California Postsecondary Education Commission

Summary of Higher Education Accountability Statutes in Other States

At its September 7 meeting, the Commission adopted the report entitled "Prospectus: Developing a Framework for Accountability in California's Higher Education System." In order to move that prospectus forward, Commission staff engaged the Public Law Research Institute at the Hastings College of the Law to develop a summary of state statutes on higher education accountability.

This update provides a written summary of accountability efforts in other states and includes an oral presentation by the Institute at the December 14 Commission meeting.

The Commission advises the Governor and Legislature on higher education policy and fiscal issues. Its primary focus is to ensure that the state's educational resources are used effectively to provide Californians with postsecondary education opportunities. More information about the Commission is available at www.cpec.ca.gov.

Draft Commission Update

Forward

Implementing a viable accountability framework for California is one of the Commission's top priorities. Budget allocations for higher education are shrinking and public colleges and universities are feeling pressed to accommodate the influx of students as the children of baby boomers reach college-age. The State must take steps to ensure that public dollars are utilized in the most efficient and effective manner possible so that the greatest number of students can benefit from an affordable college education.

California Efforts

Last September, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 1331, an attempt to implement an accountability framework for higher education. SB 1331 was the product of months of collaboration between legislators, research analysts, accountability experts, and faculty and administrators from the segments of higher education. It outlined statewide goals and performance measures regarding educational opportunity, participation, success, and public benefit. SB 1331 was the latest in a number of efforts to implement policy that would hold the systems of higher education accountable for the quality of instruction they provide and the efficiency with which they provide it.

Other accountability efforts included Assembly Bill 1808, which specified several performance measures for the systems of higher education to report on, the California State University's Cornerstones Report, and the "Compacts" or "Partnerships" between the systems and the gubernatorial administrations. The perceived effectiveness of these efforts has been questioned. Some question these efforts because they fail to clearly articulate State policy

goals. Meanwhile, many states have paved the way in crafting legislation for statewide accountability for higher education, and there are numerous models and best practices to examine and consider.

At the September Commission meeting, Commission members adopted *Prospectus: Developing a Framework for Accountability in California's Higher Education System* (Commission Report 04-11). This prospectus discusses several issues that must be considered as California moves forward with implementing a framework for accountability. The efforts of other states are a useful guide in addressing the importance of goal setting, developing appropriate performance indicators, working collaboratively, leaving legislation loose enough to incorporate change, and many other "best practice" rules to follow.

First Steps

In its prospectus, the Commission expressed the desire to forge partnerships with other interested parties to research and analyze the higher education accountability policies and practices of other states. Through meaningful partnerships, the Commission hopes to pool a diverse community of experts to research, analyze, and make sound recommendations regarding an accountability structure. The Public Law Research Institute at the Hastings College of the Law provides an excellent opportunity for CPEC regarding federal and state statutes on higher education accountability. It examined which government entity was designated the task of implementing accountability, how detailed the goals are, the inclusion of performance measures, and the connection between funding and success in achieving goals. The objective of obtaining this examination of other states is to help determine patterns or anomalies, changes that have been made, inefficiencies that have been corrected, in order to present a route for success in the development of a California higher education accountability framework.

The Institute report focuses on four primary areas regarding accountability in various states. In examining ***Statutory Data***, the report breaks down the legislative language to designate a government agency with oversight responsibilities of accountability implementation. This section of the report provides information on when accountability statutes were developed, who has authority to define performance measure criteria, and how implementation is enforced. Another area of focus is ***Statutory Goals***, which details each state's accountability goals, if in fact goals have been set. The ***Performance Goals and Measures*** component goes beyond the statutory goals section by specifying the states have that specific measures tied to statewide goals. This section provides evidence that some states are very specific in their legislative direction for accountability. A fourth section, entitled ***Reporting Requirements***, essentially breaks down which states are mandated to publicly release accountability findings and which are not.

