

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

From

The Accountability Work Group

Work Group members:

Dr. Susan C. Aldridge
Ms. Tina M. Bjarekull
Dr. William E. Kirwan
Delegate John A. Olszewski, Jr.
Dr. Earl S. Richardson
Mr. H. Clay Whitlow
Mr. Lawrence A. Shulman, Chair

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

Introduction

The Accountability Work Group was charged with developing recommendations for a set of statewide accountability measures to inform the State of achievement of its goals for higher education. In developing its recommendations, the Work Group was asked to:

- Consider Maryland demographics in setting areas of priority and targets
- Examine other state accountability methods (e.g. South Carolina)
- Examine current funding accountability methods
- Develop Statewide guiding principles on:
 - Participation, i.e., % of low-income students going on to college; % of minority students going on to college
 - Quality
 - Affordability, i.e., loan debt for low-income students; unmet need
 - Achievement parity, i.e., gap in minority attainment
 - Meeting workforce shortage needs
 - Efficiency, e.g. academic programs, institutional (e.g., energy) financial aid
- Examine the use of longitudinal data for tracking Maryland students from P-20, including the use of a unique student identifier
- Examine higher education reporting requirements for federal, accreditation, and State accountability purposes

The findings and recommendations of the Work Group can be grouped under four topic areas: 1) a new approach for assessing progress toward the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education goal attainment – Maryland Higher Education’s Return on Investments; 2) graduate and employer feedback on job readiness; and 3) focus on strategic reporting; and 4) an educational longitudinal data system. This report describes the Work Group’s findings and recommendations on those four topic areas.

Data Examined

The Work Group explored the accountability work done in Connecticut, North Carolina, Kentucky, Michigan, and Minnesota as potential best practice states. In the examination, the Work Group found that:

- *Connecticut* – has six state goals for higher education, progress toward goals assessed annually using State Level Indicators, Common Core Performance Indicators and Institution Specific Indicators
- *Kentucky* - frames statewide higher education accountability measures around five key questions

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

- *Michigan* - benchmarked to the national average, the top two performing states on the measure and the top ten new economy states; report includes information about academic preparedness of high school graduates as context
- *Minnesota and Kentucky* – turned the goals into key questions then key measures were adopted to respond to those questions

The Work Group reviewed the work of the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education. The National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education has provided guidance to states and institutions of higher education in its 2005 report, ***Accountability for Better Results***. The Work Group felt that the perspective of the National Commission concerning how states and campuses should approach the issue of accountability is an appropriate one and the Work Group's approach borrows liberally from its recommendations.

The guiding principle of the National Commission is that ***the purpose of accountability is to achieve better results***. The basic assumption underlying this approach is that the motivation to excel is the most powerful force available for improving results. This approach seeks to take advantage of higher education's competitive nature, the diversity of missions evident among its institutions, and its decentralized governance structure as a means of collectively and creatively addressing state priorities.

The following are the key components recommended by the National Commission for a system on accountability that achieves high levels of performance.

- ***Agreement on a limited number of fundamental statewide priorities*** that serve as a framework for state investments, public policies, and state and institutional goals. This is the first step and the foundation of an effective accountability system.
- ***Development of a meaningful division of responsibilities for addressing state priorities.***
 - State policy makers are responsible for identifying broad public priorities and addressing them through budgets, programs, and policies.
 - Institutional boards and leaders are responsible for creating the conditions by which their campuses can excel in carrying out their particular missions, commensurate with the resources available to them, in the pursuit of critical state priorities.
 - Faculty are responsible for teaching, research, and service; students, for learning.

The U-CAN (the University and College Accountability Network) an initiative of the National Association of Independent College and Universities (NAICU) was examined. U-CAN was developed to provide comparable institutional data for prospective students, their parents, and the public to better educate consumers and foster student satisfaction and success. The template is currently in use by over 500 of the NAICU member institutions. In a similar vein, the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) has been established by public four-year colleges who are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges or the

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. It too provides for the development and reporting of comparable institutional performance data, including student learning outcomes, across participating campuses. All of the University System of Maryland campuses have committed to participating in the VSA initiative.

Maryland's current higher education accountability reporting mechanisms were examined. They include the Performance Accountability Report, Managing for Results, the new community college accountability reports/measures, the Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Report and StateStat. Maryland's Community College Performance Accountability report is nationally recognized, while the University System of Maryland's Dashboard Indicators, part of the USM's Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative, has garnered national attention as well.

To focus the Work Group's efforts the members agreed:

- The Work Group's role is to make recommendations; not implement them.
- The State Plan for Postsecondary Education goals are appropriate as they were developed through a collaborative process and still serve the State well.
- Quality is an overarching issue for all decisions.
- Accountability reporting should be manageable with no or limited redundancy with other reports.
- Accountability requires measurement against set goals.
- Goals and measures should be straight forward and simple.
- The measures and explanatory language/analysis need to be easily understood by those outside of the higher education community (e.g. public audience).

The Work Group further agreed that the accountability measures should be developed for the five goals of the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education and in consideration of each institution's unique mission and mission based contributions. The measures should focus on overarching State postsecondary goals for quality and effectiveness, access and affordability, diversity, student centered learning and economic growth and vitality. Furthermore, the accountability measures should lend themselves to long term trend analysis and be interpreted within the context of institutions' resources and capacity. Specifically, the State Plan goals for which measures will be developed are:

1. Maintain and strengthen a preeminent statewide array of postsecondary education institutions recognized nationally for academic excellence and effectiveness in fulfilling the educational needs of students, the State, and the nation.
2. Achieve a system of postsecondary education that promotes accessibility and affordability for all Marylanders.
3. Ensure equal educational opportunity for Maryland's diverse citizenry.
4. Strengthen and expand teacher preparation programs and support student-centered preK-20 education to promote student success at all levels.
5. Promote economic growth and vitality through the advancement of research and the development of a highly qualified workforce.

Accountability Work Group Goal

The Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education will develop a recommendation for a compact between the higher education community, the State General Assembly and the Governor to adequately and appropriately provide State funds to support higher education. In return for the State investment, the higher education community commits to the achievement of the State Plan goals and in particular, to:

1. Creating a highly educated citizenry that can contribute to and enhance the State's knowledge-based economy.
2. Enriching the lives of citizens so they can contribute to and participate fully in a free and democratic society.
3. Performing research at the highest level that advances our state's economy and addresses critical environmental, political and societal issues for the benefit of the State and the nation.
4. Enhancing the quality of life for all citizens through outreach services, cultural enrichment opportunities, and stewardship of the state's historical and natural resources.

In recognition of these responsibilities and the need to account for its performance, the higher education community concurrently commits to annual evaluation and review of its achievements and opportunities for improvement in meeting the State Plan goals by establishing accountability measures suitable for longitudinal examination of higher education's contributions to the State.

To gather information to fulfill its charge, the Accountability Work Group:

1. Examined other state's accountability methods for best practices and metrics that might be adapted for use in Maryland. Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Minnesota were among the states examined.
2. Determined the data that are already being collected, and identified and/or modified as needed those measures that best measure statewide progress toward State Plan goals.
3. Identified three to five measures per Goal (aiming for a maximum of 15 total measures) to measure progress toward goals.
4. Explored the interest of major employers in the State to participate in an annual survey of recent graduates from Maryland institutions of higher education to meaningfully communicate the results of a Maryland Education to the providing institutions. Issues associated with data integrity and security, as well as institutional concerns about protecting the privacy of alumni were, and remain, major concerns of the institutions in carrying out such surveys.
5. Examined the multitude of current accountability reports utilized in the State with the goal of streamlining and improving reporting processes, including identifying and reducing redundancies or overlaps in reports where possible.

6. Created a master list of required accountability-related reports that institutions of higher education are required to submit to state and federal agencies or other oversight organizations. The master list includes information on the reports, their cognizant agencies, authorizing statute or regulation, timelines, and use.
7. Deliberated on ways to link and/or integrate the existing Maryland postsecondary longitudinal data systems with the longitudinal data system being developed by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) in order to allow, for the first time, tracking of Maryland students across the PreK-20 educational spectrum . The benefits of such a system could include the ability to:
 - a. Track educational outcomes for student groups;
 - b. Compare the effectiveness of various educational interventions and educational policy; and
 - c. Assist State entities in gathering data on student groups and their success after they leave the PreK-20 system, including information on their level of satisfaction with the education they received, their postgraduate employment or additional educational experience, and, finally, the assessment of their employers regarding their abilities and skills.

Topic 1: A New Approach for Maryland – Maryland Higher Education’s Return on Investments

Findings

Currently, there exists a number of reports and a number of different measures that are not statewide but are institutionally focused that do not demonstrate current best practices, may lack long term/trend/policy focus, and, most importantly, are not easily understood by those outside of higher education and are not readily accessible. There should be a coherent, goal driven system of accountability as a means of examining the State’s return on dollars invested in higher education. Progress toward meeting the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education goal attainment should be assessed on an annual basis and reported to provide policy makers and the public with important information on the progress of the higher education commitments.

Recommendations:

1. Develop statewide higher education accountability measures and benchmarks tied to the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education.

To develop a statewide higher education accountability report, the Work Group developed a prototype for illustration purposes (See prototype following recommendations). The final measures should be developed in conjunction with the current review and revision of the 2009-2013 State Plan for Postsecondary Education. The Work Group envisioned a limited number of measures per goal that would include contextual information related to the measure, the indicator, and a benchmark against the past State Plan. Commentary should be available to compare progress based on a national average, the performance of similar states, year-over-year change, etc. The Work Group suggests naming the report, *Maryland Higher Education’s Return on Investment (ROI)* because it should serve as a means of examining the State’s return on dollars invested in higher education.

