

## **TOWSON UNIVERSITY**

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Towson University, serving both residential and commuter students, provides a broad range of undergraduate programs in both the traditional arts and sciences and applied professional fields, as well as selected graduate and doctoral level programs.

### **MISSION**

Towson University is a premier, metropolitan comprehensive institution, nationally recognized for quality and value, focused on teaching and committed to providing a broad range of opportunities for undergraduate and graduate education. The undergraduate curriculum will enable students to acquire the intellectual skills essential to effectively communicate in speaking and writing, the gathering and evaluation of information, critical analysis, competence in the use of technology and an appreciation of diverse points of view. The University offers post-baccalaureate education including certificate programs for advanced education and workforce training, masters degrees in traditional and applied disciplines, and doctoral programs. The University will continue to respond to the Baltimore metropolitan area educational and workforce needs.

### **VISION**

Towson University will be a regionally ranked Doctoral/Research – Intensive University with a broad array of programs that meet student needs and workforce requirements. The University expects to expand undergraduate offerings in inter-disciplinary fields that build on existing strengths and in graduate areas to the doctoral level that expands the commitment to professional fields in the arts and sciences, information technology, education, the health professions, and business. Through its faculty, known for excellent teaching, basic and applied research, and creative activities, the University responds to the political and economic needs of the Baltimore metropolitan area.

### **INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT**

#### **Demographic Trends**

There will be continuing increase in demand for higher education in Maryland. In its December 2003 publication, *Knocking at the College Door 1988 to 2018*, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education projects the number of Marylanders graduating from high school to peak at 68,672 in 2008-2009. This will be an increase of 7,386 students (12%) over the number of graduates in Maryland in 2004. Even though the rate of increase will slow after that year, the number of Maryland high school graduates in 2017-2018 will still be 8% higher than in 2003-2004.

According to a May 2004 forecast by the Maryland Department of Planning, Maryland residents between the ages of 20 and 24 will increase by 16% in the next ten years, as the “baby boom echo” moves through the traditional college participation years. Even though that age band will decline after the year 2015, it will still be 8% higher in the year 2030 than in the year 2005. Maryland’s population of minority residents of college age will increase at even faster rates, growing by 30% between 2005 and 2030.

As academic facilities are built, enrollment at Towson University will increase significantly. Undergraduate enrollment at Towson will grow by over 2,900 students (21%) from Fall 2003 to Fall 2013. Towson’s graduate enrollment, especially in the evening and in off campus centers, will continue to grow at a rate of 2% to 3% per year, responding to statewide needs in teacher certification, nursing, computer technology, and other applied fields.

## **Progress in Achieving Objectives**

Towson University achieved most of its goals and objectives for FY 2004.

Most of Towson's nearly 2,000 graduates join Maryland's workforce each year, making the University one of the state's major contributors to an educated workforce. While the economic downturn in Maryland and the Baltimore area certainly affected the employment rate of graduates in the last two years, the rate still remained at the 90% level.

Even though the percentages of African Americans and all minorities among undergraduate students increased in FY 2004 over the previous year, they did not reach our stated goals. There is evidence that recent sharp tuition increases may have had a disproportionate impact on minority students. In Fiscal 2004, students identified as "economically disadvantaged" decreased to 32.9% of degree seeking undergraduates compared to 39.9% the year before. Many of these needy students are African Americans. We believe that increases in university funded need-based grants will help offset the higher tuition for these students.

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

The estimated number of Towson graduates of Nursing programs employed in Maryland was 54 in the most recent year, short of university's objective.

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

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

## **E & G**

The university's unrestricted operating budget is expected to increase to \$167.9M (including COLA) in FY 2005, an increase of \$7.2M over the FY 2004 appropriation shown in the Governor's FY 2005 budget submission.

The tax dollar request for FY 2005 was \$57.8M. This is the same as the reduced amount that was received in FY 2004 due to the nation-wide recession and the commensurate reduction in state revenues. However, an additional \$1.1M for COLA was approved which raise the tax dollars for FY 2005 to \$58.9M.