Next Steps

The next step in the process is for CPEC staff to examine this information to determine best legislative approaches. Due to the difficulty in measuring the success of a framework based on legislation alone, staff will also conduct research that goes beyond what is statutorily mandated. Staff will also read accountability reports that are produced, talk with higher education experts in various states to determine how closely statutes were followed, and initiate discussions with lawmakers regarding the usefulness of these reports in state decision making. The progression of implementing a framework for accountability is a multi-layered, ongoing process that requires diverse expertise.

PUBLIC LAW RESEARCH INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE LAW

A Survey of Higher Education Accountability Statutes

by

John H. Lee, Hastings Class of 2005
Miriam Shapira, Hastings Class of 2006
Professor David J. Jung

PLRI Reports
December 6, 2004

PLRI Reports are produced by students and faculty at Hastings College of the Law. The views expressed do not represent the views or policies of Hastings College of the Law, its Board of Directors or its faculty.

Public Law Research Institute
UC Hastings College of the Law
200 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 565-4671
(415 565-4884 (fax)
www.uchastings.edu/ plri

A SURVEY OF STATE HIGHER EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILTY STATUTES

John H. Lee, Hastings Class of 2005
Miriam Shapira, Hastings Class of 2006
Professor David J. Jung
December 6, 2004

Introduction

While the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act has raised the stakes for public elementary and high schools by instituting reporting requirements and imposing clear consequences for failure to meet standards, accountability in public higher education systems is not nearly so advanced, centrally organized, or widespread. Twenty-three states, however, do have some sort of accountability statute on the books.

At CPEC's request, the Public Law Research Institute has examined these states' efforts to legislate accountability in higher education. In addition, we reviewed reports written by institutions in thirty-one states, some written to comply with specific accountability statutes, and others prepared at an institution's or agency's own initiative. This report describes our initial conclusions. A final report will include a comprehensive matrix comparing the existing mandates for accountability and an appendix containing the text of key statutory provisions from each state.

As might be expected, each state's statute is unique. Nonetheless, five key questions emerged from our analysis:

- Is the statute itself comprehensive, or does it simply delegate the task of defining goals and measuring progress to an agency or to the institutions?
- If the statute itself defines goals, what are they and how specifically are they defined?
- Does the statute define performance measures by which progress toward a goal can be assessed?
- What sort of reporting mechanisms are used to track progress?
- What, if any, sorts of enforcement mechanisms are used to hold institutions accountable?

Varying State Approaches to Accountability

A higher education accountability statute is a statute that expressly requires a performance accountability tracking system for at least some of the state's postsecondary education institutions. State higher education accountability statutes vary considerably in their approach to achieving accountability. Indeed, each state's statute is virtually unique.

In part, this may be because the movement toward accountability in public higher education is relatively recent. Of the twenty-three states with statutes, six enacted their statutes

in 2000 or later. Three additional states significantly amended their statutes in or after 2000. Thus, while non-governmental organizations like the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) are actively studying accountability in higher education, there does not yet appear to be any "model legislation" upon which states can draw in designing an accountability statute.

Further, the size of the public university system varies widely across the fifty states. Large states with highly differentiated systems of higher education require a more complex system to keep tabs on all the system's elements.

Finally, the variability in approach may also be a function of the wide variety of governing structures for higher education. Models of governance and levels of autonomy within systems of higher education vary so widely that uniformity may be neither possible nor desirable. Instead, the key to an effective system of accountability in higher education may lie in accommodating the state's particular model of governance.

Broadly speaking, states may follow one of four models of governance in higher education[1]:

- **Segmented:** branches or levels of the post-secondary education system have separate governing boards, each of which acts independently, without any central agency to coordinate their actions.
- **Unified:** a single board or agency governs all postsecondary education.
- **Coordinating:** a central agency oversees multiple university governing boards.
- **Cabinet:** higher education is governed entirely by the executive branch.

These categories may be helpful in explaining the states' choices of different approaches to accountability provisions. First, in segmented systems, with independent governing boards, it is rare to see a statewide accountability statute. Of the eight states with segmented governance structures, only Minnesota has a statutory provision for accountability, and even there the governing board for each institution is left with much autonomy to determine its own accountability goals.

