



3300 Metzert Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1690

Office of The Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance

Telephone: 301.445.1923
Facsimile: 301.445.2761

TO: Funding Guidelines Internal Committee

FROM: Joseph F. Vivona

DATE: August 23, 1999

RE: Final Draft of the Funding Guidelines

I am enclosing the final draft of the funding guidelines adopted by the MHEC workgroup at the August 11 meeting. There are no surprises here. This document, in "COMAR" format, reflects what we had agreed to in previous meetings.

MHEC's Finance Policy Committee will vote on the guidelines at its August 25 meeting. As you know, the development of the supplemental list for the FY 2001 budget was based on the guidelines. I urge you to share this document with all interest parties in your campus.

The guidelines' performance component will be driven by *Managing for Results*. You will receive more information on this process shortly.

Attachments

transmittal of guidelines (1).doc

University of Maryland, Baltimore 1807 • University of Maryland, College Park 1856 • Bowie State University 1865 • Towson University 1866
University of Maryland Eastern Shore 1886 • Frostburg State University 1898 • Coppin State College 1900 • Salisbury State University 1925
University of Baltimore 1925 • University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science 1925 • University of Maryland University College 1947
University of Maryland, Baltimore County 1966 • University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute 1985

Maryland Higher Education Commission

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING GUIDELINES

I. Authority

Chapter 515 of the Acts of 1999 and Section 11-105 (g) (4) of the Education Article of the Maryland Annotated Code require the Maryland Higher Education Commission to develop operating funding guidelines based on current and aspirational peer comparisons and other appropriate factors. These guidelines must be developed in consultation with all segments of higher education, including the presidents of home institutions.

II. Definitions

A. "Accountability factors" means a set of performance indicators selected by the presidents of each home institution and approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission for the purpose of comparing performance against current and aspirational peers.

B. "Adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment" means a proportionate number of students used to determine the appropriate level of State support for each home institution, as determined in Section IV.

C. "Aspirational peers" means a set of at least five institutions selected by each home institution to determine the adequacy of funding and performance. Aspirational peers are those institutions that the home institution aspires to emulate in performance and reputation.

D. "Cluster analysis" means the mathematical process of determining, on the basis of data, those institutions which are closest to the home institution on key variables taken collectively. The variables include program offerings, size, location, student mix, and diversity.

E. "Current Accountability peers" means a list of at least ten current funding peers selected by each home institution's president and validated by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

F. "Current funding peers" means a set of institutions identified through a series of cluster analyses that closely resemble the home institution on a series of variables such as program offerings, size, location, student mix, and diversity.

G. "Eligible home institution" means a home institution that meets or exceeds the performance of its ten current accountability peers based on selected

accountability factors.

H. "Historically Black Institutions" means the following public senior higher education institutions:

1. Bowie State University;
2. Coppin State College; and
3. University of Maryland Eastern Shore.

I. "Home institutions" means one or more of the following public senior higher education institutions under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland and the Board of Regents of Morgan State University:

1. University of Maryland, Baltimore;
2. University of Maryland, College Park;
3. Bowie State University;
4. Towson University;
5. University of Maryland Eastern Shore;
6. Coppin State College;
7. University of Baltimore;
8. Frostburg State University;
9. Salisbury State University;
10. University of Maryland University College; and
11. University of Maryland Baltimore County.

J. "Resources per full-time equivalent student" means unrestricted state appropriations and tuition and fee revenues (as reported annually by the Integrated Postsecondary Data Systems Finance Survey, Part A) divided by the number of adjusted full-time equivalent students.

K. "Projected tuition and mandatory fees" means the revenue projections for each home institution as approved by the institution's governing board and based on estimated tuition revenue and mandatory fees such as application fees, graduation fees, laboratory fees, students fees, and other mandatory fees as determined by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

L. "Variation" means a single cluster analysis using specified variables. The variables used in each variation are provided in Section V paragraph C.

