



Morgan State University

Strategic Plan
2008-2012

Adopted November, 2007

Vision

Morgan State University will be recognized nationally and statewide for:

- Its significant impact on access to higher education at all degree levels,
- The effectiveness of its teaching and of its supportive environment in promoting student success,
- Its contribution to doctoral-level research on significant problems, and
- Its service programs that improve the life of underserved populations.

Mission Summary

The mission of the University, in brief, is to:

- Offer undergraduate programs in a comprehensive range of disciplines;
- Offer master's and doctoral programs in selected fields of study of significance to Maryland and the Nation;
- Provide access to a broad cross-section of the population seeking an undergraduate degree, including a representative number of at-risk students;
- Ensure a supportive environment that promotes student success;
- Carry out research that gives significant priority to solving difficult real-world problems faced by society;
- Offer service programs that take advantage of the University's research expertise and that are directed toward the needs of under-served communities.

Values

Promoting student learning and success and faculty scholarship and research are the core values around which academic programs, support services, and business processes are organized.

Morgan State University Board of Regents

Mr. Dallas R. Evans, Chairman

Mr. Martin R. Resnick, Vice Chairman

Rev. Frances M. Draper, Secretary

Ms. Shirley Marcus Allen

The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings

Mr. Franklin L. Edmonds

Mr. Donald E. Frieson

Dr. Linda J. Gilliam

Dr. Charles W. Griffin

Senator Laurance Levitan

Dr. Shirley M. Malcom

Ms. Sally C. McMillan, Student Regent

Mr. Kweisi Mfume

Mr. William R. Roberts

General (Ret.) Johnnie E. Wilson

Contents

Executive Summary	7
The Planning Environment	11
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Vulnerabilities.....	19
Eight Strategic Goals for the University.....	27
Strategies for Development	33

Executive Summary

Morgan has a long and distinguished history of serving the state of Maryland as well as a national and international clientele. But, throughout its history, it has had to overcome many obstacles in order to attain this stature.

Founded as a religious-oriented campus in 1867, it awarded its first bachelor's degrees in 1895. From that point until 1939, as a private campus, Morgan provided African Americans with their only collegiate opportunities in the state of Maryland. The State's policy until 1939 was to provide scholarships for a limited number of blacks to attend Morgan or to obtain an education in other states.

In 1939, as it became increasingly apparent that the state's policy of denying collegiate opportunities for blacks in the public sector would not be legally sustainable, the state purchased Morgan. Subsequently, in a 1947 report, the state's Marbury Commission commented extensively on Morgan and the state's system of higher education. Morgan, was one of only two campuses in the state holding regional accreditation (the other being UM College Park). Its faculty was found to be as qualified and productive as that at College Park, but the average faculty salary at Morgan was not only lower than at College Park but lower than at the state teachers colleges, which were considered non-collegiate. Also, Morgan's facilities were found to be decrepit and in need of replacement and expansion. Some limited development of the campus took place as a result of that report. Unfortunately those buildings still represent the core of the University's physical plant and they are no larger than they were more than 50 years ago.

The state did not systematically plan for the expansion and development of its higher education system during the 1950s and 1960s and by the mid-1970s Maryland higher education was experiencing overcapacity, stable enrollments, and excessive competition among campuses. By the mid-1970s the state also was desegregating its public four-year campuses. The state's history of neglect of its historically black campuses placed these institutions in a position where they had difficulty competing for students. Due to the resulting uncertainty over the future of the HBCUs, the lack of state priority for them continued following desegregation. By the early 1980s, under federal pressure to enhance its historically black campuses, the state undertook a comprehensive study of their condition. The results were similar to the findings of the Marbury Commission in 1947. Morgan again was singled out for the poor condition of its facilities and the inadequacy of its operating budgets.

Despite this lack of a strong resource base the campus has continued to develop because it has continued to address the needs of the higher education market, even in the post-segregation era. It has developed with, at best, modest support. But it has continued to be effective in carrying out its mission and makes an important contribution to the state and national pool of African Americans holding degrees from the baccalaureate through the doctorate. Morgan recently achieved an historic milestone when it was designated as a Doctoral Research Campus by the Carnegie Commission for the Advancement of Teaching as a result of its level of doctoral degree production and the volume of

research carried out by its faculty. This designation coupled with its tradition of promoting access form the foundation of its future growth and development.

The demographics of the state are changing in a way that promises to have significant consequences for Maryland's future. The growth of the minority population, particularly the African-American population, is such that Maryland needs to find means to overcome the significant educational deficit that characterizes its black population. Morgan already leads the state on most measures of degree awards to college-age African Americans. Due to its relevant mission and its long tradition of providing a broad range of access, the University is well positioned to play a growing role in addressing the needs of the state's emerging population.

While the University has a strong track record in addressing the state's educational needs, it is still struggling to gain the priority it needs to develop to the point that it is truly comparable to other campuses in the State. Its physical plant serves as a prime example. Notwithstanding some recent replacements of outdated facilities on campus, the University has substantial needs and its general appearance is not comparable to other campuses in the Baltimore area. However, the state's facilities plan currently provides for little future development at the University.