By contrast, states with more centralized systems of governance are more likely to have an accountability statute in place. Two of the three cabinet states have accountability statutes. Of the twenty-one coordinating states, thirteen have accountability statutes of varying levels of specificity. In the unified states, seven of the thirteen have accountability statutes. Further research may reveal whether specific variations in these states' accountability statutes are responsive to their particular governance structure.

Critical Choices in Accountability Statutes

Analysis of the existing statutes seeking to achieve accountability in higher education reveals five critical points at which statutes vary in their approach:

[1] California Postsecondary Education Commission, *Prospectus: Developing a Framework for Accountability in California's Higher Education System* (September 7-8, 2004).

1. **Authority to establish goals:** Is the statute itself comprehensive, or does it simply delegate the task of defining goals and measuring progress to an agency or to the institutions?
2. **Defining Goals**: If the statute itself defines goals, what are they and how specifically are they defined?
3. **Establishing Performance Measures:** Does the statute define performance measures by which progress toward a goal can be assessed?
4. **Establishing Reporting Requirements:** What sort of reporting mechanisms are used to track progress?
5. **Enforcement:** What, if any, sorts of enforcement mechanisms are used to hold institutions accountable?

1. Authority to establish goals.

In most states, the legislature itself has taken on primary responsibility for defining the higher education system's goals. Colorado's statute, for example, defines the state's goals for its higher education with great specificity, mandating specific measures and outcomes for each goal.

Nine states' statutes, however, do not include specific goals in the statute itself. [2] In most of those states – Arkansas, Missouri, New Jersey, and Washington – the task of establishing goals is delegated to another agency, either the Department of Higher Education (Arkansas), the state's Coordinating Board for higher education (Missouri and Washington), or the Commission on Higher Education (New Jersey). In Louisiana and Utah, the task is delegated to the University's Board of Regents. In Maryland, goals are initially established by the president or chancellor of the specific institution, but must be approved by the institution's governing board and the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

Some of these delegations are extremely broad. Arkansas' accountability statue is an example of total delegation, simply mandating that the Department of Higher Education "shall develop an Arkansas Higher Education Performance Reporting System . . . to provide the General Assembly and the public with quantitative, objective information which will reveal institutional weaknesses and strengths." [3] Similarly, Louisiana's statute gives the Board of Regents authority to develop a plan for "administration, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the accountability process."

Generally, states that delegate the duty to define and enforce accountability provisions have short, nondescript accountability statutes. This approach allows goals to be refined without legislative action. Changing circumstances, problems in application, or oversights by the legislature in identifying goals are potential reasons why a state legislature would consider adopting a deferential approach to the goal setting process.

[2] Tennessee mandates data collection without specifying goals. West Virginia does not mention a specific process for establishing goals.
[3] See Arkansas Code Annotated § 6-61-127.

- Other states may delegate only particular elements of the process; for example, defining goals for the system in the statute, but delegating the power to define the criteria that will be used to evaluate particular goals to another body. Some states, like Hawaii, have established statewide goals, but allow institutions to add their own goals and indicators to the list. Still other states choose to delegate the ability to enforce cooperation with the process, or to define particular indicators to match statutory goals.

2. Defining Goals.

Whoever takes on the task of defining the goals to which institutions of higher education will be held accountable, the question remains, what will those goals be? A review of the existing accountability statutes reveals a perhaps surprising degree of consensus on the goals of a system of higher education. It also reveals a problem. In some statutes, the goals are defined so broadly as to make them vague, or even ambiguous. After reviewing the goals various state statutes propose for their higher education systems, strategies some states have adopted to provide specificity are reviewed.

a. Commonly Cited Goals.

Table One, below, summarizes some of the goals most commonly cited by accountability statutes. One goal is almost universal: striving for educational quality and excellence. Affordability and accessibility are important concerns. Other popular goals include efficient use of resources, creating a workforce that meets the employment demands in the state, and improving collaboration with the K-12 system.