III. Scope and Applicability

These funding guidelines shall apply to:

All public senior higher education institutions and research centers under the jurisdiction of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents:

- a. University of Maryland, Baltimore;
- b. University of Maryland, College Park;
- c. Bowie State University;
- d. Towson University;
- e. University of Maryland Eastern Shore;
- f. Coppin State College;
- g. University of Baltimore;
- h. Frostburg State University;
- i. Salisbury State University;
- j. University of Maryland University College; and
- k. University of Maryland Baltimore County.
- l. University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
- m. University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute

IV. Adjusted Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment

A. The adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment shall be used to calculate the resources per full-time equivalent student for current funding peers and aspirational peers. The resources per full-time equivalent student shall, in turn, be used to calculate the level of State general fund support for home institutions.

B. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment shall be based on fall headcount enrollment data, taken from the Integrated Postsecondary Data Systems national database, according to the following formula:

$$\text{adjusted FTE students} = \text{full-time students} + 1/3 \text{ part-time students.}$$

C. The adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment for the University of Baltimore and its peer institutions shall be weighted to reflect lower division undergraduates (1.0), upper division undergraduates (1.5), and professional students (1.8). (If the University of Baltimore's mission changes permitting the institution to admit first-time freshman students, these weights shall be removed.)

D. The adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment for the University of Maryland, College Park and its aspirational peers shall be weighted to reflect the higher cost of medical programs. One medical student shall equal four full-time equivalent students.

E. The adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment for the University of Maryland, Baltimore and its composite peers shall be weighted to reflect the full instructional cost ratios per full-time equivalent student. Each first professional student shall be equal to four full-time equivalent students.

F. The adjusted full-time equivalent student enrollment for the University of Maryland University College and its peer institutions shall be based on fall headcount enrollment data, taken from the Integrated Postsecondary Data Systems national database, according to the following formula:

$$\text{adjusted FTE students} = (\text{full-time students} + 1/2 \text{ part-time students})$$

This adjusted FTE student count at University of Maryland University College will be reduced by 15% to reflect the limited facility needs of the institution.

G. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually project future enrollment for each home institution in accordance with this section.

V. Selection of Current Peers

A. Current peers shall be identified for each home institution except the University of Maryland, College Park.

B. Current peers institutions shall be selected from:

1. public senior higher education institutions; and
2. within the same Carnegie Classification as the home institution.

C. Current peers shall be identified using the following six cluster variations:

1. Variation I shall contain the following nine variables:

- a. Total unrestricted revenues minus state appropriations per full-time equivalent student;
- b. Total headcount enrollment;
- c. Total FTE enrollment;
- d. Graduate and first professional students as % of total headcount enrollment;
- e. Number of baccalaureate degrees;
- f. Number of master's degrees;
- g. Number of doctoral degrees;
- h. Number of first professional degrees; and
- i. African-American, Hispanic, Native American students as % of total headcount enrollment.

2. Variation II shall contain the following eight variables:
 - a. Total headcount enrollment;
 - b. Total FTE enrollment;
 - c. Graduate and first professional students as % of total headcount enrollment;
 - d. Number of baccalaureate degrees;
 - e. Number of master's degrees;
 - f. Number of doctoral degrees;
 - g. Number of first professional degrees; and
 - h. African-American, Hispanic, Native American students as % of total headcount enrollment.

3. Variation III shall contain the following five variables:
 - a. Total headcount enrollment;
 - b. Part-time students as % of total enrollment;
 - c. Baccalaureate degrees as % of total degrees;
 - d. African-American Hispanic, Native American students as % of total headcount enrollment; and
 - e. Total unrestricted revenues minus state appropriations per full-time equivalent student.

4. Variation IV shall contain the following four variables:
 - a. Total headcount enrollment;
 - b. Part-time students as % of total enrollment;
 - c. Baccalaureate degrees as % of total degrees; and
 - d. African-American Hispanic, Native American students as % of total headcount enrollment.

5. Variation V shall contain the following eighteen variables:
 - a. Total FTE enrollment;
 - b. Engineering degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - c. Physical science degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - d. Math and computer science degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - e. Life science degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - f. Agricultural sciences degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - g. Biological sciences degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - h. Medical sciences degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - i. Other life sciences degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
 - j. Psychology degrees as % of total degrees awarded;

- k. Social science degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- l. Humanities degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- m. Art and music degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- n. Architecture degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- o. Education degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- p. Business degrees as % of total degrees awarded;
- q. Law degrees as % of total degrees awarded; and
- r. Distance in miles to closest Metropolitan Statistical Area of at least 250,000.