Despite the uncertainty of future state support for operations and facilities, this strategic plan foresees the continued development of the campus due to the state's growing need to better educate its growing minority population. Fundamental to its development is achieving comparability in all facets of its operations and resources with other Maryland campuses with doctoral research missions. This plan also provides for the campus to make numerous changes, regardless of future state support, that will make it more student-centered and committed to promoting and measuring student success. It provides for strengthening the University's doctoral and research programs which, while relatively young, are making a significant state and national contribution. It provides for making the campus more streamlined in its administrative processes while at the same time reorganizing its academic functions in a manner appropriate for a doctoral research campus. Finally, the plan provides for a campus that is more responsive to changing circumstances and the increased competition in its environment.

The Planning Environment

Maryland: A State of Contrasts

Maryland is a unique state, due in large measure to the proximity of the federal government. The federal influence is an important factor in maintaining Maryland's strong economy and the resulting attractiveness of the state to the knowledge-based organizations that address federal needs. Such organizations recruit professionals from throughout the country and the world. The net result is a well-educated citizenry and a high general level of affluence. These as well as a number of other factors are relevant to planning the University's future development.

Like most eastern states, Maryland's public higher education system developed well after its private sector. The legacy of this history is strong financial support for the private sector and a tradition of relatively modest support for public campuses. In the case of Morgan, it historically has received even less support than other public campuses, first as a result of the state's policy of segregation and subsequently during the early decades of desegregation when the fate of historically black campuses was in doubt.

As a southern state Maryland's "white" public campuses were strictly segregated (as was its public school system.) The state duplicated its higher education programs rather than integrating them. As a result, the state has a relatively large number of campuses for its size, with a significant number of them located in the Baltimore area and competing with one another. This problem was explicitly recognized more than sixty years by the State's Marbury Commission. Among its public four-year campuses are four historically black universities (HBUs), which were never segregated, and six historically white campuses which for all practical purposes were segregated until the early 1970s. An additional public institution (UM University College) was never segregated while the University of Baltimore was a private institution until 1976 when it entered the public sector.

Despite the large number and variety of educational opportunities available in Maryland, it continues to be one of the largest net exporters of college students in the nation, a trend that appears to be accelerating. This is the case despite the rapidly improving reputation of its public campuses. The strong emphasis by the state and by many of its public campuses on attracting well-credentialed students through the award of merit based financial aid has not reversed this trend. One factor responsible for the significant number of students leaving the state is the high educational attainment and affluence of a large segment of the state's population, which results in a relatively high rate of student mobility. Another is the fact that half of all Marylanders were born elsewhere and have no particular identity with the state or its institutions of higher education.

Also, despite the fact that Maryland has a relatively large number of public four-year campuses for its size, the most rapidly-growing regions of the state for the most part have relatively poor access to

public four-year campuses. One of Maryland's challenges is improving access in fast-growing regions while supporting its existing campuses at a reasonable level.

While once a heavily industrialized state, Maryland has made the transition to an information-based economy. The state once attracted employees for its factories and mills from throughout the world while today it imports talent for its information-based economy from a national and international pool of professionals. Its institutions of higher education, while important to the state, supply only a fraction of the personnel required for an economy that seeks and is able to attract talent from wherever it is available to enable it to compete globally.

While one of the most affluent states, its high average wealth camouflages large disparities in income throughout the state. The contrast between Baltimore City and the suburbs of the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area is particularly striking. The state's general wealth and modest support historically has provided the rationale for the relatively high cost of attendance at public campuses but only modest need-based student financial aid, a situation that places lower income Maryland residents at a greater disadvantage than in many other states.

Changing Demographics Are Having an Impact

Maryland's general population is 29% African American, the fourth highest percent of any state. Its public school system is 40% African American and its college age population holding a high school diploma is 33% African American. The Hispanic and Asian-American populations of the state are considerably smaller but they are young and growing rapidly. Meanwhile, the white population of the state is older than these other groups and is stable. The white public school population of the state is declining and the white college-age population, which currently is at a peak, is about to begin a long-term decline and be replaced by minority students with distinctly different educational and socioeconomic characteristics. As early as 2012, the number of African-American and Hispanic public high school graduates will equal the number of white graduates.

The number of high school graduates in Maryland has been growing since 1995 due to growth in all of the major racial/ethnic groups. The composition of graduates has been changing, however, and is about to change even more significantly. In the case of white high school graduates, this recent growth followed 15 years of decline. It is a result of the coming of age of the children of the post WWII baby boom generation, which was primarily a white phenomenon. The growth in black high school graduates is to a large extent the result of long-term growth in the state's African-American population and, therefore, is not a temporary phenomenon like the white baby-boom echo. The growth in the Asian-American and Hispanic populations has been fueled by immigration. In the case of the Hispanic population, most of the immigration has come from low-income/low-education groups, unlike the better educated Hispanic immigrants that preceded them. Most growth among college-age students

has been among minority students and has taken place at community colleges and the state's historically black campuses. These campuses are access-oriented institutions. Continuation of recent demographic trends promises to make this a long-term pattern.