Other goals are unique to particular states. Colorado strives to use technology to lower costs and provide effective stewardship of existing assets. Ohio specifically stresses adult literacy as one of its goals. Public and community service is a goal in New Mexico. A more complete table is included in the Appendix.

A few states have adopted different goals for each institution or system of institutions in recognition of the different purposes that each institution or system serves. Massachusetts's statute, for example, defines the states goals for the University of Massachusetts in one section of the statute, and goals for the state and community college system in another. Despite some overlap, each system contains goals specific to its mission and purpose. For example, the "pursuit of theoretical and applied research" is a high priority for the University system, but is not a goal appropriate for community colleges. Conversely, the state and community colleges are directed to emphasize graduating students who can respond to the immediate employment needs of the state and private enterprise, while the University's goal is to prepare its students to contribute to the state's long term economic development.

Other statute variations may allow for institution specific goals to accompany a list of common goals. For instance, Kentucky's statute allows for "other performance outcomes that support achievement of the strategic agenda . . ." along with its list of goals.[4] This approach may be more suitable where greater diversity in institutional missions exists.

[4] See KRS §164.095.

TABLE ONE: Common Goals

Goal	States	Number of states
Educational Quality / Mission		
High quality undergraduate education	CO, CT, FL, KY, MA, MN, OH, OR, SC	9
Student success, graduates' achievements	MA, MN, NM, SC	4
Work force preparation and training programs	CO, FL, HW, MA, OH, OR	6
Student recruitment		
Ensure access to and affordability of higher education	CT, FL, HW, MA, MN, NM, ND, OH, OR	9
Research & Reputation		
Requiring the university to continue to gain prominence in research	HW, KY, MA, OH	4
Expanded Mission		
Promote the economic development of the state to help business and industry sustain strong economic growth	CT, FL, MA, MN, ND	5
Respond to needs and problems of society, service	CT, KY, NM	3
Administrative Goals		
Efficient undergraduate education, use of resources	CO, FL, KY, MA, OR, SC, ND	7
Structural reforms		
Assistance to K-12education in achieving systemic reform + creation of appropriate linkages between K-12 education and higher education	CO, CT, FL, MA	4

b. Breadth and specificity.

A review of state accountability statutes reveals a critical problem. Is it possible to define goals with sufficient specificity to allow progress to be evaluated? In some statutes, goals are defined so broadly that it is difficult to imagine how progress toward meeting the goal would be assessed. For example, New Mexico's statute simply lists four goals: (1) student progress and success, (2) student access and diversity, (3) affordability and cost of education services, and (4) public and community service by the institutions.

Our survey has revealed, however, three approaches to the problem of defining goals that are precise, clear and unambiguous. One approach is simply to accompany each broad goal with a more specific definition. For example, Minnesota's statute defines its goals as:

> (1) to ensure quality -- to provide a level of excellence that is competitive on a national and international level, through high quality teaching, scholarship, and learning in a broad range of arts and sciences, technical education, and professional fields;
>
> (2) to foster student success -- to enable and encourage students to choose institutions and programs that are best suited for their talents and abilities, and to provide an educational climate that supports students in pursuing their goals and aspirations;
>
> (3) to promote democratic values -- to enhance Minnesota's quality of life by developing understanding and appreciation of a free and diverse society;
>
> (4) to maintain access -- to provide an opportunity for all Minnesotans, regardless of personal circumstances, to participate in higher education; and
>
> (5) to enhance the economy -- to assist the state in being competitive in the world market, and to prepare a highly skilled and adaptable workforce that meets Minnesota's opportunities and needs.[5]

Thus, although the subject matter of Minnesota's and New Mexico's goals overlap, the Minnesota statute provides a clearer sense for what the state wants to accomplish through its higher education system.

