

MARYLAND SENATE BUDGET AND TAXATION  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, BUSINESS AND ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND FY 2011 BUDGET  
TESTIMONY OF USM CHANCELLOR WILLIAM E. KIRWAN

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2010

Chairman Kasemeyer, Vice-Chairman Madaleno, and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the Governor's FY 2011 budget for the University System of Maryland (USM).

I want to begin by thanking Governor O'Malley for his strong support for the USM. This has been a hallmark of his administration from day one and is once again reflected in this year's budget request.

I also want to sincerely thank you—the members of this committee—for your continuing support for higher education and, in particular, the University System of Maryland. We at the USM greatly value the very productive relationship we have forged with the Legislature, especially with our key committees and subcommittees.

I have submitted more extensive written testimony, but will keep my comments here very brief. I would like to cover three key points before turning to the issues raised by the budget analysts and any specific questions you may have.

*First*, I want to note that the USM has been, and continues to be, “part of the solution” in addressing the State's current fiscal challenges. In recent years we have taken several steps to reduce our budget. We have initiated a hiring freeze, implemented system-wide furloughs; forgone pay increases for multiple years, reduced funds for facilities renewal, financial aid, and student services, and suffered a significant reduction to our fund balance. Since FY 2009 (including the 2011 Allowance) the USM budget has sustained state funding reductions of \$59.3 million, enacted furloughs to achieve savings of \$68 million, and will transfer \$134 million in fund balance back to the State; all said a total of **\$261 million**.

While we recognize that the USM must do its part as the state addresses its budget challenges, it must be acknowledged that this has come with a real cost.

The USM is less able to add or renovate research space and add faculty, costing USM grants. Our institutions have lost out on significant grants because they lacked the physical space, or the personnel, or the matching funds. For example, University of Maryland, Baltimore, lost a \$10 million National Institute of Standards and Technology grant due to lack of matching funds and lab space and University of Maryland, College Park—struggling with technology infrastructure—estimates that \$30 - \$50 million in grant opportunities were lost.

Budget constraints are also affecting affordability. Financial aid appeals have skyrocketed in recent years, reaching more than 2,000 in FY 2009 and 2,600 in FY 2010. At the same time, institutions are struggling to maintain financial aid budgets with no additional funds. At the University of Baltimore (UB) for example, the financial aid office is unable to meet the demonstrated need of 30 percent of its students. As a result of these constraints, average student loans across the system are projected to grow an estimated 10 to 20 percent, increasing students' debt burden. Even worse, with no additional funding available to maintain financial aid budgets, many students—especially students from underrepresented groups—will simply be priced out.

And while we have increased enrollment, we simply have not been able to keep up with the rapidly growing demand. In FY 2010, USM institutions did not admit an estimated 2,900 qualified students and were unable to accept 2,200 transfer students. This restricted access has impacted key workforce needs in Maryland. For example, the School of Nursing at the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) had to turn down a significant number of qualified applicants.

I don't enumerate these impacts in order to complain. As I mentioned, the USM recognizes that cuts have been made across state government, with many agencies cut much deeper than the USM. I simply point them out to illustrate the fact that the cuts we are making do indeed have consequences. Even with these cuts, we are making every effort to maintain our priorities and the quality of our institutions. The support you have provided—and the support included in the Governor's budget—will no doubt pay significant dividends for Maryland in the years to come.

*Second*, the USM plays a critical role in helping the State secure a productive economic future. We have all come to recognize the direct link between higher education and economic growth. Maryland is, of course, in an enviable position. We are home to more than 50 federal agencies and research facilities: the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), National Security Agency (NSA), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and many others. Several world-class private companies have a significant Maryland presence: Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, Verizon, and others. And we have one of the largest clusters of biotechnology companies in the U.S. But our success is not guaranteed. We must make the decisions that will position Maryland for continued leadership in the knowledge economy.

It is indisputable that the investments YOU have made in higher education these last several years have enhanced Maryland's economic vitality. The Milken Institute's State Technology and Science Index ranks Maryland second and the Kauffman Foundation's New Economy Index lists Maryland as one of the five states leading the transformation into a knowledge- and innovation-based economy.