The vast majority of the state's population resides in the Washington-Baltimore corridor. Most of the state's public four-year campuses are located in this region, with a particularly large concentration in the Baltimore area. However, the largest rates of population growth are taking place outside of this area. These growth regions do not have public four-year campuses located within their boundaries and the state has used regional centers served by a variety of campuses to provide improved access in rapidly growing regions of the state. There also have been some efforts to make certain community colleges into four-year campuses to address these regional needs. To date these efforts have not reached fruition.

The Educational Attainment Gap between the Races is Growing

As the state's racial and ethnic composition changes, the implications of differences in educational attainment among the various groups increase in significance. Unfortunately, the gap in college degree attainment between the white population and the African-American and Hispanic populations has been growing. Educational attainment for black adults in the state has been increasing but not as rapidly as that for whites, resulting in an increasing difference in the extent to which the two groups hold college degrees. In the case of Hispanics, their average educational attainment has actually been decreasing as a result of changes in the geographic origins of that group.

If the state is to have any impact on the differences in the educational attainment of its adult population, it must reduce gaps in among these groups in their preparation for college, the rate at which they enter college, and the rate at which they graduate from college. Unfortunately, the trends are not favorable.

The most commonly used measures of preparation for college are scores on tests such as the SAT and ACT. There is a large gap between black and white students taking the SAT, a gap that has grown somewhat among Maryland students of different races despite many years during which a great deal of emphasis has been placed on public school reform and improvement. In Maryland, the SAT scores of white students have increased somewhat since the late 1990s and are well above the national average for whites. The pattern is opposite for African Americans. Average African-American scores in Maryland have declined slightly since the late 1990s and are now slightly below the national average for blacks.

Recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicate the difficulty of changing achievement test scores in the short term. The nationwide findings from the

ongoing assessment program that tests samples of students in different grades and subject areas has found that test scores are not changing despite the fact that more students are taking rigorous coursework. This demonstrates the importance of colleges in Maryland and elsewhere being prepared to educate students regardless of their pre-college academic credentials for the foreseeable future.

The gap between the college-going rates of black and white Maryland high school persists. Its effects are exacerbated by a large and growing gap between the retention and graduation rates of black and white college students.

As a result of these differences in performance between the races, blacks receive bachelor's degrees from Maryland campuses at rates well below their representation in the college age population. About 33% of recent public high school graduates in the state are black but only 21% of new baccalaureate recipients are black. By contrast, about 55% of recent high school graduates are white and slightly more than 60% of recent bachelor's degree recipients are white. The problem for the state is that the percentage that whites make up among public high school graduates has been declining while that for blacks has been increasing. For blacks to be represented among new college graduates at the same rate at which they are represented among recent high school graduates, the state would have to immediately double the number of degrees it awards to blacks. Unfortunately, the state has been experiencing a widening of this gap in recent years.

Changing Student and Parental Values are Shaping Student Choices

While the demographic and economic changes have been relatively long-term trends, other characteristics of the environment in which higher education operates are more recent and, some, perhaps, more subject to change.

One enduring student value has been the motivation to obtain a college degree as a means of bettering oneself economically. This has corresponded to the increase in the relative value of a degree since the early 1970s. Closely related has been a growing emphasis on credentialing, particularly on the part of working adults. A growing number of campuses are serving this market with the promise of making employed individuals more valuable in the job market or in their current jobs by offering flexible degree programs at all levels of study.

A third trend related to both the growing economic payoff from a degree and a reaction to the credentialing phenomenon is a growing attraction to quality. Increasingly, students and their parents seek to ensure the largest possible payoff from education by choosing institutions perceived to be prestigious. At least some of this is due to the growing number of parents holding degrees who have high expectations of their children and who can assist their children in making sophisticated college

choices. At the same time, the flight to quality is a reaction to the credentialing phenomenon and a means of differentiating one's degree from others.

Another set of values is associated with the younger segment of the population, often referred to as the Millennials. These are the students currently in college and those who will attend for the foreseeable future. This group has been raised in the era of the personal computer, cell phone, the internet, ATMs, and a growing emphasis on good customer service by all types of organizations attempting to remain viable in an increasingly competitive market. At the same time, the consumer market for nearly everything has become more segmented and, as a result, individuals of college age, and younger, tend to value options and the ability to pursue a lifestyle reflecting a variety of individual preferences. They are looking for flexibility in the ways in which they pursue their goals. They respect diversity in the lifestyle choices that their acquaintances make. They value racial and ethnic diversity among their friends. They are accustomed to good customer service and demand it from businesses they patronize, including their educational institutions. They are always "connected" by cell phone, computer and/or other devices and communicating with them to a growing degree entails attempting to be part of their "personal area networks." They are adept at multitasking, including in their studies. They are demanding consumers and there is no reason to believe their attitudes toward higher education differ from their attitudes toward the broader consumer market.

The State Increasingly is a Free Market for Higher Education

Maryland higher education developed with little state oversight until the mid-1970s when its first true coordinating board was established. This was relatively late compared to other states. Prior to then, a series of temporary state commissions had provided advice to the state concerning higher education issues. In the mid-1960s the state created an advisory board that carried out studies and made recommendations but had no real power. Hence, most of the current system of public higher education was in place before a true coordinating board existed.