The FY 2005 unrestricted operating budget, excluding state tax dollars is expected to increase to \$109M, or \$6.1M over FY 2004 reflected in the Governor's FY 2005 budget submission. The increase reflected enrollment and tuition rate increases. The tuition increases for residents and non-residents has had an impact on the projected enrollment for this coming Fall. Although we expect to meet the FTE student enrollment target, the non-resident enrollment percentage is expected to either remain steady or slightly decline.

## **Auxiliary Enterprises**

The FY 2005 operating budget in the Governor's FY 2005 budget submission is increasing by \$6.4M to \$67.9M over FY 2004. This increase is due to inflation adjustments and the food service increase since board rates weren't raised for FY 2004.

## **Major Building Construction/Renovation**

The \$54.3M Center of the Arts renovation and expansion is proceeding on schedule. An additional \$575K was approved to renovate the main stage.

Planning funding of \$4.2M for a new College of Liberal Arts Complex was awarded for FY 2005. Planning and construction for a new, approximately \$4M Day Care Center will commence to enable the site for the College of Liberal Arts Complex to be cleared.

Planning for the \$5.4M Towson Center Arena Improvements will also begin in the FY 2005.

Towson University is also investigating the possibility of constructing a new parking garage in a public private partnership.

## KEY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

**Goal 1:** Create and maintain a well-educated work force.

**Objective 1.1** Increase the estimated number of TU graduates employed in Maryland from 1,912 in 1998 to 2,000 in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	Total undergraduate enrollment	13,905	13,959	14,296	13,981	14,300	14,550
<b>Output</b>	Total bachelor's degree recipients	2,608	2,561	2,717	2,740	2,850	2,900

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey</b>	<b>1998 Survey</b>	<b>2000 Survey</b>	<b>2001 Survey*</b>	<b>2002 Survey</b>	<b>2005 Survey</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Employment rate of graduates <sup>1</sup>	90.5%	94.1%	93.8%	89.5%	90.4%	>90%
<b>Outcome</b>	Estimated number of graduates employed in Maryland <sup>1</sup>	1,907	1,912	1,993	2,013	1,972	2,000

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

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	Number of undergraduates in teacher training programs <sup>2</sup>	1,921	1,981	2,217	2,221	2,235	2,250
<b>Input</b>	Number of post-bach. students in teacher training programs <sup>2</sup>	244	239	304	485	495	500
<b>Output</b>	Number of undergrad students completing teacher training program	354	365	365	452	460	465
<b>Output</b>	Number of post-bach. students completing teacher training program	92	105	118	137	145	155
<b>Quality</b>	Percent of undergraduate students who completed teaching training program and passed Praxis II	97.2%	94.6%	92.6%	96.8%	97.9%	98.8%
<b>Quality</b>	Percent of post-bach. students who completed teacher training program and passed Praxis II <sup>3</sup>	96.1%	88.2%	92.1%	96.5%	94.7%	95.0%
<b>Outcome</b>	Number of students who completed all teacher education requirements and who are employed in Maryland public schools	441	347	381	303	320	340

**Objective 1.3** Increase the number of TU graduates of IT programs employed in Maryland from 30 in 1998 to 85 in 2004.

		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	Number of undergraduate students enrolled in IT programs	823	928	862	670	700	750
<b>Input</b>	Number of graduate students enrolled in IT programs	296	368	357	359	370	400
<b>Output</b>	Number of students graduating from IT baccalaureate programs	109	142	178	156	165	170
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>2001 Actual</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Estimated</b>	<b>2006 Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey Actual</b>	<b>1998 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2000 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2001 Survey* Actual</b>	<b>2002 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2005 Survey Estimate</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Estimated number of IT graduates employed in Maryland <sup>1</sup>	26	30	54	80	82	85

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

		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	Number of undergraduates enrolled in nursing programs	310	329	378	484	450	450
<b>Output</b>	Number of students graduating from baccalaureate nursing programs	62	60	67	84	115	106
<b>Quality</b>	Percent of nursing program graduates passing the licensing examination	69%	79%	81%	72%	85%	90%
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>2001 Actual</b>	<b>2002 Actual</b>	<b>2003 Actual</b>	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>2005 Estimated</b>	<b>2006 Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey Actual</b>	<b>1998 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2000 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2001 Survey* Actual</b>	<b>2002 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2005 Survey Estimate</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Estimated number of graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland <sup>1</sup>	72	69	84	54	51	79

