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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) has continuously accredited Morgan State University since 1925. The University’s last decennial evaluation was in 1998, and a successful Periodic Review Report was submitted in 2003. Since the last full review, Morgan has made significant progress in implementing its mission and strategic goals, and it fully believes that it continues to meet or to exceed the MSCHE Eligibility Criteria and Standards for Accreditation. Therefore, the University chose to pursue the “Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards To Reflect an Institution” model for its 2008 Middle States Self-Study, by aligning the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence with the 14 MSCHE standards for excellence. This approach provided an effective means not only to demonstrate Morgan’s compliance with MSCHE standards, but also to identify and address the campus’s achievements, strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement and a variety of approaches to improving the University’s performance.

Over the past ten years, Morgan’s growing momentum has been evident in many ways, including increasing numbers of applications for attendance, increasing enrollment, program growth, increased grant and contract awards, and its history-making success in fundraising. Over the last 15 years, enrollment has grown by 40 percent, or approximately two (2) times that of higher education in Maryland overall, and graduate enrollment has grown much faster than undergraduate enrollment. In light of the State’s growing minority population and the need to address the widening educational gap between minorities and their counterparts, Morgan plans to increase its enrollment by 28 percent over the next decade, which is much greater than the 17 percent projected for higher education in Maryland overall (excluding University of Maryland University College).

Facilities, of course, are essential to support the anticipated increase in enrollment, as well as the continued development and growth of the graduate programs; and they are key to appropriately positioning the University to be comparable and competitive with other State public institutions so that it can better attract students of all races. Therefore, to accommodate the increasing number of students and to provide state-of-the-art teaching facilities and modern learning environments for these students, Morgan has built or significantly renovated several buildings on campus. Included among these facilities are: a new 221,517 GSF Library (opened in February 2008), a new 130,000 GSF Student Center (opened in Fall 2006), a new parking garage (opened in 2006), the 48,500 GSF Richard N. Dixon Science Research Center, home of the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences (opened in 2003), a new Communication Center (opened in Fall 2006) and the Estuarine Research Center (ERC), transferred from the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (2004).

Although Morgan has made significant strides recently, primarily with federal and foundation funding, it is currently, by far, the least developed of the State’s public doctoral research institutions. It is only through a concerted, accelerated capital improvement program (CIP), coupled with operating budget support, that Morgan State University will eventually achieve parity. The University’s current funding portfolio is primarily based on undergraduate funding. It provides little or no opportunity for new faculty to be hired with start up funds and other resources. In addition, existing and new faculty have limited opportunities for development of research capabilities.

In the past ten years (1998-2008), the University has experienced tremendous growth in its degree program inventory. Morgan now awards degrees in forty-one (41) undergraduate programs, thirty (30) master’s degree programs, and fourteen (14) doctoral programs. The bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral programs in Nursing, approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission in September 2007, are among the most recent additions to the University’s inventory of degree programs. Among the goals that have been set and achieved (or have progressed significantly) is the initiation of the following doctoral
programs: Community College Leadership (1998), Public Health (1999), Bioenvironmental Science (2001), Business Administration (2001), Higher Education (2003), English (2004), Social Work (2005) and Psychometric (2006). Morgan has now grown significantly in the number of doctorates and professional degrees it awards. In the last five (5) years, Morgan’s doctoral enrollment has grown by 56 percent and is expected to continue to grow over the next decade. In Spring 2006, Morgan awarded 40 doctorates, of which 29 went to African-Americans. Due to Morgan’s recent productivity, the percent of doctoral degrees awarded to African-Americans in the State increased from four (4) percent in 1996 to eight (8) percent in 2005. With greater state support, Morgan’s productivity in awarding doctoral degrees has even greater potential.

Since the last MSCHE review, Morgan has also added nine new masters’ degrees, seven new bachelor’s degrees and one post-baccalaureate certificate to its inventory. The master’s degrees include: Bioinformatics, Journalism, Telecommunications Management, Higher Education Administration, Mathematics Education, Science Education, Nursing, Psychometrics, Social Work and Museum Studies and Historical Preservation. It has also added the following new bachelor’s degree programs: Architecture and Environmental Design, Journalism, Broadcast and Integrated Media Production, Public Relations, Media Writing and Animation, Nursing and Nutritional Science.

Moreover, the University will continue its development in this area as increasing operating and capital resources are made available. It is important to note that Morgan is one of four (4) public doctoral/research institutions in Maryland, the others being the University of Maryland College Park, the University of Maryland at Baltimore and the University of Maryland Baltimore County. Because of its increase in doctoral degree production, Morgan has achieved its goal of being designated a doctoral/research University, under the Carnegie classification. In terms of doctoral degrees awarded to African Americans, Morgan currently ranks second to the University of Maryland College Park in the State. Nationally, Morgan ranks 24th among all campuses, 4th among HBCUs, 8th in Education degrees, 4th in Engineering degrees and 11th in Health Science degrees. The university’s transition to a doctoral/research university remains a major challenge for the faculty, staff and administration, in that Morgan and other state HBCUs have not yet achieved comparability to and competitiveness with the other State public institutions because of limited resources and funding.

In the last ten years, Morgan has had a substantial number of noteworthy achievements. Among traditional colleges and universities, Morgan State University awards the largest number of bachelor’s degrees to African-Americans in the State of Maryland (MHEC 2006 Degree Reports); and it has received more Fulbright Scholarships than any other historically black college or university in the nation. Additionally, the University also increased its grants and contract funding by 103percent over the last ten years. Growth in research has slowed in recent years, as the University has become increasingly dependent on temporary contractual faculty, who do not traditionally engage in research activities. However, once the University is appropriately positioned to hire additional regular full-time faculty, research grants and contract funding will accelerate in a manner consistent with previous performance.

The State’s investment in the campus has had a major impact not only on Morgan’s enrollments and degree production, but also on the State’s high rankings nationally in the number of minorities receiving college degrees. Therefore, to fulfill the vision as identified in the Strategic Plan and in this Self Study, continuing emphasis has to be placed on broadening academic programs; expanding faculty; securing additional funding; increasing the revenue base to improve student life and access, with the ultimate goal of developing Morgan to the level where it is comparable to the three (3) other doctoral research institutions within the State and can attract students regardless of race, achievement and socio-economic status.
Morgan relies on a variety of assessment instruments to determine how well the University is fulfilling its mission and in what ways the University might improve the delivery of its instructional services to graduate as well as undergraduate students. As part of its assessment, the University regularly submits itself to accreditation review by professional societies, and it has been awarded accreditation or reaccreditation for 19 of its programs. Moreover, the University has developed and begun to implement its own Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) to measure student learning and institutional effectiveness, and it seeks to provide the University with important feedback that is necessary for institutional planning, institutional growth and institutional renewal. The CAP is based on the Morgan’s mission statement, goals and objectives.

In order to guide the self-study process, the Steering Committee for Morgan State University’s 2008 Middle States Self-Study prepared a design document. The Design provided a context for the Self-Study, a statement of the University’s achievements, a statement of its intended outcomes, an overview of the organizational structure and implementation plan for the self-study process, and guidelines and timetables for completion of the Self-Study report.

The Self-Study report presents the important progress and achievements of the University over the past ten years, followed by the findings and recommendations that flowed from this process, including the identification of the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement (OFIs) in the context of the MSCHE standards, aligned with the Baldrige principles. The Self-Study report reflects a wide consensus at the University about these strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement:

**Selected Strengths**

- Recognition of Morgan by Carnegie as a Doctoral Research University;
- Expansion of undergraduate and graduate degree programs;
- The appropriateness of the Strategic Plan for the campus mission, its aspirations and the environment in which it is operating.
- The programs in the College/Schools/Institute as well as the academic support programs.
- Increase in enrollment, particularly at the graduate level;
- The contribution of the specialized programs at the University (e.g., Foundations of Excellence, Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students, Helping Hands, Male Initiative on Leadership & Excellence, Fast Track, and New Student Orientation & Registration) in meeting the needs of many students academically and personally.
- Enhancement of campus facilities and technology infrastructure;
- Successful completion of its first private capital campaign;
- The variety of instruments used to assess student learning and organizational performance; and
- The recognition by the Calvert Institute for Policy Research of the General Education Program at Morgan as a coherent and challenging experience.

**Weaknesses:**

- Too few full-time regular faculty, particularly graduate faculty, to support the teaching, research, and advising needed to implement its educational goals and objectives thoroughly;
- Too few support staff, particularly professional grant writers, laboratory and clinical staff, and information technology specialists;
- Limited financial resources to support departmental and school budgets and to fund student scholarships; and,
- Limited funds for program enhancement, faculty development and research.

**Selected Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) and Recommendations**
• Increase competitiveness in research;
• Increase communication effectiveness;
• Celebrate achievements both internally and externally;
• Secure, through the State budget appropriations process, additional funding for full-time faculty and staff positions;
• Proceed with the development of new graduate and undergraduate programs only when faculty and resources for existing programs have been fully funded by the State;
• Placement of the 2007 mission statement, along with the values and vision statements, as stand-alone entries on the University’s web site, in recruitment materials, catalogs, and other documents meant for public utilization, as well as internal planning and governance;
• Hold staff accountable in critical academic and student services areas; and
• Provide consistent technology for academic and student services staff (e.g., voice mail and email).

The University is confident that the Self Study Design and this resultant Self-Study report meet the expectations and requirements of MSCHE.
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Certification Statement
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(Chief Executive Officer) February 21, 2008
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INTRODUCTION

A. ORGANIZATION OF SELF-STUDY

1. Nature and Scope of Self-Study

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) has continuously accredited Morgan State University since 1925. The University underwent its last decennial evaluation visit in 1998. In 2003, the University had its accreditation reaffirmed on the basis of the successful Periodic Review Report, for which a site visit was not required, that it submitted to the MSCHE, and, in 2005, it followed with a Monitoring Report which met Middle States approval. The University’s recent accreditation experiences, particularly because of this successful history, provides a partial explanation and rationale for the nature and scope of the self-study format chosen for this decennial review, which will occur in the spring of 2008. Excerpts from the 1998 Self-Study, the 2003 Periodic Review Report, and the 2005 Monitoring Report serve to underscore what Morgan State University has identified as its key strengths, issues and opportunities for improvement:

The Past as Prologue—Reflections

• 1998 Institutional Self-Study (Relevant Excerpts, p. 2)

The Executive Summary (p. 2) of the 1998 Institutional Self-Study captures the University’s development and key issues at that time:

Morgan State University has changed dramatically in many respects since the mid-1980s. To some extent, new academic programs influenced its development during this period that it implemented in the early 1980s as part of its effort to develop an attractive contemporary curriculum. However, to an even greater extent, the changes experienced by the campus have reflected ongoing planning, a continuing emphasis on improving the quality of instruction and supporting services, a sustained program of capital improvement, and ongoing efforts to better utilize campus resources to address priority issues. Perhaps most importantly, the University has been able to improve its public image and increase its credibility with state officials and the private sector, support that has been crucial to its recent development and which will be the key to its future success.

The development of the campus since the mid-1980s represents a dramatic reversal of a number of negative trends that had become apparent by the mid-1970s. Morgan, like many historically black campuses, confronted a number of difficulties beginning during this period as increasing numbers of African-American students began to attend majority institutions. As enrollments dropped at Morgan and other HBCUs, their future importance came into question. While in many respects this may have been a legitimate question, it also was the case that most HBCUs were at a relative disadvantage in competing for students of any race due to their narrow missions, outdated facilities, and the historic under-funding of their operations.

In the late 1970s, prodded by the federal government, state governments in Maryland and elsewhere took measures to enhance many HBCUs. At Morgan, this took the form of the development of new academic programs designed to make the campus more attractive to students of all races and to increase the representation of minorities in fields in which they historically have been under-represented. However, because the University’s enrollment had been declining, it was not
able to obtain the additional funding from the state that typically would have been associated with new program development. Hence, in the early 1980s Morgan was faced with the task of re-allocating resources internally if it was to develop the programs upon which its future depended. This necessitated the elimination of academic programs, consolidation of academic units, and reductions in faculty and staff positions. These changes understandably led to a good deal of discontent on campus and a public perception that the University was in crisis.

- 2003 Periodic Review Report (Executive Summary)

The 2003 Periodic Review Report reflected considerable progress at the University in the five years since the self-study:

Morgan State University has grown rapidly since the mid-1980s. It has done so due to an aggressive campaign to restore the campus to its historic stature. The 1998 report of the Middle States review team confirmed how far the campus had progressed since the 1970s and early 1980s, a period during which the campus simultaneously faced the problems of under-funding, development of competing public institutions in the Baltimore area, and loss of students due to desegregation efforts at majority campuses.

Since the 1998 review, Morgan has continued to develop rapidly, primarily with respect to its facilities, the quality of its faculty, and the implementation of new academic programs. Most of the new academic programs developed during this period were at the doctoral level, where African Americans are severely under-represented. This development has begun to pay off in terms of the number of doctorates produced and for the expertise that these programs have attracted to the campus. This expertise is key to functioning as a comprehensive public urban university serving the needs of Baltimore City and other urban centers of the state and region.

The mid-1990s through 2002 were by historical standards very good years for state support of higher education. Morgan benefited from a strong state economy by using its increased appropriations to solidify its undergraduate infrastructure and begin the development of its doctoral programs. However, like public campuses throughout the nation, Morgan has now had to adjust to reductions in state funds. It is likely to continue to have to cope with the new fiscal realities for some time to come. It faces this challenge along with the need to continue its development during a period in which the demand for higher education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is again increasing rapidly. It also faces the challenge of educating increasing numbers of low-income students in a state with one of the fastest-growing African American populations in the nation, but one of the largest gaps in college degree attainment between black and white residents.

- 2005 Monitoring Report (Conclusion, pp. 10 – 11)

The action of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education with regard to the University’s 2003 Periodic Review Report generally reflected the Commission’s concurrence that Morgan State University was still in compliance with accreditation standards; however, the University was advised of the need for fully articulated and institutionalized its assessment plans and processes. As the following excerpt from the 2005 Monitoring Report indicates, the University took seriously the observations of the Commission regarding assessment, especially in the development of a Comprehensive Assessment Plan for Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness:

The University believes that it has made significant progress toward the development and implementation of a Comprehensive Assessment Plan for Student Learning and Institutional Effective-
ness. It has engaged in the careful study of existing assessment features at Morgan, the review of external assessment programs and tools, and consideration of the current assessment culture at Morgan. Specifically, the major steps toward the development and implementation of the plan that Morgan has undertaken thus far have included: (1) appointment of an Assessment Work Group to oversee the development and implementation of the program; (2) review of assessment in the current General Education Program; (3) submittal of a report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission on student learning outcomes assessment in general education; (4) review of national standardized tools for assessment of student learning in general education; (5) promotion of a culture of assessment among the faculty by holding a university-wide faculty institute on assessment of student learning; (6) application for and acceptance in the Collegiate Learning Assessment Program of the Council for Aid to Education to give Morgan an external view of student learning in critical areas of general education; (7) focus of a major portion of the summer 2005 administrative retreat on learning and institutional assessment; (8) development of an assessment component for the University’s mission statement; (9) review of research and planning data gathered by the Office of Planning and Information Technology; (10) review of existing assessment programs in the academic programs in the majors at Morgan; (11) review of the Baldrige Principles of Excellence; (12) review of national standardized examinations for various disciplines; (13) development of a proposal for a Comprehensive Assessment Program for Student Learning and Institution Effectiveness and a plan for its review, adoption and implementation; and (14) presentation of that plan to the administration for review, along with its presentation, through the President, to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Morgan is convinced that its assessment culture has grown much stronger … [and] that it has proposed the most effective strategy for developing and implementing a comprehensive assessment program for Morgan – for all of the units at the institution to move forward together step by step…in concert with one another, through all of the stages of developing and implementing the plan.

Having made steady progress in implementing its mission and strategic objectives, the University believes that it meets or exceeds the MSCHE Eligibility Criteria and Standards for Accreditation (i.e., Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, 11th Edition, 2002). Therefore, the University reviewed the various self-study models outlined in the MSCHE “Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report,” and, on the basis of its review of the available self-study options, decided that Figure 10 (The Comprehensive Report Reordering Standards to Reflect an Institution) would be the most appropriate model. This decision was taken especially since a corresponding decision was made to utilize the Baldrige categories as a vehicle for conducting the self-study and assessment processes. Thus, with encouragement by MSCHE and internal support from the President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the University Self-Study Steering Committee, the University seized upon the opportunity to use the MSCHE standards as the driver, aligned with the Baldrige criteria, not only for our comprehensive self-study, but also for concurrent strategic planning processes, the continuing refinement and use of the ERP (Banner System), and the further implementation and documentation of the University’s comprehensive assessment plans.

As a consequence of these decisions relative to the nature and scope of the self-study process, Morgan State University officially began a comprehensive review of itself at the start of the 2005-2006 academic year. After the Provost’s initial appointment of the members of the Steering Committee (a broadly inclusive group representing faculty, administrators, students, and staff), the self-study process at Morgan began.

This comprehensive review process came at a most opportune time for the University. It positioned the University to address its opportunities for improvement proactively by using a somewhat concep-
tually and structurally different approach, as well as meeting the MSCHE review requirements. The Baldrige approach was especially useful in the further establishment and implementation of the ERP (a.k.a., Banner database system). During the comprehensive review of the University over the last two and a half years, there has been a stronger and sustained implementation of the University comprehensive assessment plan, which continues to include attention to institutional assessment of overall effectiveness, as well as the assessment of student achievement (as reflected in MSCHE Standards 1, 2, 7, and 14, and in Baldrige Category 7 on Performance Results).

Assuring reasonable success of all of these elements of review as components of the comprehensive self-study process has required a robust and broadly participative structure that rests upon the involvement of a diverse group of faculty, students, administrators, and staff. From the very outset, the University has stressed the importance of inclusiveness at every level of the self-study process, including those in the University community who are familiar with MSCHE standards and the self-study process and have particular expertise and experience in applying the Baldrige criteria on organizational leadership and management, process management, and organizational performance. The self-study process has relied on both formal and informal mechanisms to accomplish its multidimensional process and to lead to performance excellence. As articulated in the 2005 Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence, “a systems perspective means managing your whole organization, as well as its components, to achieve success.” That is precisely why the seven categories of the Baldrige criteria were aligned with the 14 MSCHE standards as a basis for the establishment and implementation of Task Forces, for which faculty and administrators served as Managers.

2. **Overview of MSCHE Standards and Baldrige National Education for Performance Excellence**

The Baldrige quality approach was and continues to be particularly helpful in providing an instrument for self-analysis of the institution’s strengths and opportunities for improvement at all stages of the process, which initially provided useful feedback for the development of pertinent research questions, as well as information that would satisfy individual and group educative functions of the self-study process. After all, Morgan undertook this comprehensive self-study for its own improvement purposes, and the participants in the process have continued to be better informed about an environment in which they live, teach, learn, work, and think.

The process of aligning the MSCHE standards with the Baldrige criteria was completed well before Task Forces met initially. Though there are twice as many MSCHE Standards (14) as there are Baldrige Categories (7), the most important MSCHE standards are: Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal); Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment); and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning), while the most important of the Baldrige criteria is Category 7: Organizational Performance Results. Every level and stage of the comprehensive self-study deliberately stressed the importance of outcomes assessment, not only because of its importance to MSCHE and Baldrige, but also because of the importance attached to this issue at state, regional, and national levels. It is also important because Morgan wanted the self-study to focus more strongly on students and their learning outcomes, as well as on the effectiveness of Morgan’s institutional processes. (See table below.)

This self-study report will be organized around MSCHE standards. Each section of the report will focus on (1) an update of the University’s progress in meeting the standard, followed by (2) an analysis, list of Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) and recommendations based on Baldrige categories and principles.
## Linkage of Middle States Standards to Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSCHE Standards</th>
<th>Baldrige Education Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Mission and Goals</strong></td>
<td>Preface: Organizational Profile (Environment, Relationships and Challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal</strong></td>
<td>Category 2: Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 6: Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Institutional Resources</strong></td>
<td>Category 2: Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 6: Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4: Leadership and Governance</strong></td>
<td>Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5: Administration</strong></td>
<td>Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6: Integrity</strong></td>
<td>Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2: Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preface: Organizational Profile (Environment, Relationships and Challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3: Student, Stakeholder and Market Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 6: Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 7: Institutional Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Category 6: Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 7: Organizational Performance Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

**Category 3: Student, Stakeholder and Market Focus**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 9: Student Support Services

**Category 3: Student, Stakeholder and Market Focus**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 10: Faculty

**Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 11: Educational Offerings

**Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 12: General Education

**Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

**Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management**

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

**Category 7: Organizational Performance Results**

### 3. Participants in Self-Study

In keeping with principles espoused by MSCHE and Baldrige, the University and its representative Steering Committee deliberately included broad participation of all constituents groups in the University. In the self-study process, as shown in Section IV, “List of Participants in Self-Study,” the Steering Committee, Task Force leadership and membership, and focus groups all represent campus diversity, especially in regard to representatives from the faculty, students, administration, staff, alumni, parents, and community. Further, in keeping with MSCHE guidelines on participation and Baldrige principles, the University used focus groups as a means of purposeful input from the diversity that characterizes the schools and colleges, and it convened “town hall” meetings for larger segments of the University for corroborating the preliminary findings of the **Self-Study Report** before it submitted it MSCHE and others.

In light of the University’s familiarity with MSCHE standards and its relative lack of familiarity with Baldrige, quite early in the process, the Task Force provided orientation to the use of Baldrige National Education Criteria by inviting the assistance of local, as well as national, expertise in discussions about the value of Baldrige to the Morgan State University community at this phase of its development and in the MSCHE self-study process. In addition to holding “rump group” sessions to address a range of process issues that might inform the course of action—including means for making
the information more accessible to more persons in the University community—the Task Force was successful in convincing the University Faculty Professional Development Committee to invite an academic leader from another university that had received the prestigious Baldrige National Award for Performance Excellence. As noted on the University website, a consultant, the Provost and Vice Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Stout, provided a very informative presentation on how her institution dealt with a range of challenges (opportunities for improvement) in working to achieve the Baldrige principles. This faculty development institute was at least partly responsible for further educating members of the University community on the nature and benefits of Baldrige in the self-study process and long after the formal MSCHE review.
Organizational Structure for MSU Self-Study Process

President

Office of the Provost/VPAA

MSU Self-Study Chair

Executive Steering Committee
Task Force Managers (7)

MSU Self-Study Steering Committee

TF, Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/ Governance and Social Responsibilities)

TF, Category 2: Strategic Planning

TF, Category 3: Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

TF, Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management

TF, Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus

TF, Category 6: Process Management

TF, Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Liaison to Self-Study Process/ Assoc. VP for Acad. Affairs
B. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY HISTORY AND CHARACTERISTICS

Founded in 1867 as the Centenary Biblical Institute by the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the institution’s original mission was to train young men for the ministry. It subsequently broadened its mission to educate both men and women as teachers. It was renamed Morgan College in 1890 in honor of the Reverend Lyttleton Morgan, the first chairman of its Board of Trustees, who donated land to the college.

Morgan awarded its first baccalaureate degree to George W. F. McMechen in 1895. McMechen subsequently obtained a law degree from Yale and eventually returned to Baltimore, where he became an important civic leader and a strong financial supporter of the College.

Morgan remained a private institution until 1939. In that year, the state of Maryland purchased the institution in response to a study by a state commission, which found that Maryland needed to provide more opportunities for its black citizens. By this time the College had become a relatively comprehensive institution. Until the mid-1960s, when the state’s teachers colleges began their transition to liberal arts campuses, Morgan and the University of Maryland College Park were the only two public campuses in the state with comprehensive missions.

In the mid-1960s, the Middle States Association cited Morgan as a model liberal arts campus. This was a period of dramatic growth for the campus. In the early 1970s, the federal government began to pressure the southern states that had formerly maintained desegregated higher education systems to increase the extent of desegregation at their public campuses. This created a significant level of competition for Morgan and other historically black institutions for African American enrollments, the primary constituency of these campuses. Because major campuses were much more attractive and better financed, the mandate for increased enrollments at these campuses had a substantial negative impact on enrollments at Morgan and other HBCUs. By 1972, the campus had reached a historic enrollment high of 6,300. While this period was one of prosperity in some respects for Morgan, it also was a period during which two other developing trends were combining to create severe future problems for the campus.

In 1975, the State Legislature designated Morgan as a public urban university, gave it the authority to offer doctorates, and enabled the institution to have its own governing board. In 1988, Maryland reorganized its higher education structure. The campuses in the state college system became part of the University System of Maryland. However, Morgan and St. Mary’s College of Maryland were the only public baccalaureate-granting institutions authorized to have their own governing boards. The 1988 legislation also strengthened Morgan’s authority to offer advanced programs and reaffirmed the campus as Maryland’s Public Urban University. The university has a history of serving individuals from underrepresented minority backgrounds and, consequently, it gives priority to addressing the needs of the populations of the urban community. Morgan’s mission is to serve a multi-ethnic and multi-racial student body and to help ensure that the benefits of higher education are enjoyed by a broad segment of the population. To accomplish this, the University offers a comprehensive program of study at the undergraduate level and degrees in selected fields at the master’s and doctoral levels.

MSU is also one of the nation’s premiere historically black institutions of higher education and one of the few offering a comprehensive range of programs, awarding degrees through the doctorate and having significant programs of research and public services. The University’s current enrollment consists of approximately 6,999 students with a racial composition of 90% black, 2.5% white, 0.9% Asian, 0.7% Hispanic, 0.2% American Indian and 6% other/unknown. Of the students enrolled at Morgan, about 35% are from all fifty states and numerous foreign countries. Morgan is also one of the leading institutions nationally in the number of applications received from African American high
school graduates. The largest sources of its enrollments outside of Maryland are from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

The Academic Division at the University consists of the College of Liberal Arts, the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences (restructured from the College of Arts and Sciences in 1998), the School of Business and Management, the School of Education and Urban Studies, the School of Engineering, the School of Community Health and Policy (established in 2005), the Institute of Architecture and Planning, the School of Graduate Studies, the Continuing Studies Program, the Institute for Urban Research, the Center for Civil Rights in Higher Education (established in 2007), and the Center for Prevention Sciences, which houses the Center for the Study of Substance Abuse and the Center for Health Disparities Solutions, provides community – based programs that address intervention measures and early detections protocols of chronic diseases in urban communities; as well as several academic support programs that includes the Retention Center, Academic Development Center, Honors Program, Transfer Center, the Academic Recovery Program, Admissions and Recruitment (as of 2008), Records and Registration and the Library.

Students enrolled at the University may pursue undergraduate studies in over 45 areas of concentrations; graduate studies in over 27 areas of concentration leading to the degrees: Master of Arts, Master of Science as well as Master of Architecture, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Business Administration, Master of City and Regional Planning, Master of Engineering, Master of Landscape Architecture, Master of Public Health, Master of Science in Bio-informatics and Master of Social Work, Master of Science in Higher Education and Master of Science in Nursing, and fourteen (14) doctoral programs in areas as: Urban Educational Leadership, Mathematics Education, Science Education, Engineering, Community College Leadership and Public Health; and Ph.D. degrees in Bioenvironmental Science, Business Administration, Higher Education, English, History, Psychometrics, Social Work and Nursing.

In the past ten years (1998-2008) the University has experienced tremendous development. Among the goals that have been set and accomplished (or have progressed significantly) are:

(1) The initiation of the following doctoral programs: Community College Leadership (1998), Public Health (1999), Bioenvironmental Science (2001), Business Administration (2001), Higher Education (2003), English (2004), Social Work (2005) and Psychometric (2006). Morgan has now grown in the number of doctorates and professional degrees it awards; and as a result, it has achieved its goal of becoming a doctoral/research University as designated under the Carnegie classification. In terms of doctoral degrees awarded to African Americans, Morgan currently ranks second to the University of Maryland College Park in the state, and nationally, 24th among all campuses and 4th among HBCUs, 8th in Education degrees, 4th in Engineering degrees and 11th in Health Science degrees.

(2) The enhancement of the physical facilities of the campus: Over the past ten years Morgan’s enrollment has generally been on an upward incline. Thus, to accommodate the increasing number of students and to provide state-of-the-art teaching facilities and modern learning environments for these students, Morgan has built or significantly renovated several buildings on campus. Included among these are the new 78,000 gross square feet (GSF) Communications Center (Fall 2006), a new 221,517 GSF library (opened in February 2008), a new 130,000 GSF Student Center (opened Fall 2006), a new parking garage (opened 2006), and the 48,500 GSF Richard N. Dixon Science Research Center, home of the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences and the core and research laboratories of the Biomedical Research Center (opened in 2003), that includes 26 research laboratories (including four multi-user laboratories for molecular biology, histology/microscopy, environmental toxicology and nuclear magnetic resonance), faculty of-
In addition to building new facilities, MSU has expanded its capabilities to teach and do research in the critical area of Environmental Science by acquiring the Estuarine Research Center (ERC) from the Academy of Natural Sciences (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 1, 2004). The ERC sits on the Patuxent River in St. Leonard, Maryland, not far from the Chesapeake Bay. The Center is on the grounds of the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, home of the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory. The research emphasis of the ERC is on marine, coastal ecosystem and bioenvironmental sciences with the goal of addressing the mounting environmental problems that threaten the health, safety and well-being of urban communities, the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. Morgan’s primary goal in acquiring the ERC is to enhance its research presence in the fields of marine biology, ecology and the environmental sciences as well as increase training of minority students in these fields.

The State’s investment in the campus has had a major impact not only on Morgan’s enrollments and degree production, but also on the State’s high rankings nationally in the number of minorities receiving college degrees. The demographics are favorable for the State to continue to be a leader, if it can make college a reality for more low-income students; if retention and graduation rates for these students can be increased; if the resources are provided for broadening the academic mix of students; and if it will increase need-based financial aid to improve retention and graduation rates. (See Tables 2-4.)

