

FINAL

**Report to the Maryland Commission
to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education**

From

**The Panel on the Comparability and Competitiveness
of Historically Black Institutions in Maryland**

Panel members:

Patrick M. Callan
President, The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

William B. DeLauder
President Emeritus, Delaware State University

Franklyn G. Jenifer
President Emeritus, University of Texas at Dallas

James M. Rosser
President, California State University, Los Angeles

David S. Spence (Chair)
President, Southern Regional Education Board

Judith A. Winston
Former Under Secretary and General Counsel, U.S. Department of Education

November 11, 2008

I. The Commission's Charge to the HBI Panel

Background

The Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education was established during the 2006 legislative session by Senate Bill 959, the Higher Education-Tuition Affordability Act of 2006. The Commission includes senators, delegates, cabinet secretaries, college presidents, higher education association presidents and executive directors, members of the business community and members of the public. The Commission's charge is to review options and make recommendations relating to the establishment of a consistent and stable funding mechanism to ensure accessibility and affordability while promoting policies to achieve national eminence at all of Maryland's public institutions of higher education. Additionally, the Commission is charged with reviewing options and making recommendations relating to the appropriate level of funding for the state's historically black institutions (HBIs) to ensure that they are comparable and competitive with other public institutions.

The Charge

The Commission appointed the Panel on Historically Black Institutions to study the policy and funding issues regarding Maryland's HBIs, to define the terms comparable and competitive, and to identify performance indicators or benchmarks that would compare Maryland's historically black institutions with the traditionally white institutions in the context of the state's Partnership Agreement with the United States Office for Civil Rights.

This report is intended to provide information and policy guidance to the Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education as it recommends appropriate levels of funding for Maryland's historically black institutions. It is not intended to assess Maryland's compliance with the legal requirements of *U. S. v Fordice* or Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

The Commission's charge specifies the following responsibilities: 1) perform a study to define the terms comparability and competitiveness for Maryland's public HBIs with the public TWIs; 2) recommend performance indicators or benchmarks for determining the comparability and competitiveness of the HBIs with the TWIs; 3) examine funding levels of Maryland's HBIs to determine comparability and competitiveness; and 4) assist the legislative Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education in meeting its statutory charge to review options and make recommendations on the appropriate level of funding for Maryland's public HBIs to ensure that they are comparable and competitive with other public institutions of higher education based on Carnegie classifications and institutional mission.

In addition the charge outlines the following tasks:

- Consideration of the impact of state key policies; funding, program review, mission.
- An examination of the programs, resources, and facilities at the TWIs and HBIs, including site visits as appropriate.
- An examination of the racial and socioeconomic enrollment patterns at the TWIs and HBIs.
- An examination of the student success trends at the TWIs and HBIs, considering the academic preparation of students.
- An examination of student access at public institutions.

The charge also requests a review of the methods and measures used by other states that could serve as examples for Maryland in determining parity between TWIs and HBIs in funding, academic program offerings, enrollment diversity, campus facilities, student success rate, and any other factors determined to be relevant.

The Commission's charge specifically requests recommendations for:

1. Definitions of the terms "comparable" and "competitive" as they relate to Maryland public education institutions; and
2. Specific measurable performance indicators or benchmarks for determining the comparability and competitiveness of the HBIs with the TWIs.

The Commission's charge to the Panel was to avoid assessing compliance with the 2000-2005 Partnership Agreement. However, the Commission's charge also requests the Panel to conduct its study and analysis to determine comparability and competitiveness and their benchmarks and indicators "within the context of the state's Partnership Agreement with the U. S. Office of Civil Rights."

The Panel attempted to implement this carefully-drawn distinction by focusing on Commitment 9 of the Partnership Agreement, which contained two major elements:

1. Specific commitments regarding concrete actions to be taken, including the following:
 - Enhance funding in the areas of admissions management, student financial aid administration, and institutional development programs directed toward identification of "best practices" and the development of strategic plans in each of these areas.
 - Increase funding for Access and Success by doubling its current funding of \$3 million by FY 2003.

- Provide a 2:1 match for HBIs under the Private Donation Incentive Program.
- Commit to the expeditious completion of the following capital improvements at Bowie State University (BSU), the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) and Morgan State University (MSU):

Bowie State

- Campus Site Development
- New Science Building

UMES

- Food Science and Technology Center
- Social Science, Education and Health Science Building
- New Physical Plant Building
- Renovate Waters/Somerset Halls

Morgan State

- New Communications Center
- Science Research Facility w/Greenhouse
- Montebello Site Improvements

- Conduct an independent study leading to a comprehensive strategic plan for the revitalization of Coppin State University.
- Enhance Boards of Visitors at the HBIs.

2. The second component of Commitment 9 is concerned with the “broader goal of making certain that the HBIs are comparable and competitive with the state’s TWIs in all facets of their operations and programs,” including:

- The distinctiveness of the HBIs’ programmatic missions.
- The uniqueness and mix of quality academic programs that are not unnecessarily duplicated at proximate TWIs.
- Operational funding consistent with the mix and degree level of academic programs, support for the development of research infrastructure, and support consistent with the academic profile of students.
- Lower student-faculty ratios appropriate to support their missions.
- The expanse, functionality and architectural quality of physical facilities;
- The appearance, attractiveness, and ambiance of the campus and surrounding public infrastructure; including roads, lighting, and public transportation.
- Funding to support students’ quality of campus life.

The Panel focused its reviews and analysis on the second, broader commitment of Commitment 9 related to a clear, more specific definition of comparable/competitive. We did so, mindful of two assertions:

- The official state response to OCR in 2006, stating that the specific actions committed to in Commitment 9 had been accomplished.
- That the Commission charge asked us specifically to address the broader element of the commitment – namely, how the state should more finely address the broader (and less defined) goal of comparability and competitiveness.

II. Putting the Charge in its Proper Context: Past to Present

Defining the terms “comparability” and “competitiveness” in the context of the public institutions that comprise the Maryland system of higher education cannot be accomplished without first understanding the context in which these terms have become relevant to higher education funding. In Maryland, that context is a long history of racial segregation and disparate treatment at both the public post-secondary and elementary/secondary levels of education and decades of attempts to implement fully a federally required desegregation plan designed to eliminate the effects and vestiges of the prior dual system of higher education.

As stated earlier, this panel’s mandate does not include the responsibility to determine whether Maryland has met its legal obligations under federal law. However, the panel has no doubt that its deliberations, findings, conclusions and recommendations – like the current status of the HBIs – will be closely linked to the continuing effects and vestiges of policies and practices supported by many decades of a dual system of public higher education in Maryland. The terms “competitiveness” and “comparability” are often used as terms of art in the federal government’s evaluation of whether the state has remedied state-sanctioned racial discrimination in its public colleges and universities and eliminated where practicable the vestiges of that discrimination as required by both U. S. Supreme Court decisions in Brown V Board of Education and U. S. V Fordice and Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The federal government first cited Maryland for failure to dismantle its dual system of higher education in 1969. Over the next three decades, Maryland attempted to resolve its compliance status under federal civil rights laws through the submission of a series of desegregation or consent plans. The most recent, the 1999 Partnership Agreement between the State of Maryland and the U. S. Department of Education, committed Maryland to enhance the HBIs by among other things making them “comparable and competitive” with the TWIs. However, while the state identified and implemented several “enhancement” projects and funding commitments, it failed to establish

benchmarks, standards, or indicators to determine how and when the HBIs would be deemed “comparable” to and therefore able to become “competitive” with the state’s TWIs. As indicated above, the HBI Panel has been asked to advise the state on the development of such benchmarks, standards, and indicators to assist the state in developing funding guidelines and formulas for supporting HBIs in reaching the goals of comparability and competitiveness.