**Objective 1.5** Maintain employer's satisfaction with TU graduates within 10% of the 2001 level of 100% in 2004. <sup>8</sup>

		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey Actual</b>	<b>1998 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2000 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2001 Survey* Actual</b>	<b>2002 Survey Actual</b>	<b>2005 Survey Estimate</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Employers' satisfaction with TU graduates <sup>4</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A

**Objective 1.6** Increase the number of students enrolled in TU courses delivered off campus or through distance education from 895 in 1998 to 2,400 in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
	Number of students enrolled in distance education and off campus courses						
<b>Input</b>		2,148	2,284	2,839	3,323	3,800	4,400

**Goal 2:** Promote economic development.

**Objective 2.1** Increase the ratio of median TU graduates' salary to the median annual salary of civilian work force with a bachelor's degree from 80.8% in 2000 to 85.5% in 2004.<sup>8</sup>

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
		<b>1997 Survey</b>	<b>1998 Survey</b>	<b>2000 Survey</b>	<b>2001 Survey*</b>	<b>2002 Survey</b>	<b>2005 Survey</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
<b>Outcome</b>	Median salary of TU graduates <sup>1,5</sup>	\$27,091	\$27,926	\$30,711	\$28,395	\$32,310	\$32,500
<b>Outcome</b>	Ratio of median salary of TU graduates to civilian work force with bachelor's degree <sup>1</sup>	N/A	N/A	80.8%	74.7%	85.0%	85.5%

**Goal 3:** Increase access for economically disadvantaged and minority students.

**Objective 3.1** Increase the % of minority undergraduate students from 15.3% in 2000 to 17% in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	% of minority undergraduate students enrolled	15.0%	15.0%	14.9%	15.2%	15.5%	16.0%

**Objective 3.2** Increase the % of African-American undergraduate students from 10.4% in 2000 to 11% in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b>	% of African-American undergraduate students enrolled	10.0%	10.0%	9.7%	9.9%	10.0%	10.5%

**Objective 3.3** Increase the retention rate of minority students from 85.2% in 2001 to 87.5% in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b>	Second year retention rate of minority students <sup>6</sup>	85.2%	87.5%	91.1%	89.9%	90.0%	90.0%

**Objective 3.4** Increase the retention rate of African-American students from 86.4% in 2000 to 89% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> Second year retention rate of African-American students <sup>6</sup>	87.0%	88.5%	94.1%	92.2%	90.0%	90.0%

**Objective 3.5** Maintain the graduation rate of minority students above 50% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> Six year graduation rate of minority students <sup>6</sup>	53.3%	50.7%	52.4%	50.4%	51.0%	54.0%

**Objective 3.6** Increase the graduation rate of African-American students to greater than 50% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> Six year graduation rate of African-American students <sup>6</sup>	49.0%	44.9%	48.4%	50.6%	52.0%	54.0%

**Objective 3.7** Maintain the % of economically disadvantaged students above 40% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Input</b> % of economically disadvantaged students	38.2%	38.5%	39.9%	32.9%	40.0%	41.0%

**Goal 4:** Achieve and sustain national eminence in providing quality education, research and public service.

**Objective 4.1** Increase retention rate of TU undergraduates from 85.6% in 2000 to 87% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> Second year retention rate of students <sup>6</sup>	83.3%	84.7%	88.7%	86.8%	87.0%	87.0%

**Objective 4.2** Increase graduation rate of TU undergraduates from 62.2% in 2000 to >64% in 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Output</b> Sixth year graduation rate of students <sup>6</sup>	59.1%	64.5%	60.4%	59.9%	60.0%	60.0%

**Objective 4.3** Maintain the level of student satisfaction with education received for employment within 1% of the 2000 level of 90.6% in 2004. <sup>8</sup>