6. Variation VI shall apply to historically black institutions and shall contain the following three variables:

- a. Total headcount enrollment;
- b. Part-time students as % of total enrollment; and
- c. Baccalaureate degrees as % of total degrees.

D. The twenty institutions closest to the home institution based on each variation shall be identified as the home institution's current funding peers.

VI. Selection of Current Accountability Peers

- A. The president of each home institution shall select ten peers from the list of current funding peers for the purpose of comparing performance.
- B. The president of each home institution shall provide written justification to the Maryland Higher Education Commission for the ten peers selected in paragraph A of this section.
- C. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall validate the ten current accountability peers selected by each president.

VII. Selection of Aspirational Peers

- A. The president of each home institution shall select at least five aspirational peers consistent with the institution's approved mission statement and the State Plan for Higher Education.
- B. The president of each home institution shall provide written justification for the aspirational peers selected in paragraph A of this section.
- C. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall approve the aspirational peers selected by the president of each home institution.

VIII. Resources per Full-Time Equivalent Student for Current Peers

A. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute the 75th percentile of resources per full-time equivalent student appropriated to current peers of each home institution based on the latest national data.

B. The resources per full-time equivalent student identified in paragraph A of this section shall be adjusted using the Higher Education Price Index four-year compound annual rate and shall be used to estimate the funding gap between each home institution and its current funding peers.

IX. Resources per Full-Time Equivalent Student for Aspirational Peers

A. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute the unweighted average percentile of resources per full-time equivalent student appropriated to aspirational peers of each home institution based on the latest national data.

B. The resources per full-time equivalent student identified in paragraph A of this section shall be adjusted using the Higher Education Price Index four-year compound annual rate and shall be used to estimate the funding gap between each home institution and its aspirational funding peers.

X. Computation of Funding Guidelines Based on Current Peer Comparisons

A. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute funding guidelines based on current funding peer comparisons for each home institution by multiplying the adjusted resources per full-time equivalent student as determined in Section VIII for all current peers by the projected enrollment as determined in Section IV paragraph F and subtracting the projected tuition and mandatory fees.

B. Notwithstanding paragraph A, the funding guidelines per full-time equivalent student at each home institution shall not be less than \$5,000, except for the University of Maryland, University College.

XI. Computation of Funding Guidelines Based on Aspirational Peer Comparisons

The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute funding guidelines based on aspirational peer comparisons for eligible home institutions by multiplying the adjusted resources per full-time equivalent student as determined in Section IX for all aspirational peers by the projected enrollment as determined in Section IV paragraph F and subtracting the projected tuition and mandatory fees.

XII. Funding Guidelines for FY 2001

Except as provided in Sections XIV, XV, and XVI, in fiscal year 2001, the funding guidelines for each home institution shall be equal to the result obtained in Section X.

XIII. Funding Guidelines for FY 2002 and thereafter

A. Except as provided in Sections XIV, XV, and XVI and paragraph B of this section, in fiscal 2002 and thereafter, the funding guidelines for each home institution shall be based on the result obtained in Section X.

B. 1. If a home institution's performance on the accountability factors identified in Section XVII meets or exceeds the performance of its current accountability peers, the home institution's funding guidelines shall be computed based on current and aspirational peer comparisons as computed in Section X and XI, respectively.

2. Aspirational peer comparisons will be integrated into the funding guidelines for eligible home institutions on an incremental basis beginning in fiscal year 2002 according to the following weights:

First Eligible Year: current peer at the 75th percentile = 90% weight
aspirational peers at the unweighted average = 10%
weight

Second Eligible Year: current at the 75th percentile = 80% weight
aspirational peers at the unweighted average = 20%
weight

Third Eligible Year: current peer at the 75th percentile = 70%
weight
aspirational peers at the unweighted average = 30%
weight

3. The integration of aspirational peer comparisons into the funding guidelines shall be capped at no more than 30% for each home institution.

XIV. Funding Guidelines for the University of Maryland, College Park

In fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the funding guidelines for the University of Maryland, College Park shall equal the result obtained in Section XI.

XV. Funding Guidelines for the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science

A. Except as provided in paragraph B of this section, in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the funding guidelines for the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science shall be equal to the institution's prior year appropriation as determined in paragraph C of this Section multiplied by the percentage increase in the funding guidelines computed for the University of Maryland College Park in accordance with Section XIV.