Specifically, the state indicated in its June 19, 2006 response to the Office for Civil Rights (U. S. Department of Education) that “the task of determining that the HBIs are “comparable and competitive” with the state’s TWIs in all facets of their operations and programs resists simple assessment, since the language of the commitment lacks clear and measurable specificity.” The state goes on to promise that it will “undertake the development of measurable indicators in areas required to achieve parity among the TWIs and HBIs.”

A Note from the Panel

The Panel wishes to make a point that otherwise might go unnoticed in the context of this report’s findings and recommendations on making Maryland’s HBIs comparable and competitive with other state institutions. The conclusions below outline significant steps the state should take to ensure the HBIs attain such status.

However, what should not be lost and is highly significant is that the state of Maryland has initiated on its own this examination of the specific meaning of the terms comparable and competitive. We know of no other state that has committed to being so explicit about these standards and terms.

We note below how these concepts have tended to be more terms of art than objective criteria as applied heretofore in Maryland and in other states. Without more specific definitions of the goals and standards, it is difficult to gauge where HBIs stand and what is needed to improve their positions.

In taking this initiative, Maryland has become the first state to ask not simply for more specific definitions of comparable capacity, but also what it means to be competitive in terms of outcomes and results. In doing so, Maryland, on its own, has reached for not only a more specific standard — but a higher and more exacting one, which demonstrates its commitment to strengthening the HBIs and the Maryland system of higher education as a whole.

III. The Panel's Approach and Process

The HBI panel recognizes that a “simple assessment” and measurement of “comparability” is both difficult and complex. Moreover, identifying the moment in time when comparability has been achieved is challenging, if not wholly impossible. A better approach, though no less complex and challenging, in the Panel’s view, is the development of an analytical process and a series of strategic steps that will enable the HBIs to develop the capacity to compete at all levels with other public institutions of higher education in Maryland. The Commission’s charge to the Panel portends its intent to pursue a more strategic approach to the enhancement of HBI programs and facilities to eliminate any vestiges and effects of prior discrimination and the disadvantages created by the cumulative shortfall of funding over many decades. The charge also portends an intent to adopt a strategic funding plan to acknowledge that shortfall and appropriate funds over time that will build the capacity of HBIs and make them comparable in terms of quality and resources to the state’s public TWIs. Comparability once achieved will place HBIs in the position they would have been, absent the perpetuation of discriminatory policies and practices, to compete effectively with other public institutions in the state.

There are many indicators that suggest that substantial additional resources must be invested in HBIs to overcome the competitive disadvantages caused by prior discriminatory treatment: the lack of modern “state of the art” science and technology labs, the aging physical plants and lack of consistent funding for maintenance, the poor retention and graduation rates of students as compared to TWIs, and the large number of low income and educationally underserved students in need of financial assistance. Indeed, one can reasonably assume that had the state consistently treated HBIs over their lifespan in a manner comparable to the treatment of TWIs, the HBIs would currently be competitive with other public institutions in these and other aspects of their operations both at the undergraduate and doctoral levels. The goal is to adopt a set of policies and practices that ultimately lead to the achievement of a public higher education system of national eminence in Maryland.

The Panel has attempted to be faithful and responsive to the Commission’s charge by developing definitions of the terms “comparable” and “competitive” within the context of Maryland’s examination of support for higher education institutions. The Panel then identified a series of indicators, and, in some cases, benchmarks that give meaning and specificity to those terms. In the spirit and intent of the Commission’s charge, we went further and attempted to measure how comparable and competitive the HBIs are with respect to the TWIs in Maryland and to identify the level and nature of support needed to address any differences or deficits.

The Panel organized its early work according to the following interpretations of comparable and competitive and their associated benchmarks and indicators:

We attached the term “comparable” to describe institutional comparisons of capacity, which refers to resources, including various student and faculty inputs, programs, facilities, funding and other factors. In other words, we examined those indicators whose organized and effective interaction enables an institution to generate instructional, research and service outcomes.

We used “competitive” to refer to comparisons across institutions of their outcomes or results, such as degree production, student graduation rates, external funding generated, etc.

We used “indicators” to describe the specific capacity and outcome factors that we used in the comparisons.

“Benchmarks” refer to the levels of capacity and outcome indicators that specify desired levels of capacity that lead to competitive outcomes.

The Panel quickly recognized that a straightforward, traditional comparison of Maryland HBIs and TWIs across a common set of definitions and indicators of institutional capacity and outcomes would not work, owing to some crucial limitations:

- First and most important, the mission of the HBIs in providing an undergraduate degree is substantially different and more challenging than that of the TWIs. HBIs historically and into the future have a dual mission. They are committed to the traditional mission of any institution of higher education to provide a quality educational experience and guide students to the attainment of an undergraduate degree. HBIs in the State of Maryland also have as their mission to address the educational needs of students who come from families with traditionally less education and income and who are often under prepared as a result of their circumstances – not their abilities – for college level work. Helping these under prepared students earn a bachelor’s degree is central to the HBI mission. This function for the HBIs is disproportionately more important than in the TWIs. Simply comparing the traditional indicators of capacity (funding levels, student-faculty ratios, etc.) poses the question: What kind of capacity is truly needed to carry out such a challenging mission?
- Second, the Panel’s examination of the comparative status of doctoral-level education in the HBIs was limited by Morgan State University

having no Maryland university peers in its Carnegie Classification. The Commission's intent that we focus on Maryland institutions within the same Carnegie class limited the Panel's ability to perform a traditional comparative analysis as intended.

The Panel agreed that, with these limitations, a simple assessment and measure of comparability at one moment would not be possible or accurate. Accordingly, the Panel developed its own approach for determining the HBIs' comparability and competitiveness. This strategy applies separately to undergraduate education and doctoral education in the following ways:

1. A definition of the outcomes or results that will render the HBIs competitive with TWIs. In undergraduate education, we recommend a focus on attaining similar graduation rates as those of the TWIs. In doctoral education, we suggest the traditional outcomes of degree production, external grants generated, and placement of doctoral graduates.
2. A description of a state process for determining the kind and level of capacity needed to produce the competitive outcomes. This process recognizes that simple comparisons of HBI and TWI capacity will not be effective either in undergraduate or doctoral education. For undergraduate education, the task will be to specify the different or greater capacities the HBIs will need to reach the same graduation-rate levels as the TWIs. For doctoral education, in the absence of relevant institutional comparisons within Maryland, the Panel built a strategy and model describing the specific indicators of quality doctoral universities – both in terms of institution-wide and program characteristics.

Below, we outline a process based on the judgments of academic and policy experts to determine the specific nature of the needed capacity. The goal should be to ensure HBI capacity that enables each institution to generate competitive results.

In doctoral education, effective capacity will mean that the institution has both the institution-wide platform and program indicators that are present in quality doctoral universities with similar programs

In undergraduate education, effective capacity at the HBIs will signify a different and even greater capacity required to achieve similar outcomes as the TWIs.

Organization and Conduct of the Study

The Panel organized its study, analyses, findings and recommendations of the comparability and competitiveness of Maryland's HBIs into four areas:

1. Undergraduate Education: Capacity and outcome indicators were identified and a subset of them was used to compare the four HBIs with three selected TWIs – Salisbury University, Towson University and the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Recognizing the constraints inherent in this sort of traditional analysis, the Panel outlines and recommends a different approach to determining and moving toward needed capacity and competitive outcomes.
2. Doctoral-Level Education and Research: The Panel identified a series of indicators against which the capacity and outcomes of universities in doctoral education and research can be measured and compared. Morgan State University's doctoral capacity and outcomes are referenced to a model description of the essential indicators of quality doctoral universities and programs. The Panel recommended a strategy for developing the specific enhancements needed to achieve comparable capacity and competitive outcomes. UMES' special status in doctoral education was recognized and a similar strategy recommended.
3. General Institutional Facilities and Operations: Through on-site visits and available data analysis, the Panel attempted to assess the comparability of facilities and related space of the HBIs in relation to selected TWIs.
4. State program Approval and Improvement, Funding and Accountability: The Panel notes the important statewide functions of program approval and improvement, funding and accountability and the need for these procedures to be closely aligned and applied more effectively.

