

**2005 Performance Accountability Report  
Maryland Public Colleges and Universities**

**Volume 1**

**November 2005**

**MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION**

**Kevin M. O'Keefe, Chairman**

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

**Joann A. Boughman**

**Anne Osborn Emery**

**Alicia Coro Hoffman**

**Iona Modly Hogan**

**Emmett Paige, Jr.**

**Sherman L. Ragland, II**

**Nelson J. Sabatini**

**Mario F. VillaSanta**

**Colleen Welch**

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

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

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



**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 four years.

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 tenth 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 2005; it provided updates to the strategies adopted in the campuses' minority achievement action plans. 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 26. The Commission presented reports to the General Assembly in each of the past five 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 the end of a chapter in accountability reporting for the community colleges and the beginning of a new phase for USM institutions. This is the last year of the current cycle for the community colleges. USM campuses began a new round of reporting this year, extending their benchmarks to 2009 and streamlining their accountability objectives to make them more consistent with institutional missions and the goals in *2004 State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. St. Mary's College of

Maryland also has reached the end of its five-year cycle. These changes gave the Commission the opportunity to evaluate the success of the public institutions in meeting their campus-established benchmarks. The Commission also continued to ask 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. This year's reports show evidence of the considerable attention which the public campuses give to the preparation of this annual report. This commitment augurs well for the quality of accountability reporting in future years.

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

### *Community Colleges*

**The community colleges collectively achieved approximately half of the benchmarks they set for themselves in 2000 on their accountability indicators.**

As a sector, community colleges reached or exceeded their benchmarks after five years on an average of 47 percent of their performance measures. This figure was derived by summing the number of indicators for which each community college attained its benchmark and dividing by the total number of indicators. On a large majority of the measures, community colleges attained 80 percent of their benchmark.

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were generally very strong. The quality of the reports has been repeatedly high across the two-year sector for the last several years.**

Each campus prepared a complete report following the prescribed format. The institutional analyses of 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.

**The performance of the community colleges on indicators in certain areas raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring. These include recruitment of minority faculty and staff, transfer and graduation rates for minorities, contract training, licensure exam passing rates, and the enrollment of senior adults in noncredit courses.**

While some community colleges experienced progress in the past year toward their benchmarks in the hiring of minority faculty and administrative/professional staff, others lost ground. Campuses identified factors that had hindered their efforts and described actions they are taking to ensure non discrimination in hiring. The graduation and transfer rates of minority students, both after four and six years, have continually trailed that of other students. The gap is especially large when African American and Hispanic

students are examined alone. The colleges discussed steps that they have taken to improve transfer and graduation rates, including actions that they have implemented specifically for minorities. Community colleges have experienced a setback on one or more of their indicators dealing with providing contract training to businesses in their jurisdiction. The institutions attributed this situation to weakness in the economy and a corresponding reduction in training funding by companies and government. While many colleges linked progress on these measures to a turnaround in the local labor market, several described actions they had initiated to address the problem. The passing rate on certain licensure examinations related to health programs trailed the benchmarks at nine community colleges in the past year. These institutions provided explanations for their performance and, in some cases, described steps being taken to boost future scores. Half of the community colleges reported a drop in the enrollment of senior adults in noncredit courses in the past year. The chief reason cited by the institutions was inadequate funding, including cuts in supporting government programs and competing campus priorities. Several campuses described actions being taken to deal with the decline.

**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 USM campuses and St. Mary's College of Maryland attained half of their collective accountability objectives by their specified benchmark year.**

At the conclusion of the last accountability cycle for the USM colleges and universities (2004), Morgan (2005) and St. Mary's (2005), these institutions had met or exceeded an average of 48.6 percent of the benchmarks on their accountability objectives. This figure was calculated by dividing the number of objectives for which a benchmark was achieved by the total number of objectives. Most campuses had reached at least 80 percent of their benchmarks on a large majority of their objectives.

**The accountability reports submitted by USM were uniformly well-prepared – the best that the Commission has received from this segment in the history of the process.**

USM heeded the Commission's advice in the *2004 Performance Accountability Report* that the institutional assessment prepared by three of its universities serve as models for the others. This year, each institution developed a thorough analysis of its performance on its accountability objectives and framed the discussion on the basis of its mission, campus strategies, and the goals in the *2004 State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. The reports from all of the public four-year campuses contained all of the required components.



**The performance of the public four-year institutions on their accountability objectives merit special attention in four areas: contribution to critical workforce areas, the retention and graduation rate of new full-time African American students, fundraising from outside sources, 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 five years ago, and the number of nurses graduating from the State's campuses will fall short of satisfying the projected openings. While the job market for information technology graduates has softened since the end of the 1990s, a rebound in this sector is inevitable. In revising their accountability objectives for the next cycle, several USM institutions adopted less ambitious benchmarks for serving the Maryland workforce in these three areas and others remained very far from their benchmark. The second year retention rate of new full-time African American students in the most recent cohort at the public four-year institutions was the second lowest in 12 years, and there has been a lingering gap of 20 to 24 percentage points in the six-year graduation rate of African Americans and students of other races. Many of the campuses have experienced problems achieving their objectives on these indicators, but nearly all provided details about the steps they are taking to improve the retention and graduation rates of students and particularly African Americans. 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 activities was comprehensive and detailed at all institutions.**

All public institutions provided detailed descriptions and specific dollar amounts showing how they have reduced waste, improved the overall efficiency of their operations and achieved cost savings. 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 and evaluated by the Commission staff for consistency with the accountability guidelines, saved \$46.4 million in FY 2005.





**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 four years. The National Commission on Accountability stated in its 2005 report that "state leaders are responsible for assessing whether institutions are contributing appropriately to statewide goals and obtaining evidence that institutional practices are promoting quality and improved performance." Maryland's system of performance accountability is based on this concept.

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 fifth 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.

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

This document represents the tenth 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 undergraduate student learning outcomes and minority achievement were presented to the Commission in November 2004 and September 2005 respectively. In the latest minority achievement report, campuses were asked to provide updates to the strategies that they described in their 2003 minority achievement action plans, including steps taken to improve performance on accountability indicators on which they had not made sufficient progress and examples of successes they had achieved. 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 26 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 five 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 fifth set of reports that Maryland's public colleges and universities have submitted since the accountability process was revised in 2000, and it represents a transition for both the two- and four-year institutions.

For the community colleges, this represents the final year of the current cycle. Next year's report will be based on a new five-year period. The community colleges have requested additions and revisions to their performance measures, based on the work of a task force directed by the chief executive officers of the two-year institutions, while retaining the "mission/mandate" driven structure. St. Mary's College of Maryland also has concluded a five-year cycle. USM institutions initiated a new five-year round of reporting this year, with most of its benchmarks extended to 2009 or an equivalent year. USM campuses adjusted their reports to reflect the MFR requirements established by DBM, resulting in the streamlining of accountability objectives at many campuses. In addition, the USM colleges and universities made numerous changes in their objectives based on their mission and the strategic planning process at their campuses and the System. Campuses developed their objectives on the basis of key issues driving decision-making at their institutions, and these coincided closely with the five goals in the *2004 State Plan for Postsecondary Education* and with the major areas of accountability. The result is a more focused and policy-oriented approach to accountability. Morgan State University advances its benchmark year with each report.

The conclusion of a chapter in the accountability process affords the Commission the opportunity to assess the overall success of community colleges and most public four-year institutions in reaching the benchmarks that they established for themselves five years ago. The Commission also has continued to make specific assessments about the performance of individual campuses on measures and objectives. Institutions were 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. The Commission did not pose any questions this year to University of Maryland University College or St. Mary's College. This year's assessment will continue the practice of making sector-level analyses of objectives and measures where trends in the data suggest difficulties.

This year's submissions demonstrate that the public colleges and universities expend a great deal of resources in the preparation of the accountability report and take the process very seriously. The level of interest is demonstrated by the desire of the campuses to refine their objectives and performance measures to reflect the higher education issues that are most important at their campuses and statewide. Hundreds of hours were devoted by staff at the institutions and their governing boards and associations in the past

year in the preparation of reports and in the review and selection of new and revised measures. This augurs well for the quality of accountability reporting in the future.

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

### **Community Colleges**

**The community colleges collectively achieved approximately half of the benchmarks they set for themselves in 2000 on their accountability indicators.**

Each of the 16 community colleges had 29 standard performance measures, except Garrett College with 28. Hence, the total number of indicators for the sector was 463. Of this number, community colleges reached or exceeded their self-established benchmarks after five years on 216 indicators or 47 percent. On a large majority of the indicators, community colleges attained at least 80 percent of their benchmark. There was considerable variance across the two-year institutions in the achievement rate. Many community colleges set challenging goals for themselves which they were unable to meet within the time period. Discussed below are the types of measures on which the two-year institutions had the greatest difficulty in achieving their benchmark. In arriving at the percent of benchmarks achieved, the passing rate on licensure exams was treated as a single measure with a campus given credit for having achieved it if it reached or exceeded its goal on at least half of the tests.

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were generally very strong. The quality of the reports has been repeatedly high across the two-year sector for the last several years.**

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. 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.

**The performance of the community colleges on indicators in certain areas raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring. These include recruitment of minority faculty and staff, transfer and graduation rates for minorities, contract training, licensure exam passing rates, and the enrollment of senior adults in noncredit courses.**

### 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. While some campuses demonstrated progress in the past year toward their benchmarks in this area, others lost ground. Several noted that the addition of just a few employees would enable them to reach their benchmark, and some 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 small number of vacancies due to low turnover at their institution and limited number of faculty and staff, the lack of qualified minority applicants in the college's geographical area, stiff competition for minority scholars and professionals, and the lack of competitive salaries.

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. Most 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, administrative actions by appropriate campus units, and mentoring for new hires. Specific examples included the placement of notices in national and minority publications, the hiring of more minorities as adjunct faculty, the development of ties with minority organizations, the inclusion of equal opportunity or human resources staff on search committees, racial/ethnic diversity on search committees, creation of a web-based information system to track equal education opportunity information, recruitment activities at state and regional historically black colleges and universities, mailings to minority contacts, and academic department minority hiring plans. Institutions also pointed to initiatives they described in their *2005 Minority Achievement Report* and *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

### Transfer and Graduation Rates of Minority Students

The four- and six-year transfer and graduation rates of minority students have represented a persistent accountability issue for the community colleges. Just three two-year institutions have achieved their benchmarks on both of these indicators, and six institutions have attained neither. The graduation and transfer rates of minority students, both after four and six years, have continually lagged that of other students. For example, in the most recent cohort, the four-year rate for full-time degree-seeking minority students was 24.8 percent compared to 34.0 percent for all students. The six-year rate for all degree-seeking minority students was 20.4 percent in contrast to the all-student average of 27.2 percent. There is an even greater gap when one examines the patterns among African Americans and Hispanics only.

Nearly all colleges described actions that they had initiated to improve transfer and graduation rates, including steps they had implemented specifically for minorities. These included changes in staffing, the introduction and enhancement of student support programs, instructional interventions, curricula changes, articulation efforts, readiness programs for incoming students, the appointment of study groups, 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, the tracking of 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, revised general education programs in math and English, teaching of academic success skills, establishment of an online retention system, creation of a graduation task force and a student persistence and achievement committee, use of basic skills assessment tests for entering students, programs to promote first year student integration into college, faculty and student mentoring programs, degree audit policies for students near graduation, summer bridge programs for college-bound high school students, programs aimed at the promotion of diversity and global awareness, and a “closing the gap” project aimed at eliminating the difference between the achievement of African Americans and whites. Many campuses pointed to initiatives that they described in their *2005 Minority Achievement Report* and *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

A number of colleges observed that statistics in the accountability report reflect the number and percentage of students who transfer to a Maryland public college and university only. The Commission is currently unable to track students who enroll at an out-of-state institution and has only recently gained the ability to examine those who attend a Maryland state-aided independent college or university. As a result, several community colleges have entered agreements with the National Loan Clearinghouse to obtain information about students who transfer to a campus outside Maryland. The Commission provides community colleges with the option of reporting the percentage of students who had enrolled at a Maryland independent or an out-of-state institution, based on campus-generated figures. Only Anne Arundel Community College has provided this information in the past three accountability 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 and full-time minority students by 5.8 percent and 4.9 percent respectively in the most recent cohort, and the six-year rates of all students and all minority students by 7.3 percent and 8.2 percent respectively. The community colleges are proposing a substantially changed approach to capturing retention, graduation and transfer rates in the next round of accountability reporting.

In any case, 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. Results from community college non-returning student surveys support this point. Of 2,157 students statewide who responded



to the 2003 survey, 37.5 percent had enrolled with goals other than earning a formal credential or transferring.

### Contract Training

All community colleges provide customized workforce training to employers in their jurisdiction, reflecting the importance which two-year institutions place on contributing to economic development in their area and maintaining relationships with businesses. It is one of the key ways in which community colleges contribute to the goal in the *2004 Maryland Plan for Postsecondary Education* to “promote economic growth and vitality through the development of a highly qualified workforce.” To measure their progress in this area, the community colleges adopted three indicators: number of contract training courses, number of businesses and organizations served in contract training, and number of participants in contract training. Among the 48 total indicators at the 16 community colleges, 28 recorded a drop in the latest year. Community colleges as a group achieved their benchmarks on just 17 of the indicators or 35 percent.

Community colleges attributed this outcome primarily to the recent economic downturn and an accompanying cutback in training funding by companies and government. Others factors mentioned included increasing competition from other providers and the use of in-house training, the replacement of large contracts with those from smaller companies, the loss of workforce development staff at the campus, and the decline of the information technology sector in the State. While many campuses suggested that the situation would not change until the local labor market strengthened, some described actions that they were taking to address the situation. These included developing new partnerships, increasing visits with employers, encouraging employees to take regular course offerings, collaborating with economic development agencies, and adding staff.

### 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 a majority (nine) of the campuses, the passing rate on certain tests failed to achieve the campus benchmark. 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, lower program admissions standards, and delays in test-taking. Institutions described actions that they were taking to improve the passing rate, such as training for faculty in test design, reviews and remediation for students, development of an on-line practice exam, curriculum evaluation and revision, pre-admissions testing of students, and tightening of program admissions and grading standards.

### Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses

Senior adults are the fastest growing segment of the U.S. population, and residents 50 years of age and older are taking increasing advantage of the programs and classes offered by Maryland community colleges. Half of the 16 community colleges reported a decline in the enrollment of senior adults in their institution's noncredit courses in the past year, and 10 missed their benchmark on this indicator.

The campuses cited insufficient funding, including cuts in government programs that supported these programs and shifts in institutional resources to other priorities, as the primary reason for the decline in enrollment. Several colleges acknowledged that older citizens represent an important constituency and that many courses are very popular with seniors. Among the steps that they described as being taken to address the drop in the number of elderly students in noncredit courses were the creation of new and expanded programs aimed at those 50 years of age or older, identification of alternative ways to serve older citizens, the development of marketing strategies, and the promise of additional revenues in the future.

### **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 multi-agency effort to put together an incentive package that helped to attract American Woodmark, a cabinet manufacturing firm, to the county.
- Carroll Community College landed its largest contract to date to provide millwright and electrician training for a large company's local employees.
- Chesapeake College partners with the Upper Shore Department of Social Services to provide clients with preparation in occupational skills.
- The Small Business Training Center at College of Southern Maryland assists entrepreneurs through the maze of start-up activities, running 54 training programs for 422 participants this year.
- Frederick Community College established a City and College Partnership Council with the City of Frederick to serve as a broker for the purpose of improving economic growth and development

- The Natural Resources and Wildlife Technology program at Garrett College has a role in the mitigation of acid mine drainage in the region.
- Harford Community College initiated a partnership with Harford Habitat for Humanity to offer a training program, “Home Team Advantage”, which raises funds for Habitat projects and provides revenues to the college.
- Montgomery College provided intensive information technology training in networking, programming and web design to numerous county employers via Tech Leap, a seven-month retraining program for career changers.
- Prince George’s Community College sponsored a County Economic and Workforce Summit and organized seven industry forums drawing 80 area businesses to discuss their workforce development needs.

### Public School Partnerships

- The Center for Teacher Excellence at Baltimore City Community College helps prepare for certification Baltimore City public school teachers of whom 30 percent are provisionally certified.
- The Learning for Independence program at Cecil Community College, in partnership with Cecil County public schools, allows developmentally disabled high school students to take part in an educational program at the college.
- Hagerstown Community College partnered with Washington County public schools in organizing presentations at the college for about 100 students in GEAR UP, a college preparation and intervention program, and their parents.
- Montgomery College’s summer program, Kids on Campus, jointly sponsored with Montgomery County public schools, allows children to participate in collegiate science, math and creative writing activities.
- Wor Wic Community College offers continuing education courses in the evening at area public schools and allows the equipment to be used by the public school system and its students during the day.

### Community Partnerships

- More than 1,000 students at Anne Arundel Community College donated nearly 14,000 service hours ranging from smoking cessation classes to tutoring middle school students.
- Baltimore City Community College coordinates “Wild about Reading Jamboree”, a half day symposium on children’s literacy.
- The Center for Adult and Family Literacy at Community College of Baltimore County provided courses in reading skills, GED preparation, and workplace literacy services for more than 3,000 persons.
- Carroll Community College offered Random House Book Fair, which featured nationally prominent authors and attracted over 3,000 people.
- The Mediation and Conflict Resolution Center at Howard Community College promotes peaceful resolution of conflict by providing mediation training and education for the college and the community at large.

- The annual Blue Bird Festival at Prince George's Community College attracted blues artists of national caliber and drew over 20,000 participants.

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

**The public four-year colleges and universities attained approximately half of their collective accountability objectives by their specified benchmark year.**

The five year accountability cycle for USM institutions ended last year, and the one for St. Mary's College concluded with the present set of reports. Morgan State University moves its benchmark year forward by one in each report (its latest is 2007), so a comparison was made between the benchmark it set for FY 2005 in its 2003 accountability report and its performance in FY 2005 as reported this year. At the end of their last round of accountability reporting, USM campuses, Morgan and St. Mary's had 278 combined accountability objectives for which performance measure statistics were available in the last year. Of these, 135 or 48.6 percent had been met or exceeded by the benchmark year. However, the totals mask considerable variance among the campuses in their record of attainment and in the number of objectives that were used by institutions during the previous accountability period (which ranged from 11 to 36). Many institutions had set objectives that were challenging and, in some cases, unrealistic for the time span involved. These frequently related to the issues discussed below. Nonetheless, most campuses had reached at least 80 percent of the benchmarks on a great majority of their objectives.

**The accountability reports submitted by the University System of Maryland were uniformly well-prepared – the best that the Commission has received from this segment in the history of the process.**

The reports from all of the public four-year institutions were satisfactory and 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.

Last year, the Commission identified reports from three USM institutions that it suggested be models for the other public four-year institutions in terms of the quality and detail of the institutional assessment. This advice was taken by the remaining USM campuses. The analyses which each USM institution prepared of its performance on its accountability objectives were cogent and developed on the basis of a framework that included its mission, campus strategies, and the goals of the *2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. The USM office also deserves recognition for its leadership in attaining consistent excellence in these reports from its campuses this year.

