CUSF General Body Meeting
Wye Research and Education Center (WREC)
Wye, Maryland

Minutes

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell, Vanessa Coles
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman
Salisbury (3)	David Parker, Bobbi Adams, Paul Flexner, Sehba Mahmood,
Towson (4)	Jay Zimmerman (phone), Jessica Shiller, Elizabeth Clifford
UB (2)	Julie Simon, Patria de Lancer-Julnes
UMB (5)	
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens
UMCES (2)	
UMCP (6)	William Stuart, Don Webster, Vin Norara
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Joyce Henderson, David Hershfield
Guests:	Zakiya Lee (USM), Teresa Hollander (USM), Andy Clark (USM)

Future Meeting Dates for 2014-2015:

January 16, 2015 (Friday)	University System of Maryland Office
February 12, 2015 (Thursday)	Coppin State University
March 9, 2015 (Monday)	Towson University
April 13, 2015 (Monday)	University of Maryland, Baltimore County
May 13, 2015 (Wednesday)	University of Maryland Eastern Shore
June 12, 2015 (Friday)	Salisbury University

CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 a.m.

Virletta Bryant called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

WELCOME FROM CAMPUS (WREC) - 10:15 a.m.

Don Webster, CUSF representative, provided the welcome for the Wiley Research and Education Center (WREC). He noted that their President was unable to attend. Don provided the group with a brief history of the facility. The facility is approximately 1,000 acres. He noted that their focus was on agriculture and

the environment. He noted that the Arab-Israel peace talks occurred here during the Carter administration and that the Wye Angus herd is world renown with its long blood line.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - 10:19 a.m.

A motion was made, seconded, and the minutes were passed.

REPORT FROM USM - 10:22 a.m.

Zakiya Lee, Assistant to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Joann Boughman, gave the report from USM.

Sexual Harassment Policy – The USM policy was passed by the Board of Regents in June. Institutions are now updating their policies and procedures to be aligned with the new USM policy. Institutions' policies and procedures are due to USM by December 30. In addition, Joann is putting together a faculty workgroup to address faculty-specific implementation issues. Virletta has provided Joann with recommendations for this workgroup.

Chancellor's Search – There is no news on the Chancellor's search. Apparently, the search is on track. In addition, we most likely won't know anything until the process reaches its conclusion after which it will most likely move quickly in terms of the announcement of the new Chancellor. [12/17/14 addendum: *The new Chancellor is Dr. Robert Caret, formerly President of Towson University and who currently is President of the University of Massachusetts*.]

BOR Retreat – Zakiya focused on two topics covered at the Board of Regents (BOR) retreat that occurred during Thanksgiving week: College Completion and Research. White papers, Achieving the 55% College Completion Goal: The Path Forward in an Era of Disruption (see Appendix A) and University System of Maryland Status and Future of the Research and Innovation Mission were distributed to CUSF members (see Appendix B). It should be noted that these are discussion items and they do not indicate any pending policy changes.

Implementation of Academic Freedom Resolution – As part of the question and answer session, there was a discussion of the implementation of the Academic Freedom Resolution vis-a-vis the AAAC meeting of Provosts which will occur on December 11th. Several points were made. It seemed that many Provosts were unaware of the resolution and the presentation by Virletta at the meeting is informational in this respect. Second, at least one Provost may have reservations regarding placing the resolution in the faculty handbook. Part of the discussion focused on the role of the handbooks. Third, it was noted that there may be different routes to accomplish implementation although these approaches were not delineated.

Budget Update – Teri Hollander, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, provided a brief update on the budget situation. She noted that currently the anticipated cuts include mid-year cuts, which could result in doubling the cuts. However, not a lot is known at this point regarding the budget and potential cuts. The new Governor will need to submit his budget three days after taking office in January. Finally, budget cuts are predicated on revenue projections. The revenue projections for January may be better than projected which could mitigate some of the projected budget cuts.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Andy Clark, Director of Legislative Affairs, provided the group with a prelude to the upcoming legislative session. First, there is a new Governor and 60 new legislators. A lot of new people will need to be educated about higher education and its benefits to the State and its economy. Second, *when talking to the public or to legislators, we should talk about higher education rather than budget cuts*. When we do this, we focus on positive things (higher education) rather than negative things (budget cuts). Third, Andy indicated that the structural deficit will lead to lower-than-expected revenue outlook, and constrained expenditures, in FY 2015 and FY 2016. Fourth, there was a discussion regarding how to increase visibility during the legislative session. Bill Montgomery is spearheading this effort. Also, the discussion focused on working with the students on their efforts. Andy recommended the last week in February. A specific date was not determined. Fifth, the Legislative Newsletter will again be sent out every Friday. This is a useful document and the CUSF Liaisons can distribute the newsletter by email to campus faculty. Sixth, Andy provided members with two handouts: *List of House and Senate Leadership* (see Appendix C) and *Dates of Interest* (see Appendix D).

REVIEW OF COMAR REGULATIONS

Teri Hollander, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, indicated that every eight years MHEC is required to review the COMAR regulations. The sections that she reviewed focused on Chapter 02 Minimum Requirements for In-State Degree-Granting Institutions and Chapter 03 Academic Programs — Degree-Granting Institutions. (Note: *The drafts reviewed are not provided in the Appendixes.*)

In her report, Teri made the following points. There are structural issues where the regulations do not align with Middle States and Federal standards and definitions that need to be addressed. Second, there is a disconnect for approval of instate and out-of-state programs. There have been some preliminary discussions with MHEC about the need to convene a group with representatives from all the segments to review online and out-of-state program approval. Third, the regulations are written prescriptively which tends to impede innovation. Fourth, there is the substantial change in program approval requirements has some problematic areas. Currently, if more than one-third of the courses change in the program, MHEC approval is required, we would recommend that this should reworded, perhaps without setting a percentage, rather that if the program's outcomes and goals have changed substantially that this would trigger the need for MHEC approval. It is difficult to track this in any case since, in many instances, there are incremental changes made over several years. Fifth, Shady Grove and Hagerstown are considered off-campus and require MHEC approval. Sixth, the 740 bill put a credit limit on Associate's degrees at 60 credits. Community colleges are pairing down their majors to 60 credits. Seventh, it was noted that COMAR policy applies to UMUC except for the full-time faculty requirement. Also, UMUC can offer AA degrees. Eighth, Teri differentiated between joint degrees where all the participating institutions are listed on the diploma and primary degrees where only the primary institution is listed on the degree.

LUNCH - 12:10 to 12:50 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND REPORTS - 12:50 p.m.

Academic Affairs – Joyce Henderson reported that they focused on two issues: 1) *academic freedom initiative* and 2) *University of Maryland System Wide Open Source Text Book Initiative*.