These comparative analyses were conducted through campus visits in which the Panel heard presentations of facts and opinions, interacted with faculty, staff and students, and observed facilities, equipment and space. The Panel visited the following campuses: Bowie State University, Coppin State University, Morgan State University, Salisbury University, Towson University, University of Maryland Baltimore County, and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore.

The Panel also analyzed volumes of reports and analyses provided both by institutions and various state agencies. The Panel took care that any conclusions drawn were based on data and reports that in most cases were confirmed by multiple sources, including universities and government agencies.

IV. Comparability and Competitiveness in Undergraduate Education

Maryland's per-capita income and economic success is directly related to its high rate of bachelor's degree attainment. Historically high, Maryland will be increasingly challenged over the next 15 years to maintain or increase higher education attainment levels. This is because:

- The populations growing the most through 2021 will be from African-American, Hispanic and other minority groups. These groups historically have had lower rates of higher educational attainment, owing in the past to a relative lack of opportunity and more recently to lesser preparation for college related to income and educational background.
- The change and challenge posed by Maryland's population trends can be seen clearly in the proportions of high school graduates: In 2009, 52 percent of the year's graduates will be white, but by 2021, 38 percent will be white.
- Currently, the educational gaps between white and African-American students are large in high school graduation, preparation for college and college-going and degree attainment.
- Maryland's challenge is to find ways to bring the college-going rates and attainment of the faster growing lower income groups to levels commensurate with whites to ensure the state's continued economic success.
- While every public community college and university needs to increase access and help students from lower-income families achieve higher bachelor's degree attainment, HBIs are uniquely positioned to play the largest role owing to their historical mission and effectiveness in meeting the needs of these students.

Effective undergraduate education needs to be the highest priority for HBIs and all of higher education given the fundamental role undergraduate education plays in higher education.

- The bachelor's degree has the highest currency for most students and its economic value is increasing.
- Quality undergraduate education is prerequisite for successful graduate and professional education attainment.
- The gaps in degree attainment between African-Americans and whites are great at both undergraduate and graduate levels. While larger gaps exist in graduate education, the only way is to close them simultaneously.

Analysis and Findings

To determine the comparability and competitiveness of the HBIs with the relevant Maryland TWIs, the Panel identified a set of indicators descriptive of the critical components of institutional capacity, on one hand, and institutional results or outcomes on the other (Table A-1). These indicators reflect many of the performance indicators already being used in the state funding process but also include others.

Using those indicators for which data could be obtained, the Panel compared the four HBIs and three TWIs in both capacity and outcomes. All seven universities were compared to each other because undergraduate education in all universities is expected to share similar outcomes and elements of capacity. The Carnegie Classification applies only to graduate education.

This traditional, routine comparison yielded the following findings (Table A-2):

1. The findings are clear with respect to the very different kinds of students served by all of the HBIs compared to the selected TWIs.
 - SAT scores are lower by 200 to 250 points
 - Much higher percentages of HBI students are lower income and minority.
2. On the more traditional capacity indicators, the HBIs show more similarity with the TWIs.
 - Student-faculty ratios are similar.
 - Funding per student indicators are similar.
 - Percentages of faculty who are full-time vary, but not specific to HBI or TWI status.
3. The comparison of outcome indicators reveals large gaps in performance (competitiveness).
 - HBI graduation rates are 20-30 points lower
 - HBI undergraduate programs yield fewer degrees per 100 students enrolled.
 - HBI second-year retention rates are lower.

These comparisons show more similarities than differences on traditional capacity indicators but do not take into account the fact that HBIs require additional funding in order to successfully carry out their broader missions.

The Panel holds, accordingly, that the Commission should consider a different approach as it seeks to determine the kind and level of HBI capacity needed to be competitive. This approach centers on identifying those institutional actions needed for an HBI to improve graduation rates significantly. The very

different and greater challenges faced by HBIs in terms of student preparation and affordability should determine the specific capacity required by the HBIs, not a strict comparison to that of TWIs.

Moreover, this identification of what HBIs need to do specifically to help students graduate at far higher rates likely will not be assisted by currently identified indicators or benchmarks. This is because there are few or no institutional examples of success in this endeavor. Graduation rates in U. S. higher education remain almost wholly tied to the education preparation and income of beginning students. Few institutions have been able to counter the effects of prior under preparation and low income on graduation rates. In a real way, Maryland will have to construct its own definition of what capacity is needed.

HBIs need a different form and level of capacity because unlike the TWIs, the HBIs have a dual mission: (1) to carry out their regular collegiate programs and associated functions to the best of their abilities and (2) to provide strong programs in developmental education to ensure access and success to students, mostly from low-income families, who otherwise would not have an opportunity to pursue a bachelor's degree.

The HBIs are not funded at appropriate levels to carry out both parts of this mission at once. Given the rapidly changing demographics in the state and the great disparity that continues to exist between bachelor degree attainment levels of white compared with black residents of the state, the HBIs are providing an invaluable service to the state in its commitment to helping underserved students, and in preparing African Americans for the Maryland workforce. In FY 2004, 46.2 percent of all Maryland high school graduates enrolled in a Maryland 4-year college or university. That percentage for African Americans was 38.6. Approximately 60 percent of African Americans enrolled in a public college or university within the state are enrolled at an HBI (excluding UMUC that enrolls students at multiple sites both within and outside the U. S. and enrolls a large percentage of nontraditional students.) In 2006-07, only 19.7 percent of the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded by Maryland campuses went to African Americans. Approximately 40 percent of these were awarded by the HBIs.

The consequences of serving a higher percentage of students from low-income families include the following:

1. HBIs must expend a higher percentage of revenue toward student financial aid;
2. HBIs must charge lower tuition and fees because students cannot afford higher costs. Consequently, in FY 2007, the revenue from tuition and fees for HBIs is on the average \$1,500/FTE student less than that of TWIs (this

analysis excludes UMUC and St. Mary's College because of their unique status);

3. The HBIs' graduation rates are less than that of the TWIs because of the challenges associated with graduating students from low-income families at the same rate as that of students from higher income families; and
4. HBIs must expend larger portions of their budgets toward developmental education and academic support than TWIs.

This new approach to determining comparable capacity and competitive outcomes is based on the following principles:

1. Undergraduate education should be the first priority of all state universities and the bachelor's degree should be recognized as the key credential in advancing minority attainment, closing achievement gaps and reversing the cycle of low family income, educational background and college attainment levels. Increasingly, the bachelor's degree is the key to economic and social success.
2. All state universities share this mission and all must have the capacity to help students earn the bachelor's degree at similar, competitive rates.
3. The most significant indicator of undergraduate program outcome and competitiveness is the graduation rate. An institution will be seen as competitive if it can help high percentages of students earn a degree.
4. The capacity of undergraduate programs should be judged by the extent to which the programs help students graduate. We call this "effective capacity." Different programs may have the same levels across the same indicators of capacity (student-faculty ratio, funding, and faculty characteristics) and yet result in highly different graduation rates. In these cases, the Panel holds that capacity is not comparable in that it does not lead to similar graduation rates.
5. In this context, assuring the comparability of a university's undergraduate education capacity requires taking into account the challenge of the task, the differential difficulty faced by different institutions in helping their students earn a bachelor's degree. In other words, universities that enroll students with significantly less educational preparation and readiness for college will require a very different kind of capacity.
6. The HBIs serve a different and higher-need student population. While most of the Maryland TWIs also have students with developmental educational needs, the under prepared student composes a much higher

proportion in the HBIs. In this circumstance, HBIs require greater and different capacity than TWIs to produce similar outcomes.

