



# **2006 Performance Accountability Report Maryland Public Colleges and Universities**

## **Volume 1**

## **November 2006**

**MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION**

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

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

**Victor E. Bernson, Jr.**

**Joann A. Boughman**

**Anne Osborn Emery**

**Ilona Modly Hogan**

**James G. Morgan**

**Kurt A. Musser**

**Emmett Paige, Jr.**

**Sherman L. Ragland, II**

**Paul L. Saval**

**Mario F. VillaSanta**

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

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

**Michael S. Steele  
Lt. Governor**

*TABLE OF CONTENTS*

Executive Summary.....p. 1

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

Assessment and Recommendations.....p. 17

Cost Containment Activities.....p. 35

One Page Profiles.....p. 43





**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, including in each of the past five 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, which revised their approach in 2006, use 33 standard "mission/mandate" driven performance measures. These indicators are categorized as follows: student characteristics (descriptive only), accessibility and affordability, quality and effectiveness, diversity, economic growth and vitality and workforce development, community outreach and impact, and effective use of public funding. 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 11th 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.
- 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 six 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**

The assessment in this year's report focuses on the accountability issues that mirror the goals in the *2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. It examines, for the community colleges and public four-year campuses respectively, the performance measures and objectives whose achievement will advance the implementation of the state plan and describes the steps that the institutions have taken or plan to take.

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



## Community Colleges

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were exceedingly good. The quality of the reports has been high across the two-year sector for several years.**

The institutional analyses of the colleges contained all of the required elements including 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 are directly related to goals and action recommendations in the state plan. These include tuition and fees, enrollment in on-line courses, recruitment of minority students, degree progress of students and especially racial minorities, transfer preparation and performance, and workforce development.**

Maryland community colleges have done well on their performance measure which examines tuition and fees as a percentage of those at public four-year campuses since charges have increased at a faster rate in recent years at the latter institutions. The ratio at many colleges has dropped in recent years, and the two-year institutions expressed a desire to remain financially accessible to all students.

Credit and noncredit enrollments in distance learning courses at Maryland community colleges more than doubled between 1999-2000 and 2003-2004, and the growth appears to be accelerating based on data provided for one of the accountability indicators.

The proportion of racial/ethnic minorities at all of the community colleges exceed or match the percentage of non whites in the adult population of their service areas.

A new feature of this year’s community college accountability report is the introduction of a “degree progress analysis”. Replacing the previous set of indicators dealing with retention, graduation and transfer are two measures. The first is a “successful persister” rate that encompasses persons who have earned a certain number of credits or are still enrolled in addition to those who graduated or transferred; it is designed as an interim measure of success and is intended to capture the progress of students, including those with goals other than earning a credential or transferring. The second is the graduation/transfer rate after four years. Both measures examine students on the basis of their preparation for college at entry. College ready students and those who had taken and completed remedial courses had very similar successful persister rates and graduation/transfer rates in the two most recent cohorts. But students who had not completed all prescribed remedial courses performed considerably less well.

A substantial majority of Maryland community college transfer students have rated highly the quality of the transfer preparation they received. However, the grade point averages of community college transfers after their initial year of study at a public four-

year institution was 2.56 in the 2004-2005 academic year – the lowest since the early 1990s.

One third of the benchmarked indicators in the community college accountability process deal with economic growth and vitality, and a major theme in this year's reports was efforts to address the State's need for more health care professionals especially nurses. The community colleges reported that they have increased enrollments and degrees awarded in nursing programs, worked to help their graduates pass the licensure exams, and built new facilities. Three of the measures track the progress of the colleges in the area of customized workforce training. There was a slight drop at a majority of the colleges in the number of business organizations served and in the enrollments in contract training courses in the past year, an outcome attributed largely to the decision of large companies to cut funding in this area.

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

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

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

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

Most reports contained all the required components. The reports from Frostburg State University, Salisbury University, University of Maryland Baltimore County, and University of Maryland College Park serve as models for other four-year institutions.

**The accountability issues emphasized by the public four-year colleges and universities coincided most closely with the goals and action recommendations of the state plan in these areas: academic quality, recruitment of racial/ethnic minorities, improvement in retention and graduation especially among minorities, production of new teachers, other workforce needs, and economic development.**

The public four-year institutions address quality on various dimensions – campus and department, special undergraduate programs, faculty, graduates, and students.

Minorities in general and African Americans in particular constitute a larger portion of the undergraduates at Maryland public four-year campuses than they do of the State's adult population. A majority (51 percent) of the African American undergraduates enrolled in the public four-year sector in Maryland in 2005 were at an historically black institution, while 29 percent were attending a traditionally white campus. The public

four-year institutions discussed in their accountability reports, as they did in the latest Minority Achievement Report and for the Committee I report to the U.S. Office for Civil Rights, their efforts to boost the enrollment of racial/ethnic minorities and especially African Americans.

With one exception, all of the public four-year colleges and universities which admit large numbers of full-time freshmen have adopted benchmarked objectives related to the second year retention and six-year graduation rates. In their accountability reports, many campuses described the actions they have initiated to improve the persistence and completion of students and African Americans in particular.

All of the public four-year colleges and universities that offer teacher preparatory programs have adopted accountability objectives that track their progress in contributing to the supply of new educators in Maryland. Similarly, all of the campuses that have programs in nursing and many of those with programs in information technology have objectives gauging their performance in serving the workforce in these areas. Success has been mixed. The number of teacher candidates prepared by Maryland colleges and universities has increased in the past four years to 2,576 in 2004-2005, but this figure still trails the peak reached in the late 1990s. The number of nursing graduates from Maryland campuses has risen by 38 percent in the past four years, but the quantity will not satisfy the need. Most campuses continue to report a downward trend in enrollments and degrees awarded in information technology, reflecting in part the decline in demand for these graduates since the recession earlier in this decade.

Maryland's public research universities addressed in their accountability reports their contributions to the economic development issues stressed in the state plan: attracting research and development funding, expanding the commercialization of technology, promoting entrepreneurial activity, and pursuing advanced research.

### **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, greater reliance on technology, transferal of expenses, and encouragement of competition. These ventures, as reported by the public campuses and evaluated by the Commission staff for consistency with the accountability guidelines, saved \$45.0 million in FY 2006.





**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 in each of the past five 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 year, the Commission adopted another important change to the accountability model used by the community colleges. This coincided with the conclusion of the five-year cycle for the old set of performance measures.

### **Community Colleges**

The core of the community college accountability report is a set of 33 performance measures that these institutions describe as “mission/mandate” driven. These indicators were developed by a community college work team 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 seven categories:

- Student characteristics (descriptive only)
- Accessibility and affordability
- Quality and effectiveness: student satisfaction, progress and achievement
- Diversity
- Economic growth and vitality and workforce development
- Community outreach and impact
- Effective use of public funding

A major feature of the latest revision is the introduction of a “degree progress analysis.” Replacing the previous set of indicators dealing with retention, graduation and transfer are measures that examine the “successful persister” rate and the graduation/transfer rate after four years of students on the basis of their readiness to do college-level work. The successful persister concept, which encompasses persons who have earned a certain number of credits or are still enrolled in addition to those who graduated or transferred, is intended to provide an interim measure of success and to capture the progress of students, including those with goals other than earning a credential or transferring to a four-year institution. 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 (except the student characteristics), 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 11th 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, 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 six 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 year's examination of the accountability reports from the public colleges and universities represents a break from recent practice. In the past several reports, the Commission has made specific assessments about the progress of individual campuses in reaching their benchmarks on performance measures or objectives. The institutions were asked to provide explanations of their performance and/or a description of corrective actions that were taken or planned. This approach did not fit the current set of reports well. The community colleges have introduced this year a revised set of "mission/mandate" driven indicators with a preliminary set of benchmarks. After reviewing the suitability of these goals, the two-year institutions will adopt a final version for the 2008 performance accountability report. St. Mary's College of Maryland also has initiated a new five-year round of reporting. USM is just one year into its latest cycle, having extended its benchmarks to 2009 in last year's report; the colleges and universities have made further changes to their objectives to reflect the Managing for Results requirements established by DBM and the strategic planning processes at their campuses and the System. Morgan State University advances its benchmark year with each report, following the model required of State agencies by DBM. Hence, for the vast majority of institutions, the established benchmarks on their measures and objectives are either temporary or several years away.

Consequently, the Commission's assessment in this report will concentrate on those accountability issues that relate closely to the goals in the *2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. It will identify, for both the community colleges and the public four-year campuses, the specific performance measures and objectives whose accomplishment will advance the implementation of the state plan and it will describe the steps that the campuses have taken or plan to initiate in these areas. This is an appropriate analysis. The accountability guidelines for the community colleges call on them to prepare an assessment that includes the progress they are making toward the achievement of the state plan goals. In addition, the campuses of USM developed their objectives on the basis of key issues at their institutions, and these reflected the goals in the state plan as well as the major areas of performance accountability. The State plan goals are quality and effectiveness, access and affordability, diversity, a student-centered learning system, and economic growth and vitality.

