



MHEC
MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

2003 Performance Accountability Report Maryland Public Colleges and Universities

VOLUME 1

November 2003

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

John J. Oliver, Jr., Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Joann A. Boughman

Aja Campbell

Edward O. Clarke, Jr.

Anne Osborn Emery

Hona Modly Hogan

George S. Malouf, Jr.

Emmett Paige, Jr.

Hoke L. Smith

Richard P. Streett, Jr.

Mario VillaSanta

Dr. John A. Sabatini, Jr.
Acting Secretary of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....p. 1

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

Assessment and Recommendations.....p. 15

Cost Containment Activities.....p. 31

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

Targeted Indicators and Campus Response: Four-Year Institutions.....p. 61

One Page Profiles.....p. 89



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 one for the 2002-2003 year. However, the 2002 Update to the *Maryland Plan for Postsecondary Education* urged these institutions to make their process more compatible to the one used by the four-year campuses.

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

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

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

Volume 1

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

Volume 2

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

Under the accountability process, the governing boards have responsibility for monitoring student learning outcomes and minority achievement. The Commission receives reports every three years from the public campuses regarding progress in these areas. The Commission received a status report on student learning outcomes in November 2001 and one on minority achievement in September 2002. At the Commission's request, the public campuses submitted minority achievement action plans in 2003.

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 17 measures, Morgan State University has 14, and St. Mary's College of Maryland has 23. The Commission presented reports to the General Assembly in each of the past two years examining the comparative performance of the USM campuses and Morgan on the indicators. These reports are provided separately to the performance accountability report.

Commission Assessment of the Institutional Performance Accountability Reports

This set of reports marks the approximate halfway point to the benchmark year. Consequently, the Commission has begun to ask campuses to respond to questions about measures and benchmarks about which they have not been making sufficient progress. Institutions provided an explanation of their performance and/or a description of actions they had taken or planned to take. Sections were added to the report containing this information. The accountability process that was introduced in 2000 has matured, as reflected by the amount of continuity in the indicators used by the community colleges and the objectives employed by the public four-year institutions. The implementation of a common template for the purpose of supplying trend data and preparing the institutional assessment made accountability reporting one of the smoothest in years. This bodes well for the process in the future.

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

Community Colleges

Overall, the accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were among the best that have been provided to the Commission. It is evident from the quality of the reports that the community colleges continue to give considerable attention to the accountability process.

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

In response to the Commission's concern last year about the large number of indicator benchmarks that provided little opportunity for growth beyond the institutions' current level of performance, the community colleges reviewed the challenged measures and either provided a satisfactory explanation for the levels at which the goals were set or revised them.

For 68 of the 102 benchmarks which the Commission questioned, the community colleges defended their goal but provided an acceptable explanation. Fourteen benchmarks were increased, and 19 no longer were "maintenance" in nature because the campuses' performance had dropped in the most recent year.

Although the community colleges are performing generally well on most indicators as measured by the data, trends in the recruitment of minority faculty and staff and in transfer and graduation rates (particularly those of minority students) raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring.

A large number of community colleges have shown little progress in the past four years toward their benchmarks in the hiring of minority faculty and administrative/professional staff. Most of the campuses identified factors that had hindered their efforts and described actions they are taking to ensure non discrimination in hiring. All but five of the community colleges experienced a decline in the four-year transfer and graduation rate of new full-time students in the past cohort, and state-level figures were the lowest since 1978. In addition, a huge gap persists between minorities and other students. Many colleges discussed the steps that they have taken to improve transfer and graduation rates.

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

All of the accountability reports submitted by the public four-year colleges and universities were satisfactory and reflect the strong commitment of these institutions to the process. The reports ranged in the amount of detail and analysis provided. Readers can observe these variations in Vol. 2 of the report.

All but one of the reports contained all of the required components, including goals and/or objectives in the general areas of accountability and on the specific subjects of retention and graduation, minority enrollment and achievement, and postsecondary student outcomes. Especially strong reports were prepared by Coppin State College, Salisbury University, University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Maryland College Park, University of Maryland University College, and St. Mary's College of Maryland.

Members of the Maryland Higher Education Commission, in reviewing the reports, expressed concern about aspects of the submissions of UMCP, UMB and Morgan as they related to the State's partnership agreement with the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education. Letters were sent by the Acting Secretary of Higher Education to the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland and the President of Morgan State University that urged the institutions to revisit the information provided in their accountability report.

Questioned about its lack of progress on accountability objectives related to the enrollment of African-American and all minority undergraduates, UMCP initially stated that it was pleased with the success that these students had made. UMCP subsequently prepared a more expansive response that described the activities, programs and strategies that it has taken to recruit, admit, enroll and retain minority students. UMB was urged to establish accountability goals and objectives related to diversity; however, the University maintained its position that it could encounter legal problems by taking this action. Morgan was queried about its lack of specificity in describing its efforts to increase the proportion of white students at the University – one of its accountability objectives. Morgan provided a revised response, noting that it is placing emphasis on attracting a more racially-diverse student body, particularly at the graduate level.

The public four-year colleges and universities appear to be progressing well toward their objectives in most cases. However, there are several areas in which at least some institutions seem to be having difficulty.

The objectives on which the largest number of campuses appear to lag in performance relate to retention and graduation rates, enrollment of African-American and other minority undergraduates at some traditionally white institutions, funds raised in annual private giving, and the percentage of money expended on facility renewal.

Cost Containment – All Public Colleges and Universities

Reporting on cost containment and internal reallocation 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. These efforts can be categorized as savings related to staffing, reductions in overhead, transferal of expenses, encouragement of competition, and academic program savings. Cost containment ventures, as reported by the public campuses, saved \$78.5 million in FY 2003. Six percent of this total was attributed to savings resulting from the use of distance learning technologies. However, this amount, the vast majority of which was reported by UMUC, would qualify as cost containment only if it involved the replacement of classroom instruction or the closing of off-campus sites.



**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 one for the 2002-2003 year. One of the objectives in *Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education 2000* is to "embrace a comprehensive system of accountability that recognizes the needs of all stakeholders while respecting the finite nature of public resources and the fiscal constraints of students and families." The aim was reinforced in the 2002 Update to the State Plan, which also calls on the state-aided independent institutions to make their accountability reports more compatible with the process used by the public four-year sector.

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

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

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

As a result, a new performance accountability system for public higher education was adopted by the Commission in 1996. The three required reports were replaced by a single institutional performance accountability report. The heart of this report was a series of key indicators that responded to concerns commonly expressed by legislators and a set of benchmarks. "Benchmark" refers to the multi-year desired outcome for each indicator that the institution sets for itself. The benchmark must be achievable, indicative of progress, based on the performance of similar institutions where possible, and reflective of funding. Although each institution prepared its own benchmarks, campuses were encouraged to collaborate with those with similar missions.

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

Community Colleges

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

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

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

Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities

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

The model that was agreed to by all parties was designed to streamline the process, reduce duplicative reporting for the campuses, and provide a more efficient means for policymakers to determine how well the public four-year campuses are doing. The major component of the new accountability process is that the Managing for Results framework, in which each campus develops a set of goals, objectives and performance measures, has replaced the standardized set

of indicators that were used by the Commission in the past. This approach was strongly desired by the institutions. Even though the process provides campuses with a great deal of flexibility, the Commission expects the inclusion of objectives that encompass the general areas of performance accountability: quality, effectiveness, access, diversity and efficiency. In addition, campuses are asked to include specific objectives dealing with graduation and retention, post graduation outcomes, and minority enrollment and achievement. Other requirements may be imposed by DBM.

The institutional performance accountability report for the public four-year institutions included a short mission description; a set of institutionally-defined goals, objectives, and performance measures along with operational definitions for each measure; four years of data and a benchmark for each measure; a campus self-assessment; and a description of cost containment activities.

The Commission's Consolidated Accountability Report

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

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

Continued Monitoring of Student Learning Outcomes and Minority Achievement

The Commission has retained the option of seeking periodic reports on these topics. The Commission will receive reports every three years from the governing boards of the public campuses regarding progress in these areas. Progress reports on the status of undergraduate student learning outcomes and minority achievement were accepted by the Commission in November 2001 and September 2002 respectively. For the next round of student learning outcomes assessment reports, the Commission is working with the public campuses to measure the actual progress made in the educational achievement of students. As a follow-up to the

minority achievement report, the public colleges and universities which made limited or no progress toward benchmarks on one or more of the common performance measures have submitted action plans to the Commission detailing their strategies for attaining their objectives.

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 the University System of Maryland (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 17 measures for USM and 14 for Morgan.

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

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

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



**ASSESSMENT
AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

ASSESSMENT OF THE MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

This is the third set of reports that Maryland's public colleges and universities have submitted since the accountability process was revised in 2000, and it represents the approximate halfway point to the year in which institutions are expected to meet their established benchmarks. As a result, the Commission has begun to make specific assessments about the performance of individual campuses on measures and objectives and have asked institutions to address lack of progress. The questions raised by the Commission and the responses of the colleges and universities appear later in this report. The campuses' answers consisted of an explanation of their performance and/or a description of corrective actions that have been taken or are planned. The institutions also provided reactions to the concerns expressed by the Commission in the 2002 report regarding the use of benchmarks which were very close to the current level of performance. This year's assessment will continue the practice of making sector-level analyses of objectives and measures where trends in the data suggest difficulties.

There was considerable consistency from the previous year in the indicators used by the community colleges and the objectives by the public four-year institutions. This reflects a maturing of the revised process in which the two-year campuses have settled on the "mission/mandate driven" measures on which they want to be evaluated. Likewise, the four-year campuses made relatively minimal changes in their objectives, suggesting that they are now comfortable with the report that they want to submit for both accountability and MFR purposes. The use of common templates by the two- and four-year institutions for recording performance measure data and agreement on a standard format for narrative information contributed substantially to the ease of the process for all parties. Overall, accountability reporting in the State was the smoothest in years, thanks largely to the cooperation of the campuses, and this bodes well for future efforts.

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

Community Colleges

Overall, the accountability reports submitted by the community colleges were among the best that have been provided to the Commission. It is evident from the quality of the reports that the community colleges continue to give considerable attention to the accountability process.

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. The institutions provided detailed and frank analyses of how well their colleges had performed in each of the "mission/mandate" driven areas, with many integrating information about academic and financial trends at their institutions. In addition, campuses cited numerous actions they have taken to achieve the benchmarks they set for their indicators. Finally, the

community colleges provided extensive descriptions of the ways in which they are serving their communities.

In response to the Commission's concern last year about the large number of indicator benchmarks that provided little opportunity for growth beyond the institutions' current level of performance, the community colleges reviewed the challenged measures and either provided a satisfactory explanation for the levels at which the goals were set or revised them.

The numerical goals set for many indicators in the 2002 accountability report of the community colleges were nearly identical to, and in some cases below, the level of achievement in the last year or cohort of actual data. The establishment of a "maintenance benchmark" – one in which an institution's goal is simply to adhere to a level of performance that has already been attained – can be justified when the campus achievement is already very high and not likely to be exceeded. However, these should be applied sparingly, since one of the criteria in the guidelines provided to the campuses is that benchmarks should be "indicative of progress."

The Commission asked the community colleges to review those "maintenance benchmarks" where prospects for improved performance were realistic and desirable. The campuses were requested to indicate in their report whether these goals were changed and, if they were not, to explain the reasons the benchmarks remained at the current level. The Commission questioned the benchmarks of 102 indicators at the community colleges. In most of these cases (68), the colleges stuck with their current goal but provided an acceptable explanation. Fourteen benchmarks were revised upwards. Because of a drop in campus performance in the most recent year's data, 19 benchmarks were deemed by the Commission as no longer "maintenance" in nature. The following table displays the manner in which the challenged benchmarks were handled at each community college:

| | Benchmark was revised upwards | Benchmark was revised downwards | No change was made in the benchmark but campus provided explanation for current level | No change was made in the benchmark, but it is no longer "maintenance" in nature |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Allegany | | | 7 | 1 |
| Anne Arundel | 4 | | 3 | 2 |
| Baltimore City | | | | 1 |
| Carroll | | | 3 | 3 |
| Cecil | | | 4 | 3 |
| Chesapeake | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| CCBC | 1 | | 5 | 1 |
| Frederick | | | 6 | |
| Garrett | 2 | | 3 | 2 |
| Hagerstown | | | 7 | |
| Harford | 1 | | 6 | |
| Howard | | | 6 | 1 |
| Montgomery | | | 7 | |
| Prince Georges | | | 3 | 1 |
| Southern MD | 3 | | 5 | 1 |
| Wor-Wic | 1 | | 2 | 1 |

Citing legal advice, Baltimore City Community College did not provide benchmarks for the indicators dealing with the percentage of racial/ethnic minorities among its full-time faculty and administrative/professional staff. Baltimore City leads the community colleges in the State in the proportion of racial/ethnic minorities among these categories of employees.

Although the community colleges are performing well on most indicators as measured by the data, trends in the recruitment of minority faculty and staff and in transfer and graduation rates (particularly those of minority students) raise important accountability issues that merit continued monitoring.

Minority Faculty and Staff

Racial diversity among faculty and administrative/professional staff continues to be an area of concern for Maryland community colleges, as it has in earlier accountability reports. A large number of two-year institutions have shown little progress in the past four years toward their benchmarks. Most of these campuses pointed to factors that had thwarted their efforts to attract minority candidates. These included a limited number of qualified minority applicants in their geographical area, the lack of competitive salaries, and the small number of vacancies due to low turnover or few staff at their institution.

However, nearly all of the institutions indicated that they will continue their efforts to include minorities in the interview pool for positions and ensure non discrimination in hiring. Several noted that the addition of just a few employees would enable them to reach their benchmark, and a few noted that they recently made progress by hiring additional minority faculty and managerial staff or plan to do so in the near future. Many of the institutions described proactive techniques that they have employed to expand the recruitment of minority faculty and staff and pointed to initiatives they described in their *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

Among the actions were expanded advertising and greater distribution of job announcements, search committee efforts, human resource department actions, more appealing incentives for minority candidates, and the establishment of a campus climate welcoming to ethnically diverse peoples. Specific examples included more advertising in metropolitan newspapers and in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the placement of notices in national minority publications, the posting of openings on web sites including ones targeted to minorities, the establishment of an active Diversity Committee, the inclusion of minorities on search committees, diversity training for search committee members and human resources staff, the sending of job announcements to historically black colleges and universities and to graduate schools which enroll a large number of minorities, employment recruitment tracking systems, competitive salaries, professional development opportunities, increased number of minorities in the adjunct faculty pool, evaluation of college practices by new minority employees, minority faculty and staff mentoring programs, and the development of an inclusive campus climate that values diversity.

Transfer and Graduation Rates

The four-year transfer and graduation rate of full-time community college students has been among the most frequently flagged indicator in past accountability reports, and this continues to be the case. The four-year rate of new full-time community college students was 31.1 percent in the most recent cohort – the lowest percentage since 1978. All but five community colleges experienced a drop in their transfer and graduation rate in the latest cohort.

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

Further, transfer and graduation rates provide important, but narrowly defined, measures of success at community colleges. In recent years, community colleges have expanded their missions, enrolling increasing numbers of students with goals other than earning a credential or transferring. Thus, these rates do not capture the full range of student outcomes at two-year

institutions. As a result, the Commission has convened a workgroup with the two-year institutions for the purpose of developing a mechanism for the reporting of entry goals of each community college student at matriculation. This would constitute an addition to the Commission's enrollment information system. All community colleges currently collect this type of data about new students.

Many colleges described actions that they had initiated to improve transfer and graduation rates. These included changes in staffing, the introduction of student support programs, instructional interventions, enrollment management strategies, articulation efforts and expanded data collection. Specific examples include learning community projects to help at-risk students, expanded academic advising and personal counseling, evaluation of the process for providing remedial education, the establishment of distance learning programs in cooperation with four-year campuses, enhanced tutorial services, increased interaction with faculty and staff, transfer information counseling, exploration of a mechanism for tracking transfer students outside of public higher education in Maryland, academic monitoring of students with deficiencies, the establishment of a campus-level workgroup on retention, the creation of student development courses, and faculty and staff training about student persistence and attrition.

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

Several institutions described steps that they have taken to increase the graduation and transfer rate of minorities beyond those that have been implemented for all students. Many campuses also pointed to initiatives that they described in their *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*. These included the establishment of a task force on the recruitment and retention of African-American men, a "closing the gap" project aimed at eliminating the difference between the achievement of African-Americans and whites, professional development training for faculty on the needs of diverse learners, minority mentors, minority student support groups, faculty training on minority achievement issues, increased articulation arrangements with historically black colleges and universities, a Workforce Scholarship Program for working mothers, a federally funded grant project to improve minority student transfer and graduation rates, and the development of a campus climate conducive to diversity.