Both these surveys consider factors that are very much driven by higher education: For example, they cite Maryland's highly educated workforce, especially in the science and technology fields. Seventy-two percent of bachelors' degrees in Maryland are granted by USM institutions and—again led by USM—Maryland is a top-3 state in STEM degrees. In addition, they note Maryland's research and development leadership. USM generated \$1.2 billion in research funding last year and is home to three research parks, serving as business incubators and facilitating technology transfer. Clearly, with the right investments, the University System will continue advancing knowledge and discovery in areas that will drive Maryland's economy for decades.

**Third**, even with our tight budget, we continue to advance our priorities of **Access, Affordability, Quality and Completion**. Our commitment to these priorities is best exemplified by our Effectiveness and Efficiency (E&E) initiative. As you know, we launched this effort five years ago, as an earlier economic downturn resulted in a sharp decline in state support for the USM. E&E involved a systematic reexamination and reengineering of both our administrative functions and academic processes to reduce costs, enhance access, and raise student's completion rate, while also protecting quality.

The fiscal and academic impacts of this effort speak for themselves. Administratively, we have removed more than \$130 million in direct costs from our budget, while experiencing significant additional savings through cost avoidance. Academically, USM's four-year and six-year graduation rates are well above national averages for public universities and time-to-degree across the USM is at its best level ever, averaging less than 4-and-a-half years. In addition, since the first full year under E&E, enrollment at USM institutions has increased by 15,000 students. In fact, last year—with no additional funding for enrollment growth—we added 5,000 students.

The impact of E&E is truly national. A recent case study—Taking Command of the Higher Ed Debate—produced by the Hechinger Institute, referred to E&E as “a model for not only changing the business and academic practices of public universities . . . but also for persuading politicians that they are conscientious stewards of taxpayer money.” The U.S. Department of Education singled E&E out as a “success story.” Last fall, the *Washington Monthly* referred to E & E as “A Mid-Atlantic Miracle.” And perhaps the proudest moment came last year when President Barack Obama made this observation:

“While our nation has a responsibility to make college more affordable, colleges and universities have a responsibility to control spiraling costs. And that will require hard choices about where to save and where to spend. So I challenge state, college and university leaders to put affordability front and center as they chart a path forward. I challenge them to follow the example of the University [System] of Maryland, where they're streamlining administrative costs, cutting energy costs, using faculty more effectively, making it possible for them to freeze tuition for students and for families.”

Since the first full year of E&E, we have also kept tuition for in-state, undergraduate students frozen. This unprecedented achievement is a result of the genuine partnership we have established with this body and the Governor. The USM recognized that it was incumbent upon us to work internally to bring the rising costs of college under control, and leadership in Annapolis acknowledged these efforts with additional funding to keep tuition unchanged.

And while it is true that the Governor's proposed FY 2011 budget does include a modest 3% tuition hike next year, the fact remains that over the past five years, Maryland will have moved from the 6<sup>th</sup> highest tuition in the nation down to 17<sup>th</sup> and projected 21<sup>st</sup>. That is a remarkable improvement in just 5 years. This vital affordability effort has been augmented by a renewed focus on need-based aid, which has been increased by more than two-thirds over the past few years.

Our commitment to affordability is also reflected in rankings of individual campuses. In *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* “100 Best Values in Public Colleges” for 2010 & *Princeton Review/USA Today* “100 Best Value Colleges” for 2010 you will find more than one third of USM's degree-granting institutions highlighted, with University of Maryland, College Park; Salisbury University; University of Maryland, Baltimore County; and Towson University each cited.