The current set of institutional performance accountability reports demonstrate the effort that most public colleges and universities devote to this process and the seriousness which they attach to the undertaking. The community college work team that developed the latest iteration of accountability indicators dedicated hundreds of hours to the project, which included extensive reviews of state accountability systems nationally. The public four-year colleges and universities also have spent considerable time in evaluating and adjusting their accountability objectives. The recent report of the commission appointed by U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings on the future of postsecondary

education stressed the importance of “improved accountability.” This recognition, as well as the stress which leaders in the State continue to place on the subject, should continue to ensure a high level of accountability reporting in the future.

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

### Community Colleges

**The accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were exceedingly good. The quality of the reports has been high across the two-year sector for 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 the “mission/mandate” driven areas, with often detailed discussions of the actions they have taken to improve their performance. Many colleges integrated information about academic and financial trends at their institutions. 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 are directly related to goals and action recommendations in the state plan. These include tuition and fees, enrollment in on-line courses, recruitment of minority students, degree progress of students and especially racial minorities, transfer preparation and performance, and workforce development.**

### Tuition and Fees

Nationally, Maryland ranks 12<sup>th</sup> in tuition and fees at community colleges with an average of \$2,990 for service area residents in FY 2006. However, charges have increased at a faster rate at Maryland public four-year institutions (92 percent compared to 55 percent for two-year colleges) during the past 10 years. As a result, Maryland community colleges have fared well on their accountability performance measure which examines tuition and fees as a percentage of those at public four-year campuses. The ratio at many institutions has fallen in recent years, and the community colleges uniformly expressed the desire to remain financially accessible to a broad range of students, including those with limited financial resources. Several indicated that they are working to suppress increases, and a few indicated that they had limited or frozen hikes in the latest year. Cecil Community College touted its College Bound Tuition Reduction Program, which provides a 50 percent tuition scholarship for qualified graduates from the county’s public schools. Prince George’s Community College tied its inability to make “real progress” in the area of affordability to insufficient support from its county government, noting that local funding “lags significantly behind those enjoyed by all other state community colleges”, putting it “in a serious financial squeeze with respect to



its operating budget, leading to an ever greater reliance on its student body as a source of funding.”

#### Enrollment in On-Line Courses

Duplicated credit and noncredit enrollments in distance learning courses at Maryland community colleges more than doubled between the 1999-2000 academic year and 2003-2004, and the growth appears to be accelerating based on the data provided by the two-year institutions to one of the performance measures in their accountability report. In addition, the number of credit courses at the community colleges more than doubled during this period, and noncredit offerings more than quadrupled. These developments support the state plan’s call for “initiatives to encourage the increased use of distance learning, especially on-line learning, by both the institutions of higher education and by potential students.” Several Maryland community colleges have received FIPSE grants from the U.S. Department of Education to create and implement a process to certify the quality of online courses and components. Hagerstown Community College has made the development of hybrid courses, that blend online and classroom instruction, an institutional priority.

#### Recruitment of Minority Students

Racial and ethnic minorities in general and African Americans in particular comprise a larger portion of the student body at Maryland community colleges than at other higher education sectors in the State. Minorities made up 39 percent of all students at Maryland community colleges in 2005, and African Americans represented 29 percent. Hence, community colleges have played a key role in furthering the state plan’s goal to “ensure equal access to high quality postsecondary education for citizens regardless of race, ethnicity, culture, language or background.” Maryland community colleges compare their performance in this area with the percentage of adult non whites in their service area population, and all institutions either beat or closely approached the averages including those in counties with very small numbers of minorities. For example, minority student enrollment at Garrett College was 8.4 percent in 2005, substantially above the 1.3 percent non white county population. Garrett has adopted a co-curricular program designed to expose students to multicultural experiences as part of their education. Montgomery College noted that there is no majority race at its campus and that international students represented almost one-third of all students. Prince George’s Community College, where African Americans make up a majority of students, has organized a workshop and college fair for Hispanic public high school students in the county.

#### Degree Progress of Students and Especially Racial Minorities

An important feature of the revised community college accountability model is a “degree progress analysis”. The previous set of indicators dealing with retention, graduation and transfer rates was changed substantially. In their place are measures which examine the successful persister rate and the graduation/transfer rate after four years of four groups of students: “college ready” (those not requiring any remedial coursework), “developmental

completers” (those who needed remediation in at least one area who, after four years, completed all of the recommended coursework), “developmental non-completers” (those who needed remediation in at least one area who, after four years, did not finish all of the recommended coursework), and all students. The inclusion of the “successful persister” concept, which encompasses persons who have earned a certain number of credits or are still enrolled as well as those who graduated or transferred, provides interim measures of success and captures the progress of community college students, including those with goals other than earning a credential or transferring to a four-year institution. The breakdowns on the basis of remedial needs at entry are designed to reflect the differing levels of preparation with which community college students begin their studies. The accountability report includes degree progress measures for all students and for specific ethnic groups which number at least 50 at the particular college.

Information exists only for the fall 2000 and 2001 entering classes, making benchmarking tentative until figures for an additional cohort are available. Statewide, the four-year successful persister rate was 76.7 percent in 2000 and 65.8 percent in 2001. In both years, the rates were very similar for college ready students and developmental completers but was considerably lower for developmental non-completers. The transfer/graduation rate for college-ready students and developmental completers exceeded the average for all students.

Several community colleges reported initiatives taken to improve the prospects for remedial students. These are some examples. Baltimore City Community College started First Steps to College Bridge Community in summer 2006 to help remedial students develop strategies for college success. Community College of Baltimore County is creating new data systems that will permit closer tracking of students who are not college ready at entry. College of Southern Maryland has established a pilot program aimed at reducing the number of remedial students by offering remedial course equivalents in partnership with high schools in their service area. Frederick Community College increased collaboration with the county public schools, the use and monitoring of course prerequisites, and communication with incoming students and their parents about the importance of completing remedial education early. Howard Community College has implemented the Silas Craft Collegians program to impact the persistence and graduation rates of at-risk students, especially African Americans, and introduced mandatory tutoring for third-time repeaters of remedial math or English courses, a large number of whom are minorities.

#### Transfer Preparation and Performance

Approximately half of Maryland high school graduates begin college at a two-year institution. The state plan stresses the importance of eliminating barriers to transfer to a four-year institution. Part of this effort is ensuring that students are able to transfer the maximum amount of credits that they earn at a community college and that they are credited as appropriate to their academic major at their four-year institution. Continued progress is being made in this area. The follow-up survey of 2005 community college graduates found that, of the students who transferred, 45 percent reported that all of their

credits had been accepted and an additional 30 percent indicated that no more than 6 credits had been refused. Another aspect of success as it relates to community college transfer is how well students are prepared for four-year college work. Two measures in the accountability report are designed to gauge this outcome: student satisfaction with transfer preparation and their grade point average at the transfer institution. More than three-fourths of the graduates in every follow-up survey conducted since 1986 have rated their transfer preparation as good or very good.

However, the grade point average of community college transfer students after their first year of study at a Maryland public four-year campus dropped in 2004-2005 to 2.56 – the lowest level since the Commission began collecting this information in 1991-1992. Baltimore City Community College reported that it had undertaken several initiatives to reverse this outcome. These included transfer fairs, articulation luncheons and transfer workshops for prospective transfer students; professional development opportunities to help faculty stay abreast of requirements at four-year institutions; and additional research to determine the challenges experienced by transfer students. Montgomery College has developed agreements with its two main transfer institutions that provide students with early advising to help them to understand better the steps they need to take to be successful at their four-year institution.

### Workforce Development

Maryland's colleges and universities are charged in the state plan with responsibility for responding quickly to the changing workforce needs of the State, particularly in critical shortage areas. One third of the benchmarked indicators in the community college's accountability model (11 of 33) deal with economic growth and vitality – more than in any other section. The measures cover assessments of the preparation and performance of career program graduates, wage growth of occupational degree recipients, number of formal awards in occupational majors, enrollment in noncredit workforce and continuing education courses, and contract training for employers. The idea is to capture the contributions made by the community colleges in helping employees gain or retain certifications and learn new skills or upgrade their current ones.

A common theme in the reports dealt with the efforts of community colleges to address the State's need for additional health care professionals, especially nurses. Colleges have expanded their nursing programs and thereby increased enrollments and degrees awarded, introduced new and innovative offerings, worked to achieve licensure exam passage by graduates in the health fields, built new facilities, engaged in collaborative ventures, and conducted specialized follow-up surveys of graduates in this occupational area. Carroll, Frederick and Howard Community Colleges have joined to create the Mid Maryland Allied Healthcare Education Consortium to broaden training opportunities for professionals. Cecil Community College developed an online transition course for licensed practical nurses seeking to become registered nurses. Howard Community College added a new mid-year admission option to its traditional nursing program to increase the pool of students.