Faculty Affairs – Patria del Lancer-Julnes reported that the committee focused on the issue of *adjunct faculty*.

Legislative Affairs – Chris Brittan-Powell reported that Andy Clark did most of their work with his report. The group focused on the *Legislative Day*.

CHAIR'S REPORT - 1:20 p.m.

Virletta Bryant presented the Chair's Report. Most of her report was previously covered in the section on "Report from USM."

UNFINISHED/NEW BUSINESS - 1:22 p.m.

Paul Flexner (Salisbury University) had several questions regarding having an outside review in promotion and tenure decisions on other campuses.

ADJOURNMENT - 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Vice Chair

Attachments:
Appendix A: *The Path Forward in an Era of Disruption*
Appendix B: *University System of Maryland Status and Future of the Research and Innovation Mission*.
Appendix C: *List of House and Senate Leadership*
Appendix D: *Dates of Interest*

Achieving the 55% College Completion Goal: The Path Forward in an Era of Disruption

The goal of this paper is to help frame for the Board the major challenges the USM faces in pressing forward on its 55% degree attainment goals. Critical to understanding—and resolving—this challenge is the issue of enrollment, and how well the USM institutions are doing at managing it. Enrollment dictates to a very large degree not just whether the USM will be able to increase its degree production to the level necessary to achieve its portion of the state's 55% degree goal but also whether its institutions are able to balance their budgets. Over the coming months, as the USM negotiates and implements its FY 16 budget, the Board, along with Campus and System Office leadership, is expected to engage in an extended debate over the enrollment challenges facing our institutions and the impact they have on both the USM's ability to reach its strategic goals and maintain a healthy balance sheet. To jumpstart this debate this paper lays out three scenarios, each designed to show how the USM and its institutions, working as a system, can successfully move to tackle enrollment and its related challenges.

I. Introduction to the Issues

The enrollment challenges faced by USM institutions and their connection to the fiscal health of System institutions

In 2014, the major enrollment challenges facing each USM institution vary dramatically. Some institutions, like College Park, face extremely high demand and must make near constant efforts to reasonably constrain/manage growth. Other institutions, such as Towson, face demand that is sufficiently predictable and manageable to allow them to sustain and, if desired, grow operations. Other institutions, such as Coppin, have demand profiles that compromise the sustainability of current program levels. This causes stress on all aspects of their operations. UMUC is experiencing, in real time, disruption in the highly competitive educational environment. It is a circumstance that is playing out on a national level with other institutions that have business models similar to UMUC's – high volume/low cost. The players include ***for-profit*** and ***not-for- profit*** institutions as well as emerging on-line campuses connected to public universities, all vying for greater enrollments.

Further complicating these demand-related issues are the missions and populations served by each institution. These must be looked at not as isolated markets unique to each institution but a series of overlapping markets that all USM institutions share to some degree. So a change in one institution's market strategy can have an opposite and sometimes detrimental impact on that of another.

Managing these challenges is one of the critical problems facing the USM and its institutions because enrollment doesn't just drive the USM's ultimate success under such "academic" goals as the number of degrees produced. Enrollment also directly affects the underlying economic health and operational sustainability of the institutions. Enrollment brings direct revenue to institutions in tuition and fee dollars, and indirectly it brings state general fund support for institutional educational activities and program development. Without a sustainable enrollment model, USM institutions are at greater financial risk. This paper, then, focuses on how USM can work to ameliorate this risk. It seeks to explore and pursue a comprehensive strategy (or set of strategies) that will allow the USM and its institutions to

attain beneficial economies of scale in their enrollment without sacrificing the critical goals of quality, access and affordability as we work to achieve the national priority of greater degree completion.

How enrollment drives success under the USM's strategic degree goals and the challenges ahead

A useful starting point for this discussion is the ambitious degree completion goals set by the USM and the State of Maryland. That goal, to have at least 55 percent of Maryland's adult population attain a college degree—either a two-year associate's or a four-year baccalaureate—is based on the determination to equal or exceed the performance of top competitor nations. This level of attainment will help ensure Maryland's long-term competitiveness in an increasingly global knowledge economy. In its 2020 strategic plan the USM established a goal of producing at least 28,000 undergraduate degrees annually by 2020. That is the number of undergraduate degrees the System estimates our institutions need to produce annually if the USM is going to do its part to help the state achieve its 55% degree attainment goal. When this target was being developed, USM institutions were producing between 18,000 and 19,000 degrees a year – a level of output that had increased just 25%, or 3,800 additional graduates, over the prior ten years. In comparison, the 2020 plan called on the USM institutions to ramp up degree production to at least 28,000 degrees annually (an increase of over 45%) by the end of 2020, a level of growth that at the time was acknowledged to be a huge stretch for our institutions but one that was also critical to the state's ability to achieve it 55% degree goal.

To date, the USM has been very successful in pursuing this goal. In FY 2014, USM institutions awarded 23,724 undergraduate degrees, an increase of almost 4,500 degrees over five years ago. This level of degree growth places the USM well ahead of where it expected to be when the plan was adopted in 2010. Additionally, USM institutions are performing efficiently in terms of student success. Two out of three entering freshmen now graduate within six years and three of five Maryland Community College transfers graduate within five years. Based on the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) predicted graduation rate calculations, 10 of 11 USM institutions meet or exceed their predicted national graduation rates.

With that progress noted, serious challenges lie immediately ahead that will substantially affect the USM's ability to reach its 28,000 degree target. Growth in undergraduate degrees is likely to level off within two years and there is real danger that it will begin to decline. This is largely because the enrollment of new students, particularly new freshmen students, fell off dramatically after the conclusion of the Enrollment Funding Initiative (which ran from FY 2006 through 2009). Improved efficiencies have meant that USM institutions have graduated or will graduate more from these smaller entering classes, and additional incremental improvement is possible. **However, without enrollment growth, it is unlikely we will reach 28,000 degrees.**

The impact of disruptive forces on the university business model

Adding complexity to the enrollment challenge is the fact that every aspect of the current higher education business model is being tested and examined by our elected officials, education advocates, and new entrepreneurial actors seeking to gain a leadership stake or market advantage through the use of new technologies. In this era of disruption and academic transformation some of the key questions

for this topic are: What will our core set of activities be in the years to come? What are the new expectations about how we will go about those activities? How will technology impact those activities? How is our relationship to those we serve evolving? And, perhaps most importantly, where will the resources to carry out these activities come from?

Although rapid technological change has made this period particularly unpredictable, disruption has focused on two areas: technological innovation and increased competition. Many of these disruptive forces have been developing for years, but in the last three to five years they have begun to undermine the ability of many universities to carry out their most basic mission. This disruption of the institutional business model can rise rapidly to crisis levels.