Table 2
STUDENT ENROLLMENT TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Undergraduate</td>
<td>5328</td>
<td>5567</td>
<td>5101</td>
<td>5334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Undergraduate</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>6005</td>
<td>6244</td>
<td>5747</td>
<td>5955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Graduate</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Graduate</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>6621</td>
<td>6892</td>
<td>6438</td>
<td>6705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES
FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, DEGREE-SEEKING FRESHMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Cont’d to 2nd Yr.</th>
<th>Cont’d to 3rd Yr.</th>
<th>Cont’d to 4th Yr.</th>
<th>Grad. in 4 yrs.</th>
<th>Cont’d to 5th Yr.</th>
<th>Grad. in 5 yrs.</th>
<th>Cont’d to 6th Yr.</th>
<th>Grad. in 6 yrs.</th>
<th>Cont’d to 7th Yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. PRIMARY OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

The most important goals for this self-study were: a) to improve University processes, especially to improve the teaching and learning environment on campus; and b) to identify and address substantially the University’s opportunities for improvement (OFIs).

Primary Objectives:

The primary objectives of the self-study process, based on input from a broad range of constituents, were:

- To achieve reaffirmation of accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
- To integrate the MSCHE standards effectively with the Baldrige categories.
- To review the University’s vision, mission, goals and objectives for the purpose of achieving greater clarity, determining their appropriateness to emerging trends and the changing dynamics of the campus and external environment, and building faculty, staff, and student consensus.
- To ensure that the University’s mission guides resource allocation, program development, and evaluation.
- To use the self-study process to document and improve the alignment of campus resources with the University’s priorities, goals, and objectives.
- To engage the campus community and improve communication regarding the University’s mission, goals, objectives, organizational structure and functioning, and assessment plans.
- To identify and find effective means for maintaining the University’s strengths, leveraging its assets, and addressing its opportunities for improvement (OFIs).
- To analyze, document, and synthesize the University’s progress in effectively promoting and assessing student learning and success.
- To use the self-study process as a means of informing and engaging the campus community in the University’s strategic planning process and action plans.
- To develop a more effective communication system that is continuous and ongoing and provides opportunities for the sharing of information, dialogue, and feedback between and among various University constituent groups, including continual improvement of the University’s website.
- To identify and promote proactively effective approaches to improve, integrate, and align customer services and University management systems and processes.
- To improve the quality, currency, and utilization of the University’s technology, including the ERP (a.k.a. Banner database system).
• To use the self-study process as an opportunity to improve the University’s data collection and evaluation protocols.
• To use the self-study process to identify more effective means of securing sufficient funding to advance the University as a doctoral/research institution.

Expected Outcomes

As expected outcomes of the Self-Study process, the University is expected to:

• Develop a document that meets the requirements of MSCHE and also provides the University with a useful framework for future planning, assessment, and growth.
• Refine its mission statement to more clearly reflect the campus’ current identity and future aspirations.
• Devise strategies to increase the level of student satisfaction with their overall University experience, including instructional activities, business services, and residential and student life.
• Enhance existing opportunities and develop new opportunities for faculty and staff development.
• Develop systematic strategies for collecting data to enhance facilities planning and the development of additional institutional resources.
• Ensure that faculty, staff, and students understand the campus’ mission and their role in helping the University fulfill its aspirations.
• Determine how to improve student learning outcomes, such as success in general education courses and on professional exams, in graduating, and in being admitted to graduate or professional programs of study.

D. BALDRIGE ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE (STANDARD 1)

The organizational profile for Morgan State University is reflected in its statement of Vision, Mission and Values as set forth in the “Strategic Plan 2007-2011,” (p.2).

• 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.

To fulfill this vision continuing emphasis has to be focused on broadening academic programs; expanding faculty; securing additional funding; broadening the revenue based to improve student life and access.
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. This serves as the basis for understanding and interpreting other Baldrige categories that are presented in the Task Force reports that follow. For further discussion of the Mission Statement and its impact, please see Task Force Report 7.
1. Ten-Year Progress in Meeting MSCHE Standards

The mission of Morgan State University was established by 1988 legislative statute and Maryland Higher Education Commission confirmation that reaffirmed Morgan as Maryland’s Public Urban University, and, more recently, it was underscored by the Carnegie Foundation, which classified Morgan as a Doctoral Research University. That mission was reiterated in Morgan’s 2001-2005 Strategic Plan and, more recently, in its 2007-2011 Strategic Plan.

Morgan’s mission and goals, as reflected in the most recent Strategic Plan, were developed through extensive collaborative planning and deliberation at all levels at the University: departmental/program, college/school/institute and division. It is, in part, informed by, and responds to, the impact of changing local and national demographics, the educational attainment gap between the races, changing student and parental values and their effect on student choices, and the free market nature of higher education in the state. The mission and goals were confirmed by the President and approved by the Board of Regents in November 2007. The Strategic Plan was distributed throughout the campus, and it has recently been placed on the Internet to replace the 2001 Strategic Plan, which has appeared there for the last six years.

Morgan’s mission, in all of its iterations, revolves around serving a heterogeneous population that is academically, demographically, socio-economically and racially diverse and also around making a significant contribution to increasing the educational attainment of the African-American population in fields and at degree levels where it is under-represented. It focuses on offering a comprehensive range of undergraduate programs and selected graduate programs; providing access to higher education to a broad cross-section of the population, including at-risk students; promoting student success; researching difficult problems faced by society; and offering programs that assist under-served communities. The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan outlines in detail the current vision, mission, values, goals and objectives of the University:

**Vision**

According to the Plan, 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**

The Plan also establishes the mission of the University, in brief, 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; and
• offer service programs that take advantage of the University’s research expertise and that are directed toward the needs of under-served communities.

Values

The Plan also establishes as the core values around which academic programs, support services, and business processes are organized at the University: (1) promoting student learning and success and (2) promoting faculty scholarship and research are the core values.

Goals

The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, based on the mission and values—as well as the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education and the emerging needs of the State—identifies eight strategic goals to guide Morgan’s growth and development. Those goals are to:

1. offer high quality academic programs and effective support programs and services that promote student academic success;
2. provide students with a variety of options and reasonable degree of flexibility in their academic programs;
3. 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;
4. where desirable and feasible, organize degree offerings, research, and service programs around interdisciplinary and problem-oriented themes;
5. 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;
6. develop an opportunistic culture and infrastructure to enable the University to respond rapidly and effectively to changes in its environment;
7. develop an infrastructure permitting significant growth, capable of supporting other strategic goals, and supporting the mission of the University as a Doctoral Research Institution; and
8. serve as a catalyst for the improvement of the surrounding community and of the City of Baltimore.

2. Baldrige Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category: Organizational Profile (Environment, Relationships and Challenges)

The Task Force (Organizational Profile) found that the University’s most succinct mission statement appears in the 2007 – 2011 Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Board of Regents in November 2007. As summarized by Task Force 2 in its review of MSCHE Standards 2 and 3 and the University’s strategic planning process, the mission of the University is to: offer a comprehensive range of undergraduate programs and select graduate programs; provide access to higher education to a broad cross-section
of the population including at-risk students; promote student success; research difficult problems faced by society; and, offer programs that assist under-served communities.

The Task Force notes that although this mission statement is succinct and serves as a clear statement upon which planning and resource allocation at the University may be based, different and more expansive versions of the mission statement appear in the current graduate and undergraduate catalogs and in the University’s 2001 strategic plan that are found in print and/or are published on the University’s web site. Task Force 7’s research revealed that Morgan’s mission statement does not appear on the University’s web home page and is only apparent after reviewing other planning documents and/or University catalogs.

Recommendation

Morgan State University should publish its current mission statement on its web page in a manner that makes it prominent and which makes it easy to find.
MSCHE Standard 2

PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

1. Ten-Year Progress in Meeting MSCHE Standards

Planning

Morgan State University continues to use the standard planning process that was in place when the last MSCHE visit took place, ten years ago. During difficult financial times, it has endeavored to keep that planning process in place, despite dwindling funds. Much of the planning at the University is coordinated through the Office of Planning and Technology.

Planning begins in the Office of Planning and Technology with the development of a preliminary strategic plan, after careful consideration of internal and external factors impacting the future of the University. That plan is circulated to all of the divisions and, through appropriate channels, to the lower levels—college/schools/institute, programs, departments, etc.—for deliberation and input. Once deliberation at various levels has been completed, the final plan is submitted to the President, who presents it to the Board of Regents for approval.

Once the strategic plan has been approved, it is presented to the divisions for the development of a specific and more detailed implementation strategy. The units within the divisions develop their own plans for implementation and submit their strategic plans to the unit vice-presidents. Once those plans are approved, the University proceeds with the implementation of the strategic plan.

At the end of each year, the individual units, by way of their annual reports, give a progress report on achievement of the goals and objectives of the strategic plan. In some units—Academic Affairs, for example, the units give monthly report reflecting progress toward meeting their goals and objectives; and the President receives similar progress reports from the Management Team. Occasionally, at Management Team meetings, deans are invited to give progress reports, as well; and, on other occasions, they give progress report to the Board of Regents, when requested. At each annual administrative retreat, the divisions and sub-divisions (college/schools/institute) assess their progress toward meeting their goals and objectives.

Resource Allocation

Morgan State University uses incremental budgeting practices for the allocation of additional resources. Each year, vice presidents are asked to present their resource needs to the Vice President for Finance and Management after obtaining input at the department level. The Vice President assembles the information and makes recommendations to the President for consideration. After review and possible adjustment, the recommendations are discussed further at the University’s administrative retreat for final refinement prior to implementation. Although a current practice, this process was not followed during Fiscal Years 2003 - 2006 when extensive cost containment, layoffs, hiring freezes, reallocations, etc., were required in response to cutbacks in state support due to an economic downturn. The University subsequently realized that this was an error, since the campus community thought that resource allocation decisions were being made by Finance without an opportunity for appropriate input and discussion. The University has since resumed its previous participatory budget process and will do so even during periods of budget reductions in the future to maintain communications and an understanding of the finances among relevant segments of the University.
Institutional Renewal

The University uses feedback from the divisions, units and sub-units to assess its achievement of its strategic goals and objectives as provided in their annual reports and other periodic reports given and/or requests during the year. In 2005, it moved beyond this general policy on assessment to a more specific one by adopting a Comprehensive Assessment Plan and requiring its units to develop goals and measurable objectives and engage in periodic assessment of how well they are achieving them. This Comprehensive Assessment Plan, now underway in its initial stages of implementation, will produce more formal, protracted methods of assessment and, equally important, better ways of utilizing the data and information which it generates toward institutional renewal or improvement in all of its aspects. In its initial stages, it is focusing, understandably, on assessment of student learning. Next it will move to assessing institutional effectiveness more extensively that it is being done currently.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Category 2: Strategic Planning
Category 6: Process Management
Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Strategy Planning Process

The University Board of Regents adopted its current 2007-2012 Strategic Plan in November, 2007, with deliberation on it coinciding with this self-study process, thereby permitting the Task Force to observe the process leading to its approval. The prior Strategic Plan was adopted in February 2001. Most of the observations in this report concerning plan implementation are based on that plan.

The foundation for strategic planning is the University’s vision, mission, values and goals statements. All three are deliberately situated on the opening page of the Strategic Plan to ensure their visibility. They are outlined under the discussion of Standard 1 in this report. The mission, vision, values and goals are generally understood and supported throughout the University community. This summary is based on that Strategic Plan and on the mission statement approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission, which conducts a review of campus missions every five years.

The formal planning process at the University entails participation of senior administrators, senior administrators at the college/school/institute level, the University Council and middle management in the drafting and review of the Strategic Plan. It is the responsibility of each of these parties to keep their constituencies well informed concerning the process and to reflect their views in providing input. Planning issues are discussed on a continuing basis and on a less formal basis at each session of the President’s Management Team, which typically meets twice a month. An institutional research office provides data in support of planning, decision-making, and assessment. Below is a chronology of the development of the 2007 plan, which took place over a 16 month period:

The current Plan was the major topic of the June 2006 annual administrative retreat, which initiated the most recent formal planning process. At that retreat, vice presidents, deans, and other attendees were responsible for presenting issues and recommendations for the development of the Strategic Plan. Following the administrative retreat, the Board of Regents was briefed of the results of that process and also provided input into the development of the Strategic Plan. A detailed outline of a draft of the Strategic Plan was circulated to vice presidents, the college/schools/institute, the University Council and other staff for review and input in December 2006. Following receipt of comments, a first draft of the Plan was prepared and circulated in early March 2007. A second draft was prepared and circulated for review and comment in late March.
2007. A third draft was prepared and circulated for review in May 2007. This draft was the major topic of discussion at the University’s June 2007 administrative retreat and was presented as a briefing to the Board of Regents at its June 2007 retreat. A fourth draft was developed in July 2007 and was adopted by the Board in November, 2007.

The time horizon for the Strategic Plan is considered to be five years, although specific time frames generally are not identified in the Plan, which is a combination of higher level strategic objectives and more specific strategies for achieving these objectives.

A prominent feature of the Strategic Plan is an extensive analysis of the University’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities for improvement (OFIs), and vulnerabilities. It is clear from this analysis that in some cases the campus is well positioned to take advantage of changes in its environment and the student market it serves, while in other instances it is not. Another characteristic of the Plan is its analysis of changes required to better use educational technology, the implications of the changing student market for campus viability, the demographic trends likely to affect Maryland campuses, and the challenges posed by the state’s lack of strong coordination and oversight. While the Plan emphasizes the importance of addressing campus weaknesses and threats and of taking advantage of opportunities and its strengths as means of helping to guarantee its future development, it appropriately notes that changes in the campus culture, as it relates to research vs. teaching, also are required to execute many of the strategies of the Plan in order to remain competitive in the face of changing circumstances.

In the past, there has been some variation throughout the campus in the ability to develop quality action plans and to execute specific components of the Strategic Plan. The planning process for the 2007 Plan was sufficiently long to allow a good deal of opportunity for providing comments and input, and it would appear that participation was broader than in the past. In the informal planning and assessment processes that take place in the management team meetings and other forums, there again has been a good deal of variation in the extent to which individuals outside the Team subsequently were informed about studies, analyses, and developments on campus and in the external environment that affect the University. One result, for example, was that although most faculty were committed to the major elements of the University’s mission, many may not have been well-informed about the specific strategies that the institution intends to pursue to carry out its mission. Regardless of the extent of formal participation in planning and planning implementation, a culture of continuous informal planning throughout the campus is not as evident as is desirable. A major initiative of the University designed to promote more uniform and continuous participation in planning and assessment of progress is the implementation of a Balanced Scorecard approach to implement the 2007 strategic plan. This is described below in the discussion of strategy deployment.

In general, the infrastructure for planning is adequate. Data and analysis concerning students is readily available. A particular strength is the extensive availability of surveys of students on a wide variety of topics. Special analyses typically can be carried out if data are available or can be collected with a reasonable amount of effort. Data, on the other hand, including faculty qualifications, contract status, and workload are problematic due to lack of specificity that hinders analysis of faculty utilization and needs. Facilities data concerning condition and utilization also are not readily available in a format that lends itself to planning for capital project development.

**Strategic Objectives**

The Plan contains eight strategic goals and a number of strategies for moving the campus toward their accomplishment. These objectives are outlined under the discussion of Standard 1. In general, time frames and implementation details for these strategic goals are incorporated in divisional and departmental action plans.
The strategic objectives in the 2007 Plan appropriately address the strengths, opportunities, threats, weaknesses, and changes in the environment that are discussed in the Plan. While the strategies for promoting student success are central to the Plan, they are balanced with the needs of the campus as a whole and the needs of the State of Maryland.

**Strategy Deployment: Action Plan Development and Deployment**

Without budgetary incentives or some certainty concerning the availability of resources, action planning is more aspirational and speculative than guaranteed. To a large extent, this is true because of little new funding available from the State for basic operations, much less for new initiatives, in recent years. In anticipation of the adoption of the current Strategic Plan, the campus initiated a budgeting process closely tied to the planning priorities of the University for FY2008. This has the potential to connect the goals of the Strategic Plan with departmental operations more closely.

A major challenge of the University has been sustaining the progress it has made in recent years. Given the fiscal constraints at the institution, there is a need to enhance the infrastructure by providing additional research and teaching space, as well as funds for the support of new and replacement equipment. In the past, grant funding has been used to leverage more funding from the State to develop the campus. Federal and foundation grants have been the primary source of support for these programs and for Morgan’s success in increasing the number of doctorates awarded to African Americans; and the campus does not have a base budget suitable for sustaining them. Another example is the heavy reliance on contractual personnel for such key functions as academic instruction, student academic support services, and information technology. As a result of the modest resource base for most campus operations, the University has not been in the best posture to change direction quickly, either to take advantage of opportunities or to react to adverse circumstances such as state budget reductions or unexpected changes in enrollment. A significant increase in state funds for FY2007 and a more modest increase for FY2008 have permitted the campus to anticipate a higher degree of implementation of its current plan than the prior plan adopted in 2001.

A significant aspect of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal is use of assessment of outcomes as a means toward improvement. Therefore, the campus has decided to implement a Balanced Scorecard approach to help ensure the implementation of the 2007 Strategic Plan. Use of this approach should also result in better coordination among action plans and more uniform participation in planning and plan implementation. The scorecard uses the Plan’s strategic objectives as a framework for projecting results and monitoring performance at the work-unit level. The scorecard is to be a regular topic at Management Team meetings and is to be available over the intranet for access by all campus personnel.

An important part of the evaluation of campus performance is the assessment of student learning outcomes. The campus currently uses the Collegiate Learning Assessment, among other national standardized and campus instruments, to measure the general cognitive development that takes place between the freshman and senior year. Morgan was the first campus in the state to use the CLA. The University has created a Student Learning Assessment Committee to oversee the use of this and other instruments for assessing student learning. This committee, which is composed of senior faculty representative of academic units, is responsible for selecting assessment instruments and developing models for ensuring that the results are provided to faculty in order to promote improvements in instruction on a continuing basis.

**Iterative Strategic Planning (Standard 2)**

Morgan also employs iterative strategic planning, in which senior administrators develop and monitor initiatives during their regularly scheduled meetings throughout the academic year, as well as during annual retreats. Schools use the overall strategic plan to inform their planning and implementation so that
activities on the campus are aligned as much as possible with meeting the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the University. While the application of strategic planning may be uneven across the units, depending on their stage of implementation of the plan, competing priorities and other extenuating circumstances, the objective is to move forward with synergy among the units to accomplish the mission.

**Community Involvement in Strategic Planning**

The University considers the community a partner and primary stakeholder in realizing its strategic plan. The vision is for MSU to be a nucleus around which the community continues to develop. To this end, community input on planning is sought at multiple levels. In fact, increasingly, research—as well as planning—in several disciplines at the University requires community partnerships. Therefore, input from the community comes not only from outreach and involvement with the senior administration, but also with faculty and students engaged in research. The University is also a major physical and economic resource for the community, thus allowing senior leadership to monitor community involvement and partnerships at multiple levels.

**Resource Allocation**

Research questions 5, 6, and 7 (see, Appendix A) generally concern whether the University is allocating its personnel, capital, and financial resources consistent with its mission. Specifically, these questions direct inquiry into whether sufficient faculty exist to teach, advise, and assist graduate and undergraduate students in appropriate research; whether demographic trends in Maryland suggest that Morgan will be able to recruit future populations of graduate and undergraduate students who will find its mission still viable; whether the University’s budgets, capital campaigns and other plans for the acquisition of fiscal resources are consistent with its mission, graduate and undergraduate curricula; and whether the strategic plans of the individual college/schools/institute and departmental units are sufficiently developed to realize the Morgan’s mission. The answers to these questions, along with the findings of Task Force 5: Faculty and Staff Focus and Task Force 6: Process Management, reflect how well the University is meeting MSCHE Standard 2.

The development of an infrastructure permitting significant growth, capable of supporting other strategic goals, and supporting the mission of the University as a Doctoral Research Institution is the seventh of the eight goals expressly identified in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan. One of Morgan’s most significant challenges is garnering the resources, including faculty, facilities, and funds, to fully support its mission. Notwithstanding several desegregation orders from the Office for Civil Rights of the United States Department of Education, funding from the State has historically failed to keep pace with the enrollment and/or programmatic needs of Morgan as well as other historically black colleges in Maryland. For example, the State provided neither start-up funds nor on-going financial aid for students for the forty-four (44) graduate programs it has approved for Morgan. Despite such shortfalls in State funding, the University manages to continue to implement its strategic plan and to provide sufficient funding and facilities to support its mission. Though often inadequately funded, every college/school/institute and its respective departments/programs has its own operating budget, and new academic programs, student housing, and library facilities are being added to the campus inventory of programs and buildings, respectively. Morgan’s first ever and recently completed capital campaign, “New Horizons: The Campaign for Morgan State University,” which exceeded its original goal of $25 million, is evidence of the University’s own efforts to perseverance in fulfilling its mission.

Another effort is evident in the School of Graduate Studies, which provides more than $2.7 million in financial aid from University, federal, and private funds, and has established an endowment to enhance financial support for graduate programs. Task Force 7 finds that, while securing sufficient financial resources to sustain Morgan’s mission constitutes an ongoing and significant challenge, the University has
secured the resources to renovated and build new facilities and to provide funding for basic budgets for its instructional units. It concedes that funding to hire new full-time faculty and appropriate support staff is a significant challenge for the State of Maryland as well as for Morgan State University.

Recommendations

This study recommends that the University:

- increase competitiveness in research through enhanced incentives for research productivity;
- increase the perception that MSU is employee friendly at all levels with more recognition of the rewards and perks that already exist and by adding others that may enhance performance;
- streamline the management system for grants, continue to decentralize the process and promote greater rewards for those who are successful in winning grants;
- increase the effectiveness of internal communication so that people who need to know will be informed;
- while demanding excellence, celebrate achievements both internally and externally; and
- continue strategic planning with enhanced student and stakeholder input so that as goals and objectives are met, new ones will continue to move the university in ever more challenging directions.

Performance Projections

The current Strategic Plan has a number of specific strategies that form the basis for overall performance projections as well as for individual organizational units. The University’s Balanced Scorecard provides the mechanism for monitoring implementation and promoting action to achieve objectives.

A major undertaking of the Office of Institutional Research is to develop national norms and benchmarks for assessing campus performance in comparison to different types of institutions of higher education. To the extent feasible these standards are adjusted for the missions of groups of campuses and the characteristics of their students to ensure appropriate comparisons. This assists in remedying a major problem with most existing approaches to performance assessment in higher education.

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

The strengths and opportunities for improvement of the current plan development and plan deployment are summarized below.

Strengths

It points to the following strengths:

- adequate time and opportunity for broad participation in planning process;
- strong analytical basis for planning and assessment;
- the appropriateness of the Strategic Plan for campus mission and aspirations and for the environment in which it is operating;
- the articulation of clear and measurable goals and strategies; and
- a sound and highly visible approach to monitoring progress and promoting action toward goal achievement in the Balanced Scorecard.
Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

- Gaining greater participation in developing and deploying plans
- Improving employee and facility utilization data for planning
- Connecting operational plans and budgets to the Strategic Plan
- Developing a planning culture throughout the campus
MSCHE Standard 3

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

1. Ten-Year Progress in Meeting MSCHE Standards

Those who have not visited Morgan State University for several years will observe that there has been a significant revitalization of the campus. Many projects in the planning stage during the last Middle State’s visit have been completed. In fact, since 1998, six (6) major state-support facility renovation and/or facility replacement projects have been completed at a total cost of $142.2 million. They include: McMenemy Hall, Hill Field House, Hughes Stadium, Murphy Fine Arts Center, Communications Center and Library. In addition, two new facilities have been added, the Schaefer Engineering Complex and the Richard N. Dixon Research Center, at a combined cost of $39.9 million. Further, a variety of utility, site improvement and land acquisition projects have also been completed at a cost of $32.4 million.

The State’s investment in the improvement of the campus, combined with the development of attractive programs and services, has resulted in an increasing demand for admission. Last fall, Morgan received over 12,000 undergraduate applications, more than double that of ten years ago. Due to limited operating resources, growth has been constrained to approximately 7,000 students or a 13 percent increase over the period.

The University also invested its own funds in its self-support operations, and, in some cases it enhanced the state support investment. As such, it contributed $10 million to the stadium renovation and fine arts projects. The added investment in these projects made all the difference in these facilities. The stadium and track and field facilities are among the best on the East Coast, and the Fine Arts Center rivals any concert or theatre venue in the Baltimore area. In addition, the University borrowed funds for the construction of a new student center and parking garage at a cost of $46.1 million. In total, inclusive of other smaller projects, the University invested $65.4 million of university-based resources for these enhancements. Further, to accommodate increasing demand for housing, the University coordinated the construction of a privatized housing project less than one-quarter mile from campus that accommodates 794 undergraduate and graduate students, increasing the housing capacity for University-managed and University-affiliated housing from 2,300 to 3,094. Finally, a variety of other facility/service enhancements were implemented, including a comprehensive exterior surveillance camera system and a comprehensive parking/shuttle program that includes gated parking and reliable shuttle service throughout the campus. As the University continues to grow, additional investments will be made to maintain, update and expand the self-support operations to further enhance services provided to students and other constituents.

During the period, the University renovated, replaced and/or added 1.2 million gross square feet of the current 2.1 million gross square feet of space. As a result, 68 percent of the state-support and 91 percent of self-support facilities have an age of 15 years or less.

The University is committed to continued improvements and expansion of the physical infrastructure to accommodate a planned increase in enrollment of at least 35 percent over the next decade, while simultaneously improving its competitive position with surrounding campuses. Currently, there are two major projects in progress: the renovation of Banneker Hall to house the School of Education and a new facility to accommodate the School of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Transportation Studies. There are also several utility and site work improvement projects in process. In total, $120 million of projects are in process.
The University’s physical growth has also accentuated the need to work closely with the surrounding community. Our neighbors have become advocates for the University’s development. Within recent history, the University has purchased 27 acres of land in the surrounding community and is currently working on the refurbishment of community baseball fields. An additional field will be incorporated to provide a much needed NCAA regulation softball field for University use. Also, the University has assisted with the development of a charter school. We are working with a local community development corporation to provide a neighborhood strategic plan, and we are working with a local environmental organization to engage residents in the master planning process for a city park. The University and community have collaborated to secure federal and state support to make these projects possible. The relationship between the University and the surrounding community continues to strengthen as we realize the value of working together.

Overall, more than $400 million of projects has been either completed or is in progress. Although welcomed and very much needed, the extended period of time that it has taken to refurbish the campus has resulted in the delay of other projects critical to the University’s advancement, growth and competitiveness as a doctoral/research institution. Of eight projects that the University deems critical in the short term, two are in the State’s current Capital Improvement Program (CIP)—a new business school (just accelerated by the State into the CIP) and the renovation of the old library. The renovated library project will bring student services (Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid, Bursar, Career Development, etc.) to the center of the campus. These services have been located in makeshift accommodations, a converted hospital, on the periphery of the campus for the last 12 years. Although the University is very excited about the inclusion of these projects in the CIP, it will take many years to complete the other six projects if and when they are included in the State’s future CIPs, especially since other renovation projects will surely take priority over new projects.

The University will continue to communicate its needs to the State in hopes that its development can be accelerated, so that it may contribute even more significantly to the production of graduates at all degree levels and so that the State can begin to close the educational gap between African-Americans and whites, while at the same time becoming increasingly attractive to student of all races.

Resource Allocation

Morgan State University uses incremental budgeting practices for the allocation of additional resources. Each year, vice presidents are asked to present their resource needs to the Vice President for Finance and Management after obtaining input at the department level. The Vice President assembles the information and makes recommendations to the President for consideration. After review and possible adjustment, the recommendations are discussed further at the University’s administrative retreat for final refinement prior to implementation. Although a current standard practice, this process was not followed during Fiscal Years 2003 -2006, when extensive cost containment, layoffs, hiring freezes, reallocations, etc., were required in response to cutbacks in state support due to an economic downturn. The University subsequently realized that this was an error, since the campus community thought that resource allocation decisions were being made by Finance without an opportunity for appropriate input and discussion. The University has since resumed its previous participatory budget process and will do so even during periods of budget reductions in the future to maintain communications and an understanding of the finances among relevant segments of the University.

Institutional Resources

Morgan State University’s current budget totals $191.9 million. The revenue is derived from:
State support 35.2%
Tuition 23.2%
Self Support 15.1%
Grants and Contracts 24.2%
Other 2.3%
TOTAL 100.0%

This funding composition has not changed appreciably since the last MSCHE review. Similarly, the distribution in the use of resources has not changed appreciably over the period. The current allocation is as follows:

Instruction 21.7%
Research 18.5%
Academic Support 8.2%
Student Services 3.1%
Institutional Administration 11.6%
Physical Plant 9.6%
Auxiliary Enterprises 13.6%
Scholarships 13.7%
TOTAL 100.0%

Over the past 10 years, enrollment has grown by 18.8 percent, which is relatively consistent with Maryland higher education overall. State funding support increased by an average of 6.5 percent per year, also relatively consistent with statewide increases.

Morgan State University requires, however, a higher-than-average level of state support in consideration of mission-driven costs. For instance, educating a student body with diverse backgrounds in academic preparation requires intensive advising and counseling. Even more important is an appropriate student/faculty ratio with an appropriate full-time faculty contingent. Also, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds must be supported by significant levels of financial aid. Further, to accommodate access, tuition rates are held much lower than mainstream institutions, thereby necessitating a higher level of subsidy if comparable levels of services are to be provided. Finally, the University is still a relatively small, “young” doctoral/research institution that has not reached a size at which it can realize the economies of scale enjoyed by the three other well-developed doctoral/research institutions within the State of Maryland (excluding the University of Maryland medical school).