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

As part of the process for developing the State Plan, MHEC, should consider the accountability measures suggested in this report, refining them as needed, to align with the new State Plan Goals. These measures should be limited in number, measurable, easily understood by the general public and focused on the goals/outcomes identified in the State Plan. Furthermore, there should be clearly identified data sources, specific computation methods and limitations of the measures, and the need to establish new data collection should be addressed where necessary (e.g., a statewide employer survey).

Once the measures have been established, and the current level of performance ascertained, benchmarks should be established for each measure against which progress will be measured.

2. Report annually on progress toward State Plan goals using the agreed upon measures.

MHEC should report annually through the ROI on the progress made on meeting the goals for higher education. This progress report should use a succinct format (see prototype below) that is easily understood by lay audiences, build on current reporting systems in order to minimize additional reporting burdens to the institutions, and align with emerging state and national accountability reporting trends (such as the IPEDS, Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), National Association of System Heads (NASH), and the University and College Accountability Network, (U-CAN) initiatives.

3. Use an online format (as suggested in the prototype—*Maryland Higher Education Return on Investment*) to report progress toward State Plan Goals on an appropriate website.

Present the annual progress report based on the prototype presented in this report. The report would also be available in paper copy but emphasis is placed on a user friendly online reporting format to improve access to and transparency of performance. The report should include:

- Indicator(s) with established benchmarks based on aggregated data at the state level (data may be disaggregated and reported by segment where needed or appropriate)
- Commentary on overall progress toward the State Plan Goals
- Links that provide contextual information for each measure/goal, detailed data definitions and the formula for computing each measure. The definitions and associated computation for each of the prototype measures are located in Appendix A.

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION'S RETURN ON INVESTMENT

As of December 1, 2009

STATE FUNDING GOAL Commentary			Goal	FY 2009	Progress Toward Goal
Percent of General Fund			15.5%	xx.x%	
STATEWIDE MEASURES			Goal 2013	Percent Goal Attainment	↑/↔/↓ Change from Prior Year
Quality & Effectiveness Commentary					
1	Student Success	Definition Metric	100		↑
2	National Eminence	Definition Metric	100		↔
3	Graduate Satisfaction and Employment	Definition Metric	100		↑
4	Licensure Exam Pass Rate	Definition Metric	100		↑
5	Employer Satisfaction	Definition Metric	100		↔
Access and Affordability Commentary					
6	High School Graduate Participation Rate	Definition Metric	100		↔
7	Adult Resident Degree Attainment	Definition Metric	100		↓
8	Affordability	Definition Metric	100		↔
9	Unmet need	Definition Metric	100		↓
Diversity Commentary					
10	Minority Access	Definition Metric	100		↔
11	Minority Student Success	Definition Metric	100		↔
12	Success/Achievement Gap	Definition Metric	100		↑
Teacher Preparation/Student-Centered Learning System Commentary					
13	K-12 Teacher Production	Definition Metric	100		↔
14	Student Learning Assessment	Definition Metric	100		↔
Economic Growth and Vitality Commentary					
15	Research support and competitiveness	Definition Metric	100		↔
16	Research commercialization/technology transfer	Definition Metric	100		↔
17	Workforce development	Definition Metric	100		↑
18	Graduates employed in Maryland	Definition Metric	100		↓

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

Key / Explanation

The [Commentary](#) link provides background and explanation of environmental conditions and factors for the related measure.

The [Definition](#) link provides detailed information about the data source and the measure's meaning.

The [Metric](#) link provides a technical explanation of the computations for the related measure.

↑ positive progress toward goal over prior reporting year

↔ same level of progress toward goal as prior reporting year

↓ decline in progress toward goal over prior reporting year

*In all cases, most recently available data are used. Data collections may be collected annually or triennially. Refer to the [Definitions](#) link for each measure for a detailed explanation of the data source.

Topic 2: Graduate and Employer Feedback on Job Readiness

Findings:

Feedback from graduates and the employers of graduates is essential to higher education accountability. Every three years, Maryland colleges and universities survey their graduates to learn about their experiences in their first year after graduation. All of the state's public colleges and many of its independent colleges participate. The 16 community colleges use the same questionnaire, while the four-year institutions use their own instruments but include a set of identically-worded common questions. From these surveys, the state has trend data on the employment status of its associate and bachelor's degree recipients.

Employment data include full- or part-time status, type of occupation, location of employment, relationship of job to college major, current salary, and graduate self-evaluation of how well college prepared them for employment. Continuing education data include full- or part-time status, relationship of continuing study to their degree major, acceptance of transfer credits, and graduate self-evaluation of how well their prior program prepared them for continuing education. These data can be analyzed by institution, by program of study, and by student demographics. Findings are used in mandated state Performance Accountability Reports and in campus-based program reviews.

The most recent survey of bachelor's degree recipients, conducted in spring 2005, had a statewide response rate from public institutions of 25 percent. The survey of community college graduates in spring 2006 obtained a 30 percent response rate. In the last administrations of these surveys, seven of the 29 public institutions had response rates below 25 percent. Concerns about response rates can be addressed by conducting tests for response/nonresponse bias, such as phone administration of the survey to randomly-selected nonrespondents to the mail survey.

Employer assessment of graduate readiness for employment is an important component of accountability. The community colleges have conducted an employer follow-up survey tied to the graduate survey for a number of years (the USM institutions conducted an employer follow-up survey by phone in 2001, but have not repeated it since). Under the survey process used by the community colleges, graduates who are employed are asked to provide the name and contact information of their immediate supervisor. The strength of this method is that it provides a survey population of employers with current knowledge of a recent graduate. Employers are mailed a survey asking a series of questions about the graduate's specific job skills, ability to learn on the job, communications skills, computer skills, problem-solving abilities, effectiveness working in teams, and overall preparation for employment. Despite its apparent logic, this method has had major drawbacks in practice. Very low response to the graduate survey reduces the employer survey population. Reliance on graduates to provide supervisor information introduces the possibility of bias, as graduates in less than satisfactory employment circumstances may decline to provide the contact information. The employer survey population for small colleges may be relatively few, and with approximately half of the employers responding, the number of employer responses can be quite small and often disproportionately from one or two industries. The results cannot be considered representative at the institutional level, and aggregating them up to the statewide level doesn't solve these problems.

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

An alternative to mail surveys are more qualitative, in-depth research approaches similar to the fall 2006 Solutions for Maryland's Future Listening Tour. In-person focus groups, or focused telephone surveys, targeted at specific industry clusters, would provide information useful for program and curriculum improvement while meeting statewide accountability needs. Higher education programs would be aligned with the industry clusters for analysis.

The Governor's Workforce Investment Board (GWIB) has identified ten industry clusters in Maryland. Each cluster is large with a diverse set of employers. In larger organizations, perceptions of employee preparedness and performance may vary by level in the organization. A research design that collects employer input at the senior management and the immediate supervisor/hiring manager level would address this concern. An initial focus on a single industry cluster in the first two years would allow for a comprehensive multi-level study including organizations of varying size, product or service emphasis, and location in Maryland. After the first two years, the process would be assessed to see if two industry clusters should be completed per year, based on value to both employers and the higher education institutions.

These in-depth, focused interview studies, perhaps done in partnership with the GWIB, would replace the employer follow-up surveys. In place of a single percentage or number to represent overall employer satisfaction, state accountability reporting would include summaries of the findings from the focused interview studies.

Recommendations:

1: Surveys of alumni one year after graduation continue to be conducted every three years to assess graduate preparedness for employment and continuing education; institutions achieving response rates below 25 percent to their survey shall conduct further analysis to test for representativeness of survey findings.

2: The Maryland Higher Education Commission issue a request for proposals for annual, statewide studies of employer perceptions and recommendations regarding the preparation of graduates for employment; these studies will include in-depth interviews conducted by focus groups. One industry cluster will be selected for study per year for the first two years. After completion of these two studies, the process will be evaluated to see if two clusters should be surveyed per year. All industry sectors identified by the Governor's Workforce Investment Board will be assessed. Reports of study findings shall be posted to the Maryland Return on Investment in Higher Education accountability website.

Topic 3: Focus on Strategic Reporting

Findings:

Maryland's institutions of higher education are subject to a wide array of accountability-related reporting and data submission requirements. As the chart in Appendix B shows, depending on whether they are public or private, two-year or four-year, the state's colleges and universities may be required to submit data or reports to more than a dozen state, federal, and private agencies and organizations, including their governing boards, their accrediting agencies, the U.S. Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, Maryland's Department of Budget and Management, Maryland's Higher Education Commission, the Office of the Governor, the

General Assembly, the Offices of the Comptroller and the Treasurer, etc. These reports range from multi-paged, detailed analyses of how well the institutions are meeting their strategic goals and objectives to more basic “flat” files that provide the latest information on the number of applications received, students enrolled, credit hours generated, degrees awarded, financial aid awarded, and faculty and staff employed. Many of these reports are required to be produced annually; some must be submitted biannually; some are required on a three-, five-, or ten-year cycle; and some are requested only once or on an “as needed” basis. All involve extensive data collection, analysis, and review processes that impact the workload of the both the institutions and the agencies that receive them.