The State Board for Higher Education, which came into existence in 1976, inherited a system that was no longer growing, had too much capacity, and that was just beginning its first true desegregation efforts. Several campuses encountered enrollment difficulties, but the historically black campuses were particularly affected since they had by design been poorly supported throughout their history. The Board was relatively assertive in attempting to differentiate missions and programs among competing campuses and in approving attractive academic programs for the HBCUs. In 1985 the state and the federal government agreed to the State's first acceptable five-year desegregation plan, a plan that required strong state oversight.

Morgan's changing fortunes during this period reflected the changes in state policies. Until the early 1970s Morgan was one of the fastest growing campuses in the state. In 1972 it had a large

graduate enrollment that was half white. The campus also enrolled a representative number of white students at the undergraduate level. Although the campus had not been well supported, it had many academic programs that were unique in the Baltimore area. The state's desegregation efforts coupled with the development of other campuses in the region decimated Morgan's enrollment. Almost overnight Morgan lost nearly all of its white enrollments to formerly segregated white campuses in the region, which were by then developing as comprehensive campuses. It lost a substantial portion of its black enrollment as well. It was no longer in a position to compete with other better-supported campuses in the region, many of which now had similar programs to those offered at Morgan. By the mid-1980s, campus enrollments had reached a low point. However, thanks to the strong state coordination that supported differentiated missions and the enhancement of HBCUs through development of unique programs, Morgan's enrollments rebounded strongly following 1985. For the next decade, Morgan again was one of the fastest growing campuses in the state, even though the state did not support the growth in its workload through corresponding increases in appropriations.

Following the expiration of the 1985 five-year plan the federal government did not substantively communicate with the state until 1999, when it opened negotiations for a new plan. By that time, the state had become much less assertive in differentiating missions and programs. Some of this was the result of relaxed standards due to lack of federal oversight. The state also lowered its barriers to for-profit campuses desiring to operate in the state, which necessarily reduced the degree of oversight that could be applied to in-state campuses. Legislation enacted in 1998 gave public campuses more leeway in beginning programs. On-line education lessened the possibility of controlling competition, especially from out-of-state campuses. In brief, during the 1990s the state became a more competitive environment for campuses, with barriers to duplication of mission and programs being lowered. By the time the state agreed to its second acceptable desegregation plan in 2000 the values of the free market were well entrenched and campuses continued to become more duplicative of one another's efforts, even throughout the period of the plan.

The difficulty of the free market approach for Maryland is that the state has a relatively large number of campuses in direct competition with one another. On average, its campuses are relatively small depriving them of the ability to achieve efficiencies through economies of scale. At the same time the state provides only a modest base of funding for its public campuses. Under such circumstances it is difficult to get adequate resources for any given program or campus. This suggests a future in which there will continue to be competition for funding priority and in which the prospects for obtaining adequate state support are questionable.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Vulnerabilities

Strengths

The University has a number of advantages on which to build for its future development.

Morgan has an independent Board of Regents which permits it to be a strong advocate for the University's unique mission and interests.

Morgan is a relatively comprehensive campus at the undergraduate level. While less so at the graduate level, its graduate offerings provide an attractive array of offerings in fields that are in demand and/or are of importance to the state.

More of Morgan's academic programs hold specialized accreditation than is the case at most campuses. Increasing the number of programs holding specialized accreditation has been a priority of the University for the past two decades.

Morgan is one of the better known campuses both within and outside the state. The University has a particular reputational advantage over most other Maryland campuses throughout the northeast corridor up to New England.

Morgan has a well-credentialed faculty that is racially and ethnically diverse. This represents a continuation of a long tradition at the University. Diversity is particularly valued by today's college-age population and Morgan's degree of diversity among members of its faculty differentiates it from most other Maryland campuses.

Student ratings and assessments of learning on national instruments indicate that the campus provides students with an above-average degree of rigor in its classroom environment. This also is reflected in objective measures of student learning outcomes using a nationally-normed assessment instrument. The University is a regional and national leader in the number of its students receiving Fulbright scholarships. Recent Morgan graduates find employment at the same rate of graduates of other public campuses in the state and enter graduate and professional schools at rates that are well above average. Continuing to build on and to document this strength in promoting student academic performance represents an opportunity for the campus to distinguish itself as the attractiveness of quality and the emphasis on measuring student performance increase throughout the higher education community.

Morgan's mission of providing a vehicle of upward mobility for a broad cross-section of the population is particularly relevant in the emerging environment. The state faces significant challenges as a result of long-term demographic trends and Morgan's existing mission is one that places strong emphasis on addressing these challenges.

The University has a tradition and a culture of providing a supportive environment for students. It does not have to add programs or change its prevailing culture to create this type of environment. A national study carried out in the mid-1990s identified the University's supportive environment as a major reason that its students on average made cognitive gains that were equal to or larger than found at other more selective campuses included in the study. As is the case with its mission, this is a particularly relevant strength in light of the nature of the students entering higher education now and for the foreseeable future.