I am also pleased to note that we are undertaking a new—privately funded—effort focused on college completion. Last year I was honored with the Carnegie Corporation Academic Leadership Award, which carried a \$500,000 grant. I have used that grant to leverage an additional \$1.8 million in private gifts to launch “A Matter of Degrees: the USM Leading the Way in College Completion.” This initiative will enable us to expand Way2GoMaryland, our information campaign aimed at helping middle school students and their families to begin preparing for college earlier. It will increase the odds of student success once they enter college by expanding our course redesign efforts, turning “gatekeeper” courses into “gateway” courses, with fewer failed students, better learning outcomes, and improved progress toward degrees. And it will provide “last dollar” financial assistance—combined with support and counseling—to students in danger of running out of money just a few semesters shy of graduating.

Before turning to your questions & the analysts’ concerns, I want to again express how proud I am of the partnership we have formed. Together we have established mutual priorities and focused on key work-force needs. We have also set a course to strengthen Maryland. I thank you and look forward to continuing this partnership.

### **USM Response to Overview Recommendations**

#### **Page 22– Recommendation:**

*DLS recommends reducing the fund balances of the USM by \$3.8M related to the HEIF shortfall in FY 2010.*

#### **USM Response:**

The USM opposes the recommended reduction to its FY 2011 Allowance/Fund Balance. The USM worked with the Administration to establish a fund balance level that supports a minimal current services budget level as defined by DBM. In addition, we have had a series of conversations with the Administration regarding the use of fund balance in the current fiscal year. The fund balance transfers, since FY 2009, will total \$134M to reduce the State deficit. The conversations and decisions were always mindful of the effects the transfers would have on our balance sheet strength and credit rating. USM staff met with DLS staff in January to brief them on the fund balance issue communicating that we would not support additional draw down of the fund balance for the foreseeable future.

The University System of Maryland remains committed to advancing the priorities it shares with the state—excellence, access, affordability, and fueling the state’s economy and workforce. However, it is undeniable that the ongoing fiscal crisis is challenging the system’s ability to fulfill this commitment. Since FY 2009 (including the 2011 Allowance) the USM budget has sustained state funding reductions of \$59.3M, enacted furloughs to achieve savings of \$68M and will transfer \$134M in fund balance back to the State; all said a total of **\$261 million**. A strong and adequately supported public higher education system is necessary for a strong and competitive State of Maryland and we urge you to reject this recommendation.

USM also opposes the Higher Education Overview recommendation of not reauthorizing the HEIF is also opposed by the USM. The HEIF—funded through corporate taxes—was recommended by the Governor, approved by the Legislature, and supported by the business community as a dedicated higher education funding stream. The HEIF was never intended to supplant general funds. As envisioned, the HEIF has helped protect higher education from critical reductions that would have further affected affordability, access and quality. If reauthorized, the HEIF will provide for significant enhancements in future budgets that will benefit both Higher Education and the State through student and economic improvements.

**Page 31 – Recommendation:**

***DLS will recommend in the USMO budget to reduce general funds by \$2M related to cost savings due to administrative efficiencies gained through the UMBI reorganization.***

**USM Response:**

With a vision to support economic growth and job creation in Maryland, the Board of Regents established the *ad hoc* University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBI) Review Committee, and charged it with recommending a new structure that would allow USM to maximize UMBI's resources to achieve State and USM goals in biotechnology. In June 2009, the board approved the reallocation and reorganization of UMBI's five research centers and education unit. The overarching goal was to create a bioscience research and technology transfer enterprise that would drive Maryland's rise to national and international leadership in the biosciences, resulting in economic growth and job creation.

The Regents eliminated UMBI's central administrative functions while the research centers were transferred to USM's research institutions. In FY 2009, the UMBI Central Administration was funded at \$3.8M. To date, as displayed in Table 1 below, the USM has cut \$1.8 million from the FY 2010 UMBI's administrative budget in order to comply with legislative and BPW reductions, and to cover FY 2011 state mandatory cost increases (for the research centers, the final year of the UMB Pharmacy program at Shady Grove, and new Coppin State University facilities). Thus, the Board achieved its fiscal objectives to cut administrative costs while increasing programmatic productivity in the form of increased research and technology transfer. The total savings achieved by the elimination of the UMBI Central Administration of \$1.8 million represent 49% of its general fund budget along with a reduction of 14 positions.

