

## LRAP 2025 Report to Senate

### Executive Summary

This report fulfills a [Faculty Senate charge](#) to the Long-Range Academic Planning Committee. The report synthesizes information [reported to Faculty Senate](#) in 2024, and offers suggestions for how the University should plan offerings in light of the upcoming changes to the landscape of K-12 and higher education within Maryland, specifically the [Blueprint for Maryland's Future](#). Also, Dual Enrollment is increasing [across the country](#), potentially leaving SU behind if we do not increase DE options.

Of primary importance since the Blueprint and its emphasis on DE has been law for some time:

- The need to hire a dual enrollment coordinator
- To plan for transportation for students interested in attending courses on campus
- Having a consistent manner to alert faculty of the presence of Dual Enrollment (DE) students in their classes
  - However, this is debatable, as DE students are SU students, so some think they should not be treated differently.
- Consider reserving seats for DE at SU
  - Though it could also be argued that we might consider reserving for majors if enrollment increases
- Examine DE workload within CSA
- More communication with High Schools to promote our offerings
- More participation from all departments/units to allow for a fair representation of DE options
- Have contingency plans for different budget realities
  - The state stopped covering 100% of the cost of DE for the local school districts (LEAs). There is some sort of cost-share mechanism to reduce the cost to the State. The requirement for the LEA to pay the full cost (tuition + books/supplies), however, is still in place
  - This means that all LEAs are limiting the amount of DE students can take. Locally, that's about 8 credits per semester.
- Need to clarify the benefits of DE for administration and faculty (i.e. some may think DE will encourage students to complete university requirements in less time, however, studies are showing that DE also allows for students to complete university requirements more slowly, allowing students more time to participate in athletics, university events/activities, and to work)

### Introduction

As an institution primarily focused on traditional undergraduate teaching and learning, Salisbury University must remain responsive to shifts in the landscape of higher education generally and within Maryland specifically. In January of 2022, the state of Maryland unveiled plans to increase its DE program. LRAP was charged with understanding current SU DE offerings, identifying other institutions who offer a clinical faculty career ladder, exploring possibilities of establishing DE minimum percentages, DE enrollment projections, and understanding current conversations with area high schools.

Since 2024, there has been great uncertainty about the extent to which Blueprint legislation will take effect, and the extent to which any effective legislation will create meaningful changes in dual enrollment interest.

## Methods

The Long Range Academic Planning Committee (LRAP) was charged with examining the following items and reporting back to the Faculty Senate:

1. LRAP will develop suggestions for how the University should plan academic offerings in light of the Blueprint for Maryland's Future. This should include suggestions related to the development, delivery, and tracking of dual enrollment courses; as well as how the University should address in-state and out-of-state student transfers.
2. LRAP will engage with the Strategic Planning process related to expected University enrollment data and targets, including expected impact of the Blueprint on the same.

Given the Senate charge to offer suggestions moving forward, in 2024, LRAP members Tim Dunn, Kara French, Sandy Pope, Sally Perret, Ryan Shifler met with Designated Senator Erin Weber to produce a [summary of what SU has done so far with regards to DE](#), noting successful enrollment strategies and future obstacles. This year, Tim Dunn, Konstantine Kyriacopoulos, Sally Perret Alexander Pope, E. Patrick McDermott, and Emily Story have been working with Designated Senator Brooke Rogers to finalize this report to the senate, while also continuing to define our role in the development of the University's Strategic Plan.