All of the community colleges provide customized workforce training to employers in their jurisdictions. The community colleges have adopted three measures to track their progress in this area: number of business organizations provided training and services, enrollments in contract training courses, and employer satisfaction with the training. A slight majority of the community colleges experienced a year-to-year decline in the number of business organizations served and in the number of enrollments in contract training courses. Community colleges attributed this outcome largely to the decision by companies, especially larger ones, to cut funding for training offered just to their own employees and to steer their workers into regular open-enrollment courses. The colleges noted that, despite the declines, substantial majorities of those employers who received contract training expressed satisfaction with it.

**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

- Baltimore City Community College's "Adopt a Client Campaign" is designed to offer business, industry and community organizations access to training and staff development initiatives available at the college.
- Community College of Baltimore County is using a \$3 million grant from the National Science Foundation to develop a Maryland Center for Manufacturing Educational Excellence whose purpose is to increase the number of qualified manufacturing technicians.
- Cecil Community College has partnered with the Susquehanna Workforce Network to provide basic computer training classes to individuals who lack these skills.
- Garrett College opened the Mountaintop Truck Driving Institute which offers a credit certificate program to prepare students for commercial drivers licensing.
- The Job Training Institute at Hagerstown Community College provides short-term education for basic entry level job skills in career areas in which growth is projected locally.
- The new Center for Entrepreneurial and Business Excellence at Howard Community College offers programs, services and resources to help aspiring and existing business owners.

### Public School Partnerships

- The Parallel Enrollment Program at Community College of Baltimore County allows qualified high school students to enroll in courses at the college while completing their high school graduation requirements
- Carroll Community College and Carroll County Public Schools co-sponsored a Character Education Institute which attracted more than 200 participants.
- Frederick Community College collaborated with Frederick County Public Schools and others on a program, *Frederick Reads*, designed to foster a love of reading in the community.
- Harford Community College is a partner with Harford County Public Schools in the *21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Center Program*, which provides support to low-income students and their families in the Edgewood and Aberdeen areas.
- Montgomery College partners with Montgomery County Public Schools to provide Gateway to College, a program that offers at-risk youth who have stopped attending or have dropped out of high school with the opportunity to earn credit toward a diploma and an associate degree or certificate.
- Seventh graders from Wicomico and Somerset Counties attended a day camp led by administrators, instructors and students at Wor-Wic Community College. The activities at Camp S.M.A.R.T focused on leadership skills, career development, high school class planning, and math skills.

### Community Partnerships

- Allegany College of Maryland constructed a Labyrinth and Serenity Garden to be used as a tool for community wellness and a resource for the college's integrative health programs.
- More than 3,500 Anne Arundel County residents participated in the Kids in College and Gifted and Talented programs for youth sponsored by Anne Arundel Community College.
- The Legal Assistant program at Baltimore City Community College created a Community Law Clinic where paralegal students interview persons at local homeless shelters prior to a visit by a pro bono attorney.
- The Center for Service Learning at Carroll Community College partnered with 43 agencies to provide service learning opportunities for 447 students who contributed more than 3,800 hours of volunteer work.
- Cecil Community College has partnered with North Bay Environmental Center to provide over 350 middle school students each week with an immersion program on environmental science in the field.
- Chesapeake College hosted the Maryland/Delaware Children's Water Festival, which brought 1,700 fourth graders to the campus to learn about ground water and its effect on their lives.
- The Kids' College program at College of Southern Maryland offers more than 50 courses for children 7-15 which allows them to design a day of study tailored to

their areas of interest in subjects ranging from art and photography to math and the sciences.

- Prince George's Community College held a Community Resource Fair, coordinated by its new Civic Engagement Leadership Institute, to teach leadership skills to students.

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

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

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

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

**The accountability issues emphasized by the public four-year colleges and universities coincided most closely with the goals and action recommendations of the state plan in these areas: academic quality, recruitment of racial/ethnic minorities, retention and graduation rates especially among African Americans, production of new teachers, other workforce needs, and economic development.**

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. Nonetheless, the assessment sections of the accountability reports of these institutions touched upon many similar themes, many of which related directly to the state plan.

#### **Academic Quality**

The state plan envisions an "array of postsecondary education institutions recognized nationally for academic excellence." Defining "quality" in higher education has resulted in considerable debate among academicians and a plethora of measures designed to capture it. The accountability narratives of the public four-year campuses address quality in numerous ways and at various levels: campus and departments (program and institutional rankings and accreditation of academic programs), special undergraduate programs (presence of learning communities, internships, living-learning programs, and study abroad), faculty (accomplishments, awards, scholarly publications and

presentations, and completion of public service days), graduates (licensure exam passing rates and satisfaction with preparation for advance education and the job market), and students (SAT and ACT scores of entering freshmen).

The descriptions in the report tend to emphasize the accomplishments and successes of the institutions. But one critical observation came in Salisbury University's analysis of the performance of its teaching and nursing graduates on their respective licensure examinations. Not satisfied with either, the institution outlined a series of initiatives that are being taken to improve the first time passing rate of students on the PRAXIS II exam and on the NCLEX-RN.

### Recruitment of Racial/Ethnic Minorities

Minorities in general and African Americans in particular made up a larger portion of the undergraduates at Maryland public four-year colleges and universities in 2005 (41 percent and 29 percent respectively) than they did of the State's population. A majority (51 percent) of African American undergraduates enrolled in the public four-year sector in Maryland attended one of the historically black colleges and universities, while 29 percent were enrolled at one of the traditionally white institutions (Frostburg, Salisbury, St. Mary's, Towson, University of Baltimore, and the University of Maryland campuses at Baltimore, Baltimore County and College Park). African Americans constituted 13 percent of the undergraduates at the traditionally white institutions in 2005. Whites made up 4 percent of the undergraduates at historically black campuses. As part of its partnership agreement with the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Maryland agreed to a series of commitments, one of which is strengthening recruitment and admissions. The State must to evaluate on an ongoing basis the progress that it has made in this area and to adjust policies, practices and programs as needed.

Maryland public four-year colleges and universities described in their 2005 minority achievement report the actions they have taken to bolster the enrollment of racial/ethnic minorities and especially African Americans. Campus activities in this area also appeared in the 2006 *Report of Committee I* to OCR. A few public four-year institutions addressed their efforts in their institutional accountability reports as well, with success stories related by Frostburg and Salisbury. Enrollment of minorities doubled at Frostburg between 1995 and 2005; the university credited its Minority Student Recruitment Program, which has provided additional staff and resources to this effort. Since 2000, the number of African American students at Salisbury increased by 69 percent, and Hispanics students have more than doubled. The university cited special programs in selected high schools on Maryland's western shore, increased marketing campaigns, and an expansion of institutional scholarship programs.

As in previous reports, goals and objectives related to diversity continue to be absent from the submission of University of Maryland Baltimore, in spite of concerns expressed by the Commission and its staff in the past. UMB, which has a good record in the area of minority student recruitment, has cited legal issues for its refusal to develop benchmarked

objectives related to diversity. The Commission staff does not agree with UMB's stance, and no other public four-year institution has taken this position.

### Retention and Graduation Rates Especially Among African Americans

Improvements in the bellwether six-year graduation rates of new full-time students at Maryland public four-year colleges and universities offer much to celebrate. The percentage of graduates in the most recent cohort who earned a baccalaureate within six years (62.6 percent) represented an historic high. The six-year graduation rates have risen for six straight years, and the increases have been even more dramatic over the longer term. In the 1984 cohort, the six-year rates were 52.1 percent. Maryland's public four-year campuses also compare favorably with the national average, achieving six-year rates that are more than five percentage points higher. However, recent trends in the second year retention rate of students may cloud future performance. The percentage of new full-time students who returned for a second year of study at a Maryland public four-year campus in the most recent cohort (80.8 percent) was the lowest in eight years.

All but one of the public four-year campuses which admit large numbers of new full-time freshmen have adopted benchmarked objectives related to the second year retention and six-year graduation rate of students. The exception: Morgan State University. In their institutional assessment, many campuses described actions that they are taking to improve the overall retention and graduation rate of students and speed time to degree. University of Maryland College Park has implemented a Student Academic Success – Degree Completion Policy that suggests milestones that students need to meet in order to graduate in a timely manner and offers those not making satisfactory progress with academic advising and early intervention. Frostburg opened a new undergraduate Academic Advising Center to assist incoming transfer students and native students who have not declared a major, offered modular courses online, and conducted research showing that freshmen who participated in the Learning Community Program had higher second year retention rates. University of Maryland Eastern Shore described its use of special tools (GoalQuest) to identify and monitor closely students who are at risk and provide them with the services and support they need.