Need to be Accountable

While the need for institutions to be accountable to their constituents and demonstrate to the Governor and General Assembly that they are indeed being effective stewards of the resources entrusted to them is well accepted, how to best satisfy that need is an ongoing issue of debate, both in Maryland and nationally. From the Commission on the Future of Higher Education (i.e., the Spellings Commission), which has made the creation of more robust systems of accountability and transparency a top recommendation, to the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, which has laid out its own blueprint for developing effective systems of accountability, questions are being asked and responses debated about what makes up an effective and efficient system of accountability, the proper goals and objectives under such a system, the types of data and information that can/should be required under such a system (and what those data mean), and, of course, the divisions of responsibility under such a system. Helping to drive much of this debate has been the reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act (HEA). The HEA, which is the authorizing statute for many federal higher education programs, including financial aid, was reauthorized in July 2008 after five years of serious, and often contentious, debate. Included in the latest version of this HEA are new requirements for colleges and universities to report on issues as varied as cost of attendance, use of preferred lenders, quality of teacher education, campus crime, drug and alcohol abuse prevention policies, textbook prices, missing students, and vaccine policies. One estimate is that, depending on what happens in the negotiated rulemaking process that follows reauthorization, as many as 100 new reporting requirements for colleges and universities may come out of the new HEA. Additional information on the HEA reauthorization and its possible impact is located in Appendix C.

Analysis

To better understand and assess Maryland’s own higher education accountability process, the Accountability Work Group of the Commission to Develop the Maryland Funding Model for Higher Education asked a small group of institutional representatives to review and assess, from their perspective, the state’s current approach to accountability and reporting and to see if they could develop recommendations for a more strategic model of reporting, including ways to make the accountability report process more effective and efficient. The institutional group reviewed the current accountability-related processes, mapped out the number and variety of reports and data submissions currently required/requested of Maryland’s colleges and universities, and identified the following issues. The group also developed a series of recommendations for consideration by Accountability Work Group.

Issues

1. No coherent vision

Although discrete elements of Maryland's current accountability system function well, with some reporting requirements being particularly valued by individual segments, the system as whole is complex and lacks a coherent, integrated vision for how the state should measure the effectiveness of its higher education system and the return that it is getting for its investment in higher education. This includes the lack of any formal mechanism for measuring in an objective, quantifiable way the progress achieved toward the goals and objectives for higher education as laid out in the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education.

This complexity in the accountability process appears to go against national trends in accountability practice, which argue for the development of accountability systems that focus on a few key measures that are meaningful, transparent, and easy to use and understand. The development of this type of coherent, meaningful accountability system by states is a key recommendation of the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, and is in line with Governor O'Malley's vision for State Stat.

2. Patchwork system of reports

Perhaps because there is no vision uniting the various elements of Maryland's current accountability system, much of the focus and energy under the system revolves around producing and submitting a patchwork of discrete annual or biannual reports and data requests, such as the Performance Accountability Report, the Managing for Results Report, the Peer Performance Report, the Minority Student Achievement Report, etc. These reports were created independently of each other at different times in the state's history to serve different purposes or interests. As a result, information that is required in them may be either redundant with what is already being reported in other reports, or inconsistent with information in the other reports due to slight differences in the way the information was originally requested and defined. Further, as time moves on and events play out, the original reason for requesting these reports, or requesting them in a certain way, may be forgotten, which can lead to confusion and misunderstanding as to their meaning and the role they play in the state's accountability system.

As a quick test of whether there is significant redundancy or inconsistency in the current system, the institutional representatives briefly analyzed the three major accountability reports that all public four-year universities in Maryland are required to submit each fall -- the Department of Budget and Management's Managing for Results Report, the Maryland Higher Education Commission's Performance Accountability Report, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission's Peer Performance Accountability Report. This analysis showed that despite efforts to streamline and improve the reporting process five years ago, problems remain. Significant overlaps in the data being reported in these reports exist (of the approximately 12-36 indicators that generally appear in each institution's report, either voluntarily or by agency requirement, six indicators appear on all three reports and six more appear on at least two of the reports). At the same time, the definitions and report periods used for at least some of the more common indicators in the different reports also varied (for example graduation rates were reported on a statewide basis for some institutions under the Managing for Results report, but an institution specific basis under the Peer Performance Report). Further, different formatting and submission requirements were found for some of the reports, meaning that information and data

submitted under them needed to be revised, re-entered, and/or reformatted by hand at least twice during a three-month period in order to meet the unique requirements of the oversight agencies.

Adding to the complexity of the process, and the challenge associated with any attempt to simplify the process, is the fact that not all reports are required of each segment. The public four-year institutions are required to submit data under the MFR, the MHEC Performance Accountability, and the Peer Performance Report. The community colleges are required to submit data under the MHEC Performance Accountability System, and the private institutions (MICUA) participate on a more limited, voluntary basis under both the MFR and Performance Accountability System. While good reasons for this variation exists—just as good reasons exist for why different reports may use different definitions for the same measures—the complexity this variation adds to the system limits the state’s ability, under the current accountability model, to create a unified, streamlined process to which all institutions and agencies contribute.

3. Diffused responsibility and oversight

Because responsibility for overseeing the operations of higher education institutions in Maryland is diffused throughout several state agencies and organizations, there is no single agency responsible for developing and maintaining the continuity and integrity of the higher education accountability system as a whole. This obviously contributes to the difficulty in developing and maintaining a singular vision for the state’s accountability system. It also means there is no overt, agreed upon mechanism or process for assessing and implementing needed changes to the system, if those changes cut across multiple agency lines of authority. The result is that the accountability system remains a series of discrete reports with older reporting requirements typically remaining in place even as newer reporting requirements emerge and are added into the system. The result, of course, is an accountability system that is created by accretion rather than by plan. This aspect of Maryland’s system becomes particularly troubling when new reports or requirements are added without adequate consultation with or input from the various institutions and agencies involved in the process as to the need for the new or additional information, the most effective way to present it, whether its is duplicative of information that is already being reported, and legal or workload-related ramifications that providing the new information might have.

4. Cost implications

Because some element of accountability-related assessment and reporting is now built into most university education and service activities (whether that is measuring student performance from when they first arrive on campus to surveying their satisfaction with the quality of the career preparation once they graduate and are employed) and because data from these assessments are used and reused in a variety of combinations to fulfill the reporting requirements that are mandated by a wide range of government agencies and organizations (from Congress and the federal agencies; to the General Assembly and MHEC; to discipline-based accrediting bodies and the NCAA), it is difficult to tease out the costs associated with any one accountability report, or the cost savings that could be achieved if a specific report or processes were streamlined or eliminated. A 2002 study prepared by the USM institutions for DBM did estimate the costs they incurred in fulfilling the Managing for Results reporting requirements at \$151,490, for that fiscal year. This included staff expenses estimated at \$67,997 for time spent on collecting, analyzing, and reporting the MFR data, and \$83,188 spent to carry out a survey of employer satisfaction

that, so far, has not been repeated. While these data are specific only to the MFR process carried out at USM institutions in 2002, they do provide some estimation of the costs associated with meeting just one of the accountability reporting mandates that public four-year institutions in Maryland face each year.

In addition, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in August 2008 will require new federal reporting requirements for postsecondary education institutions. Additional information regarding this can be found in Appendix B.

Recommendations:

Based on these issues, the institutional review group has proposed that, concurrent with the next state planning process for higher education, a group of institutional and segment representatives familiar with the issues covered herein, be charged with reviewing the state's current accountability system for its higher education institutions and making recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly to streamline and improve that system. That review process should be on the same timeline as the state planning process, and should include, among the actions investigated and considered, the following:

1. Create an oversight/coordinating group.

A standing higher education accountability oversight/coordinating group should be created. The overarching goal of the group should be to ensure that Maryland has a statewide accountability process that is coherent, matches the state's goals for its higher education institutions and system, and satisfies the data needs of the state and its citizens, while at the same time not overburdening institutions with redundant or unnecessary requirements. The group would be charged with meeting periodically to review and assess the state's higher education accountability processes; including reviewing and approving any needed modifications to the existing processes.

As a first phase, the oversight/coordinating group would seek to carry out the following:

a. Identify and eliminate overlap and redundancy.

The group should conduct a review of current accountability reports with the goal of determining both whether overlap and redundancy exists and whether those issues could be eliminated without harming the amount and quality of information coming to the state. This might include eliminating accountability reports that are redundant or no longer used (i.e., "orphan" reports).

b. Standardize indicators and definitions

The group should also review issues associated with standardizing commonly used indicators and their definitions across existing reports and make recommendations as appropriate.

c. Resolve calendaring issues

Finally, the group should review issues associated with the reporting calendar with the goal of streamlining work processes and due dates so that they do not unreasonably add to institutional and agency workloads.

Once the oversight/coordinating group has completed the reviews cited above, it also should be charged with the responsibility for the following:

d. Reporting

Report to the governor, president of the Senate, speaker of the House, chairs of the appropriate education and budget committees, and secretaries of the major oversight agencies on the findings from those reviews, including specific recommendations for follow up actions and a timeline for implementing those actions.

e. Continued monitoring

Carry out subsequent reviews of the accountability process, including any newly required reports and data submissions, at the half way point of each state higher education plan cycle (this would allow time for recommendations from the review to be considered in the state planning process).

f. Development of recommendations

Develop recommendations to the governor and General Assembly related to accountability reporting requirements in the interim between accountability reviews, particularly in the event agencies fail to agree upon or, in a timely fashion, follow up on prior recommended actions.

Topic 4: Educational Longitudinal Data System

Findings:

Higher Education: The longitudinal tracking of students is well established in the higher education community, both nationally and within our state. Maryland higher education institutions began developing enrollment and degree tracking systems that collect data on individual students in the mid-1970s and have used similar systems to calculate retention and graduation rates since 1980. These data systems were expanded during subsequent years to collect performance data on recent high school graduates and community college transfer students, as well as student financial aid information. They are based upon the use of social security numbers to identify and track students, and the data produced by them are currently used as the basis for much of the Maryland Higher Education Commission's (MHEC) reporting, research, and accountability measures. In 2007, MHEC began an initial evaluation of the issue of linking PreK-12 and higher education longitudinal data systems as part of an inter-segment work group established to address data reporting changes required by the U.S. Department of Education for 2010. This evaluation process was soon merged with the larger PreK-20 discussions initiated by the Accountability Work Group.

