

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

## **Minutes**

**September 10, 2008**

The Commission to Develop the Maryland Model for Funding Higher Education held its second meeting of the 2008 interim on Wednesday, September 10, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. in the Appropriations Committee Hearing Room, House Office Building, Annapolis, Maryland.

The following members were present:

Delegate John L. Bohanan, Jr., Chairman  
Mr. Norman R. Augstine, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Ben Birge (for President Susan C. Aldridge)  
Ms. Tina M. Bjarekull  
Lt. Governor Anthony G. Brown  
President Robert L. Caret  
Delegate Norman H. Conway  
Senator Ulysses Currie  
Senator Roy P. Dyson  
Secretary T. Eloise Foster  
President Murray K. "Ray" Hoy  
Dr. Kristina Johnson (for President William R. Brody)  
Senator Edward J. Kasemeyer  
Chancellor William E. Kirwan  
Mr. Larry Letow  
Secretary James E. Lyons, Sr.  
Senator Donald F. Munson  
Delegate John A. Olszewski, Jr.  
President David J. Ramsay  
President Earl S. Richardson  
Mr. H. Clay Whitlow  
Dr. Ann Wiley (for President C. Dan Mote, Jr.)  
Mr. Garland O. Williamson

### **Chairman's Opening Remarks**

Delegate Bohanan welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the designees to introduce themselves. Senator Joan Carter Conway also attended the meeting and Delegate Bohanan welcomed her.

## **Discussion of Interim Schedule**

Although the discussion of the interim schedule was last on the agenda, Delegate Bohanan decided to have the discussion first. He explained that the Commission was scheduled to meet again on October 14, 2008 but many of the HBI Study Panel members were not available on that date. A tentative new date for the meeting is October 27, 2008 and the HBI Study Panel will give its final report at that meeting. Delegate Bohanan asked Commission members to check their schedules and to let him know by the end of the meeting if there were concerns about the new date. He said that the Commission has an aggressive schedule of meetings through the end of the year and he said that the Commission will definitely finish its work by the end of the year.

## **Preliminary Findings from the HBI Study Panel**

Delegate Bohanan introduced Dave Spence as the chair of the HBI Study Panel. Delegate Bohanan said that the panel had been working since May 2008 and the panel was presenting its preliminary report to the Commission today. Delegate Bohanan said that the Commission was indebted to this group of individuals who have given their time to this study. He said that the panel is made up of individuals with the best expertise in this subject nationwide and the Commission could not have hired individuals with better expertise than this panel. Delegate Bohanan thanked the panel on behalf of the Commission and the State of Maryland and said that the preliminary report was the work of many hours and much discussion between the panel members.

Mr. Spence said that it was a privilege to appear before the Commission again and although the panel was slow to form because they waited for the best people, they have made good progress. He said that a few panel members appeared before the Commission in June 2008 and then the panel met at least three times in person, had numerous conference calls, and are very close to a final report. The panel visited seven campuses: the four public HBIs and three TWIs: Salisbury, Towson, and UMBC. Mr. Spence thanked the presidents of each of the campuses the panel visited and said the panel might have a few loose ends to tie up at the campuses but generally the panel is finished with the site visits. Mr. Spence said that while the panel was given a lot of data that was somewhat helpful, the issues are not going to be decided by data.

Mr. Spence said that the panel's main charge was to define comparability and competitiveness and he thinks they have accomplished a broad definition. He said he believes the charge can go further to apply indicators for comparability and competitiveness. He said that a simple straightforward comparison was not enough and the panel needed to go further. He said the panel wanted to go beyond simple comparisons to describe the steps, strategies, and other analyses that would provide a road map for the State in more detail for comparability and competitiveness.

Mr. Spence explained that the panel was reporting on undergraduate education at this meeting and will have a full report on graduate education (particularly doctorate) and also on the issue of facilities at the next meeting in October. He also said that the panel

could report on another issue if the Commission agrees. The other area would be the panel's observations, findings, and recommendations about the entire State process of defining missions, approving programs, budgeting, etc. He said that there are elements of the process over 20 to 25 years in terms of program approvals and funding of those programs that has contributed to the confusion now. He said if it is the will of the Commission the panel will report on this issue at the October meeting.

