On behalf of the Coppin State University's family, it is my distinct honor to present to you our decennial institutional self-study report, Pioneering Academic and Community Innovation through Technology, in preparation for our scheduled review for reaffirmation.

Individuals from various units of the University have reviewed the self-study document and provided useful comments and suggestions. The Self-Study Steering Committee, comprised of administrators, faculty and staff, guided the process to ensure that careful consideration was given to delineating the University’s strengths and areas for improvement. The visit comes during a period of significant capital improvements for the University, where two major buildings are in the process of being completed: a 160,000 square foot Health and Human Services Building and a state-of-the-art Physical Education Complex. These are in addition to several other campus improvements planned or underway.

The University has made significant enhancements in the area of academics, including strengthening course offerings and revamping the academic program review process. In addition, the School of Management Sciences was recently implemented, as well as hiring a Founding Dean for the School of Professional Studies. New academic program collaborations and partnerships are underway, including new programs abroad, as well as the reaffirmation of partnership with feeder schools in the community.

I began my position as Coppin's 5th President on January 14, 2008, and am deeply committed to advancing excellence and effectiveness in all areas in support of the University’s important legacy, mission, goals and strategic initiatives.

Coppin State University has been honored to have been reaffirmed by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education for several years, and we are hopeful of yet another positive review. We value the important reaffirmation process and the ultimate benefits to be obtained by the University. Your review and feedback are important to us as we strive for excellence to become a University where “Nurturing Potential…and Transforming Lives” becomes an integral part of all that we do.

Thank you for your important efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Reginald S. Avery
President
EXCLUSIVE SUMMARY

Introduction – Coppin State University (CSU) is pleased to present its decennial self-study, Pioneering Academic and Community Innovation through Technology, to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), in preparation for its scheduled review for reaffirmation of accreditation. This self-study report provides a comprehensive review and analysis of evidence, which shows CSU in compliance with all fourteen standards as outlined in the MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education (2006).

Since 2003, considerable changes have occurred at Coppin State University: a change in presidential leadership, a change in the status of the institution, and a change in the physical plant, to name a few. Because of these and other important changes, CSU chose a comprehensive approach to its self-study. The comprehensive approach has enabled the institution to examine and assess the impact these changes, as well as others, have had on the University and to position it to meet future opportunities and challenges. The CSU community believes that this self-study reflects two of CSU’s fundamental characteristics – continuity and innovation. These characteristics have gained even greater importance now that the institution has attained University status. The title of the self-study, Pioneering Academic and Community Innovation through Technology, was chosen both to represent the historic mission of the University and to acknowledge the use of technology to advance that mission and to foster innovation.

Standard One: Mission, Goals, and Objectives – CSU continuously reassesses its mission, goals and objectives. In 2005, 11 strategic planning attributes or priorities included in the mission statement were examined. The top five mission attributes for CSU institutional and aspirational peers were: academic excellence, community development, student development, urban agenda, and diversity. Overall, the two most important mission priorities were academic excellence and community development. Unlike the recent review (2005) of the institutional mission statement, the current list of institutional peers and aspirational peers has not been reevaluated since 2002. It is recommended that the current list of peer institutions for CSU be reexamined.

Standard Two: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal – Accountability reports required by the University System of Maryland (USM), the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), the Department of Budget and Management, the U. S. Department of Education, and the Office of Civil Rights, ensure that assessment and accountability are integral components of ongoing planning and resource allocation practices. Led by a Planning Council charged with leading the University’s efforts with respect to ongoing institutional renewal, CSU faculty, staff, and administrators have made a commitment to a culture of continuous planning, research, assessment, and accountability. These efforts enable CSU to measure overall effectiveness towards the achievement of its mission and goals. It is recommended that CSU continue to evaluate its strategic planning and resource allocation processes.
Standard Three: Institutional Resources – To achieve CSU’s strategic goals and objectives concerning facility development, and meet some of the institution’s severe space limitations, construction is underway on the $73 million, 160,000 square-foot Health and Human Services Building. Subsequently, fall of 2009 will mark the completion of the new Physical Education Complex ($137 million). An advanced information technology infrastructure remains a priority.

Innovations in digital technologies have markedly increased the use of information technologies in all facets of campus life—academic and administrative. Information technologies and information systems are increasingly perceived as vital assets, enabling CSU to accomplish its mission, realize its strategic priorities, and enhance institutional operations. Although CSU has been able to meet its commitment to students, faculty, staff, and the community, drastic under-funding over the years has resulted in a number of challenges. It is recommended that CSU identify more revenue opportunities through fiscal management strategies, tuition containment and fundraising. In addition, CSU should continue to seek funds to renovate or replace its buildings.

Standard Four: Leadership and Governance – There are provisions for collegial governance on campus, with opportunities, as appropriate, for different constituencies to have roles in policy development and decision-making. In 2004-2005, regular faculty actively participated in planning for a reorganization of the academic division. Both faculty and staff were actively consulted when the executive decision was made to place employees on temporary furlough in 2003-2004. The evaluation of CSU’s compliance with Standard Four, Leadership and Governance, resulted in a recommendation for a plan to enhance governance.

Standard Five: Administration – CSU is in compliance with expectations relative to its administrative oversight as provided by the collective leadership of the Executive Council. The Administration seeks to be compliant through learning and research/scholarship to foster quality improvement and support for CSU’s organization and governance.

Standard Six: Integrity – CSU provides full access to its policies and procedures through both hard and online copies. Faculty and students participate through a variety of means to communicate their interests and concerns. CSU requires that all course syllabi adhere to standards of basic content with the specification that all courses complete a faculty evaluation form. With this in mind, it is recommended that the academic administration establish clear mechanisms to review the specific departmental course syllabi to ensure adherence to standards of basic content and to provide clear and specific feedback to faculty. Department chairs should discuss the results of end-of-semester faculty evaluations with each member of their departments with a view toward continuous improvement.

Standard Seven: Institutional Assessment – A holistic approach is used in crafting the University Assessment model, which encompasses a three level approach to assessment (institution, program, and course). In addition to facilitating this process, an Assessment Steering Committee was created to facilitate ongoing assessment at the institution. This committee’s charge is to ensure that assessment is happening at all levels within the institution along with appropriate assessment measures and continuous improvement efforts. A unique contribution of
this assessment model is that it integrates the use of technology throughout the assessment process. Using technical resources, CSU has the ability to make real-time decisions that are more reflective of the ever-changing learning environment. The assessment model positioned here is an inclusive model, which allows for feedback from all CSU’s constituencies in an effort to promote continuous improvement.

**Standard Eight: Student Admissions and Retention** – Retention and graduation rates reflect the increase in students’ progression and degree completion. However, there is a strong need to institutionalize enrollment and retention efforts for targeting specific student populations. CSU is aggressively working to resolve its enrollment and retention issues. As a result, the Financial Aid Office (FAO) has become far more effective and efficient in meeting the needs of students. Additionally, the recent implementation of instructional technology and EagleLINKS (PeopleSoft) has provided the institution with a greater opportunity to meet its mission while student placements have positively affected enrollment behaviors for new students. Currently, several initiatives assist prospective and currently enrolled students in addressing academic and career goals i.e., Black Male Initiative Taskforce, Office of Academic Advising, and the securing of additional institutional financial aid.

**Standard Nine: Student Support Services** – A comprehensive program of student support services complemented by a knowledgeable and committed staff and guided by a broad-based institutional commitment to excellence in urban education is essential to fostering an environment where Coppin State University students can achieve their educational and personal goals. However, limited resources such as finances and the need to enhance the number of core faculty and staff in critical support areas, prevent CSU from having stronger programs across the institution. Despite these limited resources, CSU does an exceptional job with respect to the provision of program and services. However, appropriate and sufficient resources will enable the institution to: (1) increase the range of services and access to facilities for evening, weekend, and commuter students; (2) offer new students the opportunity to participate in self-assessment and career exploration using the System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI) during their orientation to CSU; and (3) develop a campus-wide policy for records that is compliant with federal, state and local mandates.

**Standard Ten: Faculty** – CSU has inaugurated several measures to increase the institutional support needed to enhance the depth and breadth of faculty excellence in teaching, scholarship and service. An increase in Title III funds has enabled CSU to increase its financial commitment to faculty development and research. Qualified regular faculty across the liberal arts and professional disciplines at the institution are engaged in service initiatives that embody the vision and spirit of CSU’s mission with respect to the needs and aspirations of African Americans living in Baltimore City. Reasonable measures are in place to ensure that Coppin recruits and maintains sufficient faculty who are appropriately qualified and credentialed to support undergraduate and graduate curriculum and instruction in the liberal arts and the professional disciplines offered by the University. CSU provides faculty and staff on-going opportunities to be trained in the use of instructional and information technologies. However, CSU faculty continues to carry the heaviest teaching load of any institution in the University System of Maryland (USM).
Standard Eleven: Educational Offerings – The self-study report includes evidence that CSU offers appropriate curriculum and courses of study that guide the institution in the fulfillment of its mission, evidenced by course syllabi, accreditation process, periodic program review, and self-studies comparing peer institutions’ retention and graduation rates. Certificate programs at the institution, both non-degree and degree oriented, range from Day Care certification (non-degree) to advanced licensing in Rehabilitation Counseling (post-Master’s degree) and are consistent with the mission and external standards. In addition to the main campus, CSU offers courses at three other instructional sites: Baltimore City, Prince George’s County, and St. Mary’s County. CSU has also developed over 50 on-line courses and more than 60 technology-enhanced courses through the use of Blackboard and Tegrity. Off-campus courses, technology enhanced courses and on-line courses meet the same standards as other courses offered at CSU.

Standard Twelve: General Education – An aggressive campaign to assess student-learning outcomes has been launched to ensure that proper interventions are implemented to improve general education requirements and course level performance. During the summer of 2007, the Math faculty redesigned the Developmental Math courses, which included more time allocated for lab and enhanced assessment measures. The first of these redesigned courses was piloted in fall 2007. Additionally, the English department has been cited as having courses that need further redesign to address unprepared student needs. Specifically, actions are underway to assess Accuplacer and to address the need for a lower level English course for students who cannot successfully pass EN 101. Continuous professional development and training is required for general education assessment to be ongoing and embraced by faculty.

Standard Thirteen: Educational Programs – CSU has developed a systematic approach to assist underprepared students achieve success. This approach combines mandatory placement testing, developmental and modified courses, academic support services and summer pre-college programs. The institution needs to re-evaluate the use of the placement tests. At present, the tests only have a direct impact on placement in developmental math courses. It appears that supplemental diagnostic tools administered during the first two weeks of classes have more of an impact on Reading and English placement of CSU students.

Standard Fourteen: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – Coppin State University’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process provides both formative and summative feedback relative to institutional effectiveness. Through data collection and analysis, snapshots of how well CSU serves students, and the nature of their success are taken, which in turn are shared and used by faculty, students and administrators to improve programs, services and learning. Using PeopleSoft, CSU has developed specialized Assessment modules for warehousing critical institutional effectiveness indicators. Notably, the School of Education was reaccredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education programs and the Maryland State Department of Education during spring 2006, the School of Nursing received a favorable review during the fall semester and the Department of Social Work is scheduled for review in spring 2008. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) was re-activated in 2001 to facilitate internal academic program reviews and provide ongoing assessment of all programs. In spring 2006, CSU administered the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus.
Conclusion: Finally, as a result of the comprehensive studies, research, and analysis undertaken in order to prepare this comprehensive self-study report, CSU finds it is in compliance with all fourteen standards found in the MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education (2006). CSU continues to pioneer academic and community innovation through technology in support of its mission and commitment to its students. Moreover, CSU continues to implement innovative solutions not only to address its concerns but to pursue and advance opportunities for its faculty, staff, students, and community. …Powered by information technology as the centerpiece for all institutional operations, “Coppin State University embodies … and leverages the technology as a tool for improving teaching and learning practices, client, management, and student services:…” (p. 9, CSU in 2010).
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INTRODUCTION

Since its last review in 2003 by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), considerable changes have occurred at Coppin State University (CSU): a change in presidential leadership, a change in the status of the institution, and changes that have doubled the size of the physical plant, to name a few. Because of these and other changes, CSU chose a comprehensive approach to its self-study. The comprehensive self-study (see CSU Self-Study Design, Appendix 1.11) has enabled CSU to determine the extent to which it complies with each of the 14 MSCHE accreditation standards as defined in the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education (2006). This self-study report, Pioneering Academic and Community Innovation through Technology, provides a comprehensive review and analysis of evidence relative to stated self-study outcomes, and a summary analysis of relevant strengths and challenges, with recommendations for improvement and continued compliance with accreditation standards.

One of the most fundamental changes to occur is that the advancement of CSU has become a primary goal of State lawmakers, the University System of Maryland (USM) Office of the Chancellor, the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and other varied external and internal constituencies. After the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) mandated that an independent study team make recommendations about the revitalization of Coppin State College (CSC) in 2001, those recommendations were adopted and supported by the State in 2002 and beyond. CSU continues to strive to achieve the recommendations delineated in the oft-quoted report--Independent Study Team Report on the Revitalization of Coppin State College (2001) as well as subsequent institutional strategic plans (2002, 2005, and 2007) and the master facilities plan (2002). It should be noted that these subsequent plans incorporated many of the 2001 study team’s recommendations (all of these reports and plans are presented at Appendix 1.2., 2.6 and Appendix 3.3). New academic programs have been added and more are being planned for implementation. CSU continues its specialized accreditations, with reaffirmations in education, nursing, and social work in 2006, 2007, and 2008, respectively. Additional specialized accreditations are being planned for the visual and performing arts programs, with an initial candidate review in 2009. A physical plant expansion similar to the type our peer institutions enjoy is well underway: construction of the Health and Human Services building is scheduled for completion in fall 2008 and the Physical Education Complex is scheduled to be completed in 2009. As a result, CSU is better positioned to provide the programs, facilities, and services its students demand and deserve.

Institutional Overview

Founded in 1900, Coppin State University (CSU) is a comprehensive, urban institution offering programs in liberal arts, sciences, and professional disciplines. Named in honor of an outstanding African-American educator, Fanny Jackson Coppin, CSU has reaffirmed its dedication to excellence in teaching and student success. As a Historically Black Institution, CSU fulfills a particularly important mission of access for primarily first-generation college students in the State of Maryland. In fiscal 2005, the proportion of CSU students who qualified for Federal Pell Grants was approximately 60 percent, higher than on any other campus in the USM, where the average is around 35 percent (Governor’s Budget Books, Fiscal 2008, R30B27
– USM – Coppin State University, Analysis of the FY 2008 Maryland Executive Budget, 2007, p. 11). Pell grants are an indicator of the financial need of an institution’s students.

CSU recruits prospective students from Baltimore City and the surrounding counties, nationally, and internationally. CSU’s students have varied academic backgrounds and postsecondary preparation. Historically, the student body has been predominantly African American, female, non-traditional, and commuter. The current student body is reflective of these characteristics. In fall 2007, 3,932 CSU students were enrolled—3,242 were undergraduate students and 690 were graduate students. The average age of the student population is 29. For the freshman class entering fall 2006, the average SAT score was 850. Students of color comprise more than 98 percent of the student population, and 92 percent are African-American. The majority (89 percent) are in-state residents who reside in the City of Baltimore (45.6 percent) and the surrounding counties (44.4 percent) of Maryland. Of the 10 percent out-of-state student population, 6.6 percent live in the United States and 3.4 percent are from foreign countries. CSU provides educational access to students with all levels of placement test scores.

With a faculty of 262 and a staff of 367, CSU offers excellence in academic programming with 55 majors and minors and 11 graduate-degree programs. The faculty works in the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Professional Studies, Nursing, Graduate Studies, and the Honors College. CSU advances faculty (133 full-time and 129 part-time) who are evaluated by students and peers as excellent teachers; evidence of scholarly contributions and growth is expected.

CSU is classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a Master’s (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I (MA I) institution, and is accredited by the National League for Nursing, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the Council on Rehabilitation Education, the Council on Social Work Education, and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

Institutional Identity

Founded in 1900 as a one-year training program, CSU’s highly focused mission was to prepare teachers for public schools in a growing urban center. CSU became a city normal school in 1926 and a teachers college in 1930, grew into a comprehensive college in 1970, and in 1988 joined the USM. CSU’s history and location allow it to perform a unique role that has not been duplicated by any other institution within USM.

Throughout its 107-year history, a point of institutional pride has been the steady contribution to the city, state, and nation. As CSU has grown, its connections with the community have deepened and matured, serving as a model for how urban colleges and universities can operate in the 21st century. CSU serves a community that is 99 percent African American, in which more than one-third of the households are headed by women, and 27 percent of the residents earn less than $15,000 annually. The neighborhood suffers from a crime rate that is among the highest in Baltimore. The campus traditionally hosts a variety of community-oriented events, from high school graduations to summer day camps. CSU is ideal for these purposes because the campus has the size and feel of a close-knit “learning community” that encourages exploration and public service. The University’s location sends a twofold message:
education is critical to this particular community’s future and viability, and higher education is within this community’s reach. These factors only intensify CSU’s urban-based mission. (Report of the Independent Study Team on the Revitalization of CSU State College, September 2001, pp. 1-2).

Addressing accessibility for those historically underrepresented in higher education while valuing community outreach and service is the underlying theme of the institutional mission. CSU seeks to fulfill and extend the role of providing access to a wide range of high quality educational programs at the baccalaureate and master levels as a means of economic, educational, intellectual, professional, and social mobility for its primary constituency--students whose promise may have been hindered by limited social, personal or financial opportunities. CSU is committed to promoting educational excellence and fostering student success. The University is equally committed to excellence in teaching, research, and continuing service to its community. By strengthening existing programs in the liberal arts and sciences, humanities, education, and nursing, and adding new programs in allied health, science and technology, CSU is poised to address the critical shortages of teachers, nurses, and science and technology professionals across the State.

Located on 52 acres on West North Avenue in the west central section of Baltimore City, CSU utilizes its resources to meet urban needs when those needs are aligned with its mission, goals, objectives, and academic programs. For example, the American Humanics program is a stellar example of how an academic program can link service learning to applied research within the social science curriculum (see Appendix 1.12). The American Humanics program¹ at CSU prepares students (35 students and 9 graduates) for nonprofit careers and collaborates with the local branches of National Nonprofit Partners by providing internship and career placement opportunities that offer students professional development and visibility in the community. The American Humanics program allows CSU students to help fulfill the University’s outreach mission and to achieve their professional and personal goals to enhance their communities.

An institutional pioneer in urban education, CSU established the Urban Education Corridor initiative as the first higher education institution in the State to assume responsibility for the restructuring and administration of a public elementary/middle school and a public high school (see Appendix 1.13). Similarly, CSU will expand the Nurse Managed Community Health Center and provide added health services to the community. The School of Management Science and Economics has a program to support small business owners, a project to assist individuals with credit/debt related problems (Consumer Education Center), and a tax preparation program for those in the community who cannot afford to pay for the services. The Community Revitalization Study (see Appendix 1.4), sponsored by CSU and the Greater Coppin Heights neighborhood associations, engaged the west Baltimore community in a University led urban renewal program.

¹ American Humanics is a national partnership of colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations with a mission to educate, prepare, and certify professionals in an effort to strengthen and someday lead nonprofit organizations. The 21-credit program is geared toward students interested in a future of non-profit management and leadership.
CSU has utilized its resources to effect change in light of the urban ills that exist in west Baltimore, through partnerships with the Baltimore City Public School System, the Nurse Managed Community Health Clinic, the Consumer Education Center, and the Community Development Center. These partnerships model how urban institutions can use their resources to uplift urban communities where they are located. In each case, the community outreach is tied to an academic program, where faculty and students engage in service learning and applied research projects.

**Institutional Capabilities**

To promote achievement and competency, CSU offers rigorous educational programs, expects students to pursue the highest levels of academic achievement and standards of conduct, provides appropriate student support and enrichment opportunities, and employs a process of accountability. Building upon its legacy of expanding higher education access to students who traditionally have been underrepresented, CSU plans to continue to offer enrichment bridge programs for students needing some developmental learning experiences. Equally important, CSU will expand the recruitment of students for its honors program. By creating a common ground of intellectual commitment in a supportive learning community, CSU educates and empowers its diverse student body to lead by the substance and force of its ideas—to become critical, creative and compassionate citizens of the community and leaders of the world, with a commitment to lifelong learning and dedicated public service.

Through information technology and telecommunications, Coppin State University advances the understanding and use of emerging technologies by integrating technology into all teaching and learning practices, client, management and student services, and institutional advancement operations. With a commitment to develop a savvy web citizenry and in preparation of the millennial generation, CSU continues to make substantial investments in its information technology infrastructure. The result is a globally renowned information technology program that supports academic excellence, student access and academic success for new workforce careers in a global economy.

The renovation of existing buildings and the construction of new buildings will secure a campus environment that fosters excellence in teaching, service, and research, and increased student enrollment and success (see Chapter 3, pp. 18 to 19 for more details). By refocusing and retooling fundraising capabilities, CSU will increase private support for student scholarships and the retention of renowned faculty.

In order for CSU to continue to maintain diversity across educational and campus climate experiences for students, faculty, and staff, collaborative relationships exist with other public and private institutions. Working with other USM institutions, state agencies, local schools, and business and industry, CSU continues to take the leading role in the economic revitalization of its immediate community. CSU is a vital resource for the educational, economic, recreational, and cultural needs of the citizens of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, providing access to its facilities and expertise in the academic disciplines, professional fields, and the fine and performing arts.
Conclusion

With the significant changes that abound on the campus, including increased capital-funding opportunities, it is imperative that CSU continue to assess its present strengths and challenges in order to ensure continuous quality improvement by the most effective and efficient means. This self-study report assesses the next steps in planning for and assuring CSU’s capacity to absorb expected increases in enrollment, academic programs, community partnerships, and campus facilities on the road to pioneering academic and community innovation through technology.
MISSION AND GOALS

Standard 1

Introduction

Since its founding, inextricable ties between access and public service roles and the effective integration of the two roles have characterized the institutional mission. The mission clearly defines the institution’s purpose within the context of higher education, indicates those whom the institution seeks to serve, and outlines what the institution seeks to accomplish.

CSU provides educational access and diverse opportunities for students with a high potential for success and for students whose promise may have been hindered by a lack of social, personal or financial opportunity. High quality academic programs offer innovative curricula, and the latest advancements in technology prepare students for new workforce careers in a global economy. By creating a common ground of intellectual commitment in a supportive learning community, CSU educates and empowers a diverse student body to lead by the force of its ideas to become critical, creative and compassionate citizens of the community and leaders of the world, with a heart for lifelong learning and dedicated public service. CSU applies its resources to meet urban needs, especially those of Baltimore City, wherever those applications mesh well with its academic programs. (Coppin State University Institutional Mission, December 2005).

Rationale for CSU Mission Statement

As a part of the 2001 revitalization study of Coppin State College (CSC), an independent study team as tasked by the Office of Civil Rights, the USM, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) recommended to CSC, now CSU, that its institutional mission be broadened. This mandate led to a total of four research-based strategic planning efforts (see Appendix 1.7) for advancing and enhancing its mission, academic programs, student mix, administrative and faculty staffing, institutional advancement, fiscal affairs, and physical plant. All of the efforts required the involvement of internal and external constituencies. Armed with the findings of these studies, the University Planning Council was charged with taking the best of all of the reports and deciding whether there were recommendations, suggestions, or observations that should be included in our vision in the 21st century.

In addition, the MHEC routinely conducts a review of institutional missions of the colleges and universities in the State every three years. The Planning Council, whose membership represents all CSU internal constituencies, takes the lead in facilitating any review of the institutional mission statement. The president ultimately reviews the Planning Council’s recommendations concerning the institutional mission.

Since 2001, CSU has submitted for approval four iterations of its mission statement. Key elements found in earlier CSU mission statements are still included. The emphasis on aligning academic programs with public service has remained an underlying attribute. In addition, two bulwark attributes remain as well:

a.) advancing technology to create a supportive learning community, and
b.) providing educational access and diverse opportunities for students with a high potential for success and for students whose promise may have been hindered by a lack of social, personal or financial opportunity remain integral attributes of CSU’s mission.

To facilitate an assessment of the University mission statement in accordance with MHEC and USM requirements, the Planning Council commissioned an intensive qualitative research methodology. With 11 strategic planning attributes or priorities included in the mission statement as independent variables, the mission statements of CSU and its ten institutional and five aspirational peers were assessed in order to find common mission priorities unique to an urban comprehensive institution such as CSU. The eleven strategic planning attributes or priorities were: academic excellence, academic innovation, access, applied learning, collaboration, community development, diversity, institutional assessment, student development, urban agenda, and workforce development. For this assessment, 16 peer institutions were classified by institutional and aspirational status. Institutional peers included: Alabama State University, Alcorn State University, Chicago State University, Columbus State University, Fort Valley State University, New Jersey City University, New Mexico Highlands University, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, Sul Ross State University, and Western New Mexico University. Aspirational peers included: California State University, San Marcos; New Mexico Highlands University; New Jersey City University; Texas A&M International University; and Western New Mexico University (see Appendix 1.4.)

The top five mission statement attributes for these current and aspirational peers were: academic excellence, community development, student development, urban agenda, and diversity. Overall, the two most important mission priorities reflected in the sample were academic excellence and community development.

As Tables 1.1 and 1.2 indicate, these assessments revealed that CSU’s mission statement is in alignment with its peer institutions. (For more details, see Mission Study Results, Appendix 1.6)

Table 1.1: Mission Statement Code by Peer Institutions (Current Peers Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION CODE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Agenda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: Mission Statement Code by Institutions (Current and Aspirational)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION CODE</th>
<th>PEER INSTITUTION CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 16 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Excellence</td>
<td>2 2 4 2 10 6 4 2 1 6 2 6 2 5 5 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 2 0 1 0 0 1 1 2 1 2 1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Learning</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1 2 5 2 7 1 7 3 2 7 2 3 1 3 2 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 4 2 6 0 0 5 1 1 0 1 1 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Assessment</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 2 3 4 2 2 3 3 6 2 4 0 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Agenda</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 3 4 1 2 2 3 1 1 1 1 1 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9 5 11 7 29 17 23 9 7 27 10 20 7 17 12 210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an annual retreat, the Executive Council, which is comprised of all senior administrators on campus, engages in goal-setting for CSU. Goal-setting by the senior administrators and the units, departments, divisions, and schools they represent on campus is followed up by the development of goals and objectives by the college-wide Planning Council and/or a subcommittee of the Council. One outcome of these deliberations is the development of the University’s strategic plan by the Office of Planning and Assessment staff. An annual review of the goals and strategies in the plan is conducted, and progress reports are prepared which document the status of institutional goals, strategies, and objectives.

Since 2004, the institutional goals and strategies are disseminated via technology (list serve) to the University family for review and comments, at division and department level staff meetings, faculty meetings, and other conferences on campus. Goals and strategies are evaluated annually, particularly as budget priorities are set. Assessment tools are used to determine whether goals and strategies have been met. (see Progress Report Matrices at Appendix 1.5).

Conclusion
The current mission statement (December 2005, see p. 6) contains three noteworthy changes. First, CSU commits to prepare students for new workforce careers in a global economy. Second, CSU is adding new programs in science and technology to address the critical shortages of teachers, nurses, and science and technology professionals across the State of Maryland. Third, CSU will enhance opportunities to educate and empower a diverse student body to become critical, creative, and compassionate citizens of the community and leaders of the world.

Strengths
1. CSU has created several task forces to address critical areas
2. The University has enhanced their technology infrastructure to intra-face with academic programs and produce data analysis more efficiently
3. CSU has aligned all academic programs with the University’s mission and with its goals to increase public service to outside constituents

---

2 Academic excellence, student success, facility development, and external relations.
Recommendation

1. Reexamine the list of institutional and aspirational peers, established in 2002, to ensure ongoing congruence between stated goals and priorities and the University mission and vision.
Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Standard 2

Introduction

For the purpose of continued institutional renewal, faculty, staff, and administrators at Coppin State have committed to a culture of planning, research, assessment, and accountability. In particular, one year prior to its periodic review report for reaffirmation of accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, internal and external constituencies participated in an extensive study of all aspects of CSU. Campus-wide research studies led by external consultants appointed by the University System of Maryland Office of the Chancellor and the Office of the Secretary, the Maryland Higher Education Commission centered on enhancing the mission, academic programs, student mix, administrative and faculty staffing, institutional advancement, fiscal affairs, and the physical plant. The results of these studies were used in crafting new and broadened vision and mission statements, and institutional goals that directly emanated from the enhanced vision and mission statements.

Strategic Planning at Coppin State: A New Vision, A New Reality, A New Coppin

Historically, this single development has had a profound effect on planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal. In December 2000, Maryland’s Report and the Partnership Agreement between the State of Maryland and the U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights was developed and signed by the Governor. Within the Partnership Agreement was the call for a legislated independent study on the revitalization of Coppin State College that would lead to a Report and follow-up comprehensive strategic plan and the facilities masters plan. The written plan, Coppin State University in the 21st Century: An Emerging Presence, was developed under the leadership of the Planning Council (see Planning Council minutes at Appendix 2.1) and with the Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment as staff for the Planning Council. The plan was organized around five institutional goals designed to advance a vision of the University as a model urban comprehensive liberal arts institution. The five goals were restructure and strengthen academic programs, enhance student success, leverage the usage of information technology, construct and renovate facilities, and diversify funding sources.

Similarly, the Planning Council and the Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment have led the development of all subsequent strategic plans for CSU. The Planning Council\(^3\) is comprised of senior administrators on campus who represent all campus constituencies.

The USM Board of Regents requires that each USM institution align its strategic plan with the USM strategic plan, supporting system-wide goals and objectives. Those system-wide goals and objectives are developed in response to environmental scans concerning the state’s demographic and work force trends. Appendix 2.2 is the full table which shows how the

---

\(^3\) The President organized the Planning Council in 1979. It is comprised of senior administrators that represent the total campus community: Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Deans, President of the Faculty Senate, and Directors. The Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment serves as Chairperson of the Council. Responsibility for establishment and oversight of the planning process rests with the Planning Council.
University plan is aligned with the USM strategic plan and the MHEC state plan for postsecondary education.

The Coppin State University strategic plan and other operational and academic planning documents are systematically reviewed against strategic indicators in relation to institutional and aspirational peer institutions (see Peer Performance Reports, Managing for Results Reports, Appendixes 2.3, 2.4). Accordingly, changes in strategies and unit-level plans, particularly resource allocation decisions, are made as needed.