As noted above, UMUC provides a case study in rapid disruption and strategies for addressing the effects of such change. After more than a decade of rapid growth in both enrollment and the market for online education, UMUC was confronted with an explosion of competitors (including top-tier state research universities) entering the online marketplace. These competitors have sought to claim a piece of the lucrative market even as that market matured and its rate of growth slowed. The result has been a rapid intensification of competition. Simultaneously, the advent of MOOC's and other modalities have called into question the long-term viability of the "traditional" online model of teaching. These trends have impacted the enrollment (and revenue) environment at UMUC significantly. The institutional leadership has responded with a sweeping reorganization of teaching and enrollment management operations. It has applied analytics at a level among the most advanced in higher education to improve UMUC's enrollment management and business functions. But even with all of these interventions, the challenges facing UMUC are still dramatic going forward.

These and other cases of disruption have guided our development of some general assumptions on these issues and the starting point for the scenarios we introduce below.

1. First, although we have had good success in obtaining state funds for both operations and facilities, we have assumed that direct state support of higher education alone will not keep pace with the escalating cost of higher education, including costs associated with increasing enrollments.

2. Logic takes us to a second assumption: Despite a highly successful, decade-long commitment to E&E, a "business as usual" approach toward institutional efficiency and accountability will not work. To meet the challenges facing us, the USM must achieve substantially higher levels of efficiency and accountability.
    - Working under these first two assumptions will serve a twofold purpose: a) they will maximize the impact at whatever level of funding is available and b) they will demonstrate our resolve to appropriators that we as a System are maximizing the return on their investment in us.

3. A final assumption concerns the need for greater coordination of enrollment management: A proactive system-wide coordination effort will be achieved by more effectively integrating enrollment management with both strategic planning and budget decision-making.

- System-wide solutions must focus simultaneously on meeting broad goals, and creating solutions to ensure sustainable business models for all of the USM's component institutions. These solutions will vary based on the current health of the individual university and the areas of enrollment that the institution can reasonably hope to address. Therefore, coordination should not be confused with standardization. Rather, the likely outcome of coordination will be a greater degree of segmentation of activity; this is to say, solutions tailored to the circumstances of each institution, its mission, enrollment market, and mode of instruction.

II. Strategies for Addressing the Enrollment and Enrollment-Related Business Challenges Facing the USM

Presented below are three scenarios, each developed to promote progress toward the USM strategic plan's degree attainment goal and support long-term institutional viability. Each scenario presents a different approach and each carries different levels of risk for attaining our strategic plan goals, for the fiscal health of USM institutions, and for different segments of Maryland students and potential students. The three scenarios outlined in this paper are as follows:

1. Maximizing Undergraduate Graduation Levels within Existing Resources – Using enhanced efficiencies and existing unused capacity to enroll and graduate more students,
2. Growth as a Driver of Success – Embracing substantial growth with enrollment funding along with efficiencies to ensure growth with high quality throughout the USM,
3. Focused Production of High-Demand Degrees – Shifting focus from overall number of graduates to the highest impact degrees for students and the economy.

Scenario 1— Maximizing Undergraduate Graduation Levels within Existing Resources

Assumptions

1. The overall State budget will provide funding of current services only. No enhancement funding will be provided by the State for achieving the State's 55% college completion goal.
2. If a campus seeks to increase degree production through higher enrollment levels and/or improved student success rates it would do so via internal budget reallocations or additional external funding or successful effectiveness and efficiency initiatives that can be achieved with existing resources.
3. USM institutions will have to go outside traditional target populations to expand pipeline of incoming students.

Strategies

Actions under this scenario will focus on improved retention and graduation of existing populations as well as managing enrollment towards under-enrolled or lower cost options—for example, tuition-funded growth at UMUC. These strategies include:

Analytics – Developing focused high-utility analytics would strengthen all the strategies discussed in this scenario and those that follow. Analytical modeling could yield considerable results through: 1) amelioration of financial risk to these students through refinement of financial aid or tuition discounting strategies, 2) creation and reinforcement of appropriate and robust "bridging" programs to guide students, and 3) identification of effective actions from high school through baccalaureate completion. This focus could dramatically alter efficiency of an entire range of interventions.

Transfer Pathways Programs – ACES and other similar strategies involve cross-segmental work with the Maryland Community Colleges and local school districts to more effectively use under-enrolled and low cost institutions/locations. These strategies rely on two critical changes in recruiting: 1) a new focus on qualified students who had not intended to be college bound, and 2) a more purposeful directing of these students to locations within the USM. Estimates indicate that as many as a third of Maryland High School graduates (more than 20,000 students each year) do not immediately go on to attend any form of higher education. These programs would begin to recruit some of these students.

Closing the Achievement Gap – This initiative is essential to the success of this scenario, specifically at institutions that have not shown significant improvement to date. The achievement gap programs are a mature set of initiatives, which, if the campuses met the 2020 goal to close the achievement gap, would add approximately 1,000 degrees to the USM total. A critical evidence-based review of these programs would be conducted to determine the contribution, feasibility and vitality of each activity, and would provide the basis for improving success and freeing existing resources for internal reallocation.

Focus Institutions

Although all institutions would participate in these strategies, some would be more involved under this scenario than others. Specifically, those institutions that are currently enrolling fewer students than their peak enrollments (e.g. Coppin) and could increase enrollment at lower costs than those at or near record enrollment would be the primary drivers under the scenario. Institutions with existing achievement gaps (e.g. UB) would be expected to make major progress. Similarly, recruitment to regional centers would both be beneficial to those centers and critical to reaching populations that have not had easy access to a USM institution. Finally, UMUC (with its tuition driven model) would also be expected to increase enrollment under this scenario.

Summary (Risks and Benefits)

The major benefit of this approach is that it can be pursued aggressively under the current services budget and scaled up effectively if additional State General Fund support is available. It would build on programs currently in place, and if properly managed could improve access. However, it carries a high risk of the USM missing its degree target as the combination of identified efficiency improvements are not sufficient to reach the 28,000 degree goal. Additionally, it relies on high levels of success from programs and institutions that have a mixed record to date. It also carries a potentially higher cost per student as those students with weaker academic preparation are integrated into programs, and require additional interventions.

Probable Outcome (with CSB only):

- Degrees in 2020: 25,000
- Date to hit 28,000 degrees: 2024-2027

Scenario 2—Growth as a Driver of Success

Assumptions

1. Enhancement funding will be provided by the State for achieving the State's 55% college completion goal, preferably in the form of direct enrollment funding.
2. All efficiency improvements discussed under scenario 1 would be pursued as part of this scenario.
3. A large number of institutions would plan and move forward with relatively rapid growth of incoming student classes.
4. Growth would involve three populations: Maryland high school graduates retained for in-state enrollment, out-of-state recruits to USM, and those not initially planning to attend college.
5. Institutions would receive funding based on enrollment of new students and maintenance or improvement of retention and (ultimately) graduation rates.