7. The Panel suggests that HBI capacity be deemed comparable when it has the programs and services it needs to help its higher-need students to graduate.

Strategy for Making HBIs Effective in Capacity and Competitive in Results

With the preceding as background, the Panel recommends the following:

1. The capacity of HBIs in undergraduate education should provide the opportunity to raise graduation rates to levels approaching those of TWIs. Graduation rates should be the primary criterion determining competitiveness in HBI outcome or results. The graduation rate benchmark for Coppin State University may need to recognize its low beginning baseline.
2. The HBIs as a group, coordinated by the Maryland Higher Education Commission and assisted by national experts, should outline in detail those programs and services needed to ensure that lower-income, lesser-prepared students eventually graduate. These programs and services may extend from pre-admission work with feeder high schools to summer bridge programs to first-year freshman programs and through graduation.

The primary focus of these services should be on academic achievement. The programs should address specifically the improvement of learning skills, especially reading, writing and mathematics.

These services also should provide for the continuous advising and monitoring of student progress and appropriate intervention. These services should employ the latest effective technology that maximizes the connection of students with needed advising, counseling and individualized learning and learning tutorials.

The faculty and staff resources needed to implement these services and programs should be identified and the cost estimated. The nature of the professional resources required should be carefully evaluated according to student need. It is most likely that many of these student needs are best met not necessarily through tenure-track faculty but through full-time academic professionals with specialized preparation in learning skills development and subject-based learning.

These programs should be comprehensive and be planned using criteria shared by all HBIs (and certain TWIs if relevant). The Panel notes that

Towson University has planned a comprehensive and impressive student assistance program. However, HBIs and TWIs in Maryland currently have student bodies with significantly different academic needs and characteristics and the best practices at each may not automatically translate into best practices at another.

Each of the HBIs offers a range of the contemplated services and programs in some form. The Panel recognizes the state-supported “Access and Success” grant program aimed at improving student achievement and graduation. We find an absence of suitably-specific and common criteria that shape these programs. This program also lacks the nature and level of goals and accountability that we have in mind.

3. The dominant focus on learning skills in these programs is reinforced by the knowledge that such skills (reading, writing and math) are the most important predictor of eventual graduation. The Panel estimates, and research data confirm, that at least 80 percent of HBI students need further preparation to succeed in college if reasonable readiness standards are applied. For HBIs to become competitive with TWIs in graduation outcomes, HBI capacity must be able to address the needs of the great majority of their entering students.
4. These programs should be based on a common, statewide definition of college readiness in the form of specific statewide standards in reading, writing and mathematics. These standards should be established statewide and applied through common placement/readiness tests taken by all admitted students. These standards should specifically focus on the developmental programs and be used as the criteria for determining when students have achieved a level of college readiness. Meeting these standards coupled with successful course completion and eventual college graduation should provide the measure of these programs’ effectiveness.
5. These student academic assistance programs should be available to any university that enrolls a significant proportion of low-income, under prepared undergraduate students.
6. The Panel believes strongly that increasing the capacity of HBIs in undergraduate education in the above ways to be the first priority for additional state support.
7. The Panel also notes that HBIs serve students who disproportionately have greater unmet financial needs. Compared to students in the TWIs, students attending HBIs find a college education much more difficult to afford. While these more needy students qualify for need-based federal and state aid, it is highly likely that a large number of these students have

unmet financial need along with unseen greater financial burdens and responsibilities.

In furtherance of its recommendations, the Panel makes the following observations:

- That affordability is a critical factor in students staying in college and eventually graduating.
- That many students at the HBIs (and in the TWIs to a lesser extent proportionately) have unmet financial need that affects their successful attendance.
- That the HBIs, to a greater extent than TWIs, must constrain tuition and fee charges in recognition of the income status of their students.
- That HBIs, to a greater extent than TWIs, need to redirect portions of their tuition and fee revenue to support lower income students.

Accordingly, the Panel further recommends that Maryland consider augmenting its need-based student assistance programs so that affordability is increased for lower income students at all public universities. This, of course, will affect HBI students, and HBIs, disproportionately.

V. Comparability and Competitiveness in Graduate Education: The Doctoral Level

Maryland's Process for Planning, Mission and Program Approval, Funding and Accountability

In carrying out its charge from the Commission to define comparability and competitiveness, the Panel's attention was frequently directed to historical and contemporary situations and circumstances that, while related to funding, were caused or affected by other parts of the state's process for coordinating higher education. Understanding the development and nature of this coordinating process has become particularly relevant to our deliberations over capacity, comparability and competitiveness among Maryland doctoral institutions and the doctoral programs offered at these institutions.

We refer to the process by which a state sets university missions, approves new programs, funds them through some model or process, and then holds universities accountable for results. Whether intentional or not, the past treatment of the historically black institutions in this process in contrast to the treatment of other public institutions in the state has had the effect of substantially marginalizing the HBIs and their ability to develop and maintain comparable quality and competitiveness in the state's system of higher education. This is especially the case with respect to the doctoral granting status of Morgan State University (MSU) and the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore (UMES).

The current result of these longstanding past practices is that there exists a substantial lack of comparability and capacity (as compared generally with quality doctoral granting institutions both in and outside of the state, taking scale and composition into account) at both MSU and UMES (whose status as a doctoral granting institution is somewhat different from that of MSU). The substantial lack of comparability, and therefore the inability to be competitive, exists both in terms of the institutional platform upon which doctoral programs must be built and sustained, and with respect to the quality and nature of the specific doctoral programs offered by these two HBIs.

The Panel wishes to comment on one part of this process that has produced serious current consequences and led to confusion and concern about current funding levels of higher education programs in Maryland. This aspect of the higher education coordinating process in Maryland is best characterized by the common refrain from the HBIs, and others well-acquainted with Maryland public higher education, that the programs exist but are not funded, either at all or funded inadequately. This situation could be caused in several ways:

- The institution is receiving funding but chooses not to apply it to a program;
- The institution stated before approval that it could fund the program out of its existing resources; and/or
- The state approved a program without ensuring that funding would be available either through the state, the institution, or a combination thereof.

Each of the two doctoral-level HBIs has multiple graduate programs that have been approved by the state but for which each claims to have received no specifically-designated state support. At this point, it is probably not helpful to “roll back the clock” and review motivation or assign responsibility for this situation. However, as stated in the earlier section of this report on undergraduate programs, we recognize the key and unfortunate role played in the distant past by a legally-enforced dual system in the development of the doctoral programs offered by the two HBIs. What is most important at this juncture is for the Commission to remedy both the lack of comparability among the doctoral institutions and restructure the process that has caused the inequities and lack of competitiveness between the HBIs and the traditionally white doctoral institutions.

Defining and Measuring Comparability Among the Doctoral Granting Institutions

Determining comparability and competitiveness in the graduate area is more complex than for undergraduate education. This is because:

- The number and kind of graduate programs, especially at the doctoral level, depend on defined institutional missions. Most public institutions do not offer doctoral programs; those that do, offer different kinds and numbers by state design.
- Doctoral programs that are research- and academic science-based are relatively lower-demand and higher-cost programs. Consequently, an accepted and key tenet of state coordination and planning policy is that the number and kind of graduate programs in any state must be limited by state needs and available funding. In contrast to undergraduate education, in which all or most institutions are expected to have a full set of basic programs, in graduate education the programs must be assigned and coordinated carefully according to what a state needs and can afford.
- Virtually all states experience a number of public institutions wishing to offer more graduate programs than a state can afford, or truly needs. A constant tension exists between institutional aspiration and state coordination. This has been true in Maryland from at least the 1960s to present.