The remaining Central Administration state funds of \$2M relate to current services costs that will continue in FY 2011, such as technology transfer and facilities operation and renewal. With an elimination of technology transfer funds, UMBI components would be less able to compete for federal research dollars, current patent actions would have to be abandoned, potentially driving up legal costs, and commercialization, business start-ups and job creation in the State would be reduced. The facility needs at the Columbus Center are critical. Existing space must be reconfigured to increase productivity. The existing "tent" must be replaced or eliminated to meet safety requirements. A portion of the remaining \$2M from UMBI's central administrative budget was allocated to the Columbus Center to address a fraction of the on-going facility deficiencies now and facing the Center in the future.

In short, reducing these funds will significantly lengthen the time it takes for the State to realize any benefits from the UMBI reorganization due to insufficient core funding at the remaining research

centers. The USM participating institutions have stated that full funding of the current core research program and related facilities is critical to move this restructuring forward and I urge you to reject this recommendation of eliminating \$2M of state funds.

In order to achieve the Board’s vision for the reconfigured UMBI to be a success, it is imperative that sufficient resources be allocated to maximize the existing research programs and develop new research programs. In a time where the State is experiencing major revenue deficits and new funding is not available for investment in restructuring at UMBI, funding from the UMBI Central Administration needs to be allocated to participating USM institutions to continue certain essential functions that were currently performed at the Central Office. This is not enhancement funding but is what is minimally necessary for current services needs. It is believed that the synthesis of UMBI’s research capabilities with the research and technology transfer capacity of the USM’s other research institutions will yield major benefits to Maryland.

Any reductions to current operations to the remaining UMBI core centers will require the Board and participating institutions to reevaluate the current restructuring plan that was approved last June. The USM participating institutions have stated that full funding of the current core research program and related facilities is critical to move this initiative forward and I urge you to reject this recommendation of eliminating \$2M of state funds.

Table 1  
The University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute  
Estimated Savings

<b>FY 2010 reductions:</b>	
Governor’s base and legislative reduction	<u>(\$211,557)</u>
BPW actions (July and August)	<u>(\$398,974)</u>
Furlough & HEIF reductions	<u>(\$83,931)</u>
FY 2010 total cost containment and reductions	<u>(\$694,462)</u>
<b>FY 2011 reallocations:</b>	
UMB Pharmacy @ Shady Grove	<u>(\$300,000)</u>
Coppin new facilities funding	<u>(\$500,000)</u>
Mandatory costs reallocated from Central Admin*	<u>(\$366,042)</u>
Total reallocations	<u>(\$1,166,042)</u>
Total estimated savings	<u>(\$1,860,504)</u>
FY 2009 UMBI Central Administration Actual General Funds	<u>3,795,116</u>
% savings	<u>-49%</u>

\*This includes health, retirement, and other statewide adjustments

**Page 23 Exhibit 11 State Supported Revenues Available for Other Expenditures:**  
**USM Funds Available \$17.7M:**

**USM Response:**

Exhibit 11 State Supported Funds available display is mistaken and misleading. There are several issues that should be correctly displayed:

**FY 2011 Furloughs:**

The USM is required to take furlough actions in FY 2011 to achieve savings of \$26.1 million. The state will reduce general funds by \$14.4 million and the USM must transfer the remaining cash savings of \$11.7 million as is included in the BFRA. The BFRA (page 30 line 7) requires the USM to transfer \$51.7M. The Governor's plan includes \$40M of a direct transfer of fund balance and the balance of \$11.7M relates to the furlough cash transfer.

The USM and DBM notified DLS that the exhibit 11 does not included the required cash transfer of \$11.7M required of the USM as it relates to the FY 2011 Furlough Action in the revenue section. Exhibit 11 displays the full Furlough Salary Savings of \$26.1M in expenditures– while only recognizing the state funding reductions of 14.4M.

As part of the statewide furlough plan, the USM is required to transfer \$11.7M in state supported funds back to the state and this amount is reflected in the BFRA. This schedule incorrectly implies that the USM has \$11.7M additional state supported funds available for enhancement – when in reality the USM must make a cash transfer to the State for these savings.