However, goals and objectives related to diversity continue to be absent from the submission of University of Maryland Baltimore in spite of concerns expressed by Commissioners in the past. UMB, which has a good record in the area of minority student recruitment, has taken the following position:

“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.”

The Commission staff does not agree. First, a representative of the U.S. Office for Civil Rights, at a workshop earlier this year for staff attorneys at Maryland colleges and universities, stated that the establishment of numerical goals by themselves did not violate the law or court decisions. Second, Maryland institutions may use diversity indicators that are not related to the admissions process to satisfy the accountability requirement. Third, no other public four-year institution shares UMB’s position. Finally, UMB prevailed in every aspect of the lawsuit that prompted the University to adopt this stance in the first place.

**The performance of the public four-year institutions on their accountability objectives merit special attention in four areas: contribution to critical workforce areas, the retention and graduation rate of new full-time African American students, fundraising from outside sources, 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, there are four types of objectives in which several institutions face challenges. The first two have substantial policy importance and have been identified as key issues at the state, system and campus levels. All have been cited in previous accountability reports.

#### Number of Graduates in Critical Workforce 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 nearly 13,000 new teachers by 2007. However, the number of teacher candidates prepared by Maryland colleges and universities, while increasing in the past three years to 2,553 in 2003-2004, was still below the 2,653 produced in 1998-1999. 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. Studies are under way at the Maryland Higher Education Commission to examine the capacity of the teacher and nursing

preparation programs at colleges and universities in the State to absorb additional students. While demand for graduates in information technology fields has cooled since the implosion of this sector in the recession of 2000-2002, the need for professionals with these skills will remain very important to employers and a rebound in the field is inevitable.

All of the public four-year institutions which offer programs in teacher preparation and/or nursing (and many of those with offerings in information technology) have accountability objectives measuring their performance in contributing to the supply of these professionals. In their previous accountability reports, campuses examined their progress on the basis of three types of objectives: size of enrollment, degrees awarded, and the number of graduates in the field working in Maryland. In the latest set of reports, in which institutions streamlined their objectives for legitimate reasons related to DBM requirements, some USM institutions retained the last of these three objectives and the only one which represented an authentic outcome. Whatever approach was taken, however, a sizeable number of campuses took the opportunity to adopt a less challenging benchmark than they previously had or ones that were below levels of achievement in earlier years. Other campuses remained quite far from their benchmarks on these objectives.

#### *Bowie State University*

Bowie introduced this objective: “By FY 2009, increase the number of undergraduate teacher education, nursing and IT graduates by 25 percent over the number of graduates in FY 2004.” Bowie reported 117 graduates in FY 2004, so its benchmark would be reached if it produces 146 graduates in FY 2009. But this number would be below the number of graduates in these fields (160) at Bowie in FY 2002.

#### *Coppin State University*

One of Coppin’s objectives is “produce 25 or more teacher education graduates for employment in Maryland each fiscal year, from FY 2005 through FY 2009.” The number of teacher education from Coppin and employed in Maryland was 64 in FY 2002, 58 in FY 2003, 22 in FY 2004 and 18 in FY 2005. Another objective is “produce 50 or more baccalaureate graduates of IT programs each fiscal year, from FY 2005 through FY 2009.” However, Coppin turned out 92 IT graduates in FY 2002, 85 in FY 2003, 70 in FY 2004, and 60 in FY 2005 – all higher than its latest objective.

### *Frostburg State University*

Frostburg has the objective to “increase the number of teacher education graduates employed in Maryland public schools from 68 in 2004 to 120 in 2009.” But the number of teacher education graduates at Frostburg employed in Maryland public schools fell steadily from 126 to 68 between FY 2001 and FY 2004, then rebounded to 82 in FY 2005. Frostburg’s FY 2009 objective is lower than the number of its teachers that it placed in Maryland public schools in FY 2001.

### *Salisbury University*

Salisbury has the following objective: “The estimated number of teacher education graduates employed as teachers in Maryland will increase from 163 in FY 2005 to 185 in 2009.” However, Salisbury produced 181 teachers in FY 2003 who gained employment in the State, just four below the FY 2009 benchmark.

### *University of Maryland Baltimore County*

UMBC offers the objective to “increase the number of UMBC graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 48 in FY 2004 to 95 in FY 2009. But UMBC established its benchmark using the lowest yearly figure in the past five. Maryland public schools employed 87 UMBC graduates in FY 2001, 99 in FY 2002, 79 in FY 2003 and 93 in FY 2005. In essence, UMBC has adopted an maintenance benchmark with respect to the preparation of new teachers employed in Maryland.

UMBC prepared the following response to the Commission’s observation:

Selection of the 2009 target of 95 was chosen to be both realistic and reflective of current enrollment trends. UMBC's highly successful Urban Teacher Education program, which was grant supported, came to an end a couple of years ago. During the UTE program the university enjoyed an increase in enrollments and graduates, but has now experienced a downtrend in post-baccalaureate students in teacher-training programs. Although there were 99 graduates employed by Maryland public schools in 2002, the number fell to 79 in 2003. The university believes the values of 48 in 2003 and 93 in 2004 represent the initial impact of requiring a passing score on Praxs II or NTE for program completion. In 2003 many students did not complete this requirement until after the deadline, so they artificially inflated the 2004 figure. On average, there were about 70 graduates in each of those two years. For these reasons, and others included in our report on Objective 2.1, the university targeted an increase from its current average rate of about 70 to 95 by FY 2009.

### Retention and Graduation Rates of African American Students

When viewed over a long horizon, improvements in the bellwether second year retention rate and six-year graduation rate of new full-time African American students from Maryland public four-year colleges and universities look encouraging. The percentage of African Americans who returned for a second year of study in the 2003 cohort was 74.1 percent, up from 61.7 percent in 1983. Those who earned a bachelor’s degree within six

years of matriculation in the most recent cohort was 45.6 percent, compared to 27.5 percent 15 years earlier.

However, more recent figures should subdue the level of congratulation. The second year rate in the 2003 cohort was the second lowest in the past 12 cohorts. And the six-year graduation rate has changed little in the past five cohorts. Further, a lingering gap remains between the retention and graduation rates of African American students and all other students. The second year retention rate of all other students in the 2003 cohort was 84.7 percent, and the six-year graduation rate was 69.1 percent. The difference between the six-year rates of African Americans and all other students has persisted at 20 to 24 percentage points.

All but one of the public four-year campuses which admit large numbers of new full-time freshmen have adopted objectives related to the second year retention rate and six-year graduation rate of African American students. The exception: Bowie, an historically black institution which has these objectives for all students. Many of these campuses have experienced difficulties meeting their benchmark on these objectives but, for the most part, have not backed away from them. Several institutions have adopted objectives that are challenging because of their commitment to increasing the number of African American graduates.

In their institutional assessment, nearly all campuses described the actions that they are taking to improve the retention and graduation rate of students in general and African American students in particular. These tended to fall into the following categories: additional staffing and services, the introduction and enhancement of student and academic support programs, expanded institution-based financial assistance, instructional interventions, curricula changes, pre-enrollment academic preparation, and student-centered outreach efforts. Specific examples include learning communities, expanded academic advising, tutorial assistance, faculty and peer mentoring programs, special mentoring for men, student attendance monitoring programs, the hiring of additional retention staff, the establishment of a Student Success and Retention Center and an Office of Diversity, creation of summer bridge programs for college-bound high school seniors, adoption of new academic programs, greater training of and recognition for academic advisers, departmental-level retention activities, expanded co-curricular programming, courses for at-risk students, enhanced residential experience for students, and follow-up of students not registered for upcoming term. Many campuses also pointed to initiatives described in their *2005 Minority Achievement Report* and *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

#### Fundraising from Outside Sources

Several campuses trail their objectives with respect to funds raised in annual private giving or with regard to alumni donations. 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.

## Response of University System of Maryland to the Commission's Assessment

### *Issues regarding goals for workforce issues*

Helping to address the workforce needs of the State is a vital concern to USM and, as such, is prominently featured in the USM strategic plan (as it also is in the *2004 Maryland Plan for Postsecondary Education*). While each USM institution contributes to a different degree—in line with its mission, goals, and resources—the System seeks to establish through the complementary efforts of the institutions, a multi-faceted, yet coherent, approach to meeting the workforce needs of the state. Workforce issues play a significant role in our long-term planning at the System and our success and goals under them are annually assessed and monitored not only by the Board of Regents but also by the Commission, DBM, DLS, and other oversight agencies and interest groups.

First, as noted in the Commission's analysis, several of the institutions set conservative, or as some have argued "more realistic," goals, in terms of teacher education and IT graduates. The issues underlying these indicators, and the decisions regarding the establishment of appropriate goals, are complex and involve not just the expectations of the institutional leaders and faculty but also the resources available and resources expected, the level of control the institution has over the final outcome, the definition of the indicator and how it is counted, and events in the economy and job market. In the case of both teacher education and IT graduates working in Maryland, the latter factors come significantly into play. For instance, although the USM institutions are producing more and better qualified teacher education graduates each year (*degrees awarded in all teacher preparation programs at USM institutions increased by approximately 10 percent between 2001 and 2004, while pass rates on PRAXIS II moved from 89 percent to 94 percent for all test takers over the same time period*), they cannot force graduates to remain in Maryland to work (although USM institutions, on an annual basis, do provide approximately two-thirds of the new teachers in Maryland public schools who graduated from a Maryland college or university). As a result, the institutional leaders recognize that moving this indicator dramatically will require not just increasing the overall number of new teachers prepared to join the workforce, but also addressing issues related to teacher recruitment—including remuneration, teaching conditions, discipline issues, and other job satisfaction-related factors—which can only be addressed by various elements of the educational system, including the local school systems, state and local government, and the state's higher education institutions, working together.

### *Teacher training initiatives*

As a System, we are planning to tackle this issue using a variety of tactics. For instance, the continued development of new AAT programs in critical teacher shortage areas, in collaboration with Maryland community colleges, and the creation of alternative post-baccalaureate and career changer certification programs, such as the Title II-funded Project LINC between UMCP and the Prince George's County Public Schools, will all be used to try and boost teacher education enrollments and, we expect, will result in increased numbers of new teachers being graduated. *The institutions are projecting up to a 19 percent increase in the total number of degrees awarded through their traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programs between 2002 and 2007, and a 39 percent increase in the number of students graduating from their post-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs—such as the MAT—over the same time period.* Not all of these graduates will choose to stay in Maryland to teach (and the individual institutional accountability reports reflect this fact); however, our survey data indicated that about 70-75 percent typically do, so USM has set a "Systemwide" goal to increase the total number of USM graduates teaching, as first time teachers, in a Maryland public school by 38 percent by FY 2007 (over the FY 2004 level).

If large numbers of graduates continue to leave the profession after one or two years into their careers, the State institutions can never adequately fill the hole their loss creates in the workforce. To address this job retention issue, USM and its institutions have proposed, in conjunction with MHEC and the other higher education segments, expanded support for the professional development school (PDS) programs in the state. Research has shown that, nationally, over 30 percent of new teachers are lost to the profession within the first three years of teaching (and Maryland's experience appears to parallel the national data). However, researchers at Towson University conducted a study that compared PDS-prepared graduates of Towson University with traditional program, non-PDS-prepared, graduates who were employed by Baltimore County Public Schools. By the third year, 94 percent of the PDS-prepared graduates were still teaching, versus just 58 percent of the non-PDS-prepared graduates. Through an expanded PDS initiative, USM and its institutions are seeking to provide all USM teacher education students with a PDS experience. The USM's systemwide goal is to develop or maintain over 300 professional development school partnerships by 2007 (there were just 161 in FY 2002). This should allow all USM teacher education students to benefit from PDS training. We believe it will help to reverse the high turnover rate among teachers that contributes to the State's continual need to recruit large numbers of new teachers.

### *Issues related to IT goals and the workforce needs of Maryland*

As the Commission points out in its analysis, the job market for IT graduates has fallen significantly since the crash of the economy in 2000-2001, led largely by the decline of high tech and Internet-related stocks. According to the Computing Research Association (CRA), one of the major computing-related membership associations based in DC, between 2000 and 2002 employment in professional IT occupations fell by 5 percent, significantly higher than the total U.S. employment which fell only 1.7 percent. More

importantly, national unemployment rates in IT occupations reached all-time highs of 6.1 percent for computer programmers in 2002, and 5 percent for computer system analysts and scientists. While CRA and other think tanks have predicted that the IT job market will rebound over the next five years, concern over recent job loss in the profession—combined with national news stories about overseas outsourcing of IT jobs—has led to declining interest among USM students in IT majors. After reaching all time highs in FY 2001, IT enrollments at USM institutions have fallen by approximately 23 percent by FY 2005 as students chose majors in other fields. As a result, the USM institutions have had to fight to maintain both IT enrollments and the number of degrees produced in their IT programs. Given the job market and declining student interest in IT majors, I think that conservative estimates by institutions of future IT enrollment and graduate production are both realistic and understandable. At the System level, for instance, USM currently projects that *the number of IT graduates produced Systemwide (baccalaureate level only) will fluctuate at around 2,000-2,200 per year while the information technology job market stabilizes and, we hope, begins to turn around.* However, even at that “steady state” output level, we expect to be able to maintain the historic highs of IT graduates working in Maryland recorded by the USM institutions in 2002 and 2005, when, according to data reported by the institutions from their alumni follow up surveys, over 1,300 IT baccalaureate graduates from each of the two classes surveyed were estimated as working in Maryland.

Chancellor Kirwan has expressed concern that the USM MFR and the institutional Performance Accountability/MFR reports focus only on IT graduates (as defined under the former MAITI program) in the workforce. He believes that Maryland’s continued economic success depends upon the USM contributing adequate numbers of well prepared graduates in a wide range of key areas that are seen as vital to the success of a knowledge-based economy—including business, engineering, and science, as well as IT. He has asked the USM staff to begin working, in cooperation with MHEC and DBM staff, over the coming year to review this indicator with the goal of expanding it to incorporate graduates in additional fields. Definitions for the new indicator, as well as institutional and Systemwide goals, will need to be reviewed and revised at that time as appropriate.

#### *Workforce issues related to nursing*

With regard to nursing issues and the number of USM nursing graduates working in Maryland, the USM institutions have experienced a significant upturn in BSN enrollments over the past four years. Bachelor’s of science in nursing (BSN) enrollments for all USM programs increased by 55 percent between 2001 and 2004 (while enrollments in all nursing programs, master’s of science in nursing (MSN) as well as BSN, increased by approximately 38 percent). While not all of these students will choose to remain in and complete this difficult major, USM is projecting that the number of BSN graduates from our institutions will increase to well over 650 by 2007 (that would represent an increase of over 50 percent between FY 2002 and FY 2007). However, as with teachers and IT graduates, USM also realizes that nursing graduates are in high demand throughout the region and, therefore, our institutions have only

limited control over whether their graduates choose to stay in the state to work after graduation. According to follow up survey data, 79 percent of the nursing graduates who were surveyed and responded in 2005 indicated that they worked in Maryland, with an additional 10 percent indicating they worked either in DC or Northern Virginia. Working with hospitals and agencies in the state to help retain these graduates, along with finding ways to creatively expand their number and the impact they have, will be critical if we are to solve the nursing shortage in the state. The System is committed to helping address this critical workforce issue. Given the statewide need, and in keeping with the growth trends in nursing enrollments projected by our institutions, we have set a Systemwide MFR goal of supplying, by the next alumni survey in 2008, at least 500 new BSN graduates per year who choose to stay and work in Maryland's hospitals and health care facilities. To help accomplish this USM is working to build into its budget and programmatic initiatives for 2007, and beyond, a level of resources, new program initiatives, and other types of support that will allow our institutions to expand their research and training programs in nursing, public health, and other key health care-related areas. An example of one policy-related initiative is the revision of the low income assistance repayment program (LARP), in which USM worked with MHEC and the General Assembly to change the program's eligibility requirements to include nursing faculty members, a workforce population for which there is a critical need.

#### *Fundraising*

The MHEC analysis cites annual private giving and/or alumni support as areas where some institutions have struggled over the year due to the "lingering softness in the national economy," and, we believe, the general lull in fundraising that typically occurs between capital campaigns as new plans are laid and resources put in place. USM's last capital campaign, the Campaign for Maryland, concluded in June 2002 after raising \$903 million. Over the past three years, USM, as a System, has worked to develop and implement the infrastructure, staff, and resources necessary to carry out its next major capital campaign, which is set to be kicked off this coming year. As part of these efforts, and despite being in the "silent phase" of the new campaign, USM and its institutions overall raised \$226 million in FY 2005 (up from \$159 million in 2004) in private funds. Current plans call for USM to officially announce its next capital campaign in early 2006 with a Systemwide goal for the seven-year effort of well over \$1 billion. We believe that effort, and the resources and support it will require at all levels of the System, will lead to much stronger results in both private fundraising and alumni support over the next seven years.

#### *Retention and graduation rate of African American students*

As the 2005 MHEC Performance Accountability Report notes, increasing the retention and graduation rate of African American students continues to be a challenge for many USM institutions. But it is also a challenge that the USM institutions have not backed away from in setting their 2009 goals. Despite the significant cuts in state support and increases in tuition and fees that have occurred over the past three years, and which have disadvantaged many students whatever their race, we believe that progress in this area

has been made by our campuses. At UMCP, for instance, the institution reported a jump in the six-year graduation rate for African American students from 56.8 percent in fall 2004 (1998 cohort) to 67.6 percent in fall 2005 (1999 cohort), and at UMBC, the Systemwide second-year retention rate of African American students went from 89.1 percent in fall 2003 (2002 cohort) to 93 percent in fall 2004 (2003 cohort) while the Systemwide six-year graduation rate went from 61.2 percent in fall 2003 (1997 cohort) to 64.3 percent in fall 2004 (1998 cohort). Still, much needs to be done not only to reduce the gap in retention and graduation rates between African American and other students on USM campuses but to improve the academic success experienced by all USM students. To help lead and continue that improvement, the USM has recently hired a new Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to oversee diversity and faculty development initiatives for the System as a whole. Through his leadership and guidance, the USM is confident that the goals and strategies outlined in the Systemwide Plan for Improving Minority Achievement, as well as the plans developed by the individual USM institutions, will be advanced and success in this area will be achieved.

#### *Facility renewal*

As the 2005 MHEC Performance Accountability Report analysis points out, facility renewal is another area in which some USM institutions have struggled to make their goals. In recognition of the critical nature of this issue, and the attention that must be given to it, the USM Board of Regents (BOR) has moved on several fronts this year to address the issue. First, the BOR is revising and restructuring its existing policy on facilities renewal. Under the new policy, institutions will be required to increase the amount of operating expenditures (from all sources) devoted to facilities renewal at an average annual increment (over five years) of 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1 percent of replacement value until the Board's goal of annually spending at least 2 percent of the current replacement value of all institutional capital assets on their renewal and renovation is achieved. In addition, to help reduce the current backlog of renovation and renewal needs among USM institutions, the BOR is proposing to target toward renovation and renewal projects an annual amount equal to approximately 50 percent of capital spending (adjusted for inflation) beginning with the FY 2007 budget and every year into the foreseeable future. Finally, to ensure that a future backlog of renovation/renewal needs does not occur as new buildings come on line and begin to age, the revised BOR policy will give the Board the option of requiring that one half of one percent of the replacement value of any new building be allocated annually for the institutional operating budget as part of the start up cost of the building, until the 2 percent target is reached. These combined initiatives should allow the USM institutions to make better progress toward their facilities renewal goals in the future and reduce the backlog of needs that currently exists.

