

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY
MANAGING FOR RESULTS (MFR) 2007**

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 in applied master and doctoral level programs.

MISSION

Towson University, as the State's Metropolitan University, focuses on providing highly developed educational experiences and community service through a broad range of intellectual opportunities to a diverse student body at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The academic programs and services offered through the university provide a core quality environment for students to acquire the intellectual and social preparation to achieve their potential as contributing leaders and citizens of the workforce and a complex global society. Faculty, students, and staff serve the region through research and professional outreach that specifically responds to the state's socioeconomic and cultural needs and aspirations.

VISION

Towson University will be a regionally ranked Doctoral/Research – Intensive University with a student population of 25,000 by the year 2012 that provides the appropriate array of programs to meet students' intellectual and cultural needs as well as respond to workforce requirements. At the undergraduate level, the University will build on existing interdisciplinary and programmatic strengths. At the graduate level, curriculum development will occur up to the doctoral level to support more fully our commitment to professional fields in the arts and sciences, information technology, education, the health professions, and business. Through its faculty known for excellent teaching, theoretical and applied research, and creative activities, the University will respond to the advancement of the surrounding diverse region by forming formal partnerships and collaborations based on the metropolitan university model.

**MANAGING FOR RESULTS (MFR) 2007
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 1,972 in Survey Year 2002 to 2,400 in Survey Year 2008.

		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Input	Total enrollment	17,188	17,667	18,011	18,921	19,758	20,500
Output	Total degree recipients	3,519	3,816	4,138	4,127	4,200	4,350
Performance Measures		1998 Survey	2000 Survey	2002 Survey	2005 Survey	2008 Survey	
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimate	
Outcome	Employment rate of graduates ¹	94.1%	93.8%	90.4%	92.7%	94.0%	
Outcome	Estimated number of graduates employed in Maryland ¹	1,912	1,993	1,972	2,137	2,400	

Objective 1.2 Increase the number of TU graduates hired by MD public schools from 303 in FY 2004 to 480 in FY 2009.

		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Input	Number of Students in teacher training programs ²	1,616	1,670	1,638 ⁸	1,567	1,590	1,613
Output	Number of students completing teacher training program	589	640	689	619	631	644
Quality	Percent of students who completed teaching training program and passed Praxis II	96.8%	94.0%	93.0%	96%	96%	96%
Outcome	Number of students who completed all teacher education requirements and who are employed in Maryland public schools	303	410	390	367	385 ⁷	405 ⁷

Objective 1.3 Increase the number of TU graduates of IT programs employed in Maryland from 82 in Survey Year 2002 to 100 in Survey Year 2008.

		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Input	Number of undergraduate students enrolled in IT programs	670	524	458	432	456	485
Input	Number of graduate students enrolled in IT programs	359	330	363	330	300	310
Output	Number of students graduating from IT baccalaureate programs	156	127	123	75	70	70
Performance Measures		1998 Survey	2000 Survey	2002 Survey	2005 Survey	2008 Survey	
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimate	

Outcome	Estimated number of IT graduates employed in Maryland ¹	30	54	82	96	100
----------------	--	----	----	----	----	-----

Objective 1.4 Increase the estimated number of TU graduates of nursing programs employed in MD from 51 in Survey Year 2002 to 100 in Survey Year 2008.

Performance Measures		2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Estimated	2009 Estimated
Input	Number of qualified applicants who applied to nursing program	85	178	205	218*	250*	280*
Input	Number accepted into nursing program	56	56	56	80*	88*	104*
Input	Number of undergraduates enrolled in nursing programs	161	160	162	257	284	311
Output	Number of students graduating from baccalaureate nursing programs	84	90	105	110	141	151
Quality	Percent of nursing program graduates passing the licensing examination	72%	87%	81%	83%	85%	85%
Performance Measures		1998 Survey Actual	2000 Survey Actual	2002 Survey Actual	2005 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Estimate	
Outcome	Estimated number of graduates of nursing programs employed in Maryland ¹	69	84	51	77	100	

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 85% in Survey Year 2002 to 87% in Survey Year 2008.

Performance Measures		1998 Survey Actual	2000 Survey Actual	2002 Survey Actual	2005 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Estimate
Outcome	Median salary of TU graduates ^{1,4}	\$27,926	\$30,711	\$32,310	\$34,400	\$37,500
Outcome	Ratio of median salary of TU graduates to civilian work force with bachelor's degree ¹	N/A	80.8%	85.0%	82.3%	87.0%

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

Objective 3.1 Increase the percent of minority undergraduate students from 15.2% in 2004 to 18.0% in FY 2009.