The campus is of moderate size, which is an advantage in providing a personal and supportive environment. In many respects, Morgan students are able to get the attention typically found at a private institution.

The campus has a variety of partnerships that result from its national reputation as a magnet for black students and its success in educating African Americans. For example, it has a new partnership with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to offer a doctoral degree in psychometrics, a program that will be the only one in the country located at an HBCU. It has a number of partnerships with federal agencies such as NASA and NIH as well as with private corporations that are based on the University's strength in the sciences and its success in preparing students for advanced study.

Morgan also recently gained access to a specialized resource – the Estuarine Research Center in Calvert County. Marine sciences represent an area in which blacks are extremely under-represented nationally. Morgan is the only HBCU in the nation with a resource of this nature. This facility will not only permit Morgan to address the under-representation problem but also to assist the state in addressing problems facing the Chesapeake Bay and strengthen the University's existing science programs.

Weaknesses

There are a number of areas that need to be addressed if the campus is to develop in an optimal manner. In some cases the University has the ability to improve the situation on its own. In other cases development of the University is dependent on outside forces.

Morgan has a modest resource base. While on the surface the University might appear to be well funded currently compared to most Maryland campuses, its long history of neglect places it in the position of continually attempting to compensate for deficiencies. Due to the nature of its physical plant, the campus has to spend an inordinate amount of its operating funds on facilities operations and maintenance. Due to the nature of its student body, it spends the highest percentage of operating funds on student financial aid of any public campus in the state. Because of its emphasis on engineering and the sciences, its instructional program is inherently more expensive than that of the typical Maryland campus. The limitations on operating funds due to these and other circumstances result in

teaching loads that are too heavy for the mission of the campus, insufficient numbers of staff, heavy reliance on contractual faculty, and a limited ability to respond to opportunities as they arise.

Although the state by law made Morgan a doctoral-granting research university in 1976, to date it has provided little financial support for graduate education. This includes no dedicated funding for graduate facilities, faculty, student stipends, or for strengthening its research base. Morgan has only been able to obtain modest funding, primarily with federal assistance, for this important and growing part of its mission.

Morgan lacks adequate facilities capacity to serve current students, much less to grow. Due to their age, they also usually are less functional than facilities at other campuses. Holmes Hall, for example, which is the home of the School of Liberal Arts, was built in the 1940s and has not been expanded despite the University's request to do so during its renovation. The buildings of the science complex pre-date Holmes Hall and are the same size as when they were originally built. McMechen Hall, which houses the School of Business and Management, is the same size as when it was constructed in the early 1970s. The original engineering school was opened in the early 1990s without any classrooms. An annex had to be constructed to deal with this basic need. While the annex makes it appear that the state provided an additional facility, this facility in reality merely compensated for an earlier planning error by the state.

Morgan's facilities are less attractive than its historically white competitors in the region. This was the conclusion of the 1947 Marbury Commission, of a comprehensive state study carried out in the early 1980s and remains the case today.

Morgan is an expensive school to attend in comparison to the ability of its student body to pay for college. It is one of the most expensive public HBCUs in the country for an out-of-state student. Its cost of attendance is higher than many private HBCUs and not far below the most expensive private HBCUs.

Morgan has a relatively traditional classroom and lab-based approach to instruction. While this approach is at the heart of an effort to ensure quality for a student body that includes many students in need of extra attention, this approach probably is less attractive to members of the current generation of students who value flexibility in pursuing their educational goals. It also is a disadvantage in reorienting instruction for adult learners, on-line classes, and off-campus courses and programs.

Morgan has a student body that is primarily made up of students of traditional college age attending on a full-time basis and living on or near campus. While a good environment for promoting success among students in this age group, this emphasis to a large extent precludes the campus from serving the adult student either on campus or at remote locations. This is a segment of the market that will continue to grow for some time.

Competition for better prepared students is increasing. As the demographics of the college-age population continue to change, selective campuses are more aggressively recruiting better prepared

students from the pool from which Morgan historically has recruited to compensate for the downturn in white middle income students. As noted above, Morgan has some disadvantages in competing with other campuses for these students.

Morgan devotes the largest share of its operating budget to student financial aid of any public campus in the state. But this is inadequate. At the graduate level, Morgan has only modest ability to provide financial support for students. In both cases this adversely affects Morgan's competitive position and, of course, limits access by students in need of aid.

The University's short-term retention rates have begun to decline, which is likely to be a precursor of a decline in its graduation rate. This has generally been true across the state as well. Currently, Morgan's six-year graduation is at its highest point in 25 years. It ranks among the top public urban universities nationally in the graduation rate for African Americans. Based on the SAT scores of its entering freshmen and the degree of dependence on financial aid of its students, its graduation is where it is expected to be among Maryland public campuses. To convert its graduation rate into a strength, the campus will have to graduate students at a rate higher than what would be expected based on the characteristics of its incoming students.

Morgan's access-oriented mission, while important to the state's future, at the present time does not appear to be as highly valued by state policy makers as the prestige associated with campuses having highly selective admissions policies. Hence, Morgan has difficulty in making the case for mission-based funding, even though its mission inherently is more costly than one of educating better prepared students.