## Cost Containment – All Public Colleges and Universities

**Reporting on cost containment activities was comprehensive and detailed at 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.

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 institutions provided detailed descriptions and specific dollar amounts associated with their cost containment activities. Cost containment efforts by Maryland’s public colleges and universities saved a total of \$46.4 million in FY 2005. These figures reflect only those savings that met the cost containment criterion in the guidelines for the accountability report as cited above; other amounts reported by campuses were neither included in this total nor appear in Vol. 1 of this report. The cost containment activities can be categorized into five areas:

- Savings related to *staffing*, such as reductions or downgrades in positions, a delay or freeze in filling job openings, the hiring of part-time or non-tenure track full-time faculty for vacancies in full-time faculty, use of nine- rather than twelve-month contracts for faculty, greater use of adjunct faculty, restrictions on travel expenses, credit card initiatives, and cuts in advertising for employment searches.
- 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 recycling of equipment, the use of web and telecommunications capabilities and other technologies to reduce printing and mailing expenses, cuts in membership dues and promotional spending, lowered rental payments, cuts in supplies, and facilities and workplace efficiencies.
- *Transferal of expenses* by means of the use of in-house resources and staff rather than contractors, selected outsourcing and privatization 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, participation in statewide contracts to purchase computer equipment and other merchandise at discount, selected renegotiations of contracts with vendors, lower insurance costs, and procurement efficiencies.
- *Program savings*, including program and office eliminations, course cutbacks (cancellations, reductions in sections and increases in class size), and the use of distance learning technologies.







**COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES**



## **COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

### **Allegany College of Maryland**

Cost containment measures totaled \$88,203 and included a \$32,000 savings in travel budgets, and a \$12,400 savings through changes in the telecommunications system and procedures. In addition, a one-time credit of \$15,430 was recognized. Credit card processing costs have been reduced saving the college \$8,197 and professional liability insurance costs were reduced saving the college \$6,176. The college expects to save \$14,000 per year by reducing its color paper purchasing.

### **Anne Arundel Community College**

The college saved a net (after internal reallocations) of \$2,701,040 million through cost saving initiatives. These savings included \$1,008,000 from lapsing positions, \$1,119,000 in negotiated position savings, and \$649,040 in renegotiated procurement contracts. In addition \$448,000 was saved as a result of contract savings for equipment. Also, reduced energy costs saved the college \$124,000.

### **Baltimore City Community College**

Cost containment measures adopted by the college for FY 2005 included terminating a preventive maintenance contract for a savings of \$45,000, conducting corrective maintenance in house for a savings of \$30,000 and conducting in house transition space renovation in support of the Main Building renovation for a savings of \$60,000. In all the college saved \$175,500 during FY 2005 through cost containment measures.

### **Carroll Community College**

The college saved \$464,800 during FY 2005 through a variety of cost containment activities. The college saved \$243,500 through the use of adjunct faculty versus hiring new full time faculty. The college used the Maryland State Collection Agency to collect receivables deemed uncollectible by the college for a savings of \$17,300. Cafeteria services were outsourced at no cost to the college for a savings of \$24,000. A distance learning classroom was upgraded through a grant from Maryland Association of Community Colleges and Verizon, saving the college \$75,000. In addition, the college used in house IT staff on a variety of projects saving the college \$35,000.

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

Cost containment actions during FY 2005 for the Community College of Baltimore County included continuing a modified hiring freeze resulting in a savings of \$750,000, terminating a lease at the Eastern Boulevard facility saving \$340,000, and maintaining non salary reductions saving \$483,547. The college saved a total of \$1,573,547.

### **Cecil Community College**

The college saved \$147,476 during FY 2005 through a variety of cost containment actions. These included a \$43,850 reduction in property and liability insurance, a \$53,868 reduction in part time instruction expenses, a \$16,223 reduction in the cost of program/instruction supplies, a \$12,000 in savings as a result of a shift of a full time Accounts Payable position to part time, a \$10,000 reduction in library and media equipment, a \$6,535 savings in contracting for building maintenance and a \$5,000 reduction in employment advertising.

### **Chesapeake College**

Through reductions in adjunct faculty costs the college expected to save \$6,000 during FY 2005.

### **College of Southern Maryland**

During FY 2005 the college saved \$183,201 through cost containment measures, many of which involved using in-house staff instead of outside contractors. By using the Physical Plant instead of outside contractors the college saved \$12,000 on campus moves, \$16,000 on snow and ice removal, and \$18,000 on office renovations. By using the Information Technology Services Department instead of outside contractors, the college saved \$8,250 from the installation of instructional technology at the Leonardtown campus, \$4,800 from the installation of Network Electronic for the Prince Frederick campus, and \$21,600 for the installation of document imaging software for two administrative departments. The Information Technology Service Department utilized fiber optic cabling provided by Charles County I-net instead of Verizon T-1 circuit for a projected savings of \$8,400. The College also saved \$94,151 through competitive bidding on operational purchases.

### **Frederick Community College**

The college saved a total of \$940,282 during FY 2005. The college saved \$104,500 through the use of county in kind services to the college, \$595,000 was saved through Continuing Education Program cost savings and \$240,782 was saved through freezing two administrative and two support staff positions.

### **Garrett College**

Through discontinuing the Agriculture Management Program Director position and delaying filling the Business/IT Director and Arts/Sciences Director positions, the college saved \$150,000 during FY 2005.

### **Hagerstown Community College**

Cost containment actions undertaken by the college during FY 2005 resulted in a savings of \$119,274 and primarily involved reducing staff. The college eliminated the Industrial Technology/Trades Program Manager position for a savings of \$41,600, eliminated the Coordinator of the American Heart Association Community Training Center for a savings of \$21,632 and realigned the positions of Director and Assistant Director of the Wellness Center into one Coordinator position for a savings of \$55,042. In addition a single equipment maintenance contract for the Wellness center was implemented for a savings of \$1,000.

### **Harford Community College**

The College replaced a mini van with a Honda Civic Hybrid through the State contract. Total cost of ownership was reduced by \$1,020. In addition, the college expected to save \$875 in fuel costs. The total savings for this switch was \$1,895.

### **Howard Community College**

Howard Community College initiated two costs containment actions during FY 2005, totaling \$43,500. The college reduced liability insurance cost by \$33,500. Costs for trash removal decreased by \$10,000 when the college changed its recycling methods.

### **Montgomery College**

Cost savings measures at Montgomery College during FY 2005 included \$300,000 through an aggressive bid process for printing or printing some materials in house, \$9,000 through the use of electronic procurement processes, \$500,000 through either contracting additional services at no cost or reducing costs of outside contracts, and \$1,350,000 through reducing costs of Microsoft software licensing, purchasing anti virus software and computers at less than state contract costs, and negotiating discounts with the college's primary hardware PC vendor. The total measurable cost savings reported: \$2,159,000.

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

During FY 2005 the college saved \$480,000 through reorganizing the Human Resources area for a savings of \$25,000, using grants to fund faculty positions for a savings of \$155,000, and limiting hiring in all areas for a savings of \$300,000.

## **Wor Wic Community College**

Wor Wic implemented a variety of cost containment activities during FY 2005 for a total savings of \$316,370. Four faculty and three administrative positions were eliminated for a savings of \$231,560, the filling of a faculty position was delayed for a savings of \$40,000, two positions in student services were left vacant for a savings of \$35,000, course offerings were reduced for a savings of \$4,560, the number of mathematics laboratory assistances was reduced for a savings of \$2,000, duplicated or unneeded insurance coverage was eliminated for a savings of \$1,000, travel reimbursements were reduced by \$1,000, the media center library aide was trained to administer diagnostic assessments when classes are not in session for a savings of \$750, and telephone automated dialing messaging was implemented eliminating paper mailings for a savings of \$500.

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

### **Bowie State University**

Cost containment actions totaled \$1,990,000 during FY 2005 and included reducing or downgrading positions for a savings of \$400,000; using in house staff for a variety of functions for a savings of \$1,205,000; reducing rental costs by moving satellite classrooms on to the main campus for a saving of \$15,000; reducing printing costs by using online technology for syllabi, registration and class schedules for a savings of \$26,000; reducing advertising costs and outsourcing moving operations for a savings of \$343,000.

### **Coppin State University**

Coppin State University's cost containment measures saved over \$981,932 during FY 2005. The University saved \$207,635 as a result of the dissolution of the USM Service Center. Use of the VISA procurement card program saved the University \$25,000. The reorganization of student technology services saved \$175,000. Realigning the responsibilities in the Financial Operations area saved \$50,000. Savings from the Energy Performance contract totaled \$124,297 for the period October 2004 through March 2005. Also, opening an on campus health suite staffed by current nursing staff and student interns reduced the University's medical costs by \$400,000.

### **Frostburg State University**

Cost containment activities at Frostburg State University totaled \$478,900 for FY 2005. The University significantly reduced costs in the area of Information Technology by terminating its participation in the University System of Maryland Service Center, renegotiating the campus software agreement with Microsoft, and adopting the USM Interactive Video Network as the exclusive format for distance learning. The total savings in this area was \$366,100. Through the closing of its Frederick and Hagerstown Centers, the University saved \$112,800.

### **Salisbury University**

The University's cost containment measures resulted in \$2,718,772 in savings for FY 2005. Hiring freezes and delays netted a savings of \$1,314,300. The University's contingent labor force of 29 full time positions represented a savings of \$391,500. The use of non-tenure track faculty saved \$573,750. The University's total energy management system saved \$242,722. Other preventive maintenance measures saved \$34,500. Collaboration in academic programming and support services with the University of Maryland Eastern Shore saved \$139,000. Additionally the use of multifunction technology equipment and web technology saved \$23,000.

### **Towson University**

Towson implemented initiatives to contain costs that resulted in a savings of \$484,800 during FY 2005. The consolidation of the Service Center saved \$190,800. By providing in-house temporary storage for the Center for Fine Arts Addition/Renovation, the University saved \$101,000. By competitively bidding contracts the University saved \$99,700. Reductions in subscriptions, travel, promotional items, advertising, brochure size, cell phones, telephone directory listings and remote access servers saved \$46,300. A Homeland Security grant of \$28,500 allowed the campus to purchase additional equipment and collaboration with other campuses saved the University \$18,500.

### **University of Baltimore**

The University saved \$130,000 during FY 2005. Cost savings measures included collaboration with other USM campuses on PeopleSoft implementation which saved \$100,000, and the utilization of credit cards for small purchases, the use of the Bowie Service Center surplus equipment and centralization of summer classes for utilities savings which saved a total of \$30,000.

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

For FY 2005, the University achieved total cost savings \$6,186,000 of which \$3.15 million was saved through new contracts that reduced utility costs. Others savings resulted from reorganizations that led to the elimination of staff positions, delays or downgrades in the replacement of retiring faculty, cuts in the subscription budget for the Health Services Library, and reductions in operating expenses in the Maryland Psychiatric Research Center.

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

UMBC reported cost savings and avoidance of \$3,116,000 for FY 2005. UMBC achieved savings by outsourcing some grounds maintenance for a savings of \$96,000, and reassigning or eliminating positions in other areas on campus for a savings of \$175,000. Cost avoidance activities included a donation worth \$2,540,000 of construction management services by the Erickson Foundation to build campus apartments, donation of computer equipment by IBM worth \$90,000, plant equipment replacement that which resulted in increased energy efficiency (\$125,000) and negotiation of discounted Microsoft licenses for students for a savings of \$90,000.

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

The University saved \$11,571,000 through improved business practices during FY 2005. Highlights of these practices include \$2,250,000 saved through negotiated discounts on major contracts; \$2,421,000 from indirect cost recoveries from increased contract and grant activity; \$2,000,000 saved in utility costs through improved demand side management; \$1,300,000 generated through the privatization of the bookstore;



\$2,100,000 in avoided debt costs in student housing through public-private partnerships; and \$1,500,000 saved by using in house facilities maintenance for Intercollegiate Athletics.

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

During FY 2005 the University saved \$1,575,231 through a variety of measures. Highlights of these measures included reorganizing the Information Technology Division for a savings of \$150,831, reducing liabilities and loss through an integrated campus wide security system for a savings of \$150,000, achieving indirect cost recoveries from increased contract and grant activity for savings of \$150,000, deferring the purchase of new vehicles for the motor pool for a savings of \$125,000, collaborating with Salisbury University for dual degree programs for a savings of \$139,000, improving the energy management system and thus reducing energy consumption for a savings of \$300,000, and deferral of two staff positions for a savings of \$90,000.

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

Significant cost containment measures at UMUC saved \$5,243,000 during FY 2005. Streamlining recruitment and retention procedures saved \$2 million, using faculty on nine-month contracts instead of twelve month contracts saved \$1.6, implementing a financial aid call center saved \$200,000, and eliminating the Office of Distance Education and Life Long Learning saved \$160,000, million. Changes in procurement included a \$333,000 savings by using an Oracle site license rather than an FTE model, consortia licensing of databases resulted in a cost reduction of \$125,000, and standardizing PCs in academic labs allowing for bulk purchasing rates saved \$100,000. Implementing a self-help web based Student Financial Services Inquiry system saved \$275,000 and implementing PeopleSoft financial modules saved \$250,000. Additionally, \$200,000 was saved through out sourcing a campus help desk service.

### **Morgan State University**

Cost containment activities at Morgan for FY 2005 included \$1.6 million in savings from SCT contract negotiations, Xerox copying contract renegotiation for a savings of \$49,500 and telephone reallocation of technology debt service for a savings of \$384,000. In total the University saved \$2,033,500 through these measures.

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

Cost savings initiatives during FY 2005 at St. Mary's College of Maryland totaled \$377,895. Significant activities included \$144,900 saved through out sourcing a housekeeping contract, \$100,000 saved through a more cost effective method for power line replacement, \$50,000 saved through a modified life cycle replacement policy for computers, and \$23,000 in postage saved by using Mailers+4 software.





**TARGETED INDICATORS  
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES**



**TARGETED INDICATORS AND CAMPUS RESPONSES  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

**ALLEGANY COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**

**Explanation Required**

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate -- Occupational Therapy Assistant*

**Commission assessment:** Allegany's benchmark is 92 percent. But the percentage of occupational therapy assistant students who passed the certification exam was 80 percent in the most recent year and the lowest rate in the past four years.

**Campus response:** This result is attributed to a national trend of decreased enrollment in occupational therapy and occupational therapy assistant programs which has caused a much smaller pool of local applicants and less latitude for the program to be as selective in its admission standards. Furthermore, only a small number of students take the certification exam, and the test results of one student can have a large impact on program outcomes.

**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:** During FY 2005, the college did hire a minority professional staff member (an African American male). Therefore, the benchmark for this indicator was met during fall 2004.

*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 has declined from 92 percent to 71 percent in the past three years.

## ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

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

**Commission assessment:** Anne Arundel's benchmark is 15 percent. But the proportion which minorities constitute of full-time faculty has remained flat at approximately 12 percent during the past four years.

**Campus response:** The college has identified the hiring of minority faculty as a top priority and the Vice President for Learning is working with Human Resources, Deans and Department Chairs on this college priority. The college is committed to the diversity of its workforce and will continue to work towards meeting its benchmark. The college Diversity Committee is also actively involved in helping the college identify qualified candidates. For example, a work team of the Diversity Committee is currently assessing the college's recruitment efforts and developing strategies to promote it. One strategy involves providing direct assistance to hiring managers when the college advertises for credit faculty. This involves sending vacancy announcements to department chairs at targeted institutions and asking the chairs to assist the college in identifying qualified candidates to fill vacant positions.

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

**Commission assessment:** Anne Arundel's benchmark is 30 percent. But the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students slumped to 22.6 percent in the most recent cohort – the lowest level in the past four years.

**Campus response:** The rate has shown progress in the right direction with the 2000 cohort. The 26.9 percent rate for the 2000 cohort is four percentage points above the rate reported for the 1999 cohort. Programs such as The Student Achievement and Success Program, whose primary focus is to retain students and increase the graduation and transfer rates of under prepared students are having a positive impact on the transfer/graduation rates.

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

**Commission assessment:** Anne Arundel offered 3,994 courses in the most recent fiscal year. This figure is considerably below its benchmark of 5,000 and the lowest number in the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** The 2002 through 2004 economic slowdown that affected both the private and public sectors in the region have had a trickle down effect on college workforce programs. For contract instruction, in particular, the effect is evident in the

declining enrollments. For example, in the three years between FY 2002 and FY 2004, the college's Office of Training and Performance experienced a 33 percent decline in contract revenue and a 50 percent decline in enrollments. Most recent trends in FY 2005 indicate that both revenue and enrollments might begin to increase after this period of decline. Another contributing factor to the decline is the decreased activity with the college's contract with Northrup Grumman. Between FY 2002 and FY 2004, college revenue from this contract decreased by 70 percent and corresponding enrollments decreased by 77 percent. These downward shifts in the economic environment were not evident at the time the benchmarks were set five years ago.

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate – EMT Basic*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of students on the EMT Basic exam was 76 percent in the most recent year – the lowest in four years and considerably below Anne Arundel's benchmark of 100 percent.

**Campus response:** While the pass rates of the flagged areas have gone up with the 2004 group, they are not where the college would like them to be. The small number of students who sit for the exams could partly explain the variability in the pass rates. For example, only seven students took the EMT-Paramedic licensure exam in 2004.

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate – EMT Paramedic*

**Commission assessment:** Anne Arundel's benchmark is 80 percent. But the percentage of EMT Paramedic students who passed the qualifying exam in the most recent year was 70 percent.

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

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Medical Assisting (Certificate Program)*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of students on the Medical Assisting (Certificate) exam dropped to 60 percent in the most recent year – considerably below Anne Arundel's benchmark of 100 percent.

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

*Enrollment in Workforce Development Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Enrollment in workforce development courses at Anne Arundel fell sharply in the past fiscal year to 39,948 – far below the college's benchmark of 50,000.

**Campus response:** Same as for indicator, "number of contract training courses offered".

## BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Market Share of Recent Public High School Graduates in Service Area*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore's City's benchmark is 40 percent. But the percentage of recent public high school graduates in Baltimore City who have enrolled at the college has steadily fallen in the past four years from 37.4 percent to 32.4 percent.

**Campus response:** Baltimore City Community College is proud of its 32 percent "market share" of the City population as well as its 32 percent share of the recent high school graduates. Baltimore City has many colleges and universities and Baltimore City Community College enrolls the highest percentage of undergraduate residents of any Maryland institution.