Despite constrained resources, the University continues to advance and develop even during the most difficult times. For instance, the State’s FY 2002 funding level of $52 million was not exceeded until FY 2007 due to a very untimely economic downturn. Compounding the situation were skyrocketing utility costs, the need to replace the information technology infrastructure and the implementation of a new administrative software system (Banner), to name a few. The University worked very hard to manage, through this period, not only to maintain the fiscal viability of the University, but also to provide selective funding to maintain the forward momentum of the University, inclusive of the implementation of several academic programs.

A very high priority for the University has been the addition of faculty. Over the last ten years, the full-time equivalent faculty contingent was increased by 112, from 342 to 454 or 33 percent. As a result, the student/faculty ratio was reduced from 14.9 to 13.8. However, the challenge continues to be funding full-time regular faculty versus adjunct faculty. Of the 112 additional FTE faculty, 49 are contractual, increasing the contractual contingent to 149, or 32.8 percent. Staffing is similarly challenged with 21.6
percent of the workforce being contractual. The University is anticipating that the Governor's FY 2009 operating budget recommendation, in which an 11.7 percent increase is recommended, will establish the base for which we can better advance in the future.

At the same time, the University continues to pursue non-state funding sources to broaden its revenue base. Emphasis has been placed on increasing grants and contracts. For the ten year period, the volume of grants and contracts has increased from $13.2 to $26.8 million or by 103 percent. These grants provide a valuable supplement to the operating budget, not to mention providing enriching classroom instruction and valuable practicum experiences for students. Title III and foundation funding have been an important source for the development of advanced degree programs over the period. The fact that the rate of growth in grants and contracts is slowing as fewer full-time regular faculty are added to service enrollment growth and advanced degree program development is a matter of concern. Tuition increases are routinely given consideration as an added revenue source. Although Morgan's tuition is significantly less than other doctoral/research institutions within the State, any significant increase in rates would assuredly negatively impact retention and graduation rates. An area where significant progress has been made is fundraising. Five years ago, the University embarked upon its first capital fundraising campaign. The $25 million goal was exceeded by $6.2 million, or 25 percent, thereby raising $31.2 million. The majority of the funds are endowed for scholarships, which is one of the greatest areas of need at the University. The level of financial aid, not only impacts retention and graduation rates, but also influences the level of student satisfaction regarding support services for those that must stand in lines, have their schedules dropped and, hopefully, reinstated, etc., due to the lack of financial support.

Finally, the self support operations of the University, including the bookstore, housing, dining hall, student center and athletics, have continued to perform well as a combined program. Student fees, a cost of attendance, are a major component of the revenues. This program maintains an adequate repair and replacement reserve in its fund balance to ensure that its facilities can be appropriately maintained well into the future.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category: 2: Strategic Planning
Baldrige Category 6: Process Management
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

It is clear that the University needs additional resources in order to promote more efficient, effective institutional operations and in order to maximize its potential to fulfill its mission.

Institutional Resources

Library and Information Resources

Since the last Middle States review, there have been significant improvements in library and information resources, especially in terms of physical facilities, information technology, and the application of software to improve academic management and administrative efficiency and effectiveness. Perhaps the most visible and striking improvement has been the completion and recent dedication of a new $56 million and 260,000-plus square feet library facility—a structure that was planned to accommodate technological ad-
vances, to improve access to and utilization of information resources and to expand print and electronic resources for the foreseeable future. The new library obviously greatly expands capacity for patron use and provides an environment that is more conducive to study and research by students, faculty and other members of the University community. However, Morgan will be in dire need of additional state dollars for commensurate library acquisitions, as well as professional and technical personnel to provide optimal services to a growing number of undergraduate and graduate students. With particular regard to the increase in the number of graduate programs (master’s and doctoral) offered, the pace of procurement of appropriate resources to support undergraduate, graduate and faculty research should be expedited. The realization of the new library facility at Morgan, which was in the planning stages for decades, is one of our signal achievements in the current drive to strengthen Morgan as a doctoral-intensive professional research university.

Other Resources

As critical as improving the information literacy of University students, faculty and other employees will be investment by the University in information technology to support programs and services. Detailed plans—including life-cycle management—for addressing the University’s needs are found in Appendix C, “Information Technology Plan, 2006.” One document, entitled “Priorities for Funding, FY 2008-2012 makes five important recommendations that will be critical to effective implementation of the IT Plan:

- **Request State Funding To Replace Selected Title III Funded Contractual Positions with State-Funded Regular Positions:** Though the campus is growing and technology is advancing, funds for upgrades and replacement in the technology infrastructure are limited. As such, the University has developed a heavy reliance on Title III funding for supporting information technology operations. Title III has been used primarily to extend technology to academic functions over the past decade, and it also has been used to support some core functions such as the campus web page and technology training. The University needs to request state-funded positions to hire permanent technology personnel.

- **Request State Funding To Add Full-Time State Positions Incrementally to Address Other Technology Priorities:** Funding this request alone will permit the campus to address a variety of IT priorities. IT has fewer positions than it had several years ago, despite a significant increase in the demand for technology services. It has never had a predictable increase in personnel, which is the root cause of several important campus problems. Well over half of the full-time IT staff are contractual, and many have been contractual for an extended period of time. At the same time, the University lacks some important core functions (e.g., data base manager, reports coordinator). The campus also does not have technology leaders for its major academic units, some of which will be becoming more comprehensive and larger and which will operate with more autonomy as the campus strategic plan is implemented. Finally, the campus has not been adding personnel as it opens new buildings, even though these buildings typically have more technology built into them than the older buildings. The addition of state positions on a regular basis would over time help to remedy the contractual reliance problem, permit the campus to add some core positions, including technology leadership at the major academic unit level, and permit existing contractual money to be shifted to hiring personnel for new buildings and other functions that need support.

- **Request State Funding To Restore IT Equipment Budget to Add Equipment Primarily for Computer Labs and Smart Classrooms:** Until the mid-1990s, IT had a modest annual equipment budget of $200,000. However, since the opening of McMehen Hall, this budget has had to be used almost entirely for personnel to staff new buildings, a function for which it has
been inadequate for the past several years. As a result, campus equipment needs have not been able to be addressed incrementally and on a continuing basis. One result is that the University is one of the relatively few campuses nationally that does not have a program for regularly replacing technology equipment. This has a major impact on labs, which experience much heavier use than equipment used by individuals. Another result is that the campus has relatively few smart classrooms compared to the typical campus. A $200,000 annual allocation would restore the IT equipment budget that, while not adequate even a decade ago, would at least begin to help to address both items on an incremental basis. This is a very modest approach to a problem which is escalating rapidly as much lab equipment becomes obsolete or unusable at the same time as a result of a lack of a program of continually refreshing it. For all practical purposes, an equipment budget would be a new expenditure category for central IT.

- **Request State Funding To Assume Costs for Memberships and Licenses Currently Covered by Title III**: The current Title III grant for IT, which is expiring, in the past paid the annual licensing fee for Blackboard ($110,000 this year) and the annual membership fee for UMATS (USM Telecomm Network) ($50,000). Due to the expansion of programs dependent on Title III funding, the FY2007 program budget was reduced and did not include funding for these items. However, carry-over money was provided for FY2007, which is the last year of this grant. Blackboard is the University’s course management system, and it is used by the vast majority of faculty. It will be the campus platform for distance education. UMATS membership gives Morgan access to Internet II at a very reasonable price and low prices for Microsoft products. The campus is heavily dependent on both.

- **Request State Funding To Purchase New Administrative Computer Cluster**: The University’s administrative computing cluster is aging and operates more slowly than it should during peak periods. More importantly, however, is the fact that the new release of Oracle, the platform on which Banner runs, will not operate on the University’s cluster. While the hardware requirements have not yet been released for the new version of Oracle, they will be in the near future.

**Institutional Advancement**

Significant strides have been made in the Division of Institutional Advancement: development, alumni relations, and public relations and communications. As noted earlier, the first comprehensive capital campaign in the history of the University was completed in May 2007. This campaign attracted many major contributions from alumni and friends, corporations and foundations. Significantly, two of Morgan’s alumni gave the largest individual gifts in its history, $1.5 million and $1 million. The campaign enabled Morgan to grow its endowment from $2.5 million to $20 million. The institution is now in the planning phase for its next major fundraising initiative.

Morgan’s Alumni Association is one of the most supportive of such organization among its peer schools. This is directly attributable to the creativity of the Alumni Affairs Office. Alumni have become sensitive to their role as recruiters and advocates for the University and the need to support their alma mater.

The Communications and Public Relations Office has significantly enhanced the quality of Morgan’s publications and communications with the external community. It has won national acclaim and numerous awards for its publications. It has also embarked upon a comprehensive marketing campaign to further brand the University and to enhance its image in the city, state and nation.

**Sponsored Programs**
The Office of Sponsored Programs and Research (OSPR), Division of Academic Affairs, is the primary administrative unit responsible for coordinating the University’s externally sponsored programs. It processes and monitors all sponsored research grants, cooperative agreements and contracts to ensure that they are consistent not only with institutional goals, policies and procedures, but also with sponsors’ guidelines and requirements. The goal of OSPR is to consistently maintain a first rate infrastructure to manage and constantly improve research grants and contracts administration, as well as technology transfer services at Morgan State University. It works closely with other offices in the Division of Finance and Management (e.g., Restricted Funds Accounting, Human Resources, Purchasing Card, Procurement and Bursar) and has post-award functions related to the management of sponsored awards. The Office of Sponsored Programs has recorded an impressive growth in total extramural funding within the last ten years. The University attained an average increase of more than 40% annually. The funding trend from 1998 through 2007 increased from around $16 million to over $28 million in 2007.

The functional scope of OSPR encompasses the following specific areas: (1) Research Administration, (2) Regulatory Compliance, and (3) Faculty Research Support and Training. The cumulative result of these OSPR efforts has been a demonstrable increase in research vitality at the University. This is reflected in the consistent growth in the number of proposals submitted to sponsors, as well as the number of awards. The current total competitive funding from extramural sources exceeds $29 million, an improvement on the two preceding years during which the recorded totals were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$27,920,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$28,223,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ERP(Banner System): Implementation and Development**

In 2003, Morgan migrated from the SUNGARD Plus system to the SUNGARD Banner system, a single integrated ERP system that eliminated the need for individual data stores and disparate databases. Banner also introduced web based services to students, faculty and staff. The implementation of the basic Banner features for Students Records, Financial Aid, Finance, and Human Resources were installed after an extensive business process analysis was completed for each module. This allowed the University to analyze how it processed information before the Banner system was installed and allowed the documentation of current business processes to plan for improvement. Finance was the first module installed in 2003, followed by Human Resources and Financial Aid with Student Services implemented in 2006.

Though the primary focus of the report of Baldrige Task Force 5 is on process management for improved and more efficient, effective institutional operations, perhaps the greatest attention has been given to the development and implementation of the University ERP (Banner System). In reference to the latter, the report strikes a balance between some of the opportunities for improvement encountered in the implementation of Banner, and the modest successes already achieved in improving the management of processes (e.g., on-line employee timesheet application and the new parking management system). Again, the report demonstrates how the University Focus Groups and the “Town Hall” meetings played a critical role in assessing faculty, student, administrator and staff perception of management processes at Morgan State University.

The Banner system has been installed to assist in managing all aspects of the finances of the university. For more specific information about the Banner system and its effectiveness, please see Task Force VI Report on Process Management. The interface to researchers is such that they can be more involved in the overall monitoring of spending on their grants, thus having information to better inform decision making toward optimizing resources. However, even though training has been provided, there is uneven embrace and use of this technology. It is recognized that the expanding research agenda of the university as well as
the emerging online grant systems at federal and state levels will require diligence as we move forward to remain current and accountable. The interface of the financial management system with students continues to present opportunities for improvement (OFIs).

Strengths

Because Banner is an integrated system, it required University departments to work from one data base and thus forced coordination and communication of data processing among the various work areas. Among its other strengths, Banner allowed Morgan to accomplish the following tasks. It:

- reduced redundancy and duplicate records;
- allowed web-based, self-service information for students, faculty, and staff;
- eliminated paper time sheets and instituted web time entry;
- provided authorized end-user access to appropriate financial information online;
- provided for automated packaging of financial aid information;
- provided an integrated database for Human Resources to streamline and enhance management of employee records;
- provided for automated billing and letter generation functions throughout the Student system; and
- provided faculty access to program budgets, student advising and enhanced online grading

Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

Not all of the Banner ERP features are fully installed. Purchasing Card Operations, Grant Accounting, and Degree Auditing are a few of the features that need to be implemented. In some cases, certain functions are being performed the same way they were on the older Plus System, and the campus is not taking full advantage of Banner’s capabilities. For example processes, such as online procurement, still require paper attachments and take just as long as before to process.

An ERP system is more than just an information system since it embodies the institution’s business rules. Some business rules at Morgan have either not been activated or tested. These business rules must be closely tied to the institution’s business needs in order for Morgan to realize the ERP system’s full benefits.

Recommendations

- Specific work-oriented Banner training is needed in the areas of Finance and Records and Registration. As Morgan is learning to use the Banner system, there are areas that generate numerous questions from the faculty and staff. These can be handled with more involvement from the functional areas responsible for the data. Recent surveys and focus group results have shown that the academic areas are sometimes frustrated with limited access to student data and reporting. Plans are in place to allow more access and permit users to generate their own ad hoc queries and reports.

- Key work processes need to be evaluated to determine how they can be done more expeditiously in Banner to maximize efficiency. Unnecessary approval paths for online requisitions, student billing and refunds, and request for transcript and grade information can be improved. Increased communication among the various departments can assist in providing seamless customer service between offices.
Data Management Priorities

• To make information readily available to administrators, staff, and faculty, the data must be organized in such a manner that it is easily queried, e.g. cohort specific.
• All survey information should be placed in data format accessible to all interested parties with password protected intranet accessibility.
• Sharing information and ideas for new innovative programs, as well as identifying and then solving developing problems, is crucial not only to the management of data, but also to informing Morgan's evolution as a research university dedicated to the education of a diverse student body, graduate as well as undergraduate, and to service to the community.

Conclusions

Morgan State University has a strong track record in addressing the state’s educational needs. It is an institution-based on tradition and has educated many African American leaders and scholars. The challenge of attracting successful high school students in the State of Maryland is becoming more pronounced as more and more of the state’s public institutions look to increase their enrollment. Morgan no longer holds the market on educating African American students and, therefore, should continue to look for ways to improve its key processes and customer service for attracting students and faculty.

The implementation of the Banner ERP system is a step in the right direction. With continued use of the system, broader access to data and information, more work-oriented training, along with incorporating the more advanced ERP features, current processes at Morgan State can be enhanced and improved. ERP systems promise to increase operational efficiency, improve customer service, and help enforce a University’s business rules. With the implementation of Banner, Morgan now has the opportunity to seriously examine its current key processes and determine how to improve and realign policies and practices in order to better serve the University community. The University should strive to make sure that its main stakeholders, the students, can successfully and confidently move through all of the processes that take them from recruitment, admissions, registration, and financial aid to attending classes for instruction and learning.
MSCHE Standard 4

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

The structure of postsecondary education in the State of Maryland was established by the Higher Educational Reorganization Act of 1988, which established three segments of public senior higher education in the State. These segments are Morgan State University, the University System of Maryland, and St. Mary’s College. Each segment is governed by an independent board.

Morgan State University has the same system of leadership and governance that it had ten years ago when it last had its MSCHE decennial review, except for slight increases in the number of members on its governing board and the number of faculty representatives on the University Council. Its system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

The governance structure of Morgan State University consists of its Board of Regents, the administration, led by a President and Chief Executive Officer, and the University Council. This structure has been exceedingly effective in University policy development and decision-making.

Board of Regents

The government of the University is vested in the Board of Regents, consisting of 15 members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The number of representatives reflects an increase of two over the Board that existed when Middle States last visited the campus ten years ago. One member of the Board is a student in good academic standing at the University. Except for the student (who serves for one year), the Board members serve for a term of 6 years and until a successor is appointed and qualifies.

The Board has statutory authority set forth in Section 14-104 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland for the management of the University and has all the powers, rights, and privileges that go with that responsibility; it may not be superseded in that authority by any other State agency or office. The Board has the authority to adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with the law for the government and management of the University. The Board has the authority to (1) review or adopt all manner of policies and procedures for the proper management of the University; (2) prepare and submit budgets; (3) contract to receive or provide services; (4) establish all manner of personnel standards; (4) fix tuition and fees, use the receipt of fees for the purposes for which they were collected, establish academic programs, review and approve operating and capital budgets requests; and (5) appoint a President of the University who shall be the Chief Executive Officer of the University and Chief of Staff for the Board of Regents.

The Board governance structure established by the State has been exceedingly effective. The establishment of a governing Board exclusively dedicated to the governance of Morgan State University has been essential to the growth and development of the university consistent with its mission. The structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.
University Council

In 1975, the Maryland legislature granted Morgan university status with the authority to award doctorates and reestablished a singular governing Board of Regents. In 1986, the Board directed the President to develop a system of internal governance that promoted broader participation of the various constituencies of the University. That structure was expected to: (1) reflect the institution’s development from a liberal arts college into a comprehensive university, with five distinct colleges and schools, (2) establish the primacy of the role of the departments and colleges/schools/institute in matters of curriculum; appointment, promotion and tenure; and other academic matters, and (3) improve internal relations and communications within the University.

After an extensive period of review and considerations of models of University governance by faculty, students, classified employees and professional administrative staff, a governance structure was recommended to the Board of Regents and on November 19, 1987, the Board of Regents approved the establishment of the University Council and its attendant Constitution and Bylaws.

The role and function of the University Council is substantial. It is responsible for reviewing proposed policies and advising the President concerning those policies of University-wide impact. It reviews such matters submitted by the President for its consideration and advice. The University Council may also, on its own initiative, make recommendations to the President for the President's and the Board of Regent's consideration with respect to any matter of University-wide significance and impact.

The University Council Constitution/By-Laws establishes the Morgan State University Council as a campus-wide governance structure involving the administration, faculty, professional administrative staff, classified employees, and student body in the ongoing operation of the University. The constitution and by-laws provide the faculty with two-thirds (2/3) majority representation on the University Council, with representation from each college/school/institute and the faculty-at-large. The number of faculty representatives, according to a proposal now before the University Council, will increase with each new college/school established at the University, thereby giving the faculty, in the future, representation that exceeds the two-thirds that it presently has.

In 1991, the Board assessed the effectiveness of the University Council and determined that it had evolved into an effective forum for faculty, students, professional and classified employees to have input into the overall operation and governance of the University. On August 21, 1991, the Board issues a “Resolution on University Governance” affirming that it strongly believed that the University Council system of internal governance was appropriate and effective, based on the organizational structure and overall status of the University, the role of the faculty in departmental and school matters and the majority vote of the faculty on the University Council through its school and University-wide representatives. During this period of assessment, the Board considered a proposal by a small group of faculty to establish a separate faculty organization (described as a faculty assembly or faculty senate) and determined that there was no compelling need for such a body, since the University Council structure provides the faculty with a 2/3 majority vote and also assures a participatory governance structure in which other members of the University community have an opportunity for involvement, communication, and accountability.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results
Consistent with the Steering Committee charges, this report from Task Force I focuses specifically on the nature and perceived effectiveness of senior leadership and administration at Morgan State University. As such, this report deals with a full range of leadership and organizational climate issues, leadership and mission attainment, and issues of University governance, especially the participation of faculty, staff and students in institutional decision-making. In addition to analyzing official University, state and national documents, the Task Force opted to use the original analytical questions that it developed as a basis for conducting interviews with members of the senior leadership of the University. The Task Force Report also integrated pertinent information on senior leadership and administrative effectiveness as reflected in the focus group summaries and the results of the “Town Hall” meetings.

**Senior Leadership Accountability (Standards 4 & 7)**

The senior administrators indicated that they hold regularly scheduled meetings to communicate strategic direction at all levels and provide feedback. MSU has a strategic plan with appropriate goals; however, measurable objectives may not be sufficient in the absence of accountability. The system for accountability is a work in progress, but teamwork and incentives were mentioned as approaches to stimulate faculty to meet strategic goals and objectives. This may be especially needed as we continue to transition from a predominately teaching institution to one with a dominant research orientation.

**Faculty Accountability and the Administration (Standards 5 & 10)**

Because MSU continues to attract first-generation college students, the Task Force is sensitive to the need to place emphasis on the development of professionalism and career plans. This guidance comes from faculty, organized career development activities on campus, guest speakers visiting the campus and field trips/internships. Several of Morgan’s programs have internships that are designed to bring students in contact with professionals in cutting edge industrial ventures. We also make sure that students and faculty are engaged in their professions and attend professional meetings to stay abreast of cutting edge information.

**Shared Governance (Standard 4)**

Most accreditation organizations for the schools have as one of their mandates, the ability of the school to have a voice in governance. The organizational structure of the university is designed such that leaders at all levels have autonomy and responsibility commensurate with being able to develop, implement, monitor and report upon activities in their units. Governance is monitored through the extensive reporting system at all levels of the university.

Consistent with the Steering Committee charges, this report from Task Force I focuses specifically on the nature and perceived effectiveness of senior leadership and administration at Morgan State University. As such, this report deals with a full range of leadership and organizational climate issues, leadership and mission attainment, and issues of University governance, especially the participation of faculty, staff and students in institutional decision-making. In addition to analyzing official University, state and national documents, the Task Force opted to use the original analytical questions that it developed as a basis for conducting interviews with members of the senior leadership of the University. The Task Force Report also integrated pertinent information on senior leadership and administrative effectiveness as reflected in the focus group summaries and the results of the “Town Hall” meetings.

**Findings**

The concept in the mission statement implies that Morgan’s academic programs and products should be shaped to serve the city of Baltimore and surrounding counties. Since Baltimore’s population is predominately African American (roughly 68% according the U.S Census Bureau), Morgan has a special focus on ensuring that the academic programs are targeted to generate and disseminate knowledge that speaks
to the needs of this population. The current “urban” focus is consistent with and reinforces the university’s legacy of training those who will provide services to a primarily African American population. The urban mission is accomplished by employing methods of assessment, intervention, monitoring and evaluation that allow these students to improve their ability to perform effectively in the university academic setting. This also involves aggressive fund raising to provide resources to support under-privileged students that we accept.

Each school at the University contributes toward achieving the urban mission by identifying needs in the urban community and developing strategies to meet those needs through teaching, research and service. They realize that the demographic profile of Baltimore is dynamic with a disproportionate level of poverty and socio-economic disparity. This disparity creates opportunity for MSU to fill the gap by preparing a competent and competitive workforce, understanding urban problems, posing solutions that work through innovative but relevant research and, finally, serving the community through the resources that MSU has to offer. The ultimate goal is to develop Morgan comparable to the three (3) other doctoral research institutions within the State such that we would be able to attract students regardless of race, achievement and socio-economic status.
MSCHE Standard 5

ADMINISTRATION

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Over the last ten years, the administration of the University has been restructured to reflect its growth in size and complexity, to enable better management of its programs and resources and to fulfill its mission. The most important of those changes is that of Vice President for Academic Affairs to Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in 2005. There have been a number of additional positions created to reflect new units and support programs that have been developed.

The President is the Chief Executive Officer of the University, and he is appointed by the Board of Regents and serves at its discretion. The President is responsible for the administration of the University and the supervision of all of its units.

The University is divided into five major divisions, each headed by a Vice President who reports directly to the President. These divisions are: Academic Affairs, Finance and Management, Student Affairs, Institutional Advancement and Planning and Information Technology. The Executive Assistant to the President, the Special Assistant to the President, the Assistant to the President for Governmental Relations, the Internal Auditor and the General Counsel also report directly to the President.

Management Team

The President presides over the Management Team, which consists of the five Vice Presidents and other personnel reporting directly to the President. There is also an Extended Management Team, which includes its regular members, the Deans, other activity directors and the President of the Student Government Association. These Teams meet regularly.

The Academic Affairs Council

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs presides over the Academic Affairs Council, which is composed of the college/school/institute deans and director: The College of Liberal Arts, the Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management, School of Community Health and Policy, School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences, School of Education and Urban Studies, School of Engineering, School of Graduate Studies, and Institute of Architecture and Planning, as well as the Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs. The Council meets regularly to discuss academic issues.

Baldrige Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)
Baldrige Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Baldrige analyses and recommendations were reported under the discussion of Standard 4 earlier in this report.
MSCHE Standard 6

INTEGRITY

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Morgan State University affirms the statement of the Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation which state: “integrity is a central, indispensable and defining hallmark of effective higher education institutions” (MSCHE, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, 21). Accordingly, the University has established a record of demonstrating adherence to the highest ethical standards in implementing its own policies in this regard and also in support of academic and intellectual freedom.

The integrity of Morgan State University is reflected at all levels of the institution. The Board of Regents, the governing body of the University, routinely adopts policies and procedures designed to ensure integrity and equity in areas such as faculty and staff recruitment, selection and cultivation of the student body, the institution of programs and research, the allocation of resources and service in the public interest. As examples, the Board has adopted the Policy of Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity (1996), which has a stated purpose of protecting the “mutual respect for the learning and teaching process, and intellectual honesty in the pursuit of new knowledge”; the Conflict of Interest for Faculty Interest in Sponsored Research and Economic Development (1996), which guards the legal and ethical concerns regarding sponsored research; and the Policy on Nondiscrimination (2002), which prohibits discrimination within the campus community and establishes a formal channel for reporting discriminatory practices. In addition to these policies, the Board has ratified several collective bargaining agreements between the University and its staff, each with the purpose of promoting the “harmonious relations between the [University] and Union [and the] establishment of an equitable and peaceful procedure for the resolution of differences. . . .” All University policies and procedures are expected to be followed and implemented by University faculty and staff.

In addition to the policymaking of the institution, the governance model of the University ensures integrity in campus decision making. In 1986, the University established the University Council, a broad-based governance structure which includes representatives of the administration, faculty, professional administrative staff, classified employees, and student body. This model provides each of these constituencies with a voice in the ongoing operation of the University. Among other priorities, the University Council is expected to improve internal relations and communications within the University.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 1: Leadership (Senior Leadership/Governance and Social Responsibility)
Baldrige Category 2: Strategic Planning
Baldrige Preface: Organizational Profile (Environment, Relationships and Challenges)
Baldrige Category 3: Student Stakeholder and Market Focus
Baldrige Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management
Baldrige Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus
Baldrige Category 6: Process Management
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results
Focus and Method of Inquiry

The key method of inquiry of the Task Force was a 14-month review of pertinent institutional documents, including the University Catalog, Student Handbook, area reports, external assessments and evaluation reports, and web pages, to determine compliance with the standards and criteria with which the Task Force was charged. Special emphasis was given to language, policies, and practices that were “not” presented in these institutional documents, to discern areas to which students did not have access to essential information, policies, and services. To better understand institutional compliance with standards and criteria, focus groups were conducted with diverse groups of students and institutional staff, including students participating in the Access-Success Summer Program and Student Retention Coordinators from the University’s School of Education & Urban Studies; School of Business and Management; School of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences; School of Engineering; College of Liberal Arts; and the Institute for Architecture & Planning. All together, the Task Force talked to 56 students and educational staff members.

To determine compliance with MSCHE Standard 6 and Baldrige Category 3, Task Force 3 gained input and feedback from three major stakeholders: (1) students, (2) parents, (3) and selected institutional staff members. Additionally, a “Town Hall Meeting: Focus on the Student” was conducted on Thursday, November 29, 2007 from 11:00 AM – 1:00 p.m. in the University Student Center, where students had the occasion to offer “opportunities for improvement” related to their collegiate experiences both inside and outside the classroom settings principally. Nearly 25 questions were submitted prior to the Town Hall meeting electronically. In addition, more than 20 questions were submitted during the event. Taken together, students raised about 50 questions to a panel of University senior administrators, mid-level managers, and the president of the Student Government Association.

To complement the Task Force’s inquiry into compliance with the standards and criteria, a one-page survey containing three open-ended questions was presented to key stakeholders—parents and guardians of students during the fall 2007 registration period in August 2007. Over two days, 212 surveys were completed.

The foci and methods of inquiry for arriving at institutional strengths and opportunities for improvement, connection to criteria and standards, conclusions, and recommendations are based on a review of a vast array of institutional documents, numerous focus groups proceedings, a survey of parents and guardians during fall 2007 in-person registration, and a Student Town Hall Meeting in fall 2007.

The MSCHE Standard 6 requires institutional “integrity.” Task Force 3, made an assessment to determine compliance with this standard, specifically regarding fair and impartial processes concerning student grievances, including fairness and promptness in addressing and adjudicating alleged violations of institutional policies, as well as access to institutional records. The University is, indeed, in compliance with this standard.

In the case of student grievances concerning alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct, the Office of Judicial Affairs, which falls under the purview of the Division of Student Affairs, receives, investigates, and adjudicates student misconduct, when necessary. The Code of Student Conduct, student due process rights, procedures for hearings, institutional sanctions, and the appellate process are accessible for review by students, faculty, parents, and others through the Student Handbook. The Student Handbook is available in hard copy and is presented on the University’s web page under “Current Students.”
The University “Policy on Academic Dishonesty,” which makes clear that academic dishonesty is considered “among the most egregious” (2006-2007 Morgan State University Catalog, p. 48) violations of University policy is discussed in the University Catalog, which is available to students in hard copy, electronically on the University’s web page, and on a compact diskette. In cases where academic dishonesty is alleged to have occurred, the administration of the policy falls under the general auspices of the Division of Academic Affairs, beginning with the faculty who may have filed the initial charges. According to the policy, the student alleged to have engaged in academic dishonesty may be referred to the appropriate academic dean.

