campus response:** This decrease might be partly explained by the fact that two thirds of the students who did not pass had waited a year after graduation to take the test. The College created and implemented an action plan to ensure that future pass rates will be at 90 percent or better, and the FY 2003 rate increased to 90 percent.

#### *Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 1,500. However, senior adult enrollment in noncredit courses has steadily declined in the past three years from 1,357 to 1,163.

**Campus response:** The criteria for the Maryland Higher Education Commission's approval of courses for seniors was modified in FY 2002 to eliminate all courses that would not be approved for funding if offered to the general public, thereby limiting the number of potential senior offerings. In addition, the College's computer labs have increased usage by credit courses, vocationally-oriented open enrollment courses and contract training, allowing less prime hours to be available for senior courses. Lastly, the local library has increased its course offerings, which are free, very short and

recent cohort of students, that percentage has declined to eighteen, down one percentage point from the previous cohort. In the 2003 Action Plan for Minority Achievement, Prince George's outlines several measures it will take to increase the time to goal completion for minority students which include enhancing degree audit policies and procedures, increasing counseling and mentoring, and strengthening marketing and communications. We will continue these measures along with those outlined for the previous indicator.





**TARGETED INDICATORS  
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

**PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**



**TARGETED OBJECTIVES AND CAMPUS RESPONSES  
PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

**BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Explanation Required**

*Objective 2.7 – By fall 2004, achieve a 75 percent pass rate on all three categories of Praxis I.*

**Commission assessment:** The pass rate on all three categories of Praxis I has fallen steadily in the past three years, and Bowie is far short of its objective. In the most recent year, the rate was 44.5 percent for reading, 48 percent for writing, and 36.4 percent for math.

**Campus response:** The pass rates for the latest exam indicate progress in each of the three categories of the test. The effectiveness of the Praxis practice lab as well as other intervention methods makes the objective as stated achievable.

*Objective 3.2 – By FY 2005, increase number of graduate degrees awarded to under-represented minorities in management information systems from 49 in FY 1999 to 60.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of graduate degrees awarded in this field to under-represented minorities fell from 60 to 42 in the past year.

**Campus response:** The economic cool-down in the information technology sector, as well as competitive issues with open enrollment, on-line degree services, have negatively impacted the achievement of the stated goal. Degree production will increase from the present level but not at the rate necessary to reach 60 degree awards by FY 2005.

**Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Objective 1.2 – By fall 2005, increase the six-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students from 34 percent in FY 2000 to 50 percent.*

**Commission assessment:** The six year graduation rate of these students has fallen steadily in the past three cohorts from 42.3 percent to 38.9 percent, and Bowie is far short of the objective.

*Objective 2.3 – By fall 2005, increase the number of graduate degrees awarded from the computer science department from 18 in FY 1999 to 38.*

**Commission assessment:** Bowie awarded just 11 graduate degrees in computer science in the most recent year – less than one-third of its objective.

*Objective 2.4 – By fall 2005, increase the number of graduate degrees awarded in management information systems from 101 in FY 1999 to 126.*

**Commission assessment:** Bowie awarded just 65 graduate degrees in management information systems in the most recent year – the lowest number in the past four years and nearly half of its objective.

*Objective 2.5 – By FY 2004, increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded in nursing from 34 in FY 1999 to 46.*

**Commission assessment:** Bowie awarded 29 undergraduate degrees in nursing in the most recent year – considerably short of its objective.

*Objective 3.1 – By FY 2005, increase number of graduate degrees awarded to under-represented minorities in computer science from 9 in FY 1999 to 20.*

**Commission assessment:** Just eight graduate degrees were awarded to under-represented minorities in computer science in the most recent year, and nine in each of the previous three years.

*Objective 3.3 – By FY 2005, increase from 0 in FY 2000 to 10 the number of under-represented minority students receiving graduate degree in mathematics.*

**Commission assessment:** Just one degree was awarded in the past two years.

*Objective 4.2 – Increase total research and development expenditures as reported by the National Science Foundation from \$2.675 million in FY 1999 to \$5.4 million in FY 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** While Bowie reported that its R&D expenditures have risen from \$2.68 to \$3.0 million since FY 1999, it remains far from its objective.

*Objective 5.3 – By fall 2005, increase the six-year graduation rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking African-American students from 34 percent in FY 2000 to 50 percent.*

**Commission assessment:** The six year graduation rate of African-American students has fallen steadily in the past three cohorts from 43.4 percent to 39.0 percent – considerably short of Bowie's objective.

## COPPIN STATE COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.1 – Diversify the student enrollment by 2004, moving from 3,564 African American students in 1999 (or 95 percent) to 3,438 in 2004 (or 83 percent).*

**Commission assessment:** African Americans comprised 92 percent of Coppin's enrollment in the most recent year, and this figure has not dropped below 90 percent in the past four years.

**Campus response:** Committed to its mission of serving the Baltimore central city and metropolitan area, Coppin has also set an aggressive goal of ethnically diversifying its student body. In fall 2002, of the 3882 total population, 3592 were African American, 11 were Native American, 13 were Asian American, 24 were Hispanic, 174 were white, and 95 were foreign. Exceeding its regional reputation for its commitment to providing access, opportunities and success for students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and with varied academic experiences, Coppin most recently enrolled students from 20 countries, 27 different states, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

*Objective 4.1 – Increase by 10 percent the number of days faculty and students spend in college initiated community outreach and service activities from 2,046 in 1999 to 2,100 in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** Even taking into account that Coppin reported incomplete data for the most recent year, the number of days (618) was less than one-third of its objective.

*Objective 5.1 – By 2004, increase to 40 percent the percentage of graduates pursuing graduate study immediately after graduation.*

**Commission assessment:** The proportion of bachelor's degree recipients pursuing graduate study immediately after graduation has slipped from 33.5 percent to 25.3 percent in the past four surveys.



## FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.5 – Increase the number of Teacher Education graduates employed in Maryland public schools from 109 in 1999 to 120 in 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of Frostburg graduates teaching in Maryland public schools has declined steadily in the past three years to 91.

**Campus response:** Over the past several years, a number of initiatives have been developed to help encourage graduates to teach in Maryland. Most influential among these initiatives is the HOPE scholarships. Candidates accepting the HOPE Scholarship will likely seek a teaching position in Maryland in order to fulfill their financial obligation to the State. On average, 37.9 percent of Frostburg's current education candidates hold these scholarships, and it is expected that many will search for employment in Maryland's public schools.

Increasing the number of candidates placed in Maryland Professional Development Schools (PDS) as interns will also help encourage graduates to seek teaching positions within Maryland public schools. For FY 2004, 85.3 percent of Frostburg's interns were placed in a PDS. As PDS interns and pre-service teachers, Frostburg candidates gain a positive view of their future profession. Furthermore, the in-depth knowledge of the State system acquired as PDS interns promotes their retention as certified Maryland public school teachers.

**Commission response:** While those students with Maryland Teacher Scholarships will be able to continue to receive the awards, no new applications are being accepted. This scholarship program is being phased out.

*Objective 3.11 – Maintain private giving annually to include scholarships, undergraduate research opportunities, and international study from \$2.4 million in 1999 to \$2.4 million in 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** The amount of funds raised in private giving at Frostburg has fallen steadily to \$1.5 million in the past four years.

**Campus response:** Nationally, private giving has been depressed in recent years attributed in large part to a lack of confidence in the economy. Reviewing Frostburg's historic data, as compiled by the University System of Maryland for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, alumni giving totals mirrored the national economy's peaks and valleys during this period of time.