In keeping with the College's commitment to provide accessibility to all City residents, Baltimore City continues to expand its "Weekend College" and on-line courses to help meet the needs of the City's working adults who often have child care concerns during the week. Evening and weekend services have been expanded at the Liberty and Harbor Campuses, as well as all of the student services at RPC. RPC has over 10,000 square feet of classroom, computer lab, and administrative space and offers free parking and easy access to the City's subway and bus system. RPC now offers courses daytime and evening weekday courses as well as Saturday courses. It has designated open computer lab time for students. The College will continue to survey students to determine their preferred times and locations. The Evening Weekend Student Services Center (EWSSC) works to provide more comprehensive and better-coordinated services for students and increased instructional support for faculty; the EWSSC particularly focuses upon greater assistance to part-time adult students. Services are provided to applicants, students, and faculty at the Liberty and Harbor campuses and at RPC. BCCC has many initiatives underway designed to increase the enrollment of high school graduates and facilitate their transition to the College.

The Early Enrollment Program has grown tremendously over the past six years. This unique program offers full tuition scholarships to high school juniors and seniors to provide opportunities to earn credits either toward an associate degree or for transfer to another college while still in high school, and credit can be earned towards high school graduation requirements as well. Students may take one or two credit courses per semester during Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters in day, evening, and weekend courses. Participation has increased from two Baltimore City public school students (BCPSS) in Fall 1999 to 208 participants from 21 schools in Spring 2005.



Upward Bound and Talent Search serve over 600 middle and high school students at eight high schools and five middle schools; these programs are designed to help students complete their high school education and pursue postsecondary training. An Assistant Director of Intercollegiate Athletics was recently hired on a contractual basis to increase the number of BCPSS athletes that attend the College. An Annual Recruitment Luncheon is held on campus for BCPSS honor students to learn about the College's scholarships. New initiatives underway to increase this market share include the Community Law in Action Emerging Leaders Program, a youth-oriented advocacy and leadership development program affiliated with the University of Maryland School of Law. It empowers urban youth to become civically engaged, problem-solving leaders and advocates for change. Twenty fellowships are awarded to seniors from four Baltimore City public high schools to attend selected the College's courses. Lake Clifton/Eastern High School students participate in the ACE/Gear Up Weekend Academy. This three-phase program provides enrichment via internships on campus, development of career-related portfolios, preparation for SAT exams, mathematics, analytical reading, and writing.

#### *Tuition and Fees as a Percent of Tuition/Fees at Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions*

**Commission assessment:** In the most recent fiscal year, tuition and fees at Baltimore City were at 42.2 percent of the average costs at Maryland public four-year campuses, which is above the college's 40 percent ceiling.

**Campus response:** As a result of funding legislation in the 1998 General Assembly, the College's funding was linked to the State aid provided to public four-year colleges and universities for fiscal years 1999 through 2004. In FY 2005, the College received a fixed 3.3 percent increase in new State funding. However, due to the Budget Reconciliation Financing Act (BRFA) adjustment of \$3,518,086, the resulting FY 2005 State appropriation of \$30.4 million represented an increase of only \$965,000 when compared to FY 2004. The State appropriation in FY 2005 and FY 2006 decreased \$3.5 million and \$816,000, respectively, when compared to the original appropriations. The College's Board of Trustees has approved a \$9 per credit hour increase in tuition for in-state and out-of-state students. Effective FY 2006, the credit tuition rates will be \$78 and \$168 respectively. The College will allocate the additional revenue generated by the tuition increase to 12 initiatives that directly impact students: advising, disability, enrollment and health services. The College is also working to analyze and design a fee structure that correlates program expenses and fees for FY 2007.

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

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 900. But the number of contract training courses offered has fallen from 853 to 703 in the past three fiscal years.

**Campus response:** The Business and Continuing Education Center (BCEC) lost the majority of its leadership team in FY 2004. The Office of Training and Professional Development lost its Director and all three of its Assistant Directors. Thus, the numbers

of contract training courses, numbers of business and organizations served in contract training, and number of participants in contract training decreased. The new Director of Business and Industry Services is rebuilding business relationships and developing new partnerships. New marketing materials have been developed for mailing to Baltimore area businesses. BCEC staff plan to hold bi-monthly industry-specific breakfast meetings and make weekly visits to businesses, agencies, and municipalities. New weekly contact reports will be shared to enhance communication and follow-up. With these efforts and the complement of new staff, BCEC will rebuild its enrollment.

*Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 80. But the number of businesses and organizations served by its contract training dropped to 59 in the most recent fiscal year.

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

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Physical Therapy*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 90 percent. But the percentage of students who passed the exam in Physical Therapy has been noticeably short of the college's goal in the past three years.

**Campus response:** The Physical Therapy's program's rate increased to 100 percent, surpassing its benchmark.

**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 was 9.9 percent in the most recent cohort – the lowest in the past four.

**Campus response:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate for full-time students has increased to 11.4 percent. Most Baltimore City Community College students have multiple goals, carry extensive household and work-related responsibilities, and require substantial preparation in academic skills. The College must therefore help its students address numerous challenges in order to pursue their studies, graduate, or successfully transfer. Sixty-two percent of the 50 non-returning students who responded to surveys and who had educational goals other than degree or transfer reported that their goals were met. In another survey, 35 students contacted this past few months listed the following as "major" reasons for leaving the College without graduating: personal reasons, financial difficulties, transfer, childcare difficulties, and employment demands.

The College is committed to improving retention, graduation, and transfer rates. The number of graduates has increased in recent years. There were 317 graduates in FY 2002 and 322 in FY 2003; in FY 2004 there was a 32 percent increase to 425 graduates. Activities are underway to maintain these increases. In Fall 2004, the Graduation Task Force was instituted to increase the degrees and certificates awarded to eligible graduates in FY 2005. Staff identified 1,521 students who had completed at least 45 credits toward a degree or six credits toward a certificate and had been enrolled since Spring 2004. Rigorous efforts were made to contact these students via telephone calls from Program Directors, automated calls, and postcards encouraging students to meet with their advisors to register for the appropriate Spring 2005 courses. Staff worked to assist potential graduates by researching obligations, arranging financial assistance, and expanding and extending the degree audit process. During the first week of advising, 21 percent of these students came on campus for degree audits and 36 percent of them applied for graduation. As of June 27, there were 586 graduates, 38 percent more than in FY 2004.

#### *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 been considerably short of the college's goal in the past three 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 was 9.2 percent in the most recent cohort. The college is considerably far from its benchmark of 18.0 percent.

**Campus response:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students increased slightly to 11.6 percent. Because the College's student body is comprised primarily of minorities, all steps described above to enhance student success will enhance outcomes for minorities. Activities underway to improve minority students' success include enhanced support services and the Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of African American Males. The Committee's charges: establish activities addressing academic, transfer, career, financial aid, student activities, and support services needs of African American males while assisting them in their acclimation to the College; develop activities to educate faculty, staff, and students on African American male issues; and strengthen community support for African American males in addition to supporting their own communities. Objectives: research why African American males attend the College; examine data from the Accuplacer placement exam; and produce a report describing the College's African American male students, their academic goals, and risk factors.

*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.

*Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** While enrollments in workforce development contract training courses at Baltimore City have almost doubled from 4,964 to 9,609 between FY 2000 and FY 2002, the number remains far short of the college's benchmark of 15,000.

**Campus response:** Same as for earlier measure, "number of businesses and organizations served in contract training".

*Licensure Exams Passing Rate -- Emergency Medical Services*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 75 percent, but just half of the graduates who took the exam in FY 2003 passed it as did only 25 percent in FY 2002.

**Campus response:** The Emergency Medical Services rate increased to 92 percent.

*Percent of Expenditures on Instruction*

**Commission assessment:** Baltimore City's benchmark is 50 percent, but instruction made up just 40.6 percent of its total expenditures in FY 2003 and the College has not approached its goal in any of the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** The total expenditure on instruction increased by \$308,587 from \$18.2 million in FY 2003 to \$18.4 million in FY 2004. The corresponding percentage expenditure on instruction in the operating budget increased from 40.6 percent in FY 2003 and to 41.0 percent in FY 2004.

*Percent minorities of full-time faculty*

*Percent minorities of full-time administrative/professional staff*

**Commission assessment:** The following indicators lacked benchmarks in the 2004 report. The College must provide adopt benchmarks for these measures or explain their absence.

**Campus response:** Based on the advice of the College's legal counsel, the College does not submit benchmarks for these indicators.

## CARROLL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Percentage of Expenditures on Instruction and Selected Academic Support*

**Commission assessment:** Carroll's benchmark is 58.0 percent, but the percentage of its total expenditures devoted to instruction and selected academic support has declined steadily from 57.3 percent to 51.0 percent in the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** Data reported for Carroll in FY2000 and FY2001 included all academic support expenditures, and the college established the initial benchmark based on these data. Revising these figures to include only the expenditures associated with selected academic support yields 51.1 percent for FY2000 and 50.0 percent for FY2001. Based on these revised baseline figures, and with the knowledge that new buildings were preparing to come on line, the college would have established the benchmark at 52 percent. *The college requests that the benchmark for indicator 27 be revised to 52.0 percent.* The percentage of expenditures on instruction and selected academic support for FY2002-04 has been consistent at 51.2, 51.0, and 51.2 percent, respectively. Given the recurring physical plant expenses of opening the Scott Center for the Fine and Performing Arts, the Business Training Center, and the Life Fitness Building during this period, the college is satisfied with maintaining the proportion of its budget devoted to instruction and related academic activities.

**Commission response:** The Commission has no objection to the benchmark change.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

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

**Commission assessment:** Carroll's benchmark is 6.0 percent, but it has had no full-time minority faculty in the past three years.

**Campus response:** Carroll Community College continues to experience challenges in attracting an ethnically diverse faculty and staff, for the following reasons:

- Carroll County's relatively homogeneous population, which limits both the pool of ethnically diverse and professionally qualified potential employees, and the college's ability to attract an ethnically diverse workforce to an area with few ethnic communities
- Very low turnover

The college administration continues to be concerned with the problem of recruiting an ethnically diverse workforce, and it continues to fine tune its recruitment procedures to find qualified minority candidates. These procedures include:

- Communication of vacancies with institutions and organizations that are likely to be sources of minority candidates, such as Bowie State University and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. Recently, the list of such institutions was significantly expanded to include similar institutions outside of the D.C.-Maryland region.
- National searches for all faculty and administrative positions, including the use of [higherjobs.com](http://higherjobs.com).
- Use of advertising sources that focus on minority candidates, with research about their ultimate effectiveness. For example, the college for some time advertised its vacancies in *Black Issues in Higher Education*. Review of information from candidates revealed that none had been alerted to the college's vacancies by advertisements in this periodical. Accordingly, the college eliminated use of this periodical and substituted the *Baltimore Afro-American*. By concentrating on a more local periodical, it is hoped that the college's commitment to diversity will become more well-known in the immediate surrounding area.

These approaches appear to be improving the college's effectiveness in attracting minority candidates to apply for vacant positions, as documented in the college's 2005 Minority Achievement Report. Over the past three fiscal years, a total of 379 people applied for 12 vacant professional staff positions at the college. Forty, or 10.6 percent, of these applicants were minorities. Minority applicants were hired into two of these 12 positions (16.7 percent).

The college has not been successful in hiring minority faculty. Over the past three years, six full-time faculty positions were filled. Forty-two, or 14.8 percent of the 283 faculty applicants, were minorities. None of the hires were from minority racial or ethnic groups.

Like most institutions with large numbers of adjunct faculty, Carroll Community College tends to attract individuals from this base as applicants for full-time positions. In 2002, just over 5 percent of the credit adjunct faculty were minorities. In fall 2004, minorities accounted for almost 9 percent of the adjunct faculty. This should ultimately attract a more diverse pool of applicants for future full-time openings, while providing a more diverse set of instructors for current students.

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

**Commission assessment:** The six-year transfer/graduation rate of minority students at Carroll jumped from 7.7 percent to 22.2 percent in the last cohort. However, the college remains far from its benchmark of 30.0 percent.

**Campus response:** Strategies for improving performance on this indicator include the use of basic skills assessment tests for entering students; interpretation of test scores in First Advising Sessions to ensure appropriate course placements; use of the Early Alert Program whereby faculty refer students in academic difficulty to appropriate support services; Orientation, First-year Programs, and co-curricular activities to promote student integration into college; opportunities for tutoring in the Academic Center, both by appointment and on a walk-in basis; and opportunities to participate in Academic Communities -- career-oriented learning support groups featuring mentoring and hands-on, active, collaborative learning experiences inside and outside the classroom. Eight Academic Communities are offered: Body by Carroll: Adventures in Health incorporating Healthcare, Wellness, Sports and Fitness; Creativity; Education, Human Development, and Behavior; Great Ideas from the Human Experience; Law and Criminal Justice; Leaders, Investors, and Entrepreneurs; How Things Work; and Social and Cultural Awareness.

The six-year transfer/graduation rate for minority students has improved since its low point of 7.7 percent for the 1996 cohort. The two most recent cohorts, students entering in fall 1997 and 1998, achieved transfer/graduation rates of 22.2 percent and 18.2 percent, respectively. The small number of minority students in these cohorts can result in large swings in these indicators. For example, the 1997 cohort had 18 students. Had two more students transferred or graduated, the rate for this cohort would have exceeded the benchmark of 30 percent. It is the relatively low transfer and graduation success of part-time students that is holding the six-year rate down.

Carroll also described two activities that it hopes will improve minority student retention: a strategic initiative on diversity and global awareness and a student persistence and achievement committee. Details are in Vol. 2 of the performance accountability report.

### *Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses*

**Commission assesment:** Carroll's benchmark is 2,800, but senior adult enrollments in noncredit courses have ranged between 2,184 and 2,516 in the past four fiscal years.

**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 established a benchmark of increasing senior enrollment to 2,800, an increase of over 16 percent, based on estimated county population growth in this age group. However, in a time of constrained resources, the college decided against significantly increasing courses or promotional efforts targeted toward the senior adult population specifically. Instead,

resources for new program development were used to launch a new summer youth program and to expand lifelong learning programs targeting all adults.



## CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Senior Adult Enrollment in Non-Credit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Cecil's benchmark is 2,800, but the enrollments of senior adults in non-credit courses have been more than halved in the past three fiscal years falling from 2,839 to 1,253.

**Campus response:** The FY 2003 figure for senior adult enrollment in non-credit courses was under reported. The correct figure was 2,020 and not 1,253. Reasons for this decline included de-funding of high enrollment classes, decline in the value of an FTE, insufficient funding to underwrite the program and a shift of focus from the original community services model of the program. To stem the decline, a year-long study was conducted, involving internal and external analyses and focus groups, to identify program alternatives. Program options are being modified to suit the elderly population. Additional marketing strategies also are built into the program. The College is repackaging and remarketing its course offerings as a way of strategically positioning its continuing education programs to generate increased demand.

## CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 12,000, but noncredit enrollments have fallen steadily from 11,674 to 9,545 during the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** This trend reflects the decreased availability of funds for training from manufacturer and government agencies. In addition, enrollment decreases have resulted from cost-savings measures at the College that have included staff reductions, the closing of an instructional site, and the elimination of uneconomical programs and courses. Despite the downward trend, Chesapeake's noncredit enrollment is the second highest among small community colleges in the state. Also, Chesapeake's ratio of non-credit enrollment to credit enrollment is the highest among all community colleges in the state.

#### *Market Share of Recent Public High School Graduates in Service Area*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 57 percent, but the percentage of recent public high school graduates in their service area who enrolled at the college dropped sharply in the past year to 49.0 percent.

**Campus response:** This percentage rebounded nicely in AY 2003-2004 by matching the benchmark of 57 percent.

#### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 150, but the number of businesses and organizations receiving contract training was halved in the past fiscal year falling from 160 to 80.

**Campus response:** The decreasing availability of funds for training from manufacturer and government agencies and institutional cost-savings measures that have negatively impacted Chesapeake's noncredit enrollment has had even greater impact on contract training, workforce development, and their relative performance indicators. This has been reflected in the decreasing number of businesses and organizations served in contract training, participants in contract training, and enrollment in workforce development courses.

Chesapeake is currently reviewing the data methodology that created only 80 businesses and organizations served in contract training for FY 2003. Preliminary analysis shows that the actual number was around 122. This number is higher than any other community college in the state.

### *Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 10,000, but the number of participants in contract training dropped from 11,344 to 8,241 in the past fiscal year.

**Campus response:** The FY 2003 number of participants (8,241) in contract training and enrollments in workforce development courses (9,830) were both higher than all other small community colleges in the State. The future looks bright, as the Workforce Investment Board/Maryland Business Works, the Upper Shore Manufacturing and Business Council, and Chesapeake College have established a unique working relationship that has become a model for the state. It is the only situation in Maryland where WIB, a manufacturing and business council, and a Continuing Education department are all located under one roof.

### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate – State Protocol (EMT-CRT)*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of students on this licensure exam has fallen steadily in the past three years from 100 percent to 70 percent. Chesapeake's benchmark is 90 percent.

### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate – National Registry (EMT-I)*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 90 percent, but the percentage of students who passed this exam has consistently declined in the last four years from 100 percent to 70 percent.

**Campus response to the above two assessments:** While below their benchmarks, the pass rates for State EMT-CRT and National Registry EMT-I (70 percent) for Chesapeake College graduates are well above the state average of 56 percent. The trend in declining pass rates is occurring at both the state and national level and is currently under study. Department of Transportation requirements have changed during that time period and increasing rigor in the content may have an effect.

### *Enrollment in Workforce Development Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 11,625, but enrollments in workforce development courses have fallen steadily during the past three fiscal years from 11,595 to 9,830.

**Campus response:** The decreasing availability of funds for training from manufacturer and government agencies and institutional cost-savings measures has negatively impacted the enrollment in workforce development courses.

*Senior Adult Enrollment in Non Credit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Chesapeake's benchmark is 7,800, but the enrollment of senior adults in non credit courses has dropped consistently in the last three fiscal years from 7,927 to 6,999.

**Campus response:** The decrease of senior adult enrollment in non-credit courses has been a consequence of large senior events moving off campus and revenue enhancing strategies to shift limited resources to business and industry contract training courses. Despite the decrease, Chesapeake's senior non-credit enrollment of 6999 was the highest among small community colleges and the fourth highest among all community colleges in the state.

*Licensure exams passing rate: National Registry Exam (EMT-P)*

*Licensure exams passing rate: State Protocol (EMT-P)*

**Commission assessment:** The following indicators lacked data for FY 2003 in the 2004 report. This information needs to be provided in the next report or an explanation provided regarding its absence.

**Campus response:** Indicators for national and state EMT-P protocol exams are absent because there was no cohort taking exams for that year. Low enrollment forced the program to be offered on an alternate year basis with the CRT/EMT-I program in order to build a cohort.

## COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** CCBC's benchmark is 48,600. But the college's noncredit enrollment slipped from 47,166 to 40,442 in the past fiscal year.