A second approach to the problem of vague or broad goals is to provide specific sub-goals, as in Colorado, or Ohio. Taking Colorado as an example, like most states one of Colorado's goals is "a high quality, efficient, and expeditious undergraduate education, consistent with each institution's statutory role and mission."[6] Colorado's statute, however, goes on to state specific objectives that Colorado expects its institutions of higher education to pursue in order to attain that goal:

> (I) Delivery of a degree program in the number of credit hours specified in the course catalogue; except that the institution may make exceptions to accommodate students who are pursuing double majors and other students with special circumstances. To meet this goal, each institution shall, at a minimum:
>
> > (A) Provide frequent and convenient scheduling of required and core courses;
> > (B)Ensure that no student's graduation is delayed due to lack of access to or availability of required and core courses;
> > (C) Schedule courses to accommodate working students; and

[5] See Minnesota Code Annotated §135A.053.
[6] See COS § 23-13-104

(D)Ensure that students who change degree programs lose only those credit hours that clearly and justifiably cannot apply in the degree program to which the student transfers . . .

(III) Progress to improve and attain high student achievement levels through curriculum review, development of new programs, solicitation and consideration of employer and student input and faculty evaluations, and increased availability of small classes and clinical learning experiences;

(IV) Implementation of a student advising system that includes, at a minimum: That institutions create and maintain an advising record for each student; that institutions must offer freshman and transfer student orientation programs; that advisors must provide information about potential employment opportunities relevant to degree choices or provide direction as to where such information may be accessed. In addition, institutions shall assign each student to a faculty or staff member, or both, from whom that student may seek advice concerning course study, scheduling, potential employment opportunities relevant to degree choices, and information about instructional policies, procedures, and requirements.

(V) Attain and reward high quality or improved faculty instruction and student learning by, at a minimum:

(A) Ensuring that the faculty members in each department or college spend, in the aggregate, a specified, appropriate percentage of time teaching and, if such faculty member's workload includes advising students, an appropriate percentage of time advising students;
(B) Basing a high proportion of each faculty member's rating and evaluation on the amount of time the faculty member spends teaching and, if applicable, advising and the quality of the instruction provided; and
(C) Developing a system of instructional supervision and evaluation to ensure quality of instruction;

(VI) Implementing programs for faculty and staff development, including but not limited to training in:

(A) Advising and counseling skills; and
(B) Teaching skills and methods.

To afford some flexibility in meeting these sub goals, the statute requires the state’s Commission of Higher Education to annually review the statewide expectations and goals and shall recommend to the general assembly appropriate changes.

The third approach to the problem represented by broad, vague or ambiguous goals is to accompany each goal with specific performance indicators, as the next section discusses.

3. Establishing Performance Measures

Metrics are necessary to measure how well colleges and universities are meeting performance accountability goals. Adopting metrics that accurately reflect performance is challenging, especially when goals are not specifically defined and can be construed differently. Because no single metric can truly capture how well an institution is meeting a particular goal, performance measures are better defined as *performance indicators* because one can only draw conclusions based upon assumptions taken from the data. Because it is difficult to determine what types of data will most accurately measure performance, many statutes decline to enumerate performance metrics and instead delegate that responsibility to others.

a. Delegating the Responsibility of Determining Performance Indicators

Only four states (Florida, Colorado, North Dakota, South Carolina) have statutes that link performance indicators to accountability goals. Two statutes (New Jersey, Tennessee) list performance indicators but do not indicate what goal such indicators will measure. All other accountability statutes delegate this responsibility to others.

Several factors may explain why legislatures opt not to define performance indicators in the statute. Because evaluating data on such a large scale is not a perfect science, an accountability system may take several years to refine. Consequently, the performance indicators used may change from year to year. Secondly, more types of data may be evaluated over time. Therefore, legislators may hesitate to list performance indicators when more effective indicators may become available in the future. Finally, the legislature may simply believe that another body or the institutions themselves are better situated to determine how to evaluate performance.

b. Common Performance Indicators.

Although few statutes provide indicators, we were able to identify the performance indicators employed by most of the states by reviewing accountability reports provided to the public. Certain types of performance indicators are commonly utilized. Table Two, below shows the performance indicators most frequently utilized to measure performance in meeting some of the goals that commonly appear in higher education accountability statutes.