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

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

Economic and Workforce Development Activities

- Allegany College of Maryland helped to fund a county-level study of underemployment in conjunction with the county Workforce Development Workgroup. The data from this survey are used as a tool for recruiting and retaining businesses in the community.
- Community College of Baltimore County works with 11 different apprenticeship organizations including labor unions, regional housing authorities and trade associations and has more than 1,000 students enrolled in trade and technical courses.
- Carroll Community College organized BizTech Expo in partnership with the county Chamber of Commerce and Carroll Technology Council to showcase new technologies that could enhance business efficiency and effectiveness.
- As a member of the Rapid Response Team to deal with the upcoming closing of the Black & Decker plant in Easton, Chesapeake College is coordinating retraining for displaced workers.
- The Maryland Center for Environmental Training at College of Southern Maryland provides businesses and government throughout the Mid-Atlantic region with training and technical assistance in water and waste-water treatment, pollution prevention, worker health and safety, and environmental management.
- Frederick Community College's Career Center created an award-winning Online Career Center with a variety of web-based services: taking a career assessment, viewing career tutorials, linking to career resources, posting a resume, and searching for current job openings.
- Garrett College completed construction of the Garrett Information Enterprise Center, an incubator facility located on the campus and designed to attract start-up businesses in the telecommunications area.
- Hagerstown Community College is providing most of the required training in manufacturing skills, management development skills, and computers to employees at Mack Trucks to prepare them for a new work environment at its local facility.
- Montgomery College's Gudelsky Institute for Technical Education formed a partnership with Washington Area New Car Dealers Association and Ford Motor Company to train new technicians for dealerships.
- Wor-Wic Community College, as an approved training provider for the Lower Shore Workforce Alliance, offers training programs to low income adults and youth facing serious barriers to employment and provides retraining and employment assistance to eligible dislocated workers.

Public School Partnerships

- Staff at Allegany College of Maryland is working with Vo-Tech teachers to develop a new high school course in "integrative mathematics" that will teach concepts that will improve student performance on the college placement test and other college aptitude tests.

- The Center for Teacher Excellence at Baltimore City Community College has designed a program that will help the 30 percent of all teachers in Baltimore City who are provisionally certified to complete the courses they need to teach under Maryland law.
- ESOL staff at Carroll Community College, working in partnership with the Carroll County Public Schools' Learning Together Program, offers classes at a nearby elementary school while the staff of the school system provides childcare for participating parents.
- Cecil Community College's Learning for Independence program, in partnership with the Cecil County Public Schools, allows developmentally disabled high school students to take part in an educational program on computer skills at the college.
- Garrett College partnered with the Board of Education and Mountain Top Mental Health to improve the academic performance and behavior of at-risk youth.
- Hagerstown Community College partnered with the Washington County Board of Education to form a learning community, which has hosted several events during the past academic year.
- Harford Community College and the Harford County Public Schools co-host an annual Education After High School Fair which draws 1,000 students and parents.
- Howard Community College and the Howard County Public Schools have entered into an agreement with the county Fire and Rescue Services to establish a career pathway that certifies area high school students as emergency medical technicians and firefighters.
- Montgomery College and the Montgomery County Public Schools sponsor Kids on Campus, a summer youth program that exposes students up to the eighth grade to collegiate experiences as well as classes and activities in the areas of computers, creative writing, science and the arts.
- Prince George's Community College is directing a federally-funded grant project to provide computer literacy to over 1,400 teachers in 72 secondary schools in Rwanda over the next two years.

Community Partnerships

- Anne Arundel Community College started offering education at a third site. This facility, located at Arundel Mills, has complete administrative and student services and will allow the college to better meet the educational needs of residents and employers in the western portion of the county.
- Respiratory care program students at Baltimore City Community College assist with Camp Super Kids activities and may volunteer to help with the Special Olympics. The Dental Hygiene Clinic provides free cleanups to community children and senior citizens.
- The Center for Adult and Family Literacy at Community College of Baltimore County provide courses in reading skills, GED preparation, an external degree program, workplace literacy services and ESOL that serves more than 3,000 students.
- Cecil Community College's 60+ Programs provide seniors access for one membership fee to an array of classes specifically tailored to the interests of the elderly.
- Through its Performing Arts Center, Chesapeake College provides the people of its five-county region with a rich array of programs. More than 25,000 individuals visited the Center for artistic, musical, theater, and educational events.

- The arts and communications department at Frederick Community College prepared a video to draw attention to the needs of the disabled. The 15-minute program, which features 12 disabled adults discussing the need to be independent, was shared with the Maryland General Assembly.
- The Harford Leadership Academy at Harford Community College prepares county residents for important civic leadership responsibilities with nonprofit, business and citizen organizations.
- The Student Government Association at Howard Community College hosted approximately 250 students, faculty and staff at a Volunteers Day to learn about community and service organizations in the county and the volunteer opportunities that are available.
- Wor-Wic Community College offers continuing education courses in the evening at area public schools, where equipment of the college is accessible to secondary school students during the day.

Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities

All of the accountability reports submitted by the public four-year colleges and universities were satisfactory and reflect the strong commitment of these institutions to the process. The reports ranged in the amount of detail and analysis provided. Readers can observe these variations in Vol. 2 of the report.

The reports from all but one campus 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. The continued absence of any goals or objectives related to diversity in the submission of University of Maryland, Baltimore remains a serious omission. In its assessment, the university stated "UMB has a long-standing commitment to improving the academic achievement of minority students and to fostering diversity among its faculty and staff. Due to the potential for legal challenges, however, quantifiable objectives cannot be established."

Particularly strong reports were prepared by Coppin State College, Salisbury University, University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Maryland College Park, University of Maryland University College, and St. Mary's College of Maryland.

The difficulties cited in the 2002 report regarding the use of "maintenance benchmarks," inconsistencies between statistics in objectives and performance measures, the absence of data, and non measurable objectives were almost completely eliminated. Nearly all affected campuses responded satisfactorily to Commission concerns about objectives whose benchmarks were set at or below the current level of achievement. University of Baltimore revised upwards seven of its benchmarks and Frostburg one. UMB and UMCP provided an acceptable reason for retaining the current level of one of their benchmarks.

Members of the Maryland Higher Education Commission, in reviewing the reports, expressed concern about aspects of the submissions of UMCP, UMB and Morgan as they related to the State's partnership agreement with the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education. Letters were sent by the Acting Secretary of Higher Education to the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland and the President of Morgan State University that urged the institutions to revisit the information provided in their accountability report.

UMCP

The Commission staff questioned UMCP's lack of progress on its accountability objectives that dealt with the percentage of African-American and all minority undergraduates enrolled at the University. The Commission observed that the percentage of minority undergraduates at UMCP has steadily fallen in the past four years from 33.1 percent to 31.7 percent and that the percentage of African-American undergraduates at UMCP has steadily dropped in the past four years from 14.2 percent to 12.4 percent.

In its initial response, UMCP stated that it was pleased with the success that African-Americans had made progressing through its academic programs and asserted that it enrolls a greater number and proportion of African-American students as well as awards a higher number of degrees to African-Americans than its peers. UMCP attributed the decline to a drop in the pool of African-American applicants and to an overall reduction in the size of the entering class.

Commissioners expressed the view that this answer suggested that UMCP is satisfied with its current level of performance and does not plan to take steps to reverse the downward trend in minority enrollments. With respect to the spirit and letter of the State's commitment to OCR, the Commissioners thought it was inconsistent for the flagship university to accept a continual drop in the number of African-Americans enrolled.

In reaction, UMCP submitted a much more detailed explanation of the University's intention and efforts to achieve its benchmarks on the two accountability objectives questioned. This response, which appears in the section of this report containing the answers to the queries raised by the Commission staff, contains an expansive account of the array of activities, programs and strategies that UMCP has undertaken to recruit, admit, enroll and graduate minority students.

UMB

Commissioners urged UMB to establish accountability goals and objectives related to diversity. In the context of the OCR partnership agreement, the Commission expressed concern that one of the State's top research universities (which has a very good record in the area of minority recruitment) does not document its efforts in the accountability report or provide quantitative objectives. No other public four-year institution has taken UMB's position. Moreover, UMB clearly prevailed in every aspect of the lawsuit that prompted the University to adopt this

stance in the first place. The U.S. Supreme Court recently upheld the consideration of race as a factor among many in an institution's efforts to achieve the educational benefits of a diverse student body.

However, UMB has continued to decline to provide quantifiable objectives at this time. The University submitted the following explanation to the Commission:

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

"UMB is the focal point for graduate and professional education in a series of complaints to OCR. The complaints, which have been brought by a national, conservative organization, assert that too much weight is being given to race as a factor in admissions decisions, violating Supreme Court guidance. These complaints may lead to a reconsideration of OCR positions, with resulting changes in USM obligations and in federal regulations. UMB will revisit its practices and may propose accountability measures as federal law becomes more settled.

"UMB remains aggressive in its recruitment of well-qualified minority and African-American students and is committed to maintaining its outstanding record of a diverse student body. Our statistics speak for themselves."

Morgan

Commissioners expressed concern about the response which Morgan gave to an issue raised by the staff with respect to its efforts to achieve an accountability objective related to increasing the percentage of white student enrollment at the University. Commissioners believed that Morgan's answer did not address white students specifically and failed to describe steps that Morgan is taking or intends to take to improve its level of performance on this objective. White student enrollment at Morgan has been flat at 2 percent during the past four years. While the State's partnership with OCR is not intended to disadvantage the special role that Historically Black Colleges and Universities play in Maryland, these institutions were not exempted from the State's desegregation commitments. Indeed, the State's enhancement efforts for the HBCUs are grounded in the obligation to improve educational opportunities for African-American students *and* to achieve desegregation.

Morgan provided a revised response about this matter, noting that it is placing "special emphasis on attracting a more racially-diverse student body." The University's efforts, to date, have achieved success at the graduate level, where whites constitute 12 percent of all students.

The public four-year colleges and universities appear to be progressing well toward their objectives in most cases. However, there are several areas in which at least some institutions seem to be having difficulty.

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

Retention and Graduation Rates

Maryland's public four-year colleges and universities set historic records in the most recent cohorts for second year retention rates and six-year graduation rates of new full-time undergraduates. In addition, many of these institutions are within striking distance of their benchmarks on objectives dealing with retention and graduation rates, both for all students and for African Americans. However, several others are trailing in their goals. Among the initiatives that campuses have taken to address this issue are increased academic support services such as advising and counseling, academic monitoring of at-risk students, the establishment of a "learning community" or orientation courses for first semester freshmen, additional institution need-based financial aid, a campus wide retention campaign, the establishment of a retention committee, mentoring programs, increased interaction between students and faculty, greater availability of required courses, more research on retention and graduation issues, and peer tutoring. Many institutions provided examples from their *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*.

Enrollment of African-American and Other Minority Undergraduates

As noted in *2002 Minority Achievement Report*, the proportion of African-American undergraduates has been flat or has declined at more than half of Maryland's "traditionally white" four-year colleges and universities during the past four years. This pattern has not changed. As a consequence, four institutions in particular face a challenge to meet their objectives in the recruitment of minority undergraduates in general and/or African-Americans in specific:

Salisbury: An increase in the proportion of African-American undergraduates from 8 to 10 percent and all minorities from 10.4 percent to 13 percent by 2004.

Towson: An increase in the percentage of minority undergraduates from 15.3 to 17 percent by 2004.

UMBC: An increase in the percentage of African-American undergraduates from 16 to 18 percent by 2004.

UMCP: An increase in the percentage of African-American undergraduates from 13.8 to 14.8 percent by 2004 and all minorities from 33 to 35 percent by 2004.

In their institutional assessment, each university offered a different perspective on their performance. Salisbury reported the percentage of minority undergraduates rose to 12.6 percent in 2002 and that it expected to surpass the benchmark this year. Salisbury stated that the campus also was showing progress in increasing the proportion of African-Americans due to campus diversity initiatives. However, the university noted that it may not achieve its benchmark by 2004, partly because of limited financial aid resources and the elimination of two staff positions that directly supported diversity efforts due to state budget cuts.

Towson predicted that it would experience increases in the proportion of minorities attending the campus as a result of higher retention rates among these students. UMBC noted that the number of African-American undergraduates has risen slightly during the past six years – but that the proportion which these students represent of all undergraduates has remained flat because enrollments have been growing faster among other groups, particularly Asian-Americans.

UMCP, in its revised response discussed above, stated that it has begun to analyze its lack of progress in the enrollment of African-American and minority undergraduates with the intention of determining its causes and identifying appropriate responses. The University noted that it has adopted a variety of activities, programs and strategies to recruit, admit, enroll and retain minority students, and it described these in considerable detail. UMCP also observed that it enrolls and graduates a higher number and proportion of African American students when compared with its national peers. Nonetheless, the percentage of minority undergraduates at UMCP is below the level of five years ago.

Many campuses have adopted intensive recruitment campaigns to achieve their benchmarks, some of which were described in the *2003 Minority Achievement Action Plans*. These include partnerships with community colleges, marketing efforts, high school bridge programs, mentoring, contacts with high school teachers and counselors, campus visits, and additional off-campus and distance learning programs.

Fundraising from Outside Sources

Several campuses have made little progress toward or remained far from their objectives with respect to funds raised in annual private giving. These institutions generally remained committed to their benchmarks. Fundraising struggles were tied to the continued softness in the national economy and a corresponding decline in private philanthropy. Private private giving to colleges and universities fell in 2002 – the first decline in 14 years.

Facility Renewal

Many colleges and universities lagged considerably behind their objective on the proportion of funds allocated to facility renewal at their institutions. The campuses expressed concern that they were falling behind in investments in infrastructure but indicated that these funds had to be diverted to cover other expenses in the face of the State budget cuts and current fiscal realities and priorities.

Cost Containment – All Public Colleges and Universities

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

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

Because of the interest in cost containment activities by members of the Commission and by legislators and their staff, a summary of the institutions’ endeavors in this area is included in this report. Specific cost containment actions taken by the University System of Maryland, which for the first time submitted a breakdown for each of its institutions, Morgan State University, St. Mary’s College of Maryland, and all 16 community colleges were outlined.

The cost containment reporting in the current accountability cycle was commendable. All of the institutions which reported cost containment actions provided detailed descriptions and specific dollar amounts associated with their cost containment and internal reallocation activities. These activities can be categorized into five areas:

- Savings related to staffing, such as reductions in positions, a hiring freeze with respect to vacancies, lower salaries for newly hired personnel, greater use of adjunct faculty, reductions in the cost of employee health insurance, restrictions on travel expenses, cuts in staff development and training, and credit card initiatives.
- Reductions in overhead, through such efforts as energy management and conservation programs, cuts in utility and phone expenditures, administrative reorganization, deferred equipment purchases and facility improvements, the use of web capabilities to reduce printing and mailing expenses, and facilities efficiencies.
- Transferal of expenses by means of the outsourcing of services, partnerships with private companies, collaborative agreements with other collegiate institutions, and reliance on pro-bono help and in-kind donations of technology.
- The encouragement of competition, including aggressive contracting and the negotiation of lower interest rates on loans.
- Academic program savings, including program eliminations, course cancellations, and the use of distance learning technologies.

Cost containment efforts by Maryland’s public colleges and universities saved a total of \$78.5 million in FY 2003. Six percent of this total reflects the use of distance learning. The vast majority of this amount comes from UMUC, which claimed \$4.5 million in savings. However, this would qualify as cost containment only if it involves the replacement of classroom instruction or the closing of off-campus sites – and there were financial implications in the past fiscal year.



COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES

COST CONTAINMENT ACTIVITIES

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Allegany College of Maryland

Allegany College of Maryland breaks down cost containment measures into two categories: those which reduce waste and improve overall efficiency of operations and those which are used as emergency cost cutting measures in times of unexpected revenue reductions. Cost containment measures include health insurance savings brought about by increased employee participation in health insurance, adoption of a self-insurance plan with a third party administrator, and increased deductibles. Allegany also has removed coverage for physical damage for some of our vehicles, which has reduced our auto policy premium. Other initiatives: telecommunication costs saving controls, purchase of a new library server reducing maintenance costs, reduced communication expenses, and reduced postage by utilizing the assistance of the Information Center to prepare bulk mailings. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$222,485.

Savings resulting from cost containment measures are addressed in the normal budget process. On the expense side of the budget, these savings can be used to budget for new initiatives in the strategic planning process. On the revenue side, these savings can be used to compensate for revenue shortfalls or to keep tuition increases down.

Anne Arundel Community College

Anne Arundel Community College concentrates on sustaining its growth using an intricate balance between resource management and integrating a cost efficiency philosophy and model into all departments. The college continues to provide more courses, more programs and services to more students, in greater formats, at more times and in more locations with little or no staff increases. In FY 2003, the college saved over \$3,006,000 million through cost saving initiatives. Some of the savings were transferred to support instruction and academic support initiatives and operations. Additionally, state directed mandatory budget cuts required the college to further cut its fiscal year 2003 budget by more than \$811,000. In order to meet critical demands within current resources and account for a total of over \$2.8 million in cuts to our state aid, the college initiated several cost saving strategies: contract savings for classroom equipment, Datatel system efficiencies, negotiated positions savings, renegotiated procurement contracts, lapsing positions as strategy, AV equipment contract negotiations, supplies contracts renegotiations and cuts, energy contract consortium savings, power plant efficiencies, technology energy management systems, and engineering study management savings.