**Campus response:** The College does not anticipate that it will reach the benchmark by FY 2005. This benchmark was set in FY 2001, during a time of peak CCBC non-credit enrollments. FY 2001 enrollment had grown 16 % over the previous year, a rate of enrollment that has now proven unsustainable. Since that time a series of significant events occurred that impacted enrollment in continuing education: the technology bubble burst, the US declared war on international terrorism, state budget deficits multiplied, Bethlehem Steel went bankrupt, and General Motors closed their local manufacturing plant. Because of state budget cuts, the Maryland State Department of Corrections Occupational Skills Training Center terminated their intensive training contract with the College and the Baltimore County Department of Social Services reduced their intensive training contract.

CCBC is taking corrective actions to address non-credit enrollment declines including: looking for opportunities and partnerships with correctional facilities for their transitioning inmates; and co-locating educational services and assuming teaching duties for pre-employment workshops at the Baltimore County One Stops. Other partnerships have slowed downward trends in the area of intensive training, and expanded facility-sharing partnerships with the Baltimore County Public Libraries and Department of Aging. The CCBC Hunt Valley and Owings Mills expansions in FY2006 will provide additional classrooms to offer more non-credit programs in these growing areas of the county.

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

**Commission assessment:** CCBC's benchmark is 28.0 percent. However, the percentage of students transferring to Maryland public four-year institutions has fallen steadily in the past three cohorts from 27.0 percent to 23.0 percent.

**Campus response:** The percentage of CCBC students enrolling in a Maryland public four-year institution within four years of starting at CCBC increased dramatically in the latest cohort of students. CCBC's learning outcome projects for its general education courses and closer monitoring of student success in core transfer oriented courses has also contributed to a higher rate of students transferring. CCBC continues to increase its efforts to improve transfer student advising and counseling, and is also tracking the categories of student transfers as part of its internal institutional effectiveness system. In addition to a closer look at CCBC's impact on the preparation of student transfers, the

College has also examined how barriers, including high tuition, at the four-year campuses in Maryland might be influencing transfer rates. Along with other colleges, CCBC is closely examining The “Tschechtelin” Report and is taking a number of recommended steps to increase cooperation between CCBC and the campuses that accept most of the students seeking to transfer.

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

**Commission assessment:** CCBC’s benchmark is 840. But the number of contract training courses has dropped consistently in the last three fiscal years from 799 to 732.

**Campus response:** The number of training courses delivered under contract to particular organizations has been declining in the past few years and meeting the benchmark is questionable. Several large contracts for training were carried out to their successful conclusion and these have been replaced with less intensive contracts with smaller companies. Companies like Allison Transmission, Bethlehem Steel, Comcast, General Motors, and the Maryland Department of Corrections Occupational Skills Training Center cut back on their training funding and the multiple courses that were developed for them in the late 1990s and at the beginning of this review period. As large companies and agencies have pulled back from contracts to train their workers in courses designed exclusively for their workers, there has been some movement of these employees to open enrolled courses, but in general, employer sponsorship of training has declined. CCBC expects that the number of courses developed for particular companies will rise when large employers and funding agencies in this area once again begin to invest in training. One exception to the decline in employer sponsored contract training has been the continued emphasis on Workforce Literacy courses and contract courses for teaching English as a Second Language.

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate: Occupational Therapy*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of students who passed the occupational therapy exam dropped sharply in the last year from 100 percent to 71 percent. CCBC’s benchmark is 100 percent.

**Campus response:** The pass rate for the Occupational Therapy program rebounded to 100 percent during FY 2004. The small number of graduates in this type of program increases the likelihood of volatility in the pass rates.

#### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate: Emergency Medical Technical – EMT – P*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of students who passed this exam declined sharply in the past year from 100 percent to 73 percent. CCBC’s benchmark is 96 percent.

**Campus response:** The pass rate for this program is also subject to the volatility of the small numbers of graduates who take the licensure exams each year. The dip in pass rates in FY 2003 was investigated and instructional interventions were made. Data for FY 2004 indicate that the pass rate has rebounded to 88 percent.

#### *Enrollment in Workforce Development Courses*

**Commission assessment:** CCBC's benchmark is 49,000. But enrollment in workforce development courses have dropped steadily in the past three years from 47,110 to 41,900.

**Campus response:** There is little likelihood that the benchmark will be reached in FY 2005.

The College has traditionally performed very well on this indicator and continues to lead community colleges in Maryland in workforce development courses and enrollment. Beginning in FY 2002 enrollment in workforce development courses have experienced decreases as several long-standing business and government contracts for training were completed. New contracts for training were severely impacted by the economy. In addition to the loss of these contracts, there were sharp declines in enrollments in Information Technology courses as that industry experienced contractions from the boom years of the 1990's. In addition, during this period the federal role in funding the training of unemployed and underemployed workers changed significantly. These changes reduced the number of FTEs being supported by the Workforce Investment Act from 300 FTE in the mid-1990s to less than 50 FTE in FY 2004 and impacted thousands of course registrations.

CCBC's Continuing Education Division continues to work closely with the business community to help them identify cost effective means of providing quality training. As Baltimore County has lost a number of its large manufacturing companies, the College is finding some opportunities in smaller and mid-sized companies. Marketing and course development resources are also being shifted to health care organizations as that industry continues to grow and to demand increasingly skilled workers at all levels of care and business operations.

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

**Commission assessment:** CCBC's benchmark is 29,000. But the enrollment of senior adults in noncredit courses has fallen consistently in the past three years from 27,994 to 18,011.

**Campus response:** The FY 2004 enrollment is up slightly from the previous year but it is unlikely that the benchmark will be reached.

During this period local funding from partnering agencies was impacted by the economy, there were cutbacks in governmental programs that supported several of the programs serving this segment, and the College lost several large sites where CCBC courses were

being taught. In particular, CCBC had previously taught seniors in courses at senior centers in Baltimore City, but shifted these courses to Baltimore City Community College. In addition, the state changed its policy on the funding of certain very popular courses for senior adults. When these courses were no longer funded, the enrollment shifted to non-funded categories on state reporting or these courses were no longer offered by CCBC.

CCBC continues to offer more than 1,000 different courses targeted to seniors and the annual enrollments in these courses exceed 18,000. New programming, in partnership with the Baltimore County Department of Aging, is now underway and there have been a number of efforts to build bridges to communities serving seniors. CCBC has also developed several programs to reach out to the 50-59 year old age group and to provide courses that will help this age group prepare for a retirement full of learning activities.

**Commission response:** Non-credit courses that are determined to be “recreational” are ineligible for State aid regardless for whom they are intended. No special treatment is given to courses that are designed for seniors or any other specific group.



## FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Credit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Frederick's benchmark is 7,636. But its credit enrollment has declined steadily in the past three fiscal years from 7,098 to 6,726.

**Campus response:** Although Frederick has not met its benchmark for credit students, in FY 2004 unduplicated credit enrollment increased 2 percent over FY 2003 from 6,726 to 6,859. The increase in unduplicated headcount can be attributed to the increased enrollment of students of color in fall 2004. The College's enrollment management team has been making extraordinary efforts during the academic year to visit the nine Frederick County high schools numerous times, including the Maryland School for the Deaf, Evening High School and the Career and Technology Center.

Frederick continues to work with the Frederick County Public Schools to encourage students to earn college credit while still in high school and to identify capable, first generation college students to concurrently enroll at Frederick and the public schools to earn 30 college credits upon high school graduation.

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

**Commission assessment:** The number of participants in contract training at Frederick rose steadily from FY 2000 to FY 2002 to 4,704, but then fell to 4,546 in FY 2003. The college is short of its benchmark of 5,131.

**Campus response:** Frederick is happy to report that the College has achieved its benchmark in all three indicators relating to contract training (CT). In FY 2004, there was a 48 percent increase in the number of employees (6,712 v. 4,546) participating in CT courses, and the number of businesses participating in CT also increased by 7 percent in FY 2004 from 88 to 94 businesses. The number of contract training courses increased by an overwhelming 116 percent from 270 in 2003 to 583 during this time period.

### Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional

#### *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 (12 percent), the college is shy of its benchmark of 19 percent.

**Campus response:** During the last four years, the number of minority students has increased from 642 in fall 1999 to 783 in fall 2004 (22 percent). The College continues to strive to attain its benchmark through the efforts of the College Outreach and Recruitment Office.

*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 recruit nationally for most faculty positions and a few administrative positions. The College completed the centralization of the application process for all employees, including adjunct instructors. A web-based application system, ProHire, allows for continuous advertising to fill the adjunct rolls and allow us to track EEO information and provide us with hiring source information electronically. As of fall 2004, adjunct faculty of color was 8 percent. The Director of Diversity is now part of the initial orientation for all new employees and provides training on the importance of cultural competence and the value of diversity to the organization.

*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 32 percent in any of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** Frederick Community College has seen a significant increase in its four-year transfer/graduation rate of first-time, full-time, degree seeking students of color. MHEC data (which is based only on transfers to Maryland public 4-year institutions) reports that the College's performance has increased from 32 percent to 36 percent for the 1999 and 2000 cohorts. The College has utilized the transfer enrollment data provided by the National Clearinghouse and has determined that Frederick has actually achieved a 46 percent performance score for the transfer/graduation indicator, surpassing its benchmark of 41%. The increase is attributed to students of color transferring to out-of-state four year institutions of higher learning. The Clearinghouse report revealed that eight students who were reported as "Dropped" in the MHEC report, actually transferred to out of state institutions.

**Commission response:** Community colleges may report transfers to out-of-state institutions as an optional indicator in the performance accountability report, with the condition that they supply the Commission with verification of their statistics. Frederick did not take this alternative, so we cannot judge the accuracy of its response.

*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:** Unfortunately, data from the National Clearinghouse for the 1998 cohort is not currently available to calculate the true transfer rate of students of color. We believe that the results will be similar to the students of color four-year transfer/graduation rate showing that some of the "Dropped" students actually transferred to out of state institutions.

## GARRETT COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Credit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Garrett's benchmark is 909. But its credit enrollment has fallen steadily in the past three fiscal years from 874 to 777.

**Campus response:** These enrollment figures are attributable to three factors: out-migration of all population cohorts other than senior citizens, increasing employment, and declining numbers of high school students. The College developed three signature programs to expand its marketplace, and it has instituted new marketing strategies to bolster enrollment. It substantially improved the appearance and navigability of its web page, and it has instituted a new inquiry response and tracking system.

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

**Commission assessment:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students at Garrett had risen from 0 percent to 11.1 percent in three consecutive cohorts. But it dropped back to none in the most recent cohort. The college's benchmark is 12.0 percent.

**Campus response:** Due to the small number of minority students at Garrett College in the past, four-year and six-year minority transfer/graduation rates have fluctuated significantly from year to year. Although the 1999 cohort showed no full-time minority graduates or transfers, the 2000 cohort's transfer/graduation rate increased to 8.3%. 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 percentage of minority students graduating from Garrett has been rising with three minority students graduating in 2003 (3.9 percent of the graduating class) and six (6.8 percent of the graduating class) graduating in 2004.

Further, despite the data captured by the four- and six-year graduation rates, Garrett's minority students have continued their education elsewhere, but this data is not captured as they typically transfer out-of-state. For example, of the 85 minority students enrolled at Garrett in 2003 or 2004, 20 students (or 23 percent) have transferred to an institution outside of Maryland and thus will not be captured in MHEC's data. 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.

**Commission response:** Community colleges may report transfers to out-of-state institutions as an optional indicator in the performance accountability report, with the

condition that they supply the Commission with verification of their statistics. Garrett did not take this alternative, so we cannot judge the accuracy of its figures related to out-of-state transfers.

*Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Garrett's benchmark is 1,500. However, the number of participants in contract training has declined consistently in the past three fiscal years from 1,337 to 1,043.

**Campus response:** FY 2004 data show that Garrett exceeded its benchmark on this indicator. The number of participants in contract training increased 100.7 percent in the one-year period by going from 1,043 to 2,093 participants.

**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 the past four years.

**Campus response:** Garrett College 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 financial environment of recent years, the College was not optimistic that this condition was likely to change soon. However, effective June 2005, Garrett College was successful in hiring a new administrator who is Hispanic. The College will look forward to reporting a new percentage in next year's Accountability Report.

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

**Commission assessment:** Garrett's benchmark is 12 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students did not exceed 8.3 percent in three of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** Same as for earlier measure, "four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students".

## HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

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

**Commission assessment:** Hagerstown's benchmark is 21.0 percent. But the percentage of students who transferred to a Maryland four-year institution dropped sharply to 14.0 percent in the most recent cohort.

**Campus response:** It must be noted that the College's transfer rates, which are not reflected in the MHEC reports that are the basis of the accountability indicators, are impacted by its location in the tri-state area of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. With such incentives as offering Hagerstown graduates in-state rates and attractive financial aid packages, as well as proximity to the local area, colleges outside of the University System of Maryland are attractive to Hagerstown students and graduates. According to data received from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), 48 percent (148) of the 2000 cohort of graduates enrolled in transfer programs (305) matriculated to four-year colleges or universities. Of those, 60 percent attended out-of-state two-year or four-year institutions. Transfers to those institutions have steadily increased, which, in turn, negatively impacts transfer/graduation rates within the USM. Shepherd University (WV) and Shippensburg University (PA) are the primary institutions to which Hagerstown students and graduates transfer.

**Commission response:** Community colleges may report transfers to out-of-state institutions as an optional indicator in the performance accountability report, with the condition that they supply the Commission with verification of their statistics. Hagerstown did not take this alternative, so we cannot judge the accuracy of its figures related to out-of-state transfers.

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

**Commission assessment:** Hagerstown's benchmark is 42 percent. But the four-year transfer/graduation rate of new full-time students has consistently fallen in the past four cohorts from 51.0 percent to 35.0 percent.

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

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

**Commission assessment:** Hagerstown's benchmark is 2.0 percent. But the proportion of minorities among the college's full-time faculty has declined steadily in the past four years, and Hagerstown employed no full-time minority faculty in the most recent year.

**Campus response:** The College achieved its benchmark of 2 percent minority representation in full-time faculty in Fall 2004. As faculty positions become available, a primary institutional goal is to add more diversity within the ranks.

## HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

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

**Commission assessment:** Harford's benchmark is 350. However, the college has not offered more than 303 contract training courses in any of the past four fiscal years, and the latest number (279) was the lowest.

**Campus response:** Contract training offerings in FY 2004 increased by 13.2 percent (from 279 to 316 courses) demonstrating a steady increase toward the benchmark of 350 courses in FY 2005. FY 2005 marketing and outreach efforts, coupled with added offerings and a new website, indicate that progress toward the FY 2005 goal will be sustained.

#### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** The number of businesses and organizations which received contract training rose from 52 to 66 between FY 2000 and 2002 – but dropped sharply to 51 in FY 2003. Harford's benchmark is 60.

**Campus response:** This apparent decline in organizations was a result of cuts in government training that directly affected the number of Department of Defense contractors able to engage in contracted training. These employees were still able to be served through our open enrollment course offerings. Efforts continue to be made to increase our client base, replacing government-related agencies with private businesses. The business and industry training team is actively participating in the Harford County Business Outreach Committee, a coalition of agencies serving the economic development needs of Harford County. Through this organization, our coordinators accompany Susquehanna Workforce Network counselors to present our training capabilities to the businesses in the community. We have also produced an impressive PowerPoint presentation available on CD, which speaks to our reputation and capabilities. With this initiative, greater movement toward the FY 2005 benchmarked goal is anticipated.

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

**Commission assessment:** Harford's benchmark is 4,000. However, the number of participants in its contract training programs has fallen steadily from 3,793 to 3,361 in the past three fiscal years.

**Campus response:** There was an increase of nearly 20 percent in the number of people trained between FY 2003 and FY 2004. With 4,009 enrollments in FY 2004, the FY 2005 benchmark of 4,000 has been exceeded. Continued increases in this area are expected.



*Licensure Exams Passing Rate: NCLEX RN*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of Harford students who have taken and passed the licensure exam for registered nurses has dropped consistently from 91 percent to 78 percent during the past four years. Harford's benchmark is 91 percent.

**Campus response:** For FY 2004, 81 of 99 first-time NCLEX-takers passed for a rate of 81.8 percent. The required pass rate for Maryland was 78 percent. The previous year, the pass rate for first-time NCLEX takers was 78.2 percent. Although still below the benchmark pass rate of 91 percent, the pass rate increased 3.6 percentage points.

We are confident we will achieve the 91 percent benchmark for FY 2005. Over the past year, the nursing program implemented several measures to continually improve the NCLEX pass rate. These measures include curriculum revision, remediation, faculty professional development in test design, and NCLEX reviews for students.

*Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** The enrollment of senior adults in noncredit courses has fluctuated in a narrow range between 3,049 and 3,192 during the past four fiscal years and far from Harford's benchmark of 3,700.

**Campus response:** There was an increase of 642 senior adult enrollments between FY 2003 and FY 2004. This increase of approximately 20 percent exceeds the FY 2005 benchmark and we expect to continue to do so through FY 2005.

## HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Market Share of Recent Public High School Graduates in Service Area*

**Commission assessment:** Howard's benchmark is 46 percent. However, there has been a steady decline in the past three academic years from 47.5 percent to 39.6 percent in the proportion of recent public high school graduates in Howard County who have enrolled at the college.

**Campus response:** The market share of recent public high school graduates in the service area increased to 40.8 percent in academic year 2003-2004 after a two-year decline in AY2001-02 and AY2002-03. Institutional data show that the college's applicant pool continues to strengthen, with record enrollment in the Freshman Focus and Rouse Scholars programs this year. However, due to the affluence of service area residents and the services these students are seeking and can afford, the college's recruitment efforts are challenged when competing with the offerings of nearby four-year institutions. In addition, increasing numbers of home-schooled and private-schooled Howard County residents may affect the college's progress toward the benchmark for this indicator. It is possible that students, who in the past would have matriculated via the public school system, are now doing so through home and/or private schooling.

The college and the Howard County Public School System have a number of agreements in place across a wide range of programs and majors, including computer systems, education, business, graphic arts, human services, hospitality, and health care designed to ensure that area high school students are aware of academic options at HCC.

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

**Commission assessment:** Howard's benchmark is 32.5 percent. However, the percentage of all new students who have earned a credential or transferred to a four-year institution within six years has consistently fallen during the past four cohorts from 32.7 percent to 28.6 percent.

**Campus response:** The college has implemented a number of strategies to improve the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all students. Among them is mandatory tutoring for third-time repeaters of a developmental math or English course. The data indicate that the college is dramatically improving its ability to move these third-time repeaters to success. In addition, this year Howard faculty and staff have implemented a pilot mentoring and coaching program called Step-Up. The program couples weekly student/coach meetings with networked communication with faculty and student services staff to monitor students' progress, signal the need for early intervention, and help overcome barriers to students' academic success. Other programs in place at the college to increase success rates include two of its longest running programs, the Learning

Assistance Center's tutoring services and specialized ESL support in writing. The Student Support Services (SSS) program is an intensive, personalized support program that includes services such as academic advising, personal and career counseling services, individualized tutoring, and assistance by academic specialists. The First Year Experience (FYE) is an expanded peer mentoring and leadership program, which has increased success and retention rates for students in classes with FYE objectives over stand-alone sections.

The college's six-year transfer/graduation rate for the 1998 cohort has increased to within 0.3 percentage points of the benchmark. This increase seems to be an indicator of the positive impact of a number of strategies put into place over the last several years to improve transfer and graduation rates.