In its most recent publication, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Carnegie Classifications Data File, June 11, 2008), classifies only three of Maryland's public universities as Doctoral-Granting Universities: Morgan State University (Doctoral/Research University or DRU), the University of Maryland Baltimore County (Research University – High or RU-H), and the University of Maryland College Park (Research University – Very High or RU-VH). Maryland has no public universities within the same Carnegie Classification as Morgan State. UMBC's classification of "Research University – High," is a step above "Doctoral/Research University". The University of Maryland College Park, the state's "flagship" institution of higher education, and one of the select universities in the United States belonging to the prestigious American Association of Universities, is the sole Maryland public university in Carnegie's highest research classification.

Although UMES is not classified by Carnegie as a doctoral level university, it offers programs at the doctoral level. Of these seven programs, three are applied degrees; two are first-professional degrees which, in these instances, are needed to begin practice in pharmacy and physical therapy. Two more of the UMES programs are offered jointly with other Maryland public universities. The doctorates in Food Science and Technology, Marine Estuarine Environmental Sciences, and Organizational Leadership all have a research focus. Nevertheless, UMES is not classified as a doctoral-level university by Carnegie.

The Panel is aware of the fact that Bowie State University also offers two applied doctoral programs, one in Educational Leadership and the other in

Applied Computer Science. As in the case of UMES, Bowie is not included in the Carnegie Classification system. However, because Bowie, unlike UMES, is not a land-grant institution and neither of Bowie's doctoral programs has a research focus, it fell outside of the Panel's focus on comparability and competitiveness at the doctoral level. In considering the status of Bowie in this area of its academic offerings, the State should be guided generally by the indicators, strategies and recommendations following regarding the capacity of specific doctoral programs.

Comparison of Morgan State University to Other Doctoral Universities

As indicated above, Morgan State University is the only HBI in Maryland classified as a DRU doctoral university. MSU, founded in 1867, became a public institution in Maryland in 1939. However, its growth as a graduate institution traces to 1975 when it was authorized by statute to operate as a university that offers professional and graduate education as approved by its Board and relevant state authorities. MSU offers 15 doctoral programs currently.

MSU's first doctorate was in higher education and was approved by the State coordinating board in 1979. The next doctorates were approved in 1994, in engineering and history. Two more education doctorates were approved in 1995. The other ten doctorates were approved in 1999 or after.

UMBC's classification of "Research University—High", is a step above "Doctoral/Research University," and falls closest to MSU among Maryland public universities. UMBC was established as part of the University System of Maryland in 1966. It currently offers 23 doctoral level programs.

However, a direct comparison of MSU's doctoral program status to that of other similar universities in Maryland and outside is complicated in several ways. First, MSU has no Carnegie Classification doctoral university peer in Maryland.

Second, directly comparing MSU to similarly Carnegie-classified universities outside of Maryland, while possible, is not useful because such out-of-state comparisons do not address directly the desired focus on keeping the comparison between Maryland HBIs and TWIs. In addition, the 26 other universities in the U.S. with the same Carnegie classification as MSU, while all technically doctoral universities, represent a wide range of size and programs, funding support and mission, history and quality. The Panel's attempts to compare doctoral-level education and research among possible comparable institutions have been further limited by the lack of comparable financial and facilities data from institutions both inside and outside of Maryland.

It was also impossible to compare funding support for specific programs. Simply comparing current or recent general fund appropriations per student for the entire university cannot yield the kind of program-specific information needed to determine comparable support (i.e., did other program priorities claim disproportional shares of this overall funding leading to inadequate support?).

Moreover, as an historical fact, MSU's ability to develop as a quality doctoral university has been slower than the other doctoral institutions in the state. Specifically, even taking into account scale and uncertainty over intended specific missions, the data show that MSU has been slower to develop as a graduate/doctoral university than UMBC over roughly the same period (from the mid-1970s forward). UMBC gained clear direction by the 1980s in terms of its institutional role within the state and developed its current program cohort at a faster pace. In comparison, MSU's development as a graduate and doctoral university occurred seemingly without the support of a state strategic plan that delineated and directed specific state support of its graduate mission. We have been unable to determine the extent to which the state's approval of MSU's doctoral programs carried with it specific funding commitments or the nature of any state oversight of subsequent program development.

We find a continuing lack of consensus between the state and MSU on how specifically to develop and support MSU's graduate/doctoral role. In 1975, the state statutorily authorized and approved MSU to offer doctoral and professional programs as an "urban-oriented institution." The statute did not define or provide further direction as to the scope of the doctoral level programs authorized at MSU. However, fifteen such programs have been approved since that time and their development has certainly not been within the same trajectory as found in most quality doctoral universities with which we are familiar.

The Panel believes that the doctoral programs at MSU should have the support needed to become quality doctoral programs according to accepted standards of quality for doctoral programs of the kind offered by MSU. Equally important, Morgan should have the resources required to mount the kind of university-wide institutional platform needed, and generally expected in the higher education community, to support quality and competitive doctoral programs and quality doctoral universities.

Conceptual Strategy for Achieving Comparability and Competitiveness at the Doctoral Level

Recognizing these limitations but mindful of our charge to establish a comparative context within which institutional capacity and outcomes could be assessed, we turned to our collective expertise to conceptualize the elements of a quality doctoral-level institution offering the types of doctoral

programs currently offered by MSU. Our conceptualization projects a highly regarded doctoral-level research institution that has implemented a university-wide institutional platform upon which to build and support research and development in thirteen specific Ph.D. granting programs like those that comprise the MSU graduate-level program. We do this having reached consensus that absent its racial character and past treatment, there is every reason to believe that MSU would have been treated differently and would have developed the capacity to attain the status and quality that we describe in our specification of a quality doctoral institution. It would not necessarily have become UMBC or UMCP, each of which is unique in its category within the state. But MSU very likely would be – within the unique category of programmatic offerings it has chosen and been permitted to offer – an institution of comparable quality, resources, reputation and support.

In addition to our charge to determine whether MSU is comparable and competitive with other doctoral institutions in the state, we have been asked to help determine how the state should support MSU to develop its capacity to offer and maintain doctoral programs that are comparable to and therefore competitive with those offered at other quality doctoral universities. We have concluded that the definition of “comparable capacity” should be developed in the context of a set of general indicators. Having come to this conclusion, we acknowledge that the task of definitively benchmarking or identifying the level of quality required within this set of indicators is a complicated and somewhat elusive challenge. Nevertheless, we are recommending an approach that will link MSU’s development to that of universities with universally acknowledged and generally accepted levels of quality expected within doctoral institutions and the doctoral programs they offer. The Panel suggests, therefore, that the indicators of quality that are gleaned from these doctoral institutions and doctoral programs will provide the “roadmap” to the doctoral programs of high quality to which MSU would like to aspire and emulate. Once this level of quality is achieved at both the institutional and programmatic level, we believe MSU will have the capacity to be judged comparable as a doctoral institution within Maryland. And, further, we believe the achievement of comparability will give MSU the opportunity to become competitive in its ability to attract to, and graduate students from, its doctoral programs.