Customer service is not rated as a strength by Morgan's students. To some extent this may be a function of the difficulty students have in making financial arrangements to enroll, register for classes, and secure housing. It certainly is a function to some degree of the location of most student service functions away from the main part of campus and the poor condition of the Montebello complex in which most of these services are housed. However, students express a variety of other concerns that the campus needs to address. This issue has grown in importance as the preference for good service by students and their parents has grown in priority.

Opportunities

Morgan has a number of opportunities for growth and development, based primarily on the fact that its mission is a particularly good fit with emerging state needs.

The state has a growing educational attainment gap between the races. As the percentages of minorities, particularly African Americans and Hispanics, continue to grow, the implications of that gap will become more critical for the state's social and economic well-being.

Maryland has a higher education access problem. Most predominantly white public four-year campuses have become more selective during the temporary bulge in white high school graduates. This has resulted in the tracking of African-American students of traditional college age into community colleges and HBCUs. Morgan's admissions policies are appropriate for the state's changing demographics and the campus will not have to significantly alter its admissions strategies to address the emerging needs of the state.

Most of the state's growth in minorities is in its suburban jurisdictions. Morgan is in a position to work with school systems in these jurisdictions to improve minority student achievement and the preparation for college by students from families with little or no college experience and, increasingly, with little exposure or success in education at lower levels. For the University to take advantage of this opportunity it will have to continue to expand the number of school systems with which it works throughout the state. It currently is working with Montgomery County to develop a model which may have applicability elsewhere.

Quality is a growing concern of students in the college-age population and their parents. With a well credentialed faculty and a relatively large number of academic programs holding specialized accreditation, Morgan is in a good position to benefit from this trend. The University can enhance its reputation by giving additional priority to its current initiatives to document its quality and the educational value it adds through use of quantitative indicators of student learning.

Developments such as the influx of personnel from to military base closings and realignment (the BRAC process) have the potential to provide Morgan with new markets to serve. BRAC's main impact will be in Harford County and at Fort Meade. Neither area is served by a four-year campus. Potentially the campus can offer its programs in these regions to the extent that they address emerging needs.

Vulnerabilities

There are numerous potential obstacles to Morgan's future development.

Limits on state resources available to higher education present a potential problem for Morgan as well as for other institutions of higher education. In recent decades, a growing share of state budgets nationwide have been allocated to mandated programs. Higher education, which is primarily discretionary spending by the states, cannot realistically plan for an increasing share of the state's budget under such circumstances. While higher education overall is likely to continue to benefit during times of state surplus, it is prudent to assume that in most years increases in funding will be modest and that during difficult periods cutbacks will be required.

In an environment in which state funding is spread thinly, Morgan will be at a particular disadvantage unless it receives special priority. This coupled with an already-weak resource base, would place limits on its future growth, its ability to develop and improve, and its ability to take advantage of emerging opportunities.

One of the factors that limits the University's prospects for obtaining additional priority from the state is Maryland's adherence to funding guidelines as a means of assessing adequacy of funding. These guidelines utilize a peer group that is not representative of the University's situation in terms of mission, students served, or the need for special development funding. The result is that the University's unique needs are not recognized by the state as part of its normal budgetary process.

The upcoming downturn in white high school graduates will result in greater competition for minority students, which campuses like Morgan previously had an advantage in attracting. Of particular concern to Morgan is the fact that it has historically enrolled a significant concentration of well-credentialed minority students who to a growing degree will be recruited by campuses experiencing a reduction in the size of their traditional student markets. The fact that surveys of freshmen show that the University is not the first choice of many entering students reinforces the threat faced by the campus.

There is growing duplication of programs and missions among public institutions in the Baltimore area. This not only increases the competition among campuses for students and resources but it makes it more difficult for any campus to increase its attractiveness to students of all races.

For the past decade, the philosophy of the state coordinating board has been to allow increased competition among campuses. To the extent that it encourages more duplication of effort than is necessary and spreads scarce resources more thinly, this is not a healthy state of affairs. Such an approach hinders the development of campuses such as Morgan which has not been able to develop as rapidly as it should have.

Eight Strategic Goals for the University

The University has identified eight strategic goals to guide its growth and development over the next five years. These strategies are consistent with the emphases on the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary and emerging needs of the State of Maryland.

1. *Develop an infrastructure supporting the mission of the campus as a Doctoral Research University comparable to other Doctoral Research campuses in the state, that supports significant growth, and that supports other strategic goals.*

In order to develop in the manner envisioned in this Plan, the campus requires resources that make it comparable to other campuses with comparable missions. In addition, the campus needs to make internal changes to support its mission. In many respects the campus is organized around business processes more appropriate for a smaller campus with a teaching mission than one with significant graduate study and research. The campus needs to organize academic units in ways to support its current mission. It needs to improve support services for faculty and staff and to streamline its business processes. Decision making should be more decentralized. The University needs to be able to provide more incentives to attract and retain research faculty and to compete for graduate students. It requires state-of-the-art equipment and lighter teaching loads to support research. Its budget processes and the administration of the budget should support these changes and the implementation of the strategic goals and the processes for achieving them. These and other improvements would enable the campus to have an infrastructure that is more supportive of a doctoral research campus.