PreK-12: The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has been working on its longitudinal tracking efforts for several years. Unlike higher education, however, MSDE cannot

rely upon social security numbers. In order to address this issue as well as reporting constraints enacted by FERPA, MSDE has created a system of unique state assigned student identifiers (SASID) for all public PreK through Grade 12 students and for students attending non-public institutions receiving special services via public funding. The SASID is a randomly generated identifier that is unique to each student and does not contain any demographic elements. This initiative began in the 2007 school year. The SASID is now reported and validated in all student-level data collections allowing MSDE to begin longitudinally linking student data. As of September 1, 2008, over 900,000 students have been issued a SASID.

The Need: The need to provide useful longitudinal data that supports an extensive number of complex accountability measures is important to improving the performance of students in the Maryland education system. The PreK-12 and higher education segments of the State's education system need to possess the ability to analyze student performance, not just within their individual segments, but across the two segments as well. This requires the development of a capability to track students longitudinally through their entire PreK-20 education experience and beyond into any lifelong education, including employment, if that becomes a prudent course of action in the future.

Need to be Accountable

The U.S. Department of Education has recognized the need to build systems based upon student level data in order to meet accountability demands. Even though the federal government is not pursuing the development of a student level system at the national level, it has been encouraging states to develop their own state longitudinal data systems (SLDSs). In support of this effort, the U.S. Department of Education has created and funded an SLDS grant program that assists states in developing this capacity in their PreK-12 segments. Over 20 states are involved with SLDS in various stages of development. Additionally, several national organizations have become involved in providing information about PreK-12 and PreK-20 data systems and supporting the creation and use of such systems throughout the nation. The State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Data Quality Campaign of the National Center for Educational Achievement, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) are some of the organizations involved in this movement.

The educational segments within Maryland recognize the need for the linkage and/or integration of data between the PreK-12 and higher education communities. However, current activities in both segments are focused on the needs within their respective areas. Looking toward the future, tracking student performance across the State's education spectrum will require the expansion of accountability both within the respective segments and throughout the entire education spectrum. The development of meaningful and useable accountability measures and the required need to analyze student performance from those measures requires the use of detailed student-level data. These data need to be collected in a format that is usable and accessible across Maryland's education segments.

Analysis

As a first step toward linking PreK-12 and higher education data systems in Maryland, the Accountability Workgroup of the Commission to Develop the Maryland Funding Model for Higher Education appointed a sub-workgroup composed of only higher educational

representatives to examine the need for a Maryland Educational Identifier for all students in Maryland PreK-20. This type of identifier, which is unique to each student and can be used to track his/her progress from pre-kindergarten through postsecondary education and beyond, was recognized as a prerequisite for making a system that links and/or integrates PreK-12 and higher education data systems a reality. As a result, the sub-workgroup spent much time reviewing and discussing current identification and tracking efforts within both the PreK-12 and higher education segments. These efforts, which included discussions and presentations by each segment, resulted in pertinent issues being identified.

Challenges and Issues

MSDE has developed and implemented a Unique Student Identifier System (USIS) for generating state-assigned student IDs (SASIDs) for all PreK-12 students, which is required for public schools and optional for private schools. Given MSDE's investment in the SASID system, and its ubiquity in Maryland's public PreK-12 student information system, the subgroup focused on the SASID as the most realistic candidate for use as a unique Maryland Student Identifier. While adoption of the SASID by higher education institutions would allow linkages to be developed between the PreK-12 and postsecondary data systems, its linkage and/or integration into higher education also presents a number of challenges or issues. These include 1) identifying and selecting the best system for integrating the SASID with the higher education student data system; 2) identifying the data management and partnering structures needed to implement and oversee the data linkage system and to demonstrate its benefit and effectiveness, and 3) identifying and understanding the full range of costs and benefits associated with the various options for implementing the longitudinal data system and how these costs would be distributed among the segments and institutions.

The decisions made with respect to each of these challenges/issues will have an impact on the type of system developed in terms of its comprehensiveness and utility, its cost, and the degree of participation and partnership arrangements required. Given these challenges, the Accountability Work Group spent several months exploring ways to integrate the higher education segment and the MSDE PreK-12 system using the SASID. After much debate the Work Group reached the conclusion that only a thoughtful, coordinated planning effort between the higher education and PreK-12 segments could address all the possible issues and concerns.

Recommendations:

1. MSDE, Maryland higher education institutions, MHEC, Maryland Association of Community Colleges, Maryland Independent College and University Association and other parties as deemed appropriate should work in partnership over the next 12 months to develop a plan for linking and/or integrating public postsecondary institutional data with PreK-12 data at the student level. The participation of independent PreK-12 and higher education institutions should be considered. The additional participation of private career and technical institutions may also be considered depending upon further study by that segment in conjunction with MSDE and MHEC.

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

2. The plan should address the following issues:
 - a. Identifying the necessary elements for the establishment of a successful partnership between the PreK-12 and higher education segments for data sharing and management and how that arrangement will be overseen.
 - b. Identifying the most effective approach to use for integrating and/or linking student identification between PreK-12 and higher education. Given the extensive research on the topic already done by the Accountability Work Group, particular focus should be given to the utility of the SASID as the preferred mechanism for linking the systems.
 - c. Developing a proposed implementation plan that includes a prioritized schedule of activities relating to building the linkage and developing useful analyses from the data that could be shared in the first five years of implementation, a timetable, and a schedule of anticipated costs for implementation and annual operations.
 - d. Identifying likely sources of funding of such a plan, including, to the degree possible, consideration of any likely savings that could result against the State's current expenditures, such as remedial education expenditures.
3. Importantly, the plan should explore and highlight ways Maryland's agencies and institutions can make maximum use of the linked and/or integrated data system to address critical statewide educational accountability needs. This should include proposals for additional linkages or combined assessment and reporting systems in the future as the benefits of a longitudinal data system and its effectiveness becomes more established.
4. Finally, in addressing these issues, the planning group should take into consideration lessons learned from other states that are effectively creating successful State Educational Longitudinal Data Systems. It should also consider the continuity that exists within Maryland's current data systems and ensure that data integrity and continuity is preserved.

Appendix A

Statewide Measures, Definitions and Metrics

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
OVERARCHING INDICATOR					
	STATE FUNDING GOAL	Percentage of General Fund revenues allocated to State general fund and capital support for higher education per annum in accordance with Code of Maryland §11-105 (i)(5)(iii)	MHEC	State funding commitment to higher education State Plan goals – particularly access, affordability and quality	Annually
Goal 1: QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS					
<i>Maintain and strengthen a preeminent statewide array of postsecondary education institutions recognized nationally for academic excellence and effectiveness in fulfilling the educational needs of students, the State, and the nation.</i>					
	STUDENT SUCCESS				
1					
1a	Student Success – Undergraduate Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate (4-year institutions): Percent of full-time, first-time students who graduate 6 years	MHEC Enrollment & Degree Info System (P4Yr) IPEDS GRS Survey (Indep.)	The effectiveness of Bachelor’s degree attainment at 4-year institutions	Annually
1b	Student Success – Community College Student Persistence	Community college successful-persister rate (Community Colleges): Percent of first-time fall entering students at Maryland community colleges attempting 18 or more hours during their first two years, who graduated, transferred, earned at least 30 credits with a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or above, or were still enrolled, four years after entry	MHEC Transfer Student System, National Student Clearinghouse, & Institutional Data	The effectiveness of Associates degree attainment/success via transfer at community colleges	Annually
1c	Developmental Completer Success Rate	The percentage of first-time-any-college students entering a Maryland community college in the fall, who attempted at least 18 hours during the two years following initial enrollment, and who needed and completed all recommended developmental courses, who graduated or transferred within four years of entry.	Degree Progress Analysis component of PAR submitted to MHEC	The graduation-transfer success of students who needed and completed developmental education	Annually in conjunction with the community college Performance Accountability

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
OVERARCHING INDICATOR					
	STATE FUNDING GOAL	Percentage of General Fund revenues allocated to State general fund and capital support for higher education per annum in accordance with Code of Maryland §11-105 (i)(5)(iii)	MHEC	State funding commitment to higher education State Plan goals – particularly access, affordability and quality	Annually
					Report (PAR)
2	NATIONAL EMINENCE				
2 a		Composite of the rankings received and reported by UMB and UMCP. The rankings are drawn from such national publications or research reports as U.S. News & World Report, The Wall Street Journal, The Financial Times, Business Week, Success, and the National Research Council. UMB rankings of Schools of Medicine and Dentistry by amount received in NIH research dollars is also included (based on data published by NIH).	Publications	Eminence of public higher education relative to other states.	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
2b		<p>Number of faculty awards and memberships from independent sources based upon the mission of the institution. Awards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nobel • Fullbrights • Guggenheims • NSF Career (Young Investigator) • Sloan fellowships • Pullitzer prize • MacArthur Fellows • Shaw Price <p>National Academy memberships include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute of Medicine • National Academy of Engineering • National Academy of Sciences • American Academy of Arts & Sciences • National Academy of Education • Institute of Medicine <p>Other measures of eminence for non-doctoral granting institutions and community colleges.</p>	Institutions	Expertise of the Faculty at research institutions.	Annually
3	GRADUATE SATISFACTION & EMPLOYMENT	<p>Satisfaction of college and university graduates with their college experience/learning</p> <p>Employment after graduation.</p>	<p>Associate's & bachelor's degree recipient follow-up surveys</p> <p>Associate's & bachelor's degree recipient follow-up surveys</p>	<p>"Customer satisfaction" with their higher education experience at Maryland public and independent colleges and universities</p> <p>The success of Maryland graduates in obtaining employment.</p>	Once every 3 yrs