Strategies

To achieve the target degree production levels in the strategic plan, USM would substantially increase enrollment. This approach has yielded results historically and this scenario would include strategies that have been successful. These include:

Financial Aid as an Enrollment Driver –Financial aid (both merit and need-based) would be a primary tool for recruiting both in-state Maryland freshmen as well as out-of-state students. To retain more Maryland High School graduates in-state, competitive financial aid packages and aggressive recruitment to USM's strongest institutions for highly desirable programs would be required. If 10% of those who now leave the state for higher education were retained in Maryland, then it could yield 1,000 additional degrees per year. Out-of-state students from both contiguous areas and more broadly could be recruited to Maryland institutions if the cost differential was minimized. This could be accomplished through targeted financial aid packages.

Tuition Discounting – Strategic tuition discounting could be used by USM to attract students into USM universities. For out-of-state students, Maryland universities could improve recruitment if the cost differential was decreased. Reducing financial risk to potential first-generation students from Maryland through deep discounting at USM institutions could add to the pool of those seeking college. Finally, discounting tuition at locations with enrollment growth potential or for high-demand programs at under-enrolled institutions could also increase enrollment. Enrollment funding could be used to offset reduced revenue from this discounting.

Academic Programs to Expand Enrollment – New academic program offerings or expansion at multiple institutions or regional centers could drive enrollment increases. Institutions that have not been major attractors of in-state or out-of-state students in the past would benefit from more high quality, competitive programs. Expanding programs in regional locations for students that are not mobile would provide a powerful attractor for enrollment growth.

Funding to "Scenario 1" Programs – Finally, the programs outlined under scenario 1 would be funded beyond the levels possible through reallocation and tuition revenue. Enhanced retention would increase enrollment and drive degree production.

Focus Institutions

Under this scenario, most or all institutions would participate aggressively in one or more strategies and would increase enrollment. It is likely that those who had success under the earlier Enrollment Funding Initiative would grow most immediately (e.g. Towson University and UMUC). Similarly, those with currently expanding enrollment (e.g. UMBC) might take a leading role. The Historically Black Universities and Frostburg would be the location of programmatic additions to attract greater numbers of students.

Summary (Risks and Benefits)

Rapid enrollment growth based on dedicated funding and clear targets is the approach most likely to allow the USM to meet its degree goals. Implemented promptly, it is still possible to meet those goals by the 2020 target date. However, enrollment funding has proven a very difficult "sell," despite a demonstrated record of success. Additionally, even if a USM-wide program is successful the results are likely to be uneven across institutions further complicating building and holding State support. Finally, some USM institutions have indicated that they would prefer to avoid rapid growth in enrollment because of concerns about student and program quality.

Probable Outcome (with strong enrollment funding):

- Degrees in 2020: 27,000
- Date to hit 28,000 degrees: 2021-2023

Scenario 3—Focused Production of High Demand Degrees

Assumptions

1. This scenario plans for growth of majors within certain high demand areas (e.g. healthcare) and majors (e.g. computer science) either with or without overall enrollment growth.
2. Enhancement funding may or may not be provided by the State to meet critical goals. Funding for general enrollment growth is not anticipated.
3. The focus would be on changing the degree mix of graduates in a fashion that would yield greater economic impact both for the State and for individual students regardless of the total number of degrees awarded.
4. Neither enrollment nor number of degrees would necessarily increase under this scenario.
5. In the event funding became available (through differential tuition, targeted funding or another source), institutions could receive funding to develop or expand specific targeted programs. Institutions would be held accountable for increases in degrees in those areas.

Strategies

Under this scenario, general degree growth would not be the central focus. This approach has proven successful at generating support in periods where generalized funding for enrollment was unavailable. The focus would be on the highest impact areas in terms of economic development and workforce demand. The three main strategies are:

Expansion of STEM and Health Care – Expansion of STEM and Health Care programs at USM's research institutions would open these options to students in cases where majors have been limited to date. This would help retain more of the highest performing high school graduates in Maryland and attract high quality out-of state students to our institutions. The expansion of these programs could allow the expansion of graduate programs on those campuses and would require the addition of entrepreneurial faculty in some instances. These changes could help drive expanded economic activity and technology transfer from those campuses.

Institutional Support and Enrollment Expansion – The addition of high demand majors on comprehensive campuses (and particularly on the HBU campuses) could help draw students to those institutions, many of which have struggled to maintain or expand enrollment. These programs would be specifically selected based on their demand by students and high level of demand for graduates in the State's workforce.

Regional Center Expansion – Expansion of programs at the regional higher education centers (RHECs) would add to overall enrollment, and open program enrollment to Marylanders who might not otherwise have been able to attend. To effectively support the expansion of these programs to these new venues and populations, appropriate and robust transfer pathways would have to be established. These would focus on the preparation of these students for extremely challenging programs from high school and through community college.

Focus Institutions

Under this scenario, the research institutions would be prominently featured for STEM and Healthcare programs, and the Historically Black Universities would be leaders in addition of new high demand programs. The remaining comprehensive universities would also expand current STEM and Healthcare programs, or develop new high demand programs, and shift students within their majors.

Summary (Risks and Benefits)

This scenario carries a high risk of missing the USM's degree production target. This risk is balanced against the benefit of a program mix that is matched closely with the State's workforce and other economic needs. More graduates would find jobs and other economic opportunities immediately available as added programs would be focused on high demand areas. However, this strategy will disproportionately benefit students who would have attended college regardless of intervention, and disadvantage students not prepared to pursue the most demanding courses of study.

Probable Outcome (with CSB budget only):

- Degrees in 2020: 25,000
- Date to hit 28,000 degrees: 2024-2027
- Increase in STEM/Healthcare Degrees in 2020 over present: 10-15% (1,000 plus degrees)

University System of Maryland Status and Future of the Research and Innovation Mission
Fall 2014 Operating Budget Retreat

The purpose of this paper is to help frame the issues for the Board's discussion on the future of the USM's research and innovation mission. In addition to providing background information on the USM's strategic goals for research and innovation, and the progress made on them since the adoption of the strategic plan in 2010, the paper also seeks to tee up potential strategies the Board and USM institutions might engage in to revitalize—or reboot—the USM's research and innovation efforts. Finally, for each of the strategies discussed, the paper posits a number of questions that the Board and USM leadership might explore, beginning with this session but continuing over the coming year, as they move to develop and refine a new USM research and innovation agenda.