When viewed from both a short and long-term horizon, the six-year graduation rates of new full-time African American students at Maryland public four-year campuses also appear encouraging. The percentage who earned a bachelor's degree within six years in the most recent cohort (47.5 percent) was at an all-time high. This compares to 29.7 percent of those in the 1984 cohort. Nevertheless, there continues to be a gap between African Americans and other students, although it has narrowed over the years. In the latest cohort, the six-year graduation rates for African Americans remained 15 percentage points below the average of all students, and African Americans trailed each of the other racial/ethnic groups. Further, the second year retention rate of African Americans in the most recent cohort (72.3 percent) is the lowest in 16 years.

The public four-year campuses described initiatives they have taken to address the persistence and completion of African American students in their *2005 Minority*



*Achievement Report and 2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans.* Coppin State University, which has consistently had the lowest six-year graduation rates of the public four-year institutions, devoted much of its accountability assessment this year to a description of the strategies it is pursuing to increase retention and graduation rates. These include forming a campus wide Retention Campaign, enhancing students' first year experience with "learning communities", offering summer enrichment sessions in courses often repeated or failed by students, instituting a training and reward program for departmental advisers, increasing student support services to evening and weekend students, offering adequate institutional need-based financial assistance, and providing web-based tutorials.

### Production of New Teachers

Maryland is confronting a shortage of teachers over the next two years. Maryland's schools are unlikely to recruit enough teachers from any sources to meet classroom demand. Maryland's public school systems estimate that they will need to hire 8,122 new teachers in 2006-2007, but the staffing pool of prospective candidates as determined by Maryland State Department of Education in *Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2006-2008* is 6,861. The problem is largely concentrated in several of the certification areas that MSDE has identified as posing a "critical shortage". However, the number of teacher candidates prepared by Maryland colleges and universities, while increasing in the past four years to 2,576 in 2004-2005, was still below the 2,653 produced in 1998-1999. Just 17.9 percent of the newly hired teachers in Maryland public schools in 2005-2006 were beginners who had graduated from a traditional teacher preparation program in Maryland or had taken an alternative certification route. This is an historical low.

All of the public four-year colleges and universities that offer a teacher preparatory program included accountability objectives measuring their success in producing new teacher candidates. Campuses examined their progress in terms of enrollment, number of certified teachers produced, the proportion who passed the PRAXIS II exam, and/or the number employed in Maryland. Several campuses described initiatives in their institutional assessment that they had undertaken to try to expand the number of teacher candidates. Bowie State University reported that it had received new grant support for the preparation of teachers. Frostburg has expanded training opportunities in the Hagerstown and Frederick areas and is working on a proposal for a new certification program in critical shortage fields to be offered at the Hagerstown regional center. \* UMCP has restructured some of its teacher preparatory programs so that their content will address the critical shortage majors. UMES indicated that the performance of its teacher candidates on the PRAXIS II exam had increased significantly due to "new and innovative" programming offered through its teacher education computer laboratory. In the Commission's 2006 report, *A Study of the Capacity of Maryland's Teacher Preparation Programs*, the deans and directors of these programs cited additional undertakings aimed at increasing graduates in critical shortage areas.

### Other Workforce Needs

Demand for nurses and information technology professionals dominated the remainder of the discussion on workforce needs in the institutional accountability reports of the public four-year colleges and universities. All of the public four-year institutions which offer programs in nursing and many of those with offerings in information technology have accountability objectives measuring their performance in contributing to the supply of these employees. Campuses examined their progress in terms of enrollment, degrees awarded and/or the number of graduates in the field working in Maryland.

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 nursing graduates from Maryland colleges and universities has increased steadily in the past four years from 1,891 to 2,615 or by 38 percent. However, this level of production will not satisfy the need, and alternative sources may not prove to be adequate. As a result of analyses conducted at the Maryland Higher Education Commission to determine ways to increase the capacity of nursing preparation programs and identify other strategies for boosting the number of nurses and nurse educators in the State, the General Assembly established the Nurse Support Program II in FY 2007 to fund initiatives to expand the number of bedside nurses in the State by increasing nursing graduates.

While the 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 may be on the horizon. As evidenced by the recent conference on "Rising Above the Gathering Storm", keen interest remains in graduates in information technology as well as in science, mathematics and engineering by Maryland employers. However, as measured by enrollments, degrees awarded and graduates employed in Maryland, most public four-year institutions reported that the downward trend in information technology has not yet abated although there are signs at some campuses that it may be flattening.

### Economic Development

The state plan suggests that Maryland's colleges and universities have a vital role to play in attracting research and development (R&D) funding, expanding the commercialization of technology, promoting entrepreneurial activity, and pursuing advanced research. Maryland's public research universities addressed these issues in their institutional accountability reports. One of the accountability goals of University of Maryland Baltimore is to "conduct recognized research and scholarship in the life and health sciences, law and social work that fosters social and economic development." UMB reported that its sponsored research has grown by an average of 10 percent annually between FY 1995 and FY 2004, that it received 14 multiyear grants totaling \$150 million in FY 2006, and that its researchers developed a record 118 new inventions in FY 2005. Average grant awards from federal and other sources supporting traditional research and

technology transfer at UMB rose by 21 percent during the past four years. At University of Maryland Baltimore County, dollars in total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty have risen by 37 percent in the past four years. UMBC stated that it has ranked first in each of the past four years among public research peer institutions in average five year growth in federal R&D expenditures. UMCP reported \$339 million in R&D expenditures to the National Science Foundation in FY 2005, and these dollars have increased steadily during the past four years. Morgan reported that its research grants and contracts have consistently risen in the past four years from \$25 million to \$28 million.

The state plan also encourages university faculty and staff to pursue patents, licenses and start-up businesses. Frostburg established a business incubator on its campus to build a base of technology-related companies in the Western Maryland region. Frostburg's institutional accountability report stated that the firms which have established offices in this facility "offer internship and employment opportunities for Frostburg students, engage in collaborative research and teaching with Frostburg faculty, and serve as an inducement for professionals to settle in the area. The University hopes to continue the growth of the incubator over the next few years by attracting more businesses, along with moving the 'incubated' companies into buildings located in a new campus technology park, the Allegany Business Center." The Technology Advancement Program at UMCP is incubating technology companies in bioscience, engineering and computer science; the number of companies that have graduated from this program has steadily risen in the past four years from 47 to 53.

One of the goals in the state plan received comparatively little attention in the institutional accountability reports of the public four-year colleges and universities: access and affordability. The handful of references to this topic focused on the availability of off-campus courses including those offered on-line, the necessity of additional need-based financial aid from the State, and the providing of institutional scholarships, grants and assistantships. Only one university touched upon the issue of restraining increases in tuition and fees. University of Maryland University College introduced a new accountability objective in its report this year: "maintain undergraduate tuition for Maryland residents at an affordable level". UMUC's objective is measured by the undergraduate resident tuition rate per credit hour and the percent increase from the previous year. UMUC stated in its report, "The university is cognizant that the most important measure to broaden access to higher education is to maintain affordable tuition rates for Maryland residents."

### **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.” Dollar amounts had to be attached to each specific effort. Examples were provided to demonstrate the type of reporting desired by the Commission staff.

Breakdowns of the various cost containment actions taken are presented by campus.

The cost containment reporting in the current accountability cycle was generally good. 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 \$45.0 million in FY 2006. 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 the following section 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 staff or student workers, use of nine- rather than twelve-month contracts for faculty, greater use of adjunct faculty, restrictions on travel and professional development expenses, credit card initiatives, reductions in merit pay increases and employee benefits, limits in hourly or overtime wages, increases in faculty and staff workload, lower salaries for new hires, and the adoption of teleworking arrangements.
- Reductions in *overhead*, through such efforts as energy management and conservation programs, cuts in utility expenditures, administrative reorganization and consolidation, deferred vehicle purchases, the recycling of equipment and supplies, cuts in the cost of supplies, facilities and workplace efficiencies, greater use of leasing arrangements, reduction in debt expenses, bulk mail initiatives, more dependence on bulk purchases, and controls on cell phone usage for business.
- Greater reliance on *technology*, including the use of web and electronic communication capabilities and other technologies to reduce printing and mailing expenses, adoption of more cost-effective hardware and software, cuts in information technology costs, purchase of licenses from computer companies at a discount, more acceptance of web-based products and automation, and use of free online services as a substitute for fee-based software applications.
- *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 and the State, collaborative agreements with other collegiate institutions, reliance on pro-bono donations and help, and the securing of grants to fund operations.
- The encouragement of *competition*, including aggressive contracting and bidding, participation in multiparty contracts to purchase computer equipment and other

merchandise at discount, selected renegotiations of contracts with vendors, lower insurance and worker compensation costs, and procurement efficiencies.





**COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES**





## **COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

### **Allegany College of Maryland**

The college saved \$128,830 in FY 2006, over half of which is accounted for by a reduction in employee Flexible Savings allocations, a savings of \$70,555. Reductions in travel budgets saved \$32,000 and telecommunication contract changes as well as collection of reimbursement for non-business telephone usage resulted in savings of \$12,400. A reduction in credit card processing costs saved \$6,475 and format changes in student recruitment mailings accounts for a savings of \$1,400 annually. Personnel consolidation efforts resulted in over \$6,000 in savings.

### **Anne Arundel Community College**

As a result of cost containment initiatives, \$1,317,000 were saved. Savings from purchasing initiatives were responsible for almost \$1,000,000 in savings and institution-wide reductions in supplies, travel and professional development saved an additional \$317,000.

### **Baltimore City Community College**

The use of paid internships, funded through internal reallocation or by external sources, accounts for the college's reported \$64,400 in cost savings.

### **Carroll Community College**

The college saved \$313,318 in FY 2006 via a variety of cost containment initiatives. Through the use of adjunct faculty in lieu of full-time instructional personnel, the college estimates cost savings of \$185,000. The use of freeware and in-house developed software instead of commercial software applications saved \$49,000, and negotiated software license discounts accounted for savings of \$38,618. The college used the Maryland State Collection Agency to collect receivables otherwise deemed uncollectible to recover \$12,500. The training of an in-house designer to produce television commercials saved \$12,000 in production costs. The use of e-mail and the web for publication purposes saved the college \$1,200 in printing, copying and paper costs.

### **Cecil Community College**

Through a variety of cost containment actions, the college saved \$214,350 in FY 2006. The use of competitive bidding for telephone service saved \$60,000. Changes in utility providers for energy, heating and propane and a credit from the electric company saved \$54,950. Outsourcing the facilities staff produced savings of \$57,000 while a change in vendors saved \$2,700 in the cost of water treatment, ice melt and air filters. Improved collections on student accounts saved \$12,000 and the college saved \$4,700 in workers compensation and athletic accident insurance. The elimination of instructional supplies for the Electronics program saved \$14,000. The college reported saving \$5,000 by systematically analyzing credit card rates and saved \$4,000 on software maintenance.

**Chesapeake College**

By using adjunct faculty to cover the vacancies of three full-time faculty positions, the college saved \$221,090 in salary and benefits.

**Community College of Baltimore County**

The college saved \$1,262,884 in FY 2006. Reduced merit increases for employees saved \$1,153,914 while a reduction in bad debt expenses saved an additional \$108,970.

**Frederick Community College**

Through the elimination of positions and a reduced classification of another, the college saved \$118,000. A reduction in vacation liability saved \$25,000 for the college. Total savings for FY 2006 were \$143,000.

**Garrett College**

By delaying the filling of the Business/IT Academic Director position and restructuring the Information Technology Department, the college saved \$101,000. The consolidation of Grantsville Facilities saved an additional \$32,000 for a total savings of \$133,000 in FY 2006.

**Hagerstown Community College**

A position elimination and postal initiatives resulted in savings totaling \$35,961 in FY 2006. The elimination of one support staff position saved \$19,666 for the college. The implementation of a process for pre-sorting and postal bar coding bulk mail saved \$16,295.

**Harford Community College**

A reduction of three full-time positions resulted in cost savings of \$203,268. Delays in filling vacant positions saved an additional \$109,808. The college was able to reduce the premium increase in health insurance by \$212,058 due to favorable claims experience. Total cost containment during FY 2006 was \$523,134.

**Howard Community College**

A variety of cost containment initiatives produced savings for the college: \$86,450 in FY 2006. The elimination of contract services for electrical work and carpet cleaning, now performed by Howard personnel, saved \$21,300. A new risk management policy reduced liability insurance costs \$20,700 and a renegotiation of long-term disability premiums saved \$5,000. A new energy contract should save \$14,500. The implementation of a new tuition payment interface reduced staff hourly and overtime costs, saving \$16,920. In addition, a new free online benefits management system replaced the former licensed software application, saving \$1,250. The elimination of outside trainers in lieu of in-house developed presentations for the leadership and diversity programs will save \$6,800.

**Montgomery College**

Measurable cost savings from a variety of cost containment activities totaled \$1,312,000 in FY 2006. Rigorous internal printing and publication inventory control, as well as

aggressive bidding for contracted printing, saved the college \$300,000. State contributions and a partnership with local healthcare providers saved \$300,000 through the purchase of used instead of new healthcare lab equipment. Grants provided a savings of \$141,000 in the operation of the Rockville Campus Child Care Center. New partnerships and vendor changes accounted for \$123,000 in savings from the bookstores while the library system saved \$109,000 through a vendor change, renegotiated online database costs and the elimination of 74 paper-based subscriptions. In addition, the college saved \$9,000 by renegotiating its service contract with a software vendor.

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

A total savings of \$1,213,819 for FY 2006 was achieved via a number of cost containment measures. A reduction in contracted services and utility expenses saved \$430,000. Personnel expenses were reduced, including overtime and travel, saving \$200,000. A reduction in Evening Administrator expenses, a reduction in adjunct faculty compensation, the elimination of seven full-time positions, and the reduction of eleven part-time support positions, one associate dean, and part-time special event staff resulted in a savings of \$583,819.

#### **College of Southern Maryland**

By utilizing in-house Physical Plant staff in lieu of outside contractors, the college saved \$58,780 on various projects around the campus, including snow removal (\$3,780), the installation of 100 sign poles (\$4,000), parking lot striping (\$5,000), furniture assembly and arrangement (\$10,000) and equipment moves (\$2,000). In addition, the in-house Physical Plant staff performed multiple workspace and building reconfigurations and upgrades which saved the college \$34,000. The in-house IT staff also conducted a number of tasks that would have been contracted, resulting in savings of \$68,000, the largest of which was the conversion of the college's current Course Management System; this project saved an estimated \$55,000. In addition, the use of Network.Maryland-provided fiber optic cabling instead of commercial T-1 circuits saved \$35,000. Competitive bidding on operational and capital purchases saved an additional \$1,192,768. Total savings for FY 2006: \$1,388,548

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

In FY 2006, the college saved \$55,258 through several containment measures. Through procurement cooperatives and consortiums, \$7,725 was saved on equipment, \$2,542 was saved on new copiers, and a rebate of \$967 was received on OfficeMax purchases. Changes in janitorial products saved \$10,850 and a switch to natural gas from No. 2 fuel oil for some campus buildings saved \$33,175.

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

### **Bowie State University**

In FY 2006, Bowie State University saved \$1,821,000 through a variety of cost containment actions. The cross training and use of in-house staff as well as work-study students, in lieu of additional employees, saved \$190,000 while the contracting of outside agency police officers and the renegotiation of the housekeeping contract saved \$130,000 in training costs. Postponing the filling of positions and reducing staff sizes in several units resulted in savings of \$125,000. Renegotiating the debt service on the Residence Hall saved \$1,000,000, and the renegotiated office supply agreement saved an additional \$50,000. Utilizing the web for a variety of publications, including the listing of position openings, produced savings of \$27,000. The purchase of alternative fuel vehicles saved the institution \$12,000.

### **Coppin State University**

A number of cost saving initiatives were employed during FY 2006, saving the institution \$1,996,000. Actions included implementing the VISA Purchasing Card program and using it for small procurement (\$45,000), consolidating multiple units under the Office of the Provost (\$113,000), and utilizing in-house staff for such tasks as doing PeopleSoft training and troubleshooting, producing PeopleSoft "how to" videos, developing the web admissions application system, and performing physical plant service work (\$419,000). Leasing desktop computers in lieu of purchasing them saved \$100,000 and lengthening the "refresh" cycle of desktop and server computers from three to five years saved an additional \$50,000. Staffing controls such as assigning additional duties to existing staff, using contract employees instead of permanent staff, leaving open staffing vacancies, and hiring at reduced salaries saved the university an additional \$430,000.

### **Frostburg State University**

A total of \$353,445 was saved through outsourcing and reducing overtime expenditures in FY 2006. Outsourcing its e-billing functions and 1098 form disbursements to Sallie Mae saved the institution \$314,445 by reducing paper and postage fees, eliminating convenience fees and retiring an old web-based payment system. Reducing the amount of overtime pay resulted in a savings of \$39,000.

### **Salisbury University**

Savings totaling \$1,607,571 were realized in FY 2006 through several cost containment activities. Through program collaboration agreements with UMES, \$139,000 in salary and benefits were saved. Additional personnel savings of \$1,159,015 were realized through the use of contingent workers in lieu of full-time regular staff and a hiring freeze. Information technology initiatives such as the use of multi-function business machines, the "one card" for inter-departmental transfers, and web time sheets saved the institution \$30,500. An energy management system and preventative maintenance program saved \$279,056.

### **Towson University**

A variety of cost containment actions resulted in savings of \$1,375,000 for Towson University in FY 2006. A one-time donation for a security platform saved \$258,000. Saved was \$38,000 in printing and postage costs by re-designing and web-actuating a number of publications. Replacing the storage area network saved \$66,000 in maintenance costs. By providing its own moving and temporary storage solution, the institution saved \$200,000, and the restructuring of the housekeeping contract resulted in savings of \$870,000.