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
4	LICENSURE EXAM PASS RATE	<p>Proportion of graduates of a program who passed their licensure examination on the first attempt, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maryland Board of Nursing Licensure Examination • Teacher certification rates • Radiology Technology • EMT • Respiratory Therapy • Physical Therapy • CPA Examination • Maryland Bar Examination • Maryland Board of Professional Engineers • Maryland State Board of Physicians Examinations. 	Various Sources	The quality of instruction for some professional fields	Annually
5	EMPLOYER SATISFACTION *	Employer satisfaction with Maryland graduates: A survey designed by the higher education and business community to measure employer satisfaction with graduates from colleges within Maryland. Details to be determined	Data currently not available.	The quality of Maryland's college and university graduates preparation for the workforce.	Once every 3 years
<p>Goal 2: ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY</p> <p><i>Achieve a system of postsecondary education that promotes accessibility and affordability for all Marylanders.</i></p>					
6	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE PARTICIPATION RATE	Percent of Maryland high school graduates enrolling in Maryland higher education the fall following their high school graduation	Fall enrollment files and high school graduate count from the Maryland Dept. of Education	Proportion of the state's high school graduates enrolling in college in Maryland in the fall	Annually
7	ADULT RESIDENT DEGREE ATTAINMENT	Percent of state's population age 25 and above with an Associate or higher degree	Maryland Department of Planning	Proportion of adult population with a college degree	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
8	AFFORDABILITY	Average annual full-time tuition and fee cost at Maryland community colleges (in-district), and public four-year institutions (in-state), divided by median family income in Maryland (two percentages are reported)	MACC, USM, Maryland Department of Planning	Measures ability of Maryland families to afford a public college education	Annually
9	UNMET FINANCIAL NEED	Percent of students in lowest 40 percent of median family income who have unmet financial need after accounting for expected family contribution and financial assistance, including loans	Financial Aid Information System	Proportion of low and middle income students who have unmet financial need	Annually
Goal 3: DIVERSITY <i>Ensure equal educational opportunity for Maryland's diverse citizenry.</i>					
10	MINORITY ACCESS	Percent which African Americans, Asian Americans and Hispanics represent of all Maryland undergraduate and graduate/professional students and percent which each ethnic group represents of all Maryland residents between 18 and 44 years of age	MHEC Enrollment Information System, U.S. Bureau of the Census	How well the racial and ethnic composition of Maryland colleges and universities reflects that of the State	Annually
11	MINORITY STUDENT SUCCESS	Percent which African Americans, Asian Americans and Hispanics represent of all recipients of community college certificates, associate's degrees, bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, doctoral degrees, and first professional degrees and the percent which each ethnic group represents of all Maryland residents 25 years of age or older	MHEC Degree Information System, U.S. Bureau of the Census	How well the racial and ethnic composition of the graduates of Maryland colleges and universities reflects that of the State	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
12	SUCCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT GAP				
12a	Achievement Gap – Community College Students	Percent of each ethnic group and all community college students attempting at least 18 credit hours within two years of matriculation and who, within four years, graduated, transferred, earned at least 30 credit hours with GPA of 2.0 or better, or were still enrolled	Maryland Association of Community Colleges	How well Maryland is achieving its longstanding goal of improving the persistence and graduation rates of racial and ethnic minorities in postsecondary education	Annually
12b	Achievement Gap – Public Four Year Students	For each ethnic group and all students at public four-year campuses, the number of first-time full-time students who earned a bachelor’s degree from any public four-year campus in the state (or a state-aided independent institution for Maryland residents) within six years of matriculation divided by the number of all first-time full-time students in the same cohort	MHEC Retention and Graduation Longitudinal Files	How well Maryland is achieving its longstanding goal of improving the persistence and graduation rates of racial and ethnic minorities in postsecondary education	Annually
12c	Achievement Gap-Community College Transfer Students	For each ethnic group and all students at public four-year campuses, the number of community college students who transferred with at least 12 credit hours to a public four-year institution and earned a bachelor’s degree within four years of transfer divided by the number of all community college students in the same cohort who transferred with at least 12 credit hours	MHEC Transfer Student System	How well Maryland is achieving its longstanding goal of improving the persistence and graduation rates of racial and ethnic minorities in postsecondary education	Annually
Goal 4: STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING SYSTEM					
<i>Strengthen and expand teacher preparation programs and support student-centered, preK-16 education to promote student success at all levels.</i>					
13	K-12 TEACHER PRODUCTION	The five year change, in numbers and percentages, in certified teachers in critical shortage areas (as determined by Maryland State Department of Education) produced by the teacher preparation programs at Maryland colleges and universities. A separate breakdown for each critical shortage area will be used	Maryland State Department of Education <i>Maryland Teacher Staffing Report</i>	How well Maryland is fulfilling the need for producing teachers in critical shortage areas	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
14	STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT	Number of Maryland Colleges and Universities that participate in the NSSE, CSSE, or comparable assessment within the previous 3 years and use the assessment to improve academic programs and the student learning experience.	Institutions	Institutions are using assessment systems and feedback loops to improve academic programs and student learning.	Annually
Goal 5: ECONOMIC GROWTH AND VITALITY					
<i>Promote economic growth and vitality through the advancement of research and the development of a highly qualified workforce.</i>					
15	RESEARCH SUPPORT AND COMPETIVENESS				
15a	Research and Development (R&D) Expenditures	The total amount of R&D expenditures generated by colleges and universities in Maryland during the most recent fiscal year for which data are available (includes federal, state, private, and institutional R&D expenditures)	National Science Foundation (NSF) Division of Science Resources Statistics' <i>Academic Research and Development Expenditures</i>	The degree to which Maryland's higher education institutions are able to generate support for research projects	Annually
15b	State R&D Rank	Maryland's rank among all states in total R&D expenditures on a per capita basis (includes federal, state, private, and institutional R&D expenditures) during the most recent fiscal year	American Electronics Assoc. publication, <i>Cyberstates: A complete state-by-state overview of the high-technology industry</i>). Data in <i>Cyberstates</i> based on NSF's <i>R&D in Industry and Science and Engineering Indicators</i> and the U.S. Bureau of the Census	The degree to which Maryland's higher education institutions are able to generate support for research projects, and where the state ranks versus other states in generating this research support on a per capita basis	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
16	RESEARCH COMMERCIALIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER				
16a	Invention Disclosures Filed	Total number of invention disclosures received by Maryland's colleges and university over the past year, as reported to the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM)	AUTM Annual Licensing Survey (Table 11)	The degree to which Maryland's higher education institutions are able to take the new ideas and discoveries generated by their faculty and, through the technology transfer process, turn them into commercially viable (or potentially viable) products and processes	Annually
16b	U.S. Patents Issued	Total number of U.S. patents issued or reissued to any Maryland college or university over the past fiscal year, as reported to AUTM	AUTM Annual Licensing Survey (Table 13)	See above	Annually
16c	Patent & Licensing Income Generated	Gross income received from licenses/options executed by any Maryland college or universities, adjusted to subtract any licensing income paid to another institutions per an inter-institutional agreement, as reported to AUTM	AUTM Annual Licensing Survey (Table 8).	See above	Annually
17	WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT				
17a	Non Credit Workforce Development Enrollments	Unduplicated annual headcount of enrollment in noncredit contract and open enrollment courses, with workforce intent, offered at Maryland community colleges during the most recent fiscal year	Community College Performance Accountability Reports.	Number of individuals enrolled in workforce development continuing education courses in a year	Annually
17b	Critical Workforce Areas Credential Production	Total number of degrees and certificates awarded annually by Maryland colleges and universities in key workforce need areas, as defined by MHEC (e.g., the health professions, medical technology-related fields, STEM fields, etc.)	MHEC Degree Information System (DIS).	The degree to which Maryland's colleges and universities focus and succeed on developing and supplying a workforce for Maryland that is responsive to critical workforce needs and the varying levels of education and training required by them	Annually

Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education
 Subcommittee on Accountability Measures
 Prototype Accountability Measure Information

	Proposed Measure	Definition	Data Source	What does this tell us?	How often do we measure?
18	GRADUATES EMPLOYED IN MARYLAND	Percentage of the most recent cohort of 2-year and 4-year graduates from Maryland colleges and universities who were reported as employed in Maryland one year after graduation	MHEC Degree Information System (DIS) matched against Unemployment Insurance wage database (from Jacob France Center)	Proportion of Maryland college graduates working in Maryland a year later	Once every three years

Notes:

- 1) Most current available data will be used for all measures except for the overarching indicator - funding goal attainment. Fiscal year data for the funding goal attainment measure will be matched to the same data year for the majority of the indicators.
- 2) While most measures can be computed from current data collections, a few as indicated by * will require new data collection. Resource availability for new data collection systems needs to be taken into consideration (e.g. staff resources, software and computing resources, financial resources) when making final decisions on which indicators to use.