After producing the above report, the committee became aware of current initiatives, headed by Dean Scott to promote DE courses to high school DE students, including specific "[pathways](#)" and courses they can take, depending on their academic interests. In an email, Dean Scott also added the following comments:

- There is a need to collect more data on DE
- All DE courses are first-year courses with multiple sections (a [full list of approved classes](#) can be found as a pdf by county). The courses below have at least 5 DE students per year
  - ACCT201, ART130, ASL101, BIOL101, BIOL201, BIOL202, CHEM121, ECON211, ENGL103, HIST101, HIST102, MATH 155, MATH 201, MATH 202, PHYS 121, PSYC101
- Often, DE students help some under-enrolled sections become adequately-enrolled since most DE enrollment takes place in August and January when all other students have had a chance to register
- DE students are often excellent students:
  - Within courses and across all courses in AY2025:
    - The average GPA of DE students was 3.04
    - The grade breakdown was A-50.7%, B-23.7%, C-11.6%, D-8.8%, F-4.2%, W-0.9%
    - The grade breakdown was typical of past years except for student's earning D's; that doubled (from 4.4% in AY24)
- There is a lack of data with regards to admission yield

- Difficult to tell as it's tough to track students who enrolled in schools other than SU. I do think an important goal of a DE program is demonstrating to potentially hesitant students that yes, they can complete a college degree, even if it isn't at SU!
- High yield for SU enrollment was 43.2% (in AY22). Last year, it was 17.8% but that's not a complete number as some DE students are juniors in high school and some go away and then transfer back. It takes a couple of years to get a complete picture on yield.
- Where are they coming from?
  - This data shows a key flaw in our DE program, in my opinion. 9 high schools sent us DE students
    - JMB-57, Parkside-17, WiHi-8, SDHS-7, Mardela-4, Delmar-3, Snow Hill-3, HGCS & SCS-1
    - We do not track demographics of DE students, but this list is quite telling
    - I'm particularly dismayed that Stephen Decatur sends almost 2x the students as one of our county HS
    - 0 DE students from Somerset County...the cohort of students who could probably use the program the most

### **Analysis**

LRAP still believes that dual enrollment represents the most substantial potential change should the state continue with its implementation. Within that uncertainty, the committee reviewed a prior committee report ([here](#)) and identified clear obstacles within the dual enrollment process. These include:

- No singular point person or process for approving courses for dual enrollment
- Lack of transportation for students interested in attending courses on the SU campus
- Unless a DE student self-identifies, SU faculty have no way of knowing they are non-traditional
- Tuition costs are capped by MOUs, which would need to be taken into account when calculating costs (it is estimated that the state pays one third for DE student enrollment). The net difference between the two groups is as much as \$11,400,000, as [previously reported](#).\*

\*According to Dean Scott in an email these calculations may be misleading, given that a base of 500 students was used, when we only have 100 DE students

The committee suggested requesting additional information on certain questions related to DE, including:

- Are there any DE-approved courses that are under-enrolled by traditional SU standards?
- Is there data on the persistence of DE students?
- Is there data demonstrating the likelihood of DE students registering at SU?
- Do we know which high schools DE students are coming from, and is there interest in better targeting those or other schools?

The committee did not feel the question of transfer students under the Blueprint within our purview. That is a broader question about transfers and general education. We recognize that there is a potential alignment between DE transfer and AP or community college transfers under the new general education program. As such, we were interested in:

- Assessing the impact of transfer student recruitment or retention rates
- Transfer credit plans under the new general education model

As a final note, though outside the official Senate motion, LRAP members have not been part of drafting the university's strategic plan, which per [Senate bylaws](#), "The Long-Range Academic Planning Committee exists to represent all academic and Faculty perspectives pertinent to the strategic planning processes of the University." Article VII, Section 9 (page 12).

LRAP was also included in the prior strategic planning process. That is referenced [on this timeline](#). It's worth noting that LRAP was not involved until a draft plan was shared with the campus. It is possible that the same plan is underway this time, in which case we would become involved whenever the draft is shared. As of today, no such timeline has been *communicated*.

Last spring, Erin Weber brought [This is the motion](#) forward at LRAP's request. It specifically mentioned involvement in the strategic planning process.

[These meeting minutes](#), also submitted by Senator Weber, indicate that the motion was amended, removing mention of the strategic plan.