

**UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
BOARD OF REGENTS
COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 25, 2012**

PUBLIC SESSION

The Committee on Effectiveness and Efficiency of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents met in public session on Wednesday, January 25, 2012 in the Atrium of the Wilson H. Elkins Building, University System of Maryland Office, 3300 Metzert Road, Adelphi, Maryland, beginning at 1:00 p.m. Present were Mr. Slater, Chair; Mr. Gosset, Vice Chair; Dr. Florestano, Ms. Gonzales, and Dr. Vance. Also attending were Ms. Doyle, Ms. Goedert, Dr. Goldstein, Ms. Lerman, Mr. Lurie, Ms. Marionni, Dr. Passmore, Ms. Purushotham, Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Specter, Dr. Spicer, and Ms. Yeh.

Mr. Slater called the meeting to order. The agenda items were discussed in the order reported in the minutes; copies of materials distributed at the meeting are on file with the official minutes of the meeting.

1. 2010-2011 Dashboard Indicators.

Dr. Ben Passmore, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, gave an on-screen presentation of the 2011 Dashboard Indicators. He noted that the basic organizing principles for the dashboards are to illustrate, in a single snapshot, where we are and where we are headed in terms of the areas that the Board of Regents, the Chancellor, the individual institutions, and the state have indicated are important and are mirrored by the State Plan for Higher Education. Dr. Passmore showed a slide entitled "Anatomy of a Dashboard Indicator" to help the Regents interpret the material included in the report.

Dr. Passmore noted that this year, 76% of indicators are stable or improving. Five institutions were steady or improving on 80% or more of the measures this year, up from three institutions last year. Ten of 12 institutions were steady or improving on 70% or more of the measures. Overall, he said, 53% of the indicators meet the benchmark. Five institutions met benchmarks on 60% or more of measures, while four institutions met fewer than 50% of the benchmarks.

Dr. Passmore noted that this is the first year in which USM has attempted to determine the "key indicators" from the entire array. Three key indicators have been identified: (1) upper-division STEM enrollment; (2) fiscal stress on students; and (3) the overall fiscal environment, including expenditures for instruction, facilities renewal, faculty salaries, and alumni giving.

Dr. Passmore noted that after today's presentation to the E+E Committee, the next step is presentation of the 2011 Dashboard Indicators to the full Board of Regents in February.

Mr. Slater asked about the data on the percent that the administrative budget represents of the total operating budget. Dr. Passmore said that this is a peer-based measure for each institution, but that the calculation of the percentage is constant across institutions. Mr. Slater noted that CSU is an outlier on this measure and asked why their indicator is green; Dr. Passmore said that CSU is red on the benchmarks but green on the indicator because their position is stable; it hasn't worsened. Mr. Slater asked if the staff is looking into the differences in administrative expenditures for those institutions that persistently deviate from peers or from other USM institutions.

Dr. Passmore noted that the presentation of the indicators was modified somewhat this year for clarity and thanked Ms. Mary Lerman and Ms. Ichun Yeh of the Administration and Finance Office for their redesign. Ms. Gonzales commented that this presentation is a "huge improvement" over last year's.

2. Report on Alternative Means of Earning Academic Degree Credit (BOR III-8.01).

Dr. Passmore noted that, in 2005, when the System was under significant enrollment pressure, the Board of Regents adopted a policy designed to increase the number of credits generated outside of the traditional classroom, thereby freeing up classroom space. The Board determined that students should upon graduation have earned 12 credits by these alternative means. The Board requested that USMO staff monitor progress towards this goal and report on its implementation. Dr. Passmore said that the report provided to the E+E Committee for today's meeting details system-wide and institutional performance against the goal over the last five years.

Overall, he noted, the USM has met the desired targets for the last three years. Five of the seven institutions for whom the policy is applicable met the benchmark, and all have made progress towards the goal. Dr. Passmore noted that the report does not address the quality of the academic experience of those students who have earned credit through alternative means such as study abroad, winter or summer session instruction, and advanced placement testing; it was hoped that the academic experience would be improved. He added that institutions are becoming more effective at capturing alternative credit, so that future reports should be even more accurate reflections of actual experience.