**FY 2011 Other Mandatory Costs:**

While the DLS analyst footnoted several issues related to mandatory costs, they have stated in their analysis that the USM institutions are not required to expend these costs and conclude that there is additional funds available. The USM contends that these costs are mandatory and not available for other purposes. Expenses such as the fourth year of the UMB pharmacy program at Shady Grove (\$0.9M), Dr. Gallo's Memorandum of Understanding commitment (\$3M), UMUC's WebTycho – online instructional platform (\$3M) as well as numerous other institutional aid, faculty, accreditation and contractual obligations must be expended in FY 2011 and are not available to fund enhancements.

In conclusion, once the full impact of the FY 2011 furloughs and true mandatory costs are recognized (see revised USM Exhibit 11 below) the USM has no additional funds available; in fact the institutions will be required to make reductions in the range of \$14M to balance their budgets.

**REVISED USM Exhibit 11**  
**USM State Supported Revenues Available for Other Expenditures**  
**FY 2011 Operating Budget**

**Expenditures**

Current Services Expenditures*	\$ 71,244,331
Furlough Savings	(26,088,466)
Insurance Savings	<u>(4,883,390)</u>
<b>Total Current Services Expenditures</b>	<b>40,272,475</b>

**Revenues**

General & Other State Funds		
New General Funds	\$ 8,137,438	
Replace FY 2010 HEIF	3,800,973	
Restore FY 2010 Furloughs	6,053,022	
Other (Replace RGGI & Teacher Survey)	<u>670,163</u>	
<b>Subtotal General Funds</b>		<b>\$ 18,661,596</b>

**Adjustments**

General Funds reduced for 2011 Furlough Plan	(14,357,145)	
General Funds reduced for Health Savings	(3,370,889)	
RGGI Funds Eliminated	<u>(545,163)</u>	
<b>Subtotal Adjustments</b>		<b>\$ (18,273,197)</b>

**Total New General & Other State Funds** **\$ 388,399**

New Tuition & Fee Revenue	\$ 39,113,965
Furlough Cash Transfer to State (BFRA)	(11,731,321)
Other Unrestricted Funds	<u>(1,630,703)</u>
<b>New General Funds, Tuition &amp; Other Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 26,140,340</b>

**Funds Available** **\$ (14,132,135)**

\*Includes costs for financial aid (graduate and undergraduates), UMB Pharmacy, UMB Gallo MOU Commitment, Accreditation costs, UMUC WebTycho, student/faculty and other contractual increases

**Page 10 – Teacher Education:**

*Chancellor should comment on efforts USM institutions are undertaking to increase undergraduate enrollment as well as retaining students in teacher education programs.*

**USM Response:**

The teacher shortages in Maryland have been a systemic problem for many years, as detailed annually in the Teacher Staffing Report published by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). According to the most recent report, USM institutions were recognized as graduating over 60% of the teachers prepared in the state (Staffing Report 2008-2010).

***Teacher recruitment:***

USM and its institutions are focusing their efforts on expanding the pipeline to increase the flow of new students into their teacher preparation programs. Programs created by the USM institutions address four different target groups: STEM teacher recruitment, programs for career changers, continuing collaborations with community colleges through the AAT programs, and developing pipelines for high school students through teacher academies and future educator clubs. Further information on each of these efforts is presented below:

*STEM Teacher Initiatives:*

- Funding provided in last year's budget was targeted for UMCP, TU, and UMBC to develop and enhance STEM teacher programs.
- Frostburg State University has created a new program focused on current STEM majors in the baccalaureate program at FSU. Students accepted at FSU to finish a BS in one of the STEM areas and be automatically enrolled in the Master of Arts in Teaching graduate program
- UMCP is initiating a new program called Terps Teach, adapted from the UTeach model in Texas. This emerging program will recruit and advise mathematics and science majors to become teachers. The program targets undergraduate students who serve as peer teachers, discussion group leaders, and/or lab assistants in undergraduate STEM courses.
- USM offered technical assistance to all USM institutions to apply for external funding to support STEM Teacher programs on campuses.
- In addition to these ongoing efforts, USM hopes to participate in Maryland's 2010 proposal for Race to the Top funding to help support the STEM teacher initiatives