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

**Commission assessment:** Howard's benchmark is 25 percent. However, the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students has declined regularly from 24.1 percent to 19.8 percent during the past three cohorts.

**Campus response:** Howard Community College has implemented a series of initiatives to positively impact the transfer and graduation rates of minority students. Foremost among them is the Silas Craft Collegians program, a program targeted to the retention and success of at-risk students, especially African American students. The college's goal is for these students to have graduation and retention rates equal to those of all students. Currently, the four-year graduation rate for the Collegians exceeds that of the general student population, and the transfer/graduation rate for participants is 44 percent. The college believes that retention is an important component of the four- and six-year transfer/graduation rates; therefore, the Silas Craft Collegians program has a strong focus on retention, and the data indicate that the college is being very successful in that arena. The Silas Craft program has not been in existence for six years, so there are not yet any six-year transfer/graduation data for participants of this program. However, the current trend suggests that the program will have a positive impact.

Another strategy adopted to improve the six-year transfer/graduation rate of minority and all students is mandatory tutoring for third-time repeaters of a developmental math or English course. Minority students figure highly among these numbers. The data indicate that the college is dramatically improving its ability to move these third-time repeaters to success. In addition this year, Howard faculty and staff have implemented a pilot mentoring and coaching program called Step-Up, which extends many of the successful strategies of the Silas Craft Collegians program to a different cohort of students. The college is still compiling the qualitative and quantitative results of the Step-Up program, which is designed to be another important tool in the pursuit of minority student success.

There are a number of other programs in place at the college to increase success rates, and these programs have a high rate of minority student participation. Among them are two of the longest running programs, the Learning Assistance Center's tutoring services

and specialized ESL support in writing. The Student Support Services (SSS) program is an intensive, personalized support program that includes services such as academic advising, personal and career counseling services, individualized tutoring, and assistance by academic specialists. The First Year Experience (FYE) is an expanded peer mentoring and leadership program, which has increased success and retention rates for students in classes with FYE objectives over stand-alone sections.

Efforts underway to increase the six-year transfer/graduation rate of minority students have led to a sound increase toward the benchmark. The rate increased from 19.8 percent for the 1997 cohort to 21.9 percent for the 1998 cohort.

#### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Howard provided contract training to 78 businesses and organizations in FY 2000. Since that year, the number has not exceeded 63 and has been far from the college's benchmark of 80.

**Campus response:** In FY00, there was a strong, growing economy, specifically in information technology, which required increased training. Since then, the information technology sector has decreased, the number of students requiring basic training has declined, and the need for high-end technology training does not equal the initial need for basic skills. In addition, there is an increased trend of employers purchasing in-house controlled training, much of it online. Although performance for this indicator improved in FY04 (66), the benchmark for this indicator may need to be re-evaluated for the next performance accountability cycle.

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

##### *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 was less than 19 percent in the past two years.

**Campus response:** The College moved toward the benchmark in fall 2004.

## MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Noncredit enrollments at Montgomery College have steadily increased from 12,072 to 14,949 in the past four fiscal years. However, this remains far from the college's benchmark of 19,896.

**Campus response:** Comprehensive course offerings and an increased availability of course offerings at convenient locations appear to have a positive effect on non-credit enrollment. Enrollment increased 2.8 percent above the figure for last year (from 14,494 to 15,368) and more than 16 percent above the figure for fiscal year 2001. Thus far, enrollment in non-credit courses has reached 78 percent of its goal. There are many variables that come into play for noncredit enrollment activity. Over the past few years, the country has become involved in external conflicts, the information technology market softened, the "dot.com" industry took a major down slide and the availability of federal funding for employment and training was reduced significantly. These combined conditions have had a substantial impact on the soft money that is frequently used to fund continued training and education for adults in the workforce, which is a major source of business for WDCE. Despite these unpredictable events, the College's services to the community expanded in this area of discretionary education and training for adults.

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

**Commission assessment:** The proportion which racial/ethnic minorities constitute of Montgomery's full-time faculty has fluctuated in a narrow range between 23.3 percent and 25.6 percent during the past four years. This is quite short of the college's benchmark of 30 percent.

**Campus response:** After several years of relative stability, recent data show that the proportion of full-time faculty who are non-white increased almost one percentage point from 25.6 to 26.4. Thus far, the College has achieved 88 percent of its goal; and the increase moved the College to less than four percentage points from its goal of 30 percent.

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

**Commission assessment:** The proportion which minorities make up of Montgomery's full-time administrative and professional staff has steadily declined in the past three years from 32.4 percent to 30.3 percent. The college's benchmark is 35 percent.

**Campus response:** Collectively, administrators and professional staff are becoming increasingly more diverse. An almost three percentage point gain was noted between fall 2003 and fall 2004 following two years of successive declines. Within the past year, the

College hired four non-white administrators, which has had an enormous impact on the progress made in this area. This increase in diversity among administrators and professional staff brings the College less than one percentage point shy of its goal.

*Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** There has been a consistent increase in the number of businesses and organizations which have received contract training at Montgomery in the past four fiscal years from 49 to 65. But this remains considerably short of the college's benchmark of 100.

**Campus response:** On average, between fiscal 2001 and 2004, the College has served 61 businesses, offered 744 contract training courses and served almost 8,000 participants. The most recent data show a decline in all three areas compared to the previous year. The number of contract training courses declined 13 percent. The workforce development and continuing education unit at Montgomery served five fewer businesses and organizations and the number of participants dropped six percent. Consequently, the declines in these areas recede from the benchmarks.

Contract training is affected by market demand and current economic trends have softened the market conditions. For example, a temporary, one-year loss (since restored) of the apprenticeship program with the Associated Building Contractors, Inc. resulted in the loss of several hundred enrollments. As a result, many employers have been compelled to cut back budgets that had been devoted to training. It should also be noted that the figure for "contract training" is understated. Technically the College serves several hundred business clients each year through a much smaller number of contracts. For example, a single contract with the Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA) provides training for more than 100 companies that belong to that organization. This is true of many of our association type of training programs. Even though the College has served only 60 businesses and organizations, it anticipates serving 100 contracts each year in the foreseeable future. Thus, the College could have set easy to reach targets but chose not to do so because of the commitment to expand services to the community.

## 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 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.

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

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 25 percent. But the percentage of all students who earned a credential or transferred to a four-year Maryland campus within six years dropped from 24.1 percent to 19.2 percent in the most recent cohort.

**Campus response:** A genuine down slope is perceivable across the six year graduation/transfer rates, the last (cohort 1998) producing the lowest statistic among the four comparison groups (18.8 percent of cohort 1998 graduating or transferring to a Maryland public four-year institution by 2004). There are a number of reasons for such worrisome findings, the most salient of which is the very high proportion of first-time freshmen entering without proper college preparation. For example, in fall 2004, 68 percent of entering students new to higher education required remediation, the second highest rate among all Maryland community colleges, and 44 percent had multiple skill deficits. The college is moving to implement many of the proposals to reform developmental education made by the Learning Centered College Committee and described in the 2004 report, but it will take several years before these bear fruit.

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

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 23 percent. But the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all students has been less than 19 percent in three of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** The six-year transfer and graduation rate for minority students dropped to a new low (17.0 percent) with the latest cohort (1998). In the 2003 Action Plan for Minority Achievement, Prince George's Community College 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. It will take at least two years for the effectiveness of these reforms to make a measurable impact, and we will continue to monitor these trends closely.

### *Number of Contract Training Courses Offered*

**Commission assessment:** The number of contract training courses offered at Prince George's nearly doubled from 202 to 385 between FY 2000 and FY 2002. However, in the last fiscal year, there were 207. The college's benchmark is 350.

### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 50. But less than 40 businesses and organizations received contract training at the college in three of the last four fiscal years.

### *Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Prince George's benchmark is 5,198. But the number of participants in contract training at the college has fallen steadily from 4,513 to 3,756 in the past three fiscal years.

**Campus response to the above three assessments:** The 2004 drop in contract course enrollment from 2003 (3,756) does not reflect a decline in training reputation, but rather a decision made last year by the Continuing Education division to change strategic directions by de-emphasizing contract training (155 contract training courses were offered in 2004 compared with 207 in 2003) and concentrating its effort to encourage area businesses to support employee enrollment in regular credit and non-credit vocational courses by providing scholarships and release time.

### *Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Nuclear Medicine*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of Prince George's students who took the licensure exam in nuclear medicine has continually declined during the past four years from 100 percent to 60 percent, leaving the college far short of its benchmark of 90 percent.

**Campus response:** The Nuclear Medicine pass rate has stabilized at 60 percent (both in 2003 and 2004). As yet, it is too soon for the Allied Health program academic admissibility reforms inaugurated in 2002 to show up in this accountability indicator.



## **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 61.1 percent in any of the past four cohorts.

**Campus response:** The second year retention indicator shows a slow but regular improvement comparing cohorts for 2001 (57.2 percent) through 2003 (62.4 percent), a period increase of 9.1%. Although the trend is not strong enough for goal fulfillment (73.0 percent), 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. Furthermore, this should lead to increasing graduation and transfer rates four years out in 2005 and beyond.

### *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 four cohorts from 28.5 percent to 19.5 percent.

**Campus response:** For last four full-time assessment cohorts, the four-year graduation/transfer rate shows mostly fluctuation around 21 percent. The latest figure (for cohort 2003) is 20.4 percent, a slight improvement over cohort 2002's low rate of 19.5 percent.

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

**Commission assessment:** Minority representation on Prince George's full-time faculty has fluctuated between 26 and 31 percent during the past four years – 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 Community College has grown in a steady upward trend from the lower twenties to what it is today, 32 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% 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 nearing our goals by fiscal year 2005. In fiscal year 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.

*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 four cohorts from 24.7 percent to 18.0 percent.

**Campus response:** We are happy to report that the figure for the last cohort in this sequence (2000) showed a modest improvement (18.7 percent), but it is too soon to tell if this represents a genuine turn-around.

## COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND

### Explanation Required

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

**Commission assessment:** College of Southern Maryland's benchmark is 15 percent. However, representation of minorities on its full-time administrative/professional staff has declined steadily during the past four years from 14.0 percent to 12.0 percent.

**Campus response:** College of Southern Maryland is continuing its aggressive efforts to recruit and retain minorities in all job categories with a special focus on faculty and executive managers. Although efforts were systematic and coordinated college wide, low turnover rates, competition and internal recruitments significantly modified our success rate. The college has very recently hired a department chair and an executive, both of whom are members of minority groups. The college is hopeful that these developments will be positively reflected in future reports. Hiring one minority would significantly change the overall percentage (one hire = 1 percent). For example, based on the 107 total administrative/professional staff employed in Fall 2003, an increase of one minority would have changed the reported 12 percent to 13 percent.

The college has initiated two operational objectives related to this benchmark: 1) to develop a plan to improve recruitment of minorities; and 2) to improve retention of minorities. The following strategies are now in place to enable the college to improve both the recruitment and retention of the minority employees:

- Diversity Office or Human Resources Department personnel will be represented on selected administrative and faculty hiring committees.
- A new hiring policy will be developed, reviewed and monitored by the Human Resources Department and Diversity Office to consider fairness of rating criteria (i.e. transferable skills, interviewing techniques, etc.).
- A competitive salary range and merit promotions and executive development evaluation are presently in place.
- A staff mentoring program has been reinvigorated and new minority administrators are encouraged to participate.
- New networking resources for minority candidates and assistance with meeting local community members will be identified and utilized.

#### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** The number of businesses and organizations that received contract training offered by College of Southern Maryland dropped consistently during the past three fiscal years from 100 to 73 – far from the college's benchmark of 120.

**Campus response:** The 120 benchmark was set in 2001 against one year of data collection established using the Business Training Network. We recently changed the way data are gathered for this indicator and current methods do not conform to the prior method. The BTN is no longer used at the college. Data for these indicators are extracted directly from college revenue logs. We also may be experiencing a change in employee training needs and trends. Over the last three years, we shifted our emphasis. Originally, our Corporate and Community Training Institute (CCTI) sought to serve as many employers as possible through basic training programs. Our corporate training staff provides more in depth needs assessments and a more complete range of training for each customer. Thus, fewer employers are served, but measured by increased revenue, the relationship is stronger. An additional business representative has been hired and CCTI anticipates an expansion of the customer base.

## WOR-WIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

### Explanation Required

#### *Number of Noncredit Students Enrolled*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 7,000. But noncredit enrollments have fallen steadily during the past three fiscal years from 7,042 to 6,013.

**Campus response:** Even though the college's unduplicated enrollment in community and continuing education classes surpassed the benchmark in FY 2001, the 11 percent decrease in FY 2002 was not unexpected. A contract course for 500 employees at a local business contributed to a significant amount of the FY 2001 growth and, due to the downturn in the economy, contract training greatly decreased in FY 2002. Enrollments decreased 5 percent in FY 2003 and remained unchanged in FY 2004. The college strives to attain its benchmark again by continuously working with area employers and professional groups, such as the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, to develop new and improve existing training opportunities.

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

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 28 percent. However, the percentage of all students who earned a credential or transferred to a four-year Maryland institution within six years of entry has consistently declined over the last three cohorts from 26 percent to 22 percent.

**Campus response:** This was mainly due to the decrease in the percentage of students graduating without transferring. For the most recent cohort, the percentage of graduates has increased and the rate is again at 26 percent, representing 93 percent of the college's benchmark of 28 percent.

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

**Commission assessment:** The four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students rose from 10 percent to 31 percent for three straight cohorts. However, it fell to 22 percent in the latest one. Wor-Wic's benchmark is 28 percent.

**Campus response:** This wide range is likely due to small cohort sizes of 16 to 41 students. This year's figure of 32 percent is 7 percent above the state average and has exceeded the college's benchmark of 28 percent.

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

**Commission assessment:** The six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students increased from 13 percent to 18 percent for three consecutive cohorts. But it dropped back to 13 percent in the latest cohort and is considerably below Wor-Wic's benchmark of 20 percent.

**Campus response:** This pattern was largely due to a smaller portion of students transferring without earning an award. The rate increased to 20 percent for the 1998 cohort, meeting the state average and the college's benchmark for this indicator.

### *Number of Contract Training Courses Offered*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 225. However, the number of contract training courses offered at the college has steadily fallen during the past three fiscal years from 203 to 151.

### *Number of Businesses and Organizations Served in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 50. But the number of businesses and organizations receiving contract training from the college has continually dropped over the past three fiscal years from 47 to 41.

### *Number of Participants in Contract Training*

**Commission assessment:** Wor-Wic's benchmark is 3,000. But the number of participants in contract training has plummeted during the past three fiscal years from 2,848 to 1,791.

**Campus response to the above three assessments:** The decrease in contract training figures from FY 2001 through FY 2003 is most likely due to many local businesses closing, downsizing and budgeting less money for training due to economic conditions. Shorter, more intense courses might have caused the FY 2004 increase in the number of contract training courses and participants. The college has increased visitations to businesses in an effort to promote contract training opportunities. All of the businesses and organizations that participated in contract training in FY 2004 responded that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with Wor-Wic's contract training.

## **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 has been 6 or 7 percent in each of the previous four years.

**Campus response:** Due to the low turnover of credit faculty, the limited number of new credit faculty positions each year (three were added in FY 2005), and the lack of qualified minority applicants, attempts to meet the college's benchmark of 10 percent minority credit faculty have not been very successful. However, the percentage of minority credit faculty increased from 6 percent to 7 percent in the fall of 2004. Gaining two more minority credit full-time faculty employees would enable Wor-Wic to meet its benchmark. With only two new credit faculty positions approved for FY 2006, it is unlikely that the benchmark will be met.

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

**Commission assessment:** The proportion which minorities constitute of Wor-Wic's full-time professional/administrative staff has risen consistently from none to 7 percent in the past four years. But Wor-Wic remains short of its benchmark of 10 percent.

**Campus response:** The percentage of minority full-time administrative/professional employees increased to 9 percent this year, which is 90 percent of the benchmark. Hiring one more minority 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 continues implementation of 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.

### *Senior Adult Enrollment in Noncredit Courses*

**Commission assessment:** Senior adult enrollment in noncredit courses at Wor-Wic was 1,183 in the most recent fiscal year and quite below its benchmark of 1,500.

**Campus response:** To service the growing local senior adult population, the college offers special courses designed exclusively for Maryland senior adults and has enrolled more than 1,100 senior adults in non-credit courses in the past year. Senior enrollment has decreased 13 percent since FY 2001 due to several factors. The criteria for MHEC'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 scheduled during convenient daytime hours. Additional non-credit computer labs will be available in college's new Workforce Development Center, scheduled to open in the fall of 2007. It is anticipated that this will allow us to offer more senior courses at convenient times.

**Commission response:** Non-credit courses that are determined to be "recreational" are ineligible for State aid regardless for whom they are intended. No special treatment is given to courses that are designed for seniors or any other specific group.





**TARGETED INDICATORS  
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

**PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**



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

**BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Explanation Required**

*Objective 1.2 – The percent of core faculty with terminal degrees will increase from the FY 2004 amount of 74.6 percent to 86 percent by FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The proportion of faculty with terminal degrees in the most recent year was the lowest figure in the past four years.

**Campus response:** A focused effort has been placed on achieving this goal. All of the core faculty hired for the fall have terminal degrees.

*Objective 1.3 – Increasing from 70 percent in FY 2004, the second year retention rate will have reached or exceeded 80 percent by FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The second year retention rate of these students was the lowest in the last four.

**Campus response:** It is our belief that the rising tuition costs and students having to work more hours per week have been contributing factors. In the 2004 National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) report, it showed that Bowie freshmen worked off campus more hours than those of other NSSE institutions. Consequently, they spent less time on studying and academic work than students at other NSSE institutions. In an institutional survey of the same year, it was found that of the new students responding to the survey, 38 percent worked off campus.

In spite of the fact that the university provides a wealth of resources to assist in student retention, the New Student Survey reveals that for questions regarding frequency of use of the available resources, the students seem not to be very engaged.

*Objective 2.2 – At least 80 percent of teacher education program completers will pass Praxis II by FY 2009 from 73 percent in 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The pass rate on Praxis II in the most recent year was considerably short of the objective.

**Campus response:** Bowie has achieved a 100 percent pass rate on Praxis II for all teacher education programs completers in the School of Education. However, students in the School of Arts and Sciences, though they may have had education classes, have not

had the benefit of the same preparation as the students in the School of Education; therefore, they do not fare as well. To try to minimize this in the future, all students in the School of Arts and Sciences who express an interest in teaching will have to have a dual major, where they will be advised both in their academic discipline and in the School of Education.

**Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Objective 1.4 – Increase the graduation rate, for students graduating within six years, to 51 percent by FY 2009 from the baseline 40 percent in FY 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The six year graduation rate of these students has fluctuated in a narrow range between 38.9 percent and 42.3 percent in the past four cohorts, and Bowie is far short of the objective.