TABLE TWO: Goals and Performance Indicators

Goal	Performance Indicators
Educational excellence	Number of degrees awarded. First year retention rates. Passage rates on licensing or post- baccalaureate entrance exams. Student survey results.
Improving Student Access and Diversity	Race and gender student body profiles. Tuition fees. Costs per student. Number of students enrolling.
Economic development or Meeting workforce demands of the state	Employer surveys. Technical or professional degrees awarded.
Efficient use of resources	Overhead costs. Use of technology.

4. Establishing Reporting Requirements

Some statutes include specific reporting requirements, stipulating when reports must be submitted, to whom they must be submitted, and whether they must be submitted by institution, type of institution, or simply as a part of the state as a whole. Tennessee's statute, for example, requires its higher education commission to compile and submit a report to the governor and the general assembly annually. Information is submitted by institution.[7]

Higher education accountability statutes generally do not define reporting requirements in great detail. Requirements can often be deduced from the statute if the statute specifies goals or performance indicators. In the absence of statutory mandated goals and performance indicators, however, statutes often will simply mandate institutions or higher education coordinating authorities to produce a report. Usually, the statute will designate to a governing authority the responsibility of overseeing the reporting process. Reports often range in the kinds of data

[7] See Tennessee Code Annotated § 49-7-210.

featured, and are an excellent indication of the type of information that many states consider relevant in crafting a higher education accountability plan.

Each state's accountability statute has different measurement criteria, including or excluding 2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, and technical or vocational schools. Most state accountability statutes require information to be collected and submitted by institution, including Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee, and Washington. Kansas's statute also requires that information be collected and reported for the higher education system as a whole. Minnesota asks for information to be sent based on school type, where 2-year schools will submit information separately than 4-year universities. Other states do not specify the levels on which data should be collected, or leave this determination to the authority delegated to create statutory accountability goals.

The key variations between reporting requirements can be found in the following areas:

- **Peer comparisons**: While accountability statutes do not generally require peer comparisons to be made, many reports do include a comparison of institutional or system wide performance data to their out-of-state counterparts. Peer counterparts are often identified because they share similar characteristics, such as student population size or mission statement. Reports that make peer comparisons compare in-state institutions to either out of state peers or national averages. For instance, Massachusetts tracks graduation and freshmen retention rates for its state and community colleges and compares those statistics against the national average.[8] Of the thirty-one accountability reports (which include reports from states without higher education accountability statutes) we reviewed, eleven made national or out-of-state peer comparisons.

- **Summary of findings**: While some reports simply provide statistical data, others are supplemented with qualitative analysis, including explanations for statistics, contextual information, and highlights of institutional programs. Most states provided an introductory summary of key findings and highlights. However, most statutes do not specify how the data should be presented.

- **Reporting frequency**: Most states require accountability reports to be produced annually. A significant minority require biennial reports. The remaining statutes do not specify how often reports must be produced.

- **Comparisons to prior years**: Almost all accountability reports compare the current year's data to previous years. Each of the thirty-one reports we examined made data comparisons to prior years.

- **Common core measures v. institution-specific measures**: Because each institution or system of institutions serves a different mission, many states require each institution or system to report on different types of data. For example, a university may have a strong

[8] . *See* Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, *Accountability Report: State and Community Colleges, Performance Indicators Trend Assessment FY 1998-2003.*

focus on its graduates' preparedness for success in the professional world. On the other hand, a community college's mission may be high retention rates. Also, the mission of a highly selective university may be very different from that of a community college. Thus, the state may have different criteria of data collection for these institutions.

- **Establishing targets**: Some states require institutions to meet targets for certain goals. Twelve of the thirty-one reports we found included target goals for the year.