Furthermore, the University Catalog presents the “Academic Appeals Process,” which addresses student grievances such as disputes related to academic standing, grades, and the appellate procedures for academic dishonesty. The academic appeals policy provides certain due process rights for students, including written notice of an alleged violation of an academic dishonesty matter and the right to a hearing with the appropriate academic dean or her or his designee.

Finally, access to institutional records, namely student records, is permitted through University adherence to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), which is referred to in the University Catalog as “Students’ Right to Know.” The Catalog details guidelines necessary for a student to inspect, consent to release of, and correct records, if necessary. (See the University Catalog for a description of the procedures.)

In informal the University
There are internal and external communication structures used to inform the public about the university. Internally, Morgan uses campus newspapers, news bulletins, bulletin boards and electronic media to communicate our success stories. In addition, it has WEAA-FM Radio Station, located at 88.9 FM. This is a major vehicle for informing the public about MSU accomplishments and an important voice for informing the public about local and national news and views important to civic discourse.

Staying Current
As with most large institutions, the University has a unit responsible for understanding technological developments that are relevant to the university and making sure that systems are installed and that training for implementation and utilization occurs in a timely way. As mentioned earlier, there are resource limitations that may interfere with proposed schedules, but MSU has been fortunate to figure out ways to keep administration, teaching, research and student development as current as possible with technological developments.

Morgan State University complies with MSCHE Standards 6 and Baldrige Category 3 and meets the requirements and standards. Due process procedures are practiced, an academic grievance policy exists, and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act provides access to student records.

Conclusions
The University has fair and impartial practices with respect to student grievances and alleged incidents of student misconduct. An academic grievance policy ensures students have a mechanism to address their concerns equitably. These policies and procedures are discussed in the Code of Student Conduct, the University Catalogs, the Student Handbook and the University web page and through presentations at key forums for students and parents. As such, the University’s adherence to MSCHE Standard 6 is sound. Similarly, the Task Force concluded Baldrige comports with this standard.
MSCHE Standard 7

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Morgan State University has a long-standing commitment to institutional assessment, and it employs a great number and variety of means for assessing and ensuring that it is achieving its mission and goals and serving its constituents well. It realizes that the continual renewal of the University is dependent upon comprehensive assessment of what the University does and how well it does it and development of plans for improvement. Accordingly, the University seeks assurance of its institutional effectiveness by way of: (1) monitoring all of its programs through unit annual reports reflecting their achievement of missions and goals; (2) gathering institutional research data on academic programs and student performance; (3) assessing student learning based on institutional data; (4) using national and standardized tests to measure student learning against national norms; (5) participating in national studies of student learning; (6) seeking accreditation by national and international accrediting agencies; (7) assessing its management and operational processes through invited external reviews; (8) conducting periodic reviews through a Comprehensive Assessment Plan; and (9) studying its rankings nationally and locally in student and program achievement.

Over the past ten years, Morgan has developed a very strong commitment to assessment of student learning and of institutional effectiveness, and, for the last three years, it has worked diligently toward developing a “culture of assessment” at the institution. In 2005, it designed and implemented a Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) calling for every unit, sub-unit and employee on campus to develop an orientation toward setting goals and measurable objectives and reviewing their performance periodically to ascertain the extent to which they have achieved those goals and objectives—all of this consistent with, and viewed in the context of, the University’s mission and goals. In fact, the University incorporated into its most recent mission statement a strong commitment to assessment.

Over the past ten years, Morgan has developed a very strong commitment to assessment of student learning and of institutional effectiveness, and, for the last three years, it has worked diligently toward developing a “culture of assessment” at the institution. In 2005, it designed and implemented a Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) calling for every unit, sub-unit and employee on campus to develop an orientation toward setting goals and measurable objectives and reviewing their performance periodically to ascertain the extent to which they have achieved those goals and objectives—all of this consistent with, and viewed in the context of, the University’s mission and goals. In fact, the University incorporated into its most recent mission statement a strong commitment to assessment.

The University maintains as a high priority the continuing and on-going assessment of its overall institutional effectiveness and of its achievement of its mission and goals. It gives primary attention to the assessment of student learning and of related educational programs and activities, and it links that to the assessment of all other aspects of the University, including institutional resources, resource allocation, leadership and governance, administration and institutional integrity. Assessment of all facets of the University is tied directly to the institution’s mission and goals, and the University employs a broad variety of internal and external measures, including self-study, to gauge its effectiveness. Morgan uses the research and data generated by assessment not as an end, but as a means to enhancing teaching and learning, improving services and processes, implementing effective planning, ensuring institutional renewal and otherwise ensuring accountability and overall improvement.

CAP has resulted in the establishment on campus of an assessment office that coordinates the institution’s efforts at comprehensive assessment. Within the Academic Division, each college/school/institute also has a Coordinator of Assessment to ensure that those units and their departments and programs achieve their goals in student learning and program effectiveness, and units within other divisions at the University will soon appoint coordinators to oversee assessment efforts. Once CAP is fully in place, the University will require units to assess the quality of all of their operations.
In the last three years, Morgan has, understandably, placed its greatest emphasis on assessment of student learning. This new focus has produced, already, substantial results. Those activities are reported in more detail in the discussion of Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning.

Naturally, one of the major means by which Morgan assesses its academic programs is their record of success in attaining national and/or international accreditation in the profession. In the last ten years, all of Morgan’s programs that have applied for accreditation or reaccreditation have achieved it. Its programs hold accreditation by 19 accrediting bodies in accounting, architecture, business, chemistry, city and regional planning, civil engineering, clinical laboratory science, dietetic science, education, electrical engineering, finance, industrial engineering, landscape architecture, management, music, public health, social work and teacher education, including accreditation by Middle States since 1925.

Morgan also measures its success, in part, by the number and quality of its graduates; and, over the past ten years, it has achieved prominence locally and nationally for the number of African-American graduates it has contributed to various fields. At the baccalaureate level, nationally, it ranks 12th in total degrees awarded; 5th in the biological sciences, 7th in engineering, 9th in computer and information sciences, 15th in education, 19th in English and 22nd in business and management. At the doctoral level, Morgan ranks 14th in total degrees awarded to African Americans, 7th in engineering, 7th in education and 8th in the health sciences. Morgan’s success, however, is not measured only quantitatively. Over the years, it has won more Fulbright Scholarships than any other HBCU. Among HBCUs, it has the largest number of graduates from its ROTC Program who have achieved the rank of general officer in the United States Army. During the last ten years, it has ranked 9th among American public four-year institutions for the number of its African-American graduates who went on to earn the doctorate. The achievement of its graduates is a clear indication of the institution’s effectiveness.

Over the decade, just as the University has demonstrated an increasingly strong commitment to assessing and ensuring student learning, it has also shown a strong commitment to ensuring effective administration and management. As it did in the nineties with the Fisher Report, the University commissioned Ayers and Associates, Inc., to conduct an organizational analysis of the operation of the institution. That review, as pointed out below, concluded that “the University has been efficient and effective in its operation with the current resources available to the institution.”

With the measures of success noted and highlighted above, Morgan continues to make assessment of student learning and of institutional effectiveness one of its top priorities.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Institutional Assessments (Standard 7)

Morgan relies on a variety of assessment instruments to answer the questions of how well the University is meeting its mission and in what ways the University might improve the delivery of its instructional services to graduate as well as undergraduate students. Specifically, Morgan’s professional academic programs are accredited regularly by their respective professional societies. Accreditations include but are not limited to the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) the National Accreditation Agency for Clinical Laboratory Services (Medical Technology), the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Morgan also conducts surveys of constituent groups including the Annual Alumni Survey, to measure how well the University is meeting its mission.
Morgan utilizes a Comprehensive Assessment Program (CAP) to measure student learning and institutional effectiveness. Task Force 7 also finds that it program can be strengthened by ensuring that the University community, including faculty (graduate as well as undergraduate), staff, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, and friends (particularly potential donors), comprehends how the many discrete assessment instruments and surveys mentioned above are used by Morgan to conduct ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and how it utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal.

In July 2007, Morgan completed an Organizational Analysis Report authorized by the University’s Board of Regents and conducted by Ayers & Associates Inc. The Report represents a comprehensive assessment of the administrative units at Morgan, headed by each of the five vice-presidents and the seven deans, in order to determine whether the University is operating efficiently and effectively in fulfilling the institution’s mission. The Report concluded that:

The outcome of this organizational analysis of MSU clearly indicates that the University has been efficient and effective in its operation with the current resources available to the institution. The study also indicates that the degree of operational efficiency and effectiveness could be improved through the enhancement of existing systems, key functions and processes as well as the acquisition of much-needed resources. (See, Overview.)

Recommendation

Task Force 7 recommends that the University share the results of CAP with all of its constituents and that it promote among them a full understanding of what the assessment results mean, how they are used in institutional renewal and what impact they have on institutional planning and resource allocation.
MSCHE Standard 8

STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Morgan State University’s attractiveness to new students is reflected in increased demand for admission. The office of admission and recruitment, last fall, received more than 12,120 undergraduate applications. The applicant pool was more than twice the size that it was a decade ago. The student body is now comprised of approximately 7,000 students: it has grown by 13% during the past 10 years.

Under the direction of an Executive Director for Enrollment Management, a position established by the university about six years ago, the admission staff has broadened its recruitment constituency both inside and outside the state of Maryland. Although most students are residents of Baltimore City, an increasingly higher percentage of new students are from the suburban Washington, D.C., area, and Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties in Maryland. Additionally, non-Maryland students are well represented in the University’s population base, although their percentage in the student population has decreased slightly from the last reporting period. This circumstance is a result of the increased cost of tuition for non-Maryland residents and the fact that available financial assistance has not kept pace with demand for admission, especially for out-of-state aspirants to a Morgan education.

The University has also strengthened its programs for new transfer students by developing and implementing a University Transfer Center housed in the Division of Academic Affairs. The Center works closely with admission and recruitment and with other academic units to facilitate the processing of students entering the university from other colleges.

The Office of Student Financial Assistance continues to work diligently in the effort to assist students in their attempt to generate the financial resources necessary to pay for the educational expenses. In FY 1997, undergraduates received $33.6 million in financial aid of all types. By 2007, undergraduate financial aid had more than doubled to almost $80 million. The increased demand for financial aid service is moderated somewhat by the University’s investment in its Banner information system, which enables automated processing. Today, more than 90% of financial aid applicants apply through an on-line process. The goal is to eventually accomplish a paperless system.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 3: Student, Stakeholder and Market Focus
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Charges

Although Task Force 3 was responsible for determining institutional compliance with three MSCHE standards: Standard 6 (Integrity), specifically institutional integrity regarding student grievances, fair and impartial processes related to alleged violations of institutional policies, and access to institutional records; Standard 8 (Student Admissions), including undergraduate student recruitment and retention; and Standard 9 (Student Support Services), which addresses the extent to which the University provides reasonable services to meet the collegiate needs of its students; and with Baldrige Category 3 (Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus); this discussion will focus on MSCHE Standard 8, aligned with Baldrige
Category 3. To address these categories, the Task Force assessed the extent to which the University determines student, stakeholder, and market needs, expectations, and requirements, along with key factors that lead to student satisfaction, persistence, and educational services and programs. The Task Force was comprised of a mix of members from the University community, including faculty, Academic Affairs staff, Student Affairs staff, and undergraduate and graduate students. (For research questions addressed by the Task Force, see Appendix A.)

Admissions

MSCHE requires that institutions admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission. The mission of Morgan State helps identify the student and market segments that the University will serve. Morgan’s mission states that it will recruit and enroll students with diverse academic talents and backgrounds. (See the Mission Statement of Morgan State University.) Rather than serving one segment of students, the University enrolls students in three categories: (a) high ability students, (b) regularly admitted students, and (c) pre-college studies students. Specifically, honors students are high-performing students characterized by stellar high school grade point averages and SAT or ACT scores. The majority of students admitted as first-year students, however, fall under the category of “regularly admitted students,” who earn admittance to the University by meeting the admission requirements as set forth in the University Catalog and presented on the institution’s webpage. Students who do not meet the previous two categories—students falling below the general admission policy—may seek admittance to the University through a specially-targeted summer enrichment program—the Pre-College Studies Program, which enables educational access and opportunities to students who might not otherwise gain admission to college. They must meet the conditions of the summer program in order to be admitted as regular first-year students through an intrusive First-Year Studies Program.

To address future students and market segments, the University has a long-standing Enrollment Management Advisory Committee, comprised of the Executive Director of Enrollment Services as chair, the Director of Undergraduate Admission and Recruitment, the Executive Assistant to the President, the Registrar, representatives from the University college/schools/institute, and other Academic Affairs and Student Affairs personnel. Additionally, to understand its future market segments better, the University hired Noel-Levitz to develop enrollment potential analysis reports in 2001 and 2006.

Furthermore, to capitalize on potential community college transfer students, the Office of Admission and Recruitment has a specially-designated staff member, assisted by recruiters, to identify, market, and recruit students to the University. This is complemented by a new Transfer Evaluation Center (established in 2006), which was put in operation to ease the processes and functions of transfer students that have applied to the University. This center, which falls under the aegis of the Division of Academic Affairs, has a close relationship with the Offices of Admission and Recruitment, Student Financial Aid, Records and Registration, Residential Life, and University Honors among others.

Collectively, these categories have enabled the University to admit and enroll students with diverse academic talents and backgrounds, as stated in the University mission. Morgan has generally increased its first-year and transfer students steadily from 2000 to 2006. From 2000 to 2004, student enrollment among African Americans and Asian/Pacific Islanders steadily increased. This is also the case for students falling under the self-identified category “other.” During the same period, enrollment trends for White, Hispanic, and Native American students fluctuated. Given the growth of Hispanics in the region, the University could capitalize on this by more aggressively recruiting these students from high schools and community colleges in the State. Still, overall undergraduate student enrollment consistently increased from 2000-2004.
The University is adhering to its mission by enrolling a majority of its students from Baltimore City and the region. In this sense, the University has been successful in three regions of the state: (1) Baltimore City, (2) Prince Georges County, and (3) Baltimore County, where large numbers of African Americans reside. There has been limited growth in enrollment from other counties in Maryland. From 2000 to 2006, the vast majority of first-year students were from Baltimore City. Yet, the University has not fully capitalized on students from other contiguous and nearby counties, including Harford, Anne Arundel, Howard, and Cecil. Lastly, more can be done in terms of capitalizing on Maryland’s growth in racial and ethnic diversity, such as high school graduates from Hispanic backgrounds.

Morgan State University measures up to MSCHE Standard 8 and Baldrige Category 3. The University Admission & Recruitment Office has identified, attracted, and enrolled students based on its mission and from key market segments. The latter is a key principle of Baldrige. Furthermore, to determine future market segments, an enrollment advisory committee sets goals based on the State’s changing demographics. For example, though the University has enrolled increasingly high numbers of students from Baltimore City, Prince Georges County, and Baltimore County for most of the current decade, more can be done to recruit and enroll students from other market segments in Maryland, where there are racially and ethnically diverse high school and community college students. On-the-spot admission decisions address both MSCHE standard 8 and Baldrige criteria insofar as the practice satisfies potential students and cultivates relationships with key stakeholders.

Retention

To determine the needs and expectations of transfer and other students, the University is steadily moving towards a culture of evidence, assessing perceptions of student satisfaction and customer service, levels of student engagement/involvement in various academic and co-curricular domains of college life, and student values and interests. A new comprehensive assessment of first-year students began in fall 2007—Foundations of Excellence (FOE)—as a self-study of the experiences of first-year students on key dimensions, such as learning outcomes, diversity awareness, student transitioning, and student-faculty interactions. The FOE initiative is a national project spearheaded by the South Carolina-based Policy Center on the First Year of College and sponsored by Lumina Foundation for Education. Morgan’s engagement in FOE will help assess how well first-year students are performing through nine university-wide “Dimensions” committees. Moreover, FOE will help get the University community, primarily educational staff, faculty, and administrators, assessing and critically talking about its first-year students in small manageable groups with specific objectives and as a larger group overall comprised on all nine dimensions committees.

To ensure increased educational services and programs, the University developed a model for student retention—“retention coordinators” in each college/school/institute, providing specially focused services to undergraduates in order to enhance student success. Each unit has between one and five retention staff members, with the largest number residing in the College of Liberal Arts, which has the greatest number of majors: University Retention Office (4), College of Liberal Arts (5), School of Business and Management (3), School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences (2), School of Education and Urban Studies (1), School of Engineering (3), and the Institute of Architecture and Planning (1). The School of Community Health and Policy uses the retention staff of the School of Education and Urban Studies.

The general purpose of each retention staff is to help students persist to graduation by providing academic coaching for at-risk students, directing students to academic and student support resources, monitoring the academic progress of students through an Early Alert and Response System (EARS), encouraging students to complete the FAFSA, and ensuring that students are aware of and have access to adequate financial assistance. The Office of Student Retention develops annual reports detailing rates at which first-year students are retained from fall-to-fall.
Student, Stakeholder, and Market Focus

The University has a number of venues for listening to student needs and concerns. Some “listening methods” to determine the needs of students include the University President, vice presidents, academic deans, and others that have longstanding open-door practices, enabling students to visit these administrators and discuss their concerns. Morgan State University also enables student voice and vote on the University Board of Regent through a “student regent” selected by the student body and appointed by the Governor of Maryland. Further, through the Student Government Association (SGA), any member of the student body may articulate concerns as they may arise. The executive members of the SGA meet regularly with the Vice President for Student Affairs and periodically with the University President. Furthermore, to address the concerns of graduate students that fall outside of formal student grievance procedures, a Graduate Student Association (GSA) similarly enables graduate student voice and vote. The Dean of the Graduate School meets with GSA regularly.

The input from students concerning their needs and expectations are channeled to an Assistant Vice President for Information Planning & Technology who is responsible for gathering, interpreting, and producing feedback for University constituent groups, though individual divisions and units may examine their own evidence. Nevertheless, the findings are intended for institutional improvements. The Task Force has determined, however, that greater use of results from surveys and other assessments on student needs and expectations is needed. Still, the University employs its homepage, electronic-based “Campus Announcements,” and other media to communicate pertinent information regarding services and programs to its students. The student newspaper—The Spokesman—is another medium for communicating changes in the educational community, including the new parking system, announcements about filing FAFSA documents timely, and student programs.

Student and Stakeholder Relationships

An institutional student recruitment staff, augmented by Student Ambassadors, plays an integral role in building relationships with high school and community college students. The latter cannot be underestimated at the University, as these peers are essential to attracting new students. The practice of on-the-spot admission decisions made at various high schools and other locales, such as college fairs also help attract new students.

With regard to new students, a new University Student Center appears to be helping to improve student satisfaction with campus life. It is a three-story building erected as a town hall gathering place for students to interact formally and informally. The new facility has a cyber café, theatre for first run movies, private meeting rooms, a game room, a dining hall that offers a wider selection of options, and other nicely appointed areas for students to visit. Other buildings have been erected, improving the physical environment of the campus, such as a new state-of-the-art Library, a Communication Studies Center, an apartment-style residential facility, and a parking garage. New furnishings in many residence halls throughout campus have improved student living-learning. Campus walkways have been resurfaced. Also, since the University’s last Middle States Commission on Higher Education visit, the University’s football stadium has been renovated, increasing seats and providing additional amenities for students and others. A new student information data system—Banner—has been installed to provide ease of use for student web-based registration and other purposes, including monitoring financial aid, billing, and midterm and final grades.

To manage student complaints and ensure the effective and prompt resolution of such, the University has a student grievance procedure detailed in the University Catalog. Again, the SGA and GSA have voice and vote on certain University procedures, policies, and practices, where appropriate.
Conclusions

Task Force 3 determined that the institution meets the requirements of MSCHE Standards 8 and Baldrige Category 3. This determination was based on examination of University policies and procedures, University data, focus groups, a survey of parents and guardians of students, and a Student Town Hall meeting, although the expertise of the Task Force was instrumental. In terms of MSCHE and Baldrige, the University meets the needs and expectations of students through an array of educational services and programs. The University identifies and recruits its students, primarily from the counties within the State of Maryland, the City of Baltimore, in particular, and the regions with diverse academic talents and backgrounds. Student “voice and vote” are central to the culture of the institution, particularly in raising concerns about programs, services, and procedures, where appropriate. To build relationships to attract and satisfy students, peer-to-peer practices, “on-the-spot” admission decisions in high schools, new student life and academic buildings, and specialized programs were identified as effective measures. Additionally, the University has developed a culture of evidence to assess student satisfaction and dissatisfaction with educational services and programs.

Also, the University’s admission practices help attract, recruit, and enroll students described in the mission. To help retain first-year and other students, Morgan State recently put in place a cadre of retention staff members dispersed throughout the University schools, College of Liberal Arts, and the Institute for Architecture and Planning. Furthermore, the University has significantly improved its student services, but there are yet opportunities for further improvement.

Demographic Trends

Current census data reveal that demographic trends in the United States and particularly trends in Maryland are consistent with Morgan’s goal of providing a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs and a careful selection of graduate programs. Census data suggest that racial and ethnic minorities in general and African-Americans in particular continue to be underrepresented in most academic disciplines. The growth in higher education in the United States is projected to be driven by increased enrollment of African American and Hispanic students. According to 2006 census data, African Americans comprised twenty-nine percent (29%) of the State population, ranking Maryland fifth in the nation in its percentage of African American citizens. Task Force 7 research suggests that demographic trends in Maryland and throughout the United States support Morgan’s goal of recruiting a diverse student body to sustain its Carnegie classification as a Doctoral Research University as well as support the University’s overall educational mission.

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

Task Force 3 has determined that there were both strengths and opportunities for improvement in student admissions and retention at the University.

Strengths

Students participating in focus groups and the results from the survey revealed noteworthy strengths:

- The Office of Student Retention, with its retention coordinators dispersed throughout the University schools, complements student success;

- An Enrollment Management Advisory Committee that keeps current with market trends helps the University identify future students;
• The development of an institutional culture of evidence is helpful in identifying student satisfaction and dissatisfaction;

• Morgan’s physical plant, as touted by many students in focus groups, helps many students select the University for their initial higher education institution;

• The Golden Ambassadors are instrumental in attracting new students;

• Many students sense a “family-oriented” environment at the University, particularly among their peers;

• New student life and academic buildings improve student satisfaction and learning; and

• The specialized programs at the University (e.g., Foundations of Excellence, Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students, Helping Hands, Male Initiative on Leadership & Excellence, Fast Track, and New Student Orientation & Registration) contribute to meeting the special needs of many students academically and personally.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

All colleges and universities face opportunities for improvement. For Morgan, the Task Force learned through focus groups and survey results that:

• Addition of personnel during registration, particularly in some offices in the Montebello Complex, will help to alleviate some of the registration problems;

• Many staff members view many student service functions, especially in Montebello, as lacking adequate support staff during peak service periods;

• Some staff members feel handicapped by the University’s inconsistent technology—voice mail and email; and

• While the University has directed some of its resources to enrolling a more diverse student pool as well as attracting students from more widespread counties in Maryland, the University should strive to ensure it capitalizes on such by devoting more human and fiscal resources to these opportunities, which could better help the institution meet its enrollment goals.
MSCHE Standard 9

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Morgan State University has made considerable progress in addressing the recommendations the Middle States team made for the student support services in the 1998 Evaluation Team Report. To enhance campus safety, additional police officers have been hired, a bike patrol has been added and problems associated with the University’s emergency call box system have been resolved. These were specifically recommended in the last report. Additionally, campus lighting has been improved and security cameras are strategically located in key positions. The plan is to expand the camera system to provide even broader coverage, inclusive of surveillance for public access areas in administrative, classroom, and residential facilities.

In the wake of the Virginia Tech incident, Morgan has also developed a Crisis Management and Emergency Response Plan, a collaborative endeavor which attracted input from all major areas of the institution. A special feature of the Plan is an emergency electronic alert system enabling quick notification of students, faculty and staff when incidents do occur.

A decade ago it was also observed that Morgan “needs to increase recreational and cultural opportunities available to resident students”. With its new state-of-the-art Student Center, featuring some of the finest amenities currently available, the University’s attractiveness to new and continuing student’s has been greatly improved. Today’s Morgan student considers the Student Center to be the hub of campus life, and an ideal place to recreate, socialize and study in an environment which complement the excellence of the institution’s educational programs.

The intercollegiate athletics program is also a major entertainment resource for Morgan students. Investments in programs and facility improvements have yielded positive dividends. Generally, Morgan’s athletic teams are substantially more competitive than in years past; this is a source of pride and increased espirit de corps among students and alumni. Successful sports teams also enhance institutional marketing, and help to carry the “Morgan” name and trademark throughout the nation. It helps too that some of the student-athletes are quite academically accomplished. Three former athletes have earned doctorates in Engineering, one is Dean of the College of Engineering at the California State University, Los Angeles. While the University has been eminently successful in addressing many of the recommendations indicated in the last report, student financial assistance is a notable exception.

Identifying additional financial assistance for the Morgan student continues to be a challenge, as is the case for other colleges and universities committed to broadening educational access despite facing budgetary constraints. Student and parent reliance upon loans to meet educational costs has not diminished, and the prospect for relief does not seem near. For its part, Morgan devotes a higher percentage of its tuition revenues to financial assistance for needy students than any other public college in the state of Maryland. However, there is no escaping the fact the University cannot from its own resources adequately address this issue. More work must be done to respond to students’ need for increased financial assistance.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations
The MSCHE requires organized, effective, and reasonably appropriate student services necessary for student learning and development. The University meets Standard 9. The type of student services delivered by the University is consistent with institutions in the region and colleges and universities considered as “peer institutions,” although Morgan implements specially-oriented services for some student sub-groups. As the following table shows, generally student services fall under the aegis of the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The Division of Business & Finance is principally concerned with providing student services related to student accounts management. As such, student services appear to be integrated broadly throughout the University.

### Selected Student Services Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Reporting Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Development Center</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access-Success Program</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission &amp; Recruitment</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid &amp; Assistance</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Studies Program</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Residential Life</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural &amp; Recreational Sports</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Registration</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities &amp; Student Center</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Evaluation Center</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Center</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Honors Programs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These services are described in the University Catalog, Student Handbook, University web page, and other internal documents. It is important to note that Admissions and Recruitment, noted above, was relocated from the Division of Student Affairs to the Division of Academic Affairs effective in January 2008.

Most of the student services are provided in the Montebello Complex, a two-story retro-fitted building on the south campus. Although Montebello houses a mix of administrative, faculty, and University support offices, most of the student registration processes occur in Montebello, and, through a campus shuttle operation, transportation is available at no cost to students and others to and from academic and student buildings on the north and south sides of campus, as well as two off-campus residential facilities operated for University students.

With regard to providing “special services,” many students involved in focus groups pin-pointed specific programs and initiatives that helped undergird their success in school, including “Access-Success,” “Pre-College Studies,” “Fast Track,” “Helping Hands,” “Building Educational Attainment for Minority Stu-
dents,” “Introduction to the University Week,” “Office of Residence Life,” “Male Initiative on Leadership & Excellence,” “Leading Ladies,” “Peer Counselors,” and “Student Orientation Advisement & Registration” among others.

With regard to the special needs of students, certain student services functions stand out. The University has a long-standing commitment to serving underrepresented students, a commitment in the university mission statement. As such, many underrepresented students bring special needs to the university, including being academically under-prepared. In response, the University has several programs to ensure the academic and personal success of these students, including the Academic Enrichment Center, a complementary academic support program through the Office of Residence Life, the Transfer Evaluation Center, and the Office of Student Retention. The Counseling Center also provides services and support for students with certain physical and learning challenges.

While the University meets Standard 9, as reflected in focus groups and results from surveys, the most intractable problem facing most of the University’s students is their difficulty mustering the financial resources necessary to pay their educational expenses at the University. Approximately 90% of the students rely upon need-based financial aid, and many are eligible for PELL grants reserved for the neediest of college students. Since grant aid, as a percentage of the financial aid award, has been decreasing steadily over the last few decades, most students and parents are also increasingly reliant on loans from federal and private sources to help pay for students’ education. Only a minority of Morgan State students are able to pay their educational costs fully and on time, consequently a number of associated problems are created. These require exceptional attention and substantial additional staff energies, to avoid foreclosing on students’ opportunities to benefit from a Morgan education.

When students cannot timely meet the obligation to pay tuition and other associated educational costs their course schedules must be cancelled, as the University exercises it fiduciary responsibility. When schedules are cancelled, student’s financial aid awards are jeopardized, the students and staff face the stresses of the students’ struggles to select alternative schedules from a diminished array of course offerings, and many students must individually negotiate arrangements to pay their bills in increments, or on a deferred payment basis. To do so, since large numbers regularly face this predicament, students find themselves in long lines to meet with staff attempting to assist the students and enable the continuation of their studies. This is a frustrating situation for all concerned, but it is deemed preferable to the alternative of turning students away.

Although Morgan State University has had a long-standing ethic of being student-centered, the University has consulted with Noel-Levitz and has administered survey instruments to better understand and address quality customer services. Another issue that appears to present opportunities for improvement for the university is the efficiency and policies of certain registration procedures. The University may expect long lines, frustrations, and certain missteps, as students have unmet financial needs. Alternatively, consistent enforcement of the procedures will alleviate these problems. Students who have unmet financial needs and do not make satisfactory financial arrangements are dropped from their courses and, hence, no longer appear on the class rosters.

The University has administered assessments to better understand and address specific registration opportunities for improvement with respect to registration. For example, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a Freshman Attitude Survey, and an external consultant agency (i.e., Noel Levitz) have been utilized to improve customer service and create better registration processes. The data have been made available to key departments in order to address student needs. Further, the University has established “Morgan Cares” and “Helping Hands” as a result of its involvement in “Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students” (BEAMS), a national project aimed at improving student success at minority-serving Institutions in the country. (This project is discussed in greater detail in Task Force 3,
Exhibit A.) Through this BEAMS-sponsored program, a cadre of institutional faculty, staff, and students are stationed in the lobby area of Montebello Complex to assist students, particularly first-year undergraduates, in the registration process.