I. Introduction to the Issues

Maryland's "home field advantage" in R&D funding — A double-edged sword
Sponsored research, and federally-sponsored research in particular, is a core strength of Maryland's economy. At almost $16 billion annually, Maryland comes in just second to California ($18B) and well ahead of the next closest competitor states -- Virginia ($8B), Massachusetts ($6B) and Texas ($5.5B) – in total federal R&D obligations. As the USM strategic plan makes clear, the USM believes that this heavy federal investment in R&D activities and R&D-related facilities gives Maryland, and its higher education institutions, a "home field" advantage when it comes to attracting federal research dollars. Between the USM, Johns Hopkins, and Morgan, Maryland's research universities account for almost $3.5 billion per year in federal research-related spending, placing the institutions in this relatively small state fourth behind only those of California ($7.9B), New York ($4.5B), and Texas ($4.4B).

However, Maryland's close ties to Washington and the federal research agencies can have negative as well as positive benefits. In times of cut backs to federal spending Maryland, because of its dependence on federal funding, can be disproportionately affected. That is what we currently see happening. The immediate trends in federal spending, particularly spending by mission- and defense-related agencies, has negatively impacted Maryland's economy, weakening the bottom lines of those Maryland universities that rely on federal funds to support basic and applied research and Maryland's for-profit businesses/companies that are dependent on federal contracts and federal workforce-related spending. Looking to the future, while federal R&D spending has largely stabilized over the past two years, we don't expect it to rebound to pre-2012 levels any time soon. In addition, the mix of federal agency "winners"— those whose research budgets are increasing (albeit at a much smaller rate than in the past) — may change. Whereas defense and health (i.e., NIH) received the lion's share of increases in the past, those agencies slotted to receive the biggest percentage increase in their R&D under the president's most recent (FY 15) budget request, according to analyses prepared by AAAS, included Energy, Commerce (NIST), and Agriculture.

The USM's R&D goals under the 2020 Strategic Plan

The USM Strategic Plan established a very aggressive goal of doubling the System's Research & Development (R&D) efforts over 10 years (going from $1.2 billion in externally sponsored R&D in 2010 to a projected $2.4B in fiscal 2020). This was one of four economic development goals/strategies outlined in the plans designed to broadly secure and enhance Maryland's economic health and competitiveness. The others goals included creating 325 new companies, broadly instilling a culture of innovation and entrepreneurship throughout our institutions, and increasing by 40 percent the number of new STEM graduates produced by USM institutions. While the R&D goal was acknowledged at the time to be a stretch, the percentage increase it projected was in line with what the USM had accomplished over the prior decade, and more importantly it helped justify the investment in research faculty and facilities envisioned in the plan (which priced out to almost $100M in additional state support for research-related operations over the first five years of the plan, as well as an additional $100M in capital improvements).

The current status of the USM's Strategic Plan goals

The USM is approaching the halfway point of its 2020 strategic plan. It has achieved significant results on most of its strategic plan goals—already surpassing those related to STEM growth and Course Redesign—yet due in large part to the slow recovery of the national economy and the lack of support in Washington for increased federal spending, the USM has not achieved much traction toward its 2020 goal of doubling extramural research. For the most recent year (FY 14), USM total expenditures fell to $1.1B, under the 2010 benchmark year level of $1.2B.

At the same time, the USM is not without research-related achievements over the past five years. The creation of MPower (not contemplated in the Strategic Plan), in combination with the BOR's focus on improving research commercialization and technology transfer, has given the USM new collaborative structures with which to compete for funds and coordinate institutional efforts/resources. The addition of almost 100,000 net assignable square feet (NASF) in new research space since 2010 (with an additional 130,000 NASF on track to open by 2017), in combination with the additional research facilities scheduled in the CIP approved by the Board and the Governor, is helping to rebuild the USM's research infrastructure. New initiatives and collaborations, such as creation of the National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence and the USM's collaborative partnership with MedImmune, both announced in FY 14, are helping those USM institutions associated with such initiatives recruit new faculty and diversify sources of R&D funding. Finally, faculty salaries, whose growth had been constrained during the worst of the economic downturn, have started to rebound and are now increasingly competitive with those for faculty at similar institutions within peer states. Taken in combination, these individual achievements can be seen as building blocks for future USM success in R&D.

Understanding the true cost of doing large scale, competitive research and innovation

An additional factor that must be considered in any discussion of the research and innovation mission is the cost associated with it, including competing at the international level. While the federal, government, along with other sponsors, underwrites the direct costs of any campus-based research it authorizes (paying for faculty time spent on a project as well as the support of any graduate assistants or instrumentation and equipment that can be directly attributed to it), the level of support it provides for

the indirect costs associated with such research (the infrastructure-related costs critical to enabling a research project to be undertaken on a campus but which can't be attributed solely and specifically to the project) are inadequate to meet the real indirect costs to an institution in terms of the wear and tear on facilities, the need for affiliated core facilities, the growing burdens of regulatory and compliance requirements, etc. And of course, the federal government typically does not pay costs associated with efforts to transfer the knowledge and ideas generated by faculty — the impetus for so much of the innovation that drives our economy — into the market place. These costs, like those associated with recruiting high quality faculty researchers and research teams, must be borne by the institutions and the USM, and the key to addressing them is having effective capital and operating plans in place at both the campus and System level.

Given the challenges the USM faces in meeting its R&D goals, the current climate for increased research spending in Washington, the cost of doing research, and what the System has been able to put in place in terms of new facilities and new initiatives over the last five years, it seems appropriate at this point in the strategic plan to stop and assess where the System is headed under the plan's R&D goals, whether they remain appropriate, and, if so, how best to move toward achieving them in the time remaining.

II. A Strategic Reboot – Identifying New Opportunities, Strategies, and Goals for Strengthening the USM's Research and Innovation Mission

> *"Pockets of research strength exist at each USM research institution, but the overall quality of our research programs and the "bench strength" of our research faculties are not as deep and uniform throughout each institution as they need to be."*
>
> *"When it comes to dependence on federal research spending, we are like Detroit of fifty years ago."*
>
> *...Comments taken from USM institutional leaders in recent conversations*

The USM's research institutions (UMB, UMCP, UMBC, UMCES) historically have had highly competitive research programs in areas related to physics, engineering, computer science (including cyber security), mathematics, information technology, medicine, and the social and environmental sciences. Such programs have helped grow the reputation of Maryland and the institutions as centers of high quality basic research. They also have provided the USM with a solid base of research funding that has held relatively steady during the volatile years of federal spending recently experienced (extramural funding has exceeded $1 billion for seven straight years).