**Campus response:** Bowie is addressing retention through various initiatives designed to increase student engagement and to enhance the academic support infrastructure. One such initiative is the Student Success and Retention Center (SSRC). SSRC operates to facilitate the centralization of the University's non-department linked retention initiatives. SSRC is comprised of the programs that primarily service freshmen students including the Freshmen Seminar course, mentoring program, undeclared major advisement service and a tutorial center. Additionally SSRC provides services for students with documented disabilities, probationary students and participants in the University's summer bridge program. SSRC works collaboratively with Retention Coordinators that are assigned to each of the academic schools at Bowie State University. Prior to the fall, three retention coordinators served the University. An additional retention coordinator was hired to work in the newly created School of Business in the fall 2004. Retention coordinators assist the staff of SSRC with placement testing, Freshmen Seminar course instruction and workshops, and work under the direction of their respective school deans to monitor retention initiatives for the school to which they are assigned.

## COPPIN STATE UNIVERSITY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 1.2 – Increase the number of students enrolled in programs delivered off-campus or through distance education programs from 262 in FY 2004 to 605 in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of students enrolled in programs delivered off campus or through distance learning in the most recent year was far short of the objective.

**Campus response:** A partnership with the Baltimore Teachers' Union (BTU) has resulted in increased enrollment for Spring 2005 for off-campus course offerings and participation in BTU meetings/workshops. The Partnership now includes public school teachers in both Prince Georges and Howard counties. Coppin will strengthen this partnership in the future, and as a follow up, the deans and chairs will monitor growth and enrollment in the number of fully online courses as well as growth in the number of and enrollment in hybrid courses. Enrollment in off-campus and distance education programs increased in FY 2005 to 512. As a result, the university estimated that 605 students will be enrolled in these programs by FY 2009

*Objective 3.1 – Increase the six-year graduation rate for all students from 23.5 percent in FY 2004 to 30 percent in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** Coppin's six-year graduation rate in the most recent cohort was the lowest in the past four and far from its objective.

**Campus response:** Under the leadership of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Coppin will continue efforts to close the achievement gap and increase retention rates by increasing activities that foster holistic student development. With the implementation of new retention and graduation programs and the expansion of programs such as the Cohort Attack, the primary objectives of this goal are twofold: (1) maintain a steady increase in the number of undergraduate student's retained, and (2) increase the graduation rate to 30 percent or higher by FY 2009. The six-year graduation rate for all students increased 3 percentage points, from 23.5 percent in FY 2004 to 26.5 percent in FY 2005. With the restructuring of the undeclared majors program, more focused advisement by the departments, and a year-long cohort attack program, Coppin intends to reach the 30 percent graduation rate by FY 2009. Other strategies to be implemented, effective this academic year include:

- The formation of a campus wide "Retention Campaign" that is cohort-based.
- Fully automate the university-wide attendance program.
- Continue to provide Merit scholarships to students who are academically successful.

- Provide access and query to the EagleLINKS database for all F-1 international students.
- Enhance the first year experience that includes “learning communities” for residential and commuter students; replicate and apply these methods to include all student classifications (sophomore, junior, seniors).
- Offer summer enrichment sessions in necessary subjects for students who are repeating and failing courses.
- Expand the cohort registration efforts where faculty are paid to contact and advise students who have not pre-registered for the upcoming semester in an effort to encourage students to register for the semester.
- Institute a training and reward program for departmental advisors.
- Increase student support services to evening and weekend students.
- Provide adequate need-based financial assistance to minimize attrition for financial reasons.
- Continuance of the incentive grant program to provide additional resources for students who are academically successful.
- Enhance on-line registration and develop web-based advisement packages.
- Improve communication with students through e-mail.
- Continue a laptop program for continuing and transfer students.
- Provide a web-based tutorial.

*Objective 3.2 – Increase the six-year graduation rate of African Americans from 23.8 percent in FY 2004 to 30 percent in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The six-year graduation rate for African American students at Coppin in the most recent cohort was the lowest in the last four and far from its objective.

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

*Objective 5.3 – Increase the number of students enrolled in urban teacher education, natural sciences, nursing and health sciences, criminal justice, and information technology academic programs from 2,221 in FY 2004 to 2,500 in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of Coppin students enrolled in these fields was 1,767 in the most recent year – the lowest in the last four and short of the objective.

**Campus response:** Through increases in enrollment projections, Coppin expects to see increases in the number of students in these areas.

*Objective 7.1 – By FY 2004, allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target from 1.5 percent in FY 2004*

**Commission assessment:** The percent replacement cost for facility renewal and renovation at Coppin increased from 1.3 to 1.8 between FY 2001 and FY 2003, but it dropped to 1.5 in FY 2004. The college remains distant from its objective.

**Campus response:** Coppin has initiated and effectively implemented campus-wide preventive maintenance programs through its operation and maintenance service contract, implementation of facilities renewal, and deferred maintenance projects.

**Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Objective 1.1 – Increase the percentage of students whose ethnicity is other than African American from 5 percent in FY 2004 to 8 percent or greater in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** African Americans comprised 95 percent of Coppin's enrollment in the most recent year.

**Campus response:** The University will continue to maintain diversity across educational and campus climate experiences for students, faculty and staff, through collaborative agreements and partnerships with other public and private institutions. As the University gains approval from USM and MHEC for additional academic programs in allied health and computer science that are not offered by other higher education institutions in Maryland, a more diverse student enrollment mix is expected to occur.

## FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 4.5 – Increase the second year retention rate of minority students from 72.9 percent in 2004 to 83.0 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The second year retention rate of minority students at Frostburg climbed from 77.8 percent to 82.1 percent for three straight cohorts. But it fell dramatically in the latest one to 72.9 percent.

**Campus response:** The University's Learning Community Program has been especially successful in retaining minority students. Open to all first-semester freshmen, learning communities provide entering students the opportunity to take classes together in an atmosphere designed to build support networks with their peers, the faculty, and the University. The current (AY 2004-2005) retention rate for African Americans enrolled in learning communities exceeds 83 percent.

Learning Communities along with the efforts of the University's Student Support Center, Programs for Academic Support and Studies, and the Diversity Center have helped the University to increase the overall retention of African Americans and other minorities by more than 7.6% from FY 2004 to FY 2005.

*Objective 4.6 – Achieve and sustain the second year retention rate of African American students at 83.0 percent through 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The second year retention rate of African American students has declined steadily to 74.2 percent during the last four cohorts.

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

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

*Objective 1.5 – Increase the number of teacher education graduates employed in Maryland public schools from 68 in 2004 to 120 in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of Frostburg graduates teaching in Maryland public schools has declined steadily in the past four years to 68, far from the campus objective.

**Campus response:** The University is helping meet the demand for qualified teachers in the state and region. In 2004, 714 students enrolled in the undergraduate education program at Frostburg and 121 successfully completed their teacher training.



*Objective 6.1 – By 2012, meet or exceed the system campaign goal of at least \$10 million cumulative for the length of the campaign (beginning in FY 2005).*

**Commission assessment:** The amount of funds raised in private giving at Frostburg has fallen steadily to \$1.2 million in the past four years.

**Campus response:** Successive years of dwindling state support of higher education have resulted in a reduction of staff in many University departments, including the areas of alumni services and development. During Frostburg State University's most successful fund-raising campaign, which coincided with the institution's centennial year celebration, the staff complement in alumni programs and development was nearly twice as large as in 2005. The ability to effectively raise private support is a function of carefully orchestrated relationship building, which is a science and an art that requires the investment of time and human resources. During lean budgetary times when staff is reduced, the ability to manage and cultivate institutional supporters is diminished. Unfortunately, the effects of reduced staff in these areas often take their toll over a period of years.

Frostburg State University will evaluate personnel needs in FY 2006 as it prepares to participate in the University System of Maryland campaign, which will culminate in 2012. It is expected that Frostburg will add the staff and resources necessary to reach the preliminary goal of \$12 to \$15 million during the campaign period.

## SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 2.2 – The estimated number of graduates employed in IT-related fields in Maryland will increase from 59 in 2004 to 70 in 2008.*

**Commission assessment:** There were 31 Salisbury IT graduates employed in Maryland in the most recent year, short of the university's objective.

**Campus response:** Salisbury University achieved this goal in 2004. However, because of fiscal and personnel resources limitations, Salisbury was unable to include survey research updates in time for their inclusion in the 2004 Performance Accountability Report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission or in the MFR to the Department of Budget and Management. Despite our success, this indicator will fluctuate downward the next few years to mirror enrollment fluctuations. Additionally, given the changing nature of the market, (the hiring of non-IT majors in IT-related careers, for instance), the University is augmenting this objective to include any graduate, regardless of major, who attains employment in Maryland in IT-related careers.

*Objective 4.5 – The six-year graduation rates of Salisbury first-time, full-time African American freshmen will increase from 53.3 percent in 2004 to 63.0 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The six-year graduation rate of new full-time African American freshmen has declined steadily during the past three cohorts to 53.3 percent, far short of its objective.

**Campus response:** From this objective's inception, the University predicted annual fluctuations in graduation rates that were based upon known trends and influenced by small initial cohorts. However, the "goal" for this objective was externally driven by a process that insisted on benchmarks set to the highest level ever achieved, even when current trends indicated those levels were not possible. Now, not only have the cohorts grown to levels that allow stability in the indicators, they also allow Salisbury to engage in specific programming that attempts to reach parity in graduation rates across all student populations. The new benchmark established for 2009 is a realistic objective that will begin to approach those of other student groups and, by 2014 should be equivalent to them.

*Objective 4.6 – The six-year graduation rates of Salisbury first-time, full-time minority freshmen will increase from 53.2 percent in 2004 to 63.0 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The six-year graduation rate of new full-time minority freshmen has dropped for four consecutive cohorts to 53.2 percent, far short of its objective.

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

**Continued Monitoring Required; Explanation Optional**

*Objective 2.3 – The estimated number of nursing graduates employed as nurses in Maryland will increase from 44 in 2004 to 70 in 2009.*

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

**Campus response:** In the past five years, nursing enrollment has exploded, doubling from 198 to 403 students. Undoubtedly much of this growth is due to market opportunities associated with a severe shortage nationally of nurses wherein the demand for nurses, unlike that for teachers, has been met by correspondingly high salary levels. A survey of our alumni two years after graduation revealed that nurses, on average, earned the highest salaries of all graduates including those working in IT, computer science, and business careers. Although Salisbury will continue to remind our audiences that it has no control over the life choices of its graduates once it has provided the discipline-specific and general education competencies our graduates need to be successful, success has been achieved with the number of nurses indicating Maryland as their place of employment. With a goal set at 70 and the number of graduates surging, an estimated 44 nurses were employed in Maryland (from the 2003 graduating class) while a survey of the class of 2004 reveals a preliminary 64 nurses employed in Maryland.

*Objective 2.5 – Increase expenditures on facility renewal from 0.5 percent in 2004 to 0.9 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of Salisbury's annual State appropriation spent on facility renewal has not exceeded 0.5 percent in the past three years.

*Objective 3.3 – Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending Salisbury from 40 percent in 2004 to 46 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of these students at Salisbury has held steady at approximately 40 percent in the past three years, short of the university's objective.

## TOWSON UNIVERSITY

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 3.7 – Maintain the percentage of economically disadvantaged students above 47.0 percent in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** Representation of economically disadvantaged students steadily increased from 38.2 percent to 39.9 percent between 2001 and 2003. However, it dropped to 32.9 percent in 2004.

**Campus response:** The percent of economically disadvantaged students among undergraduates at Towson University increased from 38.5 percent in FY 2002 to 43.1 percent in FY 2005. A data retrieval error, associated with the installation of new administrative software in fall 2003, resulted in our understating the percent of economically disadvantaged students in the FY 2004 accountability report. Correcting this data point to 40.8 percent revealed that the university has improved access to economically disadvantaged students each year since FY 2002. This was accomplished by increasing institutional need-based financial aid by nearly \$3 million (239 percent) since FY 2002.

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

*Objective 1.2 – Increase the number of Towson graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 303 in FY 2004 to 480 in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of Towson graduates hired by Maryland public schools fell to 303 in the past year, short of the university's objective.

**Campus response:** Maryland public schools hired 410 Towson graduates in FY 2005. This was 107 more than were hired in FY 2004.

*Objective 1.4 – Increase the estimated number of Towson graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland from 51 in survey year 2002 to 100 in survey year 2008.*

**Commission assessment:** The estimated number of Towson graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland has declined steadily for three years to 51 and is far from the objective.

**Campus response:** The estimated number of nursing graduates employed in Maryland increased to 77 in the most recent year.

## UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 4.2 – Increase University of Baltimore’s entrepreneurial revenues by 5 percent per year through FY 2008 (from \$363,094 in 2004).*

**Commission assessment:** Entrepreneurial revenues at University of Baltimore have declined steadily for the past three years.

**Campus response:** The decline in 2004 was due to reductions in lease and parking revenues. It is envisioned that when the new student union opens in 2006 that opportunities to grow these revenues will greatly increase.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

### **Problem Requiring Correction**

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

**Campus response:** 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.

**Commission response:** A representative of the U.S. Office for Civil Rights, at a workshop earlier this year for staff attorneys at Maryland colleges and universities, stated that the establishment of numerical goals by themselves did not violate the law or court decisions. In addition, Maryland institutions may use diversity indicators that are not related to the admissions process to satisfy the accountability requirement.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

### Explanation Required

*Objective 4.1 – Increase the percentage of African American undergraduate students from 15.0 percent in FY 2004 to 16.0 percent in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** Representation of African Americans among UMBC's undergraduates has fallen steadily in the past three years.

**Campus response:** Despite accomplishments with minority recruitment overall, success in recruiting new African American students has fluctuated unpredictably. Over the last ten years, numbers of new African American freshmen have ranged from 121 (fall 2002) to 191 (fall 1997), but there has been no discernible trend, with year-to-year values changing by as much as 45. In contrast, the number of new African American transfer students has been remarkably constant. Between fall 2000 and fall 2004 the values have ranged from 215 to 223. In terms of percentages, there is a much higher percentage of African American students among new transfers than among new freshmen (19.7 percent vs. 9.3 percent in fall 2004).

UMBC's target for enrollment of undergraduate African American students in FY 2004 was 18 percent, but over the last ten years the percentage has been fairly constant at about 15-16 percent. One reason for this is overall growth in the undergraduate population, particularly among Asian American students. The number of new Asian American freshmen has grown 133 percent since fall 1995 and undergraduate enrollment of these students has increased by 81.5 percent. These increases permitted UMBC to approach its FY 2004 goal of 39 percent minority undergraduate students, but it has had a negative impact on the percentage of African American students. Another demographic trend is that enrollment growth has been greater among freshmen than among transfer students, and as noted above, the percentage of African American students is lower among the freshmen. Taken together, these factors have held the percentage of African American undergraduate students down. Given these persistent demographic trends, the university has adjusted its 2009 target for enrollment of African American students to 16.0 percent.

*Objective 7.1 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target by FY 2009 from 0.3 percent in FY 2004.*

**Commission assessment:** The percentage of replacement costs expended in facility renewal at UMBC has not exceeded 0.6 percent in the past four fiscal years.

**Campus response:** Persistent budget constraints in FY 2005 have made it impossible for us to achieve the 2 percent target on this performance indicator.

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

*Objective 2.1 – Increase the number of UMBC graduates hired by Maryland public schools from 48 in FY 2004 to 95 in FY 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of UMBC graduates employed in Maryland public schools has steadily dropped in the past three years, falling by more than half to 48 and considerably short of the university's objective.

**Campus response:** Program completion and employment in Maryland public schools now stands at 93. The large increase in FY 2005 is likely to be only temporary because it reflects a lag in graduation for students who did not complete the Praxis II or NTE exams (which are now required for program completion) in 2004. UMBC's new FY 2009 target is 95. In addition to the factors affecting enrollment, other factors may also play a role in program completion. 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 had some impact.



## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 2.1 – Increase the percentage of undergraduate students participating in enrichment programs before graduation from 80 percent in 2004 to 90 percent by 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** While participation in these programs and activities has held at 80 percent during the past two years, UMCP remains short of its objective.

**Campus response:** This fall marks the beginning of the “The President’s Promise.” This initiative guarantees every new freshman an opportunity to engage in a special learning experience that complements the academic curriculum and offers personal growth. Our goal in the next five years is to increase the percentage of degree recipients participating in a special experience from 80 percent to 90 percent. Living/learning programs combine rigorous academic experiences with the benefits of a common residence, allowing students with similar academic interests to live together and learn from each other, both in and out of the classroom. According to *US News and World Report*, the University of Maryland ranks 3<sup>rd</sup> among the nation’s most outstanding learning communities, and 12<sup>th</sup> for its first year experience programs.

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

*Objective 3.1 – Annual giving to the University from all sources will increase from \$86 million in 2004 to over \$130 million by 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The total annual giving from all sources remains considerably short of UMCP’s objective.

**Campus response:** A presidential task force has made recommendations to rejuvenate alumni giving. With renewed efforts, the University plans to significantly increase the number of donors and the amount of giving. The University has set goals to increase the number of alumni donors to 42,000 and the amount of alumni giving to \$130 million.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

### Explanation Required

*Objective 2.3 – Increase the number of students enrolled in courses using distance education technology from 109 in 2004 to 300 in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** Enrollments in these courses fell from 307 to 109 in the two most recent years for which the university supplied data.

**Campus response:** The change in the number of students reported for Objective 2.3 is related to a change in the operational definition for that objective. During AY 1999 - 2003 the University measured combined enrollment in distance education courses and off-campus courses and reported the outcome as a combined enrollment number. However, in AY 2003-2004, the University initiated several enhancements to distance education online learning and published its Online Learning Enhancement Plan. As a result of this initiative and effective with 2004 reporting, the new Objective 2.3 only measures enrollment in courses using distance education technology (109) and the new Objective 2.4 measures enrollment in courses at off-campus sites (172).

The University of Maryland Eastern Shore is rapidly becoming proactive in its approach to online learning and enrollment in distance education. Students will continue to attend traditional classroom sessions as they have in the past, but now they will have WebCT as an additional resource for communication. We are also in the process of adding 'Hybrid' courses and fully online courses to our curriculum. "Hybrid" courses will provide students with less classroom time and more online work. Although traditional classroom time is still deemed necessary, students will benefit from having more flexible schedules for completing their work, from the encouragement of abstract thinking, and from the fulfillment of great technical responsibility consistent with the needs of a technological age. Students and faculty will be jointly responsible for using alternative learning and teaching styles consistent with current Web technology. The next step is to offer more courses that are completely online. Progress in this area has been particularly successful. The University has increased the number of on-line, web-assisted and web-based courses from 23 in AY 2003-2004 to 63 in AY 2004-2005.

The *UMES Plan for Online Learning Enhancement* outlines the University's purpose and goals for distance education. UMES is currently providing supplemental instruction in the use and application of CMS WEBCT as a teaching tool in traditional classroom courses, particularly in the use of WebCT as it supports classroom instruction. However, as the University advances in its strategic agenda over the next five years of the MFR process, new courses are being developed and will significantly increase the availability of on-line courses.

*Objective 4.1 – Increase the second year retention rate for all UMES students from 74 percent in 2004 to 79 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The second year retention rate of all students at UMES has fallen steadily in the past three cohorts.