Performance Measures		2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Estimated	2009 Estimated
Input	Percent of minority undergraduate students enrolled	15.2%	15.9%	16.9%	17.7%	18.2%	18.3%

Objective 3.2 Increase the percent of African-American undergraduate students from 9.9% in 2004 to 12.0% in FY 2009.

Performance Measures		2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Estimated	2009 Estimated
Input	Percent of African-American undergraduate students enrolled	9.9%	10.1%	10.6%	10.9%	11.3%	12.0%

Objective 3.3	Maintain the retention rate of minority students at or above 90.0% through FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Second year retention rate of minority students ⁵					
	89.9%	91.7%	90.3%	84.1%	85%	90%
Objective 3.4	Maintain the retention rate of African-American students at or above 90.0% through FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Second year retention rate of African-American students ⁵					
	92.2%	92.0%	92.2%	85.4%	86%	90%
Objective 3.5	Increase the six-year graduation rate of minority students to 57.0% or above in FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Six year graduation rate of minority students ⁵					
	50.4%	55.6%	58.2%	66.8%	65%	65%
Objective 3.6	Increase the six-year graduation rate of African-American students to greater than 59.0% in FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Six year graduation rate of African-American students ⁵					
	50.6%	58.0%	57.8%	63.5%	65%	65%
Objective 3.7	Increase and maintain the percent of economically disadvantaged students above 47.0% in FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Input	Percent of economically disadvantaged students					
	40.8%	43.1%	42.0%	40.4%	43.5%	47.5%
Goal 4:	Achieve and sustain national eminence in providing quality education, research and public service.					
Objective 4.1	Maintain the second-year retention rate of TU undergraduates at or above 87.0% through FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Second year retention rate of students ⁵					
	86.8%	87.7%	86.3%	83.8%	86%	87%
Objective 4.2	Increase the six-year graduation rate of TU undergraduates from 59.9% in FY 2004 to 65.0% in FY 2009.					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Performance Measures	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Estimated
Output	Sixth year graduation rate of students ⁵					
	59.9%	64.1%	61.0%	65.0%	65%	65%

Objective 4.3 Maintain the level of student satisfaction with education received for employment at or above 90% through Survey Year 2008.

Performance Measures		1998 Survey Actual	2000 Survey Actual	2002 Survey Actual	2005 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Estimate
Quality	Percent of students satisfied with education received for employment ¹	86.4%	90.6%	90.0%	90.6%	90.0%

Objective 4.4 Maintain the level of student satisfaction with education received for graduate/professional school at or above 97% through Survey Year 2008.

Performance Measures		1998 Survey Actual	2000 Survey Actual	2002 Survey Actual	2005 Survey Actual	2008 Survey Estimate
Quality	Percent of students satisfied with education received for graduate/professional school ¹	95.9%	98.9%	97.1%	97.8%	97.0%

Goal 5: Maximize the efficient and effective use of state resources.

Objective 5.1 Maintain expenditures on facility renewal at 0.8 percent through FY 2009.⁶

Performance Measures		2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Estimated	2009 Estimated
Efficiency	Percent of replacement cost expended in facility renewal and renovation	1.1%	1.0%	2.4%	3.45%	2.06%	2.27%

Objective 5.2 Increase the number of students enrolled in TU courses delivered off campus or through distance education from 3,323 in FY 2004 to 4,631 in FY 2009.

Performance Measures		2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Estimated	2009 Estimated
Input	Number of students enrolled in distance education and off campus courses	3,323	3,784	6,065	7,160	7,560	8,000

Footnotes:

1. Data for 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2005 Survey Actual were obtained from the MHEC Alumni Survey follow-up of Bachelor's degree recipients.
 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 salary of those employed full-time.
 5. MHEC data.
 6. The value of the campus infrastructure is expected to increase with the addition of new facilities.
 7. Projected figures for 2008 and 2009 are based on trend data provided from MSDE since 2004. USM recently contracted with the Jacob Franz Institute (JFI) at the University of Baltimore to examine teacher retention resulting from PDS-preparation. To conduct this study, JFI merged records of degree recipients enrolled in teacher preparation programs at USM institutions with employment records from Maryland-based employers generally and Maryland public school systems as a group. The JFI findings raise serious questions about the accuracy of the MSDE data. Since discrepancies between the MSDE and JFI reports may be explained by methodological factors such as when and how the information was gathered, we respectfully suggest that the bases and nature of the discrepancies between these data sets be examined. We do so because of the policy and procedural importance of the MFR process for directing Maryland's precious higher education resources.
 8. Corrected data. The previous figure incorrectly included all MAT students who were admitted to the program rather than only those enrolled.
- * Includes nursing students enrolled at USM – Hagerstown. Began enrolling students at this facility in Fall 2006.

11/29/07