Mr. Spence stated that the first page of the preliminary report explained the panel's philosophy toward all of its work and not just toward the undergraduate part. He acknowledged that a one-time snapshot of comparability and competitiveness is difficult. He said the panel recognized that the funding of HBIs that had occurred in recent years has been very positive and the State should be commended. He said that the State is trying for a more strategic plan to bring HBIs into comparability and competitiveness and he is not aware of another state that has had the courage to take the initiative to take a further look at what comparability and competitiveness means and how to get there.

Mr. Spence explained that the panel approached comparability and competitiveness in institutions by dividing those concepts into two categories: 1) capacity, which is everything you put into an institution such as facilities, students and faculty; and 2) results/outcomes, which was a focus almost entirely on graduation rates because the panel believed it was the dominant indicator.

The bottom line was that a mechanical comparison across indicators was not helpful in the capacity category. He said the panel felt that a goal and a recommendation should be to have the undergraduate capacity at HBIs provide the opportunity to raise graduation rates to levels approaching the TWIs. He stressed to the Commission that this is a very significant goal. The question is once competitiveness in outcomes (graduation rates) is established, what capacity (inputs) do HBIs need to increase graduation rates comparable to TWIs.

However, Mr. Spence said that the same kind of traditional capacity is not going to achieve this goal. He said that HBIs have a dual mission because they do the same things as other campuses but also serve a disproportionate number of lesser prepared students and students from lower income families. He said that special challenges flow from a dual mission because it is much more difficult to graduate students when they are lower income because they cannot afford school and they tend to drop out or attend school part-time while also working part-time or full-time. This said, there is a significant amount of unmet financial need at HBIs. Additionally, Mr. Spence said the students are less prepared in reading, writing, and math and these are the skills that can be developed if a student receives the right kind of help.

Mr. Spence said the dual mission is a drain on the capacity of HBIs because 1) HBIs cannot charge as much for tuition because otherwise the students would not be able to afford the tuition; 2) of the tuition and fees that HBIs collect, more has to be redirected to financially needy students; and 3) HBIs are expected to devote greater percentages of funds to developmental education.

Mr. Spence said that graduation rates at HBIs are an average of 20% lower than TWIs. An examination of the capacity indicators such as general funds and faculty to student ratio do not show the stark differences that you expect. However, Mr. Spence pointed out that the one part of capacity that makes a difference is student-specific indicators like income and SAT scores. Table A-2 on page 9 of the preliminary report shows that HBI students' SAT scores are 200 to 250 points lower than TWI students' scores. Mr. Spence said "that's the issue in a nutshell."

Mr. Spence said that we cannot just talk about comparable capacity because the HBIs are in a very different position. Mr. Spence directed the Commission's attention to page 5 of the preliminary report and he talked about number 4, which deals with "effective capacity." Mr. Spence also discussed number 5 which says that universities that enroll students with significantly less educational preparation and readiness for college will require greater and different levels of capacity. Mr. Spence also mentioned number 6, which says that HBI capacity will be comparable when an institution has the programs and services to enable it to achieve the outcomes needed.

Also on page 5 of the preliminary report, Mr. Spence began discussing the panel's recommendations. Recommendation 1 is that graduation rates should be the primary criterion determining competitiveness in HBI outcomes or results. Recommendation 2 is that the HBIs as a group need to outline in detail the strategy that enables HBI graduation rates to approach TWI graduation rates. Mr. Spence said that this might include some of what is already being done but, for example, the Access and Success Program has yet to show its real effectiveness so the HBIs should be open to the possibility that the strategy might not be more of the same. He encouraged the group to think outside the box because what we are doing now will not get us where we need to be. He also commented that the one thing that students must have is basic learning skills (reading, writing, and mathematics). He emphasized that if only one recommendation is adopted, it should be this one because it is very important.