Of the recommendations included in the Report of the Independent Study Team on the Revitalization of Coppin State College and the subsequent strategic plans in 2002, 2004, and 2005, the most dramatic recommendations and strategies focused on new construction and renovated facilities needed to support a more suitable teaching/learning environment for a model comprehensive urban university (see Chapter 3, pp.17-18). The Report provided data in support of Strategic Goal 3 to construct and renovate facilities which were found to be substandard for future institutional purposes. New and thoroughly renovated facilities were proposed as the remedy supported by data in the Physical Plant Analysis chapter of the Report. Of the twelve strategies for Strategic Goal 3, many have been implemented, including the Miles Connor Administration Building façade, the Grace Jacobs elevators additions/upgrade, the upgrade of campus utilities and infrastructure. The campus acreage has increased significantly, from 32 acres to 52 acres, and the construction of the Health and Human Services Building across North Avenue represents a significant expansion of campus boundaries. The presence of new construction and renovated facilities on campus reflects unprecedented capital in CSU.

Through the efforts of the Planning Council, CSU continuously assesses its institutional goals and strategies, guided by CSU’s abiding principles for continuous improvement. The following four institutional goals, which reflect a rededication to CSU’s urban mission were adopted: academic excellence, student success, facility development, and external relations. The strategic plan estimates the resources needed to accomplish these four strategic goals.

The senior administrators utilize the strategic plan to develop and justify annual state funding requests for programmatic enhancements. Internal Audit, in collaboration with the USM Comptroller and Coppin State University Financial Management, worked to assess the University’s finance function by documenting business and system process flows, identifying control gaps and areas of improvement, prioritizing issues, and developing corrective action plans. Additionally, the University Division of Administration and Finance took the lead, in collaboration with the Finance Assessment Steering Committee, to examine the budgeting function to ensure proper fiscal management and linkage with the University’s strategic plan. Based on the findings and recommended action plans of the Finance Assessment Steering Committee, in March 2006, the Committee produced the Finance Function Assessment Plan (see Appendix 2.5), which, in summary, encourages improved utilization of resources.
The plan was posted on the website via technology (list serve) for review and comments by CSU faculty, staff, student leaders, and administrators⁴. Based on an analysis of the feedback, an environmental scan was conducted (see Appendix 2.9), and the results were summarized in the 2007 edition of the University strategic plan. Additionally, a fifth goal, effectiveness and efficiency, was added. Institutional goals and strategies were reassessed and evaluated by senior administrators, and subsequently, some strategies were revised.

Conclusion
The current strategic plan (2007), with articulated goals and strategies, represents the collective thinking of CSU’s internal and external constituencies, with a focus on the most efficient and effective ways to accomplish a new vision and a new reality for the University.

Strengths
1. CSU has an active strategic planning process and systematically conducts strategic change.
2. The Planning efforts include both internal and external constituencies in our effort to have shared governance.

Recommendation
1. CSU should continue systematic evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support.

⁴ CSU utilizes varied media to communicate campus activities, services, and resources to students, faculty, staff and the surrounding community. CSU communications can be categorized in three basic areas: e-mail, website, and external media. In communicating to internal and external university constituencies about the university mission statement, strategic plan, self-study and other important planning documents for example, e-mail and the website were utilized.
Institutional Resources

Standard 3

Introduction

The effective use and management of human resources, physical facilities, learning resources, information technology, and financial resources at Coppin State University contributes to the institution’s purpose and mission. The chapter focuses on how CSU has organized its resources for the efficient and effective operations of the University.

Human Resources Assessment

The Coppin State University (CSU) Human Resources (HR) department seeks to create and sustain a highly qualified workforce and a quality of work life that will assist CSU in fulfilling its mission. Human Resources is committed to quality, timely, and accurate service using cost-effective, best-practice methods with the highest professional and ethical standards. The Human Resources Office is responsible for:

- Working with CSU leaders to assess human resource goals and expectations.
- Creating a work environment that encourages employees to maximize their performance, while achieving their personal and professional aspirations as they work toward accomplishing CSU’s mission.
- Providing a full range of professional support and service in the area of employment for faculty, staff and external clients.

Human Resources focuses on the recruitment, management and direction of the employees of CSU, while complying with all applicable laws and regulations. Efficient human resources management supports the institution’s mission and goals. The results of the HR assessment disclosed:

- A systematic process for salary review and upgrades is instituted and reviewed annually;
- Federal, state and local regulations and legislations are adhered to;
- Critical CSU projects and programs are successful because of the hiring of high level candidates;
- Hiring and dismissals are executed in accordance with federal and state regulations and legislations;
- Database technology is used to efficiently and accurately complete the hiring process;
- Employees’ benefit programs are efficiently administered, in accordance with federal and state regulations and legislations; and
- The HR departments have specialists who are responsible for employment management, EEO/affirmative action, job analysis, employee benefits, employee assistance, training and development, and labor relations.

These services include: Recruitment, Hiring and Retention, Benefit Administration, Safety Administration, HR Policies and Procedures, Professional Training and Development, Performance Management, Mediation, Wage and Salary Plan, Employee Relations, and Employee Satisfaction.
**Training and Development**

Training and development are made available to improve individual and organizational performance, which will assist in the achievement of the institutional mission and goals. Coppin State University uses a combination of classroom training, web-based tutorials, and self-directed learning online programs, to provide employees with opportunities to advance their professional capabilities. The Information Technology Division provides instructor-led information technology training to assist employees to increase their effectiveness and to gain knowledge of CSU’s operations.

In addition to instruction in software usage, academic courseware, personnel functions, financial operations and student records, CSU uses SkillSoft, a business skills development training via the Internet. There are more than 3,000 courses available offering a wide variety of training opportunities designed to enhance critical business, professional and information technology (IT) skills. This program will support the commitment to provide employees with opportunities to grow and develop in their careers. Employees have the benefit of access training anytime and anyplace with SkillSoft.

Tuition remission benefits are available for permanent faculty and staff. The program allows enrollment for undergraduate and graduate classes at CSU, other institutions of the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University.

**Performance Management Process**

The Office of Human Resources coordinates the process for periodically evaluating and appraising employee performance. In the University System of Maryland it is called the Performance Management Process (PMP)\(^6\). The PMP is an ongoing process for communicating about performance and helping people achieve excellence in their jobs. It involves goal-setting, feedback, coaching, evaluation and development planning. It is a process that supervisors and employees actively use throughout the year. All regular non-faculty employees should have a PMP performance evaluation once each year.

CSU finds that it is important for supervisors and their staff to conduct annual performance appraisals to sustain CSU’s mission and goals. In accordance with state policies, supervisors prepare PMPs in April followed up with a review of goals and objectives in September.

**Personnel Data**

Coppin State University achievements and progression would not have happened without its personnel. The institution cannot function without quality individuals. CSU has six personnel position types: Regular Exempt Positions, Regular Non-Exempt Positions, Contingent I Employment (Exempt or Non-Exempt), Contingent II Employment (Exempt or Non-Exempt),

---

\(^6\) PMP is based on the fundamental principles of performance management. According to the Performance Management Process: A Guide for Managers and Supervisors, employees will be more motivated, and will produce higher levels of productivity and quality of service, when they: have clearly defined objectives, know how their performance will be measured, understand how their work contributes to the success of their organization, receive timely and accurate feedback throughout the year, have a performance review discussion, with written documentation, at least once a year, and have recognition and rewards linked to their performance.
Regular Faculty Positions, and Adjunct Part-Time Appointments. For descriptions of the six personnel position types, refer to Appendix 3.1. Also included in Appendix 3.1 are Tables 3.1 and 3.2 which show the employment trends for fiscal years 2004 – 2007. As reflected in the tables, there has been an increase in human resources, especially in instruction, because instructional personnel are essential to fulfill the institution’s core mission.

Coppin State University’s wage and salary plans were developed to provide a flexible, market-competitive compensation program, which will: reward performance, encourage skill development, attract and retain qualified employees, provide career opportunities, and promote equity and consistency.

**Capital Planning Assessment**

Coppin State is recognized for its well manicured campus that has grown from 38 to 52 acres in recent years and sits in the heart of Northwest Baltimore, Maryland. Coppin moved to its present location in 1952. During the past 55 years, the campus has grown from one building to include 11 buildings. (See Appendix 3.4) The building area is now over 793,000 gross square feet. Guided by the Facilities Master Plan, CSU continues to develop land adjacent and within close proximity to the present campus.

The University’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is intended to support advancements in technology, instruction, campus safety, and the physical environments. The comprehensive facilities and infrastructure master plan, Coppin State College: An Emerging Presence, Facilities Master Plan: 2001 to 2011 (see Appendix 3.3) was approved by the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents in October 2002. The ten-year plan evaluates the physical state of the campus while mapping out the future of the institution, and is evaluated annually through the State’s capital budget funding cycle for the institution’s orderly growth. The plan is supported by self-studies and independent studies that identify the proficiency and efficiency of facility conditions.

The plan was initiated and developed by CSU’s Office of Capital Planning in conjunction with consultants and the campus community, which included faculty, staff, students, and administrators, thereby creating an inclusive assessment of the institution. Additionally, the Office of Capital Planning works in close consultation with external agencies, such as University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents (BOR), Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), Department of Budget and Management (DBM), Department of General Services (DGS), and other agencies as applicable throughout the program review and approval process.

Approximately $300 million has been authorized for facility upgrades and new construction. Examples include the following:

- Daley Residence Hall $14.5M Completed 2001
- Dining Hall $9.5M Completed 2003
- Administration Bldg. Façade $3.3M Completed 2006
- Lutheran Site Acquisition/Demo $3.0M Demolition Underway
- Telecommunications/IT Upgrades $9.7M Completed in 3 phases
- Health & Human Services Bldg. $72.3M Under Construction
To meet some of CSU’s space deficiencies, construction is underway on the $73 million, 168,106 gross square-foot Health and Human Services Building (HHSB). The building is scheduled to be completed fall 2008. The building is uniquely designed to accommodate academic excellence as well as community outreach as part of the institutional mission. The building will house clinical services, classrooms, labs, and offices for the Schools of Graduate Studies, Nursing, and Professional Studies. Subsequently, fall of 2009 will mark the completion of the new Physical Education Complex (PEC), 246,359 gross square-feet, $137 million project, which will house a state-of-the-art arena, gymnasium, swimming pool, fitness center, tennis courts, track field, classrooms, labs, and other academic and recreational space. The PEC will house the Facilities and Maintenance Department, Office of Public Safety, Procurement and Contracts Department, and the Office of Capital Planning, which currently occupies space in the Coppin Center, Tawes Center, and Frances Murphy Research Building, respectively.

There are several other capital projects underway. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is scheduled according to the timely availability of funds each year. While the development of some aspects of CSU’s physical facilities is underway and until additional new facilities are commissioned, CSU will continue to face space challenges with respect to the space needed to provide adequate educational, student support, administrative and recreational spaces.

Assessment has been conducted to gauge the impact of recent changes in institutional demographics, distance learning, increases in faculty and staff positions, and enrollment growth. The results of those assessments continue to be used to determine the effect on CSU’s existing facilities. These assessments have enabled the University to evaluate specific building issues related to the state of the art facilities, such as classrooms, labs, offices, study and stack space, student life, education, recreation, and sports to identify any other campus-wide needs. These and other detailed assessments and their timely implementation are used to determine effective and efficient use of physical facilities as well as renovation and remodeling of existing facilities.

CSU aligns its operational budget for long-range new and renovated facilities planning through the Office of Capital Planning. This office addresses the net impact on the operating budget for each new facility as a part of capital budget requests. The resulting information is then shared with other administrative departments on campus so that each unit might include any other anticipated facilities issues that might impact the overall CSU operating budget prior to its submission to USM. Coppin must adhere to USM policies that call for the preparation and completion of annual operating cost estimates that govern how future expansion will affect its capital and operational budget. With that, all new construction and facility upgrade requests
must have an approved program\(^7\) by the Department of Budget and Management before the project can be funded.

The use of surge space has become paramount in the transition of providing sufficient and appropriate space for CSU’s growing campus. CSU’s goal, which is aligned with its institutional priorities, is to provide its students with a learning environment that is conducive to student achievement and success. The realization of this goal is dependent on the construction of new physical facilities.

**Campus Safety**

Campus Police and the Department of Public Safety provide police and security services throughout the campus and the surrounding areas.

CSU complies with all federal standards for accessibility. All facilities are accessible to the physically challenged. Designated parking spaces and connecting wheelchair ramps are available in all parking lots. Each building has facilities to accommodate the physically disabled. Also, each building is equipped with voice or horn-system fire alarms with strobe lights and fire extinguishers. Newer buildings will have fire sprinklers.

Emergency blue phone poles are placed near parking lots, academic buildings, and walkways. Once a unit is activated, a bright flashing light is emitted to help attract attention to the situation. Each phone is equipped with an emergency button and a speaker phone. There are over 105 cameras throughout the campus. CSU has a crisis management team which coordinates responses to emergencies. The Department of Public Safety Crime/Incident reports for 2002-2007, found in Appendixes 9.19 – 9.24, show the lowest crime rates in the USM, despite CSU’s urban setting and open campus.

**Learning Resources Assessment**

The library, the academic resource center, and technology laboratories are integral to the overall teaching mission of CSU.

The library is a five-story, 80,827-square foot structure designed to house the library’s collections and services. The seating capacity is 750. The library is open 91 hours per week during the regular academic sessions, and it provides space for meetings, visual exhibits, special programs and receptions, and offices. The library has 40 public workstations to allow access to the Internet and various other networked resources along with two smart classrooms with 51 computers. In addition there is an open computer lab with 24 workstations.

The library’s core collection of over 475,000 volumes is comprised of monographs, microforms units, audio-visual units and serial subscriptions.

The library is a member of the University System of Maryland Library Information Management System (LIMS), a collaborative effort that permits thirteen libraries to share resources. LIMS provides a USM union on-line public access catalog (PAC), global circulations

---

\(^7\) A program is a detailed plan of a proposed renovation or new facility construction that outlines the purpose of the project and specific details of construction; thereby, no project is funded without proper justification or support.
functions and technical processing functions. A major advantage of LIMS is the accessibility to information resources including electronic indexes, encyclopedias and other reference materials, journals, and books.

The Academic Resource Center (ARC) is an academic support service available to all Coppin State University students. Each of the four labs – Mathematics Lab, Reading Lab, Science and Study Skills/CAI and Writing Lab – provides basic, intermediate and advanced level of instruction and tutoring. The staff consists of professionals and specially chosen and trained peer tutors. The ARC labs house a library of reference, which includes textbooks, practice exams, print exercises, and audiotapes. The ARC provides individual and group tutoring, computer assisted instruction, standardized test preparation, and workshops/training sessions.

CSU has exceptional information technology facilities and services. The University’s Information Technology Division supports over 20 computer laboratories, which house over 400 computers, located in academic buildings and residence halls (see Table 3.1). Many of these labs are open computer labs but several are subject/discipline specific. CSU has instructional software for chemistry, biology, nursing, English, mathematics, computer science, statistics, education, and reference suites.

CSU has smart and technology enhanced classrooms to connect teachers and students with new technologies (see Table 3.2). Smart classrooms integrate computer, multimedia and network technologies.

| Table 3.1: Coppin State University Computer Labs, 2007 |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Lab Location                    | Number of Labs    | Number of Computers |
| Grace Hill Jacobs Classroom Building | 13                | 217              |
| Parlett L. Moore Library        | 4                 | 115              |
| Percy Julian Science Building   | 2                 | 35               |
| Frances Murphy Research Center  | 1                 | 19               |
| Dedmond Residence Hall          | 1                 | 21               |
| Daley Residence Hall            | 1                 | 9                |
| Coppin (Athletics) Center      | 1                 | 6                |
| **Totals**                     | **23**            | **422**          |


| Table 3.2: Coppin State University Classrooms by Building, 2007 |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Building                        | Number of Classes | Average Capacity |
| Grace Hill Jacobs               | 35                | 28.71            |
| Percy Julian Science            | 15                | 25.66            |
| James Weldon Johnson Auditorium | 7                 | 34.29            |
| Coppin Center                   | 4                 | 25.00            |
| Parlett L. Moore Library        | 2                 | 19.50            |
| Frances Murphy Research Center  | 1                 | 40.00            |
| Charles St.-Temporary Site for Nursing | 4     | 40.50            |
| **Summary**                     | **68**            | **30.26**        |


In Appendix 3.1, Table 3.1 depicts the utilization of campus space by room type.
Three major buildings house CSU’s academic programs: Grace Hill Jacobs Building, Percy Julian Science Building, and James Weldon Johnson Auditorium. Most of CSU’s classrooms are located in the Grace Hill Jacobs Classroom Building. The building also houses the offices for most of the faculty. James Weldon Johnson Auditorium houses an auditorium, classrooms and practice rooms for music instruction and performances. Percy Julian Science Center supports the sciences and includes faculty offices, classrooms and laboratories. Additionally, the building supports the Studio Arts programs with studios. The other academic support facilities are the Coppin Center and the Parlett Longworth Moore Library.

**Information Technology Assessment**

Innovations in digital technologies have markedly increased the use of information technologies in all facets of university life. As such, information and information systems are increasingly perceived as vital assets, enabling the accomplishment of CSU’s mission and strategic priorities. CSU is taking several actions to systematically incorporate information technology in the day-to-day operations.

**Administrative Computer Systems**

Over the last five years new administrative systems have been installed, driven by the need to adopt best practices for operating an effective and efficient University. Guided by a phased-in implementation process CSU was able to go live with these systems on time and on budget.

- The PeopleSoft Financial System has enabled departments to have their financial information at all times on-line and real time. This system is being used to manage financial transactions and accounts status.
- CSU’s EagleLINKS Analytics is utilizing IStrategy software to operate an analytical system that serves as a data warehouse and provides access to data for operational and decision-making processes.
- Event and class scheduling has been enhanced by the use of Astra Scheduling software.
- The Office of Capital Planning uses CAD system to record physical plans, layouts and floor plans for CSU’s infrastructure and buildings.
- CSU’s text messaging system offers its student, faculty and staff populations a fast, convenient, 100% opt-in message, powered by e2Campus Inc. e2Campus is a patent pending universal notification system that allows designated administrators to send time-sensitive messages to the mobile phones, email, and/or pagers of their subscribers (students, faculty, staff, radio stations, TV stations and others). In the event of an emergency, subscribers can get notified immediately of the situation, wherever they are geographically.

In 2005, CSU introduced a web portal, EagleLINKS, gateway to access campus systems from a single web page. The portal is for students, faculty, and staff. EagleLINKS will offer
students a time-saving and convenient way to accomplish most standard administrative functions. Through EagleLINKS, students can access course schedule, grades, enrollment information, financial accounts, and library accounts. Students may also make electronic tuition payments through EagleLINKS e-payment system. Faculty and staff can access their time records, campus systems, the library’s catalogs and databases, human resources modules, financials modules, and student administration (which include online rosters and grade reports). Other features available via EagleLINKS are campus events and news, weather forecast, college catalogs, maps and directions, and faculty and staff directory.

Additional student services available include enrollment management, financial accounts management, student email accounts, student web space, electronic tuition payment, events calendar, and reserving and purchasing special event tickets.

In 2004, the president approved that e-mail would be CSU’s official form of communication. In 2006, the policy was revised; it now reads: Electronic messaging is the official Coppin State University means of communication. University employees and students must use the electronic messaging system when communicating electronically. The policy has been widely accepted by all parties.

Figure 3-1: Comparison of Student E-Mail Usage 2005-2007

Instructional Support Systems

The Blackboard courseware system was implemented in 1999 to improve student outcomes and enhance teaching and learning. Faculty has been able to develop custom learning paths for students, encourage student participation, communication and collaboration, and evaluate students’ work. In 2004, CSU added to their virtual classrooms initiative by launching the Tegrity software. Tegrity permits the professor to interact with both in-class and off-site students. Presentations can include streaming video of the professor, shared web pages, whiteboard notes and other features. The lecture is then archived and can be accessed on demand by both remote users and students who were in the classroom but want to review the material. Tegrity is available to students 24 hours, 7 days a week. By April 2006 there were 41 faculty members using Tegrity and 100 Tegrity courses. The infusion of instructional technology has enhanced the classroom experience.
Campus Computing

In 2002 the Office of Information Technology implemented a plan for advancing technology campus wide, (see Status of the Revised Information Technology Plan for 2002 and Beyond, Appendix 1.8).

CSU’s Center for Institutional Assessment conducts student computer usage surveys biannually. The survey includes questions assessing computer services and accessibility. The survey inquires about such data as computer ownership, internet accessibility, use of e-mail, and cell phone ownership. The results of the spring 2007 and 2005 surveys are included in Appendix 3.11.

Financial Management Assessment

The mission of the Division of Administration and Finance is to support CSU’s goals and objectives by providing critical business services and management of financial records to serve the needs of the students, faculty and staff. This division seeks to fulfill this mission by disseminating timely, accurate information related to financial administration and business practices that assist in day-to-day operations, reports on results of those operations, and increases awareness of current financial issues impacting higher education and CSU.

The Controller’s Office of the Division of Administration and Finance handles the collection, custody and disbursement of funds, the management of financial controls and the production of financial reports. The procurement and central receiving department (accountability for supplies and equipment), auxiliary enterprises, campus safety, facilities, and the human resources department are also components of the Division of Administration and Finance. The Division is overseen by the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF), the chief financial and budget officer of CSU, who reports directly to the President.

In 2006, a new Vice President for Administration and Finance, Associate Vice President of Administration and Finance (AVPAF), Controller, and Bursar were appointed by the President to improve the fiscal management of CSU. The division was audited by the University’s external auditors, Abrams, Foster, Nole and Williams, PA and as a result of their findings, a number of operational procedures have been implemented. The Division working collaboratively with other constituent groups of the University, the University System of Maryland Controller and Internal Audit Department developed a strategic plan to address major areas of concern. The objective of the assessment was to evaluate the operational and financial control environment by documenting business and system process flows, identifying control gaps and areas needing improvement, prioritizing issues, and developing corrective action plans. As a result, 139 issues were identified. To date, approximately 70% have been resolved. The revised operational procedures include reorganized work patterns and increased automation to provide better service to students, faculty, and staff. Specifically, data accuracy between PeopleSoft and the State’s financial management system was improved. The accuracy and reliability of student account information was enhanced to enable the Bursar’s Office to generate accurate invoices to distribute to students monthly. Additionally, the hiring procedure was automated which improved accountability in the hiring process and helped to reduce payroll processing errors. New Staff including a PeopleSoft Financial Systems Analyst and Grants Manager was hired.
All CSU accounts are managed in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practices (GAAP). CSU’s Controller is responsible for the integrity of the financial records. CSU is audited as a part of the University System of Maryland. The University has consistently received an unqualified audit opinion—the best opinion obtainable from a certified public accounting firm. The Vice President for Administration and Finance is responsible for responding to the audit committee’s cited recommendations, if any.

The Budget Process

The budgeting process begins in June or July of the year previous to the year to be budgeted. The Budget Director meets with other budget managers in the USM to review and discuss guidelines established by the System Office. USM guidelines and assumptions are based on guidance received from the State’s Department of Budget and Management (DBM). The Budget Office compiles revenue estimates based on projected enrollment. In addition, actual prior year expenditures are provided by the Controller’s Office that is used for projecting expenditures for the following year. The Budget Director then compiles the proposed budget information and adjusts for salaries, merit increases, enrollment fluctuations, and debt services charges. The proposed budget is then forwarded to the VPAF and the AVPAF for review and approval. The AVPAF works with both the President and the Executive Committee to develop institutional initiatives based on guidance received from the System Office and adjusts the proposed budget to include strategic priorities of the University. The proposed budget is submitted to the President for approval. It is then submitted to the Board of Regents (BOR). The BOR reviews and approves the budget. The approved budget is returned to the University. The Budget Director enters the data in the State Budgeting System (SBS) and transmits to the Department of Budget and Management. Usually this occurs no later than December. The budget information is then submitted to the Legislature for approval. Legislative approval usually occurs in March.

After final approval, the Budget Office works with the Executive Committee to determine the working allocation for the upcoming fiscal year. The Executive Committee consists of the President, Provost, and Vice President for Administration and Finance, Vice President for Information Technology, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and Associate Vice Presidents. The Vice President and Associate Vice President begin this process with a mini retreat with the Vice Presidents. The approved budget is shared at this time. All vice presidents are then asked to provide proposed budgets for their respective areas of accountability. It is expected that all Vice Presidents will meet with their direct reports to gain needed information and to ensure there is input from all levels of the institution. This information is submitted to the Associate Vice President, who compiles this information. Budget hearings are then scheduled and each Vice President meets with the President to discuss his/her budget proposal. Usually, there are two meetings with each VP; in the final session the President’s decision is shared with the VP, the VPAF and the AVPAF. The budget is disseminated to the provost and the vice presidents, who in turn disseminate the budgets to their designated departments.

At its retreat on June 27 and 28, 2007, the Executive Committee discussed the existing budget process and determined what revisions were needed. Thus, a Budget Advisory Council was established to refine the current operating budget process. In its first meeting held August
14. 2007, members agreed that the purpose of the Council is to develop a process that links strategic planning and budgeting, a process that takes into consideration institutional goals and priorities. The process should be proactive in nature and allow all members of the University an opportunity to participate. It should also educate the entire community about the process. The Council also discussed the need to develop a five year business plan that takes into consideration the following:

- The Strategic Plan
- An Academic Master Plan
- The Information Technology Master Plan
- The Facility Master Plan
- The Enrollment and Retention Plan
- A Communications Plan
- A Marketing Plan
- An Institutional Advancement Plan

Members of the Council include the Vice President for Administration and Finance, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance, Acting Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Director of External Relations, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Interim Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, Director of Budgets and one Faculty member. The Council is considering expanding to include one additional faculty member, student and staff senate representation. The Council is an advisory body to the Executive Committee.

In an effort to enlighten the University community, several budget sharing sessions were held in calendar year 2007. Both the operating and capital budgets were shared with faculty and staff.

The Operating Budget and Results of Operations

CSU receives funding from a number of sources: student tuition and fees; state appropriations; federal, state, local and private grants; state and federal financial aid; and auxiliary enterprises such as residence halls, bookstore, dining services and facilities rental. Table 3.3 provides a comparative analysis of actual revenues for fiscal years 2004 – 2007 and anticipated revenues for fiscal year 2008.

Table 3.3: Coppin State University Comparative Revenues for FY 2004 to FY 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>FY04 Actual</th>
<th>FY05 Actual</th>
<th>FY06 Actual</th>
<th>FY07 Actual</th>
<th>FY08 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>15,835,093</td>
<td>14,064,645</td>
<td>16,067,847</td>
<td>15,673,698</td>
<td>14,714,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>18,693,564</td>
<td>19,068,318</td>
<td>20,802,188</td>
<td>30,427,867</td>
<td>31,813,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>18,695</td>
<td>147,707</td>
<td>212,191</td>
<td>396,107</td>
<td>100,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>5,598,334</td>
<td>5,865,917</td>
<td>6,418,840</td>
<td>6,926,281</td>
<td>7,973,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>325,856</td>
<td>896,836</td>
<td>189,231</td>
<td>435,782</td>
<td>362,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td>40,471,542</td>
<td>40,043,423</td>
<td>43,690,297</td>
<td>53,859,735</td>
<td>54,693,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>8,765,186</td>
<td>15,990,085</td>
<td>8,868,152</td>
<td>11,785,985</td>
<td>10,760,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the four year period 2004 – 2007, actual revenues increased 23.8 percent or $12.9 million. Revenues are expected to remain relatively constant for fiscal year 2008. The increase is largely attributed to growth in State appropriations (general fund allocation). The general fund allocation increased 2% ($374 thousand) in FY05, 9% ($1.7 million) in FY06, and 46% ($9.6 million) in FY07. The increase in general fund allocation included a transfer from Access and Success funds ($1.5 million) that were previously in the Maryland Higher Education Commission’s budget (MHEC) and additional enhancement funds allocated to assist with debt service and need based financial aid. Excluding Access and Success funds, the University’s general fund appropriation increased by $7.9 million, or 38.1% when compared to fiscal year 2006. The transfer of MHEC funds can be seen in the reduction in State and local grants and contract from FY06 to FY07. In FY07 Access and Success funds were added to the base budget of the University. Additionally, funding from the U.S. Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Partnership Agreement was reduced.

The University strives to maintain affordable tuition. Revenues from tuition and fees remained relatively constant over the 5-year period since the University’s Periodic Review report in fiscal 2003. The rising cost of tuition has been the focus of concern in recent years. In response to the escalating cost of tuition, the General Assembly passed the Tuition Affordability Act of 2006. The law prohibits University System of Maryland institutions from increasing resident undergraduate tuition for fiscal year 2007 beyond fiscal 2006 levels. Although tuition was frozen in fiscal 2008, the State provided funding ($384 thousand) to cover lost revenues.

Revenue from tuition and fees is dependent on enrollment. Like revenue, the full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment has remained relatively constant. As shown in Table 3.4, FTEs spiked in the Fall 2005 and returned to its Fall 2004 levels in Fall 2007. Annualized FTEs for fiscal 2008 are expected to decrease approximately 3.2% or 98 FTEs to 2,962.
Table 3.4: Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Students, FY2004- FY2007

![Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Students](chart.png)

Auxiliary Enterprises revenues are generated from residential facilities, meal plans, and intercollegiate athletics. Between fiscal 2004 and 2008 such revenues increased 42% or $2.4 million. During the current school year (2007 – 2008), dorms were filled to capacity for the Fall 2007 semester; the same is expected for Spring 2008. Thus, room and board revenues are expected to exceed fiscal 2008 projections.

Table 3.5: FY 2008 Distribution by Division

![Distribution by Division](chart.png)

Source: Budget Office Allocation File
Table 3.6: FY 2008 Distribution by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support - Academic Computing</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Budget Office Allocation File

Shown in Table 3.5 are expenditures by division, and Table 3.6 reflects expenditures by budget category. Approximately 50% of resources are allocated to Academic Affairs to promote the primary mission of the University. Additionally, significant resources have been invested in instruction and scholarships and fellowships reflecting CSU’s priority to continue support of classroom education and to assist deserving students with an opportunity to attend CSU.