### **University of Baltimore**

In FY 2006, \$60,000 in total savings were realized through reduced waste, improved efficiency and cost savings. Reducing its food service operations saved \$30,000. Moving to credit card use for small procurements saved \$10,000 while centralizing summer class locations saved another \$10,000 in utility costs. Utilizing the web for both timesheets and academic course schedules saved \$10,000 in printing costs.

### **University of Maryland Baltimore**

Reducing projected increases in utility and information technology costs through new contracts with providers, partnerships, retrofitting existing equipment, and enhanced monitoring and reporting of usage led to \$3,500,000 in cost savings. Changes in academic programs, including the deferral of hiring replacements, program consolidation and staff reductions saved an additional \$1,200,000. The total FY 2006 cost savings: \$4,700,000.

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

Cost containment efforts in FY 2006 produced savings for the institution estimated at \$1,566,000. Collaborating with the State Risk Management Administration, out-sourcing facilities and ground maintenance, and utilizing in-house staff for PeopleSoft training and online marketing initiatives saved \$195,000 for the institution. Utilizing electronic media to defer paper and printing costs saved an additional \$252,000. Staffing changes such as consolidating positions, replacing full-time regular staff with contractors or student workers and increasing faculty workloads resulted in savings of \$541,000 while contract renegotiations with Microsoft saved \$240,000. Reorganizations of the Graduate School, campus Police Department, Bookstore and Physical Plant saved \$98,000 and energy savings and competitive contracting saved \$240,000.

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

The University saved \$16,000,000 in FY 2006 through various cost containment activities. Purchasing gas futures at a favorable price, avoiding utility costs through improving demand-side management, and negotiating lower electric rates saved the institution \$6,600,000. Increased cost recoveries from contract and grant activity netted \$4.6 million, while in-house facility maintenance and reduced team travel contributed to \$2.5 million in savings. New contracts with Fed-Ex, UPS and moving companies saved an additional \$1.3 million. Negotiating free pick-up and delivery of surplus property,

using surplus/demonstration items versus new items, and recycling of equipment and supplies saved another \$1 million.

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

Through a number of cost saving actions, in FY 2006 the University saved \$2,265,330. The use of in-house staff for services such as publication design and printing, document digitization and construction activity saved \$325,000. Salary savings from replacing retirees with lower-paid employees and the deferral of filling vacancies saved \$235,330. Collaborative efforts with USM campuses to develop PeopleSoft modules and negotiate for aggregate energy purchase, and the degree collaboration with Salisbury University saved a combined \$314,000. Other utility initiatives saved the University \$460,000. This included energy consumption controls, water usage controls, a renegotiation of the phone switch maintenance contract and upgrading transformers and underground utilities. Deferring the purchase of motor pool vehicles and purchases used vehicles in lieu of new for maintenance resulted in savings of \$253,000. Internally recycling equipment saved \$100,000, and information technology initiatives saved an additional \$170,000. A partnership with Salisbury University and the Shore Transit System saved \$67,000 and another \$60,000 was saved via the implementation of a credit card processing system. The bulk purchase of janitorial supplies, an improved delivery and storage system and stricter controls on University cell phones saved \$81,000.

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

The institution saved \$4,276,425 in FY 2006 via several cost containment actions. About half of these savings (\$2.1 million) are attributable to initiatives including the reorganization of multiple offices, reducing office space needs by allowing employees to telework full-time, and using 9-month full-time faculty in lieu of 12-month contracts. Standardizing computers to allow for bulk purchasing, licensing databases through consortia and purchasing a site license from Oracle to replace the FTE model saved an additional \$571,000. The web-based Student Financial Services Inquiry System saved \$283,000 and outsourcing the help desk saved an additional \$215,000. Utility contracts and energy conservation initiatives saved \$456,425 while consolidation operations, PeopleSoft automation and other contract renegotiations saved \$614,000.

#### **Morgan State University**

The implementation of an enterprise-wide software management system saved \$124,000.

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

In FY 2006, the college saved \$362,000 through a variety of cost containment initiatives. The purchase of used rather than new vehicles saved \$20,000. A lighting upgrade project which converted existing heads rather than installing new poles and lamps produced a savings of \$70,000, while other in-house lighting repairs saved \$10,000. In-house HVAC repairs saved \$142,000. Instructional technology personnel expenses were lowered by \$90,000 by eliminating one associate director position and combining two web-related positions into one. The implementation of an Energy Performance Contract saved \$30,000.



**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 community college profile contains a set of 10 common indicators. Those from the public four-year institutions have up to seven standard measures. 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. 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 first-time, full-time freshmen
3. Graduation/transfer rate after four years
4. Graduation/transfer rate after four years of racial/ethnic minorities
5. Student satisfaction with goal achievement
6. Student satisfaction with transfer preparation
7. Student satisfaction with job preparation
8. Employer satisfaction with community college graduates
9. Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population
10. Tuition and fees as a percent of tuition and fees at Maryland four-year institutions

### 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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark FY 2010</b>
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	3,864	4,264	4,555	4,617	4,412
Noncredit students	6,268	7,561	7,808	8,242	7,619

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	59.6%	65.4%	65.7%	58.9%	63.6%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	48.5	46.7	48.6
b. Developmental completers	52.7	44.1	49.4
c. Developmental non-completers	50.4	41.9	47.1
d. All students in cohort	50.4	43.8	48.0

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	<50 cohort	<50 cohort	NA
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	<50 cohort	<50 cohort	NA
c. Hispanic	<50 cohort	<50 cohort	NA

<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>2008 Benchmark</b>
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	82%	93%	96%	95%	90%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	72%	82%	82%	91%	80%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	92%	92%	77%	76%	87%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	85%	92%	87%	94%	89%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	6.26	8.23	9.34	9.22	8.20
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	7.6	7.9	8.1	8.2	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>Benchmark 2011</b>
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	50.3%	45.5%	44.1%	42.1%	45.5%

<b>Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>AY 2003-2004</b>	<b>AY 2004-2005</b>	<b>Benchmark 2009-2010</b>
	3.02	2.74	2.64	2.54	2.79

## ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	19,154	20,479	20,928	20,920	21,389
Noncredit students	38,015	33,895	32,186	35,482	36,644

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	62.9%	61.4%	60.6%	62.3%	61.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	62.9%	65.4%	66.0%
b. Developmental completers	54.2%	56.9%	57.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	21.9%	22.6%	23.0%
d. All students in cohort	50.8%	48.9%	51.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	36.5%	36.9%	38.0%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	52.4%	61.7%	62.0%
c. Hispanic	58.5%	46.4%	49.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	95.6%	96.2%	93.8%	95.7%	97.0%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	82.4%	85.1%	80.7%	89.0%	90.0%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	86.0%	86.0%	84.7%	84.9%	87.0%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	96.2%	97.3%	96.3%	88.9%	95.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	20.4%	21.6%	22.8%	24.1%	27.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	19.7%	20.0%	20.6%	21.2%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	AY 2003-2004	AY 2004-2005	Benchmark 2009-2010
Market share of recent, college-bound high school graduates	68.2%	66.7%	68.9%	67.3%	68.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.79	2.76	2.78	2.70	2.80

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual course enrollments in contract training courses	50,134	25,954	36,022	41,236	40,541

## 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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	9,758	10,886	10,933	10,428	14,000
Noncredit students	12,804	13,361	10,717	9305	11200

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	23%	23%	21%	22%	27%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	49%	42%	50%
b. Developmental completers	37%	41%	44%
c. Developmental non-completers	17%	19%	20%
d. All students in cohort	24%	26%	30%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	20%	25%	30%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	na (n=7)	na (n=6)	30%
c. Hispanic	na (n=10)	na (n=8)	30%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	88%	88%	90%	98%	95%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	93%	90%	79%	76%	80%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	98%	100%	81%	76%	90%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	na	100%	100%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	91%	95%	91%	90%	BCCC does not submit
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	68%	68%	68%	68%	Not applicable

**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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	3,747	3,913	4,236	4,392	4,600
Noncredit students	7,226	8,158	8,000	8,230	9,000

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	48.8%	48.6%	48.6%	47.5%	50.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	65.6%	68.2%	70.0%
b. Developmental completers	61.9%	69.9%	70.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	26.0%	20.7%	30.0%
d. All students in cohort	54.4%	60.6%	60.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	N<50	N<50	60.0%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	N<50	N<50	60.0%
c. Hispanic	N<50	N<50	60.0%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	93%	96%	99%	99%	100%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	76%	75%	70%	79%	85%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	95%	83%	100%	80%	90%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	89%	83%	100%	100%	100%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	7%	6%	7%	8%	10%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	5%	6%	6%	6%	N/A