Mr. Spence said that recommendation 4 states that the learning skills programs should be based on a common, statewide definition of college readiness in the form of specific statewide standards in reading, writing, and mathematics. Mr. Spence said the goal is to make sure students graduate from high school prepared for college. In the interim, he said that access to programs needs to be provided where the students are, including students already in college, so they can succeed where they are.

Mr. Spence clarified that while recommendation 6 states that increasing the capacity of HBIs in undergraduate education should be the first priority, he recognizes that it is not the only priority. However, while we must address both undergraduate and graduate education at the same time, students cannot go on to graduate school without a good undergraduate education. Mr. Spence said that HBIs play a very important role in undergraduate education in the State. Sixty percent of African Americans enrolled in a public university or college in the State are enrolled at an HBI. Approximately 40% of

the bachelor's degrees awarded by Maryland campuses to African Americans were awarded by HBIs.

Recommendation 7 states that HBIs serve students who disproportionately have greater financial needs; therefore, the panel recommends that need-based student assistance programs be augmented so that affordability is increased for lower-income students at all public universities.

Recommendation 8 makes an observation that HBIs are not yet comparable in facilities but the final report will be more specific regarding facilities.

Delegate Bohanan thanked Mr. Spence and asked the panel to introduce themselves. Ms. Judith Winston said that she is a lawyer and the former General Counsel and Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education and she also served as the Executive Director of President Clinton's Initiative on Race.

Mr. Spence then introduced the other panel members that were present at the meeting. He introduced William DeLauder as the retired president of Delaware State University where he had served for 16 years. He also said that Dr. DeLauder is a scientist. Mr. Spence introduced Franklyn Jenifer as the former president of Howard University and the University of Texas at Dallas. Dr. Jenifer also served as the chancellor of the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education. Mr. Spence introduced James Rosser as the current president of California State University, Los Angeles for the last 31 years. Mr. Spence said that Dr. Rosser's campus is the most diverse in the country.

Delegate Bohanan opened up the meeting for questions. The Lt. Governor asked the panel about recommendation 5. He expressed concern that it is a much broader recommendation than just comparability and competitiveness and he asked how we can ensure that all underprepared students are successful without losing the focus on HBI students. Mr. Spence said that other universities serve students similar to HBI students and any highly effective programs that are generated from this study should be available to all students. He said that 70% of students are not college ready. Dr. Rosser added that an increasing number of black students are going to TWIs. Dr. DeLauder also added that all institutions should have in place what they need for their students to be successful.

Senator Roy Dyson commented that he thought the State had been working on a common, statewide definition of college readiness. Dr. Rosser commented that there is a big difference between high school graduation requirements and college readiness and he cited the example of California high school students only needing eighth grade math to pass the exit exams. Dr. Rosser said we need to work toward graduating better teachers and a significant number of teachers graduate from HBIs.

Senator Joan Carter Conway asked about recommendations 5 and 6. She asked how we meet the needs of low income students if we start focusing on all students. Dr. DeLauder said the intention of recommendation number 5 was to focus on HBI students.

Senator Conway commented that she would like to see the phrase “low income underprepared” instead of just “underprepared.”

President Earl Richardson asked whether the panel had looked at the whole university and had addressed helping HBIs claim a larger share of the best prepared students. Ms. Winston said that HBIs have a dual mission and that HBIs attract both the brightest students of color and the lesser prepared students. Ms. Winston said the dual mission has burdened the HBIs because it prevents them from graduating students at the same rate as the TWIs. She said the dual mission is very beneficial to the State so there must be the capacity at HBIs to do both missions well but the capacity is not currently there.

Dr. Jenifer said that it was the intent of the report to focus on both the brightest and the most challenging students and he apologized if the document was not clear on that point. Dr. Rosser said that increased capacity will help Morgan State University to become competitive. He said the clear intent is to enable the HBIs to become comparable which in turn will make them competitive. This will level the playing field and allow the choice to be the student’s and not at a sacrifice of quality.