#### *Career Changers:*

- USM institutions offer post-baccalaureate programs and Master's of Arts in teaching degrees for those who major in various fields and would like to earn teacher certification after receiving their bachelor's degrees.
- This year, UMUC received approval to restart their MAT program with is geared to career changers, and President (Susan Aldridge allocated half a million dollars of scholarship money to support students in that new program and enrolled their first cohort of 39 students.
- The P-20 Teacher Shortage Task Force (2009 report to P-20 Council) recommended that MSDE expand opportunities for career changers to have more flexible opportunities for alternative certification. If that occurs, more USM institutions will take advantage of that flexibility.

#### *AAT Programs:*

- AAT agreements have been negotiated over the past four years between all the two-year and four-year colleges and universities having teacher preparation programs in Maryland.
- AAT programs provide seamless transfer for students who are interested in becoming teachers in the following fields: elementary education, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and Spanish, English and special education.
- Students who complete the AAT can transfer to any four-year college, public or private, directly into the teacher certification programs as juniors.

#### *Teacher Academies:*

- Through a \$6 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education, USM has worked in partnership with Baltimore City Public Schools, Towson, Coppin State University, Baltimore City Community College and the Maryland State Department of Education to develop programs in middle and high schools to encourage students to consider teaching as a career.
- Through USM collaboration, Baltimore City established 14 Future Educator Association Clubs with 525 student members, making Baltimore City one of the largest FEA programs in the U.S. and developing the future teacher "pipeline"
- Towson University now offers early college credit to students who complete the Teacher Academy Program under their general education requirements.

- In addition, USM is adding capacity with expansion of new programs at home campuses (UMCP, UMBC, FSU, etc.) as well as at the regional centers.

### ***Teacher Retention***

Many policy experts believe that the teacher shortages are a function of teacher retention even more so than recruitment. Efforts that support teacher retention are potentially the most cost-effective and efficient work to be done in the current environment. Professional Development Schools (PDS) are a nationally recognized model and have transformed the way we train teachers in Maryland.

Towson has developed one of the most impressive and successful PDS networks in the nation and has determined that it will need more than \$1 million to support its network of 40 Professional Development Schools. PDS were recognized in both the P-20 Teacher Shortage Task Force Report, and the P-20 STEM Task Force report as critically important for teacher retention in Maryland.

UMBC has developed a Master of Arts in Education program that supports teacher retention in collaboration with Anne Arundel County Public Schools (AACPS).

With the expected development of the new state-wide longitudinal data system, we hope to be able to better answer questions about what happens to our teacher candidates after graduation. The best way to address the problems related to retention is to collect reliable information to guide policy decisions.

Finally, as a note of caution, we stress that both recruitment into the profession and retention in the profession are affected by many external factors. Teachers report that working conditions, salaries, opportunities for advancement and professional development all factor into their decisions to stay in teaching, and college students consider these factors seriously when they weigh the decision to become teachers.

### **Page 12-Achievement Gap:**

***The Chancellor should provide an update on USM institutions' implementation of their Achievement Gap Action Plans and efforts being taken to improve the retention and graduation rates at CSU specifically.***

### **USM Response:**

In FY 09, USM and its institutions launched a major initiative, *Closing the Achievement Gap*, aimed at cutting the graduate rate gaps of low income and minority students in half by 2015 and eliminating them by the end of the decade.