MSCHE Standard 9 and Baldrige Category 3 appear to be consistent, and the University achieves both. Focus group findings reveal that students are satisfied with a broad range of student services and complementary initiatives designed to enhance student success. This is central to Baldrige, which addresses the extent to which students and stakeholders are satisfied with educational programs and services. Both Baldrige and MSCHE standards addressed by Task Force 3 help the University better understand student dissatisfaction through certain assessments (e.g., Freshman Attitudes Survey, NSSE, and Noel-Levitz). The University, however, is using these assessments and other initiatives for institutional improvements, as encouraged by MSCHE and Baldrige.

With regard to MSCHE Standard 9, the University indeed provides a reasonable mix of student services to assist students in their personal learning and development. From Morgan students’ entry to exit, quality educational support and student services are available for students, as suggested by Baldrige. Additionally, as reflected in focus groups and survey responses, the University has an array of student services that meet the broad needs of students. In fact, students could pin-point programs and services that complemented their academic and personal success. Yet, how the University best minimizes disconcerting customer service (and “stress”), is an area requiring sustained improvement. Additionally, greater accountability of some educational staff is needed in: providing quality customer service, interacting more professionally with students and other stakeholders and handling paperwork more carefully. In the view of the Task Force, holding these staff to these expectations could better create a student-centered culture and foster a sense of place for more members of the University community.

Task Force 3’s determination of institutional compliance with MSCHE Standard 9 and Baldrige Category 3 is based on examination of University policies and procedures, University data, focus groups, a survey to parents and guardians of students, and a Student Town Hall meeting, although the expertise of the Task Force was instrumental. The University has strengths in these areas, including special services oriented towards students with physical and learning challenges, high ability, and academically at-risk backgrounds. Improving customer service is both a challenge and a mandate, as it relates to the nature of the mission and the extraordinary needs of the students. As such, opportunities for improvement are recommended to improve compliance with Baldrige 3 and MSCHE standards on student admissions and student support services.

Conclusion

With regard to MSCHE Standard 9, the University indeed provides a reasonable mix of student services to assist students in their personal learning and development. From a Morgan student’s entry to exit, quality educational support and student services are available for students, as suggested by Baldrige. Additionally, as reflected in focus groups and survey responses, the University has an array of student services that meet the broad needs of students. Yet, improvements in how the University best assists students with unmet financial needs will require more need-based financial aid resources.

FINDINGS – CUSTOMER SERVICE

Colleges and universities have become more complex enterprises. With the onset of a generation of students expecting expeditious customer service and performance, it is important for institutions of higher learning to pay close attention to the needs of its constituencies. The most intractable problem facing most of the University’s students is their difficulty mustering the financial resources necessary to pay their educational expenses at the University.
Morgan faces competition for its best students and faculty and must make sure that it is comparable to its competitors in the quality of services that it offers. In order to evaluate and determine key work process requirements and improvements for its stakeholders, Morgan State University conducted a series of focus groups in 2007. Titled “Opportunities for Continuous Improvement in Academics,” focus groups from each of the seven schools with students, faculty, and administrators participated in sessions to offer their observations and comments regarding process improvements. This is in addition to numerous surveys conducted throughout the year which include the following instruments: NSSE, Graduate Exit Survey, Alumni Survey, Banner Improvement Survey, and Foundations of Excellence for First Year Students Survey.

Common themes for improvement in customer service from the student perspective are as follows:

- External and Internal Communication
- Recruitment and Retention
- Admission Procedures
- Financial Aid Procedures and Graduate Stipend Information
- Registration Procedures
- Communication of Graduation Requirements
- Student Service Support
- Faculty Availability
- Student Advisement
- Student Resources for Research and Study

Common themes for improvement in customer service from the faculty/staff perspective are as follows:

- Accurate Departmental Budget Information
- Online Procurement
- Banner Training
- Technology Support Services
- Computer Equipment
- Better Access to Student Data
- More automation of administrative processes to reduce paper processing

Opportunities for Improvement and Recommendations for Improving Customer Service

As the University grows and continues to make innovations in its work systems, it will need to improve the way it communicates. With the implementation of the Banner system, information is now in one place and is shared. Internal communication is important and ready access to data and the availability of information is vital to providing optimum customer service and adding value to key work processes. Based on document analysis, focus groups, and responses from a survey administered to parents and guardians, the following opportunities for improvement at the University were evident:

- the University should provide additional support staff in key academic and student services areas;
- technology for academic and student services staff (e.g., voice mail and email) must be consistently available; and
- specialized student services should be expanded and provided with adequate fiscal support to ensure their continuity.
1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

The Team Report for the 1998 MSCHE accreditation visit recommended that Morgan increase “the number of full-time permanent faculty and reduce the percentage of contractual faculty.” However, during the decade from 1999 through 2008, the University has been unable to make significant progress along those lines. Although enrollment has increased since 1999 and the University has had to increase the number of faculty members accordingly, it has not been able to hire additional permanent faculty to reflect that growth. Despite repeated requests, the State has appropriated few new faculty positions during this period, and state-mandated hiring freezes have been imposed several times. As a result, the University has been forced to increase the number and percentage of contractual faculty to meet the instructional staffing needs. Though the University had worked to decrease, incrementally, the percentage of contractual faculty prior to 1999, during this past decade, the percentage of contractual faculty has increased and the number of regular faculty has decreased.

The characteristics of the faculty have changed somewhat since the last MSCHE review. With reference to gender, 34% of the full-time regular faculty were female and 66% were male ten years ago, while today, 35% are female and 65% are male, reflecting little change. Of the total full-time faculty (regular plus contractual) 44% are female, and 56% are male.

Eighty-six percent (86%) of the regular faculty hold terminal degrees, a significant increase over the 78.5% ten years ago. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the faculty are tenured, compared to 54% ten years ago. The faculty profile by rank is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This compares to 19% professors, 27% associate professors, 40% assistant professors and 14% instructors ten years ago. The university also employs a substantial number of contractual faculty depending on its needs during each term.

Morgan’s Faculty Handbook includes a variety of policies concerning the terms and conditions of employment.

With the acquisition of the Estuarine Research Center (ERC), the policy and procedures on appointment, promotion and tenure were revised to include certain research faculty positions. The Faculty Handbook underwent a major revision in August 2004, and it is continuously updated as required. Within the last 5 years, Morgan has put in place the released-time procedure and a mentoring program to assist faculty in progressing towards promotion and tenure.

The teaching load of full-time faculty ranges from 12 credit hours (4 courses) per semester for undergraduate faculty to nine credit hours (3 courses) for graduate faculty. Teaching loads may be reduced through
released-time for faculty with grants and others who are actively engaged in research and/or grantsmanship.

Finally, as a new doctoral research institution, MSU has not reached a size that it can realize the economies of scale enjoyed by the three other well-developed doctoral/research institutions within the State of Maryland (excluding the University of Maryland medical school).

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Task Force 5 was charged with assessing the University’s compliance with Middle States Standard 10: Faculty and Standard 5: Administration. MSCHE Standard 5 was added because Baldrige Criteria Category 5 includes staff in its assessment. This was a distinct departure from previous MSCHE Accreditation reports which tend to focus on faculty. The research questions which guided this assessment were developed using the design set forward by the Steering Committee. The MSCHE Standards were first aligned with the University mission statement, and research questions specific to the University were developed. The questions were then related to the Baldrige Category 5: Faculty and Staff Focus. This category consisted of three components: Work Systems, Faculty and Staff Motivation, and Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction. From this process seven research questions were formulated. (See, Appendix A for specific questions addressed by each Task Force.)

The Task Force used a variety of methods to gather data and information concerning the research questions. Faculty and staff profiles (including full-time and part-time, tenured and non-tenured, gender comparisons) were taken from several sources including a survey of chairpersons and reports from Human Resources, Institutional Research and the Provost’s office. Two surveys were developed to acquire responses to those research questions which were oriented toward the Baldrige Criteria. A university-wide faculty and staff survey based on the Baldrige “Are We Making Progress” Questionnaire was conducted at the 2007 Faculty Institute. This is one of the first steps in the Baldrige process. The questionnaire covers the seven Baldrige criteria categories. Based on the survey feedback, the questionnaire was modified to address specific research questions. Task Force 5 used appropriate findings from University focus groups and "town hall" meetings results to provide further meaning and explanations of faculty and staff roles and responsibility, which result in improved institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

MSCHE Standard 10 and 5 to Baldrige Category 5.1: Work Systems

Baldrige Category 5.1 consists of the following three components:

a) Organization and Management of Work
b) Faculty and Staff Performance Management System
c) Hiring and Career Progression
Baldrige Category 5.1.a) Organization and Management of Work

Based on data provided by the Office of Human Resources, the university employs 1,386 full-time and 571 part-time faculty and staff. There are 514 academic faculty and staff employed and 427 full-time faculty members. The university demographics for full-time faculty are as follows: 62% Black, 22% White, 9% Asian, 6.6% Hispanic, 0.4% Native American. Statistics for tenured, tenure-track and contractual faculty, degree distribution and salaries were provided by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and are presented in the following tables. The 165 part-time faculty account for 46 FTE. The percentage composition of the faculty for the various classifications is shown in the following tables:

**TABLE 1: TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RANK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tenured Faculty Members = 170

**TABLE 2: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RANK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tenure-Track Faculty Members = 99

**TABLE 3: CONTRACTUAL FACULTY MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RANK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Regular Faculty Members = 269  
Total Contractual Faculty Members = 158  
Total Full Time Faculty = 427
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th># FACULTY</th>
<th># WITH TERMINAL DEGREE</th>
<th># TENURED</th>
<th># FULL-TIME LECTURERS</th>
<th>TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands. Arch.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAED (undergrad)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acctng/Fin.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Admin.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behav. Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth&amp;Pol. Mgmt.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hlth. Anal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Tech.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured-Track Faculty</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>Contractual Faculty</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEUS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE&amp;P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMSE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl/L./Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist./Geog.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil/Reli. Stud.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poli. Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soci./Anth.</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Faculty Composition
The salary ranges for the faculty are shown in the following table, compared to data on the University of Maryland Baltimore County, a state peer institution by Carnegie classification.

**TABLE 5: FACULTY SALARY DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY RANK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MSU Average Salaries</th>
<th>UMBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>86,163</td>
<td>102,103</td>
<td>94,133</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>72,438</td>
<td>73,210</td>
<td>72,824</td>
<td>74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>61,593</td>
<td>63,485</td>
<td>62,539</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>56,534</td>
<td>46,119</td>
<td>51,327</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>53,288</td>
<td>48,157</td>
<td>50,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university work systems are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *University Manual on Operational Policies and Procedures*. The university utilizes a variety of mechanisms to communicate with the faculty and staff. The faculty and staff meet bi-annually at the Faculty Institute. The Institute, conducted at the beginning of each semester, is based on an overall theme determined by a faculty/administration committee and consists of the following components: President's State of the University message, Provost's overview of the University's goals and objectives and keynote speakers, followed by panel discussions and breakout sessions. This year the entire Institute was devoted to the MSCHE Self-Study/Baldrige Evaluation Process.

The Deans of the respective college/schools/institute convene regular faculty meetings at least twice a semester and hold meetings in special session when circumstances warrant. The faculty of academic departments meet on a regular basis as determined by the chair. Each department has faculty serving on committees, such as Student-Faculty Adjudication; Courtesy; Curriculum; Facilities and Instrumentation; Student Advisement; Appointment, Promotion and Tenure; Scholarships and Awards; Student Recruitment; Library; and Graduate Programs. This committee structure is designed as a means for faculty to participate in governance at all levels. Whether or not such participation is achieved depends on the academic unit in question.

University policy provides for faculty representation from each college/school/institute on the University Council; each college/school/institute elects three faculty representatives to the University Council. All regular faculty are eligible to be elected. However, data from faculty surveys and a recently held town hall meeting indicated that some faculty perceive that these structures and processes are not fully effective. The same results also confirm faculty perceptions that the processes and procedures of the University Council need to be reexamined for the purpose of assuring a more effective faculty voice in University decision-making.

The Graduate Council is the primary vehicle for faculty participation in the School of Graduate Studies, in terms of faculty decision-making. The Graduate Council is made up of department chairs and academic coordinators/directors of graduate programs, as voting members, and deans as ex-officio, non-voting members. There are three standing committees of the Graduate Council whose members are appointed by the Graduate Dean: Curriculum Committee, Policies and Procedures Committee and Student Affairs Committee. When needed and appropriate, the Dean with the consent of the Graduate Council, appoints ad hoc committees to deal with particular topics, such as the issue of graduate teaching assistants and the issue of the policies and procedures for the periodic review of graduate programs. The primary responsibility of the Curriculum Committee is to review and to recommend approval of new courses and major
changes in programs. The Policies and Procedures Committee, as its name suggests, has as its primary responsibility the development and recommendation of graduate policies, procedures and guidelines to be followed by all University graduate program. The primary focus of the Student Affairs Committee is to address student issues, particularly concerning student financial aid, student participation in University governance, and student welfare, among others.

The teaching load of the faculty has been impacted greatly by the increase in the number of graduate programs, especially at the doctoral level. This has significantly impacted the faculty workload. The university policy is that graduate faculty teach nine credit hours per semester and that undergraduate faculty teach 12 credit hours per semester. The policies governing graduate faculty are defined by the Graduate Council. Graduate faculty workload includes teaching, scholarly activities, grant administration, dissertation and thesis advisement and committee assignments. Since there is no formal, published university-wide graduate faculty workload formula, the Policies Committee of the Graduate Council has just now begun to address the issue of graduate faculty workload and how the workloads should be determined for particular graduate programs. Workloads vary from program to program, since some programs include both undergraduate and graduate programs, while others are exclusively graduate programs.

Currently the Graduate School offers 14 doctoral programs and 27 master’s degree programs. Of these programs, nine master’s and eight doctoral programs have been added since the last accreditation review. This has significantly impacted the faculty work load. The impact on the graduate programs is reflected in the student-to-faculty ratio and faculty productivity. These estimates for new and large programs are presented in the following tables. The estimates of faculty work loads are conservative, since many of the graduate faculty are also involved in teaching at the undergraduate level. The data are based on input from Deans and Chairpersons of the respective areas.

### Graduate Faculty Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Programs</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Graduate Faculty</th>
<th>Student-Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education-Community Leadership (Ed.D.)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education Leadership (Ed.D.)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education (Ed.D.)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (Ed.D.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometrics (Ph.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (D.Eng.)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health (Dr.Ph.)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-Environmental Science (Ph.D.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These programs share faculty with the master’s and undergraduate programs within the departments.

The University has implemented two web-based systems for faculty use. They include the Banner System, which provides faculty access to student information and personal information, such as time sheets and benefits. The other system is Blackboard, an on-line system for course development and course man-
agement. The university has also recently implemented a university wide e-mail system and has improved its website for posting relevant information.

**Baldrige Category 5.1 .b) Faculty and Staff Performance Management System**

To ensure the quality of teaching and research, the University evaluates faculty systematically. It conducts student evaluations of faculty teaching in all classes each semester. In addition, the departmental chairperson evaluates the teaching of tenured, non-tenured and contractual faculty every. The evaluation is tied to a program of faculty development in which the chairperson helps the faculty member address any weaknesses or problems detected in the evaluation by the chair or by the students.

**Baldrige Category 5.1 .c) Hiring and Career Progression**

Fully committed to attracting a well-qualified faculty for its various undergraduate and graduate programs, the University depends upon its departments and schools to utilize common hiring practices for the recruitment and hiring of new faculty. Hiring of faculty is dependent upon available University resources, particularly the State budget that authorizes new faculty and staff lines. In accordance with higher education practices, attention is given to diversity, expertise in the discipline, relevant experience and commitment to student success and mission achievement of the University.

The policies and procedures for promotion and tenure are delineated in the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty are evaluated in three categories: teaching and advising, research and scholarship and service. All departments adhere to the same timeline and evaluation procedures. The candidate is evaluated by the departmental tenure and promotion committee and chairperson, the school/college tenure and promotion committee and Dean, and finally by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

In academic year 2006-2007, thirty-three faculty members applied for tenure and promotion. One third of the applicants received promotion and/or tenure. Three were granted tenure only, five were promoted to Associate Professor and five were promoted to Professor.

**MSCHE Standards 10 and 5 to Baldrige Category 5.2: Faculty and Staff Learning and Motivation**

Baldrige Category 5.2 consists of the following two components:

A. Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development
B. Motivation and Career Development

**Baldrige Category 5.1 .a) Faculty and Staff Education, Training, and Development**

The University provides a variety of opportunities for faculty development. One of the primary vehicles for faculty development is the Faculty Professional Development Program in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, which provides a variety of support services for faculty members. The Office of Faculty Professional Development has the goals of increasing faculty research, assisting in the enrichment of course curricula, and increasing awareness of developments in diverse fields. To accomplish these goals, the program has supported on-going research projects, particularly during the summer, funded presentations of papers at professional meetings and funded attendance at workshops and conferences. It provides campus workshops on writing for scholarly publications, grant proposal writing and instructional development. As a result of these efforts, annually, seven to nine faculty have completed research manuscripts for publication; seven to nine faculty have developed new courses or curricula or have enhanced existing courses to explore innovations in curricula design and implementation; 35 to 40
faculty have presented papers or participated in panels or accompanied students who have been asked to present papers or are involved in student competitions; and 12 to 14 faculty have pursued summer research for publication or grant proposals.

Additional support for faculty development is provided through sabbatical leave to develop new skills, conduct research and write grant proposals. The University also provides a regular program of faculty and staff development, including training in technology. Some of the particular workshops for faculty and staff have included training in grantsmanship and distance education, among others.

Baldrige Category 5.1.b) Motivation and Career Development

Baldrige Category 5.2.a) Work Environment

See on-line survey and results of town hall meeting.

Baldrige Category 5.2.b) Faculty and Staff Support and Satisfaction

Faculty are provided with merit increases based on their performance in teaching, research and service (i.e., research productivity, course and program development). They are also supported in their participation at conferences and professional meetings through travel funds.

Alignment MSCHE Standards 10 and 5 to Baldrige Category 5.3: Faculty and Staff Well-Being and Satisfaction

Baldrige Category 5.3 consists of the following two components:

A. Work Environment
B. Faculty Support and Satisfaction

Baldrige Category 5.3.a) Work Environment

The faculty gave the following answers to questions raised about the work environment:

(1) How do you assess your workforce capability and capacity needs, including skills, competencies, and staffing levels? The University has one of the most diverse faculties in the state and the region, augmented by a strong contingent of international faculty. They invest students with knowledge of the world that they cannot acquire from books. The University assesses its workforce capability through chairperson’s annual evaluations of faculty, student’s evaluations of faculty, departmental strategic plans, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of chairpersons. In questionnaires (Spring and Fall 2007), focus groups, and a Town Hall meeting, faculty noted the need for improvement in order for the University to engender an effective and supportive workforce environment in the following areas: governance; appointment, promotion and tenure; and the implementation of a more progressive workload policy that reflects the University’s recent classification as a Carnegie Doctoral Research Intensive Institution. Some faculty also clamor for the University to improve the integrity and reliability of the technological infrastructure as much of the university communication now transpires in cyberspace.

How do you recruit, hire, place, and retain new employees? How do you ensure that your workforce represents diverse ideas, cultures, and thinking of your hiring community? The University announces tenure-track position vacancies in national publications, conducts a new faculty orientation, and has implemented a mentoring program for new faculty.
Workforce Climate:  How do you ensure and improve workplace health, safety, and security? What are your PERFORMANCE MEASURES and improvement GOALS for each of these workforce factors? What are any significant difference in these factors and PERFORMANCE MEASURES or targets for different workplace environments? Since the last decennial evaluation in 1998 by MSCHE, the University has spent nearly $200 million dollars on construction projects as the state has made a concerted effort to address a legacy of “separate but equal” in higher education. New campus buildings include science complex, fine arts building, student center, communications building, and new library, slated to open in February 2008.

In questionnaires (Spring and Fall 2007), focus groups, and a Town Hall meeting, faculty noted the need for improvement in the following areas: health benefits for contractual employees, safety and parking on the campus and more office space.

How do you support your workforce via policies, services, and benefits? How are these tailored to the needs of a diverse WORKFORCE and different WORKFORCE groups and SEGMENTS? The University supports members of the faculty who are tenured or tenure-track with competitive salaries and benefits package, including merit pay, course reduction for research and/or curriculum development, and summer research and travel funds via a competitive process. In addition, during their first year, new assistant professors receive a one course reduction from the normal four-course per semester teaching load to assist them in acclimating to their new environment.

In questionnaires (Spring and Fall 2007), focus groups, and a Town Hall meeting, faculty noted the need for improvement in the following areas: convert more contractual employees to tenure-stream faculty, provide health benefits for contractual employees, adjust work load ratio, especially in those units that have doctoral programs, reduce class sizes, especially for the General Education courses, and address safety and parking on the campus.

Baldrige Category 5.3.b) Faculty and Staff Support and Satisfaction

University policy provides for faculty representation at the following levels: department; college/school; university-wide committees; the University Council, which includes representatives from each college/school/institute, as well as staff and students; and the Graduate Council which includes representatives from all units that have a graduate program. In questionnaires (Spring and Fall 2007), focus groups, and a Town Hall meeting, faculty noted the need for improvement in the following areas: greater faculty voice in governance; appointment, promotion, and tenure; and a more progressive workload policy, especially with the University’s recent classification as a Carnegie Doctoral Research Intensive Institution.

Strengths and Challenges

Strengths:

The faculty pointed to the following strengths at the University:

- In comparison to the University’s peer institutions, faculty salaries are commensurate with other institutions.

- The addition of graduate programs and the awarding of large number of doctoral degrees has resulted in the university’s qualifying for the Carnegie Doctoral/Research classification.

- The University has implemented new technologies to improve faculty productivity.
• The results of the Baldrige questionnaire were compared to the 2002 and 2003 Baldrige Board of Examiners results to assess the faculty and staffs perception of the University in the various Baldrige categories. The results indicate that, in general, Morgan had lower Strongly Agree and Agree, and higher Strongly Disagree and Disagree responses than the Baldrige results in most categories. The University's strengths were in Category 3: Customer Focus (as distinct from “customer satisfaction”) and Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management. The results in most cases met or exceeded the Baldrige standards.

Challenges:

The faculty also noted the following challenges faced by the University:

• extremely high student/faculty ratios in several programs,
• inadequate faculty and staff to meet program needs,
• limited resources for the workload of the university given our mission.

Recommendations

The faculty made the following constructive recommendations:

• The faculty role in governance should be reevaluated in light of the University’s new status as a doctoral research university. The University should consider implementing a differentiated faculty responsibilities model with regard to teaching and research.
• The University should undertake the development of new graduate and undergraduate programs when faculty and resources for existing programs have been fully funded and resources for proposed programs have been clearly identified.
• Incentives should be provided to faculty who are productive in seeking research funding.

Conclusions

The faculty offered the following conclusions:

• The university’s transition to a doctoral/research university presents a major challenge for the faculty, staff and the administration, in that Morgan and other state HBCUs have not yet achieved comparability to and competitiveness with the other State public institutions.
• The University’s current funding portfolio is primarily based on undergraduate funding. It provides little or no opportunity for new faculty to be hired with start up funds and other resources. In addition, existing and new faculty have limited opportunities for development of research capabilities.
• Additional faculty are needed to assist with the new mission as an emerging doctoral/research university.
MSCHE Standard 11

EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

The educational offerings of Morgan State University have increased and developed significantly since the last MSCHE decennial evaluation in 1998. The growth in the offerings is a reflection of Morgan’s determination to meet the goals and purposes established in its mission and its strategic plan. Among those major developments are:

New Degree Programs

In the last 10 years, Morgan State University has increased its degree program inventory significantly in an effort to fulfill its mission and the higher education needs of Maryland, especially in areas and at degree levels where African Americans and other minorities are underrepresented. Twenty-four new degree programs have been approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Nutritional Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>B.A., B.S.</td>
<td>Broadcast and Integrated Media Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>B.A., B.S.</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>B.A., B.F.A.</td>
<td>Media Writing and Animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>B.A., B.S.</td>
<td>Public Relations, Advertising, and Media Ratings and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Studies and Historical Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>M.PH.</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Telecommunications Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Bioinformatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>M.A., M.S.J.</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Dr.PH.</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Bioenvironmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These new degree programs, with those just approved in 2007 scheduled for implementation, incrementally, over the next three years, bring the degree program inventory at Morgan to 41 bachelor’s degrees, one post-baccalaureate degree certificate, 30 master’s degrees and 14 doctorates.

New Carnegie Classification

With the addition of new degree programs at the doctoral level, Morgan has increased significantly the number of doctorates that it awards, and since 2003 it has awarded 23 or more doctoral degrees annually. This productivity at the doctoral level earned, in 2006, re-classification by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from a Master’s Comprehensive I Institution to a Doctoral/Professional Institution.

New Academic Units

Since the 1998 MSCHE visit, Morgan has established three new academic units:

College of Arts and Sciences: In the fall of 1998, the College of Liberal Arts was divided into two separate units:


School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences: consisting of the departments of Biology, Chemistry Computer Science, Mathematics, Physics and Engineering Physics.

School of Community Health and Policy: In 2005, the University established the School of Public Health and Policy, later changing its name to Community Health and Policy. The School has four departments: Behavioral Health Science, Nutritional Science, Public Health Analysis and Health Policy Management.

Estuarine Research Center: In 2004, Morgan expanded its capabilities to teach and do research in Environmental Sciences by acquiring the Estuarine Research Center (ERC) from the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. ERC is located in St. Leonard, Maryland, on the banks of the Patuxent River, not far from the Chesapeake Bay, on the grounds of the Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum, home of the Maryland Archaeological Conservation Laboratory. ERC emphasizes marine, coastal ecosystems and bioenvironmental research with the goal of addressing the mounting environmental problems that threaten the health, safety and well-being of urban communities, the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

In addition, Morgan established two new academic support units to complement the instructional program:
University Retention Center: a central office, operating until recently under a Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) grant (retention funds are now part of the university budget), that coordinates retention efforts and units in each of the colleges, schools and institutes.

Transfer Center: a central office for evaluation of transfer credits and recruitment of transfer students

New Academic Facilities

Over the past ten years, Morgan’s enrollment has generally been on an upward swing. Therefore, in order to accommodate the increasing number of students and to provide state-of-the-art teaching facilities and modern learning environments for these students, since 1998, the University has constructed four new facilities and purchased two others to enhance the quality of teaching and research in existing programs and to accommodate the growth in program offerings. Those new facilities include:

Murphy Fine Arts Center: 2001, housing the Department of Fine Arts (art, music and theatre), the James E. Lewis Museum of Art, and a 2000+-seat concert hall;

Dixon Science Research Center: 2003, housing the Office of the Dean of the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences, research, seminar and administrative space in Physics, Chemistry, Biochemistry and Biology;

Estuarine Research Center: 2004, ERC, emphasizing marine, coastal ecosystem and bioenvironmental research with the goal of addressing the mounting environmental problems that threaten the health, safety and well-being of urban communities, the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries;

Communication Studies Center: 2006, housing the Department of Communication Studies, the Journalism and Film and Television Scriptwriting Programs in the Department of English and Language Arts, the Advanced Media Center, WEAA-FM Radio Station and student publications;

Portage Center: 2007, housing the School of Community Health and Policy, including the drug Abuse and Health Disparities Research Program; and

New Library and Information Technology Center: 2008, housing the holdings of Soper Library and exhibits, lounges, meeting rooms, classrooms, computer labs, data processing and storage. The facility will provide for up-to-date technology in an appropriate environment

Accreditation

Morgan State University has maintained its accreditation for all of the programs that were reported as accredited during the last MSCHE review. In addition, in 2004, the Public Health Program was accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health. That most recent accreditation brings to 19 the number of accreditation and certification agencies that have given a stamp of approval to Morgan’s educational programs. Morgan also continues to hold institutional membership in 11 associations, councils and boards.

General Education Program

A March 1999 report of Maryland’s Calvert Institute for Policy Research singled out Morgan State University’s General Education Program as the only institution in the state with a real liberal arts orientation based on the General Education Program which contains a strong general knowledge component that avoids the “cafeteria-style” approach to learning. Over the past ten years, Morgan has remained steadfast
in adhering to the high standards set by that program. It continues to require students to take courses in: (1) writing, (2) introduction to logic, (3) interdisciplinary humanities, (4) world or United States history, (5) health education, (6) the arts, (7) the social and behavioral sciences, (8) biology, (9) chemistry or physics, (10) mathematics (11) computer literacy, (12) research writing (information literacy) and (13) Africana Studies.

Recently, as a consequence of the implementation of the Comprehensive Assessment Program (CAP) at Morgan, the University has shifted its efforts toward improving and refining the General Education Program to focus on assessment of student learning. For the past year or so, the faculty has been working on developing and sharpening program, course goals and measurable objectives, clearly delineating student learning expectations and developing assessment tools (both in-house and national) to assess student learning accurately. Though still a work-in-progress, advancements are being made toward developing a complete assessment package for the General Education Program. Last year, the Coordinator for the General Education Program issued a report examining the grades earned by students in the Program, and the Assessment Coordinator for the College of Liberal Arts issued a report on the grades that students earn in those courses according to the employment status of the instructor (full- or part-time, permanent or temporary). Assessment of outcomes in the General Education Program is discussed later under Standard 14.