However, the assessment of those most familiar with the USM institutional research efforts – the campus leadership – is that significant "gaps" remain in the depth and breadth of quality within many USM research programs, including at its flagship research institutions. Some of these gaps are in basic areas, like the life sciences—gaps that are surprising for a University System with Maryland's reputation. The gaps are also in areas that hold significant potential for new discovery and research breakthroughs, and as such represent areas that Maryland cannot afford to fall further behind in. Finally, an additional

concern among the campus research leaders is the belief that while federal funding for basic research will always be a critical element in Maryland's R&D portfolio, we must seek ways to diversify our R&D portfolio to ameliorate some of the risk inherent in overdependence on any one funding source.

Strategies for Building Excellence in the USM's Research and Development and Innovation Mission.

Through conversations with the research and academic leadership at USM campuses, as well as other national leaders in academic research, the USM has put together a list of potential strategies the Board and campuses could investigate pursuing to "reboot" our R&D vision and build communities of excellence. These strategies are offered as topics the BOR explore in the coming year.

1) *Be more coherent in deciding which opportunities to go after.* A strategy the USM could better employ is to strategically identify and target a limited number of high level, cross-System initiatives. This would mean selecting 4-5 initiatives that fulfill one or more of the following conditions: 1) they play to the existing research strengths of the institutions (such as in cyber security, vaccine development, or quantum computing) and thereby increasing the likelihood of success, 2) they are complementary to the research strengths/foci of other departments on campus or at partnering USM campuses, and 3) they have the added benefit of potentially allowing the institution(s) to cross fertilize with existing programs/faculty and thereby address "gaps" in the quality of related programs/faculty on their campus (or partnering campuses).

   Some areas that USM institutional research leaders have identified as potentially meeting this targeted research strategy include, in no prioritized order, the following:

   a) Cyber Security (including Homeland Security)
   b) Quantum Computing
   c) Brain Behavior and Human Performance
   d) Autonomous Systems (from health to defense and including robotics and augmented reality)
   e) Infectious Diseases and Vaccine Development
   f) Cancer Research
   g) Drug and Medical Device Development
   h) Environmental Technology
   i) Computer Science and Virtual Reality
   j) Big Data and Health-Related Information Technology
   k) Energy Efficiency and Transformation

   These areas, which certainly do not represent an exhaustive list, should be looked at as a starting point for discussions on how to target opportunities in a more coherent way. For example, as campus leaders have pointed out, an initiative targeting neuroscience (as part of the brain behavior and human performance area on the list above) would meet this strategy by not just playing to current—and complementary—USM strengths in medicine, imaging, behavioral science, and computing but also could present a unique opportunity to use faculty brought in under the initiative to close gaps in knowledge or expertise existing in other departments.

2) *Go big in recruiting: focus on research teams rather than individuals.* While most universities, including most USM institutions, historically have sought to build research strength by hiring one faculty scholar/researcher at a time, periodically and as resources and opportunity allowed, institutions with sufficient resources/reputation also have been able to achieve more dramatic impacts in a particular area by focusing on research group hires. These institutions identify and target a world class researcher in a particular area and then negotiate with him/her to bring an entire research team to campus. Such a strategy has been employed successfully in recent years at UMB (as in the case of Claire Fraser Liggett) and at UMCP (in building the Health Disparities Group at the School of Public Health), and offers the key advantage of being able to be accomplished in a relatively short period of time.

   Questions the Board and the USM institutions should ask as they explore this strategy over the coming year include:

   - How do you identify individuals/teams for targeting?
   - What does it take to recruit a world class scholar and his/her team in terms of resources/time?
   - How do you build a team around her/him and integrate it smoothly into current departmental/college structures?
   - What role do graduate students and their support systems play?
   - And more generally, what is the expense of doing research on the scale envisioned in this strategy? Do indirect cost recoveries (ICR) adequately cover the cost of non-direct expenses associated with research? Are institution's current core facilities sufficient for the scope of projects envisioned, and what additional regulatory or compliance burdens might institutions face?

3) *Use the size and the strength of the System as a whole to overcome individual campus or department limitations.* As one USM research leader noted, in recruiting a researcher or research team, the size of an institution's research program matters since it is a key predictor of both the resources likely to be available and opportunities for scholarly collaboration. However, the close proximity of most USM campuses, along with the unique levels of expertise that each has developed, means that USM institutions have the opportunity to compensate for what any individual campus lacks in a particular research area by working together to offer potential hires a range of resources and collaborative opportunities not found on any but the nation's best campuses. By focusing on what the individual called a "phased array approach to recruiting and hiring," USM institutions collectively could overcome concerns related to any single institution's resource availability or programmatic expertise. For instance, in seeking to hire a researcher or research team with an interest in advanced statistical modeling of the interplay between environmental policy and nutrition, and how the resulting interactions may contribute to health disparities among inner city populations, the institutions could market the complementary strengths of UMCP's health and computational program, UMB's and UMBC's expertise in health, nutrition, and

social equity programs, and UMCES' strength in environmental policy. Further, the policies and processes that UMB and UMCP have pioneered in moving to expand joint appointments, largely as a result of MPower, offers an existing vehicle for the all USM campuses to more widely exploit this "power of a system" advantage.

Questions the Board and the USM institutions should ask as they explore this strategy over the coming year include:

- How can strategic institutional collaboration on faculty hiring be more easily facilitated?
- Do Systemwide policies and practices remain in place that inhibit institutions from easily collaborating to jointly recruit or hire faculty/research teams?
- Is there a way for research institutions and comprehensives to share graduate students and/or postdocs? For example, might a graduate student who wants to study at a research institution be awarded a graduate assistantship at a comprehensive to work with undergraduate students on the graduate student's research project? Or could a postdoc pipeline be created between a USM research institution and a comprehensive to provide the postdoc with teaching experience?

4) *Take advantage of Maryland's research expertise, location, and political assets to pursue a high profile national lab(s).* A fourth, and potentially longer-term, strategy for making a significant change to the R&D profile of the USM would be to align with a national lab. While such a strategy might involve the need for significant political intercession at multiple levels, the state, both politically and geographically, is in many ways uniquely positioned to accomplish this. Maryland has a number of potential national institutes/laboratories within its border, such as the National Cancer Institute based at Frederick, as well as two currently operating University Affiliated Research Centers (the DOD-sponsored Applied Physics Lab at Johns Hopkins and the NSA-sponsored Center for the Advanced Study of Languages at UMCP) that could serve as models. Further, it is worth noting that the establishment of the National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence as a new FFRDC (federally funded research and development center)—administered by MITRE with USM participation, especially UMCP and UMBC--may also provide an opportunity in this emerging area.

Questions the Board and USM institutions might ask as they further explore this strategy include:

- What are the System or institutional administrative responsibilities/costs associated with such an alignment (i.e., what are the downside risks)?
- What political/legislative actions would need to be taken?