The University has enhanced its financial stability since the last Periodic Review Report in 2003. At that time, the financial statements as of June 30, 2003 reflected a deficit in its unrestricted fund balance of $1.7 million. At June 30, 2007, the fund balance showed an increase of $5.0 million to a surplus of $3.3 million. The fund balance serves as an additional funding source to help the University withstand severe hardship when there is an economic downturn. Although CSU has been able to meet their commitment to students, faculty, staff and community, it has been a challenge because of the drastic under-funding over the years. It has been very difficult to remain programmatically viable and fiscally sound. In order to maintain fiscal soundness into the future, additional state support is essential. Also, the University will have to find alternative sources of revenue to adequately fund its strategic goals and objectives.

In November 2006, the State legislature established the Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education. The commission is charged with reviewing options and making recommendations relating to the development of a statewide framework for higher education funding that is consistent and stable and that ensures affordability of and accessibility to all Maryland’s institutions of higher education. The commission is also required to review options and make recommendations relating to the appropriate level of funding for the State’s historically black institutions in order to ensure comparability and competitiveness with other public institutions of higher education. Recommendations are due to the Governor and the General Assembly by December 31, 2007.

At the end of the most recent legislative session in April 2007, Maryland lawmakers were projecting a budget deficit of $1.5 billion for fiscal 2009. In subsequent months the amount escalated to a high of $1.7 billion. In October 2007, in an effort to resolve the State’s structural
deficit, a Special Session of the Maryland General Assembly was convened. On November 19, 2007, the legislature finished its work with an approved fiscal packet that resolves the budget crisis beginning January 1, 2008. Senate Bill 2 (SB2), the Tax Reform Act of 2007, includes the creation of a new special fund, the Higher Education Investment Fund (HEIF) for the express purpose of investing in both public higher education and workforce development, in order to keep tuition affordable for Maryland undergraduate resident students. In FY 2008 and FY2009, it is projected that $16 million and $56 million will be directed to the fund. Additionally, Senate Bill 3 (SB3), Maryland Education Trust Fund – Video Lottery Terminals, establishes an education trust funding for public elementary and secondary education, capital projects at community colleges and public senior higher education institutions. Revenues projected for this fund are as follows: $76 million in FY 2001; $494 million in FY2012 and $660 million in FY2013. SB3 is contingent on passage of HB4 and ratification by the voters of Maryland at the general election in November 2008. Thus, additional resources from the State to support the strategic priorities of the University look promising.

Coppin State University Development Foundation

External fundraising is primarily the responsibility of the Development Foundation of the Division of Institutional Advancement. Funds from the Coppin Development Foundations have been small but are an essential revenue source. These funds have been used for faculty development, endowed faculty chairs, student scholarships, cultural enrichment programs and the Coppin Academy. In fiscal year 2005, $1,725,396 was raised. During fiscal year 2006, Institutional Advancement was reorganized, resulting in a decline in fundraising initiatives. In fiscal year 2006 the amount raised was $388,625.

In 2006, an Interim Vice President for Institutional Advancement was appointed. The division has been reorganized, including the hiring of a major gifts director. The slow progress in building its endowment through fundraising and gifts has been a major Institutional Advancement problem. The plan is to raise more philanthropic revenue. Thus, in 2005 the Development Foundation launched a capital campaign, “The Coppin Campaign: Become a Part of Our Future.” The campaign is geared to raise $15 million dollars over a five year period. As of July 2007, $503,996 had been raised.

Federal Funds – Title III

Coppin State University receives funds through the Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The program helps eligible colleges and universities to become self-sufficient and expand their capacity to serve low-income students by providing funds to improve and strengthen the academic quality, institutional management, and fiscal stability of eligible institutions. Funds may be used for planning, faculty development, and establishing endowment funds.

Administrative management, and the development and improvement of academic programs also are supported. Other projects include joint use of instructional facilities, construction and maintenance, and student services. CSU has been a recipient of Title III funding since 1992. Funds are used to support initiatives for student retention, library enhancement, honors program, faculty and staff development, and community development.
Table 3.7: Title III Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,306,951.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,480,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,722,732.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,422,345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,912,089.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under specific eligibility requirements, an institution must have at least 50 percent of its degree students receiving need-based assistance under Title IV of the Higher Education Act, or have a substantial number of enrolled students receiving Pell Grants, and have low educational and general expenditures. The Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, may waive the eligibility requirements under certain conditions which are defined in program regulations.

**Conclusion**

A review of human resources at CSU reveals that the current staff is well qualified for their positions. The hiring and interviewing process ensures that persons hired will add to the strength of the University and will be committed to the University’s mission.

A major CSU strength is its faculty. CSU markets itself as a student-oriented institution, with a well balanced student-to-faculty ratio. CSU students find themselves in a learning environment that encourages high academic achievement because of the excellent faculty. As of Fall 2007, 76 of 145 faculty, a percentage of 52.4% hold the terminal degree.

CSU progressively works towards meeting space and capital resource requirements. Its capital improvement program is outstanding. The current Coppin State University campus consists of 11 buildings. See Appendix 3.4 for the characteristics of the current facilities of CSU, including the age, gross square feet (GSF), and net assignable square feet (NASF). CSU’s Office of Capital Planning with the support of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), USM BOR and the State of Maryland has secured the resources necessary to move forward with a major facilities development plan. Several new buildings and renovations of existing buildings will provide state of the art facilities. Over the five years, the physical makeup of CSU will change, which will enhance the institution’s ability to serve its students and the community.

CSU’s award winning (See Appendix 3.16) Information Technology Division (ITD) provides the essential infrastructure, resources, support and services for technology-enhanced instruction, learning, and research, student operations, and fiscal operations. Significant strides have been made in technology-enhanced instruction--faculty members receive technical support and training in such areas as course-management software, use of microcomputer hardware and software, multimedia and technology-related applications. ITD continues to develop and manage innovative technologies to support administrative computing needs of the University. Another strength is the University’s commitment to graduate students with skills to function in an information-oriented work force and society. Students acquire basic computer knowledge and discipline-specific computer knowledge.

CSU has offset budget reductions by increasing other sources of revenue, including out of state tuition, student fees and gifts. These funds permit CSU to continue the provision of quality instruction, construction of instructional facilities and provision of high-level technology for faculty and students.
Strengths

1. The current faculty and staff is well qualified for their positions.
2. The Office of Capital Planning has secured the resources necessary to move forward with a major facilities development plan. The physical makeup of CSU will change, which will enhance the institution’s ability to serve its students and the community.
3. CSU’s award winning Information Technology Division provides the essential infrastructure, resources, support and services for technology-enhanced instruction, learning, and research, student operations, and fiscal operations.
4. CSU has offset budget reductions by increasing other sources of revenue, including out of state tuition, student fees and gifts.

Recommendations

1. Create more revenue opportunities through fiscal management strategies, tuition containment and fund raising.
2. Continue to seek annual operating and maintenance funds to adequately support existing, new and renovated campus facilities.
3. Respond to budget cuts through the realignment of University resources.
Leadership and Governance

Standard 4

Introduction

Collegial and shared governance is the accepted standard for institutions of higher education. The expectation is that those who perform the essential work of any academic institution – students, faculty, staff, and administrators – have opportunities to participate in policy decisions that affect the core academic mission of the institution. Active participation on the part of the Coppin community is important, in that the University’s operations and the academic program must fulfill its obligations and responsibilities to the University’s mission in the higher education community.

Consistent with the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents’ Policy on Shared Governance (B.O.R. 1-6.00), Coppin State has established the Shared Governance Committee (http://www.coppin.edu/sharedgovernance/). This Committee directs the institution’s efforts in establishing procedures and formal structures that provide appropriate collaboration and communication between and among administration, faculty, staff, and students. However, the structures and procedures themselves are developed and implemented in a collegial and cooperative manner across the campus. Overall, policies and procedures that are established are disseminated to the appropriate campus constituencies.

The Shared Governance Committee is composed of representatives: four from Academic Affairs; two from Student Life; one from Business and Finance; one from Institutional Advancement; three from Faculty; two students (one undergraduate, one graduate); and three from University Support Staff. The Committee representatives from Academic Affairs, Student Life, Business and Finance, and Institutional Advancement are identified by the respective Vice Presidents in consultation with the unit’s staff. Faculty serving on the Committee are selected by the Faculty Senate while the undergraduate and graduate student representatives are selected by the undergraduate student senate and the Graduate Student Council. The Staff Senate is responsible for identifying representation from the University’s Support Staff.

The Shared Governance Committee at CSU has established a set of guiding principles in which the University operates. These principles align with the Coppin mission and the Board of Regents’ policy. They are as follows:

1. Shared governance procedures should operate throughout the University.
2. The President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, and Department Chairs should ensure that shared governance procedures are operational within their units.
3. In matters relating to budgets, mission, and other priorities for the University, administration should play a leading role, with significant input from staff, faculty, and students.
4. In such cases where an administrative decision has been made which affects the University body as a whole, such decisions and the reasons for such actions should be communicated in writing to the appropriate governance body (i.e., Staff Senate, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, and Graduate Student Council).
5. Meetings should be held on a regular basis and at regularly scheduled intervals (bimonthly: 3:00 p.m. second Thursday of the month).
6. Continued efforts should be made to solicit information and feedback from the staff, faculty, and students concerning the operation of the governance body, its members, and its decisions.

7. In those cases where shared governance is not operating to its fullest, remedies initiated by the governance committee should be sought.

8. Staff, faculty, and students should continue to exercise the right of free speech regarding all governance matters without fear of recrimination.

At CSU, there are appropriate opportunities for involvement in decision making, particularly on major issues affecting academics. As part of this analysis, a discussion on the evidence considered in evaluating the effectiveness and of course, the responsiveness of governance in relation to the University’s mission in higher education will be explored following a brief description on the formal structure of governance on the campus.

The Formal Structure of Governance

Prior to discussing the evidence, it is important to understand the formal structure of governance on the campus. Appendix 4.1 outlines the present formal structure of governance at the Coppin: 1) the relationship of Coppin to its Board of Visitors and to the USM Board of Regents, and 2) the relationship of different campus committees, councils, and other advisory groups to different administrative officials who are entrusted with formal authority in different areas of administration and governance.

Description of Roles and Functions of Key Institutional Constituencies

1. Office of the President - Shared governance at the institution is best understood by examining certain offices and units on the campus. The President’s Office provides leadership to the University. The President consults with key committees, councils and staff members by conducting weekly meetings of the Executive Council. The Council includes area vice presidents and appointed staff members that guide the President in areas related to strategic planning, budgeting, academic programming, and facility planning. The President also conducts meetings with other groups on the campus, including the President’s staff; University Planning Council, comprised of faculty, staff and administrators; Shared Governance Committee; comprised of faculty and administrators; Faculty Senate, comprised of faculty members; Staff Senate, comprised of University staff from all levels; the Student Senate, comprised of students, and administrators; and other special advisory committees and councils that may be formulated to serve and inform the President’s Office on a variety of issues affecting the University community.

As a result of sharing the responsibility of managing the institution, these groups have developed documents such as the Facilities Master Plan, the Independent Study on the Revitalization of Coppin State University (Toll Report), the campus strategic plan, and fundraising plans. To a large extent, these are living documents currently in use by the University community.

2. Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs - The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs serves as the primary office that reports to the
President as it presides over the Division of Academic Affairs. Collectively, the Office provides leadership on a variety of academic issues ranging from the formation of new academic programs, academic policies and procedures, advisement and counseling, curriculum standards, and student learning outcomes assessment. Prior to final consultation, the Provost and Vice President interacts with various groups and committees for input, active participation, and shared leadership.

Committees that play active roles and support the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs include the following: the Dean’s Council, comprised of the academic deans from the Honor’s College, Schools of Graduate Studies, Nursing, Arts and Sciences, Professional Studies and Education, the Faculty Development Committee, comprised of faculty members, the Faculty Information Technology Committee, comprised of faculty, staff from the Information Technology Division (ITD), the Curriculum Standards and Policies Committee, comprised of faculty, staff and administrators, the Graduate Council, comprised of faculty members who teach graduate level courses, the Academic Program Review Committee, comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators, and the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, comprised of faculty, staff and administrators.

These committees have played vital roles that have led to the development of such documents and polices that include the Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (A.R.T.), the Faculty Handbook, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, undergraduate and graduate catalogs, and policies and procedures related to students, student retention, and the academic programming.

3. **The Office of the Vice President for Student Life** - The Office has primary responsibilities for presiding over the Division of Student Life on the campus. It provides oversight and guidance to student organizations, judicial affairs, housing, and residence life. In conjunction with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Life provides strategic leadership direction derived from collaborations with its Recruitment Committee; comprised of faculty and staff; the Retention Task Force, comprised of faculty, students, staff and administrators; the Student Orientation committee, comprised of faculty, students and staff; the Student Academic Review Committee, comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators from academic advisement, the Academic Resource Center, and the Records Office.

As a result of collaboration among these committees and groups, the University has been informed and poised to offer and promote programs that contribute to the successful matriculation of students into the institution.

4. **The Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance** - The Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance reports to the President on a variety of issues related to the fiscal condition of the University and to human resources concerns. Offices that report to the Vice President for Administration and Finance include the Office of the Controller, the Office of Auxiliary Services, the Office of Procurement, and the Office of Central Receiving/Inventory.
This office prepares budget analyses to inform the president and oversees primary financial issues related to student accounts and financial aid and the operations of the University including the Office of Public Safety and the Office of Human Resources. These offices and others collaborate regularly. A recent example was the implementation of a new financial system via PeopleSoft. This product will be receiving an upgrade, and it is the expectation that Administration and Finance in conjunction with the campus’ Information Technology Division will continue to bring together constituents for a successful software upgrade process across the campus. This is just one of many products that are produced as a result of collaboration and cooperation among this office and other units on the campus.

5. The Office of the Vice President for Institutional Advancement - The Office of Institutional Advancement has direct responsibility for the Division of Institutional Advancement. The Division directs and facilitates key development and fundraising activities in support of the broader Coppin mission. This is done in conjunction with the Coppin State University Development Foundation (CSUDF). Key emphases of the office are the fundraising initiatives for students and the University and the revitalization agenda for the immediate community.

Institutional Advancement collaborates with the President and other constituent groups on campus. In addition to outstanding fund raising activities, the Office may be recognized for its critical role with respect to retention and graduation on the campus. It interacts with other units and division such as Academic Affairs to identify donors and scholarship opportunities for students. Also, the Office provides ad-hoc scholarships from private donations for students in crisis.

6. The Office of the Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer - This award winning and nationally recognized office holds the responsibility for maintaining the campus’ technology infrastructure. Last year, Coppin State was awarded the prestigious Educause Award for technology innovation on college and university campuses. In the past, this award has gone to institutions like Harvard University. Committees that report to this office include the Information Technology Committee, comprised of faculty and staff, and the Faculty Information Technology Committee, also comprised of faculty and staff. These committees collaborate with all units on the campus, particularly the Division of Academic Affairs, to address issues such as integrating technology into the classroom and upgrading computer software and equipment across the campus.

The new administration under the direction of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in partnership with the Office of the Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, met to determine the technology needs of the campus, particularly, the faculty. The outcome was a series of professional training workshops and mini-grants that serve to support faculty with research initiatives and curriculum development and enhancement. The technology infrastructure mandates that the campus community remain at the cutting edge of their disciplines. As a result, there has been increased use of technology to teach and train students through mediums such as Blackboard and Tegrity, both providing 24/7 access to lectures and class assignments.
7. Faculty and the Faculty Senate – The Faculty have a unique and important role in shared governance on the campus. Input, concerns and viewpoints of the campus as well as policy development and implementation are shared through the faculty senate. The Senate represents the voice of all regular faculty. Its purpose is to articulate the views of the faculty, in whose hands rests the University's values, which include academic integrity, fairness, openness, collegial governance, and the right to the full support of the faculty with the necessary financial, material, and human resources of the University.

Regularly scheduled meetings are conducted by the Senate, and minutes are posted and clearly communicated among faculty and administration. In the past, faculty believed that their concerns were not being heard nor addressed by the previous administration. One such issue in which the faculty believed they had no input or clear understanding was that of the University’s finances and overall budget. As a result, the Interim President/Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs held several exploratory meetings in winter 2007 involving the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance, and the Faculty Senate President. These meetings provided opportunities to discuss appropriate ways to encourage constructive faculty involvement in budget planning at CSU, ultimately for the benefit of the academic program and the success of CSU’s mission. One outcome was that in February 2007, the Faculty Senate invited faculty to identify the most significant budgetary priorities for the entire faculty and the academic program in 2007-2008.

Also, in March, 2007, the Vice President For Academic Affairs initiated the formation of an academic planning and budget committee, with faculty representation, to develop and articulate an open, systematic, and inclusive annual planning and budgeting process for CSU. It is anticipated that such a process will provide optimum responsiveness and improved accountability with respect to the budgetary needs of the academic program, consistent with standards of academic excellence and the University’s mission.

8. Staff and the Staff Senate – Staff are afforded several opportunities to participate in the development of policies and procedures as well. While staff are invited to participate on several levels throughout the campus, their primary concerns are expressed through the Staff Senate. The Senate holds responsibility for the following:

- Establishing a forum for discussion on matters involving the welfare of non-exempt and exempt employees at the University;
- Acting in an advisory capacity regarding the development and implementation of policies concerning the general operation of Coppin State University as such policies relate to non-exempt and exempt employees; and
- Participating and interacting actively with other System institutions to promote uniformity and consistency regarding the implementation of policies, rules, and regulations affecting non-exempt and exempt employees.

The Staff, as with other key constituencies interact with and inform the President of policies and issues directly affecting staff at the University System of Maryland level or at the local college level.
9. Students and the Student Senate – We fully embrace our students at Coppin. This group is a very active constituent on campus. Their website address is http://planet.coppin.edu/vote.asp. They assist students with technology usage by working with other groups such as the Information Technology Division to conduct training for students on software packages. They also assist students with the establishment of an electronic portfolio online and host the Miss and Mr. Coppin Pageant. Students are connected to the University through their savvy use of “Planet Coppin” located at the above address.

Student concerns on issues related to campus policies and procedures are voiced primarily through the Student Senate. The Senate is responsible for providing for the broad involvement and adequate representation of all students in governance of the College with emphasis on effective communication among the administration, students, and faculty. It provides on-going relationships with student organizations at other institutions; it also provides a mechanism for students to address community concerns. This active group also serves on key search committees, such as Dean’s Search Committee and play vital roles on decision-making committees on campus.

Findings on Shared Governance: Strengths and Concerns

Adequate Representation

CSU’s mission (see Chapter One, pg. 6) is to offer higher education in the liberal arts and select professional disciplines to urban students who demonstrate the potential for success, but whose ability to realize their personal and career aspirations has been limited because of the lack of access to educational opportunities, and because of poverty, persistent racial discrimination, and other factors. To this end, CSU is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and continuing service to the urban community of Baltimore. Fulfilling such a mission requires that governance bodies on campus have sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and the fulfilling of the campus’ mission.

Key governance advisory groups have adequate faculty representation, such as the Faculty Information Technology Committee and the Curriculum Policies and Standards Committee (“the Curriculum Committee”). Advisory groups, such as the Planning Council and the Curriculum Committee, are active in the sense that business is conducted through a regular schedule of meetings.

Newly-Formed Committees and Groups

Several newly-formed committees have been added. The following is a list of some of the most recent committees and groups that have adequate representation: Bookstore Advisory Council, comprised of four faculty, three staff, one associate vice president, and the Coppin State Bookstore manager; AAUP Chapter, supported by the President, comprised of a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer and membership of 30 faculty members on campus; A.R.T. Committee, comprised of faculty charged with the responsibility of revising and submitting a new Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty; Faculty Information Technology Committee (F.I.T.), comprised of faculty and charged with facilitating increased efforts for technology usage among faculty and integration throughout the curriculum; and the Faculty
Research Committee – comprises faculty and is charged with assisting faculty with grant-writing and other initiatives related to scholarly research.

Conclusion

In implementing collegial governance on campus different constituencies have varying roles in policy development and decision making. For example, faculty members actively participate in policy development and decision making regarding curriculum policies and standards. Recently, regular faculty actively participated in planning for a reorganization of the academic division. Staff members actively participate in policy development and decision making as well. The staff members in conjunction with the faculty were actively consulted when CSU, because of a budget deficit, elected to place employees on temporary furlough in 2003-2004, rather than to lay off employees.

However, there still is room for significant institutional development and improvement with respect to Standard Four, especially in relation to policy development and the allocation of financial and human resources in support of the academic program. The central issue is that opportunities for faculty involvement in budget planning and development at the University have traditionally been limited. However, since the installation of a new administration, Faculty have realized increased opportunities for proactive participation in significant decision-making in the allocation of financial and human resources that directly affect faculty, students, and both the quality and future of higher education at Coppin State University.

Strengths

Overall, committees are well represented and effective at getting concerns shared and heard throughout the campus community. However, unevenness exists with respect to perceptions concerning some committees’ effectiveness in carrying out their primary purposes in relation to campus governance. For example, the recommendations of the Faculty Information Technology Committee have been accepted and implemented to a great extent, by the University while significant resolutions of the Faculty Senate, including those related to tenure and promotion, have not been fully implemented. This is also due in part to the campus’ development of a revised policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure. This policy is currently being revised. We can anticipate that this will be a policy having positive effects and enhancing the understanding of the role and function of faculty on the campus and in their disciplines.

Shared Governance Works

Many governance groups at the University can readily implement changes in their internal operations, since they function under by-laws that are subject to change upon approval of either a majority or two-thirds of group membership. The Curriculum Committee, for example, recently reaffirmed or updated certain of its policies and procedures, including policies regarding membership categories and the minimum number of members required to be present to constitute a quorum.

Recommendations

The University community recommends the following plan for the development and enhancement of governance at CSU. Following the plan are other recommendations. The success of this plan is predicated on the following principles and assumptions:
1. Faculty, administration, and staff at Coppin State University will continue current dialogue and increase the engagement of open, constructive, solution-focused dialogue around concerns and issues of significance to effective governance.

2. A governance structure is useful only to the extent that it is embedded within a collegial culture on campus. It is not useful when it is established as an entity without meaningful involvement in or access to institutional decision making.

3. A governance system that includes advisory committees/councils/senates (“committees”) can be effective only when there is open, constructive dialogue and substantive decision-making between and among 1) committee members; 2) the campus constituencies whom they represent; and 3) the administrative officer(s) entrusted with formal authority in a given area, to whom the committee makes recommendations, and with whom the committee can engage in ongoing, productive dialogue. All parties should accept the principal that honoring mutual relationships between and among rights and responsibilities is an essential prerequisite for successful collegial governance.

4. The effectiveness of governance, therefore, is not a function of the complexity of the visible governance structure, nor the total number of official governance committees and councils, nor the presence of voluminous formal documents that proclaim the importance of shared governance on campus. Instead, it is a function of a living campus culture that acknowledges and actively encourages the shared, collective wisdom of different constituencies in higher education, including faculty, staff, administration, and students.

5. CSU will maintain Shared Governance by conducting a review and evaluation of the operation of all campus governance councils and committees by January 1, 2009, allowing for broad input from faculty and staff. This review should focus primarily but not exclusively on the Shared Governance Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Student Senate.

6. Revision of the published governance structure at CSU to reflect CSU’s actual governance structure. Subsequent to the review and evaluation CSU will develop a plan to address and correct structural and operational deficiencies in any of these councils, with a follow-up status report issued in May 2009, and again in May 2010.
A D M I N I S T R A T I O N
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Introduction

The administration, comprised of five administrative units – Division of Academic Affairs, Division of Administration and Finance, Division of Institutional Advancement, Division of Student Life, and Division of Information Technology – has undergone a metamorphosis within a period of three and a half decades. For thirty-two of those years (1971-2003) the institution grew under the tutelage of Dr. Calvin W. Burnett, years in which Coppin grew from an open enrollment to a comprehensive institution. In 2003, Dr. Stanley F. Battle was elected President of Coppin State College. Under his leadership, an administrative model was established that included five Vice Presidents, with responsibilities for the Division of Academic Affairs, Division of Administration and Finance, Division of Institutional Advancement, Division of Student Life, and Division of Information Technology. Dr. Battle crafted a vision of an Urban Education Corridor, which added to the portfolio of schools operated by the University, including a middle school and a high school. In 2004, Coppin State College became a University through the efforts of many Coppin constituents led by Dr. Battle. A fifth president, Dr. Reginald S. Avery, will take the helm of CSU in January 2008. Dr. Sadie R. Gregory, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, served as Interim President from June 5, 2007 to January 2008.

Summary of Findings (Executive Council Questionnaire)

The Executive Council serves as a microcosm of the larger University, bringing together the campus leadership. This leadership is such that it reflects and exhibits best practices in areas that include but are not limited to Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Community Partnerships, Enrollment Management, Information Technology, Institutional Advancement, Library Services, Planning and Assessment, Student Life, and the School of Arts and Sciences.

The Executive Council, as of June 2007, was comprised of Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors and Special Assistants to the President. The skills reflected in the roles and responsibilities of Council members are wide and varied. Generally, the Council members believe that analytical and communication skills are critical to executing their respective duties at CSU, followed by a unique blend of leadership, and journalistic writing skills. Additionally, it is the view of the members of the Council that fiscal management and budget analysis are key to providing accountability for Divisions/Departments. Each Council member having a minimum of ten (10) years experience in his or her respective fields considers this attribute to be a contributing factor to the success of the Council as one of the constituent bodies of the University.

Survey results revealed that members of the Executive Council use a variety of practical internal and external avenues to support their decision-making roles at the institution. Internally, journal subscriptions and higher education magazines are utilized for higher education trends, as

---

\(^8\) In Appendixes 5.1-5.7, Organizational charts are provided for each administrative unit, and CSU’s website provides the number of assigned staff in addition to information on each of these administrative units through a direct link. Support is provided to administrators through the expertise and skills of their assigned staff.
well as other specific internal structures, i.e., (1) surveys to measure students’ access to technology; and (2) drawing upon the expertise and skills of various departments to enhance a specific program. The institution’s website, through the EagleLINKS portal, was identified as a very effective tool for rendering assistance, not only to facilitate faculty enhancement programs, but also to benefit student learning outcomes and to keep abreast of new technology initiatives. Moreover, because the perception of the institution plays a major role in recruitment, fundraising, media coverage and campus morale, CSU’s website serves as a crucial link in the internal structure for supporting the decision making process and its decision makers.

External avenues to support the Executive Council’s decision-making roles rely upon the use of information to formulate and enforce policies and procedures that affect overall organizational issues. This information includes budgetary policies to develop state budget requests in response to external constituencies, such as the USM Board of Regents, Maryland General Assembly, and Department of Legislative Services. In utilizing external avenues to support decision-making, the Executive Council aims to access state, regional, and national data and reports; the Council reviews existing donor files for cultivating potential donor prospects and for soliciting funding support. The institution’s administrative structure fosters and supports the shared decision making initiative in keeping with its goals, organization and governance.

The membership of the Executive Council is comprised of senior administrative staff who report to the President. As a result, there is a tremendous opportunity for the Council to interface with other constituencies of the institution, especially through shared decision making. This shared decision making process is further enhanced through the interaction of the Council with various committees and formal councils, such as deans’ councils, bi-weekly departmental staff meetings and departmental chairpersons’ meetings. Council members are able to communicate effectively and strengthen collaborative efforts with other divisions through email and other forms of telecommunication. Based upon the results of the structured survey, the members of the Executive Council are effective and efficient in communicating with the other constituencies of the institution.

In terms of both qualifications and the number of persons assigned, CSU’s staffing is reflective of its goals and objectives. Members of the Middle States Steering Committee administered a structured survey (see Appendix 5.8) to members of the Executive Council and, based on the results, concluded that the administration is well structured and knowledgeable of CSU’s goals and objectives. The goals and objectives of CSU are available and shared with the Executive Council during scheduled meetings, in University literature (catalogs and University/departmental brochures), on the University’s website, during special programs, and in organized forums. The findings affirm that CSU meets the standard.

Based on survey results, periodic reviews of job descriptions and work performance are conducted to assure that appropriate duties are assigned and executed. In addition, reviews of applicants’ credentials are made by Human Resources at the departmental level as well as by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs to assure that qualified personnel are hired. It is

---

9 Vitae for the members of the Executive Council are available in the Exhibits Room. Position descriptions are also archived for review. These documents provide the qualifications of each administrator based on the specifications as detailed in the position descriptions.
further believed that the staff at CSU reflects a high level of proficiency with extraordinary talent and devotion.

CSU’s history is reflective of a staff with longevity and little turnover. However, CSU is understaffed and, as a result, many of the personnel are known to work long hours to compensate for limited staff and resources. The President and Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs are aware of this need and have been addressing the personnel shortage, making positive change in this area.

Conclusion
The Standard Five Subcommittee found through its investigation that the administration of Coppin State University is in compliance and seeks through learning and research and/or scholarship to foster quality improvement and support for the University’s organization and governance.

Strengths
1. The organizational structure that has been established promotes rapid growth of individual units within the institution, i.e., School of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Professional Studies, and School of Management Sciences and Economics. Given this structure, Coppin is now organized to help achieve nurturing support of its students.
2. The personnel currently in place bring a great deal of diversity that not only is very desirable at the moment, given the global economy, but also reflects positively on the combined experience of the administration.

Recommendations
1. CSU should distribute an up-to-date functional organizational chart to the University community.
2. CSU should maintain a central repository for the storage and archiving of presidential and major administrative reports.
3. Recorded Minutes of all executive cabinet/council meetings shall be maintained in the Office of the President’s files.
In every area of CSU—from faculty governance to academic standards and grading policies to student affairs and activities—CSU administration has not only developed policies and procedures which were designed to administer and to serve the University community with integrity but has responded to the concerns of community groups and members about those policies and procedures with efforts to revise them to ensure an even greater degree of integrity within the academy.

CSU’s policies and procedures are made available to all constituencies both in hard copy and in electronic format. Administrators, faculty, staff, and students can access those policies as online “read only” documents. These individuals are then free to respond to any policy concerns in face-to-face appointments or at both departmental and general meetings, through memoranda to the individuals responsible for those areas from which the concerns have originated, or online via either general or individually addressed email.

Thus, what ensures that CSU’s policies and procedures are guided by principles of integrity is simply this: that CSU provides full access—both hard copy and online—to its policies and procedures, that CSU provides full electronic communication access to all members of the University community to express concerns, and that faculty and students take full advantage of the available means to communicate their concerns. A review of email records of exchanges between faculty and administration shows very clearly that faculty are not loath to raise their concerns and that appropriate members of the administration respond in a timely manner. While the administration responses might not always be in agreement with the views of individual faculty or groups of faculty, the responses demonstrate a willingness to enter into further discussion of the matters at hand.