B. In any fiscal year that the percentage increase in the funding guidelines computed for the University of Maryland College Park in accordance with Section XIV is greater than the average percentage increase in the funding guidelines for all University System of Maryland institutions, the funding guidelines for the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science shall be equal to the institution's prior year appropriation multiplied by the average percentage increase in the funding guidelines for all University System of Maryland institutions.

C. Prior Year appropriations for the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science shall be adjusted to reflect on-going operating appropriations and not initial start-up appropriations for new programs or other one-time initiatives.

XVI. Funding Guidelines for the University of Maryland, Baltimore

A. In fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the funding guidelines for the University of Maryland, Baltimore shall be based on the unweighted average percentile of five composite peers selected by the six professional schools utilizing defining characteristics such as: size, location, programmatic structure, national reputation, and other key variables.

B. Composite Peers shall be selected from the Carnegie Research I and the Specialized-Medical institution classifications. Each peer selected shall contain a medical school and at least three of the other five professional schools.

C. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute the unweighted average percentile of resources per full-time equivalent student appropriated to composite peers based on the latest national data.

D. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall annually compute funding guidelines based on composite peer comparisons for eligible home institutions by multiplying the adjusted resources per full-time equivalent student by the projected enrollment as determined in Section IV paragraph F and subtracting the projected tuition and mandatory fees.

XVII. Accountability Factors

- A. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall approve the accountability factors developed and proposed by each home institution, in consultation with the presidents and the University System of Maryland.
- B. The accountability factors shall be in-line with the Managing For Results accountability process with an emphasis on outcome oriented indicators.
- C. The benchmarks for the accountability factors shall be the home institution's ten current accountability peers as determined in Section VI and/or approved aspirational peers, if applicable.
- D. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall prepare a report annually on each home institution's performance, in accordance with this section.
- E. If the home institution's performance on several key accountability factors is below the performance of its peers, the institution's president and governing board shall submit a report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission which shall include an analysis of the institution's deficiencies and a strategic plan to improve performance.

XVIII. Efficiency and Cost Containment

Each home institution shall submit a report to the Maryland Higher Education Commission that focuses on the following cost containment classifications:

- a. **Cost Savings:** The home institution shall report any item that represents a reduction in current operating expenses.
- b. **Strategic Reallocation:** The home institution shall report any item that redirects current resources toward a campus priority or critical need.
- c. **Cost Avoidance:** The home institution shall report any item that meets the following two conditions. First, the item represents a potential cost for a demonstrable unmet need. Second, the cost is avoided and the need is satisfied.
- d. **Revenue Enhancement:** The home institution shall report on any enhanced funding streams that will add to the fund balance. If additional revenue is created and used for a spending purpose, the amount shall fall into one of the previous categories discussed above.

w:\budget\outlineI.doc

percent of total degrees. The 20 institutions closest to the Maryland institution in each variable are chosen as peers, for a total of 50 to 60 peer institutions.

The selection group for most institutions was limited to public four-year colleges and universities within the same Carnegie Classification. The following table shows the Carnegie Classification for each Maryland public four-year college and university.

**Maryland Four-year Public Colleges and Universities
Carnegie Classifications: 2005 Basic**

Institution Name	Carnegie Classification 2005: Basic
Bowie State University	Master's - Larger Programs
Coppin State University	Master's - Medium Programs
Frostburg State University	Master's - Larger Programs
Morgan State University	Doctoral/Research Universities
Salisbury University	Master's - Larger Programs
Towson University	Master's - Larger Programs
University of Baltimore	Master's - Larger Programs
University of Maryland-Baltimore	Special Focus - Medical Schools and Centers
University of Maryland-Baltimore County	Research - High Activity
University of Maryland-College Park	Research - Very High Activity
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Master's - Smaller Programs
University of Maryland-University College	Master's - Larger Programs
St Mary's College of Maryland	Baccalaureate - Arts & Sciences

Selections and Adjustments based on Institutional Appeals

Towson University

Towson University was allowed to select institutions from both the Master's Larger Programs and the Doctoral Research University classifications. This was allowed because the newly restructured Carnegie Classifications split the previous selection group of institutions across two classifications. In order to remain consistent with institutions that were included in the funding peer and performance peer groups, both classifications were necessary for Towson University.