5) *Expand the vision for research to include opportunities for more USM institutions, greater emphasis on applied research, and more research-related learning by students*. In addition to strategies the USM research universities can use to capitalize on emerging research opportunities, the USM, in its conversations with campus leaders, also heard that the System must look at ways to broaden the number of System institutions participating in the research mission. And equally importantly, campus leaders expressed the belief the USM must look at how the research being carried out on campuses and in the classroom enhances the educational experience of students. Such experiences,

they stressed, particularly for students in STEM fields, can be as important to their ultimate success in the workplace or a graduate program, as any learning that takes place in the traditional classroom setting. For many USM comprehensives, the way in which they engage in the research mission already ranges from actively seeking to integrate research-based experiences into their undergraduate curriculum to carrying out traditional lab-based research. By getting more institutions throughout the System engaged in the research mission, however, and building cooperative mechanisms that support them in their efforts, the USM would not only expand its research capacity, particularly in areas of applied research, but also would help the comprehensive institutions carry out their primary mission: enriching the learning experience of students attending their institutions.

Questions the Board and USM institutions might ask as they further explore this strategy include:

- Can we use the research expertise available on our research campuses, along with the experience faculty at USM comprehensives have in best practices for incorporating research into their undergraduate-focused learning environments, to leverage greater involvement by faculty and students in research and research-based learning opportunities throughout the System?
- For the USM's larger comprehensives with existing applied doctorates (TU, UMES, SU), how can current areas of expertise in applied research be expanded and strengthened?
  Given the workload expectations for faculty at the USM comprehensives, are there policies and or reporting processes the BOR should look at that would facilitate greater faculty and faculty-led student participation in research?
- For institutions with less of the administrative infrastructure and resources needed to easily participate in going after more sponsored research (e.g., CSU), what can be done to improve their prospects for obtaining more contract and grant funding (partnering with other, more developed research campuses, developing a grants office capacity where none exists, etc.)?
- Should the USM invest some resources in smaller-scaled centers of excellence at comprehensives to build up potential growth and competitiveness in obtaining federal grants (such as the Allied Health-Care Management Training and Simulation Program)?
- How can the USM build on current institutional successes in promoting undergraduate research, including maximizing opportunities for obtaining additional federal support through such programs as NSF's Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU)?

6) *Mitigate risk from decreased federal funding by diversifying the USM's Research portfolio.*
Finally, while Maryland remains a national leader in basic research, most of which is funded through federal agencies, it remains an underperformer in the area of applied research, most of whose support comes primarily from industry. According to the most recent NSF statistics, Maryland as a state ranked just 17th in industry R&D, compared to a 4th place rank in academic R&D. While this difference is largely an artifact of Maryland's location next to the nation's capital and the federal research agencies and the historic focus of its business community, the over emphasis given to federally-funded research, both in the State's R&D portfolio and the USM's, places the USM and Maryland at greater risk in times of slowing federal spending.

Strategies discussed earlier in this paper, such as a more coherent strategy for focusing on specific areas of research need/opportunity and involving more USM comprehensive campuses in research efforts, could help to address this risk. However, more targeted strategies designed to diversify the R&D portfolio should also be explored. One potential way where USM research campuses could encourage greater collaboration between private/corporate labs and their own research faculty would be to open up university academic research facilities to corporate laboratories. By providing the corporations with research space within USM facilities, USM institutions would not only develop relationships with private companies that could help sustain research programs during times of slowdowns in federal funding but also would give USM faculty and students a degree of access to those companies not currently available.

Questions the Board and USM institutions might ask as they further explore this strategy include:

- What would be the fall out, both from the governor's office and Wall Street, if the USM opened up its research laboratory facilities to a public/private partnership?
- What policy changes related to technology transfer, protection of intellectual policy, and licensing would be required to make USM institutions a more attractive partner in private sector research?

III. Concluding Thoughts/Next Steps

Research and innovation carried out by USM institutions will continue to be primary components of the USM's strategic plan to help drive Maryland's economy. Facing an environment in which federal research funding is unlikely to grow – stability in key agency budgets may be the best near term outcome we can hope for – the USM and its institutions must explore new strategies by which they can grow and diversify their R&D portfolio. In addition, where the opportunity exists, USM institutions at all levels of mission complexity—from our most research intensive to those focused primarily on undergraduate education—should be encouraged and supported in their efforts to incorporate research-based learning experiences into their undergraduate and graduate programs. Based on ideas suggested by USM campus research leaders and national R&D experts, this paper has put forth some initial thoughts on strategies the USM could employ to boost its R&D and research-related education efforts in support of the strategic plan. They range from being more strategic in how we target and go after research opportunities to opening up academic research space to private corporations. Over the coming year, the Board and the USM campuses will engage in an extended conversation exploring these and other options as we move to "reboot" the USM research and innovation agenda.

Key Legislative Leaders for the University System of Maryland & Higher Education
For the 2015 Legislative Session

Governor Elect Larry Hogan
Governor of Maryland
State House
Annapolis, MD 21401

Lt. Governor Elect Boyd Rutherford
Lt. Governor of Maryland
State House
Annapolis, MD 21401

President Thomas V.M. Miller Jr.
Senate President
State House
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-841-3700
thomas.v.mike.miller@senate.state.md.us

Speaker Michael E. Busch
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-3800
michael.busch@house.state.md.us

Senator Edward Kasemeyer
Chairman, Senate Budget & Taxation Committee
3 W Miller Senate Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-3653
edward.kasemeyer@senate.state.md.us

Delegate Maggie McIntosh
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee
121 Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-3407

Senator Nancy King
Chair Education Budget Subcommittee
202 James Senate Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-3686
nancy.king@senate.state.md.us

Delegate Adrienne Jones
Chairman, Education Budget Subcommittee
350 Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-

Delegate Anne Kaiser
Chair, Education Subcommittee, Ways and Means Committee
151 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Senator Joan Carter Conway
Chairman, Education, Health & Environmental Affairs
2W Miller Senate Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-
joan.carter.conway@senate.state.md.us

The Honorable Nancy Kopp
State Treasurer
80 Calvert Street
Goldstein Treasury Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Senator Paul Pinsky
Vice Chairman, Education, Health & Environmental Affairs
220 James Senate Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 841-3155
paul.pinsky@senate.state.md.us

The Honorable Peter Franchot
State Comptroller
80 Calvert Street
Goldstein Treasury Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Department of Legislative Services

General Assembly of Maryland

Dates of Interest

2015 SESSION (*Preliminary*)

435th Session

JANUARY						
				1 H	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19 H	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

FEBRUARY						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16 H	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