Indeed, the development and implementation of full CSU access to electronic communication has done much to facilitate the free exchange of information and concerns.
among administrators, staff, faculty, and students. Individuals within the various constituencies now have the means with which to communicate directly and immediately any and all concerns, ideas, and suggestions to individuals or groups both within their own constituencies and across the institution. And all constituencies have the means with which to respond quickly to all concerns raised. The use of email, however, does not necessarily take the place of more traditional processes and procedures outlined in existing documents. What it offers is an alternate and public means of raising and addressing concerns. The University’s newly articulated policy that all email communications between faculty and students should be conducted only through CSU’s email facilities led to an exchange of emails among faculty and members of the administration. That exchange ended with an email from the President of the University clarifying the policy and its source. (see Appendix 6.1) In addition, as an effort to ensure integrity in academic procedures, email is used to make faculty aware of and to remind them of critical deadlines in the submission of grades, whether at mid-term or at the end of the semester (see Appendix 6.2).

With regard to faculty participation in institutional governance, the president of the Faculty Senate sent an email to the faculty raising the issue of the general weakness of the Senate: at times, it could not muster the quorum necessary for the conduct of senate business. Historically, this has been a problem at the institution: the Senate has suffered from both a perceived and an actual weakness even though there have always been individual faculty strong in their commitment to the Senate as an essential component of faculty self-governance. One member of the faculty responded with a faculty-wide email offering recommendations for an essential component of faculty self-governance. One member of the faculty responded with a faculty-wide email offering recommendations for change in the structure of the Senate (see Appendix 6.6).

With regard to the integrity of the academic process as it relates to their instructional responsibilities, faculty have academic freedom to select not only the textbooks but also the computer software they deem appropriate for the courses they teach. However, they also have the responsibility of submitting the orders for those materials in a timely manner. While the bookstore takes care of textbook orders, the University Faculty Information Technology Committee (FITC) is responsible for ensuring that the required software is installed on computers in the student computer labs. However, the faculty are responsible for bringing in information regarding the software accessibility and licensing. The FITC then submits the materials to the University’s Office of Client Computing Services (CCS) for actual installation of the software. Clearly, as in other areas of the operations of CSU, more than one constituency is responsible for ensuring integrity in the academic area: individual faculty, faculty committees, and institutional staff (see Appendix 6.3).

CSU requires that all course syllabi adhere to standards of basic content, e.g., course description, textbook requirements, student evaluation (see Chapter 12 for more details on this effort). Late in the spring of 2006, the Chairperson of the Curriculum, Policies, and Standards Committee distributed to all faculty the newly revised syllabus template as approved by that body (see Appendix 6.4). Currently, faculty in the School of Arts and Sciences, for example, are required to submit two copies of each course syllabus, one for the department chair and one for
the dean, both of whom bear the responsibility of reviewing syllabi and providing feedback to the faculty for any necessary revisions.

It should be noted here that this development of a University-wide syllabus template is part of a long-standing, continuing process at the University. In the mid-1980’s, an institution-wide committee (the University was then Coppin State College) developed such an instrument. After the template was approved by the Curriculum, Policies, and Standards Committee, it was put into use across the disciplines, and efforts were focused at the department and division levels to ensure faculty compliance. At the same time, a separate college-wide General Education Requirements Review Committee conducted a detailed study of those requirements and then made recommendations for changes both in the specific distribution of course and credit requirements and in the statement of college-wide philosophy and goals of the requirements as a whole. Course syllabi were expected to make reference to the philosophy and goals in their specific course objectives.

In the 2005-2006 academic year, the Curriculum Committee prepared new statements of categories of competencies to be addressed both in General Education courses and in majors courses: oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy. These competencies are included in the syllabus template, and faculty are expected to include reference to them in the specific course objectives in their actual course syllabi.

CSU requires that all faculty have students in their classes complete a faculty evaluation form about both course content and faculty preparation and teaching methods (see Chapter 7, p. 49). The Center for Institutional Assessment analyzes the responses and sends the results to the faculty. These evaluation forms are used to ascertain the levels of academic integrity demonstrated by faculty in the classroom. Both the departmental and University-wide faculty review committees are required to consider these evaluations in their deliberations regarding recommendations for merit pay, promotion, and tenure (see Chapter 10, p. 77). Department chairs can also use them in discussing performance levels with individual faculty.

These faculty evaluations serve also to demonstrate the integrity of the academic process in the classroom. The Center for Institutional Assessment prepared summative analyses of specific questions from both the course evaluation and the faculty evaluation sections on the faculty evaluation form. (see Appendix 6.5) Study of those analyses shows clearly that courses and faculty receive summative scores well above average and that both courses and faculty demonstrate academic excellence. But that excellence, as revealed over a three-year survey of faculty evaluations, also clearly demonstrates the integrity of the academic process: the maintenance of consistently high scores indicates that the process is a continuing one across the spectrum of the academic offerings of the University. Indeed, on all of these significant areas, student agreement in the two categories of “Strongly agree” and “Agree,” reaches or exceeds a level of 80%. CSU considers this level to be indicative of academic integrity of both courses and faculty.

Thus, for example, in fall 2004, 95.4% of students reported receiving a course syllabus during the first two class sessions; in fall 2005, the figure was also 95.4%; and in fall 2006, it
was 95%. More important than the fact that the students received their syllabi promptly at the beginning of the course was the fact that students reported that the syllabi clearly indicated actual course content and assessment measures. Thus, in fall 2004, 86.9% of students agreed that the “Course requirements, as stated in the course syllabus, are being implemented,” and 84.6% agreed that “The course objectives and content are in agreement.” For fall 2005, the corresponding figures were 86.8% and 85.0%, respectively; for fall 2006, the figures were 90.1% and 88.1%, respectively.

Review of student responses to the questions in the Instructor Evaluation section of the form indicates similar conclusions. In fall 2004, 88.6% agreed that the instructor “Seems well prepared for class sessions,” 87.7% agreed that the instructor “Emphasizes major points in lectures and discussions,” and 86% agreed that the instructor “Asks relevant/stimulating questions and encourages discussions in class.” For fall 2005, the corresponding figures were 88.3%, 87.7%, and 84.8%, respectively. For fall 2006, the figures were 90.9%, 90.4%, and 88.1%, respectively.

With adequate responses, it is clear that the course/faculty evaluations indicate coverage of a broad spectrum of courses and of faculty, and a broad spectrum of students. The sheer breadth of the courses/faculty covered and the number of years covered would indicate that the academic process at CSU demonstrates a very high degree of academic integrity on the part of the faculty both as developers of academic courses on an individual and a collective, departmental basis and as individual teaching faculty in the classroom.

This analysis and review of statistical evidence demonstrate that CSU continues to make progress in maintaining integrity in the development and implementation of its policies and procedures and that all constituencies of CSU participate actively in the ongoing process of ensuring that integrity remains a critical focus in all areas of CSU’s academic and administrative operations.

Accordingly, CSU offers to itself several recommendations with regard to the maintenance of a high degree of integrity and the pursuit of even higher degrees of integrity in its policies and procedures.

**Conclusion**

Within the key areas of academics and administration, the University—both as a whole and through its constituent bodies—has committed itself to continuing awareness and ongoing processes by which it can maintain and strengthen the level of integrity in all of its functions. The Provost-Vice President for academic Affairs, the Deans of the various Schools, the department Chairpersons, and the faculty have taken steps to ensure that the academic process—curriculum development, classroom teaching and learning—is based and functions on sound principles and practices. The administration and the faculty—through the Faculty Senate—continue to be alert to make progress toward ensuring that institutional governance incorporates administration, faculty, staff, and students in an appropriate, productive manner. As recognized in the “Strengths, Concerns, and Recommendations” section of this chapter, the University has identified a number of concerns that when addressed will strengthen the University and its operations in immeasurable ways. As with the growth of individual human beings, that
recognition is the best assurance of the potential for the University’s continued growth and of the University’s continued commitment to that process of growth.

Strengths

1. The University has several strengths: a concerned and professional faculty committed to integrity in both academic and institutional governance processes; full and open access to both traditional committee/paper and electronic communication means for all institution constituencies; and a strong institutional commitment to the ongoing nature of the process of institutional growth in academic, administrative, and governance affairs.

Recommendations

1. That CSU academic administration, which includes the Provost, the Deans of the Schools of CSU, and the Chairs of the Academic Departments within the Schools, should establish clear mechanisms to review the specific departmental course syllabi to ensure that they include all of the components of the University-wide approved syllabus template, and that the appropriate academic administration members, most notably the department chairs, provide clear and specific feedback to faculty;

2. That department chairs discuss the results of end-of-semester faculty evaluations both with each member of their departments with a view toward improving faculty scores on those items that reflect on the quality of the courses and on the quality of the faculty in the classroom, and, as appropriate, with the department as a whole with a view toward improving the quality of the academic programs in the departments; and

3. That the Faculty Senate and the faculty as a whole take appropriate action to strengthen the Faculty Senate as the duly constituted body recognized by faculty, University administration, and system administration as the official representative of the faculty in University governance.
INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Standard 7

Introduction

A holistic approach was used in developing the University Assessment model, which encompasses a three level approach to assessment (institution, program, and course). A key aspect of this model is that it integrates the use of technology throughout the assessment process. As a consequence, CSU has the ability to make real-time decisions that are reflective of the ever-changing learning environment. This inclusive assessment model supports feedback from all CSU’s constituencies, thus promoting continuous improvement in achieving learning objectives.

Institutional Infrastructure

CSU has made an institutional commitment to developing a culture of assessment backed by reliable evidence of learning outcomes. The Center for Institutional Assessment (CIA) and the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA) each have clearly defined responsibilities for providing leadership in this development with the support of other CSU departments such as Institutional Research, Academic Affairs under leadership of the Provost, and the Office of Institutional Technology.

In order to fulfill CSU’s mission to its constituency, to the community, and to the State, the University maintains an educational program that meets high standards of excellence as measured by a number of internal and external indicators of effectiveness. External evaluations are provided by professional accrediting bodies, employment rates of graduates, and employers’ opinions. Internal evaluations include program reviews, progression, retention and graduation rates, students’ evaluation of teaching, and ongoing evaluation of the general education program. These indicators of effectiveness form the basis of the assessment and evaluation process at CSU.

An on-going effort has been made to measure overall effectiveness towards the achievement of CSU’s mission and goals. With respect to assessment, CSU uses a broad range of methods for measuring, evaluating, and assessing educational outcomes. In order to promote planning and assessment, the OPA and the CIA take leadership for facilitating strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts. In addition, an Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) has been created to promote ongoing assessment at the institution. This committee’s charge is to ensure that assessment is happening at all levels within the institution along with appropriate assessment measures and continuous improvement efforts.

The University Assessment process answers two critical questions:

- How is institutional effectiveness assessed through the use of strategic goals and objectives?
- How are assessment data and results used to improve policy formation, budget and fiscal planning, curriculum and student development, and teaching and learning?

The CIA is a centralized University resource designed to inform planning and policy decisions in a wide range of academic and administrative areas. During academic year 2005-2006, the Center has focused its efforts on training and development, survey development,
assessment, educational research, and strategic planning. It provides critically important reporting, assessment, benchmarking, planning, and resource services to support institutional effectiveness in response to the needs of the University community. An ongoing assessment process consists of data collected in eleven broad categories: internal program review, external program review, formal and informal testing, and follow-up studies.

**Institutional Assessment Model**

The University has adopted an institutional assessment model that incorporates the assessment of student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. Both the institutional and program levels are informed by the strategic plan, which provides a useful blueprint for the future direction of the University. In addition, CSU began its self-study process demonstrating the application of MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence using Standard Seven and Fourteen as its guide. Assessment at CSU is anchored in the strategic goals of the Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential …Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan.

An audit is annually conducted to highlight the strengths and areas of improvement in the assessment methodology utilized at all levels. This assessment audit is delivered to each unit with detailed instructions for completion. It includes the following dimensions: assessment of goal performance, assessment of strategy performance, continuous improvement methods, assessment instruments (qualitative and quantitative), and fiscal resources required.

Based on previous audits, CSU has been able to pinpoint areas where assessment could be strengthened and enhanced. The model requires collection of evidence whereby assessment is documented and evaluated on a yearly basis and then utilized in efforts to improve the feedback process. CSU encourages a positive culture of assessment that is institutionally supported so that assessment results are used for celebration, improvement, and enhancement in the areas needing attention.

To further support academic and administrative functions, committees have also been established to spearhead institutional efforts.

**Examples of Committees**

The Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Faculty Assessment Committee, and Planning Council each link the student learning outcomes assessment process to the regular institutional planning process. This requires that plans made by respective administrative units are reviewed prior to adoption. Approved plans are given priority rank and are funded during the budget development process. These plans are included in various planning documents developed by the University up to and including the comprehensive strategic plan.

The Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC) was established to facilitate University assessment in its strategic planning goals. Comprised of the Associate Vice President, Planning and Assessment, key Faculty Representatives and CIA Director, the committee provides an opportunity for faculty to actively engage in assessment practices. In addition, it creates a forum for identifying and refining direct and indirect assessment measures. This committee is also charged with identifying specific assessment projects which are designed to evidence and document assessment practices in student learning at the course, program, and institutional level with particular attention to direct measures. After direct measures have been gathered, the data
will be reviewed by the collective team for assessing results and determining appropriate continuous improvement methods.

The Finance Assessment Committee is charged with developing a holistic approach to fiscal management at CSU with careful attention to administrative practices and procedures. Members include the Vice President, Associate Vice President, Administration and Finance and other respective colleagues. This academic year has been concentrated on developing fiscal interventions to strengthen institutional resources.

**Integration of Institutional and Student Learning Assessment**

**Framework for Assessment - The Model**

In order for an assessment model to be effective, it must be based on the Strategic Plan and require that all departments use the institutional strategic plan as a living document. Therefore, under CSU’s Assessment Model, each department, whether it is an academic or non-academic unit, must prepare a unit based strategic plan that outlines its goals, strategies, and assessment approaches on a regular basis.

This document serves as a tool in promoting continuous improvement efforts on a quarterly and yearly basis. Because assessment is occurring at various levels at CSU the academic and non-academic areas work with the CIA to provide documentation, evaluation, and assessment of their efforts. The assessment foci have been organized into three areas:

a) Institutional Level Assessment  
b) Program Level Assessment (all units)  
c) Course Level Assessment (all academic areas).

In this model, mission, goals, objectives, philosophy, and the conceptual framework of the unit are considered. In addition, the assessment model also includes useful and relevant data that can be gathered from each unit in order to assess performance and promote continuous dynamic improvement efforts (see Appendix 7.1). The following diagram illustrates this model:

![CSU Assessment model](image-url)
The model has many data components that are utilized by various areas in developing assessment knowledge including the following: comprehensive survey research, fiscal, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical, technical learning support, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and an institutional learning. Results garnered from the course and program level informs the institutional level assessment process. For more intensive analysis, a chart is provided in Appendix 7.1.

**Technology Use in the Assessment Process**

CSU has a comprehensive framework of outcomes assessment which is mission driven and dynamic as the University continues to evolve into a model urban comprehensive liberal arts institution. New assessment activities have been initiated that have enabled CSU to assess curricular changes and the quality of instruction, student services, and facilities while the methods used for data collection, analysis, and reporting continue to improve.

In 2004, CSU implemented the PeopleSoft Student Administration system (EagleLINKS). This integrated data base management system contains numerous tables for collecting academic performance indicators, academic program information and organizational data. The University uses another product developed by the vendor iStrategy to extract values from EagleLINKS tables to support in-depth analysis by unit representatives in EagleLINKS Student Analytics reports. CSU has the capability of setting the periods that apply to data appearing in these reports and can define additional reports as needed to satisfy new requests for analysis. These developments have enabled the University to use technology for data collection, analysis, and reporting to a considerable extent. The ultimate goal is to continuously improve institutional effectiveness through timely and complete outcomes assessment using technology.

A recently designed performance assessment system permits departments to review the performance of students, faculty, programs, and offices, in a more systematic manner. Departments have identified categories of goals, which have been aligned with their conceptual frameworks and strategic plans. For example, some academic categories include: 1) the quality of instructional programs, 2) diversity of faculty and students, 3) adequacy of resources, 4) unit productivity, 5) collaborative initiatives and partnerships, and 6) student retention.

**Institutional Level Assessment**

Institutional level assessment links outcome assessment to the strategic plan reinforcing CSU’s commitment to “educating the whole” as evidenced by the goals from the Strategic Plan, “Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential, Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan which indicates that CSU will endeavor to:

1. Enhance academic excellence in undergraduate and graduate academic programs,
2. Enhance student success,
3. Construct and renovate facilities, and
4. Expand external relations and improve advancement operations.

Two approaches to assessment at CSU encompass academic and non-academic methodologies. To assess the above goals and strategies, operationally, academic assessment is embedded in the core curriculum and evaluated as part of the core curriculum assessment. Non-academic goals and objectives are assessed as part of the division and department review.
Examples of Institutional Assessment Outcomes

Faculty and Course Evaluation

During fall and spring semesters, the CIA distributes faculty and course evaluation (FCE) survey forms to each class offered during the semester to collect student input on the effectiveness of their particular course and instructor. Results are tabulated, summarized, and shared with vice presidents, deans, department chairs, and individual faculty members. Departments and individual faculty members use the evaluations when considering modifications in the course content. Instructors are able to use the survey results to determine student opinions of their course(s) and instructional approaches, and make appropriate adjustments. The evaluations are also used in the process for determining merit pay.

In academic year 2005-2006, the FCE process was re-engineered, allowing for more sophisticated analysis that would support better decision-making. The re-engineering includes a more in-depth analysis by course, department, instructor, and institution that allows the institution to benchmark its activity using this instrument on a yearly and semester basis.

Institutional Results, Faculty Course Evaluation, Fall Terms 2004 to 2006

During the last three fall terms, for Question 23 (overall course effectiveness) the results have increased from 4.23 to 4.32 and for Question 44 (overall instructor effectiveness) the results have increased from 4.40 to 4.50 on a 5 point likert scale. Overall, this instrument conveys that teaching quality has improved based on student opinion (see Table 14.2).

Managing For Results Report

The OPA identified performance measures at eight agencies that can be used for auditing purposes during a fiscal year. This system categorizes the results of the performance measures audit. Measures are designated as either Certified, Certified with Qualification, Factors Prevented Certification or Inaccurate and categories are assigned based on a combination of control adequacy over a performance measure, consistency between the performance measure calculation methods and the performance measure definition, as well as, testing of source documents.

Highlights of CSU performance on the 2007 Managing For Results (MFR) report can be reviewed in Goals 7 and 8. (To see copies of MFR’s 2001-2007 see Appendix 2.4)

Goal 7: Maximize the efficient and effective use of state resources.
The percent replacement cost for facility renewal and renovation increased in FY 2007 to 0.7% from 0.1% in FY 2004. CSU has initiated and effectively implemented campus-wide preventive maintenance programs through its operation and maintenance service contract, implementation of facilities renewal, and deferred maintenance projects.

Goal 8: Make college affordable for Maryland residents particularly students from low-income families.

CSU is a leader within the University System of Maryland (USM) and the State in providing higher education access to first-generation college students, and in making college affordable to students from low-income families. CSU tuition and fees are the lowest among USM institutions.
In FY 2007, CSU responded to its fiscal constraints by adopting several efficiency and effectiveness strategies, redefinition of work, partnership with external entities, business process reengineering, and competitive contracting. By using these practices, the University has saved $2.19 Million (see Appendix 2.4: Managing For Results report).

**Professional Development for Faculty and Staff**

CSU has endeavored to link student learning assessment with institutional assessment by means of its Strategic Plan. According to Strategic Planning Goal 1, Strategy 1, CSU will “assess program effectiveness in the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Professional Studies, the School of Nursing, and the School of Graduate Studies to identify programs/majors for elimination, development, revitalization, or growth consistent with identified state, local, and national needs and the efficient use of limited resources”. As a consequence of this goal, CSU is presenting administrative and professional opportunities to enhance student learning assessment. For example, faculty development efforts have been focused on enhancing institutional knowledge regarding assessment.

During the past two years, faculty, staff, and administrators have been encouraged to participate in assessment training and development. In academic year 2006-2007, a group of faculty was selected to participate in a Middle States workshop concentrating on student learning. Opening Ceremonies for fall and spring terms have targeted student learning outcomes and assessment by the choice of speakers; for instance, in academic year 2006-2007, two speakers from Medgar Evers College discussed institutional and student learning assessment; in January 2007, a Middle States expert on student learning outcomes and assessment discussed approaches to assessing student learning.

**Peer Performance Report**

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the USM and Morgan State University. The guidelines inform the budget process by providing a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept identified funding peers that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics for comparison purposes. Seventeen measures have been utilized for USM institutions: SAT 25th and 75th percentile, percent of minority of all undergraduates, percent of African American of all undergraduates, average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rate, six-year graduation rate of all minorities, six-year rate of graduation rate of African-Americans, passing rate on teacher licensure exams, passing rate in nursing licensing exam, average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate, percent of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, acceptance rate, yield rate, FTE students per full-time faculty, and state appropriation per FTE student (see Appendix 2.3: Peer Performance Report).

Of the 17 indicators, CSU performed at or above the level on 3 indicators. Of those indicators where it performed below the level, state appropriation per FTE student played a significant role. For example, using the peer comparison, average state appropriation per FTE was $9,316 whereas CSU received state funding of $6,014 - a $3,302 difference.

---

10 Since 2004, the School of Professional Studies has been reconfigured. The Education Unit has been renamed the School of Education.
**Program Level Assessment**

Following the institution-wide goals, each unit is expected to develop a tactical plan that outlines its mission, vision, values, goals, objectives, strategies, and outcome measures. This plan will be assessed on a yearly basis in order to promote continuous improvement efforts. The institution level academic assessment process assesses competencies that every CSU student must acquire based on program objectives. These competencies are reflected in the core curriculum and mandated at the program level.

**Student Learning Outcomes, Academic Units**

Academic departments must address, specifically, student learning outcomes and their application within the educational environment which includes the following questions:

- What students should learn?
- How their learning will be assessed?
- How results will be analyzed and by whom?
- The Assessment schedule utilized
- Process for the Department to implement needed changes.

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) format has been incorporated as part of the internal academic program review with some modifications introduced by the Academic Program Review Committee to ensure data compliance with new methodological approaches being embraced by external accrediting bodies. As a result, this review ensures use of the data for improving program performance, effectiveness, market appropriateness and efficiency (See Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2007, Appendix 7.2 and Standard 14).

The University’s SLOA process provides both formative and summative feedback relative to institutional effectiveness. Through data collection and analysis, snapshots of how well the University serves students and the nature of their success are taken. These results are shared and used by faculty, students and administrators to improve programs, services and learning outcomes. Institutional goals as articulated in the MFR document are derived from CSU’s mission statement, the academic catalogue, and current initiatives. These goals, along with measurable objectives and performance indicators form the major components of the SLOA process.

Included as an integral part of the academic program review process, student learning outcomes are reviewed for mission consistency in a matrix that evaluates student teaching and learning (See Academic Program Review Matrix, Appendix 7.3). In this section of the internal review process, institutional goals related to student learning, performance, and teaching along with measurable objectives, or “domains of assessment,” and specific indicators are delineated, benchmarked and reviewed for goal achievement by department; such as, knowledge/skills acquired, values/beliefs transmitted, employment rates, performance on licensure and national exams, an assessment of departmental retention and graduation rates, and progression rates. Evaluation of the effectiveness of academic and support programs are also included to measure student performance along multiple and varied dimensions. For instance, student opinion and attitudinal information are gathered through various surveys and documents including faculty and course evaluations, program completer and graduation follow-up studies.
Assessment is embedded in each course and in every aspect of teaching, student services and instructional support programs. Continuous quality improvement is being implemented as a means of achieving desired outcomes and improved quality. For example, in the general education program, five competencies have been identified for inclusion in course syllabi:

- Written and Oral Communication
- Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning
- Critical Analysis and Reasoning
- Technological Competency
- Information Literacy

While general education has taken the lead on this initiative at CSU, each department is being encouraged to identify the competencies in which student learning will be assessed for courses offered. Within specialized program areas such as Education and Nursing, student learning outcomes have been clearly defined using specialized accreditation guidelines and program conceptual frameworks. For a more extensive description of student learning outcomes assessment at CSU, refer to Standard 14 of the self-study document.

*Academic Program Review Committee*

The campus-wide Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) was established to provide ongoing assessment data for programs not associated with accrediting bodies. This body operates on a seven-year schedule for reviewing all academic programs internally as part of its process to achieve continuous quality improvement. Historic data are used to review trends, to identify areas needing improvement, and to enhance programmatic areas of strength. Academic departments conduct their own internal review with the assistance of the APRC using data and a format provided by the Office of Institutional Research and CIA, as well as data collected by the unit to evaluate all aspects of the program.

The APRC assesses the information and outcomes derived from the departmental review and provides recommendations or suggestions for addressing areas identified as needing attention with assistance provided by the Committee as needed. The Office of Academic Affairs monitors corrective action and provides support as well as available resources. This process is used for all programs irrespective of whether programs are governed by external accrediting bodies.

*Non-Academic Unit Assessment*

Program level assessment reflects similar attributes to the academic assessment approach. Generally, non-academic units focus on supporting academic excellence so, typically, these programs/units have identified strategic goals that will promote institutional effectiveness and quality improvement. The units are assessed on a yearly basis based on state indicators for performance; for example, the MFR Report, utilized for institutional assessment of departmental goals, outlines state benchmarks such as:

- **Goal 1.** Provide access to higher education for diverse citizens of Maryland.
- **Goal 2.** Promote economic development in Maryland’s areas of critical need in particular, and the inner-city in general.
- **Goal 3.** Improve retention and graduation rates of undergraduate students.
- **Goal 4.** Provide solutions to urban community problems through outreach, public service and active research agenda.
Goal 5. Achieve and sustain national eminence in providing quality liberal arts and sciences education.

Goal 6. Increase revenue from alternative sources to state appropriations.

Goal 7. Maximize the efficient and effective use of state resources.

This report serves as an effective tool for reviewing performance on state mandatory goals and objectives. Each department also assesses its performance against the University strategic plan.

During the academic year 2006-2007, each area completed a questionnaire outlining its performance on specific goals and objectives (see Strategic Planning Assessment Matrices, Appendix 7.4). In academic year 2007-08, a final report outlined performance using assessment matrices with links to budgeting practices, and demonstrates outcomes. While units are being assessed by the MFR Report indicators on an ongoing basis, a process more closely aligned with strategic planning practices needs to be encouraged.

In those areas where no tactical plans exist, the area/department is actively being encouraged to solidify a strategic plan so that relevant benchmarks can be established. To date, the majority of the divisions at CSU have such plans which are followed and evaluated.

Examples of Non-Academic Program Level Outcomes

- **Pre-Enrollment Summer Programs.** CSU has recognized and addressed the fact that many potential freshmen need skill development prior to enrollment. To that end, CSU has implemented the Student Support Service’s STEP AHEAD program, the Pre-College Summer Program (PCSP) and the Natural Science Department Summer Bridge Program. Designed to improve student skills in writing, reading, math, test taking and study practices (Appendix 13.1), program reports show the second year retention rates for participants to be 80% in STEP AHEAD, 83% in the Bridge Program and 75% for the PCSP. All of these rates are higher than CSU overall retention rates (Appendix 13.1).

- **The Office of Academic Advisement (AA) Assessment Results.** The AA Office offers an Academic Planning and Transition Program providing undeclared students with informational workshops that address their advisement needs. Based on the results of 2001-2002 through 2005-2006 Continuing Students Advising Evaluations Surveys, students indicate an overall satisfaction with advisement services in areas of appointment scheduling, organization, service, scheduling process, and classes scheduled (See Appendix 9.2). The performance of this office is also validated by the National Survey of Student Engagement 2006 (NSSE), Question 12 (Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?) which highlights the mean comparison for CSU Senior students (3.06) as compared to Selected Peers (2.76) and Carnegie Peers (3.00). Additional services and staffing for the AA Office are shown in Table 13.A3.

- **The Office of Records and Registration Online Registration Results.** Online registration has been a successful endeavor with the number of users increasing from 2,461 students in fall 2004 to 3,294 in fall 2006. Currently, 90% of students utilize the online registration system.

- **The Office of TRIO-Student Support Services (SSS), Cohort Retention Outcomes.** The Office of TRIO-Student Support Services (SSS) provides opportunities for academic development, assists students with basic college requirements, and serves to motivate students...
toward successful completion of their postsecondary education. The program serves 160 students annually, and provides students with more than 1,050 tutorial, counseling, and advisement services, and 1,055 total contacts annually. Appendix 13.3 shows the performance outcomes for students in the 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2005-2006 cohorts.

Course Level Assessment

At the course level, assessment is modeled after the standardized approach used for program assessment in the academic area and includes: the unit’s standards, goals, objectives, learning outcomes, course competencies relative to the program, course assignments (assessment instruments), and classroom research based on student learning. At CSU, there is a common syllabus format that includes program and course level competencies. For professional programs (i.e., Nursing, Education, Social Work, and Rehabilitation), program specific competencies are outlined within the syllabus along with relevant assessment methods and evaluations tied to the national accreditation standards for that profession (see Appendixes 12.3-12.4: Course Syllabus Samples). Within the general education program, five competencies are outlined along with the “C” Paper as evidence of student learning outcomes (see Standard 12 and Standard 14 for further details, and Appendix 12.2 for the “C” Paper Guidelines).

Role of the Course Syllabus

Because the syllabus is a learning contract between the instructor and student, over the last two years, CSU has reviewed the standard format and revised it to include course information, course materials, course description, course objectives and competencies, course outline, technology used in the course, modes of instruction, mode of assessment/evaluation, writing standards, plagiarism policy, bibliography, and glossary. The revised syllabus was completed in AY 2004-2005 and submitted to the Curriculum Committee for implementation in AY 2006-2007 (see Revised Course Syllabus, Appendix 7.5).

As CSU moves along the assessment continuum, student learning outcomes and assessment are being identified by academic programs for implementation at the course level. For instance, the School of Arts and Sciences, has adopted the updated syllabus format that ties course objectives to learning outcomes or competencies while the School of Education employs a development within EagleLINKS to track conceptual framework benchmarks as Milestones. In the latter case, the student learning outcomes are extracted to reports in EagleLINKS Student Analytics that assesses performance by cohort in critical competencies mandated by the School and NCATE to meet accreditation requirements.