Appendix B

**Current Maryland Higher Education
Accountability and Data Reporting Requirements**

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
1	MHEC Performance Accountability Report (The MHEC Performance Accountability Report is also required of community colleges and is submitted on behalf of MICUA institutions but under a different process (see #61)).	MHEC	Statute -11-306(a)	Required of public four-year institutions <u>and</u> community colleges; state-aided Independent institutions participate voluntarily through MHEC	Annual. Fiscal year submissions combined with additional historical data go to MHEC on July 1 for initial analysis, with further updates provided at the end of September for review by the Commission in November. Fiscal year submissions with additional out-year projections go to DBM in October for review by DBM in Nov/Dec and the General Assembly during the next legislative session.	July 1 (September 30 update)	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Specifically, the report measures institutional performance against negotiated, common benchmarks. Each year since 1988, each public higher education institutions in Maryland has been required to provide a written report to the Commission, through its governing board, on the institution's attainment of objectives in its mandated performance accountability plan for the prior fiscal year. Independent institutions receiving Seller funds voluntarily submit a report with similar data and format to MHEC (see the note under #61). Beginning in 2001, this reporting process was merged with the state's Managing for Results (MFR) reporting system, which requires each public four-year institution, along with the USM as a whole and Baltimore City Community College, to provide information on past performance and projected performance on a series of objectives and indicators to DBM.
2	DBM Managing for Results Report (DBM's Managing for Results reports are submitted by all public Maryland 4-year institutions, the USM for the System as a whole, and Baltimore City Community College. For the MICUA institutions, MFR reports are submitted by MICUA to MHEC (see #62 under the MHEC list of reports)).	DBM	Statute – 3 - 1003 (d)(1)	Required of public four-year institutions <u>and</u> Baltimore City Community College. State-aided independent institutions are components of MHEC's MFR.	Annual. Fiscal year submissions combined with additional historical data go to MHEC on July 1 for initial analysis, with further updates provided at the end of September for review by the Commission in November. Fiscal year submissions with <u>prior actual data and additional out-year projections go to DBM in October for review by DBM in Nov/Dec with each institution's annual operating budget request (date varies by institution) and are an integral part of the institution's budget review process. The MFRs are included in the Governor's annual allowance and reviewed by the General Assembly during the next legislative session.</u>	August 31 (September 30 update)	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Specifically, the report measures institutional and system performance against both institutional- and system-established benchmarks and benchmarks negotiated with both DBM and MHEC. Each year since 1999, each public higher education institution in Maryland, along with the USM as a whole, has been required to provide a written report to DBM on the institution's actual and projected attainment of strategic goals and objectives developed under the Managing for Results process. For Independent four-year institutions, MICUA provides information on past performance and projected performance on a series of objectives and indicators to MHEC, which provides the information to DBM (see the explanatory note in #62). Beginning in 2001, this reporting process was merged with the state's MHEC Performance Accountability Report system reporting (see item 1, above). Although the MFR format serves as the basic reporting framework, both DBM and MHEC retained their own unique submission timelines, data, and formatting requirements under the combined accountability process. Depending on the requirements of the a

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
3	Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Report	MHEC	Statute 11 -305	Public four-year institutions	Annual. Submissions go to MHEC as part of the annual Funding Guidelines monitoring process	September 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Specifically the report measures institutional performance on a set of indicators (retention rates, graduation rates, etc.) against that of peer institutions selected by MHEC as part of the MHEC Funding Guideline process). Each year since 2001 each public-four year institution in Maryland has to submit a report that compares its performance on an agreed upon set of indicators to those of its peers. This annual reporting process emerged from the peer-based model for establishing funding guidelines for public four-year institutions mandated in S.B. 682 and subsequently negotiated with MHEC.
4	Minority Achievement Report	MHEC	Statute 10-204 (8); 11-1059 (r)	Public four-year institutions <u>and</u> community colleges	Triennial	June 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report assesses institutional performance in addressing a specific area of interest to the state. Requires each public institution, four-year and community college, to provide MHEC with a report every three years on the progress it has made in the recruitment and retention of minority students, faculty, and professional staff.
5	Student Learning Outcomes Achievement Report (SLOAR)	MHEC	Statute 11 - 105 (g)	Public four-year institutions <u>and</u> community colleges	Triennial (since 1998)	June 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report assesses institutional performance in addressing a specific area of interest to the state. Requires each public institution, four-year and community college, to provide MHEC with a report every three years on the progress in improving student learning, instructional effectiveness, and curricula.
6	Student Outcomes Achievement Report (SOAR)	MHEC	Statute 11 - 105 (g)	Public four-year institutions <u>and</u> community colleges. Fourteen of Maryland's Independent institutions also participate in SOAR on a voluntary basis (See #64)	Biennial	September 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report assesses performance of high school graduates at Maryland institutions, a specific area of interest to the state. Every two years Maryland's public higher education institutions are required to provide MHEC with data on the performance of recent high school graduates in order to "improve the information to high schools and local school systems concerning the performance of their graduates at the college level. Institutions provide the data for this report through the annual High School Graduate Information System data file. According to MICUA, 14 of Maryland's Independent institutions participate in SOAR on a voluntary basis (See #64).
7	Report on progress under the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education	MHEC	Agency required report	Public four-year institutions <u>and</u> community colleges. Maryland's Independent institutions participate voluntarily.	Periodic as requested by MHEC	September 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report address statewide performance of Maryland's higher education institutions in achieving the state plan goals. When requested by MHEC, Maryland's public higher education institutions report on activities and achievements associated with carrying out the goals and activities established under the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education. Maryland Independent institutions participate on a voluntary basis.
8	Report on progress under the USM strategic plan	MHEC, Governor, General Assembly	Statute – 12-106(a)(iv)(3)	USM	Annual	July 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report addresses the System's performance in achieving the goals and objectives contained in the USM strategic plan. Requires the USM to provide annually to DBM, MHEC, the Governor and the General Assembly a report on progress achieved on the USM strategic plan.
9	Faculty workload report	MHEC,DBM,DLS	BOR & Agency requirement	USM, MSU , SMCM	Annual since 1994	December 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report addresses USM and institutional performance related to effective management and operations. Requires each institution to report to the Board of Regents, MHEC, DBM, and DLS, on activity (e.g., average course units taught, research and service activity engaged in, etc.) carried out by USM tenured and tenure track faculty over the past year. Language requiring the report is typically included each year in the Joint Chairman's report.

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
10	Position accountability report	DBM, DLS, MHEC	Statute – 12-104(k)(iii)(1), 14-104(g)(3)(iii),	USM, MSU, SMCM	Annual with Budget Submission	September 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report addresses USM performance related to effective management and operations. Requires the BOR to submit each year a report to DBM, DLS, MHEC, and the General Assembly, reporting the total positions created by the USM over the past fiscal year, the cost of those positions, and the funding source.
11	Workforce Information Act (WIA) Program Performance Report	MHEC/U.S. Department of Labor	Agency required process building on federal reporting requirements	Participating four-year institutions, both public and independent, and community colleges	Annual	September 5	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report addresses institutional performance related to achievement under the federal WIA programs. Requires each higher education institution in Maryland that participates in programs sponsored by the Federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA), whether public or independent, to submit annually to MHEC information about program participants as well as other students enrolled in WIA-approved programs.
12	Opening Fall Enrollment Report	MHEC/BOR	Agency required process/BOR required process	Public and independent four-year institutions and community colleges	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The report systemwide performance related to effective management and operations. Purpose: Requires each public and private institution to submit annually to MHEC a report on the aggregate number of students enrolled at the institution broken down by level, gender and enrollment status. MHEC, as well as other agencies, use the information in the report to provide data for policy makers on institutional enrollment levels for the fall term.
13	Enrollment Projections Report	BOR & MHEC	Agency requirement	Public four-year institutions and community colleges	Annual. Submissions go to MHEC as part of the annual Funding Guidelines and Capital Planning process	March 15	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability. The report satisfies requirements related to operating budget planning, and capital budget planning (specifically for estimating funding guideline attainment in the budget planning process, planning for enrollment growth and provisioning of capital projects). This annual reporting informs MHEC's projection process.
14	Approval of Institutional Mission Statements Process	MHEC	Statute – 11-302(b)(iii)	Public four-year institutions and community colleges	Quadrennial (typically fall)		Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. The process ensures the alignment of institutional missions with state goals and interests. Each public institution, whether four-year institution or community college, is required to review its mission statement to MHEC for review and approval every 4-years following the latest review and revision of the State plan. Mission statements are reviewed by MHEC for consistency with the State Plan for higher Education.
15	Report on business entities	Governor and General Assembly	Statute – 12-113(c)	USM	Annual		Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability. The report focuses on system and institutional performance related to effective financial management and operations. Under state statute, the USM Board of Regents may establish, invest in, finance, and operate businesses or businesses entities that are designed to further one or more goals of the USM and its mission. Each year, the USM is required to submit a report to the Governor and the General Assembly on the business entities established in accordance with this section of the statute, the funds invested in and financing provided to those entities, ownership interests in any business entities established in accordance with this statute, and the current status of the business entities.
16	Report on interest or other income on investments	General Assembly	Statute – 12-105(d)(5)	USM	Annual		Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability. The report focuses on system and institutional performance related to effective financial management and operations. Each year the USM BOR is required to report annually to the General Assembly on interest or other income generated from the investment of any funds of the of the University System.