Baltimore City Community College

Baltimore City Community College saved \$1,643,000 by reallocating technology program funding to partially support seniors training program in continuing education, reallocating program development fund to partially fund NOVEL, acquired a new grant to fund ExOffenders Occupational Skills training, increased the number of distance learning Internet based course offerings and the number of evening and weekend courses while canceling courses offered at

non-peak times, acquired a new grant from Abell Foundation to fund a computer-based instructional program to accelerate remedial learning, salary savings as a result of staff and faculty vacant positions, and spending freeze enacted in March 2003.

Carroll Community College

Carroll Community College controls or avoids costs by increasing reliance on adjunct faculty to respond to enrollment growth, reduction in computer costs by negotiating pricing below State-negotiated contracts, maintained a contract with Carroll County government for building and grounds maintenance, received rebates from Baltimore Gas and Electric for thermal storage facility, and used the Maryland State Collection Agency to collect receivables deemed not collectable by the college. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$437,800.

Cecil Community College

As part of the annual budget development process, Cecil identifies areas for cost savings and incorporates these savings into the budget request. In addition, throughout the year all college staff work to find and implement innovative cost savings measures that reduce operating expenses. In FY 2003, Cecil Community College implemented \$84,000 of cost saving measures by reduction of positions and outsourcing facilities management.

Chesapeake College

Significant cost containment actions adopted by the institution in FY 2003 included procurement of electricity at a more competitive rate, reduction in proportion of health benefits paid by the college, saving postage fees by sending pay advises to employees through inter-office mail rather than by U.S. mail. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$86,900.

Community College of Baltimore County

Due to a mid-year State aid reduction of \$904,599, cost containment measures were enacted across the campuses and college-wide services effecting the following categories: salaries and fringes, contracted services, supplies and materials, communications, conferences and meetings, utilities, and furniture and equipment. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$904,599.

Frederick Community College

Significant cost containment or re-allocation actions adopted by Frederick Community College in FY 2003 included hiring freeze, restructured health, dental, and vision insurance plan; continuing education financial retrenchment savings; and reduction in staff development and training funds. These initiatives resulted in savings of \$273,000.

Garrett College

Significant cost containment actions adopted by the Garrett College in FY 2003 included reducing the Earn and Learn budget, reducing unemployment budget, deferred facility

improvements, reduction in salary adjustments, and implementation of a medical insurance cost-sharing plan. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$86,000.

Hagerstown Community College

Cost containment actions taken during FY 2003 included reduction in professional development, increased credit tuition revenue, reduction in IT service and maintenance contracts, reduction in the Elderhostel Program, personnel reductions, reduction in communication expenditures, reduction in legal fees, and designation of current unrestricted fund balance to administration building renovation. These initiative resulted in a savings of \$1,014,349.

Harford Community College

Significant cost containment and/or reallocation actions and approximate savings in FY 2003 include continued outsourcing the College's custodial operations staff, security operations staff, and ground maintenance operations staff; the filling of full-time vacancies at part-time hourly basis; reduction in technology development and expenditures; implementation of expenditure approval process; and the hiring of visiting professors in non tenure-track faculty positions who focused all of their of time on teaching duties. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$261,000.

Howard Community College

Each year the college has reviewed current operations and determined areas that can be reduced or reallocated to assist in cost containment efforts. The initiatives adopted by the college in FY 2003 include: reduction in hourly personnel; reduction in full- and part-time faculty requests; furniture and equipment reductions; Coca-Cola savings (The college negotiated a sponsorship program with Coca-Cola that generates \$170,000 a year. These funds will be used to support new initiatives in the college such as our Children's Learning Center and will also help in the generation of scholarships); foundation scholarship funding (Each year the HCC Educational Foundation has made a commitment to fund scholarships for the college); foundation building funding (The foundation has raised capital campaign funds, which are to be used for the construction of the new Arts and Humanities building. These funds will allow the college to offset the county's share of the local funding for capital projects on this project); reduction of the plant operation's budget for renovations and deferred maintenance; rented trailers to help with large enrollment growth; elimination summer scholars program; and postage savings by providing students grades on-line via web access. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$3,561,584.

Montgomery College

Montgomery College has adopted a number of initiatives to contain costs in FY 2003. The college has a hiring freeze on over 60 positions, is limiting long distance travel and curtailing all but essential purchases, is continuing to delay hiring of essential replacement personnel, and is contracting out services where it improves customer service and saves time and money without sacrificing quality.

For example, the college contracts out the cataloging of library materials, distance learning hosting, food service, and the archives function. The college also uses contractors in the technology field to pull cables, install hardware/software, perform inventories, computer repair, and manage the help desk. In the benefits areas, the college contracts out the medical assessment portion of its disability leave program. In order to cut college-wide printing costs, all publications are now being sent out to bid. Previously, many of these jobs would have been directed to the college's primary vendor for miscellaneous printing projects.

The College continues to move documents to web format. The College stopped mailing out grades because they are posted on the web resulting in cost savings. All financial aid application materials are available on the web which reduced printing and mailing costs.

Montgomery College continues to participate in countywide cooperative procurements of electrical and natural gas supply to keep costs down. The electric supply agreement in effect through May 2003 was extended with revised pricing for another year with pricing below the standard offer service at a cost savings. The gas supply agreement that was approved for the period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003 locked the college's gas prices at a low supply price of approximately \$0.55 per therm while market prices ranges as high as \$0.95 per therm. The gas contract, with three optional one-year renewals, has been extended through June 30, 2004 with revised pricing that is 1-2 percent lower than that offered by either the Maryland State contract or the utility.

The college purchases Microsoft software and McAfee Antivirus software under the statewide contract arranged through the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The college has purchased over 5,500 software licenses at educational pricing rates, reflecting discounts of 5 to 90 percent off of commercial, retail and wholesale prices. Additional discounts with the college hardware PC vendor have resulted in an on-site full time person to help with technology and a cost savings. The college negotiated additional services from the college's distance learning provider in donated staff and training while keeping the contract within the same original cost. The Enterprise Resource Planner vendor reduced expense and staff costs while maintaining the same level of vendor effort and commitment.

These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$3,524,000.

Prince George's Community College

Initiatives include reorganization of advising and counseling areas, limited technology expenditures, increase in grant funding allowing faculty positions to be paid by grant, limiting travel, and expansion of Metro Center using a federal grant. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$960,000.

College of Southern Maryland

The college negotiated a lower-than-market interest rate for the purchase of administrative software to integrate student data, financial reporting, payroll, and financial aid functions of the college; the Physical Plant Department coordinated numerous office moves without the use of contract movers; the Physical Plant Department renovated numerous offices in lieu of hiring an outside contractor; and the Physical Plant Department worked many hours on snow removal in lieu of an outside vendor. The college also promoted competitive bidding on operational purchases, obtained a grant for the purchase of technology infrastructure maintenance, received in-kind donations from a software vendor, and received donations from local business to support purchases of technology for instructional areas. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$1,269,147.

Wor-Wic Community College

During FY 2003, the following cost containment measures were implemented: deferred filling some staff positions for three months; purchased the Maintenance Plus option from Computing Options which has created savings in purchasing software, programming and training services; phased out the Novell network operating system in favor of the Windows 2000 Server system; began dealing directly with Dell for buying Dell equipment, saving 10 percent over the state contract price; eliminated four faculty positions from the budget. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$202,000.

PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

University System of Maryland

The overall goal is to report on initiatives that demonstrate how taxpayer or student costs are contained. Particular items are placed into one of four financial classes: cost savings, strategic reallocations, cost avoidance, and revenue.

Cost savings: An item is reported as cost savings only if the action represents a reduction in current operating expenses. For example, if a position is eliminated from an administrative function, it is scored. Alternatively, a salary saving associated with staff attrition – turnover savings -- is not counted.

Strategic reallocation is a management led redirection of current resources toward a campus priority or critical need. For example, management may begin the working budget process by reducing a particular function(s) to prior resource levels. The function is then challenged to live within the reduced amount. The resulting savings are directed to a priority need.

Cost avoidance items are somewhat subjective. Therefore, these actions require that two conditions be met before being scored. First, the potential “cost” is for a demonstrable unmet need, and second, the need be satisfied. Thus, a budget request item that fails to win approval is not scored as an avoided cost. On the other hand, most technology equipment that is donated is counted as an avoided cost to the State or to students – the need is apparent and the item is realized via the donation.

Revenue enhancements are new funding streams. Tuition and/or fee charges are, of course, not included, while new or additional revenues related to an entrepreneurial activity are included. If additional revenue is created and used for a spending purpose, the amount falls into one of the previous categories discussed above.

In response to legislative advice and counsel following a joint hearing on cost containment held on November 5, 1997, the University System of Maryland developed a methodology to report the ongoing efforts to improve operations, reduce and avoid costs, and increase revenue. This expanded definition of cost containment is designed to conform to our interpretation of the “sense” of the joint committee. The current report covers the efficiency efforts taken for the period of July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003.

General Categories of Efficiency

Following our initial data collection, we attempted to group like activities within a limited number of basic categories. Institutions were then asked to identify campus initiatives that related to the specified categories using the examples from other institutions as context. The current list is displayed below:

- Business Process Reengineering
- Collaboration with Academic Institutions
- Competitive Contracting
- Credit Card Availability
- Distance Ed/Tech in Teaching/Libraries
- Energy Conservation Program
- Equipment & Land Acquisition/Donation
- Indirect Cost Recoveries
- Mandatory Reallocation Process
- Meeting Federal Requirements
- Partnership with External Entities
- Patents and Royalty Income
- Pro Bono Services
- Space & Building Efficiencies
- State Supported Revenue Expansion

With each additional year that the data is collected, more consistency is seen in the organization of the information along the categories displayed above. Each year also facilitates more cross-fertilization of ideas and processes that may serve to strengthen future initiatives. Institutions appear anxious to engage activities that are reflective of successes at other institutions. This year's report did not add any new categories, but instead shows an increase in the cross-fertilization of ideas among the institutions.

The FY 2003 report shows an increase in the total amount saved through the efficiency efforts along with an increase of idea sharing among the institutions. The cross-fertilization of ideas becomes more apparent with each reporting year. Throughout the summary, several common results can be found among the different institutions. One example is the continued efforts in the mandatory reallocation process. The institutions are continually striving in their efforts to reallocate resources from low priority initiatives to high priority initiatives. With the recent downturn in the economy and the resulting reductions in state appropriations, this process has become even more critical to the institutions. The partnership with external entities category continued to increase in FY 2003. More of the institutions are looking to enter into partnerships with private companies as a method of funding certain projects, with the increase in FY 2003 related primarily to public/private partnerships for student housing. Also showing an increase in FY 2003 was the equipment/land acquisition or donation category. Institutions, particularly UMCP, UMBC and UMB are increasing the amount of equipment they receive through donations. The energy contract at UMB continued to produce significant savings in FY 2003. Two other major categories that not only showed an increase in the amount saved but also in the number of institutions implementing the efficiency effort in FY 2003, are the Collaboration with Academic Institutions and Indirect Cost Recoveries.

The following table summarizes the efficiency efforts by institutions and financial class – the total value of these actions is approximately \$57.9 million. The FY 2003 State-Supported appropriation is \$1.59 billion.

University System of Maryland
FY 2003 Efficiency Initiatives by Category
Shown as \$'s in (\$000)

| General Category | UMB | UMCP | BSU | TU | UMES | FSU | CSC | UB | SU | UMUC | UMBC | UMCES | UMBI | Total |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|---------------|
| Business Process Reengineering | 327 | 1,769 | 568 | 34 | 335 | 80 | 220 | | 428 | 375 | 335 | 170 | 315 | 4,956 |
| Collaboration with Academic Institutions | | | 210 | 250 | 154 | | 75 | | 539 | 221 | 150 | | 375 | 1,974 |
| Competitive Contracting/In&outsourcing | 200 | 1,138 | 319 | | 150 | | | 20 | | 45 | 175 | 25 | 121 | 2,193 |
| Credit Card Availability | | 200 | | | | | 30 | 10 | | | 200 | | 10 | 450 |
| Distance Ed / Tech in Teaching/Libraries | | | | | | | | | | 4,483 | | | | 4,528 |
| Energy Conservation Program | 1,550 | | | | 450 | | 300 | | | | 500 | 225 | | 3,025 |
| Equipment/Land Acquisition or Donation | 240 | 3,151 | | | | | | | | | 310 | | | 3,701 |
| Indirect Cost Recoveries | 479 | 4,800 | 5 | | 170 | | | | | | | 300 | 600 | 6,354 |
| Mandatory Reallocation Process | 2,675 | 2,829 | | 1,857 | | 513 | | 1350 | 1,108 | | 2,103 | 200 | 80 | 12,715 |
| Meeting Federal Requirements | 250 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 250 |
| Partnership with External Entities | 330 | 10,392 | | 1,268 | 30 | 200 | 700 | 725 | | | 1,216 | 22 | 300 | 15,183 |
| Patents and Royalty Income | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Pro bono services | | 390 | | | | | | | | | | | | 390 |
| Space & Building Efficiencies | | 50 | | | | | 50 | | | | | | 196 | 296 |
| State Supported Revenue Expansion | | 1,649 | | | | | | | | | 275 | | | 1,924 |
| Total | 6,051 | 26,368 | 1,102 | 3,409 | 1,289 | 793 | 1,375 | 2,105 | 2,075 | 5,124 | 5,264 | 987 | 1,997 | 57,939 |

**University System of Maryland
FY 2003 Efficiency Initiatives by Financial Class**

Shown as \$'s in (\$000)

| Financial Classes | UMB | UMCP | BSU | TU | UMES | FSU | CSC | UB | SU | UMUC | UMBC | UMCES | UMBI | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Cost Savings | 1,852 | 1,770 | 841 | 34 | 790 | 80 | 523 | 30 | 932 | 460 | 1,041 | 255 | 389 | 8,99 |
| Strategic reallocation | 2,675 | 2,829 | | 1,857 | | 513 | | 1,350 | 1,108 | | 2,023 | 200 | | 12,55 |
| Cost Avoidance | 1,045 | 12,410 | 31 | 1,518 | 329 | 45 | 775 | 375 | 35 | 221 | 1,840 | 390 | 380 | 19,39 |
| Revenue | 479 | 9,359 | 230 | | 170 | 155 | 77 | 350 | | 4,443 | 360 | 142 | 1,228 | 16,99 |
| Total | 6,051 | 26,368 | 1,102 | 3,409 | 1,289 | 793 | 1,375 | 2,105 | 2,075 | 5,124 | 5,264 | 987 | 1,997 | 57,93 |

Morgan State University

Cost containment actions in fiscal year 2003 were primarily directed to meeting mandated reductions in State support. Areas that the University reduced and/ or delayed expenditures to address its portion of the State's budget cut included technology, security surveillance camera, hiring freeze, and national transportation center. Eventually, this funding will have to be restored to maintain the quality of the academic programs. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$2,128,678.

St. Mary's College of Maryland

Significant cost containment activities adopted by St. Mary's College of Maryland for FY 2003 included reduction to wages and reduction of baseline funding to various operating departments. These initiatives resulted in a savings of \$877,024.



**TARGETED INDICATORS
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**TARGETED INDICATORS AND CAMPUS RESPONSES
COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

ALLEGANY COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

Commission assessment: Allegany's benchmark is 1 percent. But it has had no full-time minority faculty in any of the past four years.

Campus response: During FY 2003, one minority faculty (an African American male) was hired into a full-time, tenure track position as head of the physical therapist assistant program. Therefore, the 1 percent benchmark established by the college has been achieved.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff

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

Campus response: To assist in the recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff, during the past year the college expanded its job advertising to include the American Association of Community Colleges job bank and began posting openings on its website. During the next fiscal year, the personnel office will begin an employment recruitment tracking system that can be used to better gauge college success in finding and attracting minority candidates for new openings. The college also will send two staff members for training at the National Coalition Building Institute, which specializes in fostering intercultural understanding and bridge building among different groups.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

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

Campus response: In the past, indicators of minority retention, graduation and transfer have been problematic because of the relatively small number of minority students and the lack of suitable transfer data that reflects the much more national transfer patterns exhibited by the college's students. It is thought that recent decreases reflect a general college-wide drop in transfer rates because of the increased enrollment of non-degree seeking students and the increased proportion of students who are out-of-state residents and therefore much more likely to transfer to out-of-state schools which are not tracked by the Maryland Higher Education Commission. In order to obtain

better data, the college plans to introduce a new graduate tracking system during the next fiscal year. Another major reason that this trend might continue in future years is that the prison-based education program at the Western Maryland Correctional Institution was terminated in 2001-2002. Therefore, cohorts of students who began their studies before that year will be measured as not having graduated or transferred because they were not given the opportunity to complete their degrees.

ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Number of Credit Students Enrolled

Commission assessment: Anne Arundel's benchmark is 20,800, but its credit enrollment has varied within a small range between 17,253 and 18,375 from FY 1998 to FY 2001.

Campus response: Fiscal year enrollment increased from 17,256 in FY 2001 to 19,154 in FY 2002. This puts the college within striking distance of the benchmark.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

Commission assessment: Anne Arundel's benchmark is 15.0 percent, but the proportion of full-time faculty at the College has not exceeded 12.6 percent during the past four years.