During academic year 2006-2007, the faculty identified direct measures of assessment so that the institution could support ongoing assessment of student learning. Within each academic department, efforts were taken to ensure that the learning experience encompassed information literacy, critical thinking, writing, use of technology, and program competencies. Importantly, the Office of the Provost financially supported these types of initiatives.

Course level assessment is completed using a holistic process and, typically, supports the program level assessment by identifying competencies using both direct and indirect assessment measures. Additionally, each unit has its own assessment instruments, methods, analysis, and continuous improvement efforts which encompasses classroom research and promotes an environment of assessment. These indicators are also used to evaluate data gathered from CSU’s
technical infrastructure (EagleLINKS and EagleLINKS Student Analytics) to support assessment. They are tied to the institutional strategic plan.

**Conclusion**

CSU has made considerable inroads into cultivating a culture of assessment at the institution. It has strengthened its institutional assessment methodology and promotes assessment of outcomes on a continuous basis.

**Strengths**

1. All units at CSU are engaged in some form of evaluation, planning, assessment, and development so that the University will be positioned to carry out its urban mission. CSU relies on a broad range of tools and resources to measure, evaluate, and assess educational outcomes.

2. The University’s Office of Planning and Assessment and the Center for Institutional Assessment (CIA) facilitate, guide and coordinate the institution’s strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts.

3. The CIA is a centralized University resource designed to inform planning and policy decisions in a wide range of academic and administrative areas. Since academic year 2005-2006, the Center has focused its efforts on training and development, survey development, assessment, educational research, and strategic planning.

4. Committees have been established to support institutional assessment and to spearhead institutional efforts; such as, the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Faculty Assessment Committee, Planning Council, and Finance Assessment Committee.

5. CSU’s assessment model has many data components that are utilized in developing assessment knowledge and includes the following data components: comprehensive survey research, fiscal management, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical management, technical learning support, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and institutional learning.

6. EagleLINKS Student Analytics is used to extract data from EagleLINKS tables for reporting and assessment of quality improvement by unit representatives who interpret these data to provide information that can be used in a continuous improvement effort.

7. During the past two years, assessment skills have been encouraged. Faculty, staff, and administrators have participated in training and development including: Middle States workshops concentrating on assessment of student learning outcomes; Opening Ceremonies show-casing speakers from Medgar Evers College and a Middle States experts; and professional consultation from the CIA and Center for Teaching and Learning.

8. CSU’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process provides both formative and summative feedback relative to institutional effectiveness. Through analysis of data collected, snapshots are taken that indicate the nature of student success and, hence, how well the University serves its students. These findings are shared broadly for use by faculty, students and administrators to improve programs, services and learning.

9. Institutional goals as articulated in the Managing for Results (MFR) report are derived from the University’s mission statement, academic catalogue, and current initiatives. Typically, programs/units have identified strategic goals to guide its objectives and activities throughout the academic year in order to promote institutional effectiveness and quality improvement. The units are assessed on a yearly basis utilizing state indicators for performance.
**Recommendations**

1. More development is needed in the area of non-academic unit assessment. To overcome organizational restrictions, assessment infrastructure is needed that will clearly define a methodology for reporting and assessing internal results relative to goals and objectives.

2. Effort needs to be expended to document direct methods for student learning assessment. While assessment is ongoing at the institution it is often difficult to evidence.

3. Additional administrative support with expertise in assessment is needed to overcome resource limitations in the CIA and to ensure that institutional and student learning assessment can be rigorously conducted.
STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

Standard 8

Introduction

The mission of CSU is focused on providing educational access and diverse opportunities for students with a high probability for success and those whose potential may have been hindered by a lack of social, personal or financial opportunity. Consequently, CSU’s Strategic Plan (In 2010) has as a major priority the goal of enhancing student success, attaining optimal enrollment and increasing diversity within the student population. Currently, CSU enrolls undergraduate students who are low-income (59% are Pell eligible), predominantly African American (86%), primarily instate (87%), and full time (87%). However, stop-out rates adversely affect the time to graduation. Additionally, the student population is primarily female (79%) with an average undergraduate age of 24. The research for Standard 8 focuses on determining to what extent the institution admits and retains students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with CSU’s mission and Strategic Plan.

Recruitment

In compliance with regulations that govern Coppin State University, criteria have been developed that support diversity of our student population to include first time freshmen, residential, non-traditional, out-of-state, international and transfer students (Appendix 8:1: Admissions Criteria). By employing various strategies, recruitment of prospective students is geared towards both the highly talented and those requiring specific intervention for success (Appendix 8.2: Recruitment Strategies). Information on admissions, scholarships, financial aid, academic enrichment programs, Honors College and McNair are readily available to students and their families. Accurate and current information is accessible through the dissemination of printed materials and CSU’s web site. On-line access is provided for registration of campus recruitment events, CSU undergraduate and graduate catalogs, schedule booklets (include academic policies/procedures), recruitment brochures and academic materials. These components undergird our recruitment efforts (Appendix 8.3: Lists of web and printed materials). Additionally, students requiring academic enhancement are eligible for services from various student support programs and activities including remediation, academic enrichment, socialization, and exposure to cultural events.

Currently, several initiatives assist prospective students in addressing academic and career goals. These initiatives include relevant literature that is distributed in key places and upon request. Testimonials of students’ successes are highlighted in recruitment brochures: CSU View Book, Honor’s College, McNair Program, Nursing and Career Development. Further, web-based and catalog information on each program include program objectives, expected outcomes and discipline related careers. This information is contemporary and reflects current trends in the respective disciplines (Appendix 8.3: List web and printed materials). Based on Table 8.1, the five-year average yield rate for freshman students is 36 %. Specifically, first-year admissions yield rates have fluctuated between 32 % and 46 % while in-state yield rates have ranged between 40 % and 63 %. In contrast, out-of-state yield rates have varied between 13% and 23 %.
The five-year average yield rate of transfer students is 48%. (Table 8.2) The transfer year rates have also fluctuated between 30% and 65%. Specifically, in-state yield rates have ranged from 30% to 77%, while out-of-state yield rates have varied between 30% and 35%. The fluctuations in these rates and the external factors, i.e. increased competition, limited marketing campaigns and stop-outs, have resulted in significantly lower overall enrollments for the 2006 and 2007 academic years.

In addition, the data shows an increase in the number of in-state applicants (233%) and admits (56%) while the number of in-state enrollees has decreased (-1%). There has been an increase in out-of-state applicants (12%) and a decrease of seven percent of out-of-state admits. However, out-of-state enrollees increased by 20%. As competition among area institutions increases, new media marketing strategies are needed to ensure Coppin remains a viable choice for recent high school graduates and transfer students.

Table 8.1: Freshman First Year Enrollment Applications by Residency and Admissions Status: Fall Semesters 2003-2007 (Latest comparable data available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>5 year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>5593</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>233%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Admitted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Students Enrolled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Yield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website and Office of Enrollment Management
Table 8.2: Enrollment Applications by Residency and Admissions Status Fall Semesters 2003-2007 (latest comparable data available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>5 year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>202%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Admitted</strong></td>
<td>336</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Of-State</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Students Enrolled</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rates of Acceptance</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yield</strong></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website and Office of Enrollment Management

Most freshman students and specific transfer students are required to take the SAT and a CSU-administered placement test, the AccuPlace r. The 75th and 25th SAT percentiles and the average grade point averages for the past five years are indicative of our student population and congruent evidence of Coppin’s mission (Appendix 8:4).

As evidenced in Table 8.3, student placement initiatives have positively impacted enrollment behaviors of new students. From these data, it can be concluded that students taking the placement test will have a higher probability of enrolling at CSU. Ordinarily, placement testing for fall term begins in February with exceptions made for the summer programs, Pre-College and Step-Ahead programs.

Table 8.3: Student Enrollment by Placement Test and Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Number of Placement Tested</th>
<th>Number of Enrollment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website and Office of Freshman Undeclared Major Advisement
**The Enrollment Process**

Coppin’s enrollment process includes the following areas: marketing, recruitment, placement testing, advising, financial aid, registration, and billing (Appendix 8:4: Description of Offices). The University’s enrollment process is evidenced by new student enrollment and the number of students placement tested, advised, receiving financial aid, registering for classes (Table 8:1; 8:2; 8:10) and completing many enrollment processes on-line: (Appendix 8:5 List of online functions).

However, for the enrollment process to become highly effective there must be enhancements in selected areas including marketing and advisement. For example, during the past academic years, there appears to be a definite correlation between recruitment/enrollment and marketing campaigns. Marketing campaigns have demonstrated residual effects. Between 2002 and 2004, four commercials were developed and aired which resulted in an 11% enrollment increase by Fall 05. Marketing funds have decreased over the past four years because of budgetary constraints. To institutionalize marketing efforts, a funded line item is required in CSU budget.

Also, there appears to be a correlation between retention and advisement of new students (See Table 8:10). A key strategy is to continue mandatory advisement of all students throughout their academic career. Currently, continuing students are encouraged but not required to meet with their advisors prior to registration. The comprehensive enrollment plan, once developed, will address these and other related concerns.

According to Table 8.4, which represents a five year enrollment analysis, overall enrollment grew by 5%. Undergraduate enrollment increased by 6% and graduate enrollment increased by 34%. The three highest enrollment terms in Coppin’s history were realized Fall 2001 (4003); Fall 2005 (4306) and Fall 06 (4104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.4: Enrollment Trends: Headcount, Undergraduate and Graduate, 2003-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Research Website*

Based on the latest five years, the full time undergraduate enrollment has increased by 11% (Table 8.5). The graduate full time enrollment has significantly increased. Part-time enrollment for undergraduate students has decreased as intended, although, total headcount has fluctuated. Graduate enrollment growth was attributed to partnerships cultivated within the School of Education.
Table 8.5: Enrollment Trends by Student Level and Status, 2003-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Annual Total HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yr % change</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>1193%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website

The FTE trends for students have increased during the last five years by 6% from 2938 in Fall 2003 to 3111 in Fall 2007 (Table 8.6). The undergraduate FTE had its largest increase in Fall 2005 (2991), although the five year change increased by 3%. The graduate FTE increased by 4%.

Table 8.6: Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Trends by Student Level, 2003 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F03</th>
<th>F04</th>
<th>F05</th>
<th>F06</th>
<th>F07</th>
<th>5 yr % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>3213</td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Undergraduate</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>2801</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>2828</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Graduate</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website and Office of Enrollment Management.

At CSU, female students disproportionately outnumber male students nearly 4 to 1; the total number of male students has decreased by 9% over the past five years (Table 8.7).

However, the graduate male student population has increased by 2%. In 2003, undergraduate male students accounted for 25% of undergraduate enrollment. During Fall 2007, male students comprised only 21% of the undergraduate enrollment. To address this issue, a Black Male Initiative Taskforce was implemented.

Table 8.7: Enrollment Trends by Student Level and Gender, 2003-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2429</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>2602</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yr % change</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website.
Enrollment trends by student levels and resident status indicate that in 2003, 90% of CSU students were in-state residents (Table 8.8). Instate residency trends have been quite consistent during the past five years.

Table 8.8: Enrollment Trends by Student Level and Resident Status, 2003-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Website and Office of Enrollment Management

Retention

There have been several efforts initiated by CSU to enhance retention and graduation rates of students (1999-present). The efforts are extensive and are available in comprehensive reports (Exhibit Room and Appendix 8:6 Retention Reports - Access and Success Reports (2003-2006) - White Paper, 2003- Black Male Initiative Executive Summary).

The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) funded the Access and Success program in 1999 to assist with retention efforts and to enhance operating budgets of historically black colleges and universities in Maryland. The funds could not be used as financial awards in the form of scholarships or need based aid for students (Appendix 8.7 Access and Success Reports, 2003-2006). These funds were much needed and used to launch several effective initiatives that included the retention campaign.

The Retention and Graduation Campaign was launched in 1999 by former president Dr. Calvin Burnett who charged the vice presidents of Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance and Student Affairs to oversee a collaborative retention effort. A department chairperson and the associate vice president of Enrollment Management were appointed co-chairs of this campaign. Four phases of the program were developed and implemented resulting in a 10% increase in graduation rates over four years. In 2003, the new president, Dr. Stanley Battle, appointed another Retention Committee, which met for one year and developed recommendations. The recommendations were not implemented because of budgetary constraints (Appendix 8.8- White Paper).

In 2006, the Task Force on the Black Male Initiative was developed to determine how to attract, retain, and graduate males from Coppin State University. (Appendix 8.9- Executive Summary of Task Force on Black Male Initiative).

Currently, the interim president has begun the process of developing a comprehensive integrated enrollment plan to include marketing, recruitment, the enrollment process, retention and graduation, facilities, financial aid, budget, and academic program development.
According to Table 8.10, which references cohorts of first-time freshmen, students have increased by 80% from 383 in 1997 to 689 in 2005. However, the first year retention rate decreased from 72.1% in 1997 to 63.4% in 2005. The decrease can be attributed to organizational changes that resulted in fragmenting freshman student services.

Retention and graduation rates need to improve at Coppin. Many of the past efforts were modified based on changes in administrative focus and leadership. There is a strong need to institutionalize retention strategies and efforts to ensure consistent and effective outcomes. The Comprehensive Enrollment Plan will focus on student achievement by student classification level (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior).

Official graduation rates are based on six years to degree completion (Table 8.10). The 1993 cohort was scheduled to graduate by 1999. The graduation rate for this cohort was 18.8%. Noteworthy is the fact that within 3 years of implementing the Retention Graduation Campaign, graduation rates had increased by 10% because of targeted efforts.

As a result of analyses conducted by the Office of Enrollment Management to determine barriers to graduation of CSU’s students, there are two areas that impact graduation rates: longer than the national norm of six years to degree completion and the lack of adequate student financial resources. Typically, students at Coppin take longer than six years to graduate. This is evident based on the data presented below (Table 8.9A). The six-year graduation rate for F95 cohort is 26.4%; however, based on the same cohort, an additional 35 students graduated after six years, resulting in an overall 34.2% graduation rate. Additionally, CSU serves students from predominantly disadvantaged backgrounds, which often impact their ability to meet financial obligations; therefore, the lack of student financial resources creates an inability to pay tuition and fees. Subsequently, outstanding student accounts are eventually sent to the Central Collections Unit (CCU). (Table 8.9B) Students are not allowed to return to CSU until their accounts are paid in full. The economic profile of our students is further supported by Coppin’s having the highest percentage (59%) of Pell eligible students in the state. This has a strong negative impact on the six year retention and graduation rates. If the cohorts were adjusted to subtract the number of students at Central Collections, the overall graduation rate for Coppin would significantly increase.

| Table 8.9: A and B Cohort Data Adjusted for CCU and Additional Years |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 8.9-A GRAD DATA Greater Than 6 years | CSU >6 years Grad Rate | 8.9-B CCU DATA | # at CCU Not Grad | Adj Cohort | Grad Rate Adj |
| All Cohort | >6 years | Grad | Grad | # at CCU Not Grad | Adj Cohort | Grad Rate Adj |
| F95 | 439 | 150 | 26.4 | 34.2% | 62 | 377 | 39.8% |
| F96 | 514 | 184 | 29.3 | 35.8% | 78 | 436 | 42.2% |
| F97 | 383 | 114 | 23.5 | 29.8% | 64 | 319 | 35.7% |
| F98 | 457 | 146 | 26.5 | 31.9% | 77 | 380 | 38.4% |
| F99 | 441 | 112 | 24.7 | 25.4% | 106 | 335 | 33.4% |
| F00 | 417 | 91 | | | 106 | 311 | 29.3% |
| F01 | 540 | 93 | | | | ||
| F02 | 579 | 46 | | | | ||
| F03 | 571 | 5 | | | | ||
Table 8.10: Retention and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Cohort Year</th>
<th># of Matriculates</th>
<th>1st Year Retention Rate</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MHEC Retention and Graduation Rates of Four Year Public Institutions, June 2007

According to the Financial Aid Report generated by the University System of Maryland in academic year 2004-2005, 59% of first-time full time freshmen at CSU received Pell grants while the USM institutions average was 20% (Appendix 8:10: Excerpt from Governor’s Budget Book, 2007). Pell grants are an indicator of the degree of financial need of students. With that stated, CSU has endeavored to improve its financial aid processes and practices. In fall 2004, the PeopleSoft system (EagleLINKS) allowed many manual processes to be automated, such as verification of FAFSA data, file review, NSLDS monitoring, awarding, satisfactory academic progress calculation and various troubleshooting reports. As a result, the Financial Aid Office (FAO) has become far more effective and efficient in meeting the needs of students. In fall 2005, document imaging was piloted at CSU. Consequently, students can now fax documents for a faster response and electronic files move among the counselors and the internal auditor to increase workflow productivity. Lost documents are not a recurring complaint by students as in past years. As of fall 2006, students are able to accept their awards online through EagleLINKS self service. Notably, the management of scholarships on campus is still fragmented. Currently, there is a search for a scholarship coordinator to assist in this effort and to improve retention.

Importantly, institutional source of financial aid funds were ineffective based on fall 2000 and fall 2001 Financial Aid Impact Research (FAIR) analysis conducted by Noel Levitz in 2003. Based on the recommendations, merit aid has increased by 62%. In fall 2006, the FAO institutional need based aid increased from $69,000 in 2001-2002 to $1,174,912, a 1700% increase. Additionally, merit aid increased from $487,226 in 2001-2002 to $1,855,714 in 2005-2006, a 287% increase (Appendix 8:11 CSU Financial Aid Report S-5 Aid Year 2007). During the last five years, the number of students receiving financial aid has increased (See Table 8.11). For example, in aid year 2006, approximately 60% of all new undergraduate students received some form of financial aid assistance (see Table 8.12).
Table 8.11: Number of Students Awarded by Aid Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>3,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Financial Aid Office and S-5 Report

Table 8.12: Recruitment Outreach, Enrollment, and Financial Aid Data, Fall 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Type</td>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4,476</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Financial Aid Office and Admissions Office

Conclusion

Coppin State University’s enrollment process is effective. Updated printed and online materials provide information for prospective and current students. The recent implementation of instructional technology (Tegrity and Blackboard), PeopleSoft (EagleLinks), and document imaging has provided the institution with a greater opportunity to utilize technology to support student enrollment and achievement while better meeting the needs of our students. (Appendix 8:12 List of Technological Advances) Further, increased need based financial aid, though limited, has provided much needed financial resources to support retention.

However, to be most effective, there is a need to integrate enrollment planning to include marketing, recruitment and admissions, retention, academic program development, budget, facilities, technology and enrollment services assessments.

Strengths

The enrollment process at CSU is effective and reflects the efficient use of relevant technology: administrative and instructional.

1. Recruitment
   - Relevant information which governs admissions, financial aid, academic enrichment and career decisions is readily available via internet and personal interaction.
   - The number of freshman undergraduate in-state applicants has increased (233%) with a corresponding increase in admits (56%).
   - Student placement initiatives have resulted in a higher probability of students enrolling at CSU.

2. Enrollment
   - A five year analysis (2003-2007) indicates growth in both undergraduate (6%) and graduate (34%) enrollment.
   - Full-time enrollment increased by 11% for undergraduate and 34% for graduate.
   - The number of graduate male students has increased by 2%.
- A Black Male Initiative Taskforce has been implemented to address the issue of declining black male enrollment.

3. Retention
- CSU has taken a proactive stance in addressing the issues of retention and graduation rates as evidenced by documentation on the Retention and Graduation Campaign, Access and Success Reports, the Retention Committee and the Black Male Initiative.
- The cohorts of first-time freshman students have increased by 80% (2005).
- Although the reported graduation rate of the F95 cohort is 26.4%, the number increases to 34.2% when including students (35) graduating after the 6 year limit.
- Increased financial aid though limited has provided much needed financial resources to support retention: merit aid increased by 282% and need based aid increased 1700%.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are offered based on current practices in recruitment and analysis of CSU enrollment trends and retention efforts:

1. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan with adequate fiscal resources to include the following plans:
   a) Marketing plan to support recruitment and image building and branding
   b) Recruitment plan
   c) Retention plan based on student classification and student profile, i.e. freshman experience, sophomore experience and non-traditional students
   d) Academic program plans to support recruitment and retention
   e) Budget plan to support enrollment efforts
   f) Facilities plan to support enrollment growth and academic plans

2. Place resources in the base budgets of the areas to fully implement the Comprehensive Enrollment Plan.

3. Re-examine the organizational structure to support the emphasis on enrollment/retention and graduation.
Introduction

A comprehensive program of student support services complemented by a knowledgeable and committed staff and guided by a broad-based institutional commitment to excellence in urban education (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2006) is essential to assist CSU students in meeting their educational and personal goals.

Student Support Services Areas

Programming and services offered by CSU student support services areas are designed to nurture the potential and transform the lives of Coppin State University students. Each offers a supportive environment and qualified professional staff who are carefully screened by the Department of Human Resources and interviewed by the appropriate administrative team. Staff is subsequently hired based on specific educational and professional qualifications which are related to the support service. The qualifications and standards of the professional and paraprofessional staff enhance and direct leadership opportunities, potential for social growth and the promotion of academic proficiency and achievement for the students serviced by them. Professional staff members are available Monday through Friday’s 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., and many service students Wednesday evenings and weekends, or provide after hour services via e-mail and cell telephones.

Each of the following student support services areas has achieved significant accomplishments despite the evident need for additional staffing and resources. The programs and services are assessed via student and faculty program evaluations, and the results assist in future planning. Additional evidence was also gathered from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Noel Levitz Retention Management Inventory, and People Soft Reports for the following student support services areas:

The Academic Resource Center (ARC) services all Coppin State University students, and is located in the Grace Jacobs Office-Classroom Building, making it conveniently accessible to students. Each of its four laboratories - Mathematics Lab, Reading Lab, Study Skills/CAI Lab and Writing Lab-provides basic, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction and tutoring. In addition, the ARC offers an open and supportive atmosphere that is conducive to student learning. Professional and Para-professional staff tutors offer one-to-one assistance to students. The ARC averages 18,700 contact hours of support to students annually. Appendixes 9.1 and 9.2 describe the broad range of services and key personnel for the center.

The Office of Academic Advisement (AA) provides an Academic Planning and Transition Program providing undeclared students with informational workshops that address their advisement needs. Students are assisted in navigating the EagleLINKS student self-services module. Students also engage in scheduled or walk-in appointments, and tele-counseling with
advisors. The advisement staff contacts students face to face, via mailings, and with e-mail technology to follow-up as appropriate.

The results of the 2001-2002 through 2005-2006 Continuing Students Advising Evaluations Surveys show an overall satisfaction with advisement services in areas of appointment scheduling, organization, service, scheduling process and classes scheduled (Appendix 9.27). This satisfaction is validated by Question 12 (Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?) of the National Survey of Student Engagement 2006 (NSSE) showing that the mean comparison for CSU Senior students is (3.06) as compared to Selected Peers (2.76) and Carnegie Peers (3.00). Additional services and staffing for the Office of Academic Advisement are shown in Appendix 9.3.

Auxiliary Services is comprised of various service providers that enhance the quality of life for students on campus. Each delivers a variety of quality goods and services and first-rate customer service through a combination of college-operated and contractor-managed entities. Campus-operated services include the Eagle Laptop Program, Eagle Card Program, Conference and Special Events Services, and Licensing Program. Contracted vendors enable daily operations of the bookstore, food services, and beverage and vending rights. The Office of Auxiliary services satisfies its ultimate mission, which is to provide friendly, courteous service complemented by a unique selection of quality products and services in each of the auxiliary service units to assist students, faculty, and staff in achieving their personal and academic needs. Effective Fall Semester 2006, a bookstore committee was convened to review and modify, as appropriate, the current bookstore policies and procedures to ensure that its operations are meeting the needs of the students, faculty, and staff, including the needs of commuter students and adjunct faculty members. Four major services are described in Table 9.6.

The Bursar and Student Accounts Office is responsible for maintaining the financial records of students. The staff responds to inquiries regarding charges, payments, adjustments, refund checks, delinquent tuition and fee charges. Appendix 9.7 provides information regarding the student Personal Deferment Plan.

Career Development and Cooperative Education Center (CD) offers programs and services to assist students in career planning, professional development and securing rewarding employment. Programs offered include the Cooperative Education and Internship Program that provides opportunities for interested students to combine work experience with classroom instruction. Students are prepared to apply knowledge to solving real business problems and develop an understanding of organizational structure and procedures in professional environments. Additionally, the System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI); a computerized career assessment instrument was successfully administered and interpreted by career counselors to assist students in exploring career interests. The web-based version of SIGI became available to the entire student body during the 2002-2003 academic terms; total student contacts increased each academic term except in 2005-2006 academic year as shown below in Table 9.1. The decrease was due to the unavailability of software during the fall 2005 semester. Additional services for the Center are shown in Appendixes 9.8 and 9.9.
Table 9.1: SIGI: Web Application for Career Exploration Total Student Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total # of Student contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>192 (132 first time users)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Contacts decreased in the 2005-2006 because software was not available during the fall semester

The Community Health Center is a non-profit, community-based primary care clinic that is administered by the Coppin State University Helene Fuld School of Nursing. It provides comprehensive primary care to CSU students, faculty and staff, and offers services to the underserved and uninsured residents of the Coppin Heights community. Additionally, the Center provides co-operative learning experiences for both graduate and undergraduate nursing students at Coppin State University.

Its mission is to provide quality health care that is sensitive to societal needs, demands, and values with providers that are culturally sensitive and responsive to changing trends and needs of the urban environment. As an integral part of the School of Nursing and Coppin State University, the Center is committed to the mission of its parent institution. It provides readily accessible, low cost, high quality care to residents of the neighborhood surrounding CSU. Services of the Center emphasize health promotion and prevention of disease. The goal of the Center is to improve the health of persons who reside in areas adjacent to CSU. School of Nursing faculty, nurse practitioners, students, and in some instances, a physician, provide services. All professional personnel are properly licensed by the State of Maryland. A total of 4,412 patients have been serviced by the Center over a five year period (2002-2006) as show in (Appendix 9.28).

The University’s Counseling Center was administered by the Division of Student Life until the end of the spring 2006 term, and was assigned to the Division of Academic Affairs on July 1, 2006. Its name was changed to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and the mission expanded to include on-site psychological assessments and services.

During the academic years of 2002 through 2006, the mission of the Counseling Center provided services and programs that guided students through a process of self-exploration facilitating self-awareness and ultimately enabling them to reach a level of self-actualization. This process helps them to define and accomplish personal and academic goals.

Additionally, services were provided via on-site support and through referrals to community agencies assuring that students received the following services:

- Individual and Group Counseling
- Noel Levitz Testing and Interpretations
- Outreach Services
- Crisis Intervention
- Needs-Based Workshops
- Freshman Mentoring
- Disabled Student Services
- International Student Services
- Sexual Assault Programming
- Attendance Counseling
- Merit Scholarship and Grant Programs Counseling
- Health Promotion and Wellness Activities

Access and Success grant funded initiatives supported by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) enabled the Counseling Center during the terms of 2002-2005 to:

- Decrease the student-to-counselor ratio, providing increased student access to counseling services
- Assess the needs of the incoming freshman students with the Noel Levitz At-Risk Inventory
- Develop workshop and video workshop programming
- Develop freshmen bonding activities
- Identify at-risk freshmen and provide each with a personal counselor
- Offer at-risk freshmen counseling intervention and referral services as needed
- Offer at-risk freshmen individual and group sessions
- Employ an at-risk counselor who monitored the progress of students via a computerized tracking system

The Noel Levitz Assessment freshmen data also guided the services and program development for:
- Student Activities
- Housing and Residence Life
- Career Development and Co-Operative Education Center, and
- Public Safety

Counseling programs and services have continued to assist Coppin State University students in succeeding despite personal or academic challenges. In the fall of 2006, the Division of Academic Affairs introduced the new and improved center offering on-site psychological services, and expanded staffing specialties to included addictions counselors.

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) provide support services that enable students to grow in self-understanding and assist them in utilizing their personal and interpersonal resources. Individual interactions, group therapies, faculty/staff consultation, and numerous outreach activities/ involvements are some of the primary means by which the center’s mission to create and maintain a nourishing, healthy, diverse community through relationship building, education, and crisis prevention. Refer to Appendixes 9.10 and 9.11 for additional services offered by CAPS.

One of the most challenging issues facing students and parents is the financing of a college education. The Office of Financial Aid, within the confines of available funding and federal, state and institutional policies, assists 75% of Coppin State University students in financing their education. The office offers workshops, on-line procedures and guidelines for
obtaining aid, and personalized assistance via financial aid counselors who help students to understand the federal financial aid process, its interpretation and completion of documents to obtain funding. Appendix 9.14 provides additional information regarding the Office of Financial Aid.

Residence Life supports the educational mission of CSU by promoting the development of the whole person through its many programs, educational themes, student government opportunities, and learning experiences. The goal of residence life programming is to provide educational experiences outside of the classroom, which enhance the overall college learning experience. The promotion of individual growth and shared responsibility is offered by the Office of Residence Life through programming sponsored by its staff and other members of the campus community.

Students who reside on campus experience more than just a place to lodge, study and engage in social activities. They are provided a place where college memories begin and the relationships developed form friendships that last a lifetime. Appendix 9.29 shows student satisfaction survey results in the areas of educational and cultural activities, social and athletic activities and overall campus living experience for the academic terms 2002-2006. Additional residence hall descriptions and services are shown in Appendixes 9.21 and 9.22.

The Office of Records and Registration is responsible for maintaining students’ academic records, publishing the University’s Schedule Booklets, registering students for courses, evaluating students’ records for graduation, processing transcripts, verifying students’ enrollment, veterans’ affairs and collaborative enrollment. The Coppin State University-University of Baltimore (CSU-UB) Collaborative is a cooperative arrangement between two of the leading educational institutions in Baltimore. It gives undergraduate students the opportunity to broaden their education beyond one campus and study in diverse academic environments.

Online registration has been successful; the number of users increased from 2,461 students in fall 2004 to 3,294 in fall 2006. Currently 90% of the students utilize the online registration system. Additional on-line services provided by the Office of Institutional Technology that assist the Office of Records and Registration are provided in Appendixes 9.15 and 9.16.