5. Enforcement.

Accountability statutes also vary widely in their methods for enforcing accountability statutes. Of the twenty-three states with accountability statutes, twelve have no enforcement provisions. Of those statutes that expressly attach enforcement consequences to accountability performance, most do not specify procedures or formulas to follow. For instance, some states, including Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, and Washington, simply mandate that accountability performance "shall be taken into consideration" in the budgeting process. Hawaii's statute, for example, reads: "Beginning with the 1997-1998 fiscal year, the board of regents shall apply these benchmarks in the development of their annual budget request to the legislature and adoption of tuition schedules."[9]

Other states mandate that a formal performance based funding system be established. However, these statutes generally delegate budgeting procedures or formulas to a governing body of higher education. For example, Florida's statute reads:

> (f) By December 1, 2004, the Department of Education shall recommend to the Legislature a formula for performance-based funding that applies accountability standards for the individual components of the public education system at every level, kindergarten through graduate school. Effective for the 2004-2005 fiscal year and thereafter, subject to annual legislative approval in the General Appropriations Act, performance-based funds shall be allocated based on the progress, rewards, and sanctions established pursuant to this section.[10]

Finally, states also have a choice in whether to reward institutions for success or to penalize or aid states for poor performance. For example, some states, including Colorado, Florida, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Tennessee, provide funding incentives for those institutions that have reached the statutory goals or can demonstrate significant progress. Massachusetts, on the other hand, enforces penalties by reducing state funding. Massachusetts and Colorado are the only states that have a statutory mandate to set up an improvement plan for institutions not meeting the minimum target requirements.

[9] See Hawaii's Revised Statutes Annotated §304-4.5.
[10] See Florida Statutes Annotated §1008.31.

Conclusion

For many reasons – differences in the size and scope of the systems of higher education, differences in governance structure, and the newness of the issue – attempts by various states to legislate accountability in higher education show tremendous variety. Out of the variety, certain issues emerge as central to this effort. Our initial research identifies five of these central issues: the appropriate degree of delegation, nature and specificity of goals, identification of performance measures, reporting requirements, and enforceability. While others will no doubt be identified as the research continues, these variables will certainly be central in the debate over the details of any accountability scheme for higher education.

APPENDIX: Goals in State Higher Education Accountability Statutes

Goal	State	Number of States
Educational Quality / Mission		
High quality undergrad education	CO, CT, FL, KY, MA, MN, OH, OR,SC	9
Student success, graduates' achievements	MA, MN, NM, SC	4
Expeditious undergrad education, student progress in the post sec system	CO, KY	2
Work force preparation and training programs	CO, FL, HW, MA, OH, OR	6
Quality of Faculty	SC	
Student recruitment		
Ensure access to and affordability of higher education	CT, FL, HW, MA, MN, NM, ND, OH, OR	9
Recruit qualified students	MA	1
Entrance Requirements	SC	1
Student Diversity	NM	1
Research & Reputation		
Requiring the university to continue to gain prominence in research	HW, KY, MA OH	4
Research Expenditures in proportion to the amount of revenue generated by research activity and funding received for research activity	ND	1
Enhancing the international role of the university	HW	1
Requiring the university to continue to gain prominence. . [in[distance learning	HW, KY	2
Research Funding	SC	1
Expanded Mission		
Promote the economic development of the state to help business and industry sustain strong economic growth	CT, FL, MA,MN, , ND	5
Respond to needs and problems of society, service	CT, KY, NM	3
Revitalizing services to the state	HW	1
Providing policy research addressing needs of commonwealth and local community	MA	1
Promote democratic values	MN	1

Adult literacy	OH	1
Administrative Goals		
Efficient undergraduate education, use of resources	CO, FL, KY, MA, OR	5
Using technology to (1) lower costs, (2) improve deliverance and quality of education (3) provide effective stewardship of existing assets	CO	1
Increase operational productivity and effectiveness in providing services to students	CO	1
Financial Operations	ND	1
New Construction reporting	ND	1
Administrative Efficiency	SC	1
User-friendliness of the Institution	SC	1
Reduction in the number of graduate programs within the same subject area	OH	
Structural reforms		
Assistance to K-12education in achieving systemic reform + creation of appropriate linkages between K-12 education and higher education	CO, CT, FL, MA (seamless articulation)	4
Maintaining diversity by clarifying campus missions and coordinating campus plans	HW	1
Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration	SC	
Funding Goals		
Maximize fundraising from private sources	MA	1
Misc.		
Promoting collaboration b/t campuses and private sector	MA	1
Mission Focus	SC	1