Degree Program Offerings

As indicated clearly by the record of accreditation and re-accreditation of the eligible educational programs at Morgan, the institution has high-quality undergraduate and graduate academic programs that are carefully designed and well-delivered, and they have produced laudatory results. As a consequence of the excellence of its educational offerings, Morgan maintains its distinction as one of the nation’s premier historically black institutions of higher education and one of the few HBIs offering a comprehensive range of programs, awarding degrees through the doctorate and having significant programs of research and public service.

All academic programs at Morgan are required to have clear goals, objectives and learning expectations that are consistent with the mission of the University, the college/school/institute and department. In like manner, all courses must have published goals, objectives and learning expectations that appear in courses syllabi distributed to students at the beginning of the semester. Those syllabi adhere to minimum standards set by the University. These consistencies at all levels provide the synergy that is the driving force of the educational offerings in the majors (as well as in General Education) of the institution.

There were many developments and evidences of growth in the educational offerings in the various academic and academic support units during the past decade:

The College of Liberal Arts

The College of Liberal Arts was established in 1998, when the College of Arts and Sciences was divided into two new schools, the other new school being the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences. The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) includes the departments of: Communication Studies, Economics, English and Language Arts, Fine Arts, Foreign Languages, History and Geography, Military Science, Philosophy and Religious Studies, Political Science and International Studies, Psychology, and Sociology and Anthropology. The College has spent the last ten years strengthening the existing programs and developing new programs that assist the University in fulfilling its mission.

It offers baccalaureate degrees in economics, English, Fine Art, History, Music, Philosophy, Po-

As one means of strengthening existing programs, it has focused on developing and implementing a uniform assessment program in all of its educational offerings. Its program calls for the review and refinement of program missions, goals and measurable objectives and the publication of clear learning expectations for its students. While developing those components of an assessment program, it has moved forward with a number of studies of learning outcomes in the General Education Program, including a study of grades earned by students, the relationship between grades awarded and the status of the instructors for the courses (part-time/full-time, permanent/temporary).

As part of its review of its educational programs and its development of a strategic plan to move the University forward in achieving its mission, it proposed and had approved seven new degree programs:

(1) four bachelor’s degree programs:

Broadcast and Integrated Media Studies: a program that provides academic and professional training in Radio Production, Television Production, and Integrated Media Technologies through a combination of both practical and theoretical courses, as well as hands-on experiences, and prepares students for careers in integrated media technologies and more

Journalism: a program that offers academic and professional training in journalism through a strong combination of theory- and practice-based classes and direct hands-on experiences.

Public Relations, Advertising and Media Ratings and Sales: providing rigorous academic and professional training that will lead students to jobs in a highly competitive, rapidly changing and increasingly complex professional careers in media sales and ratings, advertising and public relations.

Media Writing and Animation: a program providing a strong combination of theory- and practice-based classes and direct hands-on experiences that will provide academic and professional training in Media Writing and Animation.

(2) three master’s degree programs:

Museum Studies and Historical Preservation: a program designed to meet the informational and training needs of museum professionals and other qualified individuals for advanced museology and/or historical preservation training by providing training and credentials to pursue careers in history museums, historic preservation, cultural resource management, management of historic sites, specialized design practice, and other areas of related work.

Psychometrics: a program that provides training for individuals within the educational,
psychological, and mathematics communities (e.g. teachers, administrators, staff members, and policy makers) to assist them in effectively addressing issues related to the implementation of testing, assessment, and evaluations.

**Telecommunications Management:** an advanced program of study designed for Telecommunications professionals, individuals with an interest in media management, and others whose interests or talents bring them into direct contact with the corporate and professional world of Telecommunications.

(3) **two doctoral programs:**

**English:** a program to prepare graduates for careers in teaching, research, and professional writing, with concentrations in British and American literature and literary theory, multicultural and gender studies, and language and professional writing.

**Psychometrics:** a program to develop scholars who possess sophisticated statistical and analytical capabilities and acquire the quantitative and methodological skills (e.g., measurement theory, statistical analysis, research design, evaluation, and qualitative tools) needed to construct valid measurements and assessments of what and how individuals learn; and to develop a new cadre of researchers and practitioners who have the analytical skills and cultural competence to effectively yield innovative interventions that address issues within the field (discipline) itself, as well as inform policies that influence minority or special populations (e.g., African Americans) and those within urban environments, how people learn, teach, and differ from one another. This program was initiated in the fall of 2007.

The four bachelor’s degree programs—which resulted from reconfiguring the major in Telecommunications and the concentrations in journalism and Film and Television Writing—will be implemented in the fall of 2008.

CLA also established a number of academic support programs to buttress the instructional program: (1) the Center for Museum Studies and Historical Preservation is a cultural arms of the graduate program bearing that name; (2) the African Studies Program, which offers a variety of cultural, research and educational services, and (3) the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program, which is an instrument for promoting global studies and the fostering an Africana Studies focus; (4) Honors Program at the college and departmental levels, designed to promote active and extensive engagement among honor students; and (5) the Student Enrichment Program, which monitors closely and addresses the challenges and needs of at-risk students.

The College also re-located the master’s degree program in International Studies from the Department of Political Science to the Department of Foreign Languages, renamed the Department of World Languages and International Studies, and it placed all international and global studies activities under this enhanced unit.

The undergraduate and graduate programs in Music, the only CLA programs that have sought accreditation, were also reaccredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).
The Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management

The Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management (EGGSBM) offers Bachelor of Science degrees in Accounting, Finance, Business Administration, Marketing, Management, Hospitality Management and Information Science and Systems; a Master’s of Business Administration; and a Ph.D. with concentrations in Accounting, Information Systems, and Management.

During the last ten years, EGGSBM has had the following major successes in its educational offerings: (1) reaccreditation by AACSB International of its Accounting Program (2000), (2) maintenance of accreditation of its business and accounting programs by AACSB International (2005), (3) establishment of a student chapter of Beta Alpha Psi, an honorary society for Accounting, Finance and Information Science and Systems students, (4) establishment of a Ph.D. program in Business Administration (2001), (5) the first two graduates of the Ph.D. program (2006), (6) retention program for undergraduate students, (7) Assurance of Learning Program, and (8) creation of an Honors Program.

In 2003, the EGGSBM created its Honor Program. The program is the school-level component of the Morgan State University Honors Program. The program provides a well-integrated, rigorous course of study, with both academic and experimental components, that prepares students to reach their potential as leaders in outstanding organizations.

The Ph.D. degree program is the only new academic program offered by the EGGSBM for the period of review. The Ph.D. program prepares graduates for careers in teaching, research and consulting in various functional areas of business. The Ph.D. curriculum is designed to provide graduates with in-depth exposure to a specific business content area, sophisticated analytical methods, and adult educational techniques. This last feature is unique to the program and is structured around a three-course sequence covering different aspects of university-level teaching.

In the EGGSBM, learning assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. Learning goals have been developed for each degree program. The learning goals in the EGGSBM have been developed following a structured process. This developmental process occurred in the context of the overall mission and goals of the school, as well as its distinctive competencies and shared values.

The School of Community Health and Policy

The master’s degree and doctoral programs in Public Health were approved in 1998 by the Maryland Higher Education Commission. Enrollment in those programs grew rapidly, and, in 2005, Morgan created the School of Public Health and Policy (SPHP), with three academic departments: Behavioral Health Sciences, Public Health Analysis and Health Policy and Management and assumed responsibility for the undergraduate program in Nutrition Science (transferred from the School of Education and Urban Studies. In 2007, the name of the school was changed to Community Health and Policy (SCHP). During the 2007-2008 academic year, it also absorbed the new degree programs in Nursing. The School of Community Health and Policy also contains two research centers: the Center for Urban Health Assessment, Evaluation and Policy and the Center for HIV Prevention, Evaluation, Policy and Research.

To date the Public Health Program has awarded 41 master’s degrees and 23 doctorates.
The School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences

The School of Computer Mathematical and Natural Sciences (SCMNS) was restructured from the College of Arts and Sciences in 1998. The SCMNS consist of the following departments: Biology and Medical Technology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics and Physics. The School is housed in the Science Complex and the Richard N. Dixon Science Research Center (RDSRC). The RDSRC includes a conference room with distance teleconferencing capabilities; twenty-four specialty research laboratories for Biology, Biochemistry, Organic Chemistry and Physics; a greenhouse; and faculty and administrative offices. The University also maintains an animal facility (4000 sq. ft.) located within the Biology Department (Spencer Hall basement) that is shared with the faculty in the Departments of Chemistry, Psychology and the School of Community Health and Policy. This facility houses research animals and includes a surgical suite, behavioral monitoring lab, cage-washing and sterilization station, and storage rooms. The MSU Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) has oversight responsibilities for this facility. It is staffed by one full-time and two part-time animal technicians, a faculty member from the Institute of Human Virology is the veterinary consultant for this facility and a member of the IACUC Committee.

The growth in science majors is reflected in the number of degrees awarded, which has more than doubled in the last five years in the departments. In 2005, approximately 25% of all baccalaureates awarded to African Americans were in the majors in Science, Engineering and Mathematics (SEM) fields. The University has also graduated approximately 10% of the African American undergraduates in physics nationally over the last ten years, as well as far more African American chemistry undergraduates than other institutions in the State.

The Biology Department, the largest department within the School, had two new degree programs approved since the last MSCHE review: (1) a master’s degree program in Bioinformatics in 2002 and (2) a Ph.D. program in Bioenvironmental Sciences in 2000. This Ph.D. degree program in Bioenvironmental Science is an integrated interdisciplinary program designed to offer flexibility in areas of specialization and training to meet the changing bioenvironmental needs of the nation and global community in the 21st century. It offers research opportunities and instruction in five general areas of concentration: Environmental Toxicology, Environmental Science, Environmental Chemistry, Environmental Health Sciences, and Environmental Biotechnology. In 2007, the program awarded its first doctorate.

The Medical Technology Program in the Department of Biology was granted a full seven-year accreditation, following its 2007 self-study and review. It also enjoys a 100% success rate in the placement of its students post-graduation. During the past ten years, the SCMNS increased external funding to approximately $50M. A disproportionate amount of these funds was from the National Institute of Health (NIH), followed by National Science Foundation (NSF), Department of Energy (DOE), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA), Department of the Army (DOA) and National Security Administration (NSA).

The School of Education and Urban Studies

The School of Education and Urban Studies (SEUS) added two critical doctoral programs to Morgan’s academic program inventory: the Ph.D. in Higher Education and Ph.D. in Social
Work, bringing to six the number of doctoral programs offered in the School. At the master’s degree level, it established partnerships with state and local agencies that provide students with hands-on experiences and internships that enhance their learning.

SEUS also inaugurated a Retention Success Program for first-year and upper-level students to build the skills that they need for academic success. The Program launched initiatives in block programming, special registration, counseling and peer support for at-risk students.

The Department of Social Work, with degrees now at all three levels, established the National Center for Health Behavioral Change, which develops behavioral change curriculum materials, including advanced learning modules, monographs, and occasional papers for use by schools of public health, psychiatry, psychology and related disciplines.

SEUS also developed an exchange-partnership with London South Bank University in Great Britain, in which educators from South Bank visited Morgan to study the infrastructure of the Teacher Education and Professional Development program and explored implementing collaborative research programs on educational policy and practice.

The School of Engineering

The mission of the Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr. School of Engineering is to offer degree programs which ensure that students acquire the ability to master fundamental principles of engineering which may be applied effectively to benefit society. To fulfill the mission faculty and staff work in concert toward the goals of: (1) establishing, maintaining, and sustaining an engineering school of the first rank; (2) instilling in its students the confidence and competence required to meet the challenges associated with successful careers in engineering; (3) graduating competitive engineers who have negotiated a well-balanced curriculum based on regional and national guidelines; and (4) exhibiting educational leadership in accomplishing the task of diversifying the ranks of engineering by increasing the representation of those who are traditionally underrepresented among professionals in the U.S. engineering workforce. Programs offered span the three undergraduate disciplines of civil, electrical, and industrial engineering, and graduate degree programs at both the master’s and doctoral levels. The undergraduate programs are fully accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), Inc.

As evidence that the school is on a path of continuing quality improvement, we have enjoyed a number of notable achievements over the past ten years. Among the highlights of note are: the six year re-accreditation of undergraduate programs in 2001; leading the nation in the production of African-American electrical and civil engineering graduates, at the baccalaureate degree level, for five of the six years in the 2002 and 2007 period; initiating the doctorate of engineering program in 1998; awarding the first engineering doctorate in 2002; leading the nation in graduating the largest percentage of women engineering students in 2004 at 42%; occupied a second (new constructed) engineering building in 1998; the six (6) engineering doctorates awarded to African-American recipients in 2006 represented 60% of all such degrees awarded in the State of Maryland for that year; a 1998 graduate receiving the “Most Promising Engineer Award” at the National Black Engineer Award Competition for 2008; having one of its alumni elected as Vice Chairman of the Prince George’s County School Board, Maryland’s second largest school district; and during the past ten years increasing its annual external funding by approximately four-fold to $10M.

During the 2006-2007 Academic Year, the Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr. School of Engineering ranked 4th in the nation in the production of African American engineers at the undergraduate
level. In Maryland, moreover, during the same time frame, Morgan awarded 53% of the baccalaureate, 18% of the master, and 50% of the doctoral degrees earned by African-Americans in the state.

The School of Graduate Studies

Since 2001, Morgan State University School of Graduate Studies has been guided by the goals and objectives outlined in two strategic plans. The School of Graduate Studies 2001–2006 Strategic Plan identifies three goals focusing on academic programs among its four broad goals: (1) increasing the enrollment of graduate students from 584 in 2001 to 784 in 2006; (2) enforcing standards for good academic standing by supporting the highest expectations for scholarship among graduate students; and (3) developing criteria for faculty who are qualified to teach graduate students and who are qualified to chair and/or serve on theses and dissertation committees. The 2007-2011 Strategic Plan identifies three educational programs objectives among its five broad objectives: (1) increasing enrollment and graduation of graduate students, in particular doctoral students, and maintaining data on their academic progress, including retention, time to degree, and exit status; (2) strengthening the teaching and learning environment for graduate education by working with the Graduate Council to develop policies that support graduate faculty development and innovative graduate curricula; (3) enhancing opportunities for scholarship, community, and social activity among graduate students.

Consistent with six of the nine broad strategic objectives identified in its two strategic plans, the School of Graduate Studies has accomplished the following over the last ten years: (1) increased enrollment by 73% from 524 in the fall of 2001 to 907 in the fall of 2007; (2) increased the number of doctorates awarded to more than 35 each year; (3) achieved reclassification by the Carnegie Foundation from Master’s Comprehensive I to a Doctoral/Professional Dominant institution in 2005; (4) added 8 new doctoral programs and 10 new masters programs since 1998; (5) implemented an annual new graduate student orientation program – seven orientation programs have been conducted to date; (6) created an electronic exit survey for graduate students beginning with the May 2006 commencement in collaboration with the Student Affairs Committee of the Graduate Council; (7) created a graduate school web site, www.morgan.edu/academics/Grad-Studies/ with information organized according to: Prospective Students, Current Students, and the Graduate Council. The web site includes all forms needed to make application to the School of Graduate Studies; (8) published and subsequently edited a Handbook for Dissertation and Theses; (9) developed policies and procedures for the 5-year periodic review of all graduate programs; (10) implemented a Graduate Student Advisory Committee to facilitate the dissemination of information and to enhance communication between the School of Graduate Studies and graduate students; (11) developed and received Board of Regents approval to award an accelerated 5-year bachelor’s to master’s degree(s) in Architecture; and, (12) established the Morgan State Graduate Students Association (MSGSA) in order to facilitate the implementation of graduate student government association and increase participation by graduate students at Morgan in national organizations such as the National Black Graduate Students Association; Graduate Student Advisory Committee is to facilitate the dissemination of information and to enhance communication between the School of Graduate Studies and graduate students.

The Institute of Architecture and Planning

The mission of the Institute of Architecture and Planning, which will transition to the School of Architecture and Planning in August 2008, is to address the physical, environmental, social, cul-
tural, economic and political issues that shape and revitalize urban communities from an interdisciplinary perspective. Both undergraduate and graduate students are prepared to analyze issues related to the built and natural environments and trained to creatively envision quality urban places.

The Bachelor of Science in Architecture and Environmental Design (BSAED) is a four-year pre-professional degree program consisting of two years of knowledge attainment and skills building in environmental history, visual graphics, design and planning theory, research and problem solving, report writing, and public presentation techniques and general education studies. The last semesters involve the advanced exploration of design and planning of practical field projects. This program, which started in 2001, grew from 10 students to the current number of 159 predominantly African American students.

The Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) is an accredited program geared towards the dual objectives of preparing students both for employability in quality design professional offices and leadership roles as licensed public and private sector architects. The curriculum is structured to address issues such as master planning, historic considerations, urban design, economics, construction technologies, security, maintenance, and design standards. Of special concern at Morgan State University are the issues of the African-American evolving influences in the design profession. In 2007, there were 44 graduate students, who were mostly working to fund their education. A new accelerated program, referred to as the 2+3 program, incorporates undergraduate courses and graduate design studios in its curriculum to enable undergraduate students to obtain their MArch degrees in 5 years. The purpose for the program is to graduate students with high levels of design ability, critical thinking, communication skills, and technical knowledge to gain productive employment, pass the licensure exams, and most importantly, to make a significant impact on urban society. This program is scheduled to commence in Fall 2008.

The Master of Landscape Architecture Program, the only accredited graduate Landscape Architecture Program (MLA) in Maryland, offers the pursuit of an urban-based education which involves the design, planning and management of the land. Students with landscape architecture degrees enhance the quality of life for urban residents by designing urban plazas and parks, housing projects and office parks, or developing land use policy for a whole region.

The accredited graduate program in City and Regional Planning supports Morgan's urban mission by addressing the specific social, political and economic concerns of urban areas, utilizing Baltimore as a proximate lab setting. This allows for the development of student projects that address the specific needs and meet the requests of the local citizens. Graduates of this program are prepared to assume professional positions in urban areas with specific expertise in urban design or transportation planning. Frequent use of student internships allows for the interaction of education and application. The program has 46 students, 25 full-time and 21 part-time with 25 males and 21 females, the majority African American. From 2001 to 2006, the range of graduates has been from 11 students to 31 students.

**Academic Support Programs**

In the last ten years, Morgan has expanded its corps of academic support programs designed to address the many needs of the variety of students enrolled at the University by adding a Student Retention Program: In 2003, Morgan established the Office of Student Retention to work in collaboration with the six colleges and schools of the university, the Institute of Architecture, and the various academic support programs of the university to provide continuous support for students from matriculation to graduation and to provide a structure and forum for the ongoing review and evaluation of all programs, services, policies, procedures, and behaviors that affect the quality of student life and learning at Morgan State University. All of the support programs work in concert with the degree programs to make the Morgan educational experience as fulfilling as possible for its students. One of the most significant changes is:
Student Retention Program: Restructuring under a new Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs all of the academic support program to facilitate the delivery of services to students in a more coordinated and efficient manner.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 4: (Measurement, Analysis) and Knowledge Management

MSCHE Standard 11 requires promotion of educational programs, undergraduate and graduate, that are not only current and coherent with respect to each discipline, but also reflect the most recent mission statement of the University. After completing these programs, students must evidence mastery of the learning expectations, and the programs must demonstrate that they have met their goals and objectives. Baldrige process analysis requires the identification, measurement and analysis of outcomes that provide information to individual instructors as well as administrative leaders that ensures continued accomplishment of objectives and improvement. The analysis is an essential tool not only for planning new approaches, but also for prioritizing changes to maximize university resources. Using the mission statement from the Morgan State University Strategic Plan, 2007-2011 (Draft, March 25, 2007), Task Force 4 members followed the directions stated in the Middle States Self-Study Design For Morgan State University, September 2006-2008. It generated research questions that focused on several issues. (See, Appendix A for specific questions.)

Analysis

Morgan’s mission and its educational offerings and programs are evaluated on the basis of their goals and objectives and the extent to which they achieve them. The undergraduate programs serve the University’s commitment to offer education in a diverse number of disciplines from the traditional liberal arts to business, engineering, teaching, social work, medical technology and architecture. These programs provide undergraduates access to professions which often have limited minority representation. At the graduate level, programs are equally diverse and focus on professions that serve the needs of the urban community, local, national and international. The unique orientations of the programs, as well as the ethnic/racial backgrounds of the students, offer the opportunity to make critical contributions to enriching the educational, social, psychological and physical environment of the urban community. At the master’s level, students in 30 programs not only attend traditional lecture-discussion-seminar courses in which they learn the content and skills of their profession, but also develop projects—whether in landscape architecture or social work—to address issues and problems of the urban population. This unique approach allows students to serve and experience the immediate application of their education. In the 13 doctoral programs, the majority of which are in the School of Education and Urban Studies, research assumes a prominent role in the educational process, with dissertations based on the quantitative analysis of original or secondary data or the qualitative analysis of programs or processes. The application of research findings does more than just earn the student an advanced degree or provide data to support the funding of a faculty member’s next grant proposal. It brings to the community potential solutions to improve the quality of life whether in the design of a new community center or the introduction of interventions to stem the rise of HIV positive cases in the most vulnerable neighborhoods. Faculty teaching in the graduate school are engaged in research with their students, not protected from teaching responsibilities as in many research-intensive universities. These programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels reflect Morgan State University’s unique mission.

The educational programs at Morgan State University follow closely the Middle States model, where goals, objectives and learning expectations are clearly delineated; where there are a variety of teaching
and learning modes used in the classrooms and the laboratories; where student achievement is carefully measured; and were the results of assessment are used for improving teaching, learning and program and curriculum development. Especially in programs that have sought and achieved accreditation, the educational offerings have been tested against the highest standards and their accreditations and re-accreditations have come after close scrutiny. In programs which have not sought accreditation there is a growing culture of assessment. Currently, those programs, which are concentrated in the Liberal Arts, are in the process of redefining their goals, objectives and learning expectations to meet Morgan’s new standard. After they have done so, they will development a broad variety of in-house and standardized instruments for measuring student learning and program effectiveness.

As many of the educational programs at the University reconsider their goals, objectives and learning expectations, they are guided not only by the mission of the University and the constituencies that it serves, but also by high academic standards and a strong sense of the long-standing liberal arts tradition at Morgan that has won it praise over the years. In addition, the university is on the verge of approving a policy that calls for the periodic review of all graduate and undergraduate programs, above and beyond accreditation and re-accreditation reviews. That periodic review, along with the Comprehensive Assessment Program, approved in 2005, will lead not only to better understanding and appreciation of the academic programs, but also better planning for the use of resources to promote overall institutional effectiveness.

School of Education and Urban Studies Programs
In the School of Education and Urban Studies (SEUS) the goals of each program are stated with associated measurable objectives. In the Social Work program, undergraduate students are evaluated in their field placements in their senior year and masters students in the Foundation Practicum and Advanced Practicum to determine proficiency in demonstrating knowledge, values and skills required for the generalist social work practice with urban populations as well as a commitment to the basic values and ethics that guide social work practice including an ability to resolve ethical dilemmas and engage in ethical decision making. Most of the students are African American, mature adults who are already working in the human services profession. Almost 25% are male. Many of the non-traditional students are first generation college students.

The Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance Department offers undergraduate degrees in Health Education and Physical Education, emphasizing preparation for careers in health education, administration and environmental health in the public and private sector as well as in teaching physical education and in sports management. With 200 students, success is evaluated by passing a senior comprehensive exam.

The Department of Advanced Studies, Leadership and Policy houses a number of graduate programs. The Community College Leadership Doctoral Program provides the knowledge, concepts and training to develop leadership competencies necessary for administrative positions in community college systems, both in Maryland and around the nation. Successful completion of course work, internship and research enables program participants to identify potential solutions to problems related to community college leadership. This innovative 3-year program with courses offered year-round on Friday evenings and all day Saturday attracted 50 candidates from 2002 to 2007. Of these students 42% are male, 58% are female and 86% are African American. Though this program, as well as the four other doctoral programs, has been successful in retaining and graduating students, the lack of sufficient full-time faculty continues to be a major problem in terms of providing instruction and advisement, as well as in increasing overall enrollments. Specifically, as noted in the report of Task Force 5, the graduate faculty to student ratio is much too high. This situation requires the attention of the University as soon as resources become available in order to preserve quality.

College of Liberal Arts Programs
In the History and Geography program, students at the undergraduate level are evaluated by passing History 299 and the History Senior Comprehensive Exam in which they write an expository synthetic essay on broad questions from American History, World History and the Diaspora. The students are African American, the majority women, aged 18 to 25. The master’s and doctoral degrees in History and African American Studies were developed to train teachers for the Baltimore and Maryland public school systems, as well as community college and university teachers and public historians for archival and museum systems.

In Psychology, at the undergraduate level, students are expected to gain an understanding of the field of psychology through research and internship experiences, including service in the community to apply theory to practical situations. Students have the opportunity to continue graduate studies or accept employment in the workforce. The program includes a service course as part of the liberal arts core program fulfilling the University's service mission. Successful accomplishment is measured via completion of the Junior/Senior Seminar, original research required of every graduating senior (not just those qualifying for honors) and projects presented at undergraduate research conferences, as well as submitted in thesis format. Passing the Psychology Comprehensive Exam covering core information is also evidence of success in the program. The 360 undergraduate students represent primarily African-American women. The introduction of the Psychometrics graduate program in September of 2007 offers the department the opportunity to impact the expanding testing scene by providing expertise to educational systems throughout the nation with skills in developing, assessing, and evaluating educational, psychological and other forms of tests and measurements. Their graduates will be culturally competent to attend to the needs of the urban community, to conduct research and practice, to develop innovative interventions that address the issues within the discipline and to inform policies that affect minority or special populations and those within the urban environment. Additional tenure-track faculty is a priority listed for the program.

The undergraduate program in the Department of English prepares students to use linguistic, creative and critical thinking skills in pursuit of careers in literature and language, creative writing, journalism, scriptwriting, or teaching language arts. Success is measured by passing the senior comprehensive exam. Graduates are primarily African American women, 16 to 20 each year.

The graduate program in English is the only doctoral program in the Baltimore region at a public institution and, thus, is financially accessible to teachers and others from the urban and surrounding areas, enhancing careers in teaching, research and professional writing. August, 2004 marked the first cohort of 8 students.

School of Business and Management Programs

The undergraduate program in accounting is dedicated to serving the underserved population of Baltimore and the surrounding metropolitan area. Program objectives include providing accounting students with a high quality education to enter the profession in public accounting, corporate accounting, or accounting in governmental agencies or non-profit organizations. Success is evaluated by measuring acquisition of generally-accepted accounting principles as well as written and oral communication skills, interpersonal skills and technological skills. As an indication of the success of the program, 50% of graduating seniors are placed in accounting positions by the time of graduation or within three months after graduation. The students are predominantly African American, with 32% transfer students and 86% from Maryland.

In the Department of Business Administration and Management, four undergraduate programs (Business Administration, Human Resource Management, Marketing and Hospitality Management) provide a culturally diverse student body with the skills and information to become leaders in business and industry, government and non-profit organizations and entrepreneurial ventures with an appreciation of the business world from a global perspective. Success is evaluated via a senior comprehensive exam, placement and performance in internships and field experience programs, performance on the major field exam of
the Educational Testing Service at the 60th national percentile, placement of students in graduate programs and in employment positions and entrepreneurial ventures. The more than 900 undergraduates are primarily African American with slightly more women than men, the greatest number in Business Administration. The MBA in Business Administration focuses on providing a quality education that produces effective management trainees skilled in leadership, for the business community. On average, 50 students are enrolled each semester. The majority are African American with a large proportion of foreign students from Africa and the Caribbean. Most participate in internship experiences. The number of graduates varies from 20 to 50 annually, the most recent data showing 50% placed upon graduation. The doctorate in Business Administration is focused on providing qualified students, especially minorities, interested in researching issues of importance to business and the African-American community, training for careers as business school faculty. The program's unique orientation is on promoting expertise in teaching, a major component of most HBCUs, combined with research skill development, and on ensuring the development of future business school faculty with a substantial minority presence. Currently, the program has 10 females and 13 males, 74% African American, 9% Asian and 17% Caucasian.

The undergraduate program in Information Science and Systems promotes high-quality teaching and research in partnership with the business sector to recruit, retain and graduate students who enter the market with certification (Microsoft, Oracle, CISCO) prepared to successfully compete for jobs as well as progress through the hierarchy to leadership positions. Success in the program is evaluated by performance on a comprehensive exam as well as on the major field exam for comparison with other schools, Assurance of Learning Course Reports at the end of each semester for each course, student interviews and employer feedback. Currently more than 100 undergraduates, predominantly African American with a 6:5 male to female ratio, are enrolled.

School of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Science Programs
The Medical Technology/Clinical Laboratory Sciences program offers students the opportunity to gain entry-level positions as clinical laboratory scientists in a field that has an 11% vacancy rate. Four to six graduates enter the profession each year, accepting positions in diverse clinical laboratory settings. Scores on the American Society of Clinical Pathology Board of Registry Exam, as well as an evaluation by graduating seniors and student evaluations in all classes, indicate the success of the program. Sixty-percent of the program participants are female, 60% are age 20 or younger and 70% are African American.

The Chemistry department offers two programs at the undergraduate level, with a B.S. in Professional Chemistry or a B.S. in Pre-Professional Chemistry and an M.S at the graduate level. The programs offer the opportunity to pursue careers and graduate studies in chemistry. Annually on average, 14 students have successfully completed the undergraduate programs with 3 to 4 students completing the masters program in Chemistry.