The mission of Student Activities is to provide programs and events that meet social, cultural, recreational and intellectual needs for the University community. The office complements the academic program of study and enhances the overall CSU experience. The dedicated professional staff develop and implement the following activities and programs:

- Freshman Candlelight Ceremony
- Retention Fest New Student Orientation,
- Homecoming
- Lyceum Series
- Student Senate Retreat
- Miss. and Mr. Coppin Pageant and Coronation
- Midnight Madness
Advisors Luncheon
Intramural Sports

The Director of Student Activities serves as an advisor or chairperson for student groups and committees such as:

- Royal Court
- Charles B. Wright Leadership Institute
- Pan-Hellenic Council
- Courier Board
- Orientation Committee
- Student Senate Association
- Eagle Yearbook

Student Activities also provides opportunities for students to expand and enhance their overall educational experience, improve their social lives, gain self-confidence, acquire leadership skills and learn to function as members and/or leaders of a group or a team. Appendix 9.23 provides additional information about key services offered by the Office of Student Activities.

The Division of Student Life assists students in the development of positive attitudes, personal qualities and intellectual pursuits that will promote the worth, dignity and aspirations of each student as he or she matriculates towards graduation. These attitudes and qualities are consistent with CSU’s mission of urban educational excellence and are accomplished through Divisional resources and programming that deliver:

- A safe and secure University/college community
- Educational, cultural, social, and leadership opportunities
- Health Promotion/Wellness activities
- A Residential Living and Learning environment
- Career and professional awareness development
- Specialized freshmen programming
- Honor’s College Housing
- Partnerships and community outreach and
- Counseling and support services

The Division’s mission is to empower Coppin State University’s diverse student population to persist academically and to develop personally. It encourages the completion of established goals, leading to the culmination of a comprehensive CSU experience. Beginning fall 2006, the Division no longer administered Counseling, Public Safety and Health Promotion/Wellness. However, the Division continues to administer Student Emergency Loans and the Student Health Insurance Programs. Appendix 9.24 identifies key services and personnel for the Division.

The Office of TRIO-Student Support Services (SSS) provides opportunities for academic development, assists students with basic college requirements, and serves to motivate students
toward the successful completion of their postsecondary education. The goal of SSS is to increase the college retention and graduation rates of its participants who are low-income and first generation college students. The program serves 160 students annually, and provides students with more than 1,050 tutorial, counseling, and advisement services, and 1,055 total contacts annually. Appendixes 9.36 – 9.39 shows the performance outcomes for students in the 2002-2003, 2003-2004, and 2005-2006 cohorts. The Summer Step Ahead Program is a free four-week summer program sponsored by TRIO-Student Support Services designed to assist new and transfer freshmen students in improving placement test scores, subsequently providing them the opportunity to make the transition from secondary school to higher education. Both programs are staffed by professional tutors and para-professional student staff. Additional services are shown in Appendixes 9.25 and 9.26.

The Intercollegiate Athletics Program is a fundamental part of CSU. Without exception, the Intercollegiate Athletics Program is expected to maintain the same standards of the academic, student life and other institutional programs. The Intercollegiate Athletics Department is operated in conformance with CSU’s and NCAA Division I standards.

The President of Coppin State University is responsible for, and has final authority in all issues pertaining to the operation of the intercollegiate athletics program. The athletic director has specific responsibilities for athletics. Most operational issues requiring administrative decision making of the intercollegiate athletics are funneled from the athletic director to the President. If a matter involves changes in regional membership, changes in divisional status, or eliminating or adding a sport, these matters would be referred to the University System of Maryland Board of Regents. The President is advised by an intercollegiate athletic advisory board (IAAB). The IAAB is a part of the checks and balances system for administering intercollegiate athletics. IAAB serves as the oversight group for all facets of the University’s intercollegiate athletics programs. The IAAB establishes policy, monitors compliance and promotes academic integrity. They also advise the President on policies, procedures and major decisions as they relate to intercollegiate athletics. Appendixes 9.4 and 9.5 identify three major support services that are offered by the Department of Athletics.

The Student Grievance Process is a convenient method for students to systematically obtain relief from situational conflicts that may arise between them and CSU officials, i.e., faculty, staff or administrators. Any Coppin State University student shall have the right to make known a problem or complaint without fear of reprisal or coercion. Complaints by students arising out of allegations of inappropriate, unlawful, or unauthorized behavior by Coppin State University staff or faculty (including, but not limited to, discrimination, intimidation, and verbal or physical abuse) may be brought to the attention of the University for resolution through the grievance procedures.

This process offers an open dialogue between the student and the Associate Vice President for Student Life, followed by a conference in a non-threatening environment that provides an opportunity for the student to again discuss the facts of the grievance to the accused and the relief that is sought. If the student is not in agreement with the outcome of the conference, a two step appeal process is available.
Notwithstanding the above, complaints concerning student academic matters are grievable under procedures entitled "Student Academic Due Process", and complaints of sexual harassment are grievable under the separate procedures entitled "Coppin State University Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Sexual Harassment". Student Grievance and Appeal procedures are outlined in the Coppin State University Handbook – (Appendix 9.40). Appendix 9.17 shows key services related to the Student Grievance process.

**Student Records**

The student support services areas are responsible for enforcing the federal regulations, policies and procedures that govern student records to ensure the safe and secure maintenance of student records. Federal regulations include the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) and the Health Insurance Portability Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAAA) Policies. In addition, each student support service area establishes procedures and guidelines that are set forth by departmental policies. Students are informed via CSU’s website and by paper copy of their rights regarding the custody of their records.

The majority of student records are paper copies that are secured behind locked doors and filed in locked file cabinet drawers. CSU is aggressively moving toward a paperless environment using the PeopleSoft (ERP) software, version 8.0 which delivers to the users on campus on demand both the Enterprise Relationship and Business Analytical data. With the implementation of Campus Portal and individual “role” based security, the staff, faculty, students and visitors can access information via an Internet browser. Staff and students are issued a password and login identification to use the system. The level of access to a student’s records by staff depends on the student’s specific department and job function. Students have limited access to their personal data and academic information.

Evidence collected via electronic interviews from the directors of the support services areas (see Appendixes 9.41-9.50) show that hard copy and electronic student records are managed via monitoring of file access, provision of staff training, and administering periodic and external audits. Student records are maintained for a time period specified by the support area and disposed of by contracted shredding services. As CSU moves towards the increased use of technology, safeguards must be implemented to ensure the integrity of student information.

**Conclusion**

Based on the finding of the Standard Nine subcommittee, the student support services offered to Coppin State University students during the 2002-2006 academic terms comply with and support the University’s mission of urban educational excellence.

The evidence presented supports a structure appropriate to the delivery of student support services. Additionally, student handbooks, college catalogs, and publications in print and/or available electronically exhibit the nature of services provided by the institution. Evidence shows that the process and procedures used to adjudicate student grievances meet University System and legal best practices.

The strengths, concerns and recommendations offered by the Standard Nine subcommittees are as follows:
Strengths
1. Coppin State University has provided resources that are essential to ensuring that each student is provided the services, and support needed to achieve the institution’s goals for students.
2. Student Support Services are responsive to the full spectrum of diverse student needs, abilities, and cultures.
3. The delivery of services is evidenced-based and flexible. The modes and levels of educational delivery meet the varied needs of students.
4. Consistent with the institutional mission, programs are available to provide support to diverse student populations, which include traditional, commuter and mature students, those with disabilities, international students, distance and distributed learning students and those who are enrolled in co-operative programs with sites other than the main campus.
5. There are dedicated, committed faculty and staff who are professionally trained to nurture the potential of Coppin State University students.
6. Student support programs and services are assessed and modified based on University and standard evaluative measures.
7. The final attributes, behaviors, leadership skills and overall excellence exemplified by Coppin State University students indicate that the students have benefited by student support services.

Concerns
1. Available funding does not allow for program enhancements that are needed to offer more urban focused services that would reflect the unique needs of our student population.
2. Staffing in key student support services areas are inadequate to meet the ever growing needs of Coppin State University students.
3. A need exists for environments that encourage social interaction, student leisure and study opportunities, thereby reducing the stressors associated with University life.

The following recommendations flow directly from the research, analysis and findings of this report, and support the strategies found in Appendix 2.11 of the Coppin State University Strategic Plan (2010).

Recommendations
1. Increase the level range of services and access to facilities for evening, weekend, and commuter students.
2. Offer new students the opportunity to participate in self-assessment and career exploration using the System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI) during their orientation to Coppin State University.
3. Develop a campus-wide policy for records that is compliant with federal, state and local and system mandates.
Introduction

Teaching, research and service are cornerstones of the institution’s mission. To ensure that the mission is well supported, qualified professionals are appointed to the faculty of Coppin State University. Faculty searches are initiated by departmental search committees comprised of professional peers within the discipline. The minimum qualifications required for consideration are consistent with established discipline-specific expectations (including those of accrediting associations, if applicable), and the policies governing faculty appointments at CSU as approved by the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM).

The credentials of prospective faculty are verified through reference checks made by the members of individual search committees, the appropriate Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The authenticity of academic degrees and certificates is validated by the Office of Human Resources. Faculty candidates must submit official transcripts of completed degree and certificate programs to the Office of Human Resources.

Innovative Faculty Development

Recently CSU has inaugurated several measures to increase institutional support of ongoing faculty development at CSU, to enhance the depth and breadth of faculty excellence in teaching, scholarship and service, consistent with the expectation set forth in Standard 10 (MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, page 37)

Prior to 2005, there were limited resources available, including Title III funds when appropriate, in support of faculty attendance at professional conferences. CSU has now increased its financial commitment to this venue for faculty development. For the period from October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2007, inclusive, CSU has budgeted $30,000 in Title III funds in support of faculty attendance at professional conferences. That support will increase to $40,000 in available funds for the period between October 1, 2007 and September 30, 2008.

Since 2005, the Faculty Information Technology Committee (FITC) has offered annual mini-grants to enable faculty to incorporate instructional technology such as Blackboard and Tegrity into their courses. A total of 57 mini-grants totaling $210,000 have been awarded to faculty. In 2006 the Faculty Research and Development Committee (FRDC) was created to administer mini-grants to enable faculty to conduct research, present papers at conferences, and publish on subjects within their respective disciplines. Furthermore, the mini-grants enable faculty to make course lectures, class notes, and even class discussions available 24 hours per day, seven days a week. In addition to supporting faculty development initiatives, the mini-grants support the University’s retention efforts as well. In academic year 2007-2008, a minimum of 64 mini-grants totaling $152,000 will be awarded to faculty at CSU.

Additional discipline-specific initiatives facilitate faculty research and scholarship at CSU. For example, a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) user group based in several departments assists faculty with the statistical analysis of quantitative data collected in...
social science-related research, using SPSS software. Other examples of support for research and scholarship include instructional release time available for faculty engaged in scholarly activities within certain departments, and the Education Research Focus Group (ERFG).

**Faculty Members Design and Implement New Academic Programs**

CSU faculty members are directly responsible for academic program development, implementation, and review, consistent with the expectation in Standard 10. The creation of new academic programs begins with the faculty within individual departments at CSU. The faculty-based Curriculum Policies and Standards Committee reviews program proposals made by these faculty. This Committee in turn forwards its recommendations on program proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who in turn makes a recommendation to the President for final action. A similar process exists for proposed revisions to existing academic programs at the University.

New degree programs are also subject to approval by the USM Board of Regents, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC).

The Academic Program Review Committee is responsible for conducting regular assessments of existing academic programs at CSU, under guidelines developed by the USM Board of Regents. A report with findings and recommendations is then submitted to the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs at CSU, and also to the USM Board of Regents.

Faculty in disciplines that are subject to the standards of professional accreditation associations (e.g. Education, Nursing, Social Work, Counseling Psychology, etc.), are directly responsible for meeting these standards in curriculum and instruction within their respective professions.

**Academic Programs and Faculty Driven by Information Technology**

In this decade, it is incumbent upon any institution of higher education to incorporate the latest information technology in the delivery of higher education to students, and in support of faculty with their instructional, research and service responsibilities. Coppin State University was selected by Educause (August 2005) in recognition of the innovative excellence of its information technology infrastructure in support of instruction and learning at the University. The Office of Information Technology at Coppin includes 45 staff who are dedicated to providing direct faculty support with course delivery and instruction. Forty-five classrooms at the University now incorporate “smart classroom” technologies, including desktop computers and wireless capabilities, DVD and CD-ROM players, teleconferencing technology, etc. Twenty-one campus computer labs, including 349 individual workstations, are now available to students on campus.

Since 2005 the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in cooperation with the Faculty Information Technology Committee, has provided 57 mini-grants totaling $210,000 to enable faculty to incorporate Blackboard and Tegrity instructional technology within undergraduate and graduate courses at the University. In addition, the Office of Information Technology has sponsored regular workshops to help faculty learn specific software technologies in support of
their instruction, and to complete administrative tasks associated with teaching (e.g. posting course grades, etc.).

**The Institution Supports Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activities**

In 2004, Coppin State College became Coppin State University, signaling an increased emphasis on scholarship and creative activity among faculty at the University. To this end, and consistent with the expectation set forth in Standard 10, the University has increased its direct financial support of faculty research and scholarship through technology and general research mini-grants, and indirect financial support, such as reimbursement for travel expenses associated with faculty participation at national and regional conferences. Additional support for faculty scholarship and creative activity is now provided through newly-created initiatives such as the Faculty Assessment and Improvement of Teaching and Learning and Research and Creative Work Grants.

Additional evidence of support is noted by the fact at the level of scholarly activity has increased since 2004-2005 as noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Professional Presentations</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of External Grants</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Faculty Awards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$1,892,315</td>
<td>$3,392,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Spent in Public Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Congruence between University Mission and Faculty Service Activities**

Education faculty have been involved in the creation of an “Education Corridor” in West Baltimore, preparing children and youth for a seamless, successful progression through the elementary and secondary levels of education, and on to higher education. The Education Corridor includes collaboration with Rosemont Elementary School, which has been cited as one of the best charter schools in Baltimore City (Ursula Battle, Public Relations July 25, 2006, Rosemont Elementary/Middle School Continues to Soar), and the on-campus Coppin Academy, a charter high school inaugurated by Coppin State University in 2005, that will expand from grades 9 to 12 by 2008-2009 Academic Year.

Nursing faculty are actively engaged in clinical training and community-based health care through the Coppin Community Health Center directly across North Avenue from the main campus, as well as at other clinical facilities throughout Baltimore City. The available community health services at the Coppin location will be greatly expanded when the new Health and Human Services Building (now under construction) opens in 2008. The first floor of this building will be devoted to providing nursing, counseling, childcare, and related social services to residents of West Baltimore. In the case of the Department of Social Work, this community facility will continue the service legacy of The Institute, a social work initiative that from 2002 to 2006 provided assistance to community-based organizations in Baltimore City in the area of HIV/AIDS education and prevention.

Through community art exhibits and theatrical performances, faculty in fine and communication arts provide community residents an opportunity to reflect upon and better
understand their shared humanity, and to celebrate their African American heritage. In the summer of 2007, Dr. Linda Day-Clark (Department of Fine and Communication Arts) created a public exhibition at the Baltimore Museum of Art of the quilts and photographs of the quilters of Gee's Bend, Alabama, a unique group of African American women, and the story of their artistic gifts, vibrant spirit, and inspiring resilience in the face of adversity. Each February faculty in the Department of History, Geography and Global Studies sponsor colloquia and other special events open to the public in celebration of Black History Month.

**Conclusion**

CSU has implemented processes to assure that it recruits and maintains a faculty who are professionally qualified to support the undergraduate and graduate curriculum and instruction in the liberal arts and the professional disciplines. Faculty have an integral role in the development, implementation, and review of academic programs at CSU. There has been a recent, significant increase in institutional support of faculty with respect to teaching responsibilities, primarily in the form of strengthened information technology resources at CSU, including access to instructional software such as Blackboard and Tegrity.

**Strengths**

1. Coppin faculty are committed to standards of academic excellence and academic integrity within the context of Coppin's guiding mission. They are dedicated and resilient in the face of significant challenges associated with providing higher education to traditionally underserved student populations.
2. Coppin faculty carry the heaviest teaching load of any USM institution, their productivity with respect to research and scholarship has increased significantly within the past five years.
3. Faculty continue to make significant contributions to the overall quality of life of Coppin Heights and surrounding communities of West Baltimore.
4. Coppin recruits and maintains a University faculty who are professionally qualified to support undergraduate and graduate curriculum and instruction in the liberal arts and the professional disciplines that are offered by the University.
5. Faculty have an integral role to fulfill in the development, implementation, and review of academic programs at Coppin.
6. There has been a significant increase in institutional support of faculty with respect to teaching responsibilities, primarily in the form of strengthened information technology resources at the University, including access to instructional software such as Blackboard and Tegrity.

**Recommendations**

1. Additional support for research and scholarship, such as reduced annual teaching loads, should be examined.
2. The subcommittee also recommends: (1) an expanded role for the faculty research and development committee, (2) full support of faculty by a campus office of funded research, (3) publication (i.e. reinstatement) of a scholarly journal on campus, (4) utilization of Honors/McNair students as research assistants, and (5) adjustment of average teaching loads to reflect new expectations re: scholarship.
EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

Standard 11

Introduction

Coppin State University is committed to fulfilling its legacy of providing rigorous course offerings in liberal arts and sciences and professional disciplines for economically disadvantaged students. The institution has continued to fulfill its commitment to serving the community by embracing innovative partnerships with prominent businesses and with government agencies, as well as educational partnerships with Pre-K through 12.

Honors College

Established in fall 1990 as the Honors Division and changed to its present name in 2006, the Honors College is comprised of two distinct units: The Ronald E. McNair Post Baccalaureate Achievement Program and The Honors Program. The McNair Program was established to prepare undergraduates for University teaching careers. Over 100 CSU McNair Scholars have earned master’s degrees from the nation’s best research institutions and seven have been awarded doctorates completed at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), Harvard University, Howard University, Duke University, Lehigh University, and Pennsylvania State University. Currently, thirteen CSU graduates are enrolled in Ph.D. programs throughout the nation.

The Honors Program attracts a talented pool of local, national, and international students who are committed to community service and to achieving academic excellence in their fields. Honors College alumni hold leadership posts in academia, the arts, and in business, government, legal, and non-profit sectors throughout the United States. Recent graduates have earned masters, doctorates, and first-professional degrees at such institutions as Brandeis, Carnegie-Mellon, Columbia, Howard, Johns Hopkins, Ohio State, and Wisconsin. Dr. Sean Brooks of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Dr. Leontye Lewis, former Director of the School of Education, Dr. Shawyn Jenkins of Curriculum and Instruction, and Dr. Juanita Ashby-Bey of Curriculum were honor students who returned to the Coppin Family and worked as leaders and professors in the academic program.

School of Graduate Studies

The School of Graduate Studies at Coppin State University offers professional programs and prepares students for advanced graduate work. The major goal is to provide a learning environment conducive to the development of skills, attitudes and competencies, which are applicable to growth and development in an urban setting and global environment.

The School of Graduate Studies has a strong commitment to excellence and makes a continuous effort to make its programs relevant to the changing needs of students, to the professional communities it serves, and to society. Applied research and public service endeavors are encouraged in keeping with the University’s overall urban mission.

The School of Graduate Studies offers Master’s degree programs through the School of Education (Adult and General Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Master of Arts in
Teaching, Reading, and Special Education); the School of Professional Studies (Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Criminal Justice, Human Services Administration and Rehabilitation Counseling); and the School of Nursing (Master of Science in Nursing). Certificates are offered through programs in Rehabilitation Counseling, Adult and General Education, and Nursing.

All programs provide learning experiences that enable students to secure knowledge designed to enrich their lives, foster a commitment to ethical, intellectual, and social values, and encourage the pursuit of life-long learning.

**Helene Fuld School of Nursing**

Graduates of CSU’s Nursing Program are in great demand. Students in the nursing program are prepared to practice nursing while providing care for individuals, families, groups, and communities. The University Nursing Program prepares over 80% of African American baccalaureate nurses in Maryland. Just recently, the School reported a National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX) pass rate of 86.9%. Historically, the rate has been above the average of the State of Maryland. Both the undergraduate and graduate nursing programs are approved by the Maryland State Board of Examiners of Nurses and accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission. The Helene Fuld School of Nursing is an agency member of the Council of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs of the National League for Nursing and the American Association of Colleges of Nursing.

The School of Nursing also operates the Community Health Center. The Center has the unique mission to provide health care that is sensitive to societal needs, demands, and values, with providers who are culturally sensitive and responsive to changing trends and needs of inner city clients. In keeping with the mission of CSU, the Center seeks to improve the health and quality of life of persons residing in the Coppin Heights Community, the University campus community and the surrounding area. The Center provides comprehensive, holistic, family health care services.

Graduates from the baccalaureate, RN to BSN and masters programs (family nurse practitioner and post-masters certificate) are prepared to deliver culturally sensitive health care to diverse populations within an urban environment and to practice across multiple settings. The curriculum reflects an emphasis on primary health care, patient education, health promotion, rehabilitation, and self-care. The curriculum is also reflective of the emphasis on case management, health care policy and economics, research methods, outcome measures, legislative advocacy and management of data technology.

The undergraduate nursing program is comprised of a series of carefully articulated courses offered within four classifications (freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors). The General Education Requirements (GER) of CSU and specific courses selected from the School of Arts and Sciences are included in the curriculum plan as supporting courses. In order to achieve maximum benefit from this educational experience, students must demonstrate success in prerequisite courses before advancing to higher-level courses. The mission of the Master of Science Degree in Nursing (MSN) is to prepare graduate nurses with advanced knowledge and practice skills. The graduate program of the School of Nursing derives its purpose directly from the underlying philosophy of the School of Nursing. The graduate program builds on the
foundation of undergraduate education. The program prepares professionally educated nurses who provide clinical nursing services to urban clients, especially those in underserved communities.

**School of Arts and Sciences**

The School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) offers the majority of courses in the General Education sequences as well as a wide variety of majors and minor programs in both the traditional arts and sciences disciplines and in areas reflecting CSU’s unique identity as a University serving a largely urban population. Students may earn a Bachelor of Arts degree or a Bachelor of Science degree. There are approximately 125 faculty members (full-time and part-time) in the School who provide outstanding instruction to students. Approximately ninety percent of the full-time, tenure track faculty members possess terminal degrees.

The SAS prepares students for careers in many diverse fields, and for graduate and professional schools in several disciplines, by providing them with classroom instruction and opportunities for internships, service-learning activities, community service projects, and study abroad experiences. These programs are organized by department and include History, Geography and Global Studies, Humanities, Visual and Performing Arts, Mathematics and Computer Science, Management Science and Economics\(^\text{11}\), and the Natural Sciences.

The Department of History, Geography, and Global Studies offers a major in history with several concentrations and minors in History, African American Studies, and International Studies. To help broaden the student’s thoughts and ideas concerning the world, field experiences in international agencies or foreign nations are encouraged. A student travel-study program has been initiated in order to provide structured and academically meaningful experiences in foreign nations. Students may travel to parts of West Africa and the Caribbean. As an integral part of the minor, lectures and workshops dealing with current key and international themes and topics are sponsored during the academic year.

The Department of Humanities offers programs in English, Media Arts, and Foreign Languages, which include a major in English and minors in English, Linguistics, Comparative Literature, Journalism, and Mass Communications. The major in English is designed to prepare students for graduate programs in humanities, professional schools, and careers in public relations, technical writing, and creative writing. The Media Arts major is designed to prepare students for graduate programs in broadcast or print journalism, careers as managers in the communication industry, and careers as telecommunications research and development professionals.

The Foreign Language program provides students with a background useful in several fields, including English, Linguistics, Philosophy, History, Political Science, Management Science, and International Studies and Trade. The minor in Linguistics enables students to understand the nature of language in general and the English language in particular, and develops in them the ability to handle language-related educational, social, psychological, and political problems. The minor in Comparative Literature provides an opportunity to study literature

\(^{11}\) Effective September 2007, the Department of Management Science and Economics is now the School of Management Science and Economics.
written in languages other than English, enabling students to perceive literary genres, themes, trends, and movements from a broader perspective than is afforded by the exclusive study of the literature of one language.

The minor in Journalism provides students with a knowledge of the history of journalism, an awareness of the role of media in society, and the practical skills necessary in any journalistic process, including techniques of gathering and reporting news, news writing and editing skills, and publication design. The minor in Mass Communications prepares students for careers in cable communication systems, network broadcast systems, educational communications systems, industrial communication systems, and various research and marketing systems.

The Department of Visual and Performing Arts offers many exciting features, including a unique interdisciplinary Urban Arts degree program. The program of study allows students to explore acting, ceramic sculpture, music, painting, photography, and speech. The faculty consists of talented professional artists, scholars and educators. The program provides the opportunity to study and experience the lively arts in Baltimore - a major metropolitan area that is a vibrant cultural center for the arts and features outstanding professional theatre companies, superior museums and high-caliber performances in music and dance.

The Department of Natural Sciences offers major programs in Biology, Chemistry, and General Science. There are also dual degree programs with the University of Maryland System Institutions in Engineering, Dentistry, and Pharmacy, and minor programs in Biology and Chemistry. The Dual Degree Engineering Program is offered in cooperation with the University of Maryland School of Engineering and is designed to allow students who are proficient in mathematics and science to earn a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry at CSU and later earn a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering at the University of Maryland School of Engineering. The Dual Degree Dental Program is designed to allow selected students to earn a Bachelor of Science degree in General Science-Chemistry or Biology Emphasis from CSU, and a doctoral degree in Dental Surgery from the University of Maryland Dental School. The Dual Degree Pharmacy Program is designed to allow pre-pharmacy students to earn a Bachelor of Science degree in General Science from CSU and a Bachelor of Science degree in Pharmacy from the University of Maryland School of Pharmacy. The Department is also currently an active partner in Science Technology Engineering Mathematics (STEM) and Maxie Collier Programs at CSU. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has awarded the Mathematics and Computer Science department and the Natural Sciences department a $2.5 million STEM grant. The grant enables CSU to award stipends to increase STEM majors, offer summer programs for incoming STEM students, and update STEM courses.

**School of Professional Studies**

The School of Professional Studies (SPS) is one of the newest schools at Coppin State University and home to programs focusing on preparing highly qualified professionals in human service professions. The School of Professional Studies offers eight (8) undergraduate degrees and five (5) graduate degrees within five (5) departments of study.

The Department of Criminal Justice offers several degree programs, an undergraduate concentration, and an undergraduate minor. The degrees offered include a Bachelor of Science in
Criminal Justice, a Master of Education in Correctional Education, and a Master of Science in Criminal Justice. The Bachelor of Science prepares students for occupational entry as well as for further study and research. Students are also prepared to enter the public and private security industry. The Master’s level programs are focused in specialty areas, providing appropriate research skills and a foundation for further study.

The Department of Applied Psychology and Rehabilitation Counseling offers major programs which prepare students for careers in Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counseling, Psychological Services, and advanced training in psychology. Graduates of these programs are eligible for certification by the State of Maryland Board of Counseling Certification. These programs prepare students for graduate school and for positions as professionals of various governmental and private agencies.

The Department of Social Sciences offers a major program in Social Sciences and concentrations in Political Sciences and Sociology. Minors are offered in Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science, and Non-Profit Management Youth Development (in conjunction with the Department of Management Science and Economics, and the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance).

The Social Work program at Coppin State University prepares undergraduate students for generalist social work practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Students learn to use professional knowledge, values and skills to implement planned change strategies designed to address the needs and problems of diverse populations in the society. Senior students are offered guidance and assistance in preparing for the state licensing examination and securing employment.

The Interdisciplinary Studies Program is designed to enable students to prepare for careers that bridge academic disciplines. Students have the opportunity to develop individualized, intellectually challenging courses from selected departments. Students may combine courses from any two disciplines offered at Coppin State University.

School of Education

The School of Education (SOE) offers a multitude of undergraduate and graduate programs that are designed to prepare students for careers in education, sports management, counseling and guidance, and human resource development. The Coppin State University School of Education has a long history of preparing teachers and other professionals for Maryland.

Graduates of the SOE demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective PreK-12 practitioners. As educators, they are able to teach diverse school-age populations in a variety of educational settings, and have the potential to continue to grow professionally in a technologically - rich society. The School of Education offers a variety of undergraduate and graduate programs designed primarily to prepare students for careers in teaching. The SOE qualifies students for positions in professional non-teaching fields, such as sports management. A core component of the teacher education program is the development of the student’s understanding of the realities of the multicultural, interdependent world as evidenced by their ability to work effectively with all children. Majors in any Teacher Education
Program may also minor in a discipline in the School of Arts and Sciences and prepare individuals to guide and instruct learners of all ages. Each program is based on a core of general education courses from the humanities and fine arts, the social and behavioral sciences, the natural and physical sciences, and health and physical education.

The School of Education also coordinates the Coppin Academy in conjunction with Baltimore City Public Schools. The School is a new and innovative high school founded on the premise that all Academy students will further their education at professional institutions of higher learning upon graduation. The Academy opened in July of 2005 and serves a population of over 300 students in grades nine through eleven. By 2008, it is projected that the Academy will have over 400 students when it introduces a twelfth grade. Using the latest student achievement data, Academy staff, students, and parents will acknowledge current student strengths, identify student challenges, and work as a team to complete Personal Education Plans that guide each student in reaching individual educational goals.

School of Management Science and Economics

The School of Management Science and Economics is a new school at Coppin State University. The School just recently departed from the School of Arts and Sciences and is positioning itself to offer new degree programs in addition to those it once offered while a department under the School of Arts and Sciences. The creation of this new school is indicative of the University’s efforts to offer high quality programs and meet the demands of the global marketplace.

The School of Management Science and Economics offers a major and minor in Management Science and Economics. Once fully approved by the University System of Maryland Board of Regents, the School will also offer a new Bachelor of Science degree in Entertainment Management. The new offering has just recently received approval from the Curriculum Standards and Policy Committee.

The School of Management Science and Economics prepares students for graduate school and professional careers in management in the private and public sectors. The programs are designed to assist students in 1) acquiring quantitative expertise, 2) gaining insights into human behavior and handling interpersonal relationships, and 3) developing aptness in identifying, describing, and solving problems in administrative situations. The programs are flexibly designed and structured to meet individual needs. They also include internships and practice to enhance the classroom experience and to provide pragmatic and theoretical exposure.