UMBC and UMCP may provide a model for defining the level of comparable capacity needed at MSU, at least with respect to the generic indicators of quality (identified on pages 24-25). These generic indicators of quality are those indicators that would be expected to be present in every quality doctoral program. The state should embrace this comparison of capacity among doctoral institutions within the state and support MSU in achieving comparability with respect to these generic indicators (see the discussion following, regarding a university-wide platform and baseline capacity). However, there are some doctoral program-specific indicators of quality that

may not lend themselves to a direct comparison between MSU, UMBC, or UMCP because the specific doctoral program is offered at MSU but not the other institutions. For example, Computer Science is offered at UMBC but not MSU. Similarly, Social Work is offered at MSU but not by UMBC. As a result, in some instances because UMBC is not offering the same kind of doctoral programs as MSU, specific determinations of the base-line level of capacity and quality needed at MSU in that particular doctoral program will require a comparison that focuses on comparable doctoral programs at doctoral granting institutions outside of Maryland. The comparability and capacity determination would involve doctoral universities of recognized quality. We outline below the process we recommend to implement the comparability determination for establishing the capacity needed at MSU.

The Panel members agree that there is a baseline capacity needed to develop and maintain quality doctoral-level universities whether in Maryland or elsewhere in the nation. We might add that simply offering doctoral programs does not equate to doctoral university quality. The challenge is to define this baseline capacity for quality MSU doctoral programs. These elements (or indicators) of institutional capacity that – taken together – make all quality doctoral universities comparable include a well-developed university-wide institutional platform that provides a foundation of support to the administration and operation of specific doctoral programs.

For example, quality doctoral universities have a core of doctoral program faculty who are graduates of doctoral universities with significant reputations for excellence in their respective disciplines. They should have teaching loads consistent with the need to afford them time to conduct research. They should have active research programs and publish in respected, refereed academic journals or produce scholarly books using primary sources and published by academic presses or similarly highly regarded publishers. They should teach graduate-level courses in their disciplines and supervise graduate-student dissertation research projects.

These doctoral faculties should have teaching and research assistantships available to provide financial support for their graduate students and to aid them in their teaching and research. They should have attractive and competitive salaries. Ideally, quality programs have a core of faculty with special appointments and support that supplement their state-funded salaries and who are able to generate external grant funding, which can be used to build support for doctoral students and research staff, and in doing so, expand their programs.

Moreover, the focus on program capacity extends to other vital areas. Science doctoral programs and faculty have modern, well-equipped research laboratories. While the ultimate development of these facilities and their

equipment depends on the success of doctoral faculty in generating external support, a baseline capacity is needed.

Quality doctoral universities require advanced library and information resources specific to the doctoral programs. To recruit and support top doctoral faculty and students in their programs and research, the overall university infrastructure needs to be modern, attractive and conducive to research and scholarship. The latest in university-wide technology and administrative support systems are critical. UMBC and UMCP have the institutional platform or foundation to support these qualities. MSU and UMES do not. UMBC and UMCP had the opportunity and support to develop the elements of quality described above that are the hallmarks of quality doctoral programs. MSU and UMES have not had that opportunity and support to the same or sufficient degree.

Strategy and Recommendations for Moving Forward

The next step involves developing a more specific definition of capacity and comparability in the context of MSU's institution-wide platform of support and its specific doctoral program offerings and a practical but comprehensive plan for building such capacity at MSU. This determination of comparable capacity needs to address both university-wide institutional platform components, particularly facilities and space, administrative support and specific doctoral program development.

University-Wide Capacity Indicators: The Institutional Platform

Operational indicators: In addition to the specific university-wide facility capacity elements discussed below, a quality doctoral institution to become comparable requires the financial resources to provide an efficient and well-staffed research and grants management office and internal audit and compliance office. In addition, the institutional platform must provide students, faculty, and administrative staff with an attractive, safe, and administratively effective environment in which to live and work. This includes an appropriate number of well-equipped and –trained public safety officers; adequate and safe student housing, including separate housing for graduate students and visiting faculty; an appropriately staffed and well-prepared development staff, housed in an attractive and welcoming environment; a well-staffed and trained enrollment management office housed in a central and easily accessible location.

Facility indicators: It is particularly important that the facilities housing the academic departments and interdisciplinary fields offering doctoral programs are modern and comparable to other quality doctoral universities. For graduate institutions offering doctorates in the sciences and engineering, for example, this means having modern science and engineering facilities,

complete with modern laboratories. At quality doctoral institutions that focus on doctoral programs in education (as well as their large undergraduate teacher education programs), the buildings housing these programs need to be state-of-the art. Similarly, quality doctoral programs in business administration require the latest in facilities and technical infrastructure to support faculty and undergraduate, master's and doctoral students and to provide a setting in which the campus and business community can convene comfortably and effectively. Both undergraduate and graduate institutions are placed at a significant competitive disadvantage when they lack a modern administration building that would enable centralization of administrative functions.

Strategy for Achieving a Comparable Institutional Platform

The Panel recommends the following three-pronged approach for providing Morgan as a doctoral institution with the required campus-wide infrastructure (institutional platform) needed to become a competitive doctoral level university.

1. Based on and guided by the Panel's description of what is expected of a quality doctoral university, Morgan State University should provide the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and the Secretary of Higher Education with a detailed strategic plan designed to improve its institutional platform to make it comparable to that of a quality doctoral institution. Specifically the plan addressing the institutional platform requirements should include an updated facilities plan complete with time tables for the construction of the new and renovated facilities consistent with the university-wide indicators identified by the Panel. In addition, the plan should include a proposal to address those administrative and operational and facilities elements and other resources identified above by the Panel as necessary for the support of specific doctoral programs.
2. Guided by Morgan State University's strategic plan and the Panel's recommended strategy, MHEC and the Secretary of Higher Education should provide the Governor and Legislature with recommendations to improve the institutional platform of Morgan and make it comparable to that expected of a quality doctoral university, as described by the Panel above.
3. Guided by these recommendations of MHEC and the Secretary of Higher Education and in consultation with them, the Governor and Legislature should establish a comprehensive program and provide the resources designed to make Morgan a quality doctoral research institution.

Specific Doctoral Program Indicators to Achieve Capacity and Comparability

The most effective, practical strategy for determining how to achieve comparable capacity at MSU on a program level, and for building this capacity, is through a program-centered approach. This is how today's universities develop a strong doctoral mission. Increasingly, universities do not spring up full-blown with a large number of quality, well-supported doctoral programs. Over the past 20 years, higher education has discovered that effective research universities do not have to be large and comprehensive in number of programs. The newer top universities such as UMBC have developed by emphasizing stepwise growth and the seeding and careful nurturing of a select and limited number of programs. Through careful planning and priority and selective concentration of institutional and state support, the successful universities have identified and brought to full development a focused, smaller number of programs. As these programs developed more fully, these universities then renewed the cycle for a new set of two to three programs, building on the success of the earlier programs. The best programs follow this cycle. Few programs begin with the overall state and external funding that quality programs eventually develop. This program-based principle emphasizes that the development of capacity and competitive results in doctoral programs takes focus, support, time and priority.

Recommendations for the Development of Capacity and Comparability Within Specific Doctoral Programs

The Panel recommends the following steps to guide MSU's development at the doctoral program level:

1. As an initial step, the state and MSU should identify a few of its existing doctoral programs for the initial priority and targeted development effort.
2. The MHEC and the Secretary for Higher Education should appoint a small panel of experts for each selected program to determine the threshold support and capacity needed for each of these priority targeted programs. On the basis of their knowledge of quality doctoral programs at a range of research universities (including UMBC if relevant), the panel will be asked to specify the capacity needed to enable competitive results in each of the doctoral programs. This panel should consider the following kinds of capacity and outcome indicators in their specifications (in addition to others that they may identify).