The undergraduate program in mathematics supports the University's mission of educating mathematicians for careers in industry, government and future graduate studies. Successful completion of the program is determined by completion of a senior comprehensive exam. Math majors number about 50 with slightly more males than females, 2 to 7 graduating each year. As a priority, the department plans to focus on communication using the LATEX software system, requiring graduating seniors to use this technology to write the results of their investigation of a selected topic. Introducing the system campus-wide is another priority. The graduate program focuses on training mathematicians at the master’s level with emphasis on statistics, mathematical modeling, computational science, or pure mathematics. When appropriate, state certification allows graduates of this program to assume employment in the teaching profession. Currently there are 10 – 11 graduate students, more females than males, with 1 to 2 graduates each year.
Institute of Architecture and Planning Programs
The graduate program in City and Regional Planning in the Institute of Architecture and Planning allows for the development of student projects that address the specific needs and meet the requests of the local citizens. Graduates of this program are prepared to assume professional positions in urban areas with specific expertise in urban design or transportation planning. Frequent use of student internships allows for the interaction of theory and application. The program has 46 students, 25 full-time and 21 part-time with 25 males and 21 females, the majority African American. From 2001 to 2006, the range of graduates has been from 11 students to 31 students.

Estuarine Research Program
The Estuarine Research Center offers programs to provide graduate as well as undergraduate students with the opportunity to address the environmental challenges of the region. Unique interdisciplinary research programs in collaboration with the Schools of Business and Management and Engineering explores environmental entrepreneurship. Collaboration with the Department of Mathematics develops modeling and quantitative analysis. Internships for underclassman attract diverse majors to the opportunities available in this field.

Strengths
The review of Morgan’s academic programs, using the MSCHE standards and the Baldrige principles pointed to a number of strengths in those programs:

- The Calvert Institute for Policy Research recognized the General Education Program at Morgan as a coherent and challenging experience and found that it is the only such program in Maryland higher education that avoids the “cafeteria approach” to the knowledge and skills required of its students
- Recent results of the CLA examination performance indicate that the General Education Program adds considerable value to Morgan students’ knowledge and skills
- The programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels provide a wide choice of courses that enable students to pursue career paths in diverse areas, many previously notable for the underrepresentation of African Americans and other minorities. This is particularly notable in the numerous SEM careers, psychometrics and community college leadership. At Morgan some graduation rates verify the successful outcomes.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)
The educational programs at Morgan can be improved considerably with:

- additional tenure-track faculty to reduce the size of classes in the General Education Program and faculty with the tools and professional development to promote high student achievement
- Additional tenure-track faculty for the graduate programs, particularly those with high enrollment, not only to ensure a model 3:3 course load and to reduce the need for adjunct faculty, but also to provide adequate faculty for advisement and for master’s and doctoral committees.

Recommendation
The Task Force recommends that the University:
• provide professional training opportunities for faculty to develop and implement courses that emphasize the goals of a liberal education, including enhanced writing, critical and analytical thinking and information literacy;

• review goals and objectives of General Education and determine other courses that would serve to support the achievement of them;

• conduct best practices forums with faculty and support staff to develop, implement and evaluate model programs, publish the successful results and seek external funding to support wider implementation;

• reduce faculty teaching loads; and

• provide professional training opportunities for faculty.

Programmatic Priorities

Based on the program reports, it is evident that most academic programs would benefit from additional resources to better achieve their objectives. A review of the focus group data and program evaluations indicates that additional faculty are needed to ensure mission accomplishment.

The growth in graduate programs at the master’s degree and doctoral levels has not been matched by an increase in resources from the state, and additional faculty to staff the programs are among the most urgent needs. For example, the large number of students in all of the fairly new master’s and doctoral programs in require more faculty if the goal of fully developing these programs is to be achieved.

Currently, faculty teaching graduate courses and supervising/serving on thesis and dissertation committees carry a teaching load of nine credits or three courses per semester. The teaching load should be reduced to equivalent loads based on thesis and dissertation guidance.

Recommendations

The self-study makes the following recommendations for improved performance by the University:

• Secure, through the State budget appropriations process funding for full-time faculty and staff positions.

• Development of new graduate and undergraduate programs should be undertaken when faculty and resources for existing programs have been fully funded by the State and resources for proposed programs have been clearly identified.

• Technology for academic and student services staff (e.g., voice mail and email) must be consistently available;
MSCHE Standard 12

GENERAL EDUCATION

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

For many years, the General Education Program at Morgan State University has been recognized as exemplary. As early as 1969, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools identified the Morgan General Education Program as a national model. More recently, in its 1998 periodic accreditation review of the University, it, once again, praised Morgan for the strength of that program. In addition, a March 1999 report of Maryland’s Calvert Institute for Policy Research singled out Morgan as the only institution in the state with a real liberal arts orientation based on its General Education Program which contains a strong general knowledge component that avoids the “cafeteria-style” approach to learning.

Over the years Morgan’s General Education Program has met and exceeded national standards and the requirements of accrediting agencies. In fact, the University has continued periodically to review and revise the program to ensure its currency with those external standards, as well as the needs of its student body. Its 1989 review of the program resulted not only in a number of changes in content, but also the mandate for a stronger monitoring program for student learning and the implementation of a standard institutionally-designed exit examination in each required general education course to ensure those outcomes. Between 1989 and 2002, the departments offering required general education courses incrementally implemented those exit examinations, changing and refining them as they monitored and examined student performance. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the University once again reviewed the General Education Program. This periodic review resulted in the creation of an Office of General Education to coordinate and monitor the program more comprehensively and, among other changes, it called for the expansion and improvement in student learning outcomes assessment, including closer ties to nationally-normed assessment instruments.

The Morgan’s General Education Program embraces and emphasizes, among other things, the five areas of competency specified in the Middle States Association’s Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, and it incorporates its emphasis on assessing student learning and institutional effectiveness. The General Education Program’s consonance with these standards is reflected in six of its program objectives, which are to provide:

(1) “required courses in language arts skills, critical thinking skills, mathematics and computational skills and computerization, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, biological and physical sciences, the African and African-American heritage, and health education”;
(2) “a network of placement, diagnostic, exit and proficiency testing to ensure student persistence and competency in and transit through the General Education Program”;
(3) “a focus on the freshman and sophomore years and establishment of threshold knowledge and skills as prerequisites for advancement to junior- and senior-level work”;
(4) “reinforcement of general education knowledge and skills in junior- and senior-level studies, including a writing-reading-speaking-critical-thinking-across-the-curriculum program”;
(5) “a system of monitoring and measurement to ensure that objectives and expectations are being met”; and
(6) “periodic assessment of the General Education Program to ensure its consistency with the needs of the university and the larger community” (Morgan State University Catalog, 2003-2006)
The program also sets a number of clearly defined learning goals for students that reflect those five competencies in Standard 12 of the Middle States Association accreditation criteria. According to six of the 13 “Goals for Morgan Students” outlined in the University catalog, students are expected:

1. “to read and listen with understanding and express themselves effectively in written and spoken standard English”;
2. “to think critically and analytically”; (3) “to gather information through research and use of the library and report that information responsibly”;
3. “to solve mathematical and computational problems”;
4. “to demonstrate knowledge of problem-solving methods and of the historical development, present-day applications and cross-disciplinary connections of mathematics and information structures”; and
5. “to demonstrate integrated knowledge of problem-solving techniques in the basic concepts and principles of the biological and physical sciences, of the history and philosophy of science, and of ecological, personal and social issues related to the sciences” (MSU Catalog, 2003-2006 54).

In addition, the General Education Program has goals in the areas of the arts and humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, Africana studies, and health education. Morgan students must be able to:

6. demonstrate integrated knowledge of the major contributors, masterpieces, history, criticism and theories of literature, philosophy (including religion), art and music from the ancient to the modern world, as they developed in western civilization;
7. demonstrate integrated knowledge of the heritage, culture, social structures and accomplishments of autochthonous African cultures and African-American civilization;
8. demonstrate a global perspective and integrated knowledge of the heritage, culture, social structures and accomplishments of one non-western civilization;
9. demonstrate integrated knowledge of the political, social and economic development of American society in relation to the world, of the history and geography of America and the world, of civic affairs and responsibilities, of personal, interpersonal, inter-group and intra-group relations, and of learning, work habits and career choices;
10. demonstrate integrated knowledge of health as a personal, group and social issue, of healthful living, of physical fitness and of optimal body functioning, general wellness, stress reduction and recreation;
11. demonstrate habits of courtesy, friendliness, honesty, integrity, civility and orderly conduct; and
12. demonstrate a sense of discipline that lends itself to good study habits and a sense of purpose that leads to beneficial and maximal use of university resources. (Catalog, 2003-2006 54)

To meet these learning goals, Morgan students must take 46 credits of General Education courses.
Among those requirements are the following competency-based courses: six credits of freshman writing (including research); three credits of critical thinking; eight credits of biological and physical sciences; three or four credits of mathematics; and two credits of computer literacy. In addition, they must complete the following knowledge-based courses: six credits of interdisciplinary, multicultural humanities; six credits of world or United States history; three credits of Africana studies; three credits of an arts and humanities elective; three credits of a social and behavioral sciences elective; two credits of healthful living; and one credit of physical education. These knowledge-based courses add to their symmetrical and holistic development as liberally educated students. They must also pass a sophomore-level Speech Proficiency Examination and a junior-level Writing Proficiency Examination. Through these courses and university-wide examinations, Morgan achieves the student learning goals outlined above and in the University Catalog and ensures the competency and liberal education standards set by Middle States.

The General Education Program is structured to accommodate the variety of students enrolled at Morgan, consistent with its mission. In a number of the freshman-level General Education courses special sections (Freshman Studies sections) are set aside for students whose SAT and placement test scores suggest that they might benefit from studying at a different pace. Those courses meet for four or five hours per week, rather than the regular three hours per week. On the other end of the spectrum, a number of the freshman-level General Education courses have their counterparts designated for honor students only. Those courses, with special course numbers, are enhanced versions of the regular courses and are taught by special Honors Faculty.

For the most part, assessment in the General Education Program takes place at the course and program levels. Assessment of individual student learning, of course, is embedded in the courses, in department-generated exit examinations that are used in the courses and in the university-wide Speech Proficiency Examination and Writing Proficiency Examination. Program assessment is embedded in departmental, and periodically college/school/institute, reviews of collective student performance in the courses. With the creation of the Office of General Education and the Office of Student Retention, Morgan has moved toward more program assessments at the university level in order to measure institutional effectiveness. Plans for these university-wide assessments are evidence of Morgan’s recognition of the importance of having a formal system for measuring student learning in the General Education Program and, equally, its commitment to using those assessments to improve instruction and curriculum design for the program. Assessment in the General Education Program will be discussed in more detail under Standard 14.

Currently, the University’s focus is on revising the General Education to have a clearer mission, goals and measurable objectives. Efforts are underway to revise the goals and objectives outlined above to ensure their compliance with the best guidelines for making those objectives more measurable and to sharpen their alignment with the mission and goals. Once the Program has finished refining its mission, goals and objectives of the program, it will move on to refining the goals and objectives of the individual courses and the honing and development of appropriate instruments for assessing student learning in those classes and institutional effectiveness in the program. This effort is being spearheaded by the Coordinator of the General Education programs, who works directly under the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

MSCHE Standard 12 looks to the role of a network of undergraduate courses, examinations and extracurricular experiences aimed at ensuring the acquisition of core liberal arts knowledge, communication
skills, information literacy, critical analysis and reasoning, quantitative and scientific reasoning and technical competency. It is clear that Morgan meets this standard.

**General Education Priorities**

However, the Task Force makes these observations: The large class sizes found in many of the General Education core courses, mandate additional faculty for these critical first-year courses. Those courses lay the foundation and are the gateway for meeting academic requirements and for success in the major. The average class size of 35 in Developmental Reading and 30 in Freshman English courses exacerbates the University’s retention efforts. Students who have demonstrated a deficiency on ACCUPLACER exam do not benefit from the course as much as they might because large class size only guarantees exposure to the material, rather than the attention that an expert instructor who can overcome skills deficiencies and motivate extraordinary effort might give. The current overall 15:1 student-to-teacher ratio at the University contributes to the retention problem in those classes. More instructors interested in effective teaching and learning and professionally trained to meet the needs of students, especially at-risk students, must be added to the faculty in these programs. Permanent faculty, not temporary additions on a semester-to-semester basis, will add continuity to the teaching in these critical first-year courses and increase the probability of success for students. The University also needs to provide in-house professional development for faculty to be effective in this critical area.

**Strengths**

The self-study discovered a number of strengths in Morgan General Educational Program. That strength was underscored when the Calvert Institute for Policy Research recognized the General Education Program at Morgan as a coherent and challenging experience and found that it is the only such program in Maryland higher education that avoids the cafeteria approach to the knowledge and skills required of its students.

**Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)**

The General Educational programs at Morgan can be improved considerably with:

Additional tenure-track faculty with the tools and professional development to promote high student achievement are needed to reduce the size of classes in the General Education Program.

**Recommendations**

The self-study makes the following recommendations for improved performance by the University:

- Add regular full-time faculty to staff critical undergraduate General Education courses and well-populated graduate programs;
- Continue systematically to review the goals and objectives of General Education
- Continue to use the Early Alert and Response System in General Education courses, as well as the major program courses, to monitor student progress
- Provide additional funds for university-wide support services such as the Writing Center.
MSCHE Standard 13

RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Morgan State University has an expansive and expanding network of academic support units and activities that buttress the academic programs. Its related educational activities include the Retention Center (established in fiscal 1999 with funds from MHEC); Academic Development Center supported by Title III, which houses the Pre-College Studies Freshman Studies Programs; the Honors Program; Upward Bound Program; and the Connect Program. These programs were all in place during the last MSCHE visit. In 2006, the Transfer Student Support Program, CONNECT Program and the Office of Articulation were combined to establish the new University Transfer Center. In the Spring of 2008, Admission and Recruitment was transferred from Student Affairs and placed, with these support programs, in the Division of Academic Affairs. All of these academic support programs are now structured under an Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs so that better administration of the programs can be achieved. The academic support programs now have a functional Director’s Council, and they conduct monthly meetings and prepare summaries of their unit accomplishments, which include student achievements and program developments and share them with the Academic Affairs Council.

In the last 10 years the following additional new educational activities initiatives have been launched:

**Academic Development Center**: The Academic Development Center established the following new initiatives:

- **Diversity Initiative**: To serve a multi-ethnic and multi-racial student body, the center recruited Latino and Native American students from Patterson High School;

- **Mentoring Initiative**: The Pre-College Studies Program recruited former Pre-College Studies students to serve as mentors to help with the following: (1) identify and develop strategies to overcome obstacles that impede the success of the first-year students and (2) provide developmental activities and support for first-year students;

- **Foundations of Excellence in the First College Year**: Morgan State University is one of 14 colleges and universities invited by the Policy Center on the First Year of College to participate in a self-study, the Foundations of Excellence® project, designed to help institutions of higher education evaluate and improve the overall experience of first-year students. The year-long study will utilize a recently developed model of excellence for the first college year. The centerpiece of the Foundations of Excellence is a model for first-year excellence comprised of a set of principles that are termed Foundational Dimensions®: Organization, Improvement, Diversity, Faculty, Transitions, Roles and Purposes, All Students, Learning, and Philosophy. The purpose of the Foundations of Excellence is to encourage colleges and universities to engage in a comprehensive process that acknowledges both institutional strengths and needs for improvement related to the first year. As Morgan State University systematically evaluates its level of achievement in each of nine Dimensions, it simultaneously will identify those areas in which an actionable change in policy or practice could yield improvement in institutional intentionality, efficiencies, student learning and retention. Morgan will prioritize desired changes in an Implementation Plan for campus improvement, a strategic working document that will guide its present and future approach to the first year.
Office of Student Retention: Since its establishment (1999) this office has worked in collaboration with the six schools of the university, the Institute of Architecture, and the various academic support programs to provide continuous support for students from matriculation to graduation and to provide a structure and forum for the ongoing review and evaluation of all programs, services, policies, procedures, and behaviors that affect the quality of student life and learning at Morgan State University. The following were implemented by the Office of Retention: Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), Access-Success Summer Bridge Program, Accuplacer Placement Testing and Parents’ 411 newsletter that focuses on “The Journey to Graduation,” including how to maintain ongoing financial support. Additionally, the issue provides information to parents and students pertaining to the many opportunities available to college graduates, including graduate and professional schools, working opportunities abroad, Americorps, Teach for America, and Peace Corps.

Honors Program: Over the past ten years, the Honors program has made major administrative and scholarship changes to enhance the ability of the Program to service honor students. Administratively, the Program has reorganized the Honors Advisory Committee to include faculty members and administrators who have major impact on student academic success. This change is expected to contribute to a higher retention rate among honor students. The Program also increased the number of partnerships it has with other higher education institutions and both public and private employers. Consequently, students now have greater access to internship, co-op, employment, and advanced degree opportunities that make them more competitive candidates for pre- and post-baccalaureate opportunities available in the new millennium global markets. Finally, the Program changed the criteria used to select academic scholarships recipients and the amount of the individual scholarship awards. These changes resulted in scholarship funding that more accurately reflects the accomplishment of high-ability students and makes the University more competitive among institutions that compete vigorously for students from the same cohorts and in the same recruiting markets as Morgan.

Upward Bound: This is a federally supported program designed to increase college graduation among disadvantaged individuals from geographic areas with low income and low educational attainment. The program targets high school students attending area high schools in high-poverty sections of Baltimore City that have high dropout rates. Upward Bound offers a range of academic support and cultural enrichment activities to program participants. These include a six-week summer residential component that simulates the college-going experience and provides instructions in mathematics, science, foreign language, reading and writing. An academic year component provides basic tutorial and supplementary educational activities. The objectives of the program include serving seventy-seven (77) students annually and retaining seventy-five percent (75%) of ninth graders through high school graduation.

University Transfer Center: The University Transfer Center has instituted several new initiatives which Morgan believes will increase and enhance a steadily growing segment of its student population. MSU has continued to develop articulation agreements with area community colleges to facilitate the smooth transition from a 2-year to a 4-year college. Morgan has most recently signed an articulation agreement between Harford Community College, Harford County, and its School of Business, and it is completing the final arrangements with the Engineering School. Additionally, Morgan has entered into agreements with Baltimore City College and Montgomery College, and it is exploring relationships with several 2-year and 4-year institutions in New Jersey and New York.

2. Baldrige Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 4: Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management
Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results
Standard 13 requires that support services and programs, whether preparing at-risk students for the university experience or providing enriched experiences for the honor students, adhere to acknowledged goals and objectives.

Morgan State University has an expansive and expanding network of academic support units and activities that buttress the academic programs. One of these is the Academic Development Center, an umbrella for a group of support programs, primarily funded under Title III, that work collaboratively and cooperatively and include the Pre-College Studies Program, Freshman Studies/First-Year Student Program, Tutoring Center and the Comprehensive Program for Undeclared Majors. The common goal of these units is to provide a quality education to a broad segment of the population in support of the University mission by offering support services/programs and quality advising. At the Tutoring Center, undergraduate and graduate student peers with GPAs of 3.00 or above provide academic assistance in a variety of content areas. In the Academic Advisement Center, advisors plan realistic schedules to increase the student retention rate of undeclared majors during their first year and have as their goal raising the retention rate from the current 65% to 73% over the next five years.

The Pre-College Studies Program is designed to ease the transition from high school to college for those students whose academic profiles and performances suggest the need for early intervention to improve their potential for success in college. The students enroll and successfully complete all aspects of the six-week program during the summer in order to be admitted to the University in the subsequent fall semester. The program is designed to strengthen students’ background in English, math and reading comprehension/vocabulary development, as well as introduce the student to the expectations and requirements of college. One objective of this program is to maintain a 95% transition rate from summer participation to fall matriculation. From 2000 to 2006, 1099 students completed the program. The percentages graduated as of Spring 2006 for the 2000 cohort was 30%, with 37% for the 2001 cohort and 15% and 24%, respectively, still enrolled. Characteristics of participants in the Pre-College Studies Program fall into two tiers. Tier 1 participants had SAT scores of 770-840 and a cumulative high school GPA=2.0 or higher. Tier 2 participants had SAT scores of 720-769 with a cumulative high school GPA=2.5 or higher.

The Freshman Studies/First-Year program consists of students who have successfully completed the Pre-College Studies Program and enrolled at the University. In this program, students are monitored closely, and carry a maximum academic load of 13 credit hours each semester, classes in English and math meeting five hours per week. After successfully completing 23 credits, they exit the program. It is the objective of this program to increase the retention rate from 65% in 2007 to 73% in 2011.

In addition to the University-wide efforts, the School of Engineering has developed programs to meet the needs of entering freshmen as well as advanced undergraduate and graduate students. The Pre-freshmen Accelerated Curriculum in Engineering program, (PACE), introduces 20-40 students, in a 5-6 week summer program, to the engineering field as well as to the skills necessary to achieve success as an undergraduate engineering student. Of the 1999 cohort, 66% have graduated. Of the 2000 cohort, 56% have graduated, with 18% still pursuing their engineering degrees. Of the 2001 cohort, 29% have graduated, with 41% still enrolled in engineering at Morgan. In addition, the Student Work Experience Program provides engineering undergraduates as well as graduate students with internship, co-op and research opportunities to enhance their technical expertise as well as provide financial resources to defray their educational expenses. From 2001 to 2005, an average of 74 students participated annually.

Another support program is the Upward Bound program. It is designed to provide low-income and first-generation high school students with motivation, encouragement and the essential skills to complete high school and earn a postsecondary degree. The program has two components: an academic year program and a six-week summer enrichment program. Services provided include study skills development; aca-
ademic, financial and personal counseling; subject tutoring; cultural and social activities; information about postsecondary educational opportunities; visits to colleges; assistance with college applications and financial aid applications; and preparation for college entrance exams. Seventy-eight students from four targeted urban high schools in Northeast Baltimore are currently enrolled, 52 of whom are both low-income and first-generation college students, and 26 are either low-income or first-generation four-year colleges. The retention rate in the program is 75%, with the objective of increasing that percentage to 80% in the next year. To achieve the goals of increased academic excellence, utilization of existing technology and increased partnerships and community engagement, changes in the program include applying on line with realistic deadlines, publishing guidelines and standards expected of participants, hiring instructors to review Maryland HSA content with participants, counseling personnel to monitor students in their high schools, increasing stipends for academic attainment, and requiring after-school tutoring.

Another educational support unit is the Transfer Center, which is charged with increasing the number of transfer students, as well as ensuring their success at Morgan. To guarantee that there is consistency in transfer evaluations, the Center makes efficient use of Maryland’s Articulation and Transfer System (ARTSYS) and agreements established with both in-state and out-of-state community colleges. Scholarships for transfer students have been established to attract high-ability students from the community colleges. The Center also introduced program activities to acclimate transfer students to the Morgan campus. The success of this program is evident in the number of transfer students attracted to Morgan programs, as well as the retention and graduation rates for these students. The number of new transfers has increased steadily from 302 in the fall of 2003, which was 5% of the total undergraduate enrollment, to 477 in fall of 2006, which was 8% of the undergraduate enrollment. About 25% of the transfer students are part-time students. The community colleges in Baltimore City, Baltimore County (Essex campus), Prince Georges County and Montgomery County send the largest number of transfer students. The largest number of transfer students matriculate from four-year colleges come from UMES, Coppin and Bowie State University, Maryland other HBCUs. The 6-year graduation rate for the 1999 to 2001 cohorts was about 42%.

Another educational support program is the University Honors Program. The first-year retention rates for the 2004-2006 cohorts varied from 80% to over 86%, with a 5-year graduation rate of over 42% and a 5-year graduation rate of over 58% for the 2003 and 2002 cohorts, respectively. The University has the distinction of being among the top ten universities in the country producing African-American undergraduates who go on to earn doctorates and other terminal degrees.

Support Activities Priorities

The support services for at-risk students focus on conveying information, individual advisement, tutoring and utilization of feedback to specific student groups, e.g. student athletes, Pre-College Studies Program participants, freshmen engineering students who need assistance with math or science courses, etc. This is highly labor-intensive and requires trained, knowledgeable advisors/tutors with an information system that can immediately identify individual problems and address them as quickly as possible. The different programs could share the information system, but it must be easily accessible to all. Tutoring services, especially in General Education courses, are shared with sites not only in academic centers but also in dorms and the Student Center. Instructors of the designated courses must be involved in supervising the tutors, and web-based materials and sites must be maintained to supplement the tutoring and keep in contact with the students. Finally, funds must be allocated for University-wide support service, such as the Writing Center, which does not have a specific constituency but impacts all students at every level. Graduate students in English, History and Communications should be ideal tutors and could be supported through graduate student aid.
Model programs that instill values and behaviors critical for success in college, as well as focus on academic skills and experiences specific to particular disciplines, should be fully utilized and evaluated. The University must also invest in the potential research benefits in education and in the social and behavioral sciences. The outlay is much more modest than in the sciences, but the potential return is immense. Support for faculty and graduate students to initiate projects, present papers and attend workshops would make Morgan more attractive to funding agencies and foundations. Evaluating community-based projects, whether educational or health-related, seems too obvious. The Higher Education and Psychometrics graduate programs offer an ideal synthesis of research and policy expertise that can be readily combined. Minimal funds for space and staff, plus utilization and coordination of faculty, is required.

**Strengths**

The analysis of Morgan educational program suggests:

- The support programs for under prepared, as well as honors students, provide both academic enrichment and motivational encouragement that leads to increased retention and graduation rates.
MSCHE Standard 14

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

1. Ten-Year Progress on Meeting MSCHE Standards

Assessment of student learning is a long-standing tradition at Morgan State University. As far back at the fifties, Morgan had in place an Office of Testing and Evaluation headed by an education professor, who was an expert in testing and wrote a text entitled *How to Become a Successful Student*. During that period, students were tested after they completed the General Education Program, using the General Knowledge portion of the Graduate Record Examination, and results were fed back to the department for curriculum development and improvement. That focus on testing and evaluation, or assessment of student learning, has been revived and given new impetus at Morgan since the last MSCHE review visit ten years ago, and, in the last five years, especially, Morgan has made it a priority item on its agenda.

In 2005, Morgan implemented a Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) for the entire campus and began the process of developing and nurturing a culture of assessment at the University. That plan was predicated, in part, on Middle States Standards 1, 2, 7 and 14, and the expression of the University’s strong commitment to assessing student learning and institutional effectiveness:

*Morgan considers assessment of, and accountability for, achieving its mission and goals to be one of the most important measures of its success. Therefore, it is making on-going assessment an increasingly pivotal aspect of the University’s life, and it includes in its mission statement a strong commitment of assessing institutional effectiveness and student learning.*

CAP established fourteen principles on which the assessment program would be based, including five with specific applicability to assessment of student learning:

1. that everything that the University does will be guided by clearly stated goals, objectives and measurable outcomes or expectations;
2. that assessment will be systematic, thorough and formalized; will use multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures to generate data and information; will be periodic and regular; will be conducted in a variety of settings or situations; and will reflect the total picture of what the University does;
3. that assessment of student learning will be a major focus of the Comprehensive Assessment Program (CAP), and assessment of all other areas will reflect a commitment to learning;
4. that assessment of student learning will benefit from the “value added” approach, that is diagnosing where students are academically when they enter the university and measuring that level of achievement against where they are when they complete academic programs;
5. that assessment will aim not only at enhancing student learning, but also at improving institutional planning and resource allocation, institutional processes, and the assessment process itself.

CAP has resulted in a review of college/school/institute, departmental and program missions, goals, objectives, learning expectations and instruments of evaluation or assessment of learning. The academic units are currently at various stages of that review.
Much of the assessment effort has been directed at the General Education Program, which already has a fairly advanced program of assessment of learning. In addition to the traditional, standard methods of determining competency, the required General Education courses employ a department-generated exit examination as a comprehensive assessment of student learning in the courses. In addition, the University administers a Speech Proficiency Examination in the sophomore year and a Writing Proficiency Examination in the junior year to assess these two competencies, which are usually learned in the freshman year and reinforced in other courses in subsequent years. In addition to these traditional measures, the course-embedded departmental exit examinations, and the university-wide competency examinations in speech and writing, departments gather and examine, annually, data on student grades earned in these courses, as a means of assessing instructional and program effectiveness. In addition, a significant part of the assessment package is student evaluations of every course at the end of each semester. In these evaluations they provide valuable information on their assessment of program and instructional effectiveness.

With the establishment of the Office of General Education in the College of Liberal Arts and the Office of Student Retention at the university level, both of which are data-driven in many respects, Morgan has become more systematic in its collection and analysis of data on student performance in the General Education Program. Last year, the Office of General Education conducted a study of grade distribution in General Education courses, and the Coordinator of Assessment in the College of Liberal Arts did a study of the grade distribution in key first-years courses based on the status of the instructors for the courses.

Morgan has also become involved in a number of national projects that assist in measuring student learning. In recent years, it has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). These projects give the University invaluable information about student engagement in learning and about how much value the Morgan educational experience adds to its students’ competencies between their matriculation in the freshman and their senior year.

Beyond the General Education Program, Morgan has strong programs of student learning and program assessment, especially in its accredited and re-accredited degree programs. In those programs, assessments of student learning and instructional and program effectiveness are systematic, regular and often nationally-normed, and they are used to enhance teaching, learning and program planning. The institution recognizes the need to replicate these successful assessment programs across the campus, notably in the competency areas of the General Education Program. With these measures, Morgan is well on the way toward a comprehensive program of assessing student learning and using the result for curriculum and program development.

2. Baldrige Performance Analysis and Recommendations

Baldrige Category 7: Organizational Performance Results

Programmatic Analyses (Student Outcomes Data)

Morgan uses the NSEE and FSSE, in part, to assess the success of its educational programs. Items on the NSSE and FSSE are identified by their Indiana University developers to deal specifically with student engagement from the perspective of the students (NSSE) and the perspective of the faculty (FSSE). The items or research questions that are relevant to the evaluation of the educational offerings at Morgan include:

- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations.
- Participation in a community-based project as part of a regular course.
Course work emphasizes: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or new situations.
Number of assigned textbooks, books or book length packs of course readings.
Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more.
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills.