The University's peak performance year in terms of the percentage of alumni (our most significant category of donors) who contributed to Frostburg and the total amount of private support raised was FY 1999, culminating the institution's most ambitious fundraising campaign in its history. The rallying opportunity, provided by the Centennial Campaign, coupled with a deliberate infusion of staff and operational resources to complete the Campaign were contributing factors in this success.

Staffing vacancies, a restructuring within the institution's advancement/development department and a reduction in operational dollars, all fueled by waning support from the State, has also impacted the ability to enhance private support levels. During FY 2004, the Alumni & Development offices continued their efforts with half the number of staff (two) that were available in FY 2003 (four).

### **Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Objective 1.3 - Increase annually the number of completers from Frostburg's undergraduate teacher program from 142 in 2001 to 150 in 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of undergraduates completing teacher training at Frostburg has dropped steadily to 102 in the past four years.

**Campus response:** There has been a steady increase in teacher education enrollments at Frostburg over the past few years (641 in FY 2001 to 714 in FY 2004). Commensurately, there has been a change in the path some candidates are following to obtain the credentials needed for initial certification. The major modification has come with the emergence of the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree program. The College of Education graduated 16 students from the MAT program in the summer of 2003 (FY 2004). The MAT Elementary and Secondary program will produce 29 graduates, which are prepared to enter the workforce in Fall of 2004 (FY 2005). In the summer of 2005 (FY 2006), 35 candidates are expected to graduate from the MAT program. Many of the candidates mentioned above would have entered the undergraduate program if not for the newly available MAT option. Although the College of Education is on track to graduate more than 161 candidates qualified for initial certification in spring 2005, the mix is not likely to be the 132 undergraduates and 29 graduates anticipated.

The program trends noted above offer increased opportunity for adding qualified students to each of the program options. The College of Education is using the flexibility offered by these optional routes to certification as a recruiting tool to attract more minority students and increase student interest in teaching in areas of critical need.

*Objective 2.1 – Work with Allegany County to attract companies in the newly constructed Allegany Business Center at Frostburg from 0 in 1999 to 4 in 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** No companies have been attracted in the past four years.

**Campus response:** It is the sole responsibility of Allegany County to identify and attract companies to the Allegany Business Center, but the downturn in the nation's economy has made it difficult to bring companies to the Center. The University and the County, however, remain optimistic regarding the future of the Center. Together they are joining with the Maryland Technology Development Corporation to attract science and technology-based businesses to the Center.

## SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 3.5 – Increase the estimated number of Nursing graduates employed as nurses in Maryland from 36 in 1999 to 43 in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The estimated number of nursing graduates employed in the field in Maryland has ranged between 27 and 35 in the past four years, short of Salisbury's objective.

**Campus response:** Growth in the number of nurses in the nursing program was dependent upon the completion of the new Henson Science Hall and the renovation of Devilbliss Science Building. Both projects are complete and enrollment in the undergraduate nursing program has surged to record levels. Beginning this year and in subsequent years, the number of graduates will swell resulting in a corresponding increase in employment of Salisbury nursing graduates. However, Salisbury nursing graduates are recruited from across the region. Our graduates' life choices are influenced by the income levels and community appeal offered by regional localities. It is incumbent upon Maryland communities and health care facilities to remain personally attractive and financially competitive. If they do not, our successful efforts of teaching and graduating nurses to meet the State's nursing workforce will become the gain of communities nationwide.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

*Objective 3.6 – Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending Salisbury from 52.5 percent in 2000 to 55 percent in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of these students at Salisbury has steadily dropped in the past four years to 39.4 percent.

**Campus response:** The goal for this objective was established during a period when the State was attempting to fund the University at a level consistent with the Maryland Higher Education Commission funding guidelines. However, the trend mirrors Salisbury's place in the funding guidelines and its eroding State resources. While other institutions have also seen their resources decline, Salisbury students appear especially disadvantaged. As an example, St. Mary's College has a nearly identical percentage of economically disadvantaged students but receives more than \$3,500 more per student from the State than does Salisbury. Salisbury is forced to fund institutional operations through a higher percentage of tuition revenues but is, nevertheless, committed to access by targeting a proportion of all new monies to need-based financial aid.

*Objective 5.4 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal from 0.8 percent in 1999 to 2 percent in 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of Salisbury's annual State appropriation spent on facility renewal has not exceeded 1 percent in the past four years.

**Campus response:** The amount necessary to accomplish this objective would be approximately \$1.2 million, or approximately the annual instructional cost of the Salisbury nursing program. The goal for this objective was externally not institutionally driven and is not achievable given the current fiscal realities and priorities.

## TOWSON UNIVERSITY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.4 – Increase the estimated number of Towson graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland from 54 in 2001 to 65 in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The estimated number of Towson graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland was 54 in the most recent year, short of the university's objective.

**Campus response:** These rates are estimated from data received through surveys of bachelor's degree recipients. While the overall response rate to these surveys is about 20 percent, data for relatively small programs such as nursing tend to fluctuate widely because of the low numbers of graduates. We expect the employment rate to rise in the future because the nursing program capacity has increased so there will be a greater number of graduates seeking employment.

With the aim of increasing pass rates for the nursing licensing examination, the nursing faculty made changes in the criteria for admission to the program and they are conducting research on performance in certain courses and assessment instruments that may help identify vulnerable students in time for additional preparation and support.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

*Objective 1.2 – Increase the number of Towson graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 420 in 2000 to 475 in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** While the number of Towson graduates hired by Maryland public schools increased from 347 to 381 in the past year, it remains short of the university's objective.

*Objective 6.1 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target by 2005 from 1.8 percent in 1999.*

**Commission assessment:** The percent of replacement cost expended in facility renewal and renovation has declined from 1.8 percent to 0.7 percent.

## UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

### Explanation Required

*Objective 4.2 – Increase the pro-bono days contributed of faculty to 3,650, from 3,381 in FY 1999, by FY 2004, for Maryland companies, businesses, government agencies, and not-for-profit organizations in areas of their professional expertise.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of pro-bono days contributed by University of Baltimore faculty declined to 2,577 in the most recent year -- its lowest level in the past five.

**Campus response:** The decline in the number of pro-bono days in FY 2003 was due to incomplete data collection. Not all the faculty completed the survey in FY 2003 that is used to collect this data. In FY 2004, the number of pro-bono days rose to 2,627. Increased teaching loads and larger class size due to budget reductions has decreased the number of days available for pro-bono work.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.3 — By FY 2004, increase scholarly productivity by at least 50 percent, increasing refereed publications per full-time faculty member to 3.1 from 2.1 in 1999.*

**Commission assessment:** Refereed publications per full-time faculty member have ranged between 2.1 and 2.5 in the past five years, short of UMB's objective.

**Campus response:** The FY 2004 data for this indicator was not available in time for inclusion in the report. Scholarly productivity per full-time faculty member reached 2.8 for FY 2004. Although the objective has not yet been reached, the campus is making progress towards the goal.

*Objective 2.3 – By FY 2004, increase the external funding obtained for clinical trials by 30 percent to \$30.9 million from \$23.8 million in 1999, thereby providing Marylanders with greater access to the newest available treatments.*

**Commission assessment:** External funding for clinical trials was \$22.8 million in the most recent year – below the FY 1999 figure and considerably short of UMB's objective.

**Campus response:** The methodology for measuring clinical trial funding has been changed to include only those funds actually received, rather than those anticipated as part of the initial clinical trial contract. This has resulted in a lower amount than forecast for FY 2004.