Chancellor William Kirwan picked up on Senator Dyson’s point and said that Virginia has worked on establishing measurable standards of college readiness for the state. He also said that he was pleased to see the recommendations on financial aid and he asked if the panel knew where we stand as a State. Mr. Spence said that the panel was impressed by the data Maryland has on this and said that Maryland comes closer than other states in estimating unmet need. Mr. Spence said that his sense is that Maryland was behind but over the last few years Maryland has done better. Since Maryland is a high tuition state, financial aid affects affordability.

Dr. Kristina Johnson commented that all universities in the State are involved in serving minority students. She said that three independent colleges have large percentages of minority students: Sojourner-Douglass has 98%, Columbia Union College has 60% and Capital College has 50%.

Mr. Garland Williamson commented that the report should make very clear that the HBIs do not have the capacity at this point to have graduation rates that are the same as TWIs. He is concerned if graduation rates are used as a benchmark too soon, HBIs will be at a disadvantage. He wanted to make certain that graduation rates will be phased in as a benchmark because the HBIs have so far to go. He said that at Baltimore City Community College 95% of the students are underprepared but after they receive remediation the students do just as well or better than the other students. Dr. Jenifer responded that improving capacity will be first and later benchmarks will be addressed after institutions have had time to build capacity.

Dr. DeLauder said that if HBIs are given the necessary resources they can perform. Mr. Williamson said that the panel should make that point very clear in its report. He said he does not want people to say “we built you new buildings and we gave

you remedial help, now graduate as many students as TWIs.” He urged the panel to make clear in the report that the process will take a while.

Mr. Norman Augustine thanked the panel for its contribution and said that while graduation rates are an important parameter, the HBIs could tighten their admission requirements which would help graduation rates but would hurt the people we are trying to serve. Mr. Spence replied that in his experience, as long as student funding follows enrollment, there are no concerns about access.

Dr. Rosser said that 70% of students are not prepared for college and students must be either workforce or collegiate ready. He said that the Commission should state emphatically that until students no longer need remediation, the State commits to remedial education.

Delegate John Olszewski asked if we should be exploring K-12 statewide standards. He said that when remediation is necessary in college it causes the students to take longer to graduate. Mr. Spence said that the goal is to have students come out of high school prepared. He said that no state has done the entire continuum of standards and high school based assessments. He said that the Southern Regional Education Board has a Statewide Standards Initiative and Virginia, Texas and Kentucky are participants. He invited Maryland to join because of Maryland’s progressive stance in education in the nation.

Dr. Ray Hoy said that he knows that capacity could mean facilities but also could mean programs and services. He asked if the panel had a list of programs and services. Mr. Spence said that there are very few examples because the panel is setting a very ambitious goal. He said the goal of having HBI students’ graduation rates approach the TWI students’ graduation rates is very ambitious. He said there are a few examples of best practices and he asked Dr. Rosser to comment on the program at California State, Los Angeles. Dr. Rosser said that 85% of the students entering California State, Los Angeles need remediation in reading and writing. Ninety percent of those students are remediated in one year and they do just as well as students who did not need remediation. He said this kind of program might require more money or resources could be reallocated to a more focused, measured goal like this.

Secretary James Lyons thanked the panel for its work and asked if the panel was also going to address comparability as it may relate to graduate education and facilities. Mr. Spence said yes. Dr. Lyons also commented that the panel was probably not going to give the Commission one easy definition of comparability and competitiveness and Mr. Spence said probably not. Dr. Rosser said there are capacity issues at the graduate level also and Dr. DeLauder said the panel used the same approach generally in undergraduate and graduate education. Secretary Lyons asked if this will collectively get the panel to a definition of comparability and competitiveness and he was told yes.

Delegate Bohanan thanked the panel and said he was looking forward to having the panel back before the Commission on October 27.

## **Closing Remarks and Adjournment**

Delegate Bohanan adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:15 p.m.

Prepared by: Dana Tagalicod