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
17	Report on investment performance	Governor, Comptroller, State Treasurer, General Assembly	Statute – 12-104(e)(2)	USM	Annual	November 1	Purpose: Financial and Operational Performance Accountability . The report focuses on system performance related to effective financial management and operations. Each year, the USM BOR is required to submit to the Governor, the Comptroller, the State Treasurer, and the General Assembly an investment performance report comparing the various components of the USM's gift and endowment investment portfolio to appropriate benchmark over the past year.
18	Report on unexpended/unencumbered balances	State Treasurer	Statute – 12-105(d)(3)(i)	USM	Annual		Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . The report focuses on System performance related to proper fiscal management and operations. The USM is required to report annually to the State Treasurer on all unencumbered or unexpended balances of USM revenues.
19	Minority Business Enterprise Report	Governor	Statute 4-305 (a) of state finance and procurement	USM	Annual	October 30	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability . The report focuses upon USM and institutional performance in addressing a designated state interest. Each USM institution submit annually to the Governor's Office of Minority Affairs a Minority Business Enterprise Report providing data on business activity between the institution and MDOT certified minority and women-owned businesses.
20	Report on Effectiveness and Efficiency (E&E) Initiatives and Capacity Growth in the USM	DBM, DLS	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	USM		December 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . The report focuses on performance related to managing effective and efficient operation, specifically Academic Initiatives. Requires the USM to provide information on the increased resource capacity realized through the USM's E&E academic initiatives.
21	Report on Annual Procurements in Excess of \$500,000	Governor and General Assembly	Statute 15-111 of State finance and procurement	USM, MSU, SMCM	Annual	October 30	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . Report focuses on system performance related to effective financial management and operations. Annual report on procurements by higher education institutions for all contracts greater than \$500,000 in the categories of sole source, emergency, and expedited & service.
22	Report on Procurements of \$1 Million to \$5 Million	BOR	Statute 15-111 State finance and procurement	USM	Annual	January 1	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . Report focuses on system performance related to effective financial management and operations. Annual report to the BOR on procurements by USM institutions for all contracts greater than \$500,000 in the categories of sole source, emergency, and expedited & service.
23	Report on Agricultural Programs at UMCP and UMES	BOR	BOR required	USM	Biennial		Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . Report is a specific review of performance and status that goes to the BOR. Since 1993, UMCP's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and UMES' School of Agricultural and Natural Sciences have reported on the status of the agricultural programs at UMCP and UMES, particularly agricultural instruction, research, and service. The report was annual up until 1999, when it moved to a biennial basis.
24	Annual audit of financial statements	State, Debt agreements		Public four-year institutions and community colleges.	Annual	October 1	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . Report focuses on performance related to proper financial management and operations. The USM is required to have an audit done of the System's financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles
25	Unrelated Business Income Tax Return	U.S. government, Internal Revenue Service	U.S. Internal Revenue Code, Section 501	Public four-year institutions, community colleges, and independent institutions.	Annual	November 15 (May 15 with extension)	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . Process for ensuring performance for proper financial management and operations. Annual return reporting financial results, and tax due, for activities not related to an institution's exempt purpose and in which the institutions are competing with private enterprises AND are making a profit
26	Schedule of Federal Awards	U.S. Office of Management and Budget	OMB Circular A-110	Public four-year institutions and independent institutions.	Annual	March 31	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability . Report focuses on institutional performance related to externally-sponsored research and training activity. Annual report by each institution on federal contract and grant expenditures and compliance with laws, rules, regulations and other requirements associated with administering Federal programs

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
27	Intercollegiate Athletics Report	USM Board of Regents	BOR required	USM	Annual (since 1991)	March 1	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability Report focuses on institutional performance related to addressing/meeting a specific topic of Board of Regent and national interest. Since 1991, each USM institution with an intercollegiate athletics programs provides an annual report to the BOR on the academic progress of student athletes attending their and issues associated with the overall management of the institutions' athletics programs.
28	Degree Information (Degree Information System, or DIS, File)	MHEC	Agency required process	Public four-year institutions and community colleges. Independent institutions are also required to report but under a different process (see #63).	Annual	August 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . Each year each public institution, whether four-year institution or community college, are required to submit a unit record file that contains the degrees awarded to each graduate in a fiscal year. The data are used by MHEC and the USM to support policy making and to assist institutions with meeting federal reporting requirements. Maryland independent institutions are also required to submit certain degree information but under a different process (See #63).
29	High School Graduate Information (High School Graduate Information System Electronic File)	MHEC	Agency required process	Public four-year institutions and community colleges. Four-year independent institutions participate on a voluntary basis (see #64).	Annual	September 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . Each public institution, whether four-year institution or community college, is required to submit annually a unit record file that contains first year student outcome information for recent high school graduates. This information is used by MHEC to provide feedback to Maryland secondary schools on academic success of their students in Maryland higher education institutions. It also forms part of the triennial MHEC Student Outcomes Assessment Report (SOAR) process. Maryland Independent institutions may elect to participate. Fourteen Independent institutions participate in SOAR.
30	Transfer Student Information (Transfer Student System Electronic, or TSS, File)	MHEC	Agency required process	Public four-year institutions	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . Each four-year public institution submits annually a unit record file that contains information about students who transferred to the institution from a Maryland community college, that year as well as during the previous four years. MHEC uses this information to provide information to the Commission and Maryland community colleges regarding the level of transfer student success at Maryland's four-year institutions.
31	Enrollment Information (Enrollment Information System, or EIS, File)	MHEC	Agency required process	Public four-year institutions and community colleges participate. MICUA institutions submit certain enrollment under a different process (see #67).	Annual	November 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . By mid fall semester, each institution, whether four-year institution or community college, submits a unit record file that contains information about all students enrolled in the fall term. MHEC uses this information to report further detail on enrollment, tracks OCR progress and creates longitudinal data systems. See # 67 for information on the process used by the Maryland Independent institutions.
32	Employee Information (Employee Data System or EDS)	MHEC	Agency required process	Public four-year institutions and community colleges	Annual	November 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability . Each year each public institution, whether four-year institution or community college, submits a unit record file that contains employee information. The data are used by MHEC and the USM to support policy making and to assist institutions with meeting federal reporting requirements.

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
33	Financial Aid Data (Financial Aid Information System or FAIS)	MHEC	Agency required	Public four-year institutions and community colleges. Certain financial aid information is also required of Independent institutions but under a different process (see #65).	Annual	November 15	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability. Each year each public institution, whether four-year institution or community college, is required to submit a unit record file that contains student financial aid information. The data are used by MHEC and the USM to support policy making and to assist institutions with meeting federal reporting requirements. Each MICUA institution submits a unit record file only containing student financial aid information for each Maryland resident receiving state financial aid, and aggregate information for all students (See #65 for additional information).
34	Alumni Follow Up Survey	MHEC	Agency required	Public four-year institutions and community colleges. The survey is voluntary for independent institutions (see #66).	Triennial	July 1	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each public degree granting institution, whether four-year institution or community college, is required to carry out a survey of its recent graduates every three years, seeking data on such issues as employment status, educational status, and satisfaction of graduates with education received for employment or graduate study. The data are used to support accountability related reports such as MFR. MICUA institutions participate on a voluntarily basis (See #66).
35	Other MHEC Reports – Applications, SATs, and Credit Hours	MHEC	Agency required	Public four-year institutions and community colleges		October 25 (Applications and SAT), January 12 (Credit Hours) Annual	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability. Each USM degree granting institution submits aggregated data on applicants, SAT scores of entering freshmen and credit hours of enrollment by level and by location. The data are used to support accountability related reports such as MFR. Maryland community colleges also report credit hours of enrollments.
36	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Institutional Characteristics Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually data on basic institutional characteristics, including cost and admissions requirements .
37	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Completions Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually aggregated data on the number of graduates produced by race and gender for each approved program in a fiscal year.
38	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Twelve-Month Enrollment Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually data on enrollment over the 12-month period.
39	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Human Resource Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	January 21	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually data on employee characteristics including demographic information, salary and benefits and recent hires.
40	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Enrollment Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually data on fall student characteristics by student level and enrollment status including demographic information, profile of the first-time, full-time cohort, age, residency and retention rates.

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
41	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	April 15	Purpose: Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually graduation data on first-time, full-time degree-seeking students by race/ethnicity and gender.
42	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Finance Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	April 15	Purpose: Financial and Operational Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually information from institutional financial statements.
43	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Student Financial Aid Survey	U.S. Department of Education	Federal agency requirement	Public or private four-year institutions and community colleges receiving Title IV financial aid	Annual	April 15	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability. Each institution is required by the U.S. Department of Education to provide annually financial aid data on its previous fall's first-time, full-time degree-seeking students cohort.
44	Annual Operating Budget	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	July 1	Purpose: Financial Performance Accountability. Annual operating budget information submission CC-5
45	Fiscal Year Credit Enrollment Report	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	August 1	Purpose: Operational and Financial Performance Accountability. Enrollment report for credit courses for fiscal year ending June 1 (CC-2)
46	Fiscal Year Continuing Education Enrollment Report	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	August 1	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability. Enrollment report for equated-credit Continuing Education courses for fiscal year ending June 1 (CC-3)
47	ESOL-FTES	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	October 3	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability. Full-time-equivalent-student report for English for Speakers of Other Languages courses
48	Annual Financial Report	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	October 3	Purpose: Financial Accountability. Annual financial report (CC-4)
49	Non-credit Headcount Report	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	October 15	Purpose: Operational Accountability. Total Unduplicated Non-credit Headcount Enrollment Report (CC-6)
50	Statewide Program Report	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Biannual	November 15 and March 15.	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability. Enrollment report for programs approved for statewide funding (CC-2A)
51	Enrollment Report for Health Manpower Funding	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Biannual	November 15 and March 15.	Purpose: Operational Accountability. CC-2D
52	Management Letter and College Response to Management Letter	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	December 1	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability
53	Distance Education Survey	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	January 26	Purpose: Operational Accountability. MHEC report DE
54	Continuing Education Course Biennial Review	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Biennial	January 31	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability
55	Annualized Credit Hours of Enrollment	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	January 7	Purpose: Operational Accountability. Calendar year report
56	Facilities Inventory Update	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	April 1	Purpose: Operational Accountability.
57	Continuing Education Courses for State Funding	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	Annual	Ongoing	Purpose: Operational and Financial Accountability. (CC-10 report)
58	College Catalog	MHEC	Agency required	Community Colleges	When newly issued	Ongoing	Purpose: Operational Accountability.
61	Performance Accountability Report	MHEC	MICUA Board of Trustees	MICUA	Annual. Reports are submitted to the Commission in November when the final reports from the public institutions are due.	September 5.	The independent institutions receiving Sellinger funds voluntarily submit a report with similar data and format to the Maryland Higher Education Commission and the Department of Legislative Services. Submissions include mission statements, performance data designed to highlight progress on institutional objectives, a narrative review of institutional performance over the past year (in addition to the data), a narrative review of new initiatives undertaken over the past year, and an extensive set of definitions for each indicator.