**Commission response:** UMB should revise its objective to reflect the new methodology.

*Objective 4.2 – By FY 2004, license at least three additional technologies to Maryland based companies each year, establish two new Maryland companies based on university technologies each year, and have 10 companies active in Maryland.*

**Commission assessment:** Between three and six companies have been active in Maryland in each of the past four years, short of UMB's objective.

**Campus response:** There are several reasons why this objective has not been met: (1) The success rate for Maryland based startup companies in the biotech and medical field is very low; (2) A few of the successful companies have recently been acquired by out-of-state companies; (3) UMB has been more successful partnering with larger, existing Maryland based companies such as BBI Biotech and Gene Logic; and (4) Many of the



innovations and technologies created by UMB faculty are not compatible with the business strategies of potential Maryland based startup companies.

**Problem Requiring Correction**

**Commission assessment:** UMB has no goals or objectives related to diversity, one of the major areas of accountability.

**Campus response:** UMB declines to adopt goals or objectives related to diversity, citing legal advice. In a letter to the UMB President dated August 3, 2004 the Secretary of Higher Education acknowledged this arrangement.

**Commission response:** To be clear, the Secretary of Higher Education did not endorse UMB's position in the letter cited above.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.2 – Increase the number of UMBC graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 74 in FY 2000 to 115 in FY 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** While the number of UMBC graduates employed in Maryland public schools rose from 74 to 99 between FY 2000 and FY 2002, the figure dropped to 79 in FY 2003 – considerably short of the university's objective.

**Campus response:** UMBC's *Urban Teacher Education Program* attracted many new students to UMBC, but that program has now been terminated resulting in a decrease of about 60 new teacher candidates. Program completions are also down this year. There are about 20 candidates who have not taken or completely passed the Praxis II tests, now a requirement for program completion. In addition to the factors affecting enrollment, other factors may also play a role. For example, UMBC requires a 3.00 cumulative GPA for entry into internships, presenting a higher hurdle than many other colleges and universities. Also, many prospective teachers are bypassing the rigorous requirements of NCATE approved programs in favor of Resident Teacher Certification Programs. Termination of the \$5,000 Hope scholarships may also have some impact.

*Objective 3.8 – Maintain the graduate/professional school going rate for UMBC's African-American bachelor's degree recipients of 49 percent.*

**Commission assessment:** Forty percent of UMBC's African-American baccalaureate recipients reported having enrolled for graduate or professional study in the most recent follow-up survey – the lowest in the past four.

*Objective 4.7 – Increase the graduate/professional school going rate for UMBC's bachelor's degree recipients from 35 percent in Survey Year 1997 to 38 percent in Survey Year 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The proportion of UMBC's baccalaureate recipients who reported having enrolled for graduate or professional study fell to 29 percent in the most recent survey from 35 percent in the previous three.

**Campus response:** Results of the 2000 survey revealed that more than a third of UMBC graduates are enrolled in graduate and professional study within one year of graduation; among African American students, the rate was an impressive 49 percent, reflecting the impact of the Meyerhoff Scholarship Program. The data for these objectives for 2003 are affected by the timing of the alumni survey, and therefore we do not believe that the decreases reported are valid.

**Commission response:** The 2003 figures reflect the results of the 2001 survey of graduates sponsored by University System of Maryland and conducted via telephone by University of Baltimore's Schaefer Center. This survey was administered earlier in the year than are the follow-up surveys coordinated by the Maryland Higher Education Commission, likely influencing responses to the questions related to graduate school enrollments and/or plans.

*Objective 5.2 – Increase the average alumni giving rate from 10 percent in FY 1998 to 11 percent in FY 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The average alumni giving rate has been 7.8 percent in the past two years.

**Campus response:** Unfortunately, with the downturn in the economy, the giving rate has fallen for the past two years. Increasing the giving rate will require an investment of new resources and this remains an important goal for the campus.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

*Objective 1.7 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target by FY 2005 from 0.9 in FY 1999.*

**Commission assessment:** The percent of replacement cost expended in facility renewal and renovation at UMCP has fallen steadily from 1.7 to 0.8 in the past four years.

**Campus response:** As a result of budget reductions in the State and long-time neglect, progress toward goals in facilities renewal at Maryland has slowed. The University is falling further behind each year with a current estimate of \$464 million in renewal funds needed for buildings over 20 years old. Currently, the flagship University does not have the infrastructure of a top-tier institution. We have long-term goals that will make deferred maintenance a high priority.

*Objective 2.4 – Increase the percentage of UMCP African-American undergraduates from 13.8 percent in 2000 to 14.8 percent by 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of African-American undergraduates at UMCP has steadily dropped in the past five years from 14.2 percent to 12.3 percent.

**Campus response:** One of the areas of focus for the University is the diversity of the student body. In fall 2004, 31.7 percent of our undergraduate population was comprised of students of color, a decline of a half of a percentage point from fall 2001 (32.2 percent). African American students represented 13.1 percent of the undergraduate student body in Fall 2000 and 12.1 percent in fall 2004 (a decline of one percentage point). While these figures merit attention, the University has also observed an increase in the percentage of students who identify their race as “unknown”. In fall 1999, 5 percent of new students identified their race as unknown, while in fall 2004, 10 percent of new students identified their race as “unknown”. This phenomenon needs to be addressed in terms of how it affects race reporting.

Enrollment is a function of both recruitment and retention. The University has experienced success in the retention of minority students, but still faces challenges in the area of recruitment. While fewer students of color are enrolling at Maryland, we are committed to promoting the diversity of the student population and will continue to recruit heavily. Toward that end, the University has developed a broad array of activities, programs, and strategies to attract, recruit, admit, and enroll students of color. A few of these are highlighted below.

*Recruitment Strategies.* This year's recruitment program includes a targeted strategy to attract students of color. This strategy involves a number of programs and activities that have proven successful in the past, as well as several new efforts that were recently initiated. Administered by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, these programs and activities provide assistance, education, and pertinent information about the college admission process for students of color and their families. Individually, each of the programs has positive outcomes and the efforts provide results that are clearly quantifiable. For example:

- The purchase of student names through the PSAT Student Search Service has allowed our Admissions office to increase the percentage of students of color who will be targeted for recruitment.
- The Multicultural College and Career Conference held in June had a 20 percent increase in the number of student attendees from the previous year.
- Last year, bus transportation to the campus Visit Maryland program was expanded to include two additional schools in communities that are primarily populated by minorities.
- Participation in evening receptions in Baltimore City and Prince George's County continues to increase.
- Each of the overnight programs held in conjunction with the admitted student open house programs has been filled to capacity.

The University has also developed a rigorous approach to recruiting and admitting new freshmen minority students. Many of the activities described constitute outreach to the "pipeline" of younger students of middle and high school age in targeted communities. The programs offer information, academic assistance and support at no cost to youngsters who may otherwise not have access to such services. Additionally, the activities provide students with a welcoming look at higher education opportunities in their "own back yards."

Some of these programs involve expanding and capitalizing upon the University's involvement in surrounding communities. As an example, the University is particularly proud of its success with the Baltimore Incentive Awards Program. This program combines all aspects of the University's commitment to diversity - service to the community, support and assistance to high school students in largely minority communities, and 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.

Other outreach programs target newly admitted students and address their special circumstances. Many of the pre-freshman programs do double duty, 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. The University has made great efforts and huge strides in enticing students of color at both graduate and undergraduate levels into many scientific areas. 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. Also, the recruitment and mentoring programs in the Department of Mathematics in the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences have yielded the simultaneous graduation of three African American women with doctorates in mathematics – an unprecedented accomplishment in higher education. The University intends to learn from these programs as it explores opportunities to expand and replicate them.