Capacity Indicators

Faculty

Instructional Course Load (Non-Thesis, Non-Dissertation) per Year per Doctoral Faculty Member

Released Time for Dissertation/Thesis/Scholarship/Research per Faculty Member

New faculty start-up funding/support

Special faculty appointments per Doctoral Program

(Endowed Chairs, Fellows, Professorships, Special Chairs)

Faculty salary by rank per Doctoral Program

Doctoral Students per FTE Doctoral Faculty

Faculty Awards per Faculty

Grants/Contracts funding per Faculty

Publications per Faculty

Citations per Faculty

Number of non-faculty research staff (including post-Docs)

Students

Student Assistantships (teaching/research) per Doctoral Program

Graduate enrollment per Doctoral Program

Outcomes/Results Indicators

Degrees Awarded per Doctoral Program

Federal R & D Expenditure/FTE Faculty per Doctoral Program

Placement of Graduates in Academic or Research Positions

3. This panel should also identify other elements of needed baseline capacity including office, laboratory and equipment; library and other information resources.
4. This panel should establish outcomes goals for degree production and R&D funding, if appropriate, by field.
5. The state funding (and dedicated institutional funding from other sources) should be earmarked to the specific programs.
6. The state should expect specific accountability for the funding and expected results.
7. Any new funding for doctoral-level programs at MSU and, preferably for other public universities as well, should be targeted and monitored and the university held accountable for expenditures and specific anticipated outcomes.

The Uniqueness of the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES)

Maryland has two land-grant universities: the University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES). As land-grant universities, both have the tri-fold mission of teaching, research, and public service or outreach. Both receive formula-based funds for conducting agriculture research, and for extension services, from the U. S. Department of Agriculture. These funds require a minimum of a “dollar-for-dollar” match from the state. It is important for the state to continue to provide matching funds for both the UMCP and the UMES and to increase these funds in accordance with increases in formula-based funds allocated by the USDA.

With regard to the HBI study, UMES does not have a comparable institution within the state because of its land-grant mission. It cannot be compared to UMCP because UMCP is a major research university with very high research activity. For undergraduate education, the Panel used the state’s public institutions classified as mater’s-level colleges and universities, under the Carnegie Commission descriptions, for comparative purposes. For the research doctoral programs at UMES, a comparison should be made with similar doctoral programs offered at UMCP or other appropriate out-of-state universities. The aim is to ensure that UMES has the resources it needs (faculty, staff, funding, facilities, etc.) to offer high quality doctoral programs that are comparable and competitive with similar doctoral programs at other institutions.

Recommended Strategy: Development of a Comparable Institutional Platform and Comparable Capacity Within Specific Doctoral Programs at UMES

The Panel recommends that the state undertake steps similar to those recommended to guide MSU’s development in the previous section of this report with respect to the research doctoral programs offered at UMES taking into account UMES’ status as a land-grant university. These steps include providing MHEC and the Secretary of Higher Education with a detailed strategic plan designed to improve its institutional platform and the specific doctoral programs it offers to make them comparable with those of similarly situated quality institutions. As in the case of MSU, MHEC and the Secretary would provide the Governor and Legislature with their recommendations. Guided by these recommendations, the Governor and Legislature should establish a comprehensive program and provide resources to make UMES comparable and competitive within its institutional category. The Panel further recommends that the state use the same process recommended for MSU of appointing a small panel of experts to determine the threshold support and capacity needed for each of the priority targeted programs identified by UMES for development. The appointed panel of experts should identify and

consider the capacity and outcome indicators required to establish baseline capacity, outcome goals for degree production and R&D funding if appropriate for the fields and programs targeted at UMES. While recognizing the differences in the tri-fold land grant mission of UMES, the HBI Panel believes that the recommended strategies and process outlined for MSU can be utilized effectively for moving UMES into comparability and competitiveness in its institutional category.

Observations on Doctoral Program Planning in Maryland for All Public Higher Education Institutions

The Panel acknowledges that the baseline infrastructure, faculty and indicators of quality doctoral institutions and programs alluded to above are major investments. Because of this, the programs that are built on the platform need to have synergistic potential. Rather than create Ph.D. programs in widely dispersed areas that would require many different kinds of laboratories and equipment, it is good planning to develop programs that can share certain basic facilities. Without planning for synergy, the labs and faculty are simply too expensive, especially for low graduate enrollment institutions. For a period the graduate enrollment is limited by the institution's limited reputation in this level of education. For example, if it is decided that the life sciences offer a special opportunity, then the faculty and labs could be oriented to related life science doctoral programs, rather than a "one of each" approach. Laboratories, computer facilities, lab administration facilities, and research grant support need to be focused rather than dispersed. There should be some relationship between investment in the platform and an expected outcome in terms of degrees awarded.

In addition, it is understood that programs are more expensive the smaller the graduate program enrollment. To make any program fiscally rational requires the development of a "critical mass" of doctoral students and faculty in cognate fields. Therefore, as MSU achieves greater enrollment density in related graduate fields, the cost per graduate degree awarded will go down and the program will become more cost efficient.

VI. General Institutional Facilities and Operations

The Panel recognizes the state's substantial efforts to improve the facilities, physical space, and other institution-wide operational and administrative elements of the HBIs. However, overall the facilities at the HBIs are not comparable to those of the TWIs.

The Panel also acknowledges that the capital/facilities challenge extends throughout postsecondary education. All institutions have unmet capital needs. However, the Panel wishes to make a special case for addressing the needs of the HBIs both as a priority and as expeditiously as possible. We

recommend this not only out of our first-hand findings that the HBIs visibly lag behind the TWIs but also because addressing this deficiency is crucial to achieving the goals of capacity and competitiveness of the HBIs in both undergraduate and graduate education.

Undergraduate Education

In concrete terms, to raise undergraduate graduation rates to levels competitive with the TWIs, the HBIs must find ways to improve substantially the levels of teaching and learning currently associated with the preparation and academic levels of student enrolled in their institutions. Accordingly, their campuses must be made attractive and safe not only as a means of attracting well-prepared students but also for students who by necessity will be spending more of their time there than ever before. Students, faculty and staff need an attractive, safe and administratively effective environment in which to live and work. This includes an appropriate number of well-equipped and trained public safety officers; adequate and safe student housing; accessible management and student services offices with sufficient numbers of trained staff; and adequate study and academic counseling space where students, faculty and academic advisors and tutors can meet and work long hours. For students to receive the additional help and instruction needed to graduate, they need a place that makes such academic services directly and effectively accessible.

Graduate Education

The physical environment of a campus, including its facilities and infrastructure such as landscaping, utilities, and data/telecommunications systems, contributes substantially to quality graduate education. To recruit and support top doctoral faculty and students in their programs and research activities, the overall university infrastructure needs to be modern, attractive, safe and conducive to research and scholarship. This is particularly true in doctoral programs in which faculty and their students spend so much time together on campus.

Quality doctoral programs also depend on the latest in university-wide technology and administrative support systems to manage their research and grants and the connections between the researchers on campus and the external scientific and business communities.

The Panel has previously described the facility elements central to a quality doctoral program and made recommendations concerning the institutional platform required to mount quality doctoral programs. (See section V above.) We will not repeat those elements here although they are incorporated into the Recommendations and Strategies we advance immediately below.

Recommendations and Strategies

While asserting the strong need for an institutional platform capacity at the HBIs, the Panel recognizes the large cumulative capital needs of all public higher education. However, while progress has been made, the HBIs currently have further to go than TWIs in meeting their capital needs, particularly in light of the greater outcomes and results expected of them as recommended in this report in both undergraduate and graduate education and research. Against this backdrop, the Panel offers two general recommendations and then describes a strategy for going forward.

These general recommendations stem from the presence of specific HBI capital priorities and requests already being considered as part of the state's FY2009-FY2013 Capital Improvement Program. The institutions also have identified other capital needs that they require and that extend beyond the FY2009-FY2013 period. For example, MSU has the following capital requests either approved or under active consideration by the state: New Center for the Built Environment and Infrastructure Studies; New School of Business Complex; Campus utility and site improvements; Soper Library renovations; Banneker Hall renovation; and the replacement of the Jenkins Behavioral Science Center. Projects identified more in the future include requests for a new Administration Building and Technology Transfer Center.