Educational Offerings and Institutional Competitiveness

CSU’s greatest asset continues to be its academic program. In order to fulfill its mission to its constituency, to the community, and to the State, Coppin State University continues to maintain an educational program that meets high standards of excellence as measured by a number of internal and external indicators of effectiveness: external evaluations by accrediting bodies, internal program reviews, employment rates of its graduates, progression rates, employer opinions, students’ evaluation of teaching, retention and graduation rates, and the general education program. These indicators of effectiveness, although not exhaustive, form the basis of the assessment and evaluation process at CSU (see Chapter 7, p. 41-47).
Learning Expectations

Course syllabi are aligned with national standards to meet professional expectations regarding program offerings. Faculty members are encouraged to use Blackboard to place course syllabi online for students enrolled in their courses. Printed copies of the syllabi are available as well. Course objectives and anticipated student learning outcomes are written and clearly set forth in the course syllabi. Hence, students clearly have access to performance expectations and behavioral outcomes of the course. Students are advised to meet with counselors, advisors and mentors if problems or issues arise from a course or program that may affect their successful completion of a course and their matriculation status and deadline.

Specifically, course syllabi are designed for students to acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills. Course objectives assess each student’s proficiency in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency and information literacy. Instructors use several modes of instruction: lectures and class discussions; labs, experiments, and demonstrations; guest speakers and field experiences; internet/library assignments; tapes, CDs and DVDs; attendance at conferences, meetings, speeches, and symposia and cultural and artistic performances, exhibitions, and events, etc., to aid the student in meeting the expectations of the course. Course assessments are designed to meet specific and measurable outcomes. Changes in the grading system or revisions are given to the students in writing. Each instructor specifically describes his or her weighting system for all assignments.

Additionally, CSU offers a number of academic services designed to provide additional support to students who experience difficulty in understanding and meeting course expectations and requirements. The Academic Resource Center is one such unit that provides tutorial services in writing, mathematics, reading and other types of academic support. In addition to the Academic Resource Center, the University has the Office of Advisement (explained in Chapter 13, p. 99) and the Counseling and Psychological Center (explained in chapter 13, p. 70).

Student Assessment of Learning at Coppin State University

In May 2007, the Office of Institutional Research administered the Program-Completer and Graduating Student survey to the bachelor’s degree graduating class of 2007. Over 56% of the graduates responded providing a snapshot of the graduating class’s activities, attitudes and experiences. Students believed that they learned what they were expected to learn from their programs of study. Of those surveyed, 76% held jobs that are directly or somewhat related to their areas of study. In terms of goal attainment, 80% of those surveyed expressed that they achieved their academic and career preparation goals as a result of attending Coppin State University.

Cohesiveness of Institutional and Curricular Missions

A comprehensive review of educational offerings finds that there are clear linkages between the mission of the institution and the curriculum. Selected examples have been cited in the following schools. The findings are listed below:

1. The mission of the School of Education (SOE) is to prepare teachers and other school leaders to be reflective facilitators of learning. Effective teachers are systematic planners,
instructional leaders, effective communicators, reflective decision-makers, and evolving professionals who have demonstrated that they have the content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and professional knowledge and skills to advance the teaching and learning process. The SOE has a diverse group of experienced and dedicated faculty committed to guiding students in their academic pursuits. The SOE strives to use differentiated, standard-based, and student-centered instruction to guide the tenure of students in their bid to become reflective facilitators of learning. Consistent and continuous advisement enables students to achieve their goals in a time conscious manner. Graduates of our program demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective P-12 practitioners, are able to teach diverse school-age populations in a variety of educational settings and have the potential to continue to grow professionally in a technologically rich society.

The School of Education is committed to fulfilling the institution’s mission of preparing highly qualified teachers who are academically prepared to ensure that P-12 students can meet the demands of the 21st century. The SOE offers a wide array of undergraduate and graduate programs in early childhood, elementary education, secondary education, and special education, Advanced Teacher Education Programs in reading and special education, and graduate initial certification programs in the Master of Arts in Teaching and in special education. The indicated programs are aligned with the School’s conceptual framework and national and state standards including the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the Maryland Teacher Technology Standards (MTTS), and NCATE/ SPA Standards for specialty areas. In April of 2006, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education granted the accreditation of core education programs until 2010.

2. **The School of Arts and Sciences (SAS)** is a student-centered academic division. The School is committed to assist students in critically examining ideas and becoming effective communicators. Students develop the ability to apply research methodologies across disciplines; they will value an understanding and appreciation of other cultures, will utilize the skill sets and knowledge necessary for reflective thought and decision-making, will nurture an intellectual curiosity, and an appreciation for learning that transcends professional goals, and will function as informed and responsible citizens of the world’s communities.

The School of Arts and Sciences prepares students for careers in many diverse fields and for graduate and professional schools in several disciplines by providing them with classroom instruction and opportunities for internships, service-learning activities, community service projects, and study abroad experiences. The curriculum is designed to encourage students to become thoughtful humanists and leaders in a dynamic, diverse, and global society.

3. **School of Professional Studies** is a newly-formed School that consists of the Departments of Applied Psychology and Rehabilitation Counseling, Criminal Justice, Social Sciences, and Social Work. The mission is consistent with the University’s mission in meeting the needs of students and preparing them to meet market demands in their fields and service needs to the community.

4. **The School of Graduate Studies** offers professional programs and prepares students for advanced graduate work. The major goal is to provide a learning environment conducive to the
development of skills, attitudes and competencies, which are applicable to growth and
development in an urban setting.

The School of Graduate Studies has a strong commitment to excellence and makes a
continuous effort to make its programs relevant to the changing needs of students, to the
professional communities it serves, and to society. Applied research and public service
endeavors are encouraged in keeping with the University's overall urban mission.

5. The **Helene Fuld School of Nursing**'s mission is to prepare professional nurses to
manage the nursing care delivered to clients in urban and a variety of other settings. Graduates
are lifelong learners. CSU nurses possess the skills, knowledge and competencies necessary to
deliver culturally appropriate health care to diverse populations. A highly qualified, committed
and nurturing faculty maintains a teaching-learning environment in which students receive all of
the requisites necessary to meet the demands and complexities of today's health care arena.

**New Educational Offerings**

**Table 11.1: SAMPLE OF DISCIPLINES WITH NEW COURSE OFFERINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline(s)</th>
<th>Course offering(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Geography and Global Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years new courses and academic programs have been developed
to adjust to market demands in all academic fields. CSU has also established collaborative
partnerships with the Baltimore Teacher’s Union and Prince George’s County to offer certification courses in Education and
courses leading to a Master’s Degree in Education. Also, the University System of Maryland
Board of Regents approved a new bachelor’s degree in Health Information Management for
Coppin. This program is driven by market demand and the critical need for health professionals
within the State.

**Table 11.2: List of Academic Majors and Minors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Academic Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Science (Biology Emphasis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Nursing (Traditional and RN to BSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Urban Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sports Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comparative Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Non-Profit Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sports Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just recently, Coppin State University formalized a Memorandum of Understanding on Friday, September 22, 2006 with the Ministry of Education of Barbados. This collaborative partnership is designed to facilitate key initiatives between faculty and students across varying disciplines in education. A team of educators from Barbados visited Coppin to facilitate this development. The partnership is still in the early developmental stages.

**Ensuring Academic Rigor and Coherence**

Current course offerings and measures of productivity demonstrate the success of student learning from content, rigor and coherence of the academic program offerings and curriculum. Internal and external processes require this to be the case. The Academic Program Review Committee (comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators) under the direction of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, requires all academic programs to possess measures of productivity that demonstrate the success of student learning. Furthermore, it is a requirement of the University System of Maryland and the Maryland Higher Education Commission that all institutions submit reports on student learning outcomes at the aggregate and departmental level.

The Curriculum Standards and Policies Committee (comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators) and the Deans’ Council provide oversight for academic programs and new course development and promote accreditation. These committees are comprised of faculty and staff who review and approve program changes to ensure academic rigor and coherence.

The Office of Institutional Research sends matrices for data to be used by the Academic Program Review Committee which contains common core departmental indicators. This information helps the institution make informed decisions and better understand the performance of General Education Requirements at Coppin State University. The questions of interest are attached in Appendix 12.1.

**Accreditation at Coppin State University**

Coppin State University holds accreditation from national and regional bodies. This is a clear indication of academic rigor and cohesiveness. The University is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. The undergraduate and graduate programs in Teacher Education are accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Maryland State Department of Education. The School of Nursing is accredited by the Maryland Board of Nursing and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Committee (NLNAC). The Social Work Program is accredited by the National Council on Social Work Education (NCSWE). The Rehabilitation Counselor Education Program is accredited by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE).
CSU Promotion of Information and Learning Resources

Progress is being made to actively promote use of information and learning resources. Each department offering research methods courses requires the use of the library’s facilities and resources in carrying out research projects and assignments. Instructors request library visits and sessions with the librarians to familiarize students with the resources at their disposal.

The newly revised standards for syllabus design now include information literacy competencies as part of the objectives for each course, as well as a matrix for assessing these competencies. (see Standard 12, Appendix 12.1 and Appendix 12.3). These competencies are based on the information literacy standards developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of the American Library Association.

The addition of the information literacy standard will require more collaboration between faculty and librarians in developing appropriate course-related information literacy competencies. It is recommended that a more formal approach to promoting the use of information literacy skills be adopted to encourage students to use the library research tools and resources at their disposal. This approach would include faculty workshops, online tutorials for faculty and students, and a course focusing on information literacy competencies.

Conclusion

The response to this standard provides evidence that the institution offers an appropriate curriculum that guides the institution in its fulfillment of its mission as evidenced by course syllabi, accreditation process, periodic program review and self studies comparing sister institutions’ retention and graduation rates. The mission of the institution is paramount to the effective operation of the academic programs; therefore, evidence of the mission of CSU is incorporated into the academic programs as well as course syllabi. Program and course approval follow strict guidelines set forth and implemented by the Curriculum Standards and Policies Committee, which assures consistent enforcement of academic policy, while the Deans’ Council enforces academic policies on the graduate level.

Strengths

1. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge of skills, within its educational offerings
2. The institution offers an appropriate curriculum that guides the institution in its fulfillment of its mission as evidenced by course syllabi, accreditation process, periodic program review and self studies comparing sister institutions’ retention and graduation rates
3. CSU offers strong, effective, and high quality educational programs.

Recommendation

1. The University should conduct a cost-benefit analysis of current and newly-implemented academic programs to determine appropriate resource allocation. Resources to be examined should include the number of core faculty and essential staff anticipated to support critical programs campus-wide.
General Education

Standard 12

Introduction

The General Education (GE) program fulfills CSU’s mission by “creating a common ground of intellectual commitment” while offering a diverse basis for intellectual growth “in a supportive learning environment” and providing an opportunity to take GE courses augmented by strong academic enrichment through the Academic Resource Center. Students with high potential are encouraged and advised to take advantage of the programs offered by the Honors College (see Chapter 11). These students participate in honors courses, community services and research.

Support of the Institutional Mission

The GE program assists students “to acquire a significant introductory body of knowledge about the western and nonwestern traditions that are broad enough to ensure an educational balance among the major areas of knowledge: the arts, the humanities, mathematics, the natural sciences, and the social and behavioral sciences.” For instance, GE requirements in history provide students with an opportunity to examine western or African American cultures; GE courses in the humanities ensure that all students take World Literature, thus encouraging the development of global perspectives; GE courses in the arts and in speech open diverse enriching experiences in the fine and performing arts which enhance personal growth in artistic and oral self expression. In short, the breadth of the GE course requirements enables students to appreciate and acquire foundation knowledge essential for the pursuit of courses in a major program.

Faculty and staff at CSU have diverse ethnic backgrounds and experience. Through mentoring and participation in community programs, these leaders serve as role models for all students enrolled in GE courses, thus enabling students to enrich their experiences and expand their horizons while being encouraged to develop a commitment to good scholarship and to service within the inner city. Such activities provide an impetus for students to excel beyond baccalaureate studies and serve to promote the transformation of students into life-long learners who are engaged in community life.

Regardless of students’ backgrounds, the GE Program strives to ensure that all successful students demonstrate competencies as mandated by Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and embodied in the MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence. However, an analysis of GE course syllabi in winter 2006 provided evidence that the competencies were not readily apparent. In many cases, it was necessary to infer the anticipated outcome or competency from the course objectives.

The Committee assessed all general education syllabi according to the five competencies mandated by MHEC. (Appendix 12.1)
Actions Taken

- The following actions have been taken to rectify the lack of clarity in syllabi outcomes:
  - The Standard 12 Committee updated a standard syllabus format guideline (that was not being used consistently across departments) to include the requirement that outcomes be specified for individual course objectives and ensured that the Provost endorsed use of the format by all units. The “C Paper” writing standards (an MHEC requirement), policies for e-mail communication between students and the Institution, as well as policies relevant to special needs students were added to the syllabus format. (Appendix 12.2) It was further determined that the course prerequisites should be noted on all syllabi, effective fall 2007.
  - A companion syllabus template was created to match the syllabus format to promote consistency in preparing syllabi for GE courses. (Appendix 12.3)
  - A workshop was held August 17, 2006 to demonstrate how existing syllabi could be mapped to the template and to emphasize strategies for grading using the competencies as performance criteria. (Appendix 12.4) Another workshop was held on August 18, 2007 to provide more in-depth faculty training on assessment practices at CSU.
  - CSU’s Director, Center for Institutional Assessment (CIA), met during the fall 2006/spring 2007 semesters with faculty teaching GE courses. The meeting provided one-on-one assistance to match course objectives to specific competencies. The revised syllabi are expected to be ready for use beginning spring 2007.
  - CSU Director, CIA, met during the fall 2006 semester with faculty teaching selected GE courses to establish assessable learning goals and rubrics as well as a method for tracking performance so that Coppin could begin to collect more effective evidence of learning outcomes.

Student Performance in General Education Courses

In July 2006, CSU hired a PeopleSoft specialist to evaluate functional requirements for analytical data relative to this self study. Specifications for analytical reports were quickly developed and prototypes tested by early August, 2006. The EagleLINKS Student Analytics tool, an iStrategy software application that interfaces with the PeopleSoft Student Administration (SA) system, was chosen as the tool of choice for generating the General Education analysis, since most of the SA tables were targeted for existing reports. The design involved identifying GE courses in the Course Catalog with a flag that denoted their GE category. Additional categories were created to identify developmental courses as well as information technology courses.

In order to maximize flexibility of analysis, selection criteria for the reports were set to allow choice for generating data by:
  - Term – Fall or spring terms for 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 (can be updated to add future terms)
  - GE Category – Selection by All categories or specific GE category. Category VII has been added for Developmental course analysis; Category VIII for Information Technology course analysis
  - GE Subject - Selection by All subjects or by specific GE course
Repeat Code – Selection by no repeat code or by ‘Include in GPA’ or ‘Exclude from GPA’. This feature supports determination of student repeats of GE courses.

Level – Selection by Senior/Junior/Sophomore/Freshman for the report that displays results by student level

These various reports provide the Chairs of the Academic Departments with grading outcomes to permit consideration of cause and effect for the performance results and to make informed planning decisions. (Appendix 12.5) The reports display aggregate data in a grid format with the ability to drill to detail for any selected cell in the grid. They are easy to use for ongoing analysis and decision-making and can be run to Excel for review by committees or inclusion in institutional reporting.

**Findings**

The GE Report results summarized in Table 12.1 (below) show that the success rates for all GER categories ranged from 40 % to 76 % during spring 2007. Typically, student headcount for GER categories ranged from 798 in English, 2281 in Arts and Humanities, 720 in Social and Behavioral, 418 in Mathematics, 483 in Natural Sciences, and 717 in Interdisciplinary and Emerging Issues. Of particular note, academic withdrawals accounted for less than 5 % of all grades given during spring 2007. However, there needs to be some consideration given to the number of courses within each GER category that is over the class limit for English and Arts and Humanities.

**Table 12.1: Course Categories by Success Characteristics, Spring 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success rate?</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># GER students?</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># AW grades?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Seniors in GERs?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER classes over limit? (total over)</td>
<td>15 (39)</td>
<td>38 (134)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>8 (26)</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend results shown in Table 12.2 (below) indicate that the success rate for Category I - English Composition courses varies between 55% and 40% during the period fall 2004 to spring 2007. Students must pass these two composition courses with a C grade while they may pass all other GE courses with a D grade. Considering all the other categories during this period, the next lowest pass rates are 69% and 68% for fall 2004 and spring 2007 respectively, which are found in Category IV- Mathematics. All other pass rates for all GER categories during the period are above 70%.

The low success rate for Category I is a striking discrepancy. The members of the Freshman Composition Committee, which is made up of the instructors who teach ENGL 101 and ENGL 102, attribute the low pass rate to the fact that there are many students who enter Coppin unprepared for these courses. In their judgment, one possible solution to this problem is
the tracking of students in ENGL 101 sections to provide additional assistance to students scoring low on the ACCUPLACER so that they have the requisite skills to pass this GER course.

Table 12.2: Success Rates by GER Categories and Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary &amp; Emerging Issues</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Tools

In order to provide assessment of the GE program, the following assessment tools have been utilized:

- **School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) Repository of Syllabi.**
  To support effective communication of assessment approaches, departments in the SAS, developed a repository of syllabi on a shared department drive during the fall of 2005. This initiative was expanded during the fall of 2006, when SAS created a shared School folder to enhance interdepartmental access to School syllabi and to support accountability by relating outcomes/competencies to course objectives. In this way, assessment measures used throughout the School can be reviewed by any instructor to strengthen student learning outcomes. In addition to the shared folder development, all GE instructors are required to post their syllabi on the faculty website to support public accountability. All SAS syllabi for each semester, effective fall 2006, are available to faculty to peruse on the J: drive.

- **ACCUPLACER.**
  CSU uses the ACCUPLACER to test incoming freshmen in Mathematics and Reading. Students are assigned to the developmental mathematics course DVMT 108 with an ACCUPLACER mathematics score in the 0 – 81 range; to DVMT 109 with a score in the 82 – 108 range; to the MATH course appropriate to their major with a score above 108. Test results are recorded in Test Scores for students in the PeopleSoft Student Administration (SA) system as pre-test results using the code ACCU. Post-test scores are also recorded in Test Scores for students in SA to support ongoing analysis of the relationship of the scores to performance in mathematics GE courses. The post-test score is a combination of work completed in the MATH course as well as the grade earned in the final exam. Students are assigned to the college reading course READ 101 with an ACCUPLACER reading score in the 0 – 85 range. This course is not required for students with scores above 85.
**General Education Common Exams.**

Instructors in several GE courses hold common exams. The examination results help to norm the faculty with respect to teaching and learning outcomes. More GE courses should have common exams to assure that the instructors cover the syllabus course content.

**ENGL 101 / 102 Course Level Assessment.**

ENGL 101 instructors will revise a rubric to assess the competencies appropriate to the essay examinations. [C paper] Instructors in ENGL 101 and ENGL 102 require portfolios which they evaluate based on a rubric. The English instructors will develop a rubric to assess the competencies appropriate to the portfolios. [C paper]

**Math Course Level Assessment.**

The Mathematics instructors for GER math courses [MATH 110, MATH 125, and MATH 131] will develop a rubric to evaluate the competencies appropriate to the multiple-choice examination. Forms will be developed in EXCEL to capture performance in the specified rubrics. It is anticipated that manual analysis will be supported by the target date and plans are underway to record rubric scores in EagleLINKS, using GradeBook by 2008 or 2009 following implementation of the next Student Administration system upgrade.

**Honors College.**

The Honors College is comprised of the following programs: Honors General (4-year), Honors ABC (Fast Track), Honors Upper Division (2-year), and McNair. The first two programs include freshmen and sophomores who take GERS. For renewal of the scholarships offered in the Honors General program, first year students must earn a minimum 2.8 CGPA and be enrolled full-time. For subsequent terms, students must maintain a minimum 3.0 CGPA and be full-time.

The Honors ABC program includes students with a high aptitude who are identified in their second semester. These students are “fast-tracked” through their programs by taking courses during winter and summer semesters. Typically, the time for completion is 3 to 3.25 years.

CSU has an Honors College consisting of 25 freshmen admitted annually who must meet a 3.0 minimum cumulative grade point average for admission. Close monitoring of academic performance is ongoing.

**Transfer Credit Matrices (TCMs).**

To support consistent transfer credit assessment for the top ten, 4-year feeder institutions, in 2005 CSU developed Transfer Credit Matrices (TCMs) to record equivalencies spanning the years 2002 – 2005. The TCMs are updated with new articulations on an ongoing basis. In addition, CSU uses the articulation system ARTSYS, which was developed in the early 90’s to promote consistent articulations between the 2-year colleges and the 4-year sector.

The duties of existing employees in the Offices of Enrollment Management and Records and Registration have been adjusted to maintain and monitor updates to the TCMs. A Transfer Credit Committee, chaired by the Provost, reviews policies and procedures and provides guidance to the managers responsible for handling transfer evaluations. Department Chairs are
accountable for providing subject matter expertise for the determination of equivalencies in response to ARTSYS and TCM updates sent to them for review on a periodic basis. The Chairs update ARTSYS as needed following completion of the articulation decision.

**Advisement’s Role in GER Course Selection**

The GE program includes courses which are major-specific. When CSU implemented the PeopleSoft Student Administration system in 2004, the institution took advantage of delivered functionality to electronically record enrollment requisites for courses. This feature permits the coding of pre-requisites, co-requisites and anti-requisites so that students can take advantage of self-service enrollment where requests are blocked if the student hasn’t satisfied the requisite condition. In addition, CSU implemented the Academic Advisement (AA) module which electronically checks a student’s academic record against pre-recorded degree audit rules that check to ensure that GE requirements are satisfied before the major requirements are met.

Units such as Humanities, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Natural Science take advantage of enrollment requisites to ensure that appropriate GE courses have been completed for enrollment to be permitted.

All undergraduate plans have Academic Advisement (AA) rules recorded. Advisors and students are able to generate advisement reports online as desired. These reports provide full diagnostics to indicate where a requirement is incomplete or not satisfied, including low GPAs or missing courses. In addition, online access is available for advisors and students to run “What-if” scenarios in AA to test an individual’s record against the rules for a proposed Plan. It is also possible to run a “What-if” report with the inclusion of proposed course enrollments.

**Actions Taken**

The subcommittee directed a review of the Mathematics and Computer Science requisites, as well as the Humanities requisites, in September 2006, to determine why students were being restricted from enrollment in certain courses or were being admitted to courses for which they were not qualified. The subcommittee also directed the analysis of Academic Advisement rules for English in light of course renumbering changes to assess whether or not students are effectively streamed from the GE courses to the English major.

**Conclusion**

The subcommittee charged with review of enrollment requisites found that several requisite rules required updating to reflect more current departmental requirements. Efficiencies in coding were also incorporated by generalizing the rules so that they could be used for more than one course. For instance, in the case of the English major, the number of active rules was reduced from 33 to 6, a simplification which makes the updating process less time-consuming in the future.

The subcommittee charged with investigating the English Academic Advisement rules found that once modified for the course renumbering, they demonstrated clearly that the requirements for GE courses had to be satisfied before the major requirements could be met. In the process of this review, the rules were updated and streamlined for more effective and efficient checking of degree requirements.
Data in Appendices 12.6 through 12.10 demonstrate how GERs play into the Major using enrollment requisites and AA rules.

**Strengths**
1. A uniform syllabus template is mandated for all GE courses.
2. All general education syllabi have been assessed according to the five competencies mandated by MHEC.
3. The EagleLINKS Student Analytics tool, an iStrategy software application that interfaces with the PeopleSoft Student Administration (SA) is the tool of choice for generating the General Education analysis for ongoing analysis and decision-making and can be run to Excel for review by committees or inclusion in institutional reporting.
4. Advisors and students are able to generate advisement reports online in GER course selection as desired; these reports provide full diagnostics to indicate where a requirement is incomplete or not satisfied, including low GPAs or missing courses.
5. Enrollment requisites have been created to electronically monitor admission to GER courses and ensure that the student takes course in an appropriate sequence.

**Recommendations**
1. The syllabus development project (and past workshops) suggests that continuous professional development and training is required for general education assessment to be ongoing and embraced by faculty.
2. The analysis of performance in GE courses, using GER Reports, indicates that self-paced, instructional software should be introduced into more GE courses to meet the Coppin mission for students whose promise may have been hindered by a lack of social, personal, or financial opportunity. After analysis of GER Reports in 2006, this type of software was introduced in all developmental Math courses and English Composition courses during 2007.
3. Based on enrollment requisites and academic advisement review projects directed by the subcommittee, all departments should review their enrollment requisites and Academic Advisement rules to ensure that students are effectively streamed from the General Education courses to the major.
4. Performance analysis similar to the GER Reports should be developed for non-General Education courses, particularly in the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Professional Studies, because of the value for supporting decision-making and planning experienced in regard to GE courses where these data are available.
5. When the Standard 12 Committee began meeting in early 2006 to review performance in General Education courses, it had no means to assess aggregate data in order to determine academic performance results, nor was there any individual for whom General Education was a primary responsibility. While the GE Report development provided answers to several questions posed by the committee (Appendix 12.11), a senior administrator should be hired to oversee the General Education Program, including ongoing assessment of the general education competencies, hiring and evaluation of General Education faculty based on recommendations from the subject area Department Chairs, development of an annual report, and taking steps to strengthen the GE course content.
**Related Educational Activities**

*Standard 13*

**Introduction**

Coppin State University has developed a systematic approach to assist underprepared students in achieving success. The approach combines mandatory placement testing, developmental and modified courses, academic support services and summer pre-college programs.

**Diagnostic Tests**

CSU has a mandatory placement test for all new students and any student transferring less than twenty-five credit hours. In addition, any transfer student who does not transfer a college level math course must take the math portion of the placement test. Students are assigned to developmental math or modified Reading 101 courses based on placement results (Appendix 13.2). CSU adapted the Accu-Placer tests to replace the New Jersey College Placement Tests in 2003 after determining that Accu-Placer offered more flexibility, computerized tests and faster test results. Accu-Placer is used by more than thirty colleges and universities in the state. Further, additional diagnosis is administered by faculty in the English Composition and Reading 101 classes during the first two weeks of the semester.

**Advisement**

The Office of Academic Advisement coordinates testing and course selection advisement for all new students and transfers with less than twenty-five credit hours. This office is staffed by a director and full time professionally trained advisors, and some advisement services are available online.

**Developmental and Modified Courses**

Currently, the institution offers only two developmental courses, those being Elementary Algebra (DVMT108, 5 hours) and Intermediate Algebra (DVMT109, 3 hours). Underprepared students in English Composition 101 and Reading 101 are assigned supplemental work in the form of lab hours and workshops to help them improve their skills.

The current course structure in English and Reading is the result of recommendations piloted in 1999 after a three-year review of developmental programs by the Developmental Studies Committee. The Committee was established in 1994 to study the concerns of faculty and administrators related to developmental courses, which at that time included DVMT 108 (5hrs), DVMT 109 (4hrs), DVRD (5hrs) and DVWR (5hrs). The major concerns were the number of developmental courses, the impact on credits toward graduation, the impact on retention and graduation rates, and finally, the impact on operating costs. The changes in DVMT courses are the result of on-going assessment in the department to combat the declining pass rates in the courses. In recent years the pass rate has declined from 62% to 26% (Appendix 13.3). To further address the problems in DVMT the department participated in the University of Maryland System Course Redesign Initiative to modify the course to better address student motivation, learning styles and feedback needs (Appendix 13.5).
**Academic Support Services**

CSU maintains two major programs designed to provide academic support, those being the Academic Resource Center (ARC) and the Student Support Services Program. The ARC is a program available to all Coppin students and includes centers for writing, reading, study skills and test taking, and mathematics. The Student Support Services Program is a federally funded program mandated to provide tutoring, counseling and enrichment activities for 160 students who meet federal eligibility guidelines. The ARC annually provides more than 18,000 hours of services and the Student Support Program provides more than 1,100 hours.

The support programs are professionally staffed but also utilize peer tutors and counselors and part-time professionals to provide services. The programs’ operating schedules include day, evening and weekend hours, and each program has instructional libraries, software programs and computer work stations for student use. The programs are located in areas that are visible and easily accessible.

**Pre-Enrollment Summer Programs**

CSU has recognized and addressed the fact that many potential freshmen need skill development prior to enrollment. To that end, the University has implemented the Student Support Service’s STEP AHEAD program, the Pre-College Summer Program (PCSP) and the Natural Science Department Summer Bridge Program. The Office of Admissions identifies candidates for the programs based on high school GPA’s, SAT scores and other indicators. The programs are designed to improve student skills in writing, reading, math, test taking and study practices (Appendix 13.4). Program reports show the second year retention rates for participants to be 80% in STEP AHEAD, 83% in the Bridge Program and 75% for the PCSP. All of these rates are higher than the University rates (Appendix 13.6).

**Certificate Programs**

Coppin State University offers several certificate programs designed to meet the needs of students and professionals who require documentation of special skills. Certificate programs have been offered in Applied Psychology, Rehabilitation Counseling, Non-Profit Management, Health and Recreation, Teacher Education and Day Care Operation.

**General Certifications**

CSU has provided courses for Day Care Operations, Water Safety, Dance Instruction and Athletic and Fitness Trainers. These certificates could be acquired without earning a degree. Certification in Non-Profit Management can be obtained with or without a degree. The courses required are offered as a 21 credit group that can be used for certification or as a minor field of study.

**Advanced Certifications**

The certificate programs in Applied Psychology, Education and Rehabilitation Counseling require that students possess either a Bachelor’s Degree or Master’s Degree. The Alcohol and Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate in Applied Psychology requires participants to have a Bachelor’s Degree. Standard certification in Teacher Education also requires a Bachelor’s Degree. The certificate programs in Rehabilitation Counselor require Master’s Degrees.
**Practices And Standards**

All of the certificate programs offered by CSU are planned and coordinated by full time faculty utilizing accepted course standards and practices. The certificate programs meet not only Coppin State University standards, but also external standards established by American Humanics, NCATE, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the State of Maryland Board of Professional Counselors and the Maryland Department of Education.

Programs are publicized on CSU’s web page and in brochures produced by various departments. These publications state the mission and goals of the programs and outline the course requirements and certification procedures. The web page for Rehabilitation Counseling is an excellent example. The web site indicates the certificate tracks available, the courses required for each track, and the goals, objectives and expected outcomes for each track. The site is maintained by a graduate school coordinator and is updated to reflect changes in ADA, state and federal regulations.

**Distance Education and Alternative Modes of Instruction**

CSU has demonstrated a commitment to infusing technology into the curriculum to enhance teaching performance and to improve student learning outcomes. Although earlier efforts to utilize instructional video networks and cable systems were largely unsuccessful, CSU continued to seek technological applications that were cost effective and provided effective learning opportunities for students.