*Strategies to Improve Retention and Graduation Rates.* The University has a strong history of dedication to increasing the retention and graduation rates of students of color. Programs and activities provided by the University generally are of two types. Some provide academic assistance, guidance, and support, such as the work of the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Education, the Academic Achievement Program, the Center for Minorities in Science and Engineering, and the Honors Program. Other programs, such as those in the College of Life Sciences and the NABJ Institute in the School of Journalism, facilitate entry into academic disciplines and provide practical experiences for the students. As another example, CMPS has also implemented the STAND program to address the need to increase the diversity of students pursuing studies in the computer, earth, mathematical and physical sciences. (We are pleased to note that one of the STAND programs recently received a national award.)

It is also important to note that the University of Maryland not only takes its responsibilities for student success seriously, but also communicates this emphasis to faculty. Hence, programs such as the Classroom Climate Project directed by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) perform an important role in improving minority student retention by increasing faculty awareness of the state of classroom climate and methods to ensure classroom equity.

We recognize that the classroom interactions and the one-on-one interactions that occur between the student and campus personnel often increase the possibility of retaining a student. Therefore, the University has developed numerous services and programs to enrich its academic and co-curricular environments. These programs generally fall into three categories, examples of which are set forth below.

*Programs for faculty and staff.* The Office of Human Relations offers in-service training workshops such as “Creating Multicultural Work Environments.” The Center for Teaching Excellence Classroom Climate Project is a training program dedicated to improving positive attention to diversity in all classrooms. Co-sponsored by the President’s Office, the Office of Human Relations, and CTE, this project provides training in techniques for recognizing inequity in the classroom, alternative methods that can improve classroom climate and respect for differences, and procedures to assist teachers in assessing the quality of equity and positive climate in their classrooms.

*Programs for students.* Multicultural Involvement and Community Advocacy (MICA) is a unit in the Office of Campus Programs committed to the creation and maintenance of a campus environment where diversity is valued, identity and culture are affirmed,

and individuals feel free to express themselves. MICA has the dual roles of empowering and advocating on behalf of minority students, and educating majority students to the value and benefits of multiculturalism and diversity. MICA encourages and supports student involvement in culturally-specific student organizations and promotes cross-cultural involvement opportunities for all students. In an effort to support leadership and organizational development within the African American student community, the Union and Campus Programs staff provide advice to and mentor the leadership of the Black Student Union, the Pan Hellenic Council, B.A.N. (Black Alliance Network), the College Park (student) Chapter of the NAACP, and other smaller groups.

*Community Programs.* The Nyumburu Cultural Center is dedicated to advancing and augmenting the academic and the multi-cultural missions of the University by presenting a forum for the scholarly exchange and artistic engagement of African Diaspora culture and history. The many programs are open to the entire university community and the general public. The Center has served the University community for 28 years and continues to build on its foundations as the center for black social, cultural and intellectual interaction. Nyumburu's productions and activities include lectures and seminars, art exhibits, workshops in the dramatic arts, dance, music and creative writing. Academic courses in blues, jazz, gospel music performance and creative writing are also offered. Nyumburu produces the Black Explosion Newspaper and is also home to the Maryland Gospel Choir, which has entertained the Maryland community for more than 25 years. The Center facilities also house the offices of various performing art ensembles as well as organizations such as the African Student Association, the Black Faculty and Staff Association, Dance Afrika! and the Black Alumni Association

*Objective 3.1 - Annual giving to the University from all sources will increase from \$78.5 million in 1999 to over \$125 million by 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The total annual giving from all sources rose to \$81 million in the most recent year, but this figure remains considerably short of UMCP's objective.

**Campus response:** While the number of donors has declined slightly, the funds provided through alumni donations have increased slightly. With economic hardships that have touched the lives of people all over the state, private philanthropy has declined. A presidential task force has made recommendations to rejuvenate alumni giving. With renewed efforts, the University plans to rebound from the current status quo and increase the number of donors and the amount of giving.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

### Explanation Required

*Objective 2.1 – Increase the passing rate on the Praxis II from 59 percent in 2000 to 80 percent in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of UMES graduates on Praxis II has been below 59 percent in the past two years.

**Campus response:** The University has taken corrective action to respond to this trend. The Higher Education Act of 1998 required all states and institutions of higher education (IHEs) to prepare 'report cards' on the quality of teacher preparation, including students' performance on teacher licensing examinations. In Maryland, passing the PRAXIS I and II tests are used for this purpose. While most IHEs immediately changed their policy requiring passing scores on PRAXIS tests, the University of Maryland Eastern Shore only required it for students matriculating after fall 2000 onward. This policy was changed August 8, 2003 to include all students entering teacher education, regardless of matriculation date. Now, all students who wish to enter teacher education must pass PRAXIS I and they must pass PRAXIS II prior to acceptance into their internship (i.e. student teaching.) With new policy in place, the estimated success rate on the PRAXIS exam is expected to reach 80 percent for the 2004-2005 academic year.



## MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 2.2 – Increase the number of partnerships with Baltimore City Schools by 100 percent from 25 in 1999 to 50 by 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** While the number of partnerships with Baltimore City schools has increased from 25 to 42 in the past five years, Morgan remains short of its objective.

**Campus response:** The university did not address this issue in its report.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

*Objective 1.4 – Increase the white student enrollment to 4 percent by 2005 from 2 percent in 1999.*

**Commission assessment:** White student enrollment has been flat at 2 percent during the past five years.

**Campus response:** Morgan strives to continue to obtain capital and operating support to provide facilities and programs that will be attractive to students of all races. As such, the University intends to further diversify its student body through initiatives like its Centers of Excellence and continuing the revitalization of its physical plant. Further, continued development of its existing graduate programs and the implementation of a select group of new programs, most of which would not be offered on any other campus, will assist in attracting a more diverse group of students similar to during the 1960s and early 1970s, when the campus had a unique role in the Baltimore area. In time, the campus expects diversity to increase at the undergraduate level as well due to the familiarity area residents will gain with the campus as a result of its graduate programs and due to the general prestige associated with having a significant doctoral mission.

*Objective 4.1 – Achieve centers of excellence in teacher education, the sciences, engineering and management information technology and maintain high quality programs in liberal arts and other professional programs by increasing the number of authorized faculty dedicated to doctoral education to 35 by 2005 from 4 in 2001; and by increasing the number of funded graduate assistantships to 80 from 20 in 2000.*

**Commission assessment:** Morgan had seven authorized faculty dedicated to doctoral education in the most recent year, lagging far behind its objective. While the number of funded graduate assistantships has doubled to 40 in each of the past three years, the university is just halfway to its objective.

**Campus response:** As part of the University's commitment to continually build upon the strength of its undergraduate programs and enhance its advanced degree curriculum, Morgan State University places emphasis on attracting and retaining the most qualified faculty available. As part of this effort, Morgan State endeavors to provide a very competitive compensation package to its faculty. The campus is making the transition to a Doctoral/Research-Intensive institution. Faculty salaries at these campuses on the average are considerably higher than are those in Morgan's current category.

## ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

### Explanation Required

*Objective 9.1 - Increase the endowment fund to \$29 million by FY 2005.*

**Commission assessment:** While the value of St. Mary's endowment has slowly, but steadily, risen from \$22.3 million to \$23.5 million in the past four years, the amount remains quite short of the campus objective.