**Campus response:** The downward trend in two-year retention is related to increased costs of tuition, especially as this increase impacts out-of-state students. There will continue to be a tremendous need for increased need-based financial assistance in order to help students offset the burden of increased tuition costs. In addition, the gap in available aid and student need has increased and leaves many students unprepared for the sudden change in federal guidelines.

We are using Access and Success funds to strengthen the role of counselors and mentors to provide tutorial assistance to help students persist in spite of financial limitations and academic challenges.

*Objective 4.3 – Increase the second year retention rate for African Americans from 74.5 percent in 2004 to 79 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** UMES did not come close to matching the 83 percent second year retention rate for African Americans it attained in the 2000 cohort in any of the subsequent three cohorts.

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

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

*Objective 1.1 – Increase the passing rate on the Praxis II from 45 percent in 2004 to 85 percent in 2009.*

**Commission assessment:** The passing rate of UMES graduates on Praxis II has not exceeded 45 percent in the past three years.

**Campus response:** Student performance on national examination by students enrolled in the teacher education program has improved significantly for 2005. The current PRAXIS pass rate is at 83 percent. This significant increase is the result of new and innovative programming to better assist students to prepare for the examination. The teacher education computer laboratory provides all students with an opportunity to review and study in an innovative environment for learning.

## MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

### **Explanation Required**

*Objective 3.1 – Maintain a minimum of 230 African American graduates at all degree levels in science, mathematics, information systems management, computer science, and engineering by 2007.*

**Commission assessment:** The number of African American graduates in these fields at Morgan dropped in the past year to 190 – the lowest in the last four years.

**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 5 percent by 2007 from 2 percent in 2001.*

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

**Campus response:** Morgan continues to have a more diverse student body at the graduate level than at the undergraduate level. 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 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 20 by 2007; and by increasing the number of funded graduate assistantships to 75.*

**Commission assessment:** Morgan had seven authorized faculty dedicated to doctoral education in each of the past four years and 48 funded graduate assistantships in the most recent year -- a considerable distance from its objective.



**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 up to 7 for the public four-year institutions. For some of the public four-year institutions, one or more of the common indicators were not relevant to the campus or did not have an accompanying accountability objective; in these cases, the indicators were not included. Emphasis was given to outcomes and outputs measures. The 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 used 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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,499	3,864	4,264	4,555	3,458
Noncredit students	7,442	6,268	7,561	7,808	7,479
Market share of county population	51.7%	53.4%	56.2%	56.2%	50.8%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	63.9%	61.6%	64.4%	68.7%	62.5%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	39.8%	33.6%	38.0%	41.3%	39.4%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	44.5%	27.2%	66.7%	37.4%	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	5.3%	5.2%	6.8%	7.7%	5.3%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	7.2%	7.1%	7.1%	7.2%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2006
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	55.6%	50.3%	45.5%	44.1%	58.7%

Performance Indicator	AY 2000-2001	AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	AY 2003-2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.69	3.02	2.74	2.64	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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
<b>Enrollment:</b>					
Credit students	17,256	19,154	20,479	20,928	20,800
Noncredit students	34,832	38,015	33,895	32,186	35,000
Market share of county population	58.9%	59.8%	60.3%	58.8%	60.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	70.3%	71.4%	69.5%	72.0%	73.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	36.7%	37.7%	38.8%	39.4%	38.7%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority students w/in four yrs	25.9%	28.8%	22.6%	26.9%	30.0%

<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	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%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	21.1%	20.4%	21.6%	22.8%	22.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	18.6%	18.7%	18.6%		

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>AY 2000- 2001</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>AY 2003-2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	68.2%	66.7%	68.9%	67.3%	66.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.84	2.79	2.76	2.79	2.80
Number of participants in contract training	47,527	46,073	44,724	39,039	45,000

## BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Baltimore City Community College (BCCC) is an open-door public institution serving Baltimore City and other Maryland residents. Leading to an associate's degree or a certificate, the College's undergraduate programs are distributed among allied health, nursing, allied human services, business, technology, arts and sciences, teacher education, law enforcement, engineering, and computer information systems. Developmental courses are required by the majority of entrants who are tested. BCCC's Business and Continuing Education Center offers courses in adult basic education, GED preparation, English as a second language, and workforce development.

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	8,767	9,754	10,883	10,717	9,230
Noncredit students	12,474	12,824	13,362	10,930	15,000
Market share of county population	30.0%	31.7%	33.4%	32.2%	32.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	51.4%	53.5%	58.6%	60.0%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	13.1%	13.5%	9.9%	11.4%	18.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	12.0%	13.2%	9.2%	11.6%	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	91.2%	91.3%	94.7%	90.9%	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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,515	3,747	3,913	4,236	3,650
Noncredit students	7,688	7,405	8,158	8,000	9,000
Market share of county population	47.1%	46.8%	47.8%	47.2%	48.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	67.8%	69.4%	71.0%	72.3%	70.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	40.2%	38.2%	39.9%	38.4%	42%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	15.4%	44.4%	44.4%	40.0%	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	5.5%	6.3%	5.9%	5.9%	6.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	4.6%				

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark FY2005
Number of businesses and organizations served in contract training	76	63	68	67	75
Number of participants in contract training	5,663	4,882	6,463	4,991	6,000

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark FY 2005
Enrollment in workforce development courses	6,907	6,344	7,392	6,588	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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Enrollment:					
Credit students	1,956	2,190	2,511	2,559	2,600
Noncredit students	4,885	4,951	4,947	5,736	5,363
Market share of county population	64.6%	63.7%	62.3%	64.0%	66.6%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	54.1%	54.7%	58.6%	54.8%	57.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 Cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	26.9%	22.9%	29.3%	33.8%	27.8%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	22.2%	17.6%	34.7%	36.9%	16.8%

<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	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%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	10.1%	10.9%	11.2%	12.1%	10.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	6.2%	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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
<b>Enrollment:</b>					
Credit students	2,997	3,140	3,238	3,446	3,414
Noncredit students	11,423	11,342	9,545	9,065	12,000
Market share of county population	53.0%	53.0%	55.0%	54.0%	58.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	61%	68%	62%	64%	65%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 Cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	43%	34%	35%	32%	39%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	33%	20%	24%	15%	27%

<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	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%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	20.0%	19.0%	21.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	18.0%	17.0%	17.0%	17.0%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005 Benchmark</b>
Senior adult enrollments in non-credit courses	7,927	7,122	6,999	6,491	7,800
Percentage of expenditures on instruction	50%	51%	50%	50%	50%

<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>
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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	26,606	27,892	28,566	28,427	28,000
Noncredit students	46,393	47,168	40,442	38,957	48,600
Market share of county population	50%	49%	51%	49%	52%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	65.0%	66.0%	63.3%	67.0%	67.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	29.0%	27.0%	29.0%	33.0%	31.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	19.8%	21.0%	22.0%	26.0%	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	31.0%	33.0%	35.0%	37.0%	33.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	23.0%				

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2006
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions	48.2%	45.1%	43.7%	45.0%	50.0%

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2005
Percent minorities of full-time faculty	13.3%	15.0%	15.0%	14.0%	15.0%
Percent minorities of full-time administrative/professional staff	25.5%	29.0%	29.0%	28.0%	28.0%

## 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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	7,098	6,797	6,726	6,859	7,636
Noncredit students	8,090	7,603	8,816	11,263	9,357
Market share of county population	60.8%	58.0%	56.0%	54.0%	61.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	69.6%	67.0%	68.0%	63.0%	71.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	37.7%	37.0%	41.0%	42.0%	41.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	31.4%	25.0%	32.0%	46.0%	41.0%

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	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	16.6%	15.0%	16.0%	17.0%	19.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	10.8%	11.0%	12.0%	11.0%	



## GARRETT COLLEGE

Garrett 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.

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	874	822	777	746	909
Noncredit students	2,209	2,810	3,167	3,166	2,200
Market share of county population	52.9%	51.4%	52.5%	53.0%	54.2%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	62.0%	66.2%	66.4%	59.1%	65.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	35.3%	35.2%	36.2%	37.3%	35.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	8.3%	11.1%	0.0%	8.3%	12.0%

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%	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%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	5.4%	6.2%	7.2%	9.5%	2.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older			1.3%	1.3%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	AY 2000-2001	AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	AY 2003-2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	61.3%	64.0%	64.3%	67.5%	58.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.90	2.98	2.96	2.61	2.87

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2006
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	54.0%	48.8%	46.7%	44.2%	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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,747	3,883	4,290	5,128	4,200
Noncredit students	9,282	9,895	10,084	8,811	10,270
Market share of county population	60.0%	59.0%	61.0%	62.0%	61.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	62.0%	66.0%	66.0%	66.0%	66.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 Cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	42.0%	40.0%	35.0%	37.0%	42.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	24.0%	28.0%	28.0%	23.0%	28.0%

<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	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%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	9.0%	9.9%	10.0%	11.0%	11.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	10.5%	10.0%	10.0%	10.5%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 cohort</b>
Percent of students transferring to Maryland public four-year institutions	17.0%	21.0%	14.0%	17.0%	21.0%

	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2005 Benchmark</b>
Senior adult enrollment in non-credit courses	3,640	4,362	4,178	3,008	4,000

## HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Harford Community College is a fully accredited, open-admission two year community college that offers a wide variety of majors and career training. Over 22,000 Harford county residents take credit and noncredit classes each semester. The 332 acre campus includes 21 academic and administrative buildings. Facilities include networked computer labs, a radio and TV studio, library, 900 seat theater, and an Apprenticeship and Training Center.

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	6,817	7,420	7,786	7,598	6,800
Noncredit students	15,096	16,391	15,161	15,252	17,000
Market share of county population	57%	57%	56%	53%	56%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	68%	69%	71%	69%	68%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	37%	33%	38%	39%	36%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	18%	17%	31%	30%	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	14%	15%	16%	17%	14%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	13%	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 diverse and dynamic community. As a vital partner, HCC is a major force in the intellectual, cultural and economic life of its community.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Enrollment:					
Credit students	8,406	9,012	9,262	9,545	9,462
Noncredit students	12,568	13,690	13,640	14,722	13,530
Market share of county population	44.0%	44.3%	44.7%	43.6%	45.5%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	71.8%	70.4%	70.1%	70.8%	68.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 Cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	37.8%	37.2%	43.3%	36.1%	37.3%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	31.2%	27.5%	39.5%	30.6%	34.0%

<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	92.9%	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%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	31.7%	32.2%	31.9%	33.6%	29.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	26.6%	27.3%	28.0%	n/a	

## 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 15,000 Workforce Development and Continuing Education students. While Montgomery County's population is quite diverse, Montgomery College's credit student body is even more diverse - 29% Black, 16% are Asian, 15% are Hispanic, and 41% are White. Students from 178 foreign countries comprise 32% of the students.

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	33,198	32,580	32,540	32,459	36,000
Noncredit students	13,227	14,562	14,949	15,368	19,896
Market share of county population	54.5%	54.7%	53.0%	52.6%	55.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	68.7%	72.2%	70.2%	74.4%	66.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	27.3%	28.5%	32.2%	32.1%	33.5%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	23.9%	26.0%	30.9%	26.6%	33.0%

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	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 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	50.3%	50.7%	52.2%	52.6%	50.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	38.9%	39.7%	39.6%		

**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 2001</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
<b>Enrollment:</b>					
Credit students	17,757	19,013	19,537	19,077	21,904
Noncredit students	18,481	19,584	19,804	18,244	19,883
Market share of county population	40.0%	40.3%	40.0%	39.9%	45.6%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004 cohort</b>
Second year retention rate	60.2%	57.2%	61.1%	62.4%	73.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2001 Cohort</b>
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	23.1%	22.0%	19.5%	20.4%	35.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	22.1%	19.7%	18.0%	18.7%	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 2001</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2005</b>
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	83.0%	86.8%	87.5%	89.5%	73.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	73.0%	73.5%	74.5%	75.6%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>AY 2000-2001</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>AY 2003-2004</b>	<b>Benchmark 2004-2005</b>
Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty	48.8%	48.6%	49.0%	48.5%	56.4%

## 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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2004-2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	9,123	9,824	10,737	9,997	9,700
Noncredit students	7,949	8,580	9,397	9,276	7,825
Market share of county population	59.2%	59.1%	59.3%	58.2%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	68.4%	67.1%	68.1%	67.0%	71.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 Cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	43.1%	41.9%	51.8%	39.9%	42.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	26.2%	27.4%	46.4%	32.6%	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%	95%	96%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	23.3%	24.4%	25.1%	25.2%	24.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	22.0%	22.0%	24.5%	24.5%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2006 Benchmark
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	55.2%	53.8%	52.4%	49.8%	58.0%

Performance Indicator	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2005 Benchmark
Passing rate: NCLEX - First time testing (MD Board of Nursing)	94%	88%	94%	90%	92%
Percentage of expenditures on instruction	46%	46%	46%	47%	48%

## 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 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark FY2005
Enrollment:					
Credit students	3,280	3,946	4,262	4,265	3,850
Noncredit students	7,042	6,299	6,013	6,013	7,000
Market share of county population	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	52.0%	52.0%

Performance Indicator	2000 Cohort	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	Benchmark 2004 cohort
Second year retention rate	67.0%	55.0%	60.0%	60.0%	68.0%

Performance Indicator	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2000 Cohort	Benchmark 2001 cohort
Transfer/Graduation rate within four years	33.0%	37.0%	34.0%	39.0%	38.0%
Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs	19.0%	31.0%	22.0%	32.0%	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%	100%	90%
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	94%	90%	98%	90%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	100%	100%	96%	91%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Benchmark Fall 2005
Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population	27.0%	27.0%	27.0%	30.0%	23.0%
Minority population of service area, 18 or older	22.0%	22.0%	21.0%		

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2005
Employer/Organization satisfaction with community college contract training	100%	98%	100%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Benchmark 2005
Passing rate: Licensed Practical Nurse	94%	94%	100%	100%	95%
Passing rate: Radiologic Tech, AART	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%



**BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 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>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	87%	86%	80%	80%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate	41%	39%	40%	38%	51%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	73%	75%	70%	72%	80%

**COPPIN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 Accountability Profile**

Coppin State University is a comprehensive, urban, institution offering programs in liberal arts, sciences and professional disciplines. The University is committed to excellence in teaching, research and continuing service to its community. Coppin State University provides educational access and diverse opportunities for students with a high potential for success and for students whose promise may have been hindered by a lack of social, personal or financial opportunity.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	100%	100%	99%	100%	90%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	26%	30%	24%	27%	30%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	27%	29%	24%	27%	30%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	77%	72%	70%	67%	70%

<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>2009 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates in Maryland	94%	96%	95%	94%	85%

**FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	97%	89%	91%	89%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	88%	98%	97%	99%	97%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	59%	57%	59%	57%	62%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	45%	41%	45%	46%	45%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	75%	79%	76%	79%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	13%	13%	12%	13%	12%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	95%	98%	97%	91%	98%

**SALISBURY UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 Accountability Profile**

Salisbury University is a comprehensive regional university offering undergraduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences, business, and education, as well as a range of pre-professional and professional programs, and select, mostly applied, graduate programs.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	96%	97%	98%	97%	98%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	100%	98%	100%	99%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	74%	72%	73%	73%	73%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	61%	55%	53%	59%	63%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	86%	85%	84%	84%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	8%	8%	9%	10%	12%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	96%	96%	95%	96%	95%

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 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.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	86%	91%	90%	91%	90%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	96%	99%	97%	98%	97%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	65%	60%	60%	64%	65%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	45%	48%	51%	58%	59%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	85%	89%	87%	88%	87%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	10%	10%	10%	10%	12%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second Year retention rate of African-American	89%	94%	92%	92%	89%

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE**  
**2005 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.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	33%	34%	33%	32%	39%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	94%	96%	95%	92%	95%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE**  
**2005 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.

**Campus-Specific Indicators**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Number nationally recognized memberships and awards	14	14	14	9	11
Number scholarly publications/ activities per full-time faculty	6.0	5.7	6.6	6.7	8.4
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Grant/contract awards (\$M)	\$304.3	\$323.4	\$336.6	\$409.1	\$515.5
Number licenses/ options executed per year	6	13	25	15	16
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Graduates in Nursing, Pharmacy, and Dental					
Nursing	207	200	154	193	251
Pharmacy	105	123	122	130	169
Dental	99	85	85	95	124
Number scholarships, grants, and assistantships (\$M)	\$15.1	\$20.5	\$16.7	\$17.7	\$22.1
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Campaign giving, annual (\$M)	\$37.7	\$48.6	\$46.3	\$52.9	\$450.0
Average grant award	\$149,466	\$159,252	\$177,980	\$190,816	\$238,520
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Number days in public service per full-time faculty	14.1	15.1	15.2	15.0	19.0
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Annual cost savings as percent of actual budget	1.5%	1.7%	4.4%	4.1%	4.0%
Percent of annual IT plan completed	94%	93%	98%	93%	95%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY**  
**2005 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	97%	89%	83%	90%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	99%	99%	97%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	60%	58%	61%	62%	63%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	62%	59%	61%	64%	63%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	82%	88%	89%	89%	90%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	16%	16%	15%	15%	16%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	88%	85%	81%	84%	85%



**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK**  
**2005 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	91%	89%	89%	93%	95%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	96%	98%	99%	98%	96%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	69%	70%	73%	76%	80%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	57%	56%	57%	68%	64%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	92%	93%	92%	93%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent of minority undergraduate students enrolled	32%	32%	32%	32%	35%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE**  
**2005 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>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	92%	92%	87%	95%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	80%	83%	83%	95%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	41%	47%	52%	50%	55%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	42%	44%	53%	50%	57%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	71%	78%	74%	73%	79%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
2005 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	98%	96%	97%	97%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	31%	32%	32%	32%	32%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Number online enrollments/registrations	72,126	87,565	97,144	111,511	196,994
Number off-campus/distance ed enrollments/registrations	61,786	74,309	83,524	99,202	198,750

**MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2005 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.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1998 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2007 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	96%	95%	N/A	91%	95%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	97%	98%	N/A	98%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	42%	39%	41%	43%	45%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	42%	39%	41%	43%	45%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2007 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	74%	73%	70%	73%	75%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2001 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2007 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	88%	87%	N/A	84%	85%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007 Benchmark</b>
Percent Other Race of total enrollment	10%	11%	11%	10%	12%
Number partnerships with public schools	33	36	41	45	48
Funding from grants/contracts for student research opps	\$2.9m	\$2.9m	3.5m	3.8m	4.2m
Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded	13	23	26	25	30
FTE Student-to-authorized faculty ratio	17.3:1	17.4:1	18.5:1	19:1	16:1

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**  
**2005 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	99%	99%	93%	97%	94%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	97%	100%	96%	98%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1995 Cohort</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	84%	82%	80%	na	76%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 Cohort</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	88%	91%	85%	89%	86%

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

<b>Campus- Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2005 Benchmark</b>
Graduate/professional school going rate (within one year)	30%	44%	28%	34%	30%
Graduate/professional school going rate (within five years)	59%	55%	56%	61%	50%

