

BY repealing~~Article — State Finance and Procurement~~~~Section 4-410~~~~Annotated Code of Maryland~~~~(1995 Replacement Volume and 1998 Supplement)~~

BY repealing

Chapter 345 of the Acts of the General Assembly of 1995

Section 4

~~BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,~~~~Article — Education~~~~Section 11-303~~~~Annotated Code of Maryland~~~~(1997 Replacement Volume and 1998 Supplement)~~~~(As enacted by Section 1 of this Act)~~

Preamble

WHEREAS, The Task Force to Study the Governance, Coordination and Funding of the University System of Maryland was charged with examining issues related to the University System 10 years after its creation in 1988. The Task Force completed this examination and submitted its findings and recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, The Task Force found that, despite changes caused by technology which are redefining the delivery of higher education, the goals, principles, and duties of public higher education set forth in the 1988 legislation remain valid, vital and essential. Every institution within the University System of Maryland has made significant progress towards reaching these goals despite less State funding than anticipated due to the recession of the 1990's. However, the Task Force also found that the goals should be augmented and set in priority order; and

WHEREAS, The Task Force clearly affirmed that the State's first priority is the enhancement of the flagship campus, University of Maryland, College Park, to achieve national eminence; and

WHEREAS, The Task Force found that the 1988 legislation envisioned the University System of Maryland as a decentralized system with the Board of Regents, Chancellor and administration responsible for system-wide policy and governance and the Presidents responsible for management of the campuses; and

WHEREAS, The Task Force found that the University System does add value to the quality and goals of higher education in Maryland, and should be fine-tuned, not abandoned. However, the Task Force also found that management authority had not been delegated by the Board to the presidents to the extent envisioned, and that the