**Campus response:** Over a two year period, fiscal years 2002 and 2003, the endowment portfolio lost 3 percent. Meanwhile we continued to spend 7 percent per year from endowment earnings in each of those years. The resulting impact was a 17 percent decrease offset in part by new donations.



**ONE PAGE PROFILES**

**ALL PUBLIC COLLEGES  
AND UNIVERSITIES**



## ONE-PAGE PROFILES

This section contains one-page profiles for each community college and public four-year institution. These profiles present four years of trend data and benchmarks for key indicators, as well as a brief description of the mission and major characteristics of each campus. These profiles have been added to provide legislators and their staff with a means of grasping quickly the essence of each campus' progress on the most policy significant indicators.

Each profile contains a set of common indicators: 10 for the community colleges and 7 for the public four-year institutions. Emphasis was given to outcomes and outputs measures. These core indicators for the community colleges were chosen by the Maryland Community College Research Group and those for the public four-year campuses reflect the selection of an accountability workgroup consisting of the representatives from the public campuses, the Commission staff, and personnel from DLS and DBM. Each community college had the opportunity to add up to three institution-specific indicators, and each public four-year campus up to five. University of Maryland Baltimore and University of Maryland University College were invited to select an individualized set of indicators, reflecting their special missions.

These are the common indicators appearing in the profiles. Readers are encouraged to review the operational definition of these indicators in interpreting their meaning. These can be found in Volume 2 of the accountability report.

### Community Colleges

1. Enrollment (credit and noncredit students)
2. Market share of county population
3. Second year retention rate
4. Transfer/graduation rate of all full-time students within four years
5. Transfer/graduation rate of minority full-time students within four years
6. Student satisfaction with goal achievement
7. Student satisfaction with transfer preparation
8. Student satisfaction with job preparation
9. Employer satisfaction with community college graduates
10. Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population

### Public Four-Year Institutions

1. Student satisfaction with job preparation
2. Student satisfaction with preparation for graduate/professional school
3. Six-year graduation rate of all students
4. Six-year graduation rate of African Americans
5. Second year retention rate of all students
6. Percent African American of all undergraduates
7. Employment rate of graduates



## ALLEGANY COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

Allegany College of Maryland is a public two-year college that provides quality comprehensive educational programs, training, and services at reasonable cost. The convenient campus locations offer a comfortable environment that makes considerable use of high-tech equipment and state-of-the-art learning technologies, including distance learning.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,355	3,499	3,864	4,264	3,458
Noncredit students	6,464	7,442	6,268	7,561	7,479
Market share of county population	50.7%	51.7%	53.4%	56.2%	50.8%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	60.9%	63.9%	61.6%	64.4%	62.5%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	36.8%	39.8%	33.6%	38.0%	39.4%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	35.7%	44.5%	27.2%	66.7%	33.2%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	Benchmark 2006
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	82%	93%	96%	95%	90%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	72%	82%	82%	91%	80%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	92%	92%	77%	76%	87%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	85%	92%	87%	94%	89%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	4.9%	5.3%	5.2%	6.8%	5.3%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	7.2%	7.2%	7.1%	7.1%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2006
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	58.5%	55.6%	50.3%	45.5%	58.7%

Performance Indicator	AY 1999-2000	AY 2000-2001	AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.86	2.69	3.02	2.74	2.75



## ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Committed to a 'Students First' philosophy, Anne Arundel Community College offers high quality, comprehensive learning opportunities and a wide array of student and community services responsive to the diverse needs of Anne Arundel County residents. Established in 1961, the college is a fully accredited, public two-year college with a rich tradition of community outreach and service. The college has the largest single campus enrollment among Maryland community colleges, is the second largest community college in the state and enrolls the largest percentage of Anne Arundel county undergraduates.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	18,375	17,256	19,154	20,479	20,800
Noncredit students	32,099	34,832	38,015	33,895	35,000
Market share of county population	58.7%	58.9%	59.8%	60.3%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	69.1%	70.3%	71.4%	69.5%	73.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	33.6%	36.7%	37.7%	38.8%	38.7%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority students w/in four yrs	19.6%	25.9%	28.8%	22.6%	30.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	96%	96%	94%	96%	96%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	82%	85%	81%	89%	85%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	86%	86%	85%	85%	87%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	93%	95%	96%	89%	97%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	18.6%	21.1%	20.4%	21.6%	22.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	18.8%	18.6%	18.7%		

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	AY 2000	1999 AY 2001	2000 AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	66.3%	68.2%	66.7%	68.9%	66.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.80	2.84	2.79	2.76	2.80
Number of participants in contract training	42,180	47,527	46,073	44,724	45,000

## BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The mission of Baltimore City Community College is to educate and train a world-class workforce for Baltimore. Serving more than 6,000 credit and 12,000 continuing education students, BCCC has the highest market share of Baltimore City residents enrolled in higher education in Maryland. The College offers 30 Associate degree programs, with special emphases in health, human services, and business, and eight Associate degree transfer programs. BCCC offers a multicultural, comprehensive educational experience, with programs offered at two main campuses and satellite locations throughout the City.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	8,866	8,767	9,754	10,883	9,230
Noncredit students	8,895	12,474	12,824	13,362	15,000
Market share of county population	30.4%	30.0%	31.7%	33.4%	32.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	45.0%	51.4%	53.5%	58.6%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	13.1%	13.1%	13.5%	9.9%	18.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	11.0%	12.0%	13.2%	9.2%	18.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	88%	88%	90%	98%	90%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	93%	90%	79%	76%	95%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	98%	100%	81%	76%	100%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	NA*	100%	100%	100%	100%

(NA\* - Less than 5 respondents)

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	91.0%	91.2%	91.3%	94.7%	90.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older					

## CARROLL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Chiseled above the college's main entrance are the words "Enter to Learn." This invitation captures the spirit and purpose of Carroll Community College. An open-admissions, learner-centered community college, Carroll provides the first two years of the baccalaureate degree; Associate degree and certificate programs in technical fields, specializing in computer/information technologies; and noncredit programs and courses for workforce development, continuing education, and personal and community enrichment.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,402	3,515	3,747	3,913	3,650
Noncredit students	7,581	7,688	7,405	8,158	9,000
Market share of county population	46.2%	47.1%	46.8%	47.8%	48.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	69.3%	67.8%	69.4%	71.0%	70.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	34.9%	40.2%	38.2%	39.9%	42%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	0.0%	15.4%	44.4%	44.4%	33%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	93%	96%	99%	99%	96%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	76%	75%	70%	79%	80%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	95%	83%	100%	80%	95%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	89%	83%	100%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	4.8%	5.5%	6.3%	5.9%	6.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older		4.6%			

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark FY2005
Number of businesses and organizations served in contract training		76	63	68	75
Number of participants in contract training		5,663	4,882	6,463	6,000

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark FY 2005
Enrollment in workforce development courses		6,907	6,344	7,392	7,500

## CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Cecil Community College is a small, publicly funded, open-access institution which promotes educational, cultural and economic development in rural northeastern Maryland. The College offers high-quality transfer, career credit, and continuing education courses and programs which are designed for college preparation, acquisition and upgrading of employment skills, and personal enrichment.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	1,905	1,956	2,190	2,511	2,600
Noncredit students	4,660	4,885	4,951	4,947	5,363
Market share of county population	64.7%	64.6%	63.7%	62.3%	66.6%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	57.3%	54.1%	54.7%	58.6%	57.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	28.0%	26.9%	22.9%	29.3%	27.8%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	15.8%	22.2%	17.6%	34.7%	16.8%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	95%	94%	94%	97%	90%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	83%	73%	92%	78%	80%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	81%	88%	82%	75%	86%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	94%	82%	100%	90%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	7.5%	10.1%	10.9%	11.2%	10.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	6.0%	6.2%	6.2%		

## CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE

Chesapeake College, the first of three regional community colleges in the State, serves the learning needs of residents of five counties on the Upper Eastern Shore, an area comprising 20% of the State's land mass. Through its partnership with Caroline, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot counties, the College is uniquely situated to serve as a regional center for learning offering associate degree and certificate programs and collaborative initiatives with other educational institutions, health care providers, business and industry.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,083	2,997	3,140	3,238	3,414
Noncredit students	11,674	11,423	11,342	9,545	12,000
Market share of county population	55.0%	53.0%	53.0%	55.0%	58.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	62%	61%	68%	62%	65%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	34%	43%	34%	35%	39%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	31%	33%	20%	24%	27%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	91%	96%	90%	97%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	68%	78%	72%	57%	78%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	77%	90%	77%	78%	83%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	100%	86%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	18.0%	20.0%	19.0%	21.0%	20.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	18.0%	18.0%	17.0%	18.0%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2005 Benchmark
Senior adult enrollments in non-credit courses	7,733	7,927	7,122	6,999	7,800
Percentage of expenditures on instruction	49%	50%	51%	50%	50%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Percent career program graduates employed full-time in related areas	83%	68%	84%	77%	84%

## THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

The Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC) is a premier, learning-centered public single college, multi-campus institution that anticipates and responds to the educational, training, and employment needs of the community by offering a broad array of general education, transfer, and career programs, student support services, and economic and community development activities.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	26,685	26,606	27,892	28,566	28,000
Noncredit students	45,835	46,393	47,168	40,442	48,600
Market share of county population	49%	50%	49%	51%	52%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	58.7%	65.0%	66.0%	63.3%	67.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	26.6%	29.0%	27.0%	29.0%	31.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	18.3%	19.8%	21.0%	22.0%	25.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	Benchmark 2006
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	95%	96%	94%	97%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	82%	78%	72%	81%	82%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	76%	72%	83%	88%	85%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	86%	94%	96%	92%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	30.0%	31.0%	33.0%	35.0%	33.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	23.0%				

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2006
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions	47.5%	48.2%	45.1%	43.7%	50.0%

	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2006
Percent minorities of full-time faculty	12.9%	13.3%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%
Percent minorities of full-time administrative/professional staff	22.0%	25.5%	29.0%	29.0%	28.0%

## COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND

The College of Southern Maryland serves students intending to transfer to four-year colleges and those seeking immediate career entry. Students also attend CSM to upgrade job skills or for personal enrichment. The college operates two campuses in Charles County (La Plata, and Waldorf), and branch campuses in St. Mary's and Calvert counties. Twenty associates degree programs and over 15 certificate programs are offered.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
<b>Enrollment:</b>					
Credit students	8,568	9,123	9,824	10,737	9,700
Noncredit students	7,445	7,949	8,580	9,397	7,825
Market share of county population	60.0%	59.2%	59.1%	59.3%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	77.2%	68.4%	67.1%	68.1%	71.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	37.3%	43.1%	41.9%	51.8%	42.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	21.2%	26.2%	27.4%	46.4%	27.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	94%	98%	91%	92%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	68%	80%	80%	85%	81%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	78%	84%	71%	81%	82%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	Missing	100%	83%	100%	96%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	21.4%	23.3%	24.4%	25.1%	24.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%	24.5%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2006 Benchmark
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	54.2%	55.2%	53.8%	52.4%	58.0%

Performance Indicator	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2005 Benchmark
Passing rate: NCLEX - First time testing (MD Board of Nursing)	94%	94%	88%	94%	92%
Percentage of expenditures on instruction	44%	46%	46%	46%	48%

## FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Frederick Community College prepares about 12,000 students in credit or non-credit courses each year to meet the challenges of a diverse, global society through quality, accessible, innovative, life-long education. The college is a student-centered, community focused college. Frederick Community College offers degrees, certificates, and programs for workforce preparation, transfer, and personal enrichment programs to enhance the quality of life and economic development of our area.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	6,942	7,098	6,797	6,726	7,636
Noncredit students	7,426	8,090	7,603	8,816	9,357
Market share of county population	58.5%	60.8%	58.0%	56.0%	61.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	69.2%	69.6%	67.0%	68.0%	71.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	40.6%	37.7%	37.0%	41.0%	41.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	18.9%	31.4%	25.0%	32.0%	41.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	Benchmark 2006
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	93%	95%	96%	95%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	83%	79%	88%	80%	85%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	88%	86%	83%	100%	88%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	16.5%	16.6%	15.0%	16.0%	19.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	10.8%	10.8%	11.0%	12.0%	



**GARRETT COLLEGE**

Garrett Community College is a small rural campus in the mountains of Western Maryland overlooking Deep Creek Lake and the Wisp Resort area. Students receive personalized instruction in small classes. The college offers two year associate degree transfer and career entry programs, one year certificate programs and continuing education courses.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Enrollment:					
Credit students	864	874	822	777	909
Noncredit students	2,150	2,209	2,810	3,167	2,200
Market share of county population	54.2%	52.9%	51.4%	52.5%	54.2%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004</b>
Second year retention rate	65.0%	62.0%	66.2%	66.4%	65.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	28.6%	35.3%	35.2%	36.2%	35.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	0.0%	8.3%	11.1%	0.0%	12.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>1998 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006</b>
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	96%	91%	88%	96%	90%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	67%	85%	75%	91%	75%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	100%	78%	69%	84%	75%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	4.5%	5.4%	6.2%	7.2%	2.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	1.0%				

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>AY 1999-2000</b>	<b>AY 2000-2001</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	57.7%	61.3%	64.0%	64.3%	58.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.94	2.90	2.98	2.96	2.87

	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006</b>
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	52.5%	54.0%	48.8%	46.7%	53.1%

## HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dedicated to learning and student success, Hagerstown Community College (HCC) provides career, transfer, and certificate programs, as well as opportunities for lifelong learning. As a leader in its region's economic development, HCC offers many diverse non-credit training options and partnerships with government, business and industry.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,755	3,747	3,883	4,290	4,200
Noncredit students	8,555	9,282	9,895	10,084	10,270
Market share of county population	60.0%	60.0%	59.0%	61.0%	61.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	65.0%	62.0%	66.0%	66.0%	64.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	51.0%	42.0%	40.0%	35.0%	42.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	39.0%	24.0%	28.0%	28.0%	28.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	95.0%	95.0%	93.0%	98.0%	95.0%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	75.0%	85.0%	83.0%	82.0%	85.0%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	86.0%	77.0%	68.0%	74.0%	80.0%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	81.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%*	95.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	10.0%	9.0%	9.9%	10.0%	11.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	10.5%	10.5%	10.0%	10.0%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	1995 Cohort	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Percent of students transferring to Maryland public four-year institutions	23.0%	17.0%	21.0%	14.0%	21.0%

Performance Indicator	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2005 Benchmark
Senior adult enrollment in non-credit courses	2,907	3,640	4,362	4,178	4,000

## HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Harford Community College is fully a accredited, open-admission two year community college offering a wide variety of majors and career training. Over 17,000 Harford county residents take credit and noncredit classes each semester. The 211 acre campus includes 15 academic and administrative buildings with facilities including networked computer labs, a radio and TV studio, library, 350 seat theater, and an Apprenticeship and Training Center.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	6,629	6,817	7,420	7,786	6,800
Noncredit students	14,950	15,096	16,391	15,161	17,000
Market share of county population	56%	57%	57%	56%	56%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	67%	68%	69%	71%	68%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	39%	37%	33%	38%	36%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	22%	18%	17%	31%	30%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	93%	94%	94%	96%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	80%	83%	81%	87%	80%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	82%	68%	78%	86%	85%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	14%	14%	15%	16%	14%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	13.0%	13%	13%	13%	

## HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Howard Community College creates an environment that inspires learning and the lifelong pursuit of personal and professional goals. The college provides open access and innovative learning systems to respond to the ever-changing needs and interests of a

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	7,992	8,406	9,012	9,262	9,462
Noncredit students	12,766	12,568	13,690	13,640	13,530
Market share of county population	45.5%	44.0%	44.3%	44.7%	45.5%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	67.9%	71.8%	70.4%	70.1%	68.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	33.2%	37.8%	37.2%	43.3%	37.3%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	27.9%	31.2%	27.5%	39.5%	34.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	Benchmark 2006
Student satisfaction with goal achievement		98.3%	96.4%	94.3%	98.3%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	78.8%	80.7%	82.4%	76.6%	83.0%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	82%	85%	84%	85%	86%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	82%	100%	91%	80%	90%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	30.7%	31.7%	32.2%	31.9%	29.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	22.3%	26.6%	27.3%	27.3%	

## MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Montgomery College is dedicated to *Changing Lives, Enriching Our Community, and Holding Ourselves Accountable*. With three campuses and two major business and community Workforce Development and Continuing Education sites, the College continues to grow, annually serving over 32,000 credit students and more than 12,000 Workforce Development and Continuing Education students. While Montgomery County's population is quite diverse, Montgomery College's credit student body is even more diverse - 25% Black, 17% are Asian, 12% are Hispanic, and 45% are White. Students from 168 foreign countries comprise 32% of the students.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	32,159	33,198	32,580	32,540	36,000
Noncredit students	12,072	13,227	14,562	14,949	19,896
Market share of county population	53.9%	54.5%	54.7%	53.0%	55.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	64.7%	68.9%	69.6%	70.4%	66.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	30.9%	27.3%	28.5%	30.1%	33.5%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	29.8%	23.9%	26.0%	28.5%	33.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	94%	97%	96%	97%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	83%	79%	79%	88%	85%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	93%	76%	79%	90%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	98%	100%	83%	93%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in companson to service area population	48.6%	50.3%	50.7%	52.2%	50.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	31.7%	38.9%	39.7%		

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

Prince George's Community College is among the largest community colleges in Maryland, serving over 30,000 credit and non-credit students each year. The college provides over 60 credit programs designed to prepare students to transfer to four-year colleges and universities or to help students develop in their chosen career field. In addition to day and evening courses, the college offers courses on weekends and at extension centers throughout the county as well as an ever-increasing number of online courses and degree programs.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
<b>Enrollment:</b>					
Credit students	18,025	17,757	19,013	19,537	21,904
Noncredit students	17,100	18,481	19,584	19,804	19,883
Market share of county population	40.6%	40.0%	40.3%	40.0%	45.6%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004</b>
Second year retention rate	60.0%	60.2%	57.2%	61.1%	73.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	28.5%	23.1%	22.0%	19.5%	35.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	24.7%	22.1%	19.7%	18.3%	33.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>1998 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2006 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	99%	97%	95%	93%	100%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	89%	76%	85%	88%	90%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	99%	97%	70%	75%	100%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	83.0%	83.0%	86.8%	87.5%	73.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older		73.0%	64.6%	64.6%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>AY 1999-2000</b>	<b>AY 2000-2001</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	47.0%	48.8%	48.6%	49.0%	56.4%

## WOR-WIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Wor-Wic is a comprehensive community college serving the residents of Worcester, Wicomico and Somerset counties on Maryland's Lower Eastern Shore. The college provides quality transfer and career credit programs as well as community and continuing education courses that promote workforce development. Wor-Wic encourages access by collaborating with local secondary schools and universities and maintaining cooperative relationships with area businesses.

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	2,857	3,280	3,946	4,262	3,850
Noncredit students	6,464	7,042	6,299	6,013	7,000
Market share of county population	48.0%	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	52.0%

Performance Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	Benchmark 2004
Second year retention rate	62.0%	67.0%	55.0%	60.0%	68.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	Benchmark 2001
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	37.0%	33.0%	37.0%	34.0%	38.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	10.0%	19.0%	31.0%	22.0%	28.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2006 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with goal achievement	94%	96%	96%	98%	95%
Student satisfaction with transfer preparation	100%	90%	100%	91%	90%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	94%	84%	96%	90%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	100%	96%	91%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	24.0%	27.0%	27.0%	27.0%	23.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	23.0%	22.0%	22.0%		

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2005
Employer/Organization satisfaction with community college contract training	100%	98%	100%	95%

	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Benchmark 2005
Passing rate: Licensed Practical Nurse	100%	94%	94%	100%	95%
Passing rate: Radiologic Tech, AART	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%

**BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Bowie State University (BSU), an historically black institution established in 1865, is a regional university offering a comprehensive array of baccalaureate programs and selected professionally-oriented master's programs. BSU serves both commuting and residential residents.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	95%	87%	86%	80%	85%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep.	96%	82%	83%	79%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	42%	41%	39%	40%	50%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	43%	42%	39%	39%	50%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	71%	73%	75%	70%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	87%	88%	84%	90%	88%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>1999 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	*	*	*	*	*

\* data not supplied by BSU



**COPPIN STATE COLLEGE**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Coppin State College (CSC), an historically black institution, offers selected baccalaureate and master's programs in the liberal arts and sciences, human services, and teacher education. Dedicated to excellence in teaching, Coppin focuses on the needs of inner-city sciences, human services, and teacher education. Dedicated to excellence in teaching, Coppin focuses on the needs of inner-city minority and economically disadvantaged students.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	*	*	*	*	97%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	*	*	*	*	97%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	25%	26%	30%	24%	33%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	26%	27%	29%	24%	33%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	73%	77%	72%	70%	79%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	90%	90%	92%	95%	83%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	88%	85%	95%	94%	88%

**FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Frostburg State University (FSU) is a largely residential, regional university offering a comprehensive array of baccalaureate and master's programs with special emphasis on education, business, environmental studies, and the creative and performing arts.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	97%	94%	89%	97%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	88%	98%	93%	97%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	60%	59%	57%	5900%	61%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	39%	45%	41%	4500%	45%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	78%	75%	79%	76%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	12%	13%	13%	12%	13%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	95%	98%	95%	97%	98%

**SALISBURY UNIVERSITY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Salisbury University (SU) serves the Eastern Shore of Maryland by providing a traditional liberal arts and sciences curriculum, as well as undergraduate, pre-professional and graduate programs for the region's teachers, administrators, and business leaders.

Indicator	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with job preparation	93%	92%	92%	92%	94%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	100%	98%	98%	98%	98%

Indicator	1994 Cohort	1995 Cohort	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Six year graduation rate of all students	71%	74%	72%	73%	70%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	60%	61%	55%	53%	61%

Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Second year retention rate	84%	86%	85%	84%	87%

Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	2005 Benchmark
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	7%	8%	8%	9%	10%

Indicator	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Employment rate of graduates	94%	96%	96%	96%	95%

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Towson University (TU), the largest university in the Baltimore metropolitan region, serves both residential and commuter students. TU provides a broad range of undergraduate programs in both the traditional arts and sciences and in applied professional fields, as well as selected master's-level programs.