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY2010
Annual course enrollments in contract training courses	4,882	6,218	4,991	4,783	6,400
Annual course enrollments in workforce development courses	7,198	8,619	7,485	7,709	8,800

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Successful-persistor rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	85.9%	81.8%	85.0%
b. Developmental completers	80.0%	84.9%	85.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	50.0%	26.8%	50.0%
d. All students in cohort	74.2%	73.7%	75.0%

## CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	2,190	2,467	2,559	2,630	3,000
Noncredit students	4,951	5,207	5,737	5,368	7,500

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	54.0%	55.7%	62.6%	59.4%	64.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	71%	74%	80%
b. Developmental completers	64%	64%	70%
c. Developmental non-completers	31%	31%	35%
d. All students in cohort	56%	53%	60%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	75%	78%	80%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	100%	100%	80%
c. Hispanic	0%	67%	80%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	95%	94%	94%	97%	95%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	83%	73%	92%	78%	85%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	81%	88%	82%	75%	80%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100%	94%	82%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	10.9%	11.2%	12.1%	12.9%	15.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	7.0%	7.3%	7.9%	8.3%	n/a

**CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE**

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

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	3,140	3,238	3,446	3,506	4,000
Noncredit students	11,342	9,545	9,065	8,208	8,500

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	41%	49%	43%	48%	50%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	57%	60%	65%
b. Developmental completers	46%	56%	65%
c. Developmental non-completers	16%	22%	30%
d. All students in cohort	36%	41%	45%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	<50	34%	40%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	<50	<50	na
c. Hispanic	<50	<50	na

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	91%	96%	90%	97%	98%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	68%	78%	72%	57%	80%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	77%	90%	77%	78%	80%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100%	100%	86%	100%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	19%	19%	21%	20%	25%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	18%	18%	18%	18%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of part-time undergraduates	77%	77%	78%	77%	78%

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Enrollment in online courses					
a. Credit	329	532	853	1,074	2,000
b. Non-credit	258	306	293	358	500

	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	Benchmark FY 2011
Tuition and fees as a percent of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions	44%	43%	43%	43%	45%



**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.

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark FY 2010</b>
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	27,892	28,566	28,427	28,295	28,000
Noncredit students	47,168	40,442	38,957	41,475	40,000

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	45.0%	46.0%	44.0%	39.0%	40.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	50.6%	37.7%	55%
b. Developmental completers	49.8%	34.8%	48%
c. Developmental non-completers	22.3%	22.5%	26%
d. All students in cohort	41.7%	31.9%	43%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	32.1%	26.8%	43%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	51.1%	41.7%	43%
c. Hispanic	30.8%	37.7%	43%

<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>2008 Benchmark</b>
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	95.0%	96.0%	94.0%	97.0%	95.0%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	82%	78%	72%	81%	82%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	76%	72%	83%	88%	85%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	86%	94%	96%	92%	95%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	31%	33%	35%	36%	40%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	26%	27%	28%	29%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>Benchmark 2011</b>
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions	45.2%	43.9%	45.4%	43.4%	50.0%

	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Percent minorities of full-time faculty	13.3%	15.0%	15.0%	14.0%	14.0%
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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	6,797	6,726	6,859	6,719	7,400
Noncredit students	7,603	8,816	11,263	11,783	16,500

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	50%	54%	57%	53%	54%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	65%	70%	68%
b. Developmental completers	63%	52%	58%
c. Developmental non-completers	27%	33%	30%
d. All students in cohort	63%	57%	60%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	54%	-	-
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	-	-	-
c. Hispanic	-	-	-

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	93%	95%	96%	95%	95%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	83%	79%	88%	80%	85%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	88%	86%	83%	100%	90%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	15%	16%	17%	19%	20%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	11%	12%	11%	11%	

## 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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	822	777	746	815	909
Noncredit students	2,810	3,167	3,166	3,593	4,000

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	59.4%	62.2%	58.2%	61.9%	64.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	76.0%	63.3%	76.0%
b. Developmental completers	59.0%	54.4%	60.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	45.5%	23.1%	28.0%
d. All students in cohort	63.2%	51.7%	65.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	<50	<50	n/a
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	<50	<50	n/a
c. Hispanic	<50	<50	n/a

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	96%	91%	88%	96%	90%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	67%	85%	75%	91%	75%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	100%	78%	69%	84%	75%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	6.2%	7.2%	9.5%	8.4%	2.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	n/a

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	AY 2001-2002	AY 2002-2003	AY 2003-2004	AY 2004-2005	Benchmark 2009-2010
Market share of recent, college-bound high school graduates	64.0%	64.3%	67.5%	59.0%	64.0%
Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year	2.98	2.96	2.61	2.64	2.84

Performance Indicator	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	Benchmark 2011
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions	48.8%	46.7%	44.2%	42.3%	53.1%

## HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	3,883	4,290	5,128	5,031	6,805
Noncredit students	9,895	10,084	8,811	8,695	10,579

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	62.6%	63.4%	64.6%	46.6%	65.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	61.3%	69.8%	80.0%
b. Developmental completers	59.0%	67.7%	70.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	37.7%	37.8%	40.0%
d. All students in cohort	54.0%	59.3%	64.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	*	*	*
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	*	*	*
c. Hispanic	*	*	*

*\*Cohort for analysis is less than 50 students.*

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	95.0%	95.0%	93.0%	98.0%	98.0%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	75.0%	85.0%	83.0%	82.0%	85.0%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	86.0%	77.0%	68.0%	74.0%	80.0%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	81.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	90.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	9.9%	10.0%	11.0%	11.5%	13.5%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	10.9%	11.2%	11.8%	12.3%	

## 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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	7,420	7,786	7,598	7,607	8,195
Noncredit students	17,186	16,343	16,352	15,710	17,000

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	61.8%	54.5%	59.4%	61.6%	62.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	66.2%	70.6%	72.0%
b. Developmental completers	69.1%	61.1%	62.0%
c. Developmental non-completers	36.0%	42.5%	40.0%
d. All students in cohort	54.5%	55.8%	58.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	35.8%	40.7%	58.0%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	n < 50	n < 50	
c. Hispanic	n < 50	n < 50	

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	93.0%	94.0%	94.0%	96.0%	95.0%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	80.0%	83.0%	81.0%	87.0%	82.0%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	82.0%	68.0%	78.0%	86.0%	80.0%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	15.0%	16.0%	17.0%	16.2%	18.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	13.5%	14.2%	14.9%	15.7%	

## 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.

Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	9,012	9,262	9,545	9,950	11,535
Noncredit students	13,690	13,640	14,722	14,221	15,701

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	38.5%	40.3%	37.5%	42.5%	45.0%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	75.2	72.7	80
b. Developmental completers	65	64.9	70
c. Developmental non-completers	37.1	35	35
d. All students in cohort	56	56	60

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	40	44.9	60
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	65.6	52.4	60
c. Hispanic	n<50	n<50	n/a

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	93	98	96	94	98
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	78.8	80.7	82.4	76.6	83
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	82	85	84	85	90
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	82	100	91	80	90

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	32.2	31.9	33.6	34.3	35
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	28.1	29.1	30.5	31.8	n/a

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2010
Employer satisfaction with contract training	95%	95%	100%	100%	100%

## 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 23,000 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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	31,990	32,540	32,459	32,881	33,867
Noncredit students	14,426	14,969	15,368	23,783	26,161

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	47.2%	45.0%	44.5%	40.9%	44%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	51.1%	61.8%	62%
b. Developmental completers	48.7%	45.5%	49%
c. Developmental non-completers	37.6%	31.9%	38%
d. All students in cohort	48.5%	47.8%	49%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	45.8%	46.1%	49%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	51.2%	53.3%	53%
c. Hispanic	38.1%	36.4%	45%

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	94%	97%	99%	97%	92%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	83.0%	79.0%	79.0%	88.0%	92%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	90%	93%	76%	79%	92%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	98%	100%	83%	93%	92%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	50.7%	52.2%	52.6%	52.8%	55%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	40.1%	40.8%	41.6%	42.2%	

**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 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark FY 2010</b>
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	19,013	19,537	19,873	18,509	25,000
Noncredit students	19,584	19,804	18,797	21,185	25,000

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	30.8%	29.0%	26.4%	n/a	30.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	42.0	43.2	60
b. Developmental completers	31.9	32.7	60
c. Developmental non-completers	22.8	19.0	30
d. All students in cohort	30.2	28.2	45

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	26.4	25.2	45
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	46.7	50.5	45
c. Hispanic	31.4	27.6	45

<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>2008 Benchmark</b>
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	99%	97%	95%	93%	100%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	89%	76%	85%	88%	100%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>1998 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2000 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>2002 Follow-up Survey</b>	<b>Benchmark 2010-2011</b>
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation					
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	99%	97%	70%	75%	100%
Employer satisfaction with CC graduates	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	86.8%	87.5%	89.5%	90.4%	78.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	73.5%	74.5%	75.6%	78.1%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>AY 2001-2002</b>	<b>AY 2002-2003</b>	<b>AY 2003-2004</b>	<b>AY 2004-2005</b>	<b>Benchmark 2009-2010</b>
Market share of recent, college-bound high school graduates	48.8%	49.0%	49.9%	48.5%	55.0%



**COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND**

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

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark FY 2010</b>
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	10004	10447	9518	9429	10817
Noncredit students	8058	8862	8797	10670	11780

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	55.7%	61.3%	59.1%	60.0%	59.0%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	66.6%	64.8%	65.7%
b. Developmental completers	55.6%	46.8%	51.2%
c. Developmental non-completers	23.1%	11.8%	17.5%
d. All students in cohort	61.7%	57.3%	59.5%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2000 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2001 Cohort</b>	<b>Benchmark 2006 Cohort</b>
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	53.2%	49.3%	51.3%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	Not reported	Not reported	
c. Hispanic	Not reported	Not reported	

<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>2008 Benchmark</b>
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	Missing	98%	91%	92%	95%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	68%	80%	80%	85%	82%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	78%	84%	71%	81%	83%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	Missing	100%	83%	95%	96%

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark Fall 2010</b>
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	24.4%	25.1%	25.2%	26.8%	27.0%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	24.7%	25.5%	26.5%	27.6%	

<b>Campus-Specific Performance Indicator</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>Benchmark 2011</b>
Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions	53.8%	52.4%	49.8%	48.0%	45.4%

	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark FY 2010</b>
Nursing License Exam (NCLEX) - RN pass rates	88%	93%	89%	87%	89%
Percentage of expenditures on instruction	46.1%	45.8%	46.7%	45.0%	48.6%

**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 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark FY 2010
Annual unduplicated headcount:					
Credit students	3,946	4,262	4,265	4,351	4,803
Noncredit students	6,299	6,013	6,013	6,576	7,260

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Market share of first-time, full-time freshmen	40%	39%	41%	47%	50%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation- transfer rate after four years			
a. College-ready students	62%	37%	65%
b. Developmental completers	60%	55%	65%
c. Developmental non-completers	22%	19%	25%
d. All students in cohort	47%	39%	50%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2000 Cohort	Fall 2001 Cohort	Benchmark 2006 Cohort
Graduation-transfer rate after four years			
a. African American	30%	17%	30%
b. Asian, Pacific Islander	*	*	*
c. Hispanic	*	*	*

\*Cohort for analysis is less than 50 students.

Performance Indicator	1996 Follow-up Survey	1998 Follow-up Survey	2000 Follow-up Survey	2002 Follow-up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Graduate satisfaction with goal achievement	94%	96%	96%	98%	96%
Graduate satisfaction with transfer preparation	100%	90%	100%	100%	95%
Graduate satisfaction with job preparation	90%	94%	90%	98%	92%
Employer satisfaction with career program graduates	100%	100%	96%	91%	95%

Performance Indicator	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Benchmark Fall 2010
Minority student enrollment compared to service area population					
a. Percent non-white enrollment	26%	26%	29%	29%	26%
b. Percent non-white service area population, 18 or older	26%	26%	26%	26%	

Campus-Specific Performance Indicator	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2010
Employer satisfaction with contract training	98%	100%	100%	100%	95%

	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Benchmark 2010
Passing rate: Licensed Practical Nurse	94%	100%	100%	98%	95%
Passing rate: Radiologic Tech, AART	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%

**BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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	86%	80%	85%	88%	80%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate	39%	40%	38%	41%	51%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	75%	70%	72%	74%	80%

**COPPIN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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>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 grad/prof school prep	100%	100%	99%	100%	90%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	30%	24%	27%	25%	30%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	29%	24%	27%	24%	30%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	72%	70%	67%	65%	70%

<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>
Employment rate of graduates in Maryland	94%	96%	95%	94%	85%

**FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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.

Indicator	1998 Follow-Up Survey	2000 Follow-Up Survey	2002 Follow-Up Survey	2005 Follow-Up Survey	2008 Benchmark
Student satisfaction with job preparation	90%	97%	89%	91%	89%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	88%	98%	97%	99%	97%

Indicator	1996 Cohort	1997 Cohort	1998 Cohort	1999 Cohort	2009 Benchmark
Six year graduation rate of all students	57%	59%	57%	56%	62%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	41%	45%	46%	55%	45%

Indicator	2001 Cohort	2002 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2009 Benchmark
Second year retention rate	79%	76%	79%	75%	80%

Indicator	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	2009 Benchmark
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	13%	12%	13%	15%	12%

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

**SALISBURY UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2006 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	97%	98%	97%	99%	98%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	100%	99%	99%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	72%	73%	73%	73%	73%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	55%	53%	59%	66%	63%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	85%	84%	84%	87%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	8%	9%	10%	11%	12%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2006 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	96%	95%	96%	93%	95%

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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 and doctoral-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>2008 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>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	60%	60%	64%	61%	65%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	48%	51%	58%	58%	59%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	89%	87%	88%	86%	87%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	10%	10%	10%	11%	12%

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE**  
**2006 Accountability Profile**

The University of Baltimore (UB) provides career-oriented education at the 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 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2008 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	34%	33%	32%	30%	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**  
**2006 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>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Number nationally recognized memberships and awards	14	14	9	14	11
Number scholarly publications/ activities per full-time faculty	5.7	6.6	6.7	6.5	7.5

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Grant/contract awards (\$M)	\$323.4	\$336.6	\$409.1	\$364.5	\$515.5
Number licenses/ options executed per year	13	25	23	22	24

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Graduates in Nursing, Pharmacy, and Dental					
Nursing	200	154	193	154	251
Pharmacy	123	122	130	158	169
Dental	85	85	97	106	126
Number scholarships, grants, and assistantships (\$M)	\$20.5	\$16.7	\$17.5	\$19.9	\$21.9

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Campaign giving, annual (\$M)	\$48.6	\$46.3	\$52.9	\$60.6	
Average grant award	\$159,252	\$177,980	\$190,814	\$192,582	\$238,517

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Number days in public service per full-time faculty	15.1	15.2	15.0	11.3	18.8

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Actual</b>	<b>2006 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Benchmark</b>
Annual cost savings as percent of actual budget	1.7%	4.4%	4.1%	2.2%	4.0%
Percent of annual IT plan completed	93%	98%	93%	97%	95%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY**  
**2006 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>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	58%	61%	62%	63%	63%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	59%	61%	64%	63%	63%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	88%	89%	89%	88%	90%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	16%	15%	15%	14%	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**  
**2006 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>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	70%	73%	76%	79%	80%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	56%	57%	68%	69%	64%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	93%	92%	93%	92%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent of minority undergraduate students enrolled	32%	32%	32%	33%	35%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE**  
**2006 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	92%	92%	87%	85%	95%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	83%	83%	95%	95%	85%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	47%	52%	50%	50%	55%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	44%	53%	50%	51%	57%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	78%	74%	73%	68%	79%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
2006 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>2008 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 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent African-American of all undergraduates	32%	32%	32%	32%	32%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Number online enrollments/registrations	87,565	97,144	111,511	119,391	196,994
Number off-campus/distance ed enrollments/registrations	74,309	83,524	99,202	102,426	198,750

**MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**2006 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>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	95%	N/A	91%	97%	95%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	98%	N/A	98%	96%	95%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	39%	41%	43%	42%	45%
Six year graduation rate of African Americans	39%	41%	43%	41%	45%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	73%	70%	73%	69%	75%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	87%	N/A	84%	81%	85%

<b>Campus-Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Percent Other Race of total enrollment	11%	11%	10%	10%	12%
Number of partnerships with public schools	36	41	45	64	75
Funding from grants/contracts for student research opps	\$2.9m	3.5m	3.8m	3.8m	4.4m
Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded	23	26	25	40	50
FTE Student-to-authorized faculty ratio	17.4:1	18.5:1	19:1	17.6:1	16:1

**ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND**  
**2006 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>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2006 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Student satisfaction with job preparation	99%	93%	87%	96%	94%
Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep	100%	96%	98%	100%	98%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996 Cohort</b>	<b>1997 Cohort</b>	<b>1998 Cohort</b>	<b>1999 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Six year graduation rate of all students	75%	75%	72	80	76%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2001 Cohort</b>	<b>2002 Cohort</b>	<b>2003 Cohort</b>	<b>2004 Cohort</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Second year retention rate	91%	85%	89%	89%	86%

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2003 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2004 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2005 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2006 Follow-Up Survey</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Employment rate of graduates	95%	98%	96%	92%	95%

<b>Campus- Specific Indicators</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2009 Benchmark</b>
Graduate/professional school going rate (within one year)	44%	28%	34%	34%	30%
Graduate/professional school going rate (within five years)	55%	56%	61%	65%	50%