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
62	Managing for Results (MFR)	MHEC (who submits it to DBM)	Statute 17-102	MICUA	Annual		MICUA provides information on past performance and projected performance on a series of objectives and indicators to MHEC who provides the information to DBM.
63	Degree Information	MHEC	Agency required process	MICUA	Annual	August 1	Each year each MICUA institution submits a unit record file of Maryland Residents AND aggregate information which contains the degrees awarded to each graduate in a fiscal year. The data are used by MHEC to support policy making and to assist institutions with meeting federal reporting requirements.
64	High School Graduate Information (High School Graduate Information System Electronic File)	MHEC	Voluntary process	MICUA	Annual	September 1	Each MICUA institution may voluntarily submit a unit record file that contains first year student outcome information for recent high school graduates. This information is used by MHEC to provide feedback to Maryland secondary schools on academic success of their students in Maryland higher education institutions. It also forms part of the triennial MHEC Student Outcomes Assessment Report (SOAR) process. 14 Institutions participate in SOAR.
65	Financial Aid Information System (FAIS) Electronic File or Form	MHEC	Agency required	MICUA	Annual	November 15	Each year each MICUA institution submits a unit record file that contains student financial aid information for Maryland residents receiving State financial aid. They also provide MHEC with aggregate information for all students.
66	Alumni Follow Up Survey	MHEC	Voluntary process	MICUA	Triennial	July 1	Each MICUA institution is requested to voluntarily carry out a survey of its recent graduates every three years, seeking data on such issues as employment status, educational status, and satisfaction of graduates with education received for employment or graduate study. The data are used to support accountability related reports.
67	Enrollment Information	MHEC	Agency required	MICUA	Annual	November 15	At the beginning of the fall semester, MHEC requires independent institutions to submit a preliminary count of students by program level. By mid fall semester, each MICUA institution voluntarily submits a unit record file of Maryland Residents AND aggregate information about all students enrolled in the fall term. MHEC uses this information to report further detail on enrollment, tracks OCR progress and creates longitudinal data systems.
68	MICUA Annual Survey	MICUA Board of Trustees	Voluntary Process	MICUA	Annual	November 3	Each MICUA institution submits aggregated data to MICUA which are used to support accountability related reports.
69	Sellinger Utilization of Funds Report	MHEC	Statute 17-102	MICUA	Annual	September 15	Purpose: Accountability for using State funds for authorized purposes under State statute. This form provides MHEC information as to the use of Sellinger Funds from the previous year and how it meets goals of the State Plan for Higher Education. This information is also shared with DLS.
70	Sellinger Intended Use of Funds Report	MHEC	Statute 17-102	MICUA	Annual	September 15	Purpose: Accountability for how institutions plan to use State funds for authorized purposes under State statute. This form provides MHEC information as to the intended use of Sellinger Funds for the next year and how it they will meet goals under the State Plan for Higher Education. This information is also shared with DLS.
71	Credit Hours of Enrollment Form	MHEC	Statute 17-102	MICUA	Annual		Institutions that receive Sellinger funds from the state are required to submit audited statements to the Commission on the number of sectarian and non-sectarian credits of instruction professors conducted for the previous fall semester. This data is used to calculate the number of Full-time equivalent students used under the Sellinger formula to calculate the next fiscal year's budget.
72	MHEC Annualized Credit Hours of Enrollment	MHEC	MHEC	MICUA	Annual	January 14	Institutions are required to submit data on the credit hours of enrollment for the previous calendar year. The data is used for enrollment analyses at the

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
73	MICUA Capital Grant Program Process	MICUA Board of Trustees, DBM	DBM/CIP Process	MICUA	Annual		All institutions with capital projects funded through the MICUA Capital Grant Program are required to submit information to MICUA for the Department of Budget and Management. All MICUA institutions (regardless of whether they receive state fund) must also submit a 5-year Capital plan as well. These reports include: Data needed for entry into the CBIS system, 5-year plans from each institution for the Governors CIP Other accountability documents such as a Certificate of Matching Funds, documentation of contracts, etc.
74	MICUA Student Charges Survey	MICUA	Voluntary process	MICUA	Annual	August 22	Institutions voluntarily submit data on tuition, room, and board for the next year. The data are used to give early data to external agencies.
75	Return of Organization Exempt Income Tax (IRS Form 990)	U.S. government	Sec. 501 or 4947(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code	MICUA	Annual	November 15 (May 15 with extension)	Purpose: Accountability to ensure that nonprofit organizations and foundations are abiding by the Internal Revenue Code as a tax exempt organization.
76	Self-Study Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)	MSCHE (with report to BOR)	Required of all higher education institutions receiving federal Title IV funds. Policies and procedures are covered under MSCHE's General Accreditation Policies Guidelines, and Procedures http://www.msche.org/?Nav1=POLICIES&Nav2=INDEX	Individual institutions	Decennial		Purpose: Institutional accountability. The ten-year self study serves as the major institutional report required for reaccreditation. The self study heavily emphasizes student learning outcomes assessment.
77	MSCHE Periodic Review Report	MSCHE	Required of all higher education institutions receiving federal Title IV funds. Policies and procedures are covered under MSCHE's General Accreditation Policies Guidelines, and Procedures http://www.msche.org/?Nav1=POLICIES&Nav2=INDEX	Individual institutions	Decennial at the midpoint of the self-study review cycle		Purpose: Midpoint review of the performance of the institution since the last, 10-year reaccreditation self study. Includes report of progress on any issues cited in the accreditation report.
78	Report on Funding of USM Comprehensive Institutions	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	USM		August 1	Purpose: Legislative oversight
79	Institutional Aid Report	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	USM, MSU, SMCM	With Budget Request		Purpose: Legislative oversight

**Accountability-related Reports/Data Submissions Required of Maryland Higher Education Institutions
(Combined Information for the Public and Independent Four-Year and Community College Sectors)**

ALL DATA & REPORTS

	Report or Data Submission	Requestor(s)	Authorizing Statute, Regulation, or Agency Requirement	Reporting Segments	Calendar Cycle	Estimated Due Date	Purpose/Description
80	Report on Hagerstown Regional Higher Education Center Business Plan	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	USM		October 8	Purpose: Legislative oversight
81	Report on Advertising Expenditures	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	All segments of public higher education		September 1	Purpose: Legislative oversight
82	Minority Enrollment (broken out by race or ethnic group)	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	All segments of public higher education	With final MFR.	September 30	Purpose: Legislative oversight
83	University and Affiliated Research Park Performance Data	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	USM, TEDCO	Annual	November 1	Purpose: Legislative oversight
84	Access and Success Expenditures and Measures Report	DLS, General Assembly	Joint Budget Chairs Request (JCR)	All public Historically Black Institutions (Bowie, Coppin, UMES & Morgan)		August 1	Purpose: Legislative oversight
85	USM Dashboard Indicators	BOR	USM BOR requirement	USM	Annual	December 15	Purpose: Operational Accountability. Each year the USM develops and submits a set of "dashboard indicators" that is used by the BOR to assess the operational and financial performance of the USM and its institutions in 5 strategic areas related to the USM Strategic Plan.

Appendix C

2008 Reauthorization of Higher Education Act and Its Possible Impact

The United States Congress reauthorized the Higher Education Act on July 25, 2008, and President Bush signed the Act into law on August 14. The Act is more than 400 pages long and contains numerous new reporting requirements for colleges and universities. According to the floor debate on the bill, the legislation “doubles [the] rules and regulations [for higher education] with 24 new categories and 100 new reporting requirements.” Final details concerning new federal reporting requirements will not be known until the U.S. Department of Education completes the negotiated rulemaking process to implement the Higher Education Act. However, we know that postsecondary institutions will be required to report new information in the following areas:

- Cost of attendance, percentage of students receiving different types of financial assistance, types of tuition plans, average price after grant aid by income category, and recent price increases;
- Net price calculator on an institution’s website;
- International Standard Book Number and retail price information of textbooks;
- Data on each lender on the institution’s preferred lender list;
- Quality of teacher preparation programs;
- A new three-year cohort default rate on student loans effective in 2011;
- New campus crime reporting requirements, including reports on hate crimes;
- Written agreements between a higher education institution and state and local law enforcement agencies;
- A statement on the institution’s policies regarding immediate emergency response and campus evacuation procedures;
- Fire and safety reports related to on-campus housing on a dormitory-by-dormitory basis, which must include information on the number of fires, deaths, injuries, fire drills, fire-related property damage, and the type of fire detection systems in each building;
- A missing student notification policy, which must include emergency contact information to allow students to report missing persons and must advise students under 18 that notification of a custodial parent is required after 24 hours have lapsed since the student is reported missing;
- Alternative reporting requirements concerning completion and graduation rates for students who serve in the armed forces, on official church missions, or with a recognized foreign aid service of the federal government;
- Disclosures on transfer of credit policies;
- Drug and alcohol abuse prevention;
- Notice of drug penalty violations;
- “Code of Conduct” for institutions that participate in certain federal and/or private loan programs;
- Vaccine policies;

Accountability Work Group Findings and Recommendations

- Policies related to peer-to-peer file sharing; and
- Plans for academic improvement under certain circumstances.

This is not an exhaustive list of the new federal reporting requirements. The Act requires the Department of Education to conduct dozens of studies over the next few years. We anticipate that institutions will be required to submit information to the Department in response to these studies. Notably, the Act requires the U.S. Department of Education to study the scope of federal regulations and reporting requirements with which institutions must comply. In addition, institutions participating in certain grant programs are required to submit specified information as a condition of participation.