Campus response: The college is actively recruiting minority faculty as well as professional staff and administrators. The college is making progress toward the benchmark.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff

Commission assessment: Anne Arundel's benchmark is 15.0 percent, but minorities constituted just 12.2 percent of its administrative/professional staff in 2001.

Campus response: Same as for previous measure.

BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 18 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has fallen steadily from 17.3 percent to 13.1 percent during the past four cohorts.

Campus response: Improving student retention has been the college's number one strategic priority for over 10 years, and the college has many activities underway to address student retention. The college has partnered with the Abell Foundation to identify significant barriers to retention, graduation and transfer at the college and to bring best practices from around the country to bear on their removal. In addition, owing to the fact that a majority of Baltimore City's students are single working women with dependent children and that many of these students "stop out" or leave school altogether for non-academic reasons, the college has instituted a new Workforce Scholarship Program to help more of these students stay in college. Though the incomes of the vast majority of these students are modest, they are sufficient to disqualify them from receiving support through the Pell Grant program, a result which often means that attendance next semester must be forfeited owing to the competing pressures of supporting a family. The BCCC Foundation's Workforce Scholarship Program aims to help these students stay in school by paying 50 percent of the cost of tuition, fees and books per semester as long as the student remains enrolled in six to 12 credits with at least a "C" average.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its students has declined steadily from 22.8 percent to 16.0 percent in the past three cohorts.

Campus response: Same as for previous measure.

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

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 18 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time minority students has dropped from 15.7 percent to 12.0 percent during the past four cohorts.

Campus response: In addition to the action described in the previous measures, the college has major initiatives underway to enhance these students' success. These

and a course designed for African American males. Baltimore City leads the community colleges in the State in the proportion of racial/ethnic minorities among students.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students has steadily declined from 21.1 percent to 13.7 percent during the last three cohorts.

Campus response: Same as for previous measure.

Licensure Exams Passing Rate: Health Information Technology

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 75 percent. But the figures supplied by the College show that no students passed this examination in FY 2001.

Campus response: In 2002, the Health Information Technology program's passing rate achieved 100 percent.

Percent of Expenditures on Instruction

Commission assessment: Baltimore City's benchmark is 50 percent, but instruction made up just 41.7 percent of its total expenditures in FY 2001 and the College has not approached its goal in any of the past four fiscal years.

Campus response: This is due to an overall increase in expenditures of \$7.3 million, which was allocated to fund academic support, student services, personnel costs, and deferred maintenance initiatives in support of the college's Strategic Plan.

Senior Adult Enrollment in Non-credit Courses

Commission assessment: Baltimore City has been far short of its benchmark of 1,900 in each of the past four fiscal years, and its enrollment of 457 in FY 2001 was the lowest.

Campus response: Senior adult enrollment experienced tremendous growth from AY 2000-2001 to AY 2001-2002, reaching 3,767 largely due to Baltimore City's partnership with the Commission on Aging and Retirement. Courses offered in art, financial and estate planning, computer skills, and the history of Baltimore are offered in senior centers throughout the City. Baltimore City has surpassed its benchmark.

CARROLL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

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

Campus response: The college has advertised faculty openings in media targeted at minority job seekers, using *Black Issues in Higher Education* and other vehicles. Job bulletins are sent to all historically black colleges and universities in the area. Carroll's 2003 *Minority Achievement Action Plan* identified four ongoing strategies for recruiting more minority faculty: 1) increase minorities among the adjunct faculty, 2) conduct national searches for faculty positions, including *Chronicle for Higher Education* listings, 3) post faculty openings on national Internet job search forums such as higherjobs.com, and 4) distribute job vacancy announcements to graduate schools in the surrounding area with high minority enrollments. Carroll reported in its action that the proportion of minorities among adjunct faculty has doubled in the past two years.

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

Commission assessment: Carroll's benchmark is 33 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-minority students in the past two cohorts was 0 percent and 15.4 percent respectively.

Campus response: Reflecting the demographics of Carroll County, the college enrolls a small number of full-time minority students. This creates a "small n" problem in which the achievement of two or three of these students can dramatically influence the indicator. Given this caveat, the college is pleased that the most recent cohort achieved a transfer/graduation rate of 44.4 percent, above the benchmark established by the Board of Trustees.

CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

Commission assessment: Cecil's benchmark is 19 percent, but its six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students has steadily fallen from 20.8 percent to 6.3 percent during the past four cohorts.

Campus response: First, the number of minority students at the college for the cohort years under consideration was small, so that an attrition of one or two students could trigger a big difference in the reported transfer/graduation rate. Second, some of the minority students who enrolled at the college came from neighboring states. Upon transfer to their home states before graduation, they were not captured in the reported rates. Third, Cecil has competitive athletic programs, with a disproportionate number of minority students. Over the years, a number of Cecil students have received athletic scholarships to play basketball at four-year institutions in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware. Exclusions of such minority student transfers from the limited pool of minority students at the college severely undermined the actual transfer rate for a given year.

Number of Contract Training Courses Offered

Commission assessment: Cecil's benchmark is 170, but the number of contract training courses offered at the College has dropped steadily from 188 to 135 during the past three fiscal years.

Campus response: The Business and Industry Training section at Cecil offered 160 contract training courses in FY 2002. The major reason for the decline between FY 1999 and FY 2001 was due to transition in management and high staff turnover rate. In addition, a major client of the college (the Veterans Administration) suspended training during that period for budgetary reasons, and this had an impact on the number of courses offered, as well as the number of participants in contract training.

Number of Participants in Contract Training

Commission assessment: Cecil's benchmark is 1,800, but the number of participants in its contract training programs has consistently fallen by more than half (from 3,067 to 1,494) during the past four fiscal years.

Campus response: One of the college's major clients, W.L. Gore, was responsible for a record number of courses offered in FY 1999, which increased the number of participants in contract training that year. The recent years marked a period of significant decline in demand for computer courses, which used to be the "best seller." This change in demand for basic skills in computer courses reflects a mature stage and the necessity to introduce alternative course packages. The college has been re-evaluating its focus on meeting business and industry training needs in the county. The strategic plan of the college is currently geared toward the quality of its training programs, to the extent that would generate increased revenues but not necessarily measured by the number of participants. The current priority is to secure more industry participants, which may not necessarily translate into larger number of participants.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

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

Commission assessment: The benchmark of Community College of Baltimore County is 25 percent. But the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students has fluctuated between 18.3 percent and 21.1 percent during the past four cohorts.

Campus response: The college has developed a 10-year "Closing the Gap" project. This initiative is a systematic approach to close the gap in achievement levels between African American students and white students and to improve the retention and graduation of minority students. For example, the four-year transfer/graduation rate for all students has been approximately 10 percentage points above the similar rate for minorities. CCBC's goal is to close the gap to six percentage points by fall 2005 and to eliminate any gap by 2010.

FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

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

Campus response: The college has a small faculty turnover rate of 1.2 percent, representing few opportunities to hire new faculty, except upon retirement of long-term employees. When new faculty positions become available, the college will make every effort to improve its diversity.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Professional/Administrative Staff

Commission assessment: Frederick's benchmark is 11 percent, but the make-up of minorities on its professional/administrative staff has fluctuated between 6 and 8 percent during the last four years.

Campus response: Frederick's percent of minorities for full-time professional/administrative staff increased to 10 percent for FY 2002, representing a 43 percent increase in staffing for this group. Frederick continues to make efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and staff. In summer 2002, Frederick commissioned an affirmative action analysis and plan. The analysis showed no significant historical

utilization of minority, female, disabled or veteran employees except among faculty. Frederick's current statistics are as follows: administrative positions (13.3 percent minority), full-time faculty (7.8 percent), support (12.2 percent), adjuncts (7.7 percent).

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

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

Campus response: In the college's newly revised Strategic Plan, one of the goals and objectives has specifically addressed ways in which comprehensive, ongoing assessment and learning support is provided which will enable all students to attain their goals. Frederick recognizes the problem of retaining minority students through transfer and/or graduation and believes that the main issue centers on not knowing what the students' goals are and how these goals change over time. To better understand minority students' goals, the college has instituted an Educational Achievement Plan where minority students who join the mentoring program will be tracked and mentored throughout their college career at Frederick. The college is committed to helping minority students have the same graduation/transfer rates as all other students.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

Commission assessment: Frederick's benchmark is 33 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students has not come close to this level in the past four cohorts (fluctuating within a narrow range between 19 and 21 percent).

Campus response: Frederick's six-year transfer/graduation rate for all minority students is 22 percent for the 1996 cohort, representing a 10 percent increase from the 1995 cohort. Two endeavors have enabled the college to increase its six-year transfer/graduation rate for minorities. They include a mentoring program, designed to enhance the transition of minority students to higher education and provide support for those who choose to continue their education at Frederick. The other program is Frederick's ESL program, which has increased from one class in 1996 to 18 classes in spring 2003.

GARRETT COLLEGE

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff

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

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

HAGERSTOWN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Percent of Students Transferring to Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions

Commission assessment: Hagerstown's benchmark is 21 percent, but just 17 percent of its transfer program students in the most recent cohort transferred to a Maryland public four-year campus within four years of matriculation.

Campus response: At 21 percent for the 1998, the college met its benchmark for percent of students transferring.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Administrative/Professional Staff

Commission assessment: Hagerstown's benchmark is 5 percent, but minorities have constituted just 2 percent of the institution's full-time administrative/professional staff in the past two years.

Campus response: Along with posting faculty and staff positions on the college's website, the college advertises in national minority publications such as *Black Issues in Higher Education*, *Affirmative Action Register*, and metropolitan newspapers such as *Washington Post*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and *Baltimore Sun*, and *The Chronicle for Higher Education*. The college is making every affirmative effort to recruit and hire full-time faculty from underrepresented categories. The college remains very committed to achieving all of its benchmarks within the projected timeline.

HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

Commission assessment: Harford's benchmark is 11 percent, but the proportion of minorities on its full-time faculty did not exceed 9 percent during the past four years and was just 7 percent in 2001.

Campus assessment: While this measure for faculty is still below the benchmark, it is an increase over last year. This increase is encouraging and shows the institution is again making progress towards its benchmark. Harford will continue to aggressively advertise in a variety of discipline-specific publications as well as through media widely read by members of minority groups. Harford continues to promote and sustain an atmosphere of cultural pluralism where individuals and groups can maintain a sense of cultural identity while supporting a strong, integrated campus community. Because the number of full-time faculty is relatively small, an increase of just one or two minority faculty may achieve this benchmark.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Professional/Administrative Staff

Commission assessment: Harford's benchmark is 14 percent, but the percentage of minorities on its professional/administrative staff has dropped by more than half during the past four years from 24 percent to 11 percent.

Campus response: The 24 percent reported in the 2002 institutional performance accountability report appears to be an error. The percentage of minorities of professional/administrative staff in 1998 was re-analyzed and was found to be 14.8 percent. Fluctuation of just one professional/administrative staff member can produce a significant change in this percentage. Again, in order to maintain the achievement of this benchmark, Harford will continue to aggressively advertise in a variety of discipline-specific publications as well as through media widely read by members of minority groups.

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

Commission assessment: Harford's benchmark is 30 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students has not been above 25 percent in any of the past four cohorts and was just 18 percent in the most recent period.

Campus response: It continues to be Harford's goal to have full-time minority students transfer and graduate at the same rate as that of all full-time students. Some of

the college's continuing and new correction actions (as stated in Harford's *Campus Action Plan for Minority Achievement*) include establishing and strengthening liaison relationships with four-year colleges, particularly historically black colleges and universities; infusing the content of a course, *Success in College and Beyond*, into *Basic Writing* as a pilot project to better meet the needs of students enrolled in developmental studies courses; forming a campus-wide retention work group; providing individualized academic support services to minority students; developing "At Risk and Successful Student Profiles" designed to further define the characteristics of at-risk and successful students at Harford; developing an orientation program specific to meeting the needs of ESOL students; and increasing internships and co-op opportunities for students and improving accessibility and visibility of career counseling services to help undecided students with career selections.

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Percent of Students Transferring to Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions

Commission assessment: Montgomery's benchmark is 33 percent, but the proportion of its transfer program students who have transferred to a public four-year campus in the State within four years of matriculation was 27.2 percent in the most recent period – the lowest percentage in the past four cohorts.

Campus response: Data for the most recent cohort group place the success rate below the targeted benchmark. However, it should be noted that 13 percent of this cohort group are still enrolled at Montgomery College. Another five percent earned a degree or certificate and decided not to transfer. Hence, another 18 percent of the most recent cohort had other educational goals in mind. In addition, about 12 percent transfer to colleges and universities that reside out-of-state, which raises the success of the most recent cohort to 60 percent. To complicate matters, it is likely that some students transfer out of Montgomery College and lose their transfer student status at the receiving institution because of the small number of credit hours that are transferred to the receiving institutions. Many of the colleges in the State have also begun to limit access which might influence students to look at institutions outside the State to continue their education. Lastly, some students begin their higher education experience as full-time students but do not remain full-time for a variety of reasons. These students remain part of the cohort for analysis and are not considered a success.

Commission response: Several points are in order. First, the Commission believes that continued enrollment is not a measure of success. Second, while some Montgomery College students do lose credits in the transfer process they are a minority. According to results from the survey of 2000 community college graduates, one-third of the transfer students from Montgomery College reported having lost some

credits in the process. A majority of these students lost six or fewer credits. Figures compiled in a joint study by University System of Maryland and the Maryland Association of Community Colleges show that 82 percent of all community college transfer students in fall 2001 who applied to a USM institution were accepted.

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

Commission assessment: Montgomery's benchmark is 33.5 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has declined steadily from 32.4 percent to 27.3 percent during the last three cohorts.

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

Commission assessment: Montgomery's benchmark is 33 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time minority students has fallen consistently from 31.0 percent to 23.9 percent during the past three cohorts.

Campus response: Montgomery College discussed its performance on the above two measures in tandem. The college stated the following: Almost 28 percent of the most recent cohort group of all first-time full-time degree seeking freshmen and 26 percent of the non-white cohort transferred and/or graduated within four-year of entry into Montgomery College. The success rate among both cohort groups is better than that experienced by the previous one. In fact, the transfer/graduation success for the non-white students was about two percentage points higher than the previous cohort, while a one percent point gain was achieved collectively for all first-time full-time degree seeking freshmen. A closer look at the data shows that the disparity in success between all students in general and non-white students who entered the college in 1998 declined to 2.5 percentage points, compared to the 3.4 percentage point disparity for the 1997 cohort groups.

Even though the success in this area has deviated from its targeted benchmarks, the college maintains its objective to raise student success as it relates to the transfer/graduation rate of the different cohort of students who enter the college. However, the collective analysis of non-white students, in general, makes it impossible to determine which non-white student groups are having the most difficulty. Therefore, a closer look at disaggregated data is necessary. It would be useful if the Maryland Higher Education Commission would provide the college with information about which student group is most at risk so that the college can tailor efforts to help guide those most in need.

When data for the most recent cohort of students who transferred to colleges and universities outside of Maryland's reporting capabilities were examined, 12.5 percent of all students and 9.7 percent of non-white students in the most recent cohort transferred to Maryland independent institutions. Another 19.8 percent and 18.1 percent, respectively, transferred out-of-state within four years.

Montgomery College discussed in great detail the actions that it is taking to improve student success. These can be read in their entirety in Montgomery's institutional assessment in Vol. 2 of the performance accountability report.

Commission response: The Commission would be pleased to provide Montgomery College, upon request, with breakdowns of the transfer/graduation rates of its students on the basis on specific racial/ethnic categories.

Licensure Exams Passing Rate – Radiologic Technology

Commission assessment: Montgomery's benchmark is 90 percent, but the passing rate for graduates in radiologic technology has been 66 percent and 67 percent in the last two years.

Campus response: Passing rate of the most recent Radiological Technology graduates (100 percent) was well above the performance of last year's graduates. The performance exceeded the established benchmark.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Number of Credit Students Enrolled

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 21,094. However, its credit enrollment in FY 2001 was 17,757 – the lowest in four years.

Campus response: By FY 2002, the college was 86 percent of the way toward meeting its benchmark.

Number of Students Transferring to Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 50 percent. However, the College has remained far from its goal. Just 26.5 percent of its transfer program students transferred to a public four-year college or university in the State within four years of matriculation in the most recent cohort, and only 29 percent did so in each of the previous three cohorts.

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

Second Year Retention Rate

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 73 percent. But the second year retention rate of its new full-time freshmen has ranged between 60.0 percent and 63.4 percent in the past four cohorts.

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

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 35 percent. However, the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time students has fluctuated between 21.5 percent and 28.5 percent during the last four cohorts.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 25 percent. While the six-year graduation rate of all students has steadily increased from 15.9 percent to 20.4 percent over the past three cohorts, the College remains short of its objective.