2. *Offer high quality academic programs and effective support programs and services that promote student academic success.*

Ensuring the effectiveness of these core functions is a long-standing goal of the University. By most traditional measures the campus is effective in carrying out these functions. The first priority of the University is to maintain and improve its academic quality. Another is to be a leader in documenting educational value added through its academic programs and in using assessment information to continually improve its programs and services.

3. *Provide students with a variety of options and a reasonable degree of flexibility in their academic programs.*

On average, Morgan students take longer to complete their degrees than students from most other campuses. To a large extent this is a result of students taking lighter class loads in order to work to pay their educational expenses. The typical Morgan undergraduate attending on a full-time basis averages

more than twenty hours a week working off campus. In order to reduce time to degree, on-line options and other forms of flexibility for completing degree programs will be developed by the campus. Additional options also will be added as appropriate to enrich student educational experiences.

4. *Differentiate the University's mission from that of other campuses in terms of academic offerings, research priorities, service emphasis, and the quality of programs and services offered to students.*

The campus has prospered when it has had a mission that was different from those of others in the region. While the philosophy of the state over the past decade has been one of permitting campuses to have some leeway in duplicating one another's missions and programs, the University will continue, to the extent possible, to develop in ways that complement, rather than duplicate, its peers. While unique program offerings are the most obvious means of differentiation, the orientation of its research and service programs, as described in its mission and vision statements, also differs from other campuses. The recently-acquired Environmental Research Center represents another example of an asset that differentiates the campus from others in the Baltimore area in terms of its unique educational, research, and service missions. An emphasis on documenting quality and ensuring that student support services are effective are additional means to identify and market Morgan as unique.

5. *Where desirable and feasible, organize degree offerings, research, and service programs around interdisciplinary and problem-oriented themes.*

The typical university is organized around highly specialized disciplines. Morgan is no exception. However, as the value of interdisciplinary collaboration increasingly is recognized as an effective mechanism for delivering instruction, solving real-world problems and offering important services to communities, the University intends to encourage students to be taught from an interdisciplinary perspective as well as promote the organization of research and service programs across traditional disciplinary boundaries.

6. *Extend recruitment and community service programs beyond the University's traditional service areas to strengthen its competitive position and attract a racially diverse student body.*

As a campus that traditionally has closely identified with the needs of the Baltimore area, Morgan's orientation in its recruitment and service has been focused primarily on the City. However, the state's changing demographics apply primarily beyond Baltimore and the University's mission is a particularly relevant one for the educational challenges that most of the state is facing. Extending its

traditional service area also provides the campus with access to a more racially and ethnically diverse pool of college-age students.

7. *Maintain an enterprising culture and infrastructure to enable the University to respond rapidly and effectively to changes in its environment.*

Although constraints on facilities and operating budgets have had an impact on the University's ability to respond to important opportunities as they develop, campus procedures and culture also have been impediments. The University intends to address those factors over which it has control to better position the campus to respond quickly and effectively to opportunities as they present themselves.

8. *Serve as a catalyst for the improvement of the surrounding community and of the City of Baltimore.*

As the campus physical plant has developed, the surrounding community has begun to stabilize, although there remains a good deal of work to be done to ensure the long-term viability of the areas adjacent to the campus. The University intends to continue to develop its physical plant in a manner that enhances the area surrounding it and that sets standards of architectural style in the City. Beyond the development of its on-campus facilities, the campus intends to participate in the community in ways that make Baltimore more attractive to individuals who can contribute to the City's development. This includes a variety of initiatives to improve the quality of life, make the area attractive to professionals, and provide cultural attractions.

Strategies for Development

The University will pursue strategies and request funding, as necessary, in pursuit of each of its strategic goals. These strategies will be assessed on a continuing basis with a formal report of progress prepared annually.

1. *Develop an infrastructure permitting significant growth, capable of supporting other strategic goals, and supporting the mission of the University as a Doctoral Research Institution.*

- Ensure that the campus has resources that are comparable to other campuses with similar missions.
- Ensure that the University is in a position to compete for the best prepared students and well-qualified faculty.
- Develop selected large departments into schools or colleges to support an increased number of specialties.
- Develop additional institutes and centers as the focus for instructional, research, and service collaboration among disciplines.
- Ensure an adequate base of funding, equipment, and personnel to support existing and future academic and research programs.
 - Appropriate student-faculty ratios
 - Additional faculty with strong research credentials
 - Appropriate teaching loads
 - Competitive faculty salaries
 - Adequate equipment and programs for regularly refreshing equipment
 - Support personnel for academic administration and faculty support
 - Adequate student financial aid and support for graduate students
 - Increased professional development opportunities for faculty
 - Increased support for faculty research

- Ensure that the campus information and educational technology infrastructure is adequate for the campus mission and is an asset in the recruitment of students and faculty.
- Ensure that library resources adequately support the campus mission and that the library is a significant center of educational technology on campus.
- Ensure adequate access to specialized databases for education and research.
- Ensure facilities are state-of-the art in functionality and allow for growth.
- Provide sufficient student housing.
- Continue to build a strong alumni base that can assist in marketing the University and supporting growth.
- Continue to build the University's image as an institution worthy of financial investment by corporations, foundations, and individuals.