To determine whether to allow peer institutions from more than one Carnegie Classification into the peer group for Towson, MHEC staff met with the Provost and Director of Institutional Research for Towson University and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance from the University System of Maryland Office. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the funding guideline methodology and peer selection process. Following the meeting, Towson made a proposal to include institutions from both Carnegie Classifications in the funding peer group.

In reviewing Towson University's proposal, staff looked at several factors. Staff first looked at the proposed peer group in comparison to the institutions that were included in the prior peer group for level of consistency in the peer groups. This review showed that over two-thirds of the institutions in the prior peer group were in the newly selected group.

Second, the groups were reviewed for their overall closeness to Towson in the variables within each of the selection variations. The lowest average distances in these variations belonged to the group proposed by Towson containing both Master's – Larger Programs (ML) and Doctoral Research Universities (DRU). Next, staff looked at the proposed funding level for the two peer groups. Both proposed funding levels were relatively close.

Finally, staff reviewed performance information for Towson against its set of performance peers for the past five years. The review showed that Towson outperformed the peers in several of the measures, including second-year retention and six-year graduation rates.

Based upon MHEC's analysis of institutional data and Towson's proposal, staff concluded that the proposed group of funding peers was acceptable. The peer group is shown in Table 5.

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

MHEC staff followed a similar process for the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC). MHEC staff met with the Provost, the Vice President of Administration and Finance and several Directors for UMBC as well as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance from the University System of Maryland Office. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the funding guideline methodology and peer selection process. During the meeting, UMBC and USMO agreed to perform an alternative analysis of peer institutions to include both Research-High (RH) and Research-Very High (RVH) institutions whose research levels were above a specific level. The result was a proposal from UMBC to include specific institutions from both classifications in the funding peer group

Staff reviewed the proposal on similar factors as it had reviewed in the Towson proposal. First, staff looked at the proposed peer group in comparison to the institutions that were included in the prior peer group for level of consistency in the peer groups. This review showed that over half of the institutions in the prior peer group were in the newly selected group.

Second, the groups were reviewed for their overall closeness to UMBC in the variables within each of the selection variations. The group proposed by UMBC containing both RH and RVH institutions had lower average distances in three of the five variations. Next, staff looked at proposed funding level for the two peer groups. Funding proposed by the proposed group was about \$1,300 per FTE higher than the straight selection from the combined classifications.

Finally, staff reviewed performance of UMBC against its set of performance peers for the past five years. The review showed that UMBC outperformed the peers in several of the measures, including second-year retention and six-year graduation rates for minorities and African-Americans, percent of minority and African-American undergraduate average growth rate in federal R&D expenditures and awards per 100 faculty.