Campus response: Prince George's combined into one analysis its discussion of the fluctuation of retention, transfer and graduation rates of all students. The college's Strategic Planning Council has decided to focus at least the next two years in researching and implementing tactics to support better success among its student populations. The college identified three factors in explaining the current outcomes: 1) a longer period of stop-out behavior on the students' part, 2) an increase in institutional resources devoted to developmental education, and 3) student goal achievement outside of traditional definitions of success. An assessment of how these relate to retention, transfer and graduation at Prince George's is in Vol. 2 of the performance accountability report.

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

Commission assessment: Prince George's benchmark is 33 percent. However, the College has been far from its goal with the four-year transfer/graduation rate of full-time minority students ranging between 17.1 percent and 24.7 percent during the last four cohorts.

Campus response: Our six-year transfer and graduation rate for minority students (which has surpassed the benchmark) clearly shows the presence of a significant time lag in relations to the successful completion of educational goals for minority students. In the *2003 Action Plan for Minority Achievement*, Prince George's Community College outlines several measures it will take to increase time to goal completion for minority students which include enhancing degree audit policies and procedures, increasing counseling and mentoring, and strengthening marketing and communications.

COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

Commission assessment: Southern Maryland's benchmark is 22 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of all minority students was 18.3 percent in the most recent cohort -- the lowest figure in the past four cohorts.

Campus response: College of Southern Maryland believes that the decline in performance in the 1995 cohort was an aberration that is correcting in the current year. The six-year transfer rates for minority students in this cohort were also lower than average. Four-year transfer rates also declined in the 1995 and 1996 cohorts but strongly rebounded in 1997 and 1998, which will be reflected in the six-year rates for those years.

WOR-WIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Faculty

Commission assessment: Wor-Wic's benchmark is 10 percent. But the proportion of its full-time faculty who are minorities has remained constant at 7 percent for the past three years.

Campus response: Seeking to increase diversity in all employee groups, the college works toward meeting the State Plan objective to employ faculty and staff who reflect the racial, ethnic and gender diversity of the State. Due to the low turnover in faculty, the limited number of new faculty positions each year (four were approved last year), and the lack of qualified minority applicants, it is difficult to increase the percentage of minority faculty at the college. Gaining three more minority full-time faculty would enable Wor-Wic to meet its benchmark. With only three new faculty positions approved for next year, this is a difficult task.

Percent Minorities of Full-Time Professional/Administrative Staff

Commission assessment: Wor-Wic's benchmark is 10 percent. While the representation of minorities on Wor-Wic's full-time professional/administrative staff reached its highest levels in four years in 2001 at 5 percent, the College remains short of its goal.

Campus response: Hiring two more minorities in the next two years would allow the college to meet its benchmark. To increase the likelihood of minority applicants for administrative and faculty positions, the college is implementing its minority achievement action plan which includes mailing administrative and faculty job postings to all members of the college's "Minority Friends" list and to publications and media that promote diversity. Offering diversity training to employees and updating interview skills for all supervisors are also part of the college's action plan.

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

Commission assessment: Wor-Wic's benchmark is 28 percent, but the four-year transfer/graduation rate of its full-time minority students has lagged in the past two cohorts at 10 percent and 19 percent respectively.

Six-Year Transfer/Graduation Rate of All Minority Students

Commission assessment: Wor-Wic's benchmark is 20 percent, but the six-year transfer/graduation rate of its minority students has trailed in the last two cohorts at 13 percent and 16 percent respectively.

Campus response: While the college had not shown much progress toward reaching the benchmarks for these two indicators in previous years, this year's measurements are 90 percent or greater than the benchmark figures. These increases might be attributed to the activities implemented by the director of retention since fall 2001. Advice and encouragement for students with poor attendance is provided by the director of retention and peer counselors. In addition, the implementation of the recently created minority achievement action plan should allow the college to continue improving minority student success rates.



**TARGETED INDICATORS
AND CAMPUS RESPONSE**

**PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

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

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Objective 1.1 – By fall 2005, increase the second year retention rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen from 74 percent in fall 1998 to 80 percent

Commission assessment: The second year retention rate of these students in the most recent cohort was 73 percent – considerably short of the objective.

Campus response: The retention of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen has increased steadily over the past three years. The actual FY 2003 value of 75 percent is a significant increase over the previously reported value and is the appropriate growth to meet the 2005 objective.

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

Commission assessment: The six year graduation rate of these students in the most recent cohort was 40.6 percent – far short of the objective.

Campus response: Because the university's enrollment experienced three years of decline prior to fall 2001, the university anticipates the temporary decline in graduation rates. The 2005 objective remains reasonable and consistent with the university's overall performance.

Objective 2.2 – By fall 2005, increase the number of graduate degrees awarded from the computer science department from 18 in FY 1999 to 38.

Commission assessment: Bowie awarded just 15 graduate degrees in computer science in the most recent year – less than half of its objective.

Campus response: The declining State economy and the recent increases in tuition significantly impacts degree production in the graduate programs. Part-time students who comprise approximately 80 percent of the graduate population dominate the graduate program. The graduate degree production is likely to remain flat and under perform previous projections.

Objective 2.3 – By fall 2005, increase the number of graduate degrees awarded in management information systems from 101 in FY 1999 to 126.

Commission assessment: While the number of graduate degrees awarded in this discipline has increased from 82 to 99 during the past three years, Bowie remains noticeably short of its objective.

Campus response: Same as previous response.

Objective 2.4 – By FY 2004, increase the number of undergraduate degrees awarded in nursing from 34 in FY 1999 to 46.

Commission assessment: While the number of undergraduate degrees in nursing has risen from 27 to 36 in the past three years, Bowie is quite short of its objective.

Campus response: The undergraduate nursing program began the generic program in fall 2001, in which students without previous nursing training can earn a bachelor's degree in nursing. The enrollment in this department has increased by 85 percent since the initiation of this new option. The objective of 46 degree recipients remains reasonable and attainable.

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

Commission assessment: The number has remained flat at nine for the past four years

Campus response: Same as response to Objective 2.2.

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

Commission assessment: Just one degree was awarded in the most recent year.

Campus response: Same as response to Objective 2.2.

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

Commission assessment: While Bowie reported that its R&D expenditures have risen from \$2.68 million to \$3.5 million over a three-year period, it remains far from its objective.

Campus response: The adequacy of funding will set the context for the university's level of attainment in meeting the desired objective.

Objective 4.5 – By the end of FY 2005, increase the percentage of core full-time faculty with terminal degrees from 82 percent in 1999 to 86 percent.

Commission assessment: The proportion of core full-time faculty with terminal degrees has remained flat at 82 percent in three of the past four years.

Campus response: The percent of core faculty with terminal degrees has not changed significantly in recent years because there has been no significant hiring of core faculty. The plan to hire 30 new faculty a year for the next three years will provide the means to meet the objective of 86 percent with terminal degrees. The new faculty will be selected based upon criteria that value the possession of a terminal degree and active scholarly participation in the discipline of appointment. This latter attribute will contribute to the increased research and development awards to the faculty.

Objective 5.2 – By fall 2005, increase the second-year retention rate of first-time, full-time degree-seeking African-American freshmen from 75 percent in fall 1999 to 80 percent.

Commission assessment: The second year retention rate of these students has fluctuated between 72 and 75 percent in the past four years.

Campus response: Same as response to Objective 1.1.

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

Commission assessment: The six year graduation rate of African-American students was 41.5 percent in the most recent cohort, considerably short of Bowie's objective.

Campus response: Same as response to Objective 1.2

COPPIN STATE COLLEGE

Objective 1.2 – Increase the White-American student enrollment to 10 percent of total enrollment from 98 in 1999 to 335 in 2004.

Commission assessment: By the Commission's calculation, these students represented 5.7 percent of Coppin's total enrollment in the most recent year – considerably short of its objective.

Campus response: The college has initiated several collaborations with other USM institutions as well as out-of-state institutions through distance learning. Once these initiatives are launched in fall 2003, Coppin expects that its other-race student enrollment will substantially increase, particularly for its nursing and education programs.

Objective 2.6 – Increase the ratio of median graduates' salary to the average salary of civilian work force with a bachelor's degree from .86 to .90 in 2004.

Commission assessment: By the Commission's calculation, this ratio has remained relatively flat during the past four years and was .844 in the most recent year – far short of Coppin's objective.

Campus response: As the college adds more majors in the sciences and technology, the ratio of median graduates' salary to the average salary of civilian workforce with a bachelor's degree will increase. Over the years the majority of Coppin graduates have been in human services fields. While these graduates make significant contributions to the state's workforce shortages of teachers, nurses, social workers, and other human services professionals, their median salaries are not as high as their computer science and management science counterparts. Overall, the country and the State have experienced a sour economy. The unemployment rate for the State is higher the past few years than ever before.

Objective 3.1 – Increase the overall six year graduation rate from 21.2 in 1999 to 33 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: Coppin's six year graduation rate has risen from 18.8 percent to 26.4 percent in the past three cohorts, but it remains short of its objective.

Campus response: The Retention Campaign is credited with the increase in six-year graduation rates over the past three years. The Campaign is a cohort-based, campus-wide campaign to contact and advise students that need extra help. Coppin has also created retention committees and expanded the way the institution reaches struggling students. With the implementation of new retention and graduation programs such as

the Cohort Attack, the college plans to maintain a steady increase in the numbers of graduates and the graduation rate.

Objective 3.2 – Increase the six year African American graduation rate from 22.1 percent in 1999 to 32 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The six year graduation rate of African Americans at Coppin has risen from 20.1 percent to 26.7 percent in the past three cohorts, but the campus lags behind its objective.

Campus response: Same as previous response.

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

Commission assessment: Fewer number of days were spent in this form of activity in 2002 (1,882) than in 1999.

Campus response: The Honors Division and the Coppin-Rosemont Initiative have instituted extensive tracking and qualitative evaluation mechanisms to collect data on student participation in community outreach and service activities. In the future student data along with faculty data will be reported.

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

Commission assessment: The proportion of bachelor's degree recipients pursuing graduate study immediately after graduation has slipped from 44 percent to 27 percent in the past four surveys.

Campus response: Coppin McNair Scholars, a U.S. Department of Education-funded grant, helps Coppin to support low-income, first-generation college students and students who are underrepresented at the graduate level by providing funds for graduate school visits, national research conferences, seminars, and symposia, as well as for summer research experiences at local and out-of-state universities. Three McNair Scholars have received doctorates, and 33 have earned master's degrees since 1998.

Objective 7.1 – By FY 2004, allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target from 1.1 in FY 1999.

Commission assessment: The proportion spent on facility renewal has stayed at 1.3 percent in the past three years.

Campus response: In 2003, the expenditures on facility renewal increased.

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Objective 1.1 – Raise from 42 in 1999 to 60 in 2005 the annual number of graduates from IT programs.

Commission assessment: The number of graduates has risen from 42 to 50 in the three years of data provided in the report, but Frostburg remains quite short of its objective.

Campus response: In FY 2002, the university graduated 62 IT students, thereby exceeding its established objective. Based on the strong FY 2003 enrollments in IT fields offered by the university, it is expected that this upward trend in the number of Frostburg students graduating in IT related disciplines will continue in the future.

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

Commission assessment: The number of undergraduates completing teacher training at Frostburg has dropped steadily in the three years in which data were provided.

Campus response: Frostburg has seen a 16 percent increase in the number of enrollments in teacher education, which will likely translate to a greater number of teacher education program completers. As promising as this increase is, the College of Education at Frostburg has also taken specific steps to increase its program completers and graduates. All prospective education students take a career analysis in education, which gives them a thorough orientation to the requirements of the undergraduate education programs, including a practice Praxis test. Candidates then receive help in passing their Praxis I test through workshops, computer-based assistance, or workbooks. The Department of Educational Professions maintains multiple copies of the most frequently taken Praxis tests and loans them out to students. The department faculty also offer a seminar in Praxis II, in which they carefully alert students to the particular needs of the tests to be taken. They also coach them in when and how to approach the tests.

The College of Education has also been very active in promoting the development of Associate of Arts in Teaching degrees at community colleges, visiting its feeder schools regularly and maintaining close working relationships with community college faculty. The college was instrumental in developing a Praxis online course at Howard Community College. It is also involved in the Gear Up Grant that promotes college attendance for a cohort of high school students and has developed a program for middle

school students that encourages them to consider careers in math and science. The college hopes that from these initiatives future teachers will emerge.

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

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

Campus response: The university's contract with Allegany County, which established the Allegany Business Center at Frostburg, clearly stipulates that is the sole responsibility of the county to identify and attract companies to the Center. The county has contacted 24 firms since January 2002 regarding the potential of locating in the Center. However, the recent downturn in the nation's economy has made it difficult for Allegany County to attract companies to the Center. The county and the university remain optimistic regarding the future of the Center.

Objective 3.3 – Increase the second year retention rate of Frostburg undergraduates from 74.7 percent in 1998 to 80 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The second year retention rate was 75.1 percent in the most recent cohort – the lowest figure in the past four cohorts.

Campus response: The university is pleased to note that the second year retention rate for undergraduate students at the institution increased from 75.1 percent in FY 2002 to 78.8 percent in FY 2003. This rate is expected to reach 80 percent in FY 2005.

Objective 5.3 – Increase the number of programs awarded professional accreditation (e.g. NCATE and AACSB) from 2 in 1999 to 4 in 2005.

Commission assessment: No programs were awarded accreditation in 2000 and just one each in the past two years.

Campus response: The university has achieved its benchmark of earning four national program accreditations by FY 2005. In FY 2002, the university's education programs earned professional accreditation from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Other Frostburg programs to earn national accreditation are the masters in science in counseling, social work, and recreation and parks management. The university expects to exceed its benchmark in summer 2003 by earning accreditation for its collaborative engineering program with University of Maryland College Park from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. Finally, based on its five-year accreditation plan, the College of Business was awarded candidacy status in February 2001 by the Association to Advance Collegiate Study of Business International.

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY

Objective 1.6 – Increase the proportion of lower-division student credit hours taught by core faculty from 56 percent in 1998 to 67 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The proportion in the most recent year is 57 percent, noticeably short of the objective.

Campus response: This objective was established during a period when the State was attempting to fund the university at a level consistent with the Commission's funding guidelines. However, after the latest budget revisions, Salisbury's funding is significantly below its previous high of 83 percent of the guidelines. The university remains committed to this objective in principle with an additional 23 percent of lower-division courses taught by full-time, non tenure track faculty on renewable contracts. Salisbury has already added 39 new tenured/tenure track faculty positions, while an additional 18 positions at a cost of \$1.15 million are needed to achieve the benchmark. Given the resource allocation inequities in USM, the reduction in State financial support, fixed cost increases, physical size limitations of Salisbury classroom spaces, the elimination of 15 staff positions in order to absorb FY 2003 budget reversions, and future revenue reductions, Salisbury will not achieve this benchmark.

Objective 2.4 – The annual number of Salisbury graduates in Teacher Education will increase from 233 in 1999 to 285 in 2004.

Commission assessment: The number of Salisbury graduates in this field has been relatively flat during the past four years.

Campus response: Lacking adequate facilities and space to expand its teacher education programs, the university submitted its program justification for a new Teacher Education and Technology Complex (TETC) in 1998. Objective 2.4 was developed in that context. Had the project moved readily through the queue, TETC would have opened in fall 2002 or 2003 and the teacher education program expanded. However, planning money was not approved for TETC until FY 2004. Assuming the project remains on schedule, TETC may open by fall 2007. Until that time, enrollments and graduates are limited by facilities capacities.

Objective 3.1 – Increase the estimated number of Teacher Education graduates employed as teachers in Maryland from 145 in 1999 to 200 in 2004.

Commission assessment: While the number of Salisbury graduates who are working as teachers in Maryland has risen to 176 in the most recent year, the campus remains a distance from its objective.

Campus response: In addition to the points made in the response to the previous objective, Salisbury teacher education graduates are recruited from across the nation. Our graduates' life choices are influenced by the income levels and community appeal offered by Maryland localities. While many Maryland communities are attractive, they are not as financially competitive as other regions. As a result, the opportunities provided by non Maryland communities provide a powerful incentive to relocate.

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

Commission assessment: The percentage of these students at Salisbury has steadily dropped in the past three years to 40.9 percent.

Campus response: The same factors described in the response in Objective 1.6 also influence this objective, and the trend mirrors Salisbury's place in the funding guidelines and its eroding State resources. In essence, Salisbury students are financially supplementing the education of students at other Maryland institutions. As an example, St. Mary's College of Maryland has a nearly identical percentage of economically disadvantaged students but receives more than \$3,500 more per student from the State than does Salisbury. Nevertheless, because the university is committed to access, over \$400,000 of the new monies generated from tuition increases approved by the USM Board of Regents is devoted to financial aid.

Objective 4.5 – Increase the proportion of African-American undergraduates from 8 percent in 1998 to 10 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The percentage of African-American undergraduates has stayed relatively flat at Salisbury, with 7.8 percent in the most recent year.

Campus response: Salisbury University's percentage of African-American undergraduates increased to 8.4 percent in 2002 and is projected to increase to 9.1 percent in 2003. Although the benchmark may not be achieved by 2004, this objective is beginning to show progress because of President Dudley-Eshbach's diversity initiatives. This objective is negatively impacted by limited financial aid resources as described in the response to Objective 3.6. Additionally, in order to respond to the FY 2003 budget reversion, 15 positions have been or are being eliminated through reorganizational efficiencies. Two of these positions directly supported minority and diversity initiatives. Those responsibilities will be absorbed by other individuals or offices.