UMES projects that have been approved or under active consideration by the state include a new Engineering and Aviation Science Building, replacement of the Early Childhood Center, and completion of Somerset Hall. Looking more in the future, UMES has requested a new Pharmacy Building and renovation of several older facilities on campus.

Clearly, substantial deficiencies exist among the HBIs, especially those with doctoral programs and particularly in the context of the institutional platform required to support quality programs that are comparable and competitive. With the foregoing in mind, the Panel recommends the following:

1. Using the strategy recommended above in Sections IV and V and in the context of the strategic planning process, each HBI should review its capital priorities through FY2013 and beyond based on the physical capacity that will be needed to become comparable and competitive both in undergraduate graduation rates and in graduate and doctoral program results expected of quality doctoral programs (as identified above).

If warranted, priorities should be reordered to align with these goals of comparability and competitiveness and to maximize the synergy that exists or could exist between and among graduate programs.

The panel of experts appointed to identify the elements and resources that a specific doctoral program requires should also factor into this strategic planning process their conclusions about the capital needs they believe are required to achieve an improved and expanded institutional platform. The conclusions about the resources needed to support a quality institutional platform arrived at through the strategic planning process, as well as the conclusions reached about specific doctoral programs, should together form the basis for achieving the capacity the HBIs require to become both comparable and competitive.

2. As indicated previously, the HBIs have already identified some facilities that are needed on their campuses to improve their capacity to become comparable and competitive. The state has acknowledged and approved a number of these requests. This panel recommends that the HBIs be given the flexibility to revise their capital needs request in light of the strategic planning in which they will engage pursuant to the recommendations in this report. The state should expedite its review of any revisions and accelerate the funding for the resulting capital improvement priorities of the HBIs to close as quickly as possible the gaps that exist between the comparability and competitiveness of the state's public HBIs with the state's public TWIs.

Timeframes and On-Going Monitoring of Progress and Quality

Finally, with respect to the foregoing recommendations in Sections IV, V and VI, the Panel suggests that the state develop timeframes that are realistic but also recognize the urgency of completing the tasks ahead in a timely fashion. To this end, the state should consider appointing a monitoring committee that will regularly report to MHEC and the Secretary of Higher Education. This committee should assess progress towards meeting the plan goals and provide for continuous follow-up beyond the completion of the plan to ensure all public institutions of higher education in the state are appropriately progressing within the state's established framework to ensure quality institutional development.

VII. Observations Regarding State Program Approval and Improvement, Funding and Accountability

In introducing the section on doctoral education the Panel noted the crucial way that Maryland's process for coordinating higher education state wide contributed to the current situation regarding the comparability and competitiveness of MSU and UMES.

The Commission expressed its openness to the Panel's observations and suggestions for strengthening the state-wide coordination process so that,

going forward, there is more clarity in the relationship among program approval or improvement, program funding, and program accountability.

Strengthening this process will be particularly relevant as the state considers requests from HBIs for additional funding to reach the goals of comparability and competitiveness. However, stronger linkages between the requests for new or improved programs, funding, and accountability should apply to all public higher education institutions seeking additional funding for new or improved programs.

Some states have strict procedures for connecting programs and funding. Some states will not approve new programs unless a certain funding stream is identified in the forms of new, specifically targeted state support or some kind of institutional-generated revenue: student fees, state enrollment-based funding, or reallocated internal funding from other programs at the institution.

The Panel has recommended a set of strategies with respect to the HBIs for building capacity and achieving comparability and competitiveness. If followed, the limitations imposed on their growth and development by a confused or inconsistently applied coordination process will have been addressed. However, the Panel suggests that going forward, at the very least, the state should begin to build strong links among the mission-designation, program-approval and funding phases involved in coordinating public higher education.

Practically, this would mean that missions are made clearer and more explicit and programs are approved only if an assured, clear funding stream can be identified, whether it is from the state or institutional sources. The Panel further suggests that when the state is asked to approve a new program, its approval should be contingent on the availability of state funding, that the state should earmark an allocation specifically for that program and that the institution should be expected to budget and spend that funding only on that program.

VIII. Conclusion

The Panel has been privileged to play a role in the Commission's efforts to ensure the comparability and competitiveness of Maryland's HBIs. We hope that our study and recommendations will help to determine the kind and level of support and expected results that will bring these campuses to a point at which they are comparable in capacity and competitive in results.

The State of Maryland and this Commission should be recognized for advancing this uncommon initiative to be more specific about what it means to be comparable and competitive and how the HBIs can be supported to realize these goals.

The Panel also expresses its appreciation to the many people on the campuses that we studied and visited and to the Commission and its staff for supporting our work and ensuring the independence with which we developed our findings and recommendations.

Table A-1

Undergraduate Capacity and Outcomes Indicators

Undergraduate Capacity Indicators

- A. Students
 - Average SAT
 - Average GPA
 - Percent Eligible for Pell Grants
 - Percent Fulltime
 - Percent Residential

- B. Faculty
 - Percent with Terminal Degrees
 - Percent of all Faculty Who Are Fulltime and Tenured or on Tenure Track
 - Student Faculty Ratio
 - Average Salaries by Rank for all Fulltime Faculty

- C. Funding
 - General Fund/FTE Student
 - Tuition + Fee Revenue/FTE Student
 - Other Revenue/FTE Student
 - Total Educational + General Revenue per FTE student
 - Endowment (Restricted and Unrestricted)

Undergraduate Outcomes Indicators

- A. Graduation Rate (Six-Year)
 - White
 - African-American
 - Other
 - All Students

- B. Retention Rate (Second Year)
 - White
 - African-American
 - Other
 - All Students

Table A-2

Findings of Comparability of Capacity and Competitiveness of Outcomes in Undergraduate Education – HBIs and TWIs

Comparability (Capacity) and Outcomes (Competitiveness) Indicators for Undergraduate Education

Maryland HBIs and Selected TWIs

Capacity Indicators (2006-7)

	Bowie State	Coppin	UMES	MSU	UMBC	Salisbury	Towson
<u>Students</u>							
2006-2007 SAT scores	884	849	814	907	1190	1104	1072
% African-American	88	92	77	91	14	10	11
% Low Income	36	59	53	47	22	16	16
% Full-Time	82	77	92	90	85	90	88
<u>Faculty</u>							
% Full-Time	59	51	65	75	69	69	54
% Terminal Degrees	75	58	62	80	-	82	-
Student-Faculty Ratio	13.5	18.3	16.9	14	17	15.9	15.6
E&G Funding Per Student	\$14,248	\$15,661	\$14,172	\$17,617	\$20,247	\$11,708	\$13,428
GF & TF Per Student	\$13,216	\$14,689	\$13,933	\$16,504	\$17,154	\$11,448	\$12,127
General Fund (GF)	\$7,486	\$9,944	\$8,025	\$10,300	\$8,532	\$5,036	\$4,963
Tuition & Fees (TF)	\$5,730	\$4,745	\$5,908	\$6,204	\$8,622	\$6,412	\$7,164

Outcomes Indicators (2006-7)

	Bowie State	Coppin	UMES	MSU	UMBC	Salisbury	Towson
<u>Graduation Rates (6-year)</u>							
African American	39.5%	20.2%	41.4%	39.9%	62%	62.5%	63.7%
All Students	39.4	20.7	40.9	42.3	63.7	75.1	64.9
<u>Second Year Retention</u>							
	72	64	65	66	92	83	85
<u>Bachelor's Degrees</u>							
	621	376	436	821	1,914	1,439	3,120
<u>Bachelor's Degrees per 100 Enrolled</u>							
	11.7	9.1	10.6	12.2	16.2	19.5	16.5