MARCH						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

APRIL						
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

January	**14**	GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONVENES *(noon, Wednesday)*
		Swearing in of Members
	21	Inauguration of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor *(Wednesday)*
	23	*10th Day* — Final date for Governor to introduce budget bill
	23	*10th Day* — Final date for submission of Executive Orders reorganizing the Executive Branch of State Government; either Chamber may disapprove by resolution within 50 days
		Administration bills introduced in the Senate after this date referred to Senate Rules Committee
	27	*14th Day* — SENATE AND HOUSE BILL REQUEST GUARANTEE DATE
	TBA	Election of the State Treasurer
	TBA	Governor delivers the State of the State Address (noon)
February	**2**	*20th Day* — Final date for Governor to introduce capital budget bill
	6	*24th Day* — SENATE BILL INTRODUCTION DATE
		Senate bills introduced after this date referred to the Senate Rules Committee
	12	Day before House Bill Introduction Date; "Hopper" will close at 5:00 P.M.
	13	*31st Day* — HOUSE BILL INTRODUCTION DATE
		House bills introduced after this date referred to the House Rules and Executive Nominations Committee
	22	*40th Day* — "Green Bag" appointments submitted by Governor *(Delivered on Friday, February 20)*
March	**9**	*55th Day* — Final date for introduction of bills without suspension of Rules
	17	63rd *Day* — Committee Reporting Courtesy Date
	23	Each Chamber's committees to report their own bills by this date
		69th Day — Opposite Chamber Bill Crossover Date
		Each Chamber to send to other Chamber those bills it intends to pass favorably
		Opposite Chamber bills received after this date subject to referral to Rules Committees (Senate Rule 32(c), House Courtesy Date)
April	**6**	*83rd Day* — Budget bill to be passed by both Chambers
	13	*90th Day* — ADJOURNMENT "SINE DIE" *(Monday)*
May	**13**	Final date for an extended session (Wednesday)

POST-SESSION

May	**3**	20th Day after adjournment — Final date for presentment of bills to Governor
June	**2**	30th Day after presentment — Governor to sign/veto bills by this date
June	**1**	Other than emergency bills and as otherwise provided, earliest date for bills to take effect.
July	**1**	Budgetary, tax, and revenue bills to take effect
October	**1**	Usual effective date for bills

HOLIDAYS AND OTHER OBSERVANCES

January	**1**	New Year's Day
	19	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day*
February	**12**	Lincoln's Birthday
	16	Presidents' Day*
	22	Washington's Birthday
March	**25**	Maryland Day
April	**3**	Good Friday
	4	Passover
	5	Easter
May	**25**	Memorial Day*

**State Holiday*

Library and Information Services
Department of Legislative Services

2015 Session Dates

Session dates are established by the Maryland Constitution, statute, rule, and custom as follows:

Convening

Article III, Section 14 of the Maryland Constitution requires the General Assembly to convene on the "second Wednesday of January."

Inauguration of Governor

Article II, Section 1 of the Maryland Constitution states that the term of the Governor shall "commence on the third Wednesday of January next ensuing his election."

Election of State Treasurer

Article VI, Section 1 of the Maryland Constitution requires the State Treasurer to be "appointed on joint ballot by the two Houses of the Legislature at each regular session in which begins the term of the Governor." By custom, the election of the State Treasurer takes place within the first two weeks of opening day.

Budget

Article III, Section 52(3) of the Maryland Constitution requires a newly elected Governor to submit the proposed budget for the next fiscal year to the General Assembly "not later than ten days after the convening of the General Assembly."

Green Bag Appointments

Article II, Section 13 of the Maryland Constitution requires the Governor to submit nominations of civil officers ("Green Bag" appointments) to the Senate "within forty days" from the beginning of each regular session.

Introduction of Legislation

The introduction of legislation is governed by Constitutional provision, rule, and custom. Article III, Section 27 of the Maryland Constitution prohibits the introduction of legislation "during the last thirty-five calendar days" of a regular session, unless permitted by two-thirds vote of the members. This allows 55 days for the normal introduction of bills.

Senate Rule 32(b) and (d)(1) and House Rule 32(b) materially alter the 55/35 day situation. Senate Rule 32(b) requires Senate bills and joint resolutions introduced "after the twenty-fourth calendar day" of the session to be referred to the Senate Rules Committee. Senate Rule 32(d)(1) provides that Senate bills and joint resolutions introduced "after the 10th calendar day" of session on behalf of the Administration, i.e., the Governor, be referred to the Senate Rules Committee. House Rule 32(b) requires that all House bills and joint resolutions introduced "during the last fifty-nine calendar days" of the session (after the thirty-first day) be referred to the House Rules and Executive Nominations Committee. The Senate Rules and House Rules contain further provisions concerning the requirements for forcing legislation out of these committees.

Adoption of Budget Bill

Article III, Section 52(10) of the Maryland Constitution specifies that, if the budget bill has not been acted upon by the legislature at least "seven days before the expiration" of a regular session, the Governor is required to issue a proclamation extending the session for whatever period in the Governor=s judgment is necessary for the passage of the bill. Section 52(10) further stipulates that no matter other than the budget bill is to be considered during the extended session, except a provision for the cost of the extended session.

Reorganization of Executive Branch

Article II, Section 24 of the Maryland Constitution permits the Governor to reorganize the Executive Branch of the State Government through Executive Orders submitted to the General Assembly "within the first ten days" of a regular session. The Executive Orders become effective on the date designated in the Orders, unless the majority of all members of either Chamber specifically concurs in a resolution of disapproval "within fifty days" after the Orders are submitted.

Limitation on Length of Session

Article III, Section 15(1) of the Maryland Constitution permits the General Assembly to continue its session for a period "not longer than ninety days" each year. The General Assembly or the Governor may extend the session for up to thirty days.

Presentment and Signing of Bills

Article III, Section 30 of the Maryland Constitution requires all bills passed during a regular or special session to be presented to the Governor for approval "no later than 20 days after adjournment." The Governor is required to sign a bill within a maximum of "30 days after presentment" if the Governor approves it.

Effective Date of Bills

Article III, Section 31 of the Maryland Constitution requires, unless otherwise provided, that laws passed by the General Assembly take effect on June 1 after the session during which the laws passed. June 1 is the effective date for bond bills, and July 1 is the effective date for budgetary, tax, and revenue bills. By custom, October 1 is the usual effective date for legislation.

For general information, please contact:
Library and Information Services
Department of Legislative Services
90 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Baltimore Area: 410-946-5400/5410
Washington Area: 301-970-5400/5410
Other Maryland Areas: 1-800-492-7122, ext. 5400/5410
TTY: 410-946/301-970-5401
TTY users may also use the Maryland Relay Service
to contact the General Assembly.
E-Mail: libr@mlis.state.md.us
Maryland General Assembly Web site: http://mgaleg.maryland.gov
Department of Legislative Services Web site: http://dls.state.md.us