Objective 4.6 – Increase the proportion of minority undergraduates from 10.4 percent in 1998 to 13 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The percentage of minority undergraduates at Salisbury has been generally constant during the past four years, ranging from 10.6 percent to 11.6 percent.

Campus response: In 2002, Salisbury University increased its percentage of minority undergraduates to 12.6 percent. By fall 2003, minority enrollment is projected to reach 13.2 percent surpassing the benchmark.

Objective 5.1 – From a level of \$12.7 million in 1999, in the Campaign for Maryland raise \$18.5 million for Salisbury University by 2002.

Commission assessment: The amount of money raised for Campaign for Maryland has risen from \$12.7 million to \$14.7 million in the three years for which statistics were provided. Nonetheless, Salisbury remains a good distance from its objective.

Campus response: The assets reported previously for this objective reflected only earned dollars deposited directly into endowed accounts. The data were updated to reflect total gifts instead of endowed gifts. This change allowed Salisbury University to exceed the campaign goal of \$18.5 million in FY 2000. The gifts, pledges, and endowments totaled over \$22.5 million. Of this total, a major component (approximately \$6.5 million) was in the form of real property and a museum collection. Title to these assets was transferred to the university.

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

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

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

Objective 5.7 – Increase the proportion of administrative staff who earn salaries that are or above the 60th percentile of CUPA peers from 33 percent in 2000 to 55 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The proportion of Salisbury's administrative staff who earn salaries at this level increased to 38 percent in 2001 – but still far from its objective.

Campus response: Because of the competitive hiring of several academic deans, progress has been made to nearly the benchmark level. However, 15 administrative and staff positions have been or are being eliminated in order to respond to the FY 2003 budget reversions. Additional reductions are pending with no funded salary increases in both FY 2003 and FY 2004. Despite comparable deficits in other states, the majority of states continue to allocate funds for employee salary increases. As a result, not only will Salisbury fail to achieve this objective, but also the university will begin to reverse all gains.

TOWSON UNIVERSITY

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

Commission assessment: The number of Towson graduates hired by Maryland public schools in the most recent year has declined to 347.

Campus response: While Maryland State Department of Education statistics show that Towson still leads the State in numbers of graduates hired to teach in Maryland, the number dropped in the 2001-2002 academic year. We are uncertain as to why the number of Towson University graduates hired to teach in Maryland public schools was lower in FY 2003. The number hired, as reported by MSDE, seems inconsistent with enrollment and completion trends at Towson. We understand that other institutions in the State experienced similar drops. In any case, we see this as a temporary slowing of the university's progress toward meeting Objective 1.2 because enrollment in teacher education programs at Towson is on the rise. We expect to see corresponding increases in numbers of Towson graduates hired to teach in the State. The university offers special scholarships to attract and retain students in the teacher education programs. These awards are in addition to the Maryland Teacher Scholarship.

Objective 3.1 – Increase the percentage of minority undergraduate students from 15.3 in 2000 to 17 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The proportion of minority undergraduates has remained flat at 15 percent.

Campus response: Diversity is one of Towson University's highest priorities and enrolling and graduating students of color are among our most important goals. The second year retention rates for minority students at Towson increased from 85.2 percent (fall 1999 cohort) to 91.1 percent (fall 2001 cohort). We believe this trend will continue. As it happens, the percent minority in the total population will increase because new students of color who enroll will add to the total rather than replace those

who leave. We attribute this improvement to excellent support programs, improved financial aid, and an admissions strategy that utilizes research on graduation potential irrespective of SAT scores.

Objective 6.2 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target by 2005 from 1.8 percent in 1999.

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

Campus response: The figure reported in the 2002 performance accountability report (0.7 percent) is corrected to 1.2 percent. The decline is attributable to two items. First, funds were diverted to construct temporary job space in the Enrollment Services Building. Second, money was diverted from facility renewal to cover higher than anticipated utility costs.

Objective 6.3 – Decrease the cost of raising \$1 in private donations down from \$0.51 in 2000 to \$0.50 by 2004.

Commission assessment: The cost rose from \$0.51 to \$0.54 in 2001, the most recent year for which figures were supplied.

Campus response: Due to the challenging economic situation our fundraising revenue decreased by \$198,322 for the year.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

Objective 1.3 — ByFY 2004, increase scholarly productivity by at least 15 percent, increasing refereed publications per full-time faculty member to 6.2 from 5.4 in 1999.

Commission assessment: Refereed publications per full-time faculty member have been considerably lower in each of the years since 1999.

Campus response: Data reported for this indicator prior to 2001 have been judged to be erroneous. The objective has been modified to apply to the available data set as follows: “By FY 2004, increase scholarly productivity by at least 50 percent, increasing refereed publications per full-time faculty member to 3.1 from 2.1 in 2001.” The campus is making satisfactory progress towards the restated objective.

Objective 3.1 – By FY 2005, increase the number of graduates in health and human services professions in areas of State need (currently nursing and pharmacy) by 20 percent to 453 from 376 in 2001.

Commission assessment: The number of graduates in these fields has fluctuated within a narrow range between 376 and 399 during the past four years.

Campus response: The campus is making satisfactory progress toward the objective, awarding degrees to 432 students for FY 2003. Based on the numbers of students currently enrolled or admitted into these programs, the objective will be attained by FY 2005.

Objective 5.1 – By FY 2004, ensure that the high average number of days that faculty spend in public service with Maryland’s governments, businesses, schools and communities is maintained at least at the 1999 level of 23.2 days per full-time faculty member.

Commission assessment: The number of days that UMB faculty spend in public service has dropped dramatically in each of the years since 1999.

Campus response: Data reported for this statistic prior to 2001 have been judged to be erroneous. The objective has been modified to apply to the available data set as follows: “By FY 2004, increase the number of days that faculty spend in public service with Maryland’s governments, businesses, schools and communities to 17.0 days per full-time faculty member from 9.1 days per faculty member in 2000.” The campus is making satisfactory progress towards the restated objective.

Objective 5.2 – By FY 2004, establish at least 20 high-speed telecommunications network sites to enhance access to diagnostic and clinical follow-up services to underserved populations in Maryland from 7 in 1999.

Commission assessment: While the number of telemedicine sites has increased from 7 to 13 in the past four years, UMB remains quite short of its objective.

Campus response: The campus believes it is making satisfactory progress toward the objective.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY

Objective 2.4 – Increase the number of jobs created through UMBC's Technology Center and Research Park from 182 in FY 1998 to 500 in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: While there has been a steady increase in the number of jobs created in the past four years from 289 to 370, UMBC remains quite short of its objective.

Campus response: Through our Technology Center and Research Park, we have created 461 jobs in FY 2003, and with groundbreaking for a new multi-tenant building in the Research Park scheduled for August 2003, we expect to achieve our target of 500 by FY 2005.

Objective 3.2 – Increase the percentage of African-American undergraduate students from 16 percent in FY 1998 to 18 percent in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: The proportion of African-American undergraduates has been flat at 16 percent during the past four years.

Campus response: Although the numbers of African-American undergraduates at UMBC have risen from 1,394 to 1,444 over the past six years, the overall growth in African-American student enrollment has not resulted in significant progress toward the 2004 objective of 18 percent. Three enrollment trends are interacting to produce this result: (1) the percentage of African-American students among new freshmen is lower than among transfer students; (2) new freshmen enrollments have increased 6.9 percent since 1998, whereas new transfer enrollments have remained steady; and (3) the percentage of African-American students among new freshmen has decreased since 1998. Thus, despite the fact that UMBC is enrolling large numbers of African-American undergraduates, enrollment is growing even faster among other groups, most notably Asian Americans (up 33.6 percent since 1998).

Objective 4.1 – Increase the retention rate of UMBC undergraduates from 82.9 percent in 1998 to 85 percent or greater in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: The second year retention rate of UMBC undergraduates was 82.4 percent in the most recent cohort, and it did not exceed 84.2 percent in the past four cohorts.

Campus response: This year there has been a marked improvement in the second year retention rate, from 82.4 percent last year to a new high of 87.5 percent.

Objective 4.2 – Increase the graduation rate of UMBC undergraduates from 54.2 percent in FY 1998 to 65 percent in FY 2004

Commission assessment: The six-year graduation rate of UMBC undergraduates was 59.5 percent in the most recent cohort, and it did not exceed 60.1 percent in the past four cohorts.

Campus response: It is difficult to estimate the impact of factors such as the general state of the economy and the recent mid-year tuition increases on the most recent graduation rate, but with reduced support from the State and additional tuition increases forthcoming, it is difficult to be optimistic about our ability to meet the previously stated target of 65 percent in the foreseeable future.

Despite the negative influence of factors outside the university's control, we are encouraged by several positive indicators suggesting that our long-term strategies are working. Because of UMBC's fairly small program inventory, significant numbers of students are lost to other institutions, reducing our six-year graduation rate. One strategy, therefore, has been to increase our academic program offerings. These are described in Vol. 2 of the performance accountability report. Another approach to improving our retention and graduation rates has been implementation of several recommendations of the Task Force on UMBC as an Honors University. Some of these new initiatives are designed to increase student engagement with an expected positive effect on both retention and graduation. Last year, we offered the inaugural series of First Year Seminars: small, topically focused courses taught by core faculty. In the Faculty Mentor Program, core faculty spend at least 10 hours per month in the residence halls where they interact informally with students. The program has also recently been extended to commuting students. We have enhanced academic advising for students through placement of four full-time academic advisors within our largest academic programs and through development of powerful user-friendly new software that provides faculty and staff advisors with tools to examine students' strengths, weaknesses, and progress toward degree.

Objective 4.5 – Increase total research and development expenditures as reported by the National Science Foundation from \$18.2 million in FY 1998 to \$42 million in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: While total R&D expenditures have increased to \$29.6 million in the past four years at UMBC, the campus remains quite short of its objective.

Campus response: Faculty have generated unprecedented growth in expenditures for research and development. This trend is influenced by the existence of two large research centers at UMUC (Joint Center for Earth Systems Technology and Goddard Earth Sciences and Technology Center), both established through cooperative agreements with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Objective 4.12 – Move toward public research peer institution average in ratio of FTE students to full-time faculty from 24.6:1 in FY 2000 to 23:1 in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: UMBC's ratio of FTE students to full-time faculty has increased since FY 2000 to 25.8:1.

Campus response: The ratio of FTE students to core faculty is broadly accepted as an indicator of the quality of undergraduate education, and in this regard UMBC lags behind its peers. Since 1998, the ratio has risen, as non tenure track faculty and part-time faculty have been recruited to meet the course demands created by increasing enrollment, within the constraints of current resources. In order to reduce the ratio from its current value of 25.8 and to reach the 2004 goal of 23, UMBC would need to recruit core faculty at a rate higher than the rate of growth in the numbers of students. With UMBC's current enrollment, it would take an additional 42 faculty members to achieve our target ratio of 23. Although the present target was actually achieved in FY 1997 and 1998, UMBC's recent growth in enrollment, coupled with the 1999 USM retirement incentives and today's fiscal climate, leaves us short of our target and without the resources needed to achieve it.

Objective 6.2 – Allocate expenditures on facility renewal to meet 2 percent target by FY 2004 from 0.8 percent in FY 1998.

Commission assessment: UMBC has remained at 0.8 percent in three of the past four years and has not exceeded 0.9 percent.

Campus response: UMBC continues to invest in its present physical plant, with an increase this year to 1.2 percent of expenditures devoted to facilities renewal. Unfortunately, drastic cuts to this budget for FY 2004 will make it impossible for us to achieve our 2 percent target on this objective.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

Objective 1.4 – Increase total research and development expenditures, as reported by the National Science Foundation, from \$216 million in FY 1997 to \$310 million in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: While total R&D expenditures at UMCP have reached \$267 million in the most recent year, the university remains noticeably short of its objective.

Campus response: The FY 2003 data show that UMCP has surpassed the goal of \$310 million. Despite the recent national economic downturn, we anticipate that federal

support for research and development will continue to grow, while state support will most likely decrease.

The university continues to place competitively among national peers and fellow members of the American Association of Universities (AAU), an association of leading research universities in the country. While the total R&D expenditures per institution are adjusted by taking out medical program expenditures, UMCP places 13th among all AAUs. These adjusted figures again place UMCP well in front of two of our five highly regarded peer institutions, University of North Carolina and University of California at Los Angeles. UMCP's FY 2001 federal R&D (\$145 million) exhibits a 6 percent increase over the FY 2000 figure and a 41 percent increase over FY 1997.

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

Commission assessment: UMCP remained at 0.9 percent in three of the past four years.

Campus response: As a result of budget reductions in the State and long-time neglect, the progress toward goals in facilities renewal at UMCP has slowed. The university is falling further behind each year with a current estimate of \$464 million in renewal funds needed for buildings over 20 years old. At this point in time, the flagship university does not have the corresponding infrastructure of a top tier institution. We have long-term goals that make deferred maintenance a high priority. However, in the current fiscal year, the university is not in a financial position to increase facilities renewal and may be faced with the possibility of further reductions.

Objective 2.1 – Increase the percentage of undergraduate students participating in campus-based living and learning programs, research activities, internships, independent study experiences, study abroad, or special projects with off-campus institutions from 49 percent in 1998 to 80 percent by 2004.

Commission assessment: While the percentage of undergraduates taking part in these programs has steadily increased at UMCP to 64 percent in the most recent year, the university is quite short of its objective.

Campus response: University of Maryland, College Park continues its innovative efforts to enhance the educational experiences for all UMCP students. Living/learning programs combine rigorous academic experiences with the benefits of a common residence, allowing students with similar academic interests to live together and learn from each other both in and out of the classroom. The Hinman Campus Entrepreneurial Opportunities Program, a unique partnership between the Robert H. Smith School of Business and the A. James Clark School of Engineering, continues to thrive, bringing together students interested in entrepreneurship. Beyond the Classroom is a living/learning program that is dedicated to helping upper level students

obtain significant research opportunities, internships, and community service opportunities on campus and in the greater Washington, DC area. It is the first UMCP program specifically designed for upper-class students and open to all students in good academic standing. It is also the first living/learning program housed in a building run by a public/private partnership. Programs that have been put in place in the last few years will be showing benefits in the coming year's cohort. Despite budget constraints, we continue to work toward our objective of 80 percent participation.

Objective 2.3 – Increase the percentage of UMCP minority undergraduate students from 33 percent in 2000 to 35 percent by 2004.

Commission assessment: The percentage of minority undergraduates at UMCP has steadily fallen in the past four years from 33.1 percent to 31.7 percent.

Campus response: One of the significant factors of success for the university is the diversity of the student body. In Fall 2003, 31.9 percent of our undergraduate population was comprised of students of color, which represents a 1.2 percent decline from Fall 2000; African-American students represented 13.8 percent of the undergraduate student body in Fall 2000 and 12.3 percent in Fall 2003. During the same period, we have observed a decline in the percentage of students who identified their race as "White:U.S." (from 59.2 percent to 59.1 percent), and an increase in the percentage of students who identified their race as "Unknown:U.S." (from 4.8 percent to 6.7 percent). We have begun to analyze this phenomenon with the objective of determining its cause(s) and appropriate responses.

Total enrollment is a function of both recruitment and retention. The university has experienced success in the retention of minority students, but still faces challenges in the area of recruitment. While fewer, but more talented, students of color are enrolling at Maryland, we are committed to continuing to build upon our previous success in promoting the diversity of the student population. Toward that end, the university has developed a broad array of activities, programs, and strategies to attract, recruit, admit, and enroll students of color. A few of these are highlighted below.

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

- The purchase of student names through the PSAT Student Search Service has allowed our Admissions office to increase the percentage of students of color that will be targeted for recruitment.

- The Multicultural College and Career Conference held in June had a 20 percent increase in the number of student attendees from the previous year.
- This year, bus transportation to the campus Visit Maryland program was expanded to include two additional schools in communities that are primarily populated by minorities.
- Participation in evening receptions in Baltimore City and Prince George's County continue to be successful with increasing levels of participation.
- Each of the overnight programs held in conjunction with the admitted student open house programs continue to be filled to capacity.

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

Some of these programs involve expanding and capitalizing upon the university's involvement in surrounding communities. As an example, the university is particularly proud of its success with the new Baltimore Incentive Awards Program. This program combines all aspects of the university's commitment to diversity - service to the community, support and assistance to high school students in largely minority communities, and an open door to a first-class university. The program not only provides deserving students with a college education, but also focuses on citizenship skills such as leadership, critical thinking, and character development.

Other outreach programs target newly admitted students and address their special circumstances. Many of the pre-freshman programs do double-duty in that they not only give new students assistance, but also expose them to disciplines that traditionally have less diversity, such as science and engineering. The university has made great efforts and huge strides in enticing students of colors at both graduate and undergraduate levels into many scientific areas. For example, the Center for Minorities in Science and Engineering in the School of Engineering has been very successful in serving both current and prospective students. For another example, the recruitment and mentoring programs in the Department of Mathematics in the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences (CMPS), recently graduated three African-American women with doctorates in mathematics - an unprecedented accomplishment in higher education. The university intends to learn from these programs as it explores opportunities to expand and to replicate them.

