

Understanding Expectations of the Panel to Assist the Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education

To make sure that the panel knows exactly what is expected and any limitations or assumptions about the range or nature of its work, clarification on the following points would be helpful:

1. It is our understanding that the Panel is to recommend measurable performance indicators and related benchmarks that will be used to determine comparability and competitiveness and to measure the progress of the HBIs in reaching these benchmarks. The Panel is to examine funding levels as well. Can we assume that the performance indicators are intended to be measures separate in substance from the funding levels and that these performance indicators focus on what occurs or results from the funding provided? And is it the Commission's request that funding levels be studied in light of what level of funding is needed to support certain levels of performance that would make HBIs comparable and competitive in terms of performance outcomes?
2. In terms of performance, can the Panel consider additional or different performance areas, indicators and benchmarks (compared to those now used in the funding model)?
3. Can the Panel consider not only overall funding levels but the extent to which key activities or functions are funded within an institution, particularly those functions that relate most directly to priority performance areas? This may raise issues about campus allocation decisions and priorities.
4. If needed, will any further clarification be available concerning the mission, role and program scope of each campus? This may be needed to ensure that any related performance indicators and benchmarks (e.g., in graduate or advanced graduate programs) are grounded in what the state has agreed formally to support.
5. Regarding the current and potential role and use of peer grouping in the Maryland funding process (and in specifying comparable and competitive), can the Panel assume that peers may be drawn from across the nation (as is now the case)?
6. Can the Panel assume that the criteria used in the current funding model to select peers may be examined and revised and refined as part of the Panel's study and recommendations?