Dr. Florestano asked if the Regents might want to increase further the number of credits earned by alternative means; is this a good thing to do, she asked. Dr. Passmore said that what we have done is to demonstrate that it is in fact possible to successfully implement a policy on alternative credit, although he noted that the HBCUs have had more difficulty achieving the 10% or 12 credit goal. Students with significant financial need may in fact be unable to study abroad, take costly AP tests, or take coursework during summer sessions rather than working at paying jobs.

Mr. Slater asked that Dr. Passmore look at the academic literature on the qualitative effect of non-traditional credit and report back to the Committee at a future meeting about the experience across the country. He said that the emphasis should be squarely on the quality of the educational experience. Dr. Florestano agreed that a literature review might help us speculate on whether we should increase the number of credits to be earned in this way.

3. Report on the USM Course Redesign Initiative.

After a successful pilot during 2006-2009 of the principles of course redesign as applied to large enrollment courses, the Board of Regents approved an expansion of this initiative starting in 2010. Dr. Don Spicer, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer, said that there are many initiatives under the course redesign rubric across the USM. He added that the Chancellor got a call from the White House that resulted in a comment in the State of the Union address about the importance of course redesign. Dr. Spicer reported that course redesign within the USM is underwritten by funds related to Chancellor Kirwan's Carnegie Award; statewide application of course redesign principles applied to developmental and 'bottleneck' courses is underwritten by the Lumina Foundation; and a statewide Course Redesign initiative focused on developmental mathematics courses is underwritten by a grant from Complete College America to the Maryland Higher Education Commission based on lessons

learned from USM activities. He began an on-screen presentation describing current activities in course redesign in the USM, focusing on the USM focused redesign funded by the Carnegie Award and related fund-raising. Dr. Florestano said that she would like to see a list of courses that have been redesigned and would also welcome another faculty presentation about a particular course.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Assoc Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Special Assistant to the Chancellor for P-20, continued the presentation by describing the Lumina-funded project. She shared with the Committee a six-minute video on faculty fellows and course redesign, noting that there are three videos in all to which she will provide the links for the Regents. In the fall, Dr. Shapiro noted, the Lumina Foundation sent twenty people from different states to the USM for a “strategy lab” on course redesign; their reactions are featured in one of the video clips. She said that she would also include a list of all redesigned courses in the materials sent to the full Board for the February meeting in response to Dr. Florestano’s request. Mr. Slater said he would like to include the video shared with the Committee as part of the presentation at the full Board meeting; Mr. Gosset said he would like to see a faculty presenter at the meeting as well, since featuring good news at Board meetings is important.

Dr. Vance asked about the reaction of those who came to the USM from other states under Lumina’s sponsorship. Dr. Shapiro said that the “strategy lab” was related to new models of student success; the participants asked a lot of detailed questions, since their goal is to obtain funding to undertake course redesign initiatives in their own states.

4. Report on Strategies for Implementation: Policy on the Role of the USM as a Public Corporation (BOR I – 8.00).

At the December meeting, the Effectiveness and Efficiency Committee agreed that USM staff should begin discussions regarding strategies to improve the USM’s effectiveness as a public corporation. Ms. JoAnn Goedert, Assistant Vice Chancellor in the Office: Administration & Finance, noted that the Committee received in the agenda packet a number of items regarding the strategies for strengthening the role of the USM as a public corporation.

Ms. Goedert indicated that just the prior day, the Administration had introduced Senate Bill 239, Economic Development – Maryland Technology Development Corporation – Maryland Innovation Initiative, which incorporates nearly all of the elements of the USM’s proposed strategy. She distributed copies of SB 239 to the members of the Committee. Ms. Goedert noted that the bill includes an increase in the threshold for BPW review and approval. Mr. Slater suggested that the Board concentrate on articulating vigorous support for SB 239 with key people in Annapolis.

5. Adjournment.

Dr. Vance moved, Mr. Gosset seconded, and the Committee on Effectiveness and Efficiency voted unanimously to adjourn at 2:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas G. Slater
Chairperson