2. Offer high quality academic programs and effective support programs and services that promote student academic success.

- Establish benchmarks in key performance areas based on national data and/or best practices at other campuses.
- Utilize quantitative systematic processes for directly measuring student learning outcomes and act on the results to improve student performance.
 - Student performance on the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) should be at or above the level predicted for students with the pre-college credentials of students admitted to the University.
 - Results of assessments by individual academic units should be comparable to established benchmarks among peer campuses and/or national results.
 - Results from the academic portion of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) should be at or above national averages.
- Utilize quantitative and systematic processes for assessing campus services and acting on the results to improve services for students and faculty.
 - Simplify processes and procedures.

- Student ratings on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) should be at or above the national average on measures of relationships with faculty and effectiveness of administrative services.
 - Internal surveys and assessment should show continual improvement in the level of satisfaction with key services on the part of students.
- Improve retention and graduation rates to levels higher than expected based on pre-college preparation and family income.
- Faculty ratings on surveys of faculty satisfaction should increase to appropriate benchmarks on measures of satisfaction with administrative services.
 - Internal surveys and assessment should show continual improvement in the level of satisfaction with key services on the part of students and faculty.

3. *Provide students with a variety of options and a reasonable degree of flexibility in their academic programs.*

- Develop online courses as a means of providing students with more options for completing their degrees and as a basis for offering educational opportunities beyond the campus.
 - Increase the number of courses offered during the summer both on campus and online.
 - Increase the number of minimester courses offered both on campus and online.
 - Increase the number of in-demand courses offered during the regular school year online.
- Increase the number of internships and opportunities for study abroad in preparation for employment and/or advanced study.
- Develop more concentrations in areas of study outside of the major.
- Develop more certificate programs for promoting professional development.
- Increase the number of non-credit courses for degree-seeking students as well as for non-degree students.

4. *Differentiate the University's mission from that of other campuses in terms of academic offerings, research priorities, service emphasis, and the quality of programs and services offered to students.*

- Develop academic programs, interdisciplinary offerings, and non-credit courses that are unique and address specific niches in the student market.
- Give priority to ensuring quality instruction, demonstrating learning outcomes, and using demonstrated quality as a unique strength of the University and as a marketing and recruitment advantage.
- Differentiate online courses from those at other campuses by applying nationally-recognized external quality standards.
- Give priority to ensuring a supportive student environment at all degree levels as a unique strength on the University and use this as a marketing and recruitment advantage.
- Organize instructional and non-instructional activities around the theme of promoting student success and use this as a marketing and recruitment advantage.
- Focus on problem-based research, with special emphasis on issues faced by urban centers and by urban schools.
- Focus on service to communities that are under-served.

5. *Where desirable and feasible, organize degree offerings, research, and service programs around interdisciplinary and problem-oriented themes.*

- Increase the amount of instruction, research, and service that is organized through interdisciplinary and problem-oriented centers and institutes.
- Develop additional centers and institutes that address difficult problems.
- Develop additional majors, concentrations, and non-credit courses and certificates around problem-oriented themes.

6. *Extend recruitment and community service programs beyond the University's student traditional service areas to strengthen its competitive position and attract a racially diverse body.*

- Broaden student recruitment and service programs to parts of the state experiencing significant changes in the demographics of their population.
 - Increase the number of freshmen and transfer students enrolling from outside of Baltimore City.

- Increase the percentage of non-African-Americans enrolling at the University.
- Develop off-campus programs and courses in rapidly-growing areas of the state.
- Market University strengths in promoting student success and in offering a student-centered environment.
- Market high school-to-college transition programs.
- Effectively utilize the alumni network for marketing and recruitment.

7. *Maintain an enterprising culture and infrastructure to enable the University to respond rapidly and effectively to changes in its environment.*

- Develop systematic processes to continuously –
 - Keep in touch with existing and potential markets
 - Listen carefully to faculty, students, and staff.
- Incorporate information from assessments into decision-making processes.
- Create mechanism for enabling the campus to alter existing plans and/or make timely decisions about pursuing new opportunities.
- Establish mechanisms for creating and allocating resources quickly enough to permit the campus to take advantage of emerging opportunities.

8. *Serve as a catalyst for the improvement of the surrounding community and of the City of Baltimore.*

- Ensure that the campus sets a standard for attractive and functional architecture in the City.
- Ensure that campus facilities set a standard for environmentally-friendly buildings.
- Provide leadership within the community on issues important to the City.
- Serve as a magnet for attracting talent to the City.
- Act as a thought leader in promoting creative ideas concerning urban life.
- Promote the economic and community development of northeast Baltimore.
- Serve as a resource for the community for cultural, athletic, and recreational events.

Morgan State University
1700 East Cold Spring Lane
Baltimore MD 21251
(443) 885-3000
www.morgan.edu