Indicator	1997 Follow-Up Survey	1999 Follow-Up Survey	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with job preparation	86%	91%	95%	90%	91%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	96%	99%	94%	97%	91%

Indicator	1994 Cohort	1995 Cohort	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Six year graduation rate of all students	59%	65%	60%	60%	65%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	49%	45%	48%	51%	51%

Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Second year retention rate	83%	85%	89%	87%	87%

Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	2005 Benchmark
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%

Indicator	1998 Follow-Up Survey	2000 Follow-Up Survey	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Employment rate of graduates	94%	94%	90%	90%	91%

Campus-Specific Indicators	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Second Year retention rate of African-American	87%	89%	94%	92%	89%

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

The University of Baltimore (UB) provides career-oriented education at the upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional levels, offering degree programs in law, business, public administration, and related applications of the liberal arts.

Indicator	1997 Follow-Up Survey	1998 Follow-Up Survey	2000 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with job preparation	79%	87%	91%	87%	90%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	97%	98%	98%	90%

Indicator	1994 Cohort	1995 Cohort	1996 Cohort	1996 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Six year graduation rate of all students	*	*	*	*	*
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	*	*	*	*	*

Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Second year retention rate	*	*	*	*	*

Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	2005 Benchmark
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	31%	33%	34%	36%	32%

Indicator	1998 Follow-Up Survey	2000 Follow-Up Survey	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Employment rate of graduates	94%	96%	95%	95%	82%

\* data not supplied by UB

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

The University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) offers undergraduate, master's, and doctoral programs in the arts and sciences and engineering. Within a strong interdisciplinary framework, UMBC programs link the cultures of the sciences, social sciences, visual and performing arts and humanities, and the professions.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	97%	92%	89%	93%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	99%	97%	99%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	59%	60%	58%	61%	65%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	63%	62%	59%	61%	65%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	82%	82%	88%	89%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	16%	16%	16%	15%	18%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	88%	85%	80%	81%	86%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

The University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), a comprehensive public research university, is the flagship institution of USM and Maryland's 1862 land grant institution. UMCP offers baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs in the liberal arts and sciences, social sciences, the arts, and selected professional fields. UMCP also serves the state's agricultural, industrial, and commercial communities, as well as school systems, governmental agencies, and citizens.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	91%	89%	98%	98%	90%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	96%	98%	96%	96%	90%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	64%	69%	70%	73%	70%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	48%	57%	56%	57%	60%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	91%	92%	93%	91%	92%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	13%	12%	12%	12%	15%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	87%	87%	84%	84%	90%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, an historically black institution, offers baccalaureate programs in the liberal arts and sciences and in career fields with particular relevance to the Eastern Shore in keeping with its 1890 land-grant mandate, as well as selected programs in master's and doctoral levels.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	89%	90%	92%	92%	92%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	80%	80%	83%	83%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	41%	47%	50%	52%	48%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	42%	44%	51%	53%	45%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	74%	66%	71%	70%	78%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	79%	78%	75%	78%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	*	*	*	*	*

\* data not supplied by UMES



**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

The University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) comprises six professional schools that provide training in dentistry, law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and social work. UMB also offers combined graduate degree programs with other Baltimore-area institutions and serves as the hub of the region's leading collaborative biomedical research center.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with programs (Nursing only)	93%	80%	NA	NA	*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
<b>Graduation Rates</b>					
School of Dentistry	95%	95%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		
School of Law	92%	94%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		
School of Medicine	97%	97%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		
School of Nursing	92%	92%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		
School of Pharmacy	97%	97%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		
School of Social Work	98%	98%	not reported in '03 and '04 submissions		

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American	24%	25%	29%	27%	*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	90%	97%	*	*	*

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
<b>Licensure Exam Pass Rate</b>					
Dental (NERB, Rank/Total)	100%	100%	*	*	above median
Dental (NBDE I, MD/Natl. Mean)	86.8/86.0	85.8/85.0	*	*	above mean
Dental (NBDE II, MD/Natl. Mean)	82.6/82.1		*	*	above mean
Law	81%	81%	*	*	above mean
Medicine (USMLE-2)	96%	97%	*	*	94%
Nursing (NCLEX-RN)	86%	*	*	*	88%
Pharmacy (NAPLEX)	100%	100%	*	*	100%
Social Work (LCSW)	86/82	83/79	*	*	98%
Number of refereed publications per full-time faculty	2.1	2.5	2.4	6.8	3.1
Grant/contract awards (\$M)	\$255.1	\$304.3	\$323.40	336.6	\$254.9
Number technology licenses issued per year	5	2	3	3	3

\* data not supplied by UMB

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

The University of Maryland University College (UMUC) serves primarily working adults enrolled part-time in a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs delivered online and on sites conveniently located throughout Maryland. UMUC also extends its programs throughout the Nation and the world.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	97%	98%	96%	97%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	100%	98%	96%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	31%	31%	32%	32%	31%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	96%	96%	94%	96%	95%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Number online enrollments/registrations	50,301	72,126	87,565	97,144	86,920
Number off-campus/distance ed enrollments/registrations	51,140	61,786	74,309	83,524	72,000
Number of Baccalaureate Graduates of IT Programs	769	829	889	881	*

\* indicator not benchmarked

**MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

Morgan State University is a teaching institution serving the Baltimore metropolitan area. MSU offers bachelors, master's, and doctoral degrees and gives emphasis to programs in education, business, engineering, and the sciences. Admissions policies target students who rank at the 60th percentile or higher in their graduating class.

Indicator	1997 Follow-Up Survey	1999 Follow-Up Survey	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with job preparation	100%	96%	95%	N/A	100%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	100%	97%	98%	N/A	100%

Indicator	1994 Cohort	1995 Cohort	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Six year graduation rate of all students	43%	41%	40%	41%	45%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	43%	42%	40%	41%	45%

Indicator	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2005 Benchmark
Second year retention rate	74%	73%	74%	76%	80%

Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	2005 Benchmark
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	94%	92%	91%	91%	88%

Indicator	1997 Follow-Up Survey	1999 Follow-Up Survey	2001 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Benchmark
Employment rate of graduates	88%	88%	87%	N/A	90%

Campus-Specific Indicators	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005 Benchmark
Percent Other Race of total enrollment	6%	8%	10%	11%	12%
Number partnerships with public schools	30	34	33	36	50
Funding from grants/contracts for student research opps	2.7	\$2.7m	\$2.9m	\$2.9m	\$2.1m
Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded	11	3	13	23	25
FTE Student-to-authorized faculty ratio	18.1:1	17.6:1	17.3:1	17.4:1	15:1

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**  
**2004 Accountability Profile**

St. Mary's College of Maryland is the state's public honors college serving a statewide constituency. St. Mary's offers bachelors degrees and emphasizes the liberal arts. Admissions policies target students in the top quartile of their graduating class.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	99%	99%	93%	94%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	94%	97%	100%	100%	96%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1994 Cohort</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	72%	81%	75%	75%	76%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	62%	80%	68%	67%	72%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	82%	88%	91%	85%	86%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	8%	8%	8%	7%	11%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	96%	85%	95%	98%	98%

<b>Campus- Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Four-year graduation rate	67%	63%	63%	70%	70%
Four-year graduation rate of all minorities	60%	52%	42%	63%	63%
Four-year graduation rate of Afr-Am	54%	41%	40%	68%	63%
Graduate/professional school going rate (within one year)	29%	30%	44%	28%	30%
Graduate/professional school going rate (within five years)	54%	59%	55%	56%	50%