**Table 4. Salisbury University
Funding Peers for FY 2010 Guidelines**

UnitID	Institution Name	AFTES Fall 2006	State Appropriations and Tuition and Fees per FTE FY 2007	Percent Rank		HEPI
163851	Salisbury University	6,643	11,635	42.30%		
101879	University of North Alabama	5,625	11,581			
106704	University of Central Arkansas	10,912	10,745	75th Percentile		
123572	Sonoma State University	7,305	12,868	\$ 13,066	FY 2007	3.4%
130776	Western Connecticut State University	4,834	14,309	13,536	FY 2008	3.6%
138789	Armstrong Atlantic State University	4,917	9,992	14,078	FY 2009	4.0%
139861	Georgia College & State University	5,330	10,610	14,598	FY 2010	3.7%
141264	Valdosta State University	9,256	9,018			
144892	Eastern Illinois University	10,833	10,850			
148654	University of Illinois at Springfield	3,032	13,903			
149772	Western Illinois University	11,979	12,998			
151342	Indiana University-South Bend	5,031	11,392			
151379	Indiana University-Southeast	4,262	11,066			
154095	University of Northern Iowa	10,900	14,427			
155025	Emporia State University	4,917	11,886			
155681	Pittsburg State University	6,036	9,850			
159717	McNeese State University	7,067	8,553			
160038	Northwestern State University of Louisiana	7,403	9,637			
167987	University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth	7,561	15,957			
179557	Southeast Missouri State University	8,119	11,398			
183080	Plymouth State University	4,644	12,486			
184782	Rowan University	8,145	17,769			
187134	The College of New Jersey	6,307	20,467			
196121	SUNY College at Brockport	7,138	13,706			
196149	SUNY College at Cortland	6,358	13,066			
196158	SUNY at Fredonia	5,148	13,581			
196176	SUNY College at New Paltz	6,597	15,113			
196194	SUNY College at Oswego	7,410	12,257			
196246	SUNY College at Plattsburgh	5,751	13,648			
199218	University of North Carolina-Wilmington	10,883	14,535			
207041	East Central University	3,650	9,374			
210146	Southern Oregon University	3,981	9,851			
210429	Western Oregon University	4,184	9,108			
211158	Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	8,037	11,945			
211361	California University of Pennsylvania	6,850	12,166			
211644	Clarion University of Pennsylvania	5,695	12,141			
212115	East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	6,144	12,425			
212160	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	6,583	11,217			
213349	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	9,110	11,433			
214041	Millersville University of Pennsylvania	7,221	12,987			
216010	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	6,731	11,752			
216038	Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	7,619	12,215			
217864	Citadel Military College of South Carolina	2,642	16,900			
218964	Winthrop University	5,386	14,678			
221740	The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	7,655	11,878			
228802	The University of Texas at Tyler	4,635	11,810			
229814	West Texas A & M University	5,701	11,307			
232423	James Madison University	16,486	11,325			
233277	Radford University	8,559	10,686			
234827	Central Washington University	9,673	11,690			
240329	University of Wisconsin-La Crosse	8,834	9,236			
240365	University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	10,080	8,634			
433660	Florida Gulf Coast University	6,584	11,893			

Each segment of higher education receives State funds annually through different methods. Funding to the public four-year institutions is based on several components, including; institutional budgets, funding guidelines, initiatives and State revenue. These are all considered in decisions are made by the Governor in the annual budget bill and by the General Assembly through the annual State budget process.

The University System of Maryland and Morgan State University

The University System of Maryland (USM) received \$1.056 billion in State funding for fiscal 2011, or an increase of 1.8 percent, over fiscal 2010. The increase to USM allowed the system to limit the increase to resident undergraduate tuition to 3 percent for the 2011 academic year.

The fiscal 2011 appropriation for Morgan State University was \$70.2 million. Morgan’s increase to resident undergraduate tuition was also limited to 3 percent for 2011.

In addition to the State appropriation, the University System of Maryland reverted over \$133 million in funds from the System fund balance and Morgan State reverted \$1.7 million to the State General Fund in fiscal 2010. Another \$11.7 million will be transferred from USM and \$750,574 will be transferred from Morgan State for furlough savings in fiscal 2011.

Operating Funding Guidelines

The University System of Maryland’s and Morgan State University’s operating budget requests are compared in relation to the operating funding guidelines. Funding and performance of each Maryland institution is compared to a set of national peer institutions that are similar to the Maryland institution in mission, size, program mix, enrollment composition, and other characteristics. The guidelines are used to inform the budget process with respect to funding levels and allocations and do not represent a request for an appropriation.

**Table 1. Maryland Public Colleges and Universities
Funding Guideline Attainment: FY 2006 - 2011**

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Institutions	Attainment	Attainment	Attainment	Attainment	Attainment	Attainment
Bowie State University	52%	94%	74%	86%	74%	62.8%
Coppin State University	70%	108%	93%	100%	112%	101.7%
Frostburg State University	78%	90%	82%	91%	77%	67.5%
Salisbury University	74%	104%	79%	77%	65%	63.8%
Towson University	80%	100%	90%	87%	68%	63.8%
University of Baltimore	80%	141%	132%	106%	50%	44.7%
UM Baltimore	53%	72%	73%	74%	61%	54.9%
UM Baltimore County	64%	81%	74%	88%	65%	60.6%
UM Biotechnology Institute	74%	88%	76%	72%	75%	N/A
UM Center for Env. Science	68%	81%	82%	83%	76%	71.0%
UM College Park	68%	82%	78%	79%	73%	70.5%
UM Eastern Shore	73%	99%	88%	82%	69%	62.3%
UM University College	34%	40%	61%	39%	46%	42.7%
USM Office						
USM Total	65%	84%	80%	80%	70%	65.8%
Morgan State University	75%	91%	95%	96%	85%	75.7%
Total	66%	84%	81%	81%	70%	66.3%