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey</b>	<b>1998 Survey</b>	<b>2000 Survey</b>	<b>2001 Survey*</b>	<b>2002 Survey</b>	<b>2005 Survey</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Percent of students satisfied with education received for employment <sup>1</sup>	84.9%	86.4%	90.6%	95.0%	90.0%	90.0%

**Objective 4.4** Increase the level of student satisfaction with education received for graduate/professional school from 93.5% in 2001 to 95.0% in 2004. <sup>8</sup>

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>		<b>1997 Survey</b>	<b>1998 Survey</b>	<b>2000 Survey</b>	<b>2001 Survey*</b>	<b>2002 Survey</b>	<b>2005 Survey</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
<b>Quality</b>	Percent of students satisfied with education received for graduate/professional school <sup>1</sup>	95.6%	95.9%	98.9%	93.5%	97.1%	95.0%

**Objective 4.5** Increase the full time faculty salary percentile for the ranks of assistant, associate, and professor from 68<sup>th</sup>, 60<sup>th</sup>, and 58<sup>th</sup> percentiles respectively, in 1999 to the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2004.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>							
<b>Input</b>	Full time faculty salary percentile <sup>7</sup>						
	Assistant	68 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	64 <sup>th</sup>	59 <sup>th</sup>	66 <sup>th</sup>	68 <sup>th</sup>
	Associate	75 <sup>th</sup>	79 <sup>th</sup>	74 <sup>th</sup>	71 <sup>st</sup>	73 <sup>rd</sup>	74 <sup>th</sup>
	Professor	70 <sup>th</sup>	72 <sup>nd</sup>	68 <sup>th</sup>	70 <sup>th</sup>	67 <sup>th</sup>	68 <sup>th</sup>

**Goal 5:** Increase revenue from alternative sources to state appropriations.

**Objective 5.1** Raise \$17.5 million by 2002 from \$11.1 in 1999.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>							
<b>Output</b>	Funds raised through campaign for Maryland (\$ in millions)	\$17.9	\$21.1	\$24.6	\$28.4	**	**

**Objective 5.2** Maintain current annual rate (2%) of operating budget savings through efficiency and cost containment measures.

		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>							
<b>Efficiency</b>	Rate of operating budget savings	1.0%	2.0%	2.2%	4.5%	2.0%	2.0%

**Goal 6:** Maximize the efficient and effective use of state resources.

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

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
Percent of replacement cost expended in facility renewal and renovation ***	1.2 %	1.2%	.7%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%

**Objective 6.2** Decrease the cost of raising \$1 in private donations down from \$0.51 in 2000 to \$0.50 by 2004.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Estimated</b>
<b>Efficiency</b> Cost of raising \$1	\$.51	\$.54	\$.57	\$.50 ****	\$.50	\$.50

Notes: NA = data not available

\* 2001 Survey Actual was obtained from a telephone survey conducted by the Schaefer Center.

\*\* Campaign completed in FY2001 exceeding \$17.5 m goal by \$3.6 million; new goal to be determined.

\*\*\* 2003 actual, 2004 and 2005 estimated figures are based on a new five-year model that replaced the FY95 – FY99 USM model with a new five-year model that covers FY99 – FY03. Data for 2000, 2001, and 2002 actuals are based on the old model.

\*\*\*\* Estimated figure. Data not available until 2/05.

Footnotes:

1. Data for 1997, 1998, 2000, and 2002 Survey Actual were obtained from the MHEC Alumni Survey – one year follow-up of Bachelor’s degree recipients and the 2001 Survey Actual was obtained from a telephone survey conducted by the Schaefer Center.
2. Includes Fall data only.
3. Presently it is difficult if not impossible to disaggregate undergraduate and graduate students who passed Praxis II and then replicate ETS results.
4. Based on the Schaefer Center survey of employers, the percentage of employers who said they would “definitely yes” or “probably yes” hire graduates of TU again.
5. Based on salary of those employed full-time.
6. MHEC data.
7. Compared with TU current Carnegie Classification.
8. When this goal was set, the next scheduled MHEC Alumni Survey was to be conducted in 2004. The survey cycle has been changed from a two year to a three- year cycle with the next administration to take place in 2005.

9/24/04