The results point to the strengths in Morgan’s educational offerings. Compared to peers and to a national sample of freshmen, more Morgan freshmen estimated working hard to meet instructors’ expectations. Morgan freshmen also overestimated their participation in a community-based project as part of a course requirement, how much their courses emphasized applying theory to practical problems, reading 20 or more assigned textbooks, books, or book length packs and acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills, as compared to peers or a national sample of freshmen. If Morgan freshmen come from academically deprived settings, exposure to the more rigorous requirements found in college may be perceived as much greater, a contrast effect. This does not seem to be the case for Morgan seniors who have been exposed to the quality programs at the University for three or more years. Morgan seniors were much closer to their peers and a national sample of seniors in estimating how hard they worked to meet instructor’s expectations and how much their courses emphasized applying theory to practical problems and acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills. More Morgan seniors did estimate engagement in community-based projects as part of regular course work and reading 20 or more assigned textbooks, books or book-length packs as compared to peers or a national sample of seniors suggesting that these are important components of many programs of study. Neither Morgan freshmen, their peers, a national sample of freshmen, Morgan seniors, their peers or a national sample of seniors reported writing papers or reports of 20 or more pages, a commentary perhaps on college requirements in general.

When Morgan freshmen are compared to Morgan seniors, almost twice as many freshmen report working harder to meet instructors expectations as compared to seniors, with twice as many seniors as, opposed to freshmen, reporting reading 20 or more textbooks, texts or book-length packs or participating in community-based projects as part of a course requirement, again emphasizing the important roles these experiences play in a Morgan education.

The faculty consistently reported lower estimates of student engagement for Morgan freshmen or Morgan seniors, with estimates being consistently a third of those of the freshmen and half of those of the seniors. Why are the faculty estimations of their students’ programmatic engagement consistently lower than their students and how do these estimations affect student engagement?

General Education

The University has been effective in providing a set of courses, proficiency exams and cultural experiences to all students that enhance acquisition of a liberal education and promote proficiency at the college level in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning and technological competency for all Morgan students. The courses include language arts and critical thinking, humanities and the arts, mathematics, biological and physical science with labs, history, Africana studies, a social or behavioral science, a course in health education, and a course to promote computer literacy. A physical education activity and a freshman orientation course, depending on the major, are University-wide requirements. Additionally, success in oral and written communication is required via passing speech and writing proficiency exams.

How well do these courses fulfill the University mission? First, what values, traditions, and principles, unique to Morgan, are reflected in the general education program? The breadth of General Education courses required of Morgan students ensures their symmetrical development in disciplines that are fundamental to a liberal arts education. Inclusion of the Africana studies requirement reflects the ethnic identity of the majority of Morgan’s students. The courses that require reading, writing, and critical think-
ing emphasize the importance the University places on preparing students with varied academic backgrounds to perform successfully in their chosen professions. Morgan has always prided itself in "going the extra mile" to ensure the academic success of its students. It is not merely exposure to a content area, but the requirements of analyzing and then communicating the information that produces successful Morgan graduates. Passing the speech and writing exams adds another layer to guarantee the quality of the Morgan graduate.

The effectiveness of General Education courses and experiences is assessed in a variety of ways. One instrument is course syllabi, which must clearly spell out the goals and objectives and learning expectations of the courses. A recent study by the Coordinator for General Education in the College of Liberal Arts, which offers ten of the required General Education courses, suggested the need to clarify course objectives to ensure that the goals and learning expectations for the courses are being met. A review of the goals and objectives of General Education courses is currently underway. In addition, the University uses a number of external instruments to assess the success of the General Education Program. First, it uses items on the NSSE and FSSE dealing with student engagement from the perspective of the students (NSSE) and the perspective of the faculty (FSSE). Items of relevance to this evaluation include:

- Acquiring a broad general education
- Writing clearly and effectively
- Speaking clearly and effectively
- Thinking critically and analytically
- Analyzing quantitative problems
- Using computing and information technology
- Solving complex real-world problems

One of the areas of focus of NSSE is students’ estimation of their ability to write clearly and effectively, think critically and analytically, analyze quantitative problems and solve complex world problems. Morgan freshmen, compared to their peers and a national sample of freshmen, consistently overestimated their ability in these areas. Morgan freshmen estimates of acquiring a broad general education and using computing and information technology were slightly lower than their peers or a national sample of freshmen.

When Morgan seniors are compared to their peers and a national sample of seniors, more Morgan seniors underestimated their ability to write clearly and effectively, speak clearly and effectively, analyze quantitative problems and solve complex world problems.

When Morgan freshmen are compared to Morgan seniors, the seniors reported higher engagement than the freshmen in acquiring a broad general education, writing clearly and effectively, speaking clearly and effectively, analyzing quantitative problems, using computing and information technology and solving complex world problems. Both groups reported similar engagement in thinking critically and analytically.

When the estimation of engagement of Morgan freshmen and seniors are compared to faculty estimates, the faculty consistently underestimated the engagement of both freshmen and seniors. There was a greater disparity between the estimation of freshmen and faculty than the disparity when comparing seniors and faculty. For the freshmen, the greatest student-faculty disparity was in thinking critically and analytically, while for the seniors, the greatest disparities were for writing clearly and effectively and analyzing quantitative problems.

Another external assessment of the effectiveness of the General Education Program is the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) test to freshmen and seniors. The Collegiate Learning Assessment Institu-
tional Report, 2005-2006 revealed a significant value added increment in critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving and clear writing attributable to the Morgan educational experience. This difference between student knowledge and skills when they matriculated at Morgan as freshmen and their knowledge and skills as seniors underscores the role of the General Education offerings in producing successful critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving and clear writing.

Another external instrument used for assessment is the ACCUPLACER TESTS, which is used for entering freshmen. ACCUPLACER illustrate most dramatically the academic background of entering students, with 89% in the fall 2006, 69% in the fall 2007 required to take Developmental Reading; 87% of the students in the fall 2006 and 72% in the fall 2007 required to register for Freshman Studies English; and 84% in the fall 2006 and 64% in the fall 2007 required to enroll in Math 106. Using the SAT scores as predictors, the 71% first-year retention rate, the 15% 4-year retention rate, and the 39% 6-year graduation rate are within the predicted confidence intervals for students entering college with these particular levels of academic preparation.

During the past academic year, the University conducted two important studies of student performance in General Education courses. The first was a review of student grades in freshman-level General Education courses. This study, conducted by the Office of the General Education Program, revealed that a significant majority of Morgan students succeed in earning passing grades in freshman-level General Education courses, with the passing rate for developmental courses in reading and mathematics constituting an area of concern because of their comparatively lower passing rates.

The second review was of characteristics of instructors and the grades that they awarded for the Fall, 2006 semester in math, English and developmental reading courses at the freshman level (100 numbered courses). This analysis looked at faculty by rank (tenure-track/regular or adjunct/contractual) and faculty time-status (full-time or part-time). It revealed a significant association between rank and grade, with less relationship between time-status and grade. Math 100 courses were taught by 36% regular and 64% adjunct faculty. Sixty-two percent were full-time, and 38% were part time faculty. Students were 1.7 times more likely to obtain an A or B grade from regular, as opposed to adjunct, faculty, and 1.56 times more likely to obtain an A or B grade from full-time, as opposed to part time, faculty. Conversely, students were more likely to obtain an F grade from adjunct as opposed to regular faculty and part-time as opposed to full-time faculty.

For English 101 courses, 30% were taught by regular faculty and 70% by adjunct; similarly 43% were full time, and 57% were part-time instructors. Students were 1.77 times more likely to receive an A or B from a regular faculty instructor, as opposed to an adjunct faculty member. There was no such relationship between grade and time-status. Looking at full-time faculty alone, there was a relationship between regular and adjunct status and grades issued. Students of regular faculty were over three times more likely to obtain a grade of A or B compared to students of adjunct faculty.

For developmental reading courses, 79% of the courses were taught by regular faculty and 21% by adjunct faculty. Students were 2.93 times more likely to receive an A or B grade with regular, as opposed to adjunct, faculty.

These analyses compare with NSSE data that reveal that only 10 to 15% of freshmen at Morgan feel their instructors are available, helpful and sympathetic, a significant contrast to 17 to 23% of peers or all NSSE freshmen respondents and 20 to 25% of Morgan seniors across the years 2004 to 2006. Possible explanations of the grade, rank and time-status relationships may be understood if regular and or full-time faculty are more available, helpful and sympathetic as well as more knowledgeable about the resources available to support at-risk freshmen.
The General Education Program is complemented by a series of extra-curricular activities that buttress in-class learning and focus on the rich heritage of the predominantly African-American population. Musical programs, art exhibits, theater productions, historical lectures, philosophical debates, international forums have received University-wide attention and attendance. Faculty interests have dictated presentations of programs honoring Martin Luther King, W.E.B. Du Bois, Blacks in the Korean War, and the visit of the Amistad among others. Currently a faculty committee in the College of Liberal Arts, Intellectual Life Committee, is planning a schedule of cultural activities focused on the anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination as well as a series of town hall meetings supporting different convocation themes but ensuring more individual participation.

Morgan has developed a Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) to measure student learning and institutional effectiveness. The CAP is based on the Morgan’s mission statement, its goals and its objectives. The CAP anticipates the use of several qualitative and quantitative measures of institutional effectiveness, including, but not limited to, the University’s writing and speech proficiency examinations, as well as such standard test measures of learning as the Educational Testing Service’s (ETS) Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). In addition to the assessment instruments identified in the CAP, Morgan employs numerous other assessment instruments to measure the effectiveness of undergraduate education, including an Annual Senior Exit Survey, a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Gender Equity Survey, a non-returning Student Survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, the Assessment of Student Learning in the General Education Program, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA).

Graduate Assessments (Standard 14)
Although Morgan has been authorized by the Maryland legislature to award doctoral degrees since 1976, it has been only in the last decade that a comprehensive array of graduate programs has been approved for the University by the Maryland Higher Education Commission. Since the last evaluation by MSCHE in 1998, the School of Graduate Studies has experienced a significant increase in both its doctoral and master’s degree programs. The administrative functions, including admission, dismissal, and clearance of graduate students for commencement, are centralized in the office of the School of Graduate Studies. Renovations are underway for the School of Graduate Studies and related graduate students services to move to the former student union in the McKeldin Center which will provide greater visibility for the Graduate School, more space where graduate students can convene, and more office space for the Dean’s staff and the Morgan State Graduate Students Association’s (MSGSA) office. Representatives, who are either Department Chairpersons and/or Graduate Coordinators, from all forty-four (44) graduate programs comprise the Graduate Council, which is chaired by the Dean and serves as an advisory committee to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Graduate Council’s bylaws provide criteria for membership in the graduate faculty and establish three standing committees including a Policies and Procedures Committee, a Curriculum Committee and a Student Life Committee. A graduate student is a member of the Graduate Council.

The School of Graduate Studies has implemented several instruments to assess learning outcomes of graduate students and ways to improve the quality of the graduate experience for graduate students. All candidates for the doctoral degree must complete a dissertation that assesses students’ writing, reasoning, and analytical skills. The majority of the master’s programs require students to complete a thesis or other written project successfully. The Graduate Council developed and approved a Periodic Program Review policy that requires each graduate program to implement a self-study every five years to assess the quality of its instructional services. The School of Graduate Studies also conducts an annual Graduate Student Exit Survey the results of which are reviewed by the Student Life Committee and reported to the Graduate Council.
III. SUMMARY OF STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

- Adequate time and opportunity for broad participation in planning process
- Strong analytical basis for planning and assessment;
- Plan that is appropriate for campus mission and aspirations and for the environment in which it is operating;
- Clear and measurable goals and strategies articulated in the plan;
- A sound and highly visible approach to monitoring progress and promoting action toward goal achievement in the Balanced Scorecard;
- Attraction of Morgan’s physical plant to first-year students and their selection of the University for their initial higher education institution;
- A “family-oriented” environment at the University for students, particularly among peers
- The positive impact of the Office of Admission & Recruitment’s “on-the-spot” admission
- The ubiquity of campus police as a positive feature of the University, though students expect a safer campus environment;
- Distinctive programs that meet the special needs of many students;
- The Office of Student Retention, with its retention coordinators dispersed throughout the University schools, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Institute for Architecture & Planning as complements to student success;
- An Enrollment Management Advisory Committee that keeps current with market trends and helps the University identify future students;
- The helpfulness of the institutional culture of evidence in identifying student satisfaction and dissatisfaction;
- Morgan’s physical plant as helping many students select the University for their initial higher education institution;
- The Golden Ambassadors as instruments for attracting new students;
- The “family-oriented” environment at the University, particularly among their peers;
- New student life and academic buildings promoting student satisfaction and learning; and
- The specialized programs at the University (e.g., Foundations of Excellence, Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students, Helping Hands, Male Initiative on Leadership & Excellence, Fast Track, and New Student Orientation & Registration) meeting the special needs of many students academically and personally;
- The Calvert Institute for Policy Research’s recognition of the General Education Program at Morgan as a coherent and challenging experience;
- Recent results of the CLA examination performance indicating the value added by the General Education Program for students who may not be well prepared for the college experience;
- The programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels that provide a wide choice of courses that enable students, especially those of African American ethnicity, to pursue career paths in diverse areas, many previously noted for the underrepresentation of African Americans, particularly in the numerous SEM careers, psychometrics and community college leadership, with some graduation rates verifying the successful outcomes;
- The academic enrichment, as well as emotional/motivational encouragement, given by the support programs for underprepared as well as honors;
• The institution of the APEX system, which allows individuals with particular inquiries to access data specific to their needs. Training is on-going and will be available to those who demonstrate an interest.
• Recognition of Morgan by Carnegie as a Doctoral Research University;
• Expansion of undergraduate and graduate degree programs;
• Increases in enrollment, particularly at the graduate level;
• Enhancement of campus facilities and technology infrastructure;
• Successful completion of its first private capital campaign; and
• The variety of instruments used to assess student learning and organizational performance.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs)

• Gaining greater participation in developing and deploying plans;
• Improving employee and facility utilization data for planning;
• Connecting operational plans and budgets to the Strategic Plan;
• Developing a planning culture throughout the campus;
• Improving the quality of customer service, particularly in some offices in the Montebello Complex;
• Student and parent frustration at the frequency of lost documents, not being able to reach “certain” student services office by telephone, being placed on hold (when they got through), and waiting on long lines;
• Many staff members viewing many student service functions, especially in Montebello, as antiquated;
• Staff members feeling handicapped by the University's inconsistent technology—voice mail and email;
• First-year students perceiving a “have” and “have not” type of institutional milieu—students who are either honors, pre-college, and student-athletes appearing to receive more practical, academic, and even financial support than students who are not in specialized student sub-cultures or categories;
• Improving customer services in key academic and student services areas and holding staff more accountable;
• Technology for academic and student services staff (e.g., voice mail and email) must be consistently available;
• Defining, communicating and administering policies and practices regarding dropped schedules;
• Implementing alternative registration processes that are more current, processes that improve ease of certain procedures for students, faculty, and staff during registration;
• Striving to capitalize on enrolling a more diverse student pool, as well as attracting students from more counties in Maryland, by devoting more human and fiscal resources to these opportunities;
• Expanding and providing adequate fiscal support to ensure the continuity of specialized student services;
• Adding tenure-track faculty to reduce the size of courses in the General Education Program and the tools and professional development to promote high student achievement;
• Adding tenure-track faculty to the graduate programs, particularly those with high enrollment, not only to ensure a modal 3:3 course load and reduce the need for adjunct faculty, but also to provide adequate advisement and faculty for master’s and doctoral committees;
• Integrating the support services, especially the tutoring programs, to share resources and engage the faculty in helping to focus the resources for maximum effectiveness;

• Supporting university-wide services, such as the Writing Center, to facilitate skills critical for success in all disciplines and widen services to include all students;

• Using the capabilities of the APEX system to add information, develop a cohort-specific database and allow for more sensitive data queries but would facilitate early intervention in specific instances;

• Add support staff, particularly professional grant writers, laboratory and clinical staff, and information technology specialists;

• Seek increased in financial resources to support departmental and school budgets and to fund student scholarships;

• Seek funds for program enhancement and development of new programs and research (See, Ayers exhibit);

• Publicize the 2007 mission statement, along with the values and vision statements, prominently as stand-alone entries on the University’s web site, in recruitment materials, catalogs, and other documents meant for public consumption as well as in internal planning and governance communications; and

• Delete old versions of the mission statement from current documents and have only the 2007 version of the mission statement appear in the documents meant for public and internal communication.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

• Increase competitiveness in research through enhanced incentives for research productivity. Morgan needs to survey the faculty to determine what would work;

• Increase the perception that MSU is employee friendly at all levels, with more recognition of the rewards and perks that already exist and addition of others that may enhance performance;

• Streamline the management system for grants. Continue to decentralize the process. Help all levels of leadership at MSU recognize how much work is required to acquire and manage grants so that they will recognize the value of nurturing the rewards that should ensue for those who are successful;

• Increase the effectiveness of internal communication so that people who need to know will be informed;

• While demanding excellence, celebrate achievements both internally and externally;

• Continue strategic planning with enhanced student and stakeholder input so that as goals and objectives are met, new ones will continue to move the university in ever more challenging directions;

• Add training for parents regarding the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), student misconduct and student grievances, where such is allowable by law;

• Improve customer service that is essential, particularly in key student services areas, and seek a more student-centered and “staying” environment;

• Make technology consistently available for educational staff (e.g., voice mail and email);

• Allocate resources for increased student services aimed at improving student registration and the antiquated operations associated with certain aspects of the process;

• Increase enrollment of a more diverse student pool to reflect the changing demographics in Maryland;
• Add regular full-time faculty to staff critical undergraduate General Education courses, such as English 101, Reading 101 and 100-level Math courses and popular Graduate School programs;
• Reduce faculty teaching loads for graduate faculty who are productive in research;
• Provide professional training opportunities for faculty to develop courses which articulate the goals of a liberal education, including writing, critical thinking, analysis and information literacy;
• Review goals and objectives of General Education and determine other courses that would serve to support achievement;
• Develop a cohort-specific data base for critical student data to allow efficient delivery of student support services, as well as monitor academic progress in programs and general education courses;
• Allocate funds for university-wide support services such as the Writing Center;
• Conduct “best practices” forums with faculty and support staff to develop, implement and evaluate model programs;
• Articulate and effectively communicate the University’s current mission to existing and newly hired faculty and staff;
• Re-evaluate the faculty role in governance in light of the University’s new mission as a doctoral research university;
• Reconcile Morgan State University’s mission as an urban research university with the responsibility to serve underrepresented student populations;
• Implement a differentiated faculty responsibilities model with regard to teaching and research, which would be reflected in promotion and tenure policies and practices;
• Consider developing a tenure and promotion process which rewards faculty for serving both objectives of its mission;
• Develop of new graduate and undergraduate programs only when faculty and resources for existing programs have been fully funded by the State and resources for proposed programs have been clearly identified;
• Provide incentives for faculty to be more productive in seeking research funding by ensuring that overhead is consistently distributed, with creative mechanisms for additional financial compensation;
• Offer specific work-oriented Banner training in the areas of Finance, Records and Registration/Academic Affairs;
• Evaluate key work processes to determine how they can be done more expeditiously in Banner to maximize efficiency;
• Request state positions to replace selected Title III funded contractual positions;
• Request state positions to add more regular full-time positions incrementally to address several priorities;
• Restore IT equipment budget to add equipment primarily for computer labs and smart classrooms;
• Assume costs for memberships and licenses currently covered by Title III; and
• Purchase new administrative computer clusters.
### V. INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

**Document Inventory for Middle States Commission on Higher Education**  
**And Baldrige Accreditation Processes**  
*(Site Visitors Reading Room)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Category/Name</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSCHE Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Statement of Morgan’s Accreditation Status</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU MSCHE Institutional Profile</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCHE Publications</td>
<td>Self-Study Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSU Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University Mission Statement</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents By-Laws</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of Board of Regents Meetings</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University Council By-Laws</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of Morgan State University Council Meetings</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents Pertaining to Student Conduct, Sexual Harassment, and Copyrights</td>
<td>Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Planning Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Finance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Capital Budget Request</td>
<td>Finance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Finance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Five-Year Academic Plan</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Master Plan (Including Life Cycle Replacement)</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division/School/College/Institute Annual Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business and Management</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Community Health and Policy</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education and Urban Studies</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Architecture and Planning</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Unit Annual Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Retention Program</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Development Center</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Honors Program</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Transfer Center</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soper Library</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Department</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Program</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee Reports</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Accreditation Self-Studies and Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education and Urban Studies – NCATE</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Program – CSWE</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Sciences (Medical Technology) – NACCLS</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Programs - NASM</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business and Management - AACSB</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering - ABET</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Architecture and Planning – PAB, LAAB, NAAB</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Certification – NCAA</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Studies and Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Audit Reports</td>
<td>Finance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Reports – 1998 - 2007</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Reports</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted Student Questionnaires</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Retention Initiatives – 1998 – 2007</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Meeting Report - Students</td>
<td>Self-Study Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Meeting Report - Faculty</td>
<td>Self-Study Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Meeting Report - Staff</td>
<td>Self-Study Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit Focus Groups Report</td>
<td>Self-Study Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE Report</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey Reports (1, 5, and 10 Years Out)</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogs, Handbooks, and Manuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2009 Undergraduate Catalog</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2009 Graduate Catalog</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Employees Manual</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Manual for Executive and Professional Administrative Staff</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Maps</td>
<td>Finance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Bulletin</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Magazine</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Mirror</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sable Quill</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spokesman</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A special exhibit of faculty publications and scholarly production will be in the Benjamin A. Quarles Room in Soper Library. These items may be viewed during regular Library hours from 8:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m.

Note: *We will also include the exhibits required by MSCHE to accompany the 100-page Self-Study Report.*
VI. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN SELF-STUDY

a) The Members of the Executive Steering Committee:

Howard L. Simmons, Ph.D., Chair, Self-Study Steering Committee; Professor and Chair, Department of Advanced Studies, Leadership and Policy
Dr. Yvonne Bronner (Category 1 Task Force Manager), Professor, School of Community Health and Policy
Dr. Joseph Popovich (Category 2 Task Force Manager), Vice President, Planning and Information Technology
Dr. D. Jason De Sousa (Category 3 Task Force Manager), Director, Institute for Character Development; Associate Professor, Department of Advanced Studies, Leadership and Policy
Dr. Carroll Perrino (Category 4 Task Force Manager), Associate Professor, Psychology Department
Dr. Alvin Kennedy (Category 5 Task Force Manager), Professor and Chair, Chemistry Department
Dr. Linda Mehlinger (Category 6 Task Force Manager), Assistant Vice President for Technology Training
Dr. Maurice Taylor (Category 7 Task Force Manager), Dean, School of Graduate Studies

b) The Members of the Steering Committee and Self-Study (Baldrige/MSCHE) Task Forces:

Dr. Jerome Schiele, Director, Ph.D. Program in Social Work, Category 1 Asst. Task Force Mgr.
Dr. Mildred Ofosu, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Sponsored Programs
Dr. Bala Subramanian, Associate Professor, Business Administration
Mr. Darren Franklin, Student
Mr. Tyrone Phillips, Student
Dr. Willie Braggs, Category 2 Asst. Task Force Mgr.; Assistant Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Director of Continuing Studies
Ms. Joyce Brown, Director, Alumni Relations
Dr. Estelle Young, Assistant Professor, Sociology
Ms. Karen Robertson, Director, Library
Ms. Cynthia Graves-Wilder, University Facility Planner
Ms. Cheryl Rollins, Director, Institutional Research
Mr. Jamari Bertram, Student
Dr. Tiffany McMillan, Category 3 Asst. Task Force Mgr.; Director, Student Retention
Mrs. Nina Hopkins, Director, Counseling Center
Ms. Janessa Givens, Student
Mr. Juandecarlos Ferguson, Student
Mr. Ifeanyi Igwulu, Student
Dr. Debra Ham, Professor, College of Liberal Arts
Col. Joseph Bozeman, Executive Director, Enrollment Management Services
Mr. Michael Sturm, Student
Dr. Pamela Leigh-Mack, Chairperson, Electrical Engineering
Dr. Sylvester McKay, Professor, Department of Advanced Studies, Leadership and Policy
Dr. Dolan Hubbard, Chair, English and Language Arts Department
Mr. Juan Pearson, Student
Dr. Ray Vollmer, Associate Vice President, Finance and Management
Ms. Adele Terrell, Advancement Services Manager
Dr. Linda Mehlinger, Assistant Vice President for Technology Training
Mr. Daniel Ruto, Student
Dr. Siddhartha Sen, Coordinator and Professor, Institute of Architecture and Planning
Ms. Cynthia Mendoza, Assistant Director, University Honors Program
Dr. Rosemary Gillett-Karam, Associate Professor and Graduate Program Coordinator, Higher Education
Mr. Seymour Chambers, Chief Judicial Officer, Student Affairs
Mr. Onan Marroquin, Student
Mr. Lee Gibbs, Student
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONS ADDRESSED OR FORMULATED BY TASK FORCES

1. BALDRIGE CATEGORY 1: LEADERSHIP

   • How is the meaning of “urban” being applied to the nature of the University?
   • How does Morgan assess its senior leadership to determine if their activities are contributing to the mission, vision and values of the institution?
   • What is the process for holding senior leadership accountable for setting goals and objectives and developing strategic time-sensitive plans to accomplish them?
   • How does senior leadership communicate strategic direction to faculty, staff and students?
   • Does senior leadership regularly survey faculty, staff and students to determine if the “product” is meeting their needs?
   • How does senior leadership use survey and other information from faculty, staff and students to develop iterative strategic plans that meet current and future needs?
   • How does senior leadership involve the campus community in its strategic planning?
   • How does senior leadership measure and monitor community satisfaction with MSU’s partnerships and products?
   • How does senior leadership assess the relationship between its mission to serve an urban-trained student and its infrastructure to accomplish this task?
   • How does senior leadership hold faculty accountable for offering students cutting-edge information and mentoring them to enter and succeed in their professions?
   • Are there specific research goals and objectives set for faculty and students that are clearly stated and measurable?
   • How are research goals and objectives monitored to help faculty achieve success?
   • How is governance shared at all levels? How is this articulated and monitored?
   • How is shared governance evaluated for satisfaction by faculty, staff and students?
   • How are success stories communicated to the public? How is this process monitored?
   • What method of accountability is used?
   • How has senior leadership integrated specific legislative mandates within the University’s planning and strategies?
   • What method is used to ensure that MSU is kept current with available technology for all aspects of the University: administration, teaching, research, etc.?
   • How does senior leadership assess the financial management system’s ability to support the University’s expanding research agenda?
   • How is the strategic plan developed, implemented and monitored?
   • How is senior leadership held accountable for meeting established goals and objectives?

2. BALDRIGE CATEGORY 2: STRATEGIC PLANNING

   • How does the University’s strategic plan encourage diversity among students, faculty, staff and administration?
   • How does the strategic planning of each unit support the overall goals and objectives of the University’s strategic plan?
   • How does the strategic planning process support the increasing demand for technological innovation in educational design and delivery?
   • How should the University’s strategic planning process address resource allocation to meet regional, national, and international market demands?
   • How does the expansion of academic programs within emerging technology affect facilities strategic planning?
• How does the University’s financial planning process facilitate the expansion of undergraduate, graduate, and research programs?
• How does the University’s strategic plan respond to rapidly changing environments or market demands?
• What is the relationship of academic, financial, and resource allocation to the mission of the urban university?
• How does the University’s strategic plan address organizational strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats?
• How do the goals and objectives of the University’s strategic plan direct program development as well as program change?
• How does the allocation of resources encourage collaboration and not competition for resources?
• To what extent are resources organized to match the mission, goals, and objectives of the University?
• How well is the University’s strategic plan linked to resource allocation?
• How is facility planning linked to academic purpose?
• How does strategic planning redirect resource allocation, terminate resources, modify programs, and facilitate student diversity?
• How does the University use qualitative and quantitative data to direct and or support program changes or modifications?
• How does the budget process ensure sufficient resources for students, faculty, and staff?

3. BALDRIGE CATEGORY 3: STUDENT, STAKEHOLDER, AND MARKET FOCUS

• To what extent are admission policies and practices reflective of the institution’s mission? Namely, what is the degree to which the University enrolls students from the city and region of Baltimore, with high academic ability and talents, and with racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds?
• What seem to be key variables of new students that are consistent with the mission of the University?
• What is the effectiveness of student support services, such as ensuring that students have access to need- and merit-based financial aid, that first-year students are academically prepared and successful, and that students with physical and learning challenges are provided reasonable educational assistance?
• How are new students academically socialized into the University?
• How is information related to student outcomes communicated to students?
• To what extent are student grievance concerns promptly, appropriately, and equitably addressed?
• To what extent are student complaints minimized?
• What are the special needs that the University is addressing with regard to students?

4. BALDRIGE CATEGORY 4: MEASUREMENT, ANALYSIS AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

• To what extent are Morgan State University values, traditions, and mission reflected in its educational offerings, general education and related educational activities?
• Looking at particular measurements currently available, are the stated goals being achieved?
• Is the information conveyed used in decision-making to direct or modify educational offerings, general education or related educational activities?
• To what extent does each segment of the diverse student population benefit from educational offerings, general education and related educational activities?
• To what extent do faculty abilities, interests and attitudes produce accomplishment of the goals for each segment of the diverse student population?
• What additional faculty or faculty resources would facilitate accomplishment of the goals for each segment of the diverse student population?