The university has a strong history of dedication to increasing the retention and graduation rates of students of color. Programs and activities provided by the university generally are of two types. Some provide academic assistance, guidance, and support, such as the work of the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Education, and the Academic

Achievement Program, the Center for Minorities in Science and Engineering, and the Honors Program. Other programs, such as those in the College of Life Sciences and the NABJ Institute in the School of Journalism, facilitate entry into academic disciplines and provide practical experiences for the students. As another example, CMPS has also implemented the STAND program to address the need to increase the number of underrepresented groups in the computer, earth, mathematical and physical sciences. (We are pleased to note that one of the STAND programs had just received a national award.)

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

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

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

Primarily for students: Multicultural Involvement and Community Advocacy (MICA) is a unit in the Office of Campus Programs committed to the creation and maintenance of a campus environment where diversity is valued; identity and culture are affirmed; and individuals feel free to express themselves. MICA has a dual role of empowering and advocating on behalf of minority students and educating majority students to the value and benefits of multiculturalism and diversity. MICA encourages and supports student involvement in culturally specific student organizations and promotes cross cultural involvement opportunities for all students. MICA is directed by a full-time employee in the Office of Campus Programs, and is also supported by a graduate assistant. In an effort to support leadership and organizational development within the African American student community, the Union and Campus Programs staff provide advice to and mentor the leadership of the Black Student Union, the Pan Hellenic

Council, B.A.N. (Black Alliance Network [of student organizations]), the College Park (student) Chapter of the NAACP, and other smaller groups.

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

UM is currently a place where minority students are succeeding. The retention and graduation rates of our minority population are the highest in university history. UM enrolls a higher number *and proportion* of African American students than our peers. We are also one of the non-Historically Black Institutions recognized nationally as awarding a high number of degrees to African American students. We are proud of these successes and take seriously the challenge and the opportunity to maintain the university as an educational community to which students of all races are attracted and in which a richly diverse student body will prosper. In that connection, we recognize that enrollment goals are a function of both recruitment and retention; we will continue to monitor and to address the outcomes of our efforts.

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

Commission assessment: The percentage of African-American undergraduates at UMCP has steadily dropped in the past four years from 14.2 percent to 12.4 percent.

Campus response: Same as previous response.

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

Commission assessment: The total annual giving from all sources was \$73 million in the most recent year.

Campus response: Most recent data show that the total annual giving from all sources was \$81 million in FY 2003. Our alumni are loyal and the number of donors continues to increase as the reputation and quality of the university increases. The funds provided through alumni have remained stable. With economic hardships that have touched the lives of people all over the State, private philanthropy has declined. The university expects a slight decline in the total annual giving for FY 2003 but remains hopeful that the total annual giving will increase in the next few years.

Objective 4.1 – Increase the estimated number of UMCP baccalaureate-level graduates of IT programs employed in Maryland from 187 in 2000 to 350 in 2004.

Commission assessment: Although the estimated number of UMCP bachelor's degree recipients in IT programs employed in Maryland increased to 231 in the most recent year, the University remains distant from its objective.

Campus response: At the time this objective for IT was set, the State demonstrated a commitment to producing graduates in IT fields. MAITI was a state initiative that brought together several higher education institutions with a commitment to recruit students to IT fields, to educate them in high quality programs, and to work towards improving the pool of IT graduates to meet state workforce needs. Due to the current economic crisis and changes in state priorities, MAITI is no longer funded by the State and has been eliminated. Furthermore, the recent downturn of the IT industry has resulted in fewer students entering IT related majors. Without the support and funding of the State, Objective 4.1 may not be realized. The number of undergraduate students enrolling in IT fields has dropped by more than 300 in the most recent year. Despite the bleak context, the university continues its commitment to maintain high quality programs in IT. The university has increased the number of graduate level students from 671 in 1999 to 788 in 2002.

Objective 4.4 – Increase the number of students enrolled in UMCP courses delivered off campus or through distance education from 3,104 in FY 1998 to 3,500 in FY 2004.

Commission assessment: The number of students enrolled in these courses has been relatively flat during the past four years. In the most recent year, there were 3,072 students attending off campus or via distance learning – far from UMCP's objective.

Campus response: Fall 2003 data show that UMCP has surpassed the goal of 3,500. One of our objectives is to meet the needs of students in the State by increasing the number of students enrolled in courses delivered off campus and through targeted distance education. Factoring in the enrollments for FY 2003, the university has increased the number of students enrolling in distance education and off campus by 19 percent in the last four years, due in large measure to our participation in programs at the universities at Shady Grove.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE

Objective 1.1 – Increase the percentage of first generation students from 20 percent in 1999 to 25 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The proportion of first generation students has remained relatively constant during the past four years.

Campus response: The current economic climate has been especially difficult for first generation families who are often hardest hit by the decline in the economy and the increases in tuition. Minimal change in this statistic through 2005 is anticipated.

Objective 1.3 – Increase the number of students enrolled in programs delivered off campus or through distance learning from 98 in 1999 to 400 in 2004.

Commission assessment: While the number of students enrolled in these programs has nearly doubled to 177, UMES remains a long way from its objective.

Campus response: The number of students enrolled in programs delivered off campus or through distance learning is expected to continue to grow with estimated growth realized by 2005. New programs have been initiated at Chesapeake College, and there is enrollment growth in the human ecology program currently housed there. In addition, there is increased enrollment at the Shady Grove off campus site.

Objective 3.3 – Increase the second year retention rate for African-Americans from 76 percent in 1999 to 81 percent in 2004.

Commission assessment: The second year retention rate of African-American students has remained flat during the past four cohorts.

Campus response: Although the second year retention rate of African-American students has stabilized during the past four years, the current rate is consistent with similar institutions in the State. The impact of tuition increases over the last year has also impacted family ability to pay. With anticipated continued increases in tuition, the estimate for 2004-2005 will be revised to reflect new expectations in this area.

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

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

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

Campus response: While historical circumstances and a mission oriented to serving a predominantly African-American urban center are major factors affecting the University's student body composition, Morgan is placing special emphasis on attracting a more racially-diverse student body. The results are most apparent at the graduate level, where the University is giving priority to program development. At that level, 31% of students are of a race other than African-American, compared to 8% at the undergraduate level. Twelve percent of all graduate students are white, compared to 1% at the undergraduate level.

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

Commission assessment: While the number of partnerships with Baltimore City schools has increased from 25 to 33 in the past four years, Morgan remains quite short of its objective.

Campus response: Morgan did not address this issue in its report.

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

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

Campus response: As part of the university's commitment to continually build upon the strength of its undergraduate programs and enhance its advanced degree curriculum, Morgan State University places emphasis on attracting and retaining the most qualified faculty available. As part of this effort, Morgan endeavors to provide a very

competitive compensation package to its faculty. The campus is making the transition to a doctoral/research-intensive institution. Faculty salaries at these campuses on the average are considerably higher than are those in Morgan's current category.

Objective 4.2 – Increase the number of doctoral degrees awarded to 25 by 2005, from 5 in 1999.

Commission assessment: Morgan awarded 13 doctoral degrees in the most recent year – more than double the number in 1999 but still far from its objective.

Campus response: Continued development of its existing graduate programs and the implementation of a select group of new programs, most of which would not be offered on any other campus, will assist in attracting a more diverse group of students similar to during the 1960s and early 1970s, when the campus had a unique role in the Baltimore area.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

Objective 2.3 – By 2005, increase by 10 percent (not percentage points) compared to 2000 the proportion of faculty and administrative staff from each of the following groups: African-Americans, all racial/ethnic minorities, and women.

Commission assessment: The composition of African-Americans and women among the full-time executive/managerial staff at St. Mary's has declined in the past four years, while the proportion of minorities has dropped in the last three.

Campus response: St. Mary's College of Maryland is small with a relatively small number of executive/managerial positions. Turnover in these positions is infrequent; however, when a managerial position becomes available, the college pursues every opportunity to attract minority candidates – even holding positions open for an extended period of time. Our efforts to recruit minority candidates do not always meet with success, however. Feedback obtained from minority candidates indicates that St. Mary's is at a disadvantage in recruiting such candidates for a variety of reasons: the college's remote rural setting, the lack of local cultural events of interest to African Americans and other minorities, and the lack of local job opportunities for spouses and significant others. In addition, we have found that minority employees sometimes leave St. Mary's to continue with graduate studies or to obtain a better paying job.

In short, it is very difficult to recruit and retain African-American and other minority executive and managerial employees. Even so, our EEO/AA officer (an African-American man) and our director of personnel (a white woman) regularly meet with search committees to advise them on ways to attract minority candidates. St. Mary's 2002 Minority Achievement Report presents a detailed listing of 17 strategies used by

St. Mary's to recruit and retain minority employees. Among these are the placement of an annual institutional display advertisement, listing all faculty positions for which searches are being conducted in *Black Issues in Higher Education*, the placement of position-specific advertisements in relevant disciplinary journals and newsletters directed toward minority faculty, the sending of announcements of faculty positions to predominately minority graduate institutions, and appointments to search committees that reflect the gender, racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty.

In terms of women, the percentage of full-time executive/managerial women increased in FY 2003, and the college hopes to recruit and retain additional women at the executive/managerial levels once the State emerges from its budgetary crisis. The president of St. Mary's College is a woman as is the vice president for business and finance.

Objective 9.3 – By 2004, increase giving by graduates to the College to 30 percent from 22 percent in 2001.

Commission assessment: The proportion of alumni who contribute has remained flat at 22 percent for the past four years.

Campus response: The difficult economic times of recent years have had a negative impact nationally on contributions to charities and other worthy causes. St. Mary's College of Maryland has managed to maintain, and even increase, its giving rate through these difficult times: the 2002 figures are up by 4 percent. This most recent increase reflects, in part, the transition to the public phase of our Heritage Campaign fundraising efforts. It also reflects a refinement of our fundraising strategies; we are focusing on increasing young alumni participation and segmenting the alumni population into affinity groups to improve our fundraising efforts.



ONE PAGE PROFILES

**ALL PUBLIC COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES**

ONE-PAGE PROFILES

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

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

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

Community Colleges

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

Public Four-Year Institutions

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

ALLEGANY COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 3,401 | 3,355 | 3,499 | 3,864 | 3,418 |
| Noncredit students | 6,946 | 6,464 | 7,442 | 6,268 | 6,951 |
| Market share of county population | 49.0% | 50.7% | 51.7% | 53.4% | 50.5% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 61.6% | 60.9% | 63.9% | 61.6% | 62.1% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 Cohort |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 37.5% | 36.8% | 39.8% | 33.6% | 38.0% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 23.9% | 35.7% | 44.5% | 27.2% | 34.7% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 91% | 93% | 96% | | 90% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 72% | 82% | 82% | | 80% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 92% | 92% | 77% | | 87% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 85% | 92% | 87% | | 88% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Fall 2003 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 4.4% | 5.8% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 5.5% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | 6.3% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 6.3% | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | Benchmark 2006 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions | 59.6% | 58.5% | 55.6% | 50.3% | 57.9% |

| Performance Indicator | AY 1998-1999 | AY 1999-2000 | AY 2000-2001 | AY 2001-2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year | 2.81 | 2.86 | 2.69 | 3.02 | 2.73 |

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 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 18,126 | 18,375 | 17,256 | 19,154 | 20,800 |
| Noncredit students | 30,221 | 32,099 | 34,832 | 38,015 | 35,000 |
| Market share of county population | 60.5% | 58.7% | 58.9% | 59.8% | 60.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 68.1% | 69.1% | 70.3% | 71.4% | 73.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 38.3% | 33.6% | 36.7% | 37.7% | 38.7% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority students w/in four yrs | 27.7% | 19.6% | 25.9% | 28.8% | 30.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 96% | 96% | 94% | | 96% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 18.2% | 18.6% | 21.1% | 20.4% | 22.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 18.8% | | | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | AY 1998-1999 | AY 2000 | 1999 AY 2001 | 2000 AY 2001-2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|--|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty | 66.8% | 66.3% | 68.2% | 66.7% | 66.0% |
| Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year | 2.68 | 2.80 | 2.84 | 2.79 | 2.80 |
| Number of participants in contract training | 44,609 | 42,180 | 47,527 | 46,073 | 45,000 |

BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Baltimore City Community College's mission is to educate and train a world-class workforce for Baltimore. With more than 20,000 credit and non-credit students enrolled at one of two main campuses or 85 off-campus sites, the College has the highest market share of Baltimore City residents enrolled in higher education as undergraduates in Maryland. Thirty-nine associate degree career programs are offered, eight associate degree transfer programs, and a range of non-credit training courses and programs with special emphasis in the career areas of health science, business, and information technology. Ninety-three percent of career program graduates are employed or continuing their education.

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 8,724 | 8,866 | 8,767 | 9,754 | 9,230 |
| Noncredit students | 7,113 | 8,895 | 12,474 | 12,824 | 15,000 |
| Market share of county population | 30.6% | 30.4% | 30.0% | 31.7% | 32.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 55.4% | 45.0% | 51.4% | 53.5% | 60.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 15.7% | 13.1% | 13.1% | 13.5% | 18.0% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 13.8% | 11.0% | 12.0% | 13.2% | 18.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 88% | 88% | 90% | | 90% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 90.7% | 91.0% | 91.2% | 91.3% | 90.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | | | | |

CARROLL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 3,444 | 3,402 | 3,515 | 3,747 | 3,650 |
| Noncredit students | 6,897 | 7,581 | 7,688 | 7,405 | 9,000 |
| Market share of county population | 45% | 46% | 47% | 47% | 48% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 69% | 69% | 68% | 69% | 70% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 35% | 35% | 40% | 38% | 42% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 29% | 0% | 15% | 44% | 33% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 93% | 96% | 99% | | 96% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 3.9% | 4.8% | 5.5% | 6.3% | 6.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | | 4.6% | | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark FY2005 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| Number of businesses and organizations served in contract training | | | 76 | 63 | 100 |
| Number of participants in contract training | | | 5,663 | 4,882 | 6,000 |

| | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark FY 2005 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Enrollment in workforce development courses | | | 6,907 | 6,344 | 7,500 |

CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 1,900 | 1,905 | 1,956 | 2,190 | 2,600 |
| Noncredit students | 5,142 | 4,660 | 4,885 | 4,951 | 5,363 |
| Market share of county population | 66% | 65% | 65% | 64% | 67% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 54% | 57% | 54% | 55% | 57% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 32% | 28% | 27% | 23% | 28% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 14% | 16% | 22% | 18% | 17% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 95% | 94% | 94% | | 90% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 6.6% | 7.5% | 10.1% | 10.9% | 10.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 6.0% | | | |

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 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 3,016 | 3,083 | 2,997 | 3,140 | 3,414 |
| Noncredit students | 9,355 | 11,674 | 11,423 | 11,342 | 12,000 |
| Market share of county population | 57.0% | 55.0% | 53.0% | 53.0% | 58.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 63% | 62% | 61% | 68% | 65% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 44% | 34% | 43% | 34% | 39% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 24% | 31% | 33% | 20% | 27% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 91% | 96% | 90% | | 95% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Fall 2003 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 16.0% | 18.0% | 20.0% | 19.0% | 20.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 18.0% | 18.0% | 18.0% | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | FY 1998 | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2005 Benchmark |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Senior adult enrollments in non-credit courses | 5,781 | 7,733 | 7,927 | 7,122 | 7,800 |
| Percentage of expenditures on instruction | 46% | 49% | 50% | 51% | 50% |

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

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 26,948 | 26,685 | 26,606 | 27,892 | 28,000 |
| Noncredit students | 49,801 | 45,835 | 46,393 | 47,168 | 48,600 |
| Market share of county population | 51% | 49% | 50% | 49% | 52% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 66% | 59% | 65% | 66% | 67% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 31% | 27% | 29% | 27% | 31% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 21% | 18% | 20% | 21% | 25% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 95% | 96% | 94% | | 95% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 29.0% | 30.0% | 31.0% | 33.0% | 33.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 23.0% | | | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | Benchmark 2006 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at Maryland public four-year institutions | 47.0% | 47.5% | 48.2% | 45.1% | 50.0% |

| | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2006 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Percent minorities of full-time faculty | 11.4% | 12.9% | 13.3% | 15.0% | 15.0% |
| Percent minorities full-time executive/managerial staff | 18.7% | 22.0% | 25.5% | 29.0% | 28.0% |

COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 8,688 | 8,568 | 9,123 | 9,824 | 9,700 |
| Noncredit students | 7,581 | 7,445 | 7,949 | 8,580 | 7,825 |
| Market share of county population | 58% | 60% | 59% | 59% | 60% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 68% | 77% | 68% | 67% | 71% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 48% | 37% | 43% | 42% | 42% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 34% | 21% | 26% | 27% | 27% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 94% | 98% | 91% | | 95% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 68% | 80% | 80% | | 81% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 78% | 84% | 71% | | 82% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | Missing | 100% | 83% | | 96% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 19.9% | 21.4% | 23.3% | 24.4% | 24.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 22.0% | 22.0% | 22.0% | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2006 Benchmark |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions | 58.5% | 54.2% | 55.2% | 53.8% | 58.0% |

| Performance Indicator | FY 1998 | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2005 Benchmark |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Passing rate: NCLEX - First time testing (MD Board of Nursing) | 90% | 94% | 94% | 88% | 92% |
| Percentage of expenditures on instruction | 41% | 44% | 46% | 46% | 48% |

FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 6,757 | 6,942 | 7,098 | 6,797 | 7,636 |
| Noncredit students | 6,286 | 7,426 | 8,090 | 7,603 | 9,357 |
| Market share of county population | 61% | 59% | 61% | 58% | 61% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 71% | 69% | 70% | 67% | 71% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 40% | 41% | 38% | 37% | 41% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 30% | 19% | 31% | 25% | 41% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 93% | 95% | 96% | | 95% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 15.0% | 16.5% | 16.6% | 15.0% | 19.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 10.8% | 10.8% | 11.0% | |

GARRETT COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 849 | 864 | 874 | 822 | 909 |
| Noncredit students | 1,799 | 2,150 | 2,209 | 2,810 | 2,200 |
| Market share of county population | 54% | 54% | 53% | 51% | 54% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 56% | 65% | 62% | 66% | 65% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 30% | 29% | 35% | 35% | 35% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 14% | 0% | 8% | 11% | 12% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 96% | 91% | 88% | | 90% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 67% | 85% | 75% | | 75% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 100% | 78% | 69% | | 75% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 90% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 4.7% | 4.5% | 5.4% | 6.2% | 2.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 1.0% | | | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | AY 1998-1999 | AY 1999-2000 | AY 2000-2001 | AY 2001-2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty | 57% | 58% | 61% | 64% | 58% |
| Academic performance at institutions of transfer: GPA after 1st year | 2.82 | 2.94 | 2.90 | 2.98 | 2.87 |

| | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | Benchmark 2006 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Tuition and fees as a % of tuition and fees at MD public four-year institutions | 54% | 53% | 54% | 49% | 53% |

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 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 3,756 | 3,755 | 3,747 | 3,883 | 4,200 |
| Noncredit students | 7,867 | 8,555 | 9,282 | 9,895 | 10,270 |
| Market share of county population | 60% | 60% | 60% | 59% | 61% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 64% | 65% | 62% | 66% | 64% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 35% | 51% | 42% | 40% | 42% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 27% | 39% | 24% | 28% | 28% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 95% | 95% | 93% | | 95% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 75% | 85% | 83% | | 85% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 86% | 77% | 68% | | 80% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 81% | 100% | 100% | | 95% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 10.0% | 10.0% | 9.0% | 9.9% | 11.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 10.5% | 10.5% | 10.0% | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Percent of students transferring to Maryland public four-year institutions | 19% | 23% | 17% | 21% | 21% |

| Performance Indicator | FY 1998 | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2005 Benchmark |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Senior adult enrollment in non-credit courses | 2,467 | 2,907 | 3,640 | 4,362 | 4,000 |

HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Harford Community College provides high quality, accessible and affordable educational opportunities and services, including university transfer, career, developmental and continuing education programs, to more than 20,000 Harford County residents every year. The college offers a variety of course formats at both the 331-acre main campus in Bel Air and at other locations throughout the county, including day and evening courses, weekend courses, and an ever-increasing selection of online courses.

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 6,775 | 6,629 | 6,817 | 7,420 | 6,800 |
| Noncredit students | 16,268 | 14,950 | 15,096 | 16,391 | 17,000 |
| Market share of county population | 56% | 56% | 57% | 57% | 56% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 67% | 67% | 68% | 69% | 68% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 33% | 39% | 37% | 33% | 36% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 15% | 22% | 18% | 17% | 30% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | Benchmark 2006 |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 93% | 94% | 94% | | 95% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | Benchmark 2006 |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 80% | 83% | 81% | | 80% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 82% | 68% | 78% | | 85% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 100% | 95% | 100% | | 95% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 13% | 14% | 14% | 15% | 14% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 13.0% | 13% | 13% | |

HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Howard Community College creates an environment that inspires learning and the lifelong pursuit of personal and professional goals. The college provides open access and innovative learning systems to respond to the ever-changing needs and interests of a diverse and dynamic community. As a vital partner, HCC is a major force in the intellectual, cultural and economic life of its community.

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 7,902 | 7,992 | 8,406 | 9,012 | 9,462 |
| Noncredit students | 12,513 | 12,766 | 12,568 | 13,690 | 13,530 |
| Market share of county population | 44.2% | 45.5% | 44.0% | 44.3% | 45.5% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 67.1% | 67.9% | 71.8% | 70.4% | 68.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 37.9% | 34.0% | 37.0% | 37.3% | 37.3% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 27.3% | 28.6% | 32.8% | 29.4% | 34.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 93% | 98% | 96% | | 98% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 79% | 81% | 82% | | 83% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 82% | 85% | 84% | | 86% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 82% | 100% | 91% | | 90% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 29.8% | 30.7% | 31.7% | 32.2% | 29.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | 23.9% | 22.3% | 22.3% | 22.3% | |

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 30,722 | 32,159 | 33,198 | 32,580 | 36,000 |
| Noncredit students | 10,742 | 12,072 | 13,227 | 14,562 | 19,896 |
| Market share of county population | 54.8% | 53.9% | 54.5% | 5470.0% | 55.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 66.0% | 64.7% | 68.9% | 69.6% | 66.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 32.4% | 30.9% | 27.3% | 28.5% | 33.5% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 31.0% | 29.8% | 23.9% | 26.0% | 33.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 94% | 97% | 96% | | 95% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 48.4% | 48.6% | 50.3% | 50.7% | 50.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 31.7% | | | |

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 18,253 | 18,025 | 17,757 | 19,013 | 21,904 |
| Noncredit students | 16,569 | 17,100 | 18,481 | 19,584 | 19,883 |
| Market share of county population | 42.5% | 40.6% | 40.0% | 40.3% | 45.6% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 60.5% | 60.0% | 60.2% | 57.2% | 73.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 21.5% | 28.5% | 23.1% | 22.0% | 35.0% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 17.1% | 24.7% | 22.1% | 19.7% | 33.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 99% | 97% | 95% | | 100% |

| Performance Indicator | 1996 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with transfer preparation | 89% | 76% | 85% | | 90% |
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 99% | 97% | 70% | | 100% |
| Employer satisfaction with CC graduates | 92% | 100% | 100% | | 100% |

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 81.0% | 83.0% | 83.0% | 86.8% | 73.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | | 73.0% | 64.6% | |

| Campus-Specific Performance Indicator | AY 1998-1999 | AY 1999-2000 | AY 2000-2001 | AY 2001-2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Market share of recent public high school grads in cnty | 47.1% | 47.0% | 48.8% | 48.6% | 56.4% |

WOR-WIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2004-2005 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| Enrollment: | | | | | |
| Credit students | 2,834 | 2,857 | 3,280 | 3,946 | 3,850 |
| Noncredit students | 6,395 | 6,464 | 7,042 | 6,299 | 7,000 |
| Market share of county population | 47.0% | 48.0% | 51.0% | 51.0% | 52.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | Benchmark 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 65.0% | 62.0% | 67.0% | 55.0% | 68.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | Benchmark 2001 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Transfer/Graduation rate within four years | 36.0% | 37.0% | 33.0% | 37.0% | 38.0% |
| Transfer/Grad rate of minority Students w/in four yrs | 31.0% | 10.0% | 19.0% | 31.0% | 28.0% |

| Performance Indicator | 1994 Follow-up Survey | 1998 Follow-up Survey | 2000 Follow-up Survey | 2002 Follow-up Survey | 2006 Benchmark |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Student satisfaction with goal achievement | 94% | 96% | 96% | | 95% |

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

| Performance Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Benchmark Fall 2005 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Minority student enrollment in comparison to service area population | 25.0% | 24.0% | 27.0% | 27.0% | 23.0% |
| Minority population of service area, 18 or older | | 23.0% | | | |

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

| Performance Indicator | FY 1999 | FY 2000 | FY 2001 | FY 2002 | Benchmark 2005 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Passing rate: Licensed Practical Nurse | 100% | 100% | 94% | 94% | 95% |
| Passing rate: Radiologic Tech, AART | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 95% |

BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 99% | 95% | 87% | 86% | 90% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep. | 96% | 96% | 82% | 83% | 95% |

| Indicator | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 38% | 42% | 41% | 40% | 50% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 35% | 43% | 42% | 39% | 50% |

| Indicator | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | 2002 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 73% | 71% | 73% | 75% | 80% |

| Indicator | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Fall 2003 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 86% | 87% | 88% | 84% | 88% |

| Indicator | 1996 Survey | 1997 Survey | 1999 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | * | * | * | * | * |

* data not reported by Institution

COPPIN STATE COLLEGE
2003 Accountability Profile

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

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 96% | 97% | 91% | 96% | 97% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 100% | 96% | 93% | 95% | 97% |

| Indicator | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 19% | 25% | 26% | 30% | 33% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 20% | 26% | 27% | 29% | 33% |

| Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 76% | 73% | 77% | 72% | 79% |

| Indicator | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Fall 2003 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 92% | 90% | 90% | 92% | 83% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 83% | 88% | 85% | 95% | 88% |

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY
2003 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 | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 97% | 90% | 97% | 94% | 97% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 95% | 88% | 98% | 93% | 98% |

| Indicator | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 57% | 60% | 59% | 57% | 61% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 47% | 39% | 45% | 41% | 50% |

| Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 77% | 78% | 75% | 79% | 80% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 11% | 12% | 13% | 13% | 13% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 92% | 95% | 98% | 95% | 98% |

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY
2003 Accountability Profile

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

| Indicator | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 93% | 93% | 92% | 92% | 94% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 98% | 100% | 98% | 98% | 98% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 66% | 71% | 74% | 72% | 70% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 52% | 60% | 61% | 55% | 61% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 84% | 84% | 86% | 85% | 87% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 8% | 7% | 8% | 8% | 10% |

| Indicator | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 94% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 95% |

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
2003 Accountability Profile

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

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 85% | 86% | 91% | 95% | 91% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 96% | 96% | 99% | 94% | 95% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 62% | 59% | 65% | 60% | 65% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 49% | 49% | 45% | 48% | 51% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 86% | 83% | 85% | 89% | 87% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 91% | 94% | 94% | 90% | 91% |

| Campus-Specific Indicators | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second Year retention rate of African-American | 86% | 87% | 89% | 94% | 89% |

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
2003 Accountability Profile

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

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 79% | 87% | 91% | 87% | 90% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 100% | 98% | 97% | 98% | 90% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | * | * | * | * | * |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | * | * | * | * | * |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | * | * | * | * | * |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 31% | 31% | 33% | 34% | 32% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 97% | 94% | 96% | 95% | 82% |

* data not reported by Institution

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE
2003 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.

| Indicator | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2003 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with education (Nursing only) | 95% | 93% | 80% | * | * |

| Indicator | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2001 | 2004 Benchmark |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Graduation Rates | | | | | |
| School of Dentistry | 92% | 95% | 95% | * | * |
| School of Law | 92% | 92% | 94% | * | * |
| School of Medicine | 95% | 97% | 97% | * | * |
| School of Nursing | 90% | 92% | 92% | * | * |
| School of Pharmacy | 97% | 97% | 97% | * | * |
| School of Social Work | 98% | 98% | 98% | * | * |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American | 22% | 24% | 25% | 29% | * |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | * | 90% | 97% | * | * |

| Campus-Specific Indicators | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Licensure Exam Pass Rate | | | | | |
| Dental (NERB, Rank/Total) | 5/21 | 100% | 100% | 100% | above median |
| Dental (NBDE I, MD/Natl. Mean) | 86.8/86.0 | 85.8/85.0 | 85.8/85.0 | 85.8/85.0 | above mean |
| Dental (NBDE II, MD/Natl. Mean) | 82.5/82.2 | 82.6/82.1 | 82.9/82.3 | 82.9/82.3 | above mean |
| Law | 79% | 81% | 81% | 76% | above mean |
| Medicine (USMLE-2) | 94% | 96% | 97% | * | 94% |
| Nursing (NCLEX-RN) | * | 85% | 86% | 88% | 88% |
| Pharmacy (NAPLEX) | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Social Work (LCSW) | 87/81 | 86/82 | 83/79 | * | 98% |
| Number of refereed publications per full-time faculty | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.1 |
| Grant/contract awards (\$M) | \$203.9 | \$255.1 | \$304.3 | \$323.4 | \$254.9 |
| Number technology licenses issued per year | 6 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 9 |

* data not reported by Institution

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 93% | 97% | 97% | 92% | 93% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 99% | 98% | 99% | 97% | 99% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 60% | 59% | 60% | 58% | 65% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 60% | 63% | 62% | 59% | 65% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 84% | 82% | 82% | 88% | 85% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 16% | 16% | 16% | 16% | 18% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 87% | 88% | 85% | 80% | 86% |

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 87% | 91% | 89% | 98% | 90% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 95% | 96% | 98% | 96% | 90% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 63% | 64% | 69% | 70% | 70% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 52% | 48% | 57% | 56% | 60% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 90% | 91% | 92% | 93% | 92% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 14% | 13% | 12% | 12% | 15% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 87% | 87% | 87% | 84% | 90% |

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 89% | 90% | 92% | 92% | 95% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 80% | 80% | 83% | 83% | 87% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 40% | 41% | 47% | 50% | 50% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 43% | 42% | 44% | 51% | 45% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 76% | 82% | 82% | 80% | 85% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 80% | 79% | 78% | 75% | 79% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | * | * | * | * | * |

* data not reported by Institution

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 97% | 97% | 97% | 98% | 95% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 97% | 98% | 100% | 98% | 95% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 30% | 31% | 31% | 32% | 31% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 98% | 96% | 96% | 94% | 95% |

| Campus-Specific Indicators | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Number online enrollments/registrations | 31,000 | 50,301 | 72,126 | 87,565 | 86,920 |
| Number off-campus/distance ed enrollments/registrations | 37,849 | 51,140 | 61,786 | 74,309 | 72,000 |
| Number of Baccalaureate Graduates of IT Programs | 701 | 769 | 829 | 889 | * |

* data not reported by Institution

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
2003 Accountability Profile

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

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 92% | 100% | 96% | 95% | 100% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 100% | 100% | 97% | 98% | 100% |

| Indicator | 1992 Cohort | 1993 Cohort | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 43% | 41% | 40% | 41% | 45% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 43% | 42% | 40% | 41% | 45% |

| Indicator | 1997 Cohort | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 74% | 73% | 74% | 76% | 80% |

| Indicator | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | Fall 2003 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 94% | 92% | 91% | 91% | 88% |

| Indicator | 1997 Survey | 1998 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 88% | 88% | 88% | 87% | 90% |

| Campus-Specific Indicators | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Percent Other Race of total enrollment | 6% | 8% | 10% | 11% | 12% |
| Number partnerships with public schools | 30 | 34 | 33 | 42 | 50 |
| Funding from grants/contracts for student research opps | \$2.7m | \$2.7m | \$2.9m | \$2.9m | \$2.1m |
| Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded | 11 | 3 | 13 | 23 | 25 |
| FTE Student-to-authorized faculty ratio | 17.6:1 | 17.3:1 | 17.4:1 | 18.1:1 | 15:1 |

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
2003 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.

| Indicator | 1999 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Student satisfaction with job preparation | 93% | 97% | 99% | 99% | 94% |
| Student satisfaction with grad/prof school prep | 97% | 94% | 97% | 100% | 98% |

| Indicator | 1994 Cohort | 1995 Cohort | 1996 Cohort | 1997 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Six year graduation rate of all students | 67% | 72% | 81% | 75% | 76% |
| Six year graduation rate of African Americans | 56% | 62% | 80% | 68% | 72% |

| Indicator | 1998 Cohort | 1999 Cohort | 2000 Cohort | 2001 Cohort | 2004 Benchmark |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Second year retention rate | 85% | 82% | 88% | 91% | 86% |

| Indicator | Fall 1999 | Fall 2000 | Fall 2001 | Fall 2002 | 2004 Benchmark |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Percent African-American of all undergraduates | 10% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 11% |

| Indicator | 1999 Survey | 2000 Survey | 2001 Survey | 2002 Survey | 2004 Benchmark |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Employment rate of graduates | 96% | 96% | 85% | 95% | 98% |

| Campus- Specific Indicators | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Actual | 2003 Actual | 2004 Benchmark |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Four-year graduation rate | 71% | 67% | 63% | 63% | 70% |
| Four-year graduation rate of all minorities | 60% | 60% | 52% | 42% | 63% |
| Four-year graduation rate of Afr-Am | 63% | 54% | 41% | 40% | 63% |
| Graduate/professional school going rate (within one year) | 30% | 29% | 30% | 44% | 35% |
| Graduate/professional school going rate (within five years) | 54% | 54% | 59% | 55% | 55% |