USM institutional efforts to close the achievement gap encompass initiatives related, but not limited, to student recruitment, academic preparation, and readiness for college, student enrollment, persistence, retention, and resources to enable graduation. The impact of the current national and state budget crisis on these efforts has been significant. Nonetheless, USM institutions have made commendable and noteworthy efforts to implement initiatives that are not resource intensive, while placing others on hold until adequate resources become available. Institutions have been rather creative in developing solutions to the complex resource problems associated with student persistence, retention, and graduation without compromising the quality of services provided. Some initiatives have been implemented through exceptional resourcefulness, reallocated funds, or through responsibilities being added to existing roles and responsibilities. However, without adequate resources these efforts are not

sustainable.

Assessing policy and programmatic activities to determine the appropriate approaches to systematically address a particular institutional student population characterize the work of USM institutions generally. The range and scope of the initiatives, measures for success, resources, and challenges are as varied as the institutions themselves. Examples of initiatives implemented to close the gap at this juncture include:

- new student orientation programs,
- expansion early intervention programs,
- new undergraduate policy on academic probation and dismissal,
- expansion of honors seminar for transfer students,
- submission a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education for a TRIO program to support student transition, and
- course redesign.

Institutions are being guided to benchmark their progression toward closing the achievement gap. This should enable them to make the appropriate adjustments on the achievement gap trajectory.

Recent reports have highlighted USM efforts with closing the achievement gap. Three USM institutions were cited by The Education Trust as being among the Top Gainers in Underrepresented Minority Graduation Rates: Among public research universities, UMCP is ranked 14th and UMBC 22nd. UMBC is also one of the few Non-HBUs at which the minority graduation rate exceeds the non-minority rate. Among public master's institutions, TU ranked 8th in minority graduation rate gains.

### **Coppin's Efforts:**

Coppin continues to be challenged by a complex and systemic set of socioeconomic and academic preparation issues related to the students it serves. Under its Achievement Gap Action Plan Coppin has implemented initiatives that include offering a summer bridge program, creating freshmen seminars and honors courses, establishing an early intervention program and a service-learning component.

Coppin has identified the following initiatives as ones having a meaningful impact on closing the achievement gap: the pre-enrollment summer program, the honors and early warning program, and improved academic advising policies and practices.

Coppin provides the following indicators or measures of the success of their efforts to close the achievement gap: reversing of negative trends in first-year retention and improving freshmen grade point averages, and student completion of at least one developmental course during the summer.

Further, Coppin is developing a fiscal resource plan that commits equitable share of resources (including personnel) to university programs and activities that the research literature on retention identifies as central to improving student persistence to graduation.

**Page 36- Course Redesign -**

*The Chancellor should comment on the status of USM’s course redesign effort, particularly if new courses are being redesigned, and provide an update on the statewide partnership to redesign entry level courses.*

**USM Response:**

The Course Redesign has been a successful model of academic E&E, which is why it was recognized by the Lumina Foundation as part of a statewide initiative to increase higher education productivity and degree completion.

On November 24, 2009, the Lumina Foundation announced that Maryland was one of seven states to win a “Making Opportunity Affordable (MOA)” grant (Arizona, Indiana, Maryland, Montana, Ohio, Tennessee and Texas). USM was awarded \$1,032,000 over four years to lead a statewide effort to deliver higher education in new ways and at lower expense to students and taxpayers.

Building on our three-year, system-wide course redesign initiative, USM demonstrated substantial experience with developing scalable, high-impact models that directly address Lumina’s MOA policy priority—educate and train in affordable ways. The four-year grant provides some funding to address the so-called “gatekeeper” courses (e.g., general education courses, developmental courses, and entry level mathematics and sciences courses) which pose significant problems for many college students and halt their degree progression. Our application to Lumina Foundation focused on bringing course redesign efforts in these areas to scale statewide.

Based on the recent success of the Maryland Course Redesign Initiative (MCRI), which involved course redesign pilots at each USM degree-granting institution, the MOA grant would provide support for two-year and four-year college and university faculty statewide to engage in research-based course redesign efforts to increase student success and completion in developmental education.

Over the past three years USM has “grown our own” faculty experts who can help lead the dissemination across higher education in Maryland. By investing in our own faculty, we have evolved a sustainable model for course redesign.