**Distance Education**

Coppin State University began developing its own distance education courses in 1998 in response to a University System of Maryland (USM) Web Initiative, which provided technological and financial support for interested faculty. In the fall of 1998, Introduction to Economics became the first on-line course in CSU history. Since that time, the University has regularly offered courses and now offers more than fifty courses per semester on-line that serve approximately 800 students per semester (Appendix13.7). As part of its on-line offerings, Coppin State University began a Master of Education program during the 2004-2005 academic year. Students interested in a degree in Curriculum and Instruction can complete the program on-line.

The School of Education indicates that recruitment has been an obstacle in the growth of the program. The new Dean of Education and the new CUIN chair are reviewing the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13.1: CUIN Enrollment by Fall Term**
Technology Enhanced Courses

In addition to courses offered on-line, the University has also developed courses that use technology to enhance the classroom instruction. A major application has been Tegrity. Tegrity is an electronic note taking and video playback system that allows instructors to record their lessons in the classroom and allows students to download and replay the lessons as needed. More than sixty courses are currently Tegrity enhanced and the University is committed to increasing that number. Other software used includes Blackboard.

Policies and Procedures

Several steps have been implemented to try to ensure an orderly and effective transition to a technology enhanced curriculum. The Faculty Information Technology Committee (FITC) has been established to serve as a campus resource and liaison for faculty, staff, administration and the Office of Information Technology (OIT). OIT and the FITC have recently established a Center for Teaching and Learning with Technology, whose mission is to help train faculty to effectively infuse technology into the curriculum. The Center, in coordination with OIT and the FITC, has developed on-going training workshops for Power Point, EXCEL, Blackboard and Tegrity.

Coppin State University has an “On-Line Learning Plan” outlining the goals, objectives and policies that are used as guidelines for campus activity. The FITC also has developed a “Technology Fluency Plan” that provides operational guidelines and policies for faculty interested in developing courses. These plans clearly indicate the institution’s goals to provide equipment, training, financial incentives, technological support and plans for student and faculty assessment of courses.

A special GER course was developed to assist students. MNSC 150 – Technology Fluency provides students with an understanding of new applications and an opportunity to practice their use.

OIT Support

Coppin State University has benefited greatly by having an award winning Office of Information Technology which has provided training, technical support and state of the art networks. OIT has won national the Educause Award, the Computerworld Mobile and Wireless World Award, and the “Education All-Star Award” from Network World Magazine for Information Technology. The University campus has a state of the art wireless network which gives faculty and students access throughout the campus. Computer access is also available in several computer labs on the campus, including the two residence halls.

OIT has provided additional support for institutional efforts through the development and implementation of the Eagle Links Portal. The portal provides faculty, staff and students access to all campus websites, USM library systems, campus email, Blackboard and Tegrity, as well as numerous other resources that can be used to supplement class activities.

Off Campus Sites

Coppin State University has offered courses at six off campus sites in the state, those being the Universities at Shady Grove in Rockville, the HEAT (Higher Education and
Technology) Center in Aberdeen, the Southern Maryland Higher Education Center in California, the Baltimore Teacher’s Union (BTU) Professional Development Center in Baltimore, a site in Prince George’s County (PG), and the recently opened CSU Nursing Center in Baltimore (fall 2006). The institution discontinued course offerings at Shady Grove and the HEAT Center after 2002. The primary offerings at those sites were special education courses. Low enrollment, competition for space and alternative sites were factors in the decision to discontinue offerings.

The Southern Maryland Center and Baltimore Nursing Center are the most recent sites. Course offerings at the Southern Maryland location are for students interested in careers in Criminal Justice, while the Baltimore Nursing Center offers courses towards degrees in Nursing.

The two biggest off-campus initiatives are currently with the BTU and PG County. These programs offer undergraduate and graduate courses for students interested in careers in education. Coppin State University has negotiated extensive contracts with the Baltimore City and Prince George’s County public schools to provide discounted tuition and a comparable curriculum for students at these centers. The goals of the centers are to:

1. provide pathways for paraprofessionals to become quality teachers
2. provide courses and support activities for provisional teachers seeking standard certification
3. provide professional enrichment for teachers in their disciplines
4. provide training and support in the effective use of technology in the classroom and
5. provide career-changers with pathways to becoming quality teachers.

According to Dr. Frank Kober, formerly Special Assistant to the President and former campus BTU coordinator, the BTU and Prince George’s programs are responsible for an 11% increase in University enrollment, with most of the increase reflected in graduate enrollment (Appendix 13.8). The two centers have assisted more than two thousand students to make progress towards their career goals. Graduates of the centers have participated in many of the statewide conferences evaluating educational outcomes, one of which was the 2005 BTU QUEST Conference at CSU which brought together teachers and administrators from almost all of the Maryland counties.

**Policies and Procedures**

All off campus sites are governed by the same policies and procedures established for faculty and administrators on campus. The School of Education has a new Director of Off-Campus Initiatives who serves as a liaison between the sites and the campus departments and administration. Previously there were separate campus coordinators for the BTU and PG programs. Faculty at off campus sites must meet the same employment criteria as on campus faculty, syllabi are approved by on campus chairpersons, and evaluation procedures are consistent with on campus policies.

There have been recent changes in the programs, especially with regard to the PG County program. The PG County program is undergoing revisions in response to recommendations from the Maryland State Department of Education in 2006. CSU will no longer offer degree programs in PG County and the focus of the program is being re-evaluated. CSU is also negotiating for a
permanent site in PG County so that the University can develop academic and technical support services for students in the program.

**Non-Credit and Community Programs**

The Coppin State University Mission Statement states in part: “The University is committed to excellence in teaching, research and service to its community.” It further states: “Coppin State University applies its resources to meet urban needs, especially those of Baltimore City, whenever these applications mesh with academic programs.” The mission statement has served as a guiding principle for the institution as it has sought to address some of the critical issues facing the University community and the city of Baltimore. Coppin State University has been very innovative and visionary in developing solutions to community needs, especially in the areas of education, health and community welfare.

**University-School Partnerships**

One of the goals of Coppin State University is the creation of an Urban Education Corridor that will create a seamless flow from pre-kindergarten to the completion of a bachelor’s degree (Pre-K through 16). To accomplish this goal, CSU has undertaken two bold initiatives that no other USM institutions have pursued. CSU negotiated with the Baltimore City Public School System to take over Rosemont Elementary school, and negotiated with BCPSS and the State Board of Education to create the Coppin Academy, a new high school that would be managed and operated by CSU and housed on the campus.

CSU has helped Rosemont to become one of the best elementary schools in the region, removing it from the State of Maryland Watch List as one of the poorest performing schools in Baltimore City. After assuming control in 1998 CSU faculty, administrators, staff and students have worked with Rosemont teachers and staff to improve all aspects of the school. The Coppin State University-BCPSS partnership outlined in the Professional Service Contract specifies CSU’s plan to (1) further train teachers and paraprofessionals, (2) modify curriculum, (3) provide students with tutors and mentors, (4) upgrade student personnel services and (5) upgrade facilities and grounds.

CSU faculty, especially those in the School of Education, have been active in the training and development of Rosemont teachers and have established policies and practices consistent with NCATE standards. Test scores at Rosemont have been in the top ten percent for the city at each grade level and Rosemont has been selected as one of 19 NASA Explorer Schools in the United States. CSU added the sixth-grade to Rosemont in 2005-2006 and has plans to add grades seven and eight.

The Coppin Academy opened in the Fall of 2005 as a citywide high school and currently enrolls 200 students in grades nine and ten. Grades eleven and twelve will be added in 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 respectively. Academy faculty are selected in accordance with standards established by BCPSS and CSU. The curriculum emphasizes holistic learning, a blending of conceptual knowledge and practical experiences. Assessment includes results from the High School Assessment exams, teacher and counselor evaluations of students, academic progress towards goals, student interviews and the use of Best Practices in Teaching Strategies.
**Health and Community Welfare**

CSU has attempted to meet some of the varied health needs of the community by expanding the former Wellness Center to become the University Community Health Center. The Center has as one its goals “to provide high quality health and social programs to the citizens of Baltimore City at low or no cost.” Among the center programs are stress management, weight control, hypertension and diabetes management, substance abuse and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. The Center operates within guidelines established by local, state and federal regulatory agencies which are documented in the Center’s Standards of Procedures Manual. Center staff must meet all qualifications consistent with their positions.

Another unique component of the Center is the Kinship Care Resource Center. This center was established in 1999 to address some of the special problems of adults caring for children other than their own sons and daughters. Baltimore City has the largest percentage of kinship care providers in the state according to data from the Maryland Department of Human Resources. The primary goal of the center is to provide services that will preserve families.

CSU also addresses community welfare by providing non-credit professional development workshops for social work practitioners. The workshops are topic oriented and sometimes offer continuing education credit in accordance with standards established by the National Association for Continuing Education and national social work agencies. The workshops are designed and taught by CSU faculty or other professionals in the field of social work.

In addition to these programs the institution provides numerous other community oriented workshops, programs, conferences and events designed to address specific issues (Appendix 13.9).

**Conclusion**

The Urban Education Corridor is a concept unique to CSU. The University directly impacts students in the community from kindergarten through high school via Rosemont Elementary/Middle School and the Coppin Academy. CSU addresses other community concerns via the Community Health and Wellness Center, the Kinder Care Resource Center and the Consumer Education Center.

**Strengths**

1. CSU can certainly point to community development as one of its many strengths.
2. CSU contributes through the efforts of its graduates in Teacher Education, Applied Psychology and Rehabilitation Counseling.

**Recommendations**

1. The academic support programs have expressed a need for improved funding, additional space and a cadre of specially trained tutors to assist students who have special needs.
2. The institution needs to re-evaluate the use of the placement tests. At present the tests only have a direct impact on placement in developmental mathematics courses. Reading and English placement is impacted more by diagnostic tools administered during the first two weeks of classes.
3. CSU needs to develop and publicize specific criteria for the implementation, maintenance and evaluation of on-line and technology enhanced courses.
4. CSU must make efforts to ensure that students participating in the BTU and PG County initiatives have adequate instructional and technological support resources.
5. The institution needs to better promote its programs, services and accomplishments to better promote its mission and improve its market.
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Standard 14

Introduction

CSU’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process provides both formative and summative feedback relative to student learning. Domains of assessment include assessment and evaluation of knowledge/skills acquired, values/beliefs transmitted, employment rates, performance on licensure and national exams, an assessment of departmental retention and graduation rates, and progression rates. Evaluation of the effectiveness of academic and support programs are also included to measure student performance along multiple and varied dimensions. For instance, student opinion and attitudinal information are gathered through various surveys and documents including faculty and course evaluations, program completer and graduation follow-up studies. Assessment is embedded in each course and in every aspect of teaching, student services and instructional support programs with a view to continuous quality improvement.

Analytical Discussion of Inquiry

Faculty, staff, and administrators at CSU have committed to a culture of planning, research, assessment and accountability. In general, all units at CSU are engaged in some form of evaluation, planning, assessment, and development so that the University will be positioned to carry out its urban mission. CSU relies on a broad range of tools and resources to measure, evaluate, and assess educational outcomes. The University’s Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA) and the Center for Institutional Assessment (CIA) facilitate, guide and coordinate the institution’s strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts.

Assessment Processes and Systems

The goal of the University’s assessment process is to encourage institutional self-awareness, self-understanding, and genuine self-improvement. Since 2004, CSU has actively engaged in an aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes through the institutionalization of the CIA, Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC), and Assessment Steering Committee (ASC). Beginning that same year, faculty professional development was initiated with training sponsored by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), opening sessions sponsored by The Office of the Provost show-casing assessment consultants, assessment technical assistance sponsored by the FAC and the CIA, and technical learning support provided by the Center of Teaching and Learning.

A Director of Assessment was hired by CSU to work closely with faculty and oversee the mandate of the CIA which is a centralized CSU resource designed to inform planning and policy decisions in a wide range of academic and administrative areas. To date, the Center has focused its efforts on training and development, survey development, assessment, educational research around the use of technology in teaching and student learning, and strategic planning. It provides critically important reporting, assessment, benchmarking, planning, and other services that support institutional effectiveness in response to identified needs in the CSU community. An ongoing assessment process consists of data collected in eleven broad categories.
Assessment Model

CSU has adopted an institutional assessment model that incorporates assessing student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. Both the institutional and program levels are informed by the strategic plan, which provides a useful blueprint for the future direction of the University. In addition, CSU began its self-study process by demonstrating the application of MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence using Standards 7 and 14 as its guide. Assessment at CSU is anchored in the strategic goals of the Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential …Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan.

Based on previous audits, CSU has been able to pinpoint areas where assessment could be strengthened and enhanced. The model requires collection of evidence whereby assessment is documented and evaluated on a yearly basis and then utilized in efforts to improve the feedback process. CSU encourages a positive culture of assessment that is institutionally supported so that assessment results are used for celebration, improvement, and enhancement in the areas needing attention.

Assessment Components

The CSU assessment process includes the following data components: a comprehensive survey research, fiscal, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical infrastructure, technical learning support, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and institutional learning. For more detailed information, a chart is provided in Appendix 14.1 Assessment Components Matrix.

Institutional Support

In conjunction with the OPA, the CIA has responsibilities for coordinating assessment efforts at CSU; however, the OPA has unique responsibilities for establishing an institutional culture of assessment in collaboration with all University constituencies.

The assessment campaign is mission driven and dynamic as CSU continues to evolve into a model urban comprehensive liberal arts institution. New assessment activities have been initiated and methods used for data collection, analysis and reporting continue to improve, capitalizing on the institution’s information technology infrastructure. Developments in the use of technology for assessment have enabled the University to improve academic programs through timely student learning outcomes assessment.

Deans champion efforts to improve student learning assessment in their respective divisions based on course and program level competencies. Each School has developed a collective effort for addressing course level performance which includes the development of direct and indirect measures using a conceptual framework; such as, for the Schools of Education and Nursing (See Appendix 14.2 and 14.3).
Examples of Assessment Outcomes

The following examples illustrate assessment outcomes:

Institutional Level

- **CSU Assessment Data.**
  
  The CSU assessment process is inclusive of the following data components: a comprehensive survey research, fiscal, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical infrastructure, technical learning support, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and institutional learning.

  Departments have identified categories of goals, which have been aligned with a conceptual framework and strategic plan; such as, 1) the quality of instructional programs, 2) diversity of faculty and students, 3) adequacy of resources, 4) unit productivity, 5) collaborative initiatives and partnerships, and 6) student retention.

- **Development of Technical Assessment Database Systems.**
  
  The Provost commissioned the services of a consultant in 2005 to assist in developing an electronic system that would support accreditation requirements for the School of Education. The consultant was able to leverage unused functionality that existed in EagleLINKS by creating Milestone for the benchmarks associated with the School’s conceptual framework. These data were extracted to EagleLINKS Student Analytics for analysis by specially designed reports that could be selected by cohort and performance in outcomes for various phases of the educational program. This system was successful to the point that the NCATE site team declared CSU had satisfied 100% of the reporting requirements related to performance outcomes.

  Later that same year, the consultant was engaged to review accreditation support requirements in each of the professional units – School of Nursing, Department of Social Work, and the Department of Rehabilitation Counseling. During the balance of the year, numerous queries were developed in EagleLINKS for generation on demand by functional users to extract data required for surveys and assessment of performance according to criteria specified by the unit. Each of these units has comprehensive technical database systems that are operational. Using reports created for these units, it has been demonstrated that review and processing time for evaluating data and preparing survey responses has been cut from approximately 2–3 months to 30–60 minutes.

  In a subsequent development commenced in 2006 to support analysis of General Education enrollment and performance, the consultant, once again, employed unused functionality in EagleLINKS to flag the courses to be analyzed. With these flags in place, performance and enrollment data could be extracted to EagleLINKS Student Analytics for analysis by stakeholders in specially designed reports (See Appendix 12.5). After show-casing this development at two local conferences in spring 2007, faculty across campus expressed an interest in using numerous reports available for assessing indirect measures using EagleLINKS Student Analytics. These reports extract data from EagleLINKS related to admissions, enrollment, academic performance, class diagnostics, risk analysis, and faculty. Drill down capability for any cell in a grid of outcomes and a decomposition tool allow the user to fine-tune...
the applicability of data to a specific area. An ongoing training effort throughout fall 2007 has extended expertise in using this system to numerous campus users.

   Database assessment frameworks are currently under consideration for the Academic Advisement Center, Academic Resource Center, and Counseling and Psychological Support Services.

- **New Disability Support Services Program (DSSP)**
  
  This program is a result of a merger between Disability Support Services and the Department of Applied Psychology and Rehabilitation Counseling. It is designed to ensure equal access for all qualified students with special needs who request these services. Workshops are offered periodically to educate faculty, staff, and students about the program and special accommodations at the University.

- **Faculty Assessment Grants, Fall 2007.**
  
  During fall 2007, for the first time, CSU offered faculty a funded opportunity to assess their courses based on student learning outcomes. The selection processed is coordinated by the FAC in order to encourage more opportunities for faculty to engage in course and program level outcomes assessment.

- **Faculty and Course Evaluations Re-engineered Process.**
  
  At CSU, faculty and course evaluations are assessed by institutional, program, course and instructor ratings. The results of these evaluations are included in the faculty member’s annual performance review with points awarded for overall performance with departmental feedback. At the department / program level, the evaluation information is used to improve teaching quality by the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs (See Table 14.2).

- **Institutional Results, Faculty Course Evaluation, Fall Terms 2004 to 2006.**
  
  Since implementing the FCE redesign, the institution is able to assess course, program, and institutional results using this instrument. Importantly, during the last three fall terms, for Question 23 (overall course effectiveness), the results have increased from 4.23 to 4.32; for Question 44 (overall instructor effectiveness), the results have increased from 4.40 to 4.50. Overall, this instrument conveys that teaching quality has improved based on student opinion (see Table 14.2).

- **National Survey of Student Engagement Results (NSSE).**
  
  During spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. The results for indicator 11F, (analyzing quantitative problems) based on NSSE 2006 administration is illustrated below:
  
  - First-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.92, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.86.
  - Seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.26, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.02. (See National Survey of Student Engagement Results, Appendix 14.4).

- **National Survey of Student Engagement, Spring 2006 Administration.**
The National Study for Student Engagement was first administered in spring 2006 as a means of gathering more timely information about student engagement. The results have been disseminated to the Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students (BEAMS) Project Team and Planning Council and have been used to inform the strategic planning and self-studies process as evidence of CSU’s involvement in student learning. Both of these initiatives have been spearheaded by the CIA.

Program Level

- **Course Success Rates, General Education Requirements.**
  The success rates for Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral, Natural Sciences, and Interdisciplinary and Emerging Issues, were above 70 percent for the spring and fall terms during academic year 2003-2004 to academic year 2005-2006 (see Table 14.1).

- **Developmental Math Course Redesign.**
  Mathematics faculty members have created a course redesign for developmental courses with accommodations for additional labs and the inclusion of better assessment measures. The department also committed to working on redesigning initiatives during summer 2007 with goals piloted during fall 2007.

- **General Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Project, Syllabus Review.**
  While reviewing courses that satisfied general education requirements using the course syllabus as an assessment instrument in 2006 (see Table 14.1): 88% indicated evaluation of oral and written communication as an outcome; 42% evaluated scientific and quantitative reasoning; 36% reflected technological competencies; 96% assessed critical analysis and reasoning; and 68% reflected assessment of information literacy.

- **New Academic Programs.**
  CSU has implemented a new academic program, Allied Health, in the Helen Fuld School of Nursing for which a baccalaureate degree in Health Information Management will be awarded. The program meets the need for health professionals, identified by the State as critical. The professionals who graduate from this program will be knowledgeable in managing patient health information, medical records, administering computer information systems, coding the diagnosis, and procedures for healthcare services provided to patients.

- **The Honors College Named.**
  The Honors Division was recently renamed the Honors College and will continue to operate the Honors and McNair Scholars programs, along with other programs as directed by the University. An entire floor of one of the campus’ dorms has been dedicated to provide “quiet room” space to support studying and tutoring for students in the College. Students from the general campus population are invited to participate in honors activities and programs in an endeavor to broaden the scope of the Honors program by attracting more high-achieving students. The College has established a Test-Taking Institute that offers tutoring and support for standardized tests that include LSAT and MCAT preparation.
McNair Scholars’ Retention Data.
Retention data for CSU McNair participants from 1995 to 2004 indicate that 94% completed their undergraduate degrees in 4.4 years, and 94% of the 2003 student cohort were retained in 2004.

Expanded Course Offerings, School of Education.
CSU, through the School of Education, has expanded its course offerings via its off-campus sites in Prince George’s County and through the Baltimore Teacher’s Union. During academic year 2006-07, over 45 courses were offered through these collaborative partnerships.

NCATE Re-Accreditation.
CSU’s School of Education, was recently re-accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Council cited no official areas for improvement relative to any of NCATE’s standards and remarked that the performance assessment development was an outstanding success. The accreditation decision applies to both initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation Including the following teacher education programs: elementary education, early childhood education, special education (undergraduate, graduate initial, and graduate advanced), secondary education (English, mathematics, biology/chemistry, history/social studies), and Master of Arts in Teaching (English, mathematics, biology/chemistry, history/social studies).

Course Level

English 101 Student Learning Assessment Results.
An aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes has been launched to ensure that proper interventions are in place to improve satisfaction of general education requirements and course level performance. For example, English has been cited as having courses that need further redesign to address unprepared student needs. Specifically, actions are underway to assess the ACCUPLACER results and to address the perceived need for a lower level English course to assist students who cannot successfully pass ENGL 101. During academic year 2007-08, the English department was awarded a $50,000 grant from MHEC to improve freshmen writing courses (ENGL 101 and 102) with self-paced writing lab programs.

English 495 Student Learning Assessment Results.
During spring terms 2005 and 2006, student pass rates for English 495, Senior Seminar, using the following assessment instruments were: portfolio assessment, 86 percent; comprehensive exam, 82 percent; and the departmental assessment, 57 percent.

Technology Fluency Student Learning Assessment Results.
During fall 2006 and spring 2007, three courses in MNSC 150, Technology Fluency, were assessed. Each used the Skillset Assessment Manager (SAM)) and assessed competencies using Microsoft Office with the following results: average competency score in Microsoft Excel was 74 percent; average score for PowerPoint was 85 percent; and, average score for proficiency in Microsoft Word was 94 percent.
In 2004, CSU implemented the PeopleSoft Student Administration system (EagleLINKS). This integrated data base management system contains numerous tables for collecting academic performance indicators, academic program information and organizational data. The University uses another product developed by the vendor iStrategy to extract values from EagleLINKS tables to support in-depth analysis by unit representatives in EagleLINKS Student Analytics reports. CSU has the capability of setting the periods that apply to data appearing in these reports and can define additional reports as needed to satisfy new requests for analysis. These developments have enabled the University to use technology for data collection, analysis, and reporting to a considerable extent. The ultimate goal is to continuously improve institutional effectiveness through timely and complete outcomes assessment using technology.

The School of Education has developed the use of technology to assess performance outcomes in a major way, as described earlier in this chapter. General Education has also employed EagleLINKS Student Analytics to better understand enrollment and academic performance issues and to make informed decisions for improving course teaching.

While departments across campus are now able to review indirect measures of performance in a more systematic manner, the full potential of EagleLINKS Student Analytics for assessment will only be realized when outcomes data is collected in EagleLINKS for extraction to appropriately designed analytical reports. The GradeBook module that has not yet been implemented in EagleLINKS may be the technological solution for capturing outcomes measures.

In specialized areas, CSU has many successes. The School of Education was reaccredited by NCATE and the Maryland State Department of Education during spring 2006 while the School of Nursing was reaccredited during Fall 2007 for its graduate program. The Department of Social Work is scheduled for reviews in fall 2007 and spring 2008, respectively. Importantly, the institution is preparing for its Middle States Commission on Higher Education review for reaffirmation of accreditation in academic year 2007-2008.

The University-wide Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) was re-activated in 2001 to facilitate internal academic program reviews. Its charge was to review all academic programs at the institution during a seven-year cycle. The Committee, comprised of faculty, chairpersons, and administrative representatives of CSU at large, created a review process that included the administration of a programmatic self-study. During academic year 2007-2008, the committee plans to develop an updated program review matrix that is more comprehensive and reflective of institutional data sources with a stronger focus on learning outcomes.

The instruments used to evaluate the self-study ensure compliance with MSCHE, NCATE, National League for Nursing (NLN), Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), and Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE). In addition, the APRC provides ongoing assessment of all programs irrespective of whether programs are reviewed by specialized accrediting agencies or not; such as, History, Geography, and Global Studies, Social Sciences, and Criminal Justice programs. The APRC operates on a seven-year cycle for reviewing all
academic programs, internally, as part of its goal to achieve continuous quality improvement (See Academic Program Review Matrices, Appendix 7.3).

Supporting Institutional Level Assessment

Systematic review of curriculum structure, content, and outcomes is managed by the APRC, Curriculum Committee (CC), FAC, and General Education Committee (GEC). These committees are responsible for content and assessment affecting the educational programs in the University. Ultimately, all actions and recommendations made by the APRC, CC, FAC, and GEC must be approved by the faculty. These committees are also responsible for reviewing course and programmatic assessment data to ensure that expected abilities and competencies are being met in each year of the specified program.

In 2006, the FAC was formed to develop and implement an institutional assessment plan. This committee has responsibility for matters related to instructional assessment techniques and assessment of educational outcomes by the programs offered. Currently, the FAC is reviewing assessment instruments and procedures for program and course level assessment as well as developing institutional and programmatic assessment procedures. This Committee is comprised of the Director of Assessment along with appointed faculty members and includes the Associate Vice President, Planning and Assessment. To support the FAC and all assessment activities, the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) was created with membership that includes: Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment, Director of Academic Resource Center, Faculty Chairperson, and the Director of Assessment. The goal of the ASC is to facilitate ongoing assessment at the institution and to ensure that assessment is happening at all levels within the institution using appropriate assessment measures and continuous improvement efforts.

While the GEC has been charged with assessing the course and program level performance of General Education at CSU, it has been very active in providing administrative oversight for documenting and evaluating assessment outcomes. For example, the Committee conducted a course syllabus audit to assess which of the approved competencies reported to the State of Maryland in the 2004 CSU SLOAR (see Appendix 7.2) were stated in the course objectives (see Table 14.1 and Appendix 12.1). The GEC found that it had to extrapolate intended outcomes from vaguely stated course objectives. As a consequence, it actively promoted updating the University’s syllabus outline to include the requirement for a clear mapping of the course objectives to MHEC competencies. In addition, succinct definitions of outcomes were appended to the syllabus template to promote clarity and understanding (see Appendix 12.2 – 12.4).

Conclusion

In summary, CSU has adopted an institutional assessment model that incorporates assessing student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. Both the institutional and program levels are informed by the strategic plan which provides a useful blueprint for the future direction of the University. In addition, CSU began its self-study process demonstrating the application of MSCHE, Characteristics of Excellence, using Standards 7, Institutional Effectiveness, and Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning, as its guide. The Coppin assessment process answers two critical questions: How is institutional effectiveness...
assessed at CSU through the use of strategic goals and objectives? How are assessment data and results used to improve policy formation, budget and fiscal planning, curriculum and student development, and teaching and learning?

The ongoing assessment process at CSU consists of data collected in eleven categories and is anchored in the strategic goals of the institutional strategic plan, Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential…Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan.

**Strengths**

1. All units at CSU are engaged in some form of evaluation, planning, assessment, and development so that the University will be positioned to carry out its urban mission. CSU relies on a broad range of tools and resources to measure, evaluate, and assess educational outcomes.
2. The CSU’s Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA) and the Center for Institutional Assessment (CIA) facilitate, guide and coordinate the institution’s strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts.
3. CSU developed an aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes through the institutionalization of the CIA, Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC), and Assessment Steering Committee (ASC). Since academic year 2004-05, faculty professional development included training sponsored by Middle States Commission on Higher Education, opening sessions sponsored by The Office of the Provost show-casing assessment consultants, assessment technical assistance sponsored by the FAC and the CIA, and technical learning support from the Center of Teaching and Learning.
4. The CSU assessment model has many data components that are utilized in developing assessment knowledge and includes the following data components: comprehensive survey research, fiscal management, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical management, technical learning support, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and institutional learning.
5. EagleLINKS Student Analytics is used to extract data from EagleLINKS tables for reporting and assessment of quality improvement by unit representatives who interpret these data to provide information that can be used in a continuous improvement effort.
6. Major strides have been made by CSU in using technology to develop assessment support systems for the School of Education, School of Nursing, Department of Social Work, Department of Rehabilitation Counseling, and General Education. These developments provide a model for using technology to support collection and reporting of a broader base of outcomes measures.
7. In specialized areas, CSU has many successes. The School of Education was reaccredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education programs and the Maryland State Department of Education during spring 2006 while the School of Nursing was reaccredited during fall 2007 for its graduate program. The Department of Social Work is scheduled for review in spring 2008.
8. Systematic review of curriculum structure, content, and outcomes is managed by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), Curriculum Committee (CC), FAC, and General Education Committee (GEC). These committees are responsible for content and assessment affecting the educational programs in the University, and ultimately, all actions taken by the APRC, CC, FAC, and GEC must be approved by the faculty. These committees are also
responsible for reviewing course and programmatic assessment data to ensure that expected abilities and competencies are being met in each year of the specified program.

**Recommendations**

1. CSU needs to review its existing Student Learning Assessment Plan with a view to updating it to meet current MSCHE requirements.
2. The University should consider expanding EagleLINKS functionality to include the GradeBook module so that outcomes measures can be electronically collected and reported using EagleLINKS Student Analytics.
3. While assessment is occurring within the institution, it is difficult to evidence direct methods for student learning assessment in non-specialized program areas. Therefore, a preventive measure must be initiated to ensure that documentation is collected for semester and yearly assessment outcomes.
4. Currently, the FAC has been charged with defining and cultivating the use of direct measures for student learning. It will be necessary for this committee to proceed actively and rigorously to ensure that direct measures are documented and that assessment continues to be institutionalized. Intensive review of course level performance in all areas of the academic programs needs to be conducted with proper administrative support.
5. Hiring of a General Education Assessment Coordinator will assist in facilitating ongoing assessment of the general education competencies. This additional administrative support will assist the FAC in institutionalizing student learning assessment.
6. While there is a strong core of faculty that actively support assessment activities, in order for assessment to have a lasting, long-term impact, more ongoing support for student learning assessment through faculty engagement is needed. Evaluation of how faculty engagement can be encouraged, possibly by considering options such as release time and/or stipends may move involvement up the priority scale.