The Lumina Foundation grant will provide us with seed money to fund 24 course redesign projects at community colleges and some four year colleges over the course of the four year MOA grant (six courses in each of four years), including seed money for faculty design teams and instructional technology investments, as well as technical assistance and consulting services for the three-year course redesign cycle. Participating institutions will reinvest their savings in additional course redesign efforts and other completion-related initiatives. Maryland already serves as a national model for this work, and our MOA state team considers course redesign as our highest priority academic initiative in propelling our state forward in meeting our attainment

The extension of MCRI within the USM itself will also build on the internal expertise developed during the initial 3-year pilot project phase. These faculty advocates have, in some cases, encouraged their departments to redesign other large-enrollment courses. In other instances they have run workshops in their disciplines for colleagues at other institutions. Finally, several have spoken on their experiences at national conferences and have also written professional papers on their redesign experiences.

The plan for continuation of MCRI, which has been waiting for funding that has now been established through my Carnegie Foundation Award and related fund-raising, is to promote innovation in large enrollment courses by running USM-wide competitions. We believe we have resources to support 5-10 course redesigns a year. The intent is to put out a call for proposals later this semester. The financial arrangements are yet to be worked out, but there will be an expectation of some institutional matching commitment. We expect to use the same framework for redesign as in the pilots with publicly available materials published by the National Center for Academic Transformation, our consultant during the pilot projects. Actual consultation will come from the internal core of expertise and some use of national redesign leaders on an as-needed basis.

As a side note, several institutions have developed training programs for peer assistance, a feature of many of the initial redesigns. Course Redesign often depends on “just in time” assistance when a student has a problem understanding a concept or process. Most institutions have turned to Undergraduate Learning Assistants (ULA), upper class students who fully understand the material of lower division courses, to extend the learning support beyond course faculty. The training programs that have been developed give these ULAs insights into how to become effective peer learning assistants. Thus, Course Redesign has had the secondary effect of helping these upper division students become more effective instructors themselves--which has been beneficial in their gaining admission to graduate school and the workforce.

**Page 38-Faculty Workload –**

***Chancellor should comment on overall decline in the tenured/tenure track faculty workload and the increasing reliance on adjunct faculty to teach courses. Chancellor should also address reasons for the high workload at Coppin.***

**USM Response:**

The average faculty workload at USM's Comprehensive Institutions has fallen from 7.5 Course Units to 7.4 Course Units in the last year. However, as in FY 2008, 7 of 9 institutions continue to meet the workload requirements prescribed by the Board of Regents. The decline has been entirely due to the Comprehensive Institutions at which workload had risen to too high a level. The USM needed to adjust their policies and procedures to bring the number down to more appropriate and effective levels.

In order to ensure quality, the Board and the Chancellor advise institutions not allow workload to climb to unacceptably high levels. A workload set above the current 7.5 level, and certainly any workload exceeding 8 course units, has an immediate detrimental impact on the institution and its faculty. Faculty members with excessive workloads are unable to engage in appropriate research and scholarship. Also, their ability to provide advising and personal contact with their students declines, and finally they lack the time to help manage either the course of their departments or their institutions. All of these duties are expected of a member of a University faculty. The Provosts at individual institutions have worked to manage the faculty workload to ensure that faculty can provide significant service to the institutions which balances both in-class and out-of-class activities. The reduction of course units taught at CSU reflects exactly this type of faculty management as the institution attempts to bring what had been very heavy workloads into line with Board standards.

With regards to the reliance on Adjunct faculty cited in the analysis, the analysis misunderstands the categories of faculty. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty (which are included in Exhibit 21) are considered members of the University's core faculty. Many have served as important teaching faculty for years at their institutions, serve as advisers at their institutions and receive employee benefits. When included with tenure track faculty members, the workload of these faculty members has increased slightly on some campuses. Adjunct faculty members are faculty who serve in a part-time and purely instructional role. The total workload of these faculty members, around 2.4 course units per year, has risen slightly on 3 campuses and fallen on 6. It would not be accurate to state that the use of adjunct faculty increased to any great extent in the most recent reporting year.