

Archived Information

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

A NATIONAL DIALOGUE: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION'S
COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 2006

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing was convened in the Victory Ballroom, 9th Floor of the Hilton Hotel, 120 West Market Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, at 8:12 a.m., Charles Miller, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONER PRESENT:

GERRI ELLIOTT
CHARLES VEST
CHARLES MILLER, Chairman
ARTHUR ROTHKOPF
JONATHAN GRAYER
DAVID WARD
RICK STEPHENS
BOB MENDENHALL
LOUIS SULLIVAN
KATI HAYCOCK
ROBERT ZEMSKY
JAMES HUNT
RICHARD VEDDER
NICHOLAS DONOFRIO
ARTURO MADRID
JIM DUDERSTADT
SARA MARTINE TUCKER

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:

SALLY STROUP
PETER FALETRA
EMILY DeROCCO
JOHN BAILEY
WILLIAM BERRY

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID DUNN, Chief of Staff

CHERYL OLDHAM, Executive Director
VICKIE SCHRAY
ELEANOR SCHIFF
DAVID DUNN

PRESENTERS:

JAY PFEIFFER	Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Accountability, Research, and Measurement, Florida Department of Education
GASTON CAPERTON	President, College Board
PETER JOYCE	Workforce Development Manager CISCO Systems
RICHARD KAZIS	Senior Vice President, Jobs for the Future
PETER EWELL	Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
ROGER BENJAMIN	President, Council for Aid to Education, RAND Corporation
STEPHEN P. KLEIN	Senior Research Scientist, RAND Corporation
PETER McPHERSON	President, National Association of State Universities and Land- Grant Colleges
ANNE NEAL	President, American Council of Trustees and Alumni
GEORGE K. KUH	Director, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University
KEVIN CAREY	Research and Policy Manager, Education Sector

Welcome and Overview of Format
for Public Hearing 4

PRESENTERS

Jay Pfeiffer, Assistant Deputy Commissioner
Florida Department of Education 6

Gaston Caperton, President, College19
Board

Peter Joyce, Workforce Development23
Manager CISCO Systems

Richard Kazis, Senior Vice President,. . . .34
Jobs for the Future

Peter Ewell, Vice President, National 77
Center for Higher Education Management
Systems

Roger Benjamin, President, Council for . . .86
Aid to Education, RAND Corporation

Stephen P. Klein, Senior Research86
Scientist, RAND Corporation

George Kuh, Director, Center for101
Postsecondary Research, Indiana
University

Peter McPherson, President, National125
Association of State Universities and
Land-Grant Colleges

Anne Neal, President, American Council . . .138
of Trustees and Alumni

Kevin Carey, Research and Policy151
Manager, Education Sector

ADJOURN

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(8:12 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Good morning. We've been able to control everything in this discussion except the weather. And the way we scheduled these meetings in the past, we have a full morning of presentations and questions and answers and we've left in some room at the end for discussion.

Today, I'm going to ask the group to try to get as much of the discussion in during the panel's time so that we can finish without losing the last presenter or two because they're very, very important and a big part of our material and our input. And in the process, we're going to let a couple of presenters make their presentation before we do the Q&A, a little differently than we tried yesterday and it will go smoother that way and more effectively and will break down the presentations better that way.

I thought we had a very powerful session yesterday. I want to make some part of it clear. At the end of the day when we had our open discussion, some people characterized that as a vote and we use that term rather loosely. I don't consider that a legal or any kind of other formal vote. And when we do that, we're going to post that in advance. We're going to put out what the things are that are going to

1 be voted on, if we can in time. We're going to have
2 formal motions if we do that and we're going to have
3 discussions on the motions and do it in that kind of a
4 formal process.

5 Yesterday, was a very valuable benefit for
6 the Commission to talk and to vent and to comment and
7 it did show some of the values in the sense of where
8 people relate things. By the time we get to the May
9 meeting, we're going to have some of those things
10 refined more and we're going to have some ability to
11 have specific recommendations and things that would be
12 actionable if we do this right. So for people to
13 understand that process.

14 We have an open agenda in May. We won't
15 have the traditional presentations. We hope to have
16 in front of the Commission, with the Commission's
17 input, what it would be -- what would be recommended
18 or put in a formal report, the final part.

19 The two major topics today are
20 articulation and accountability and assessment. The
21 Commission's had a wide variety of inputs on the
22 process by which students in the education system move
23 through the structure K through 12, community
24 colleges, specialized institutions and four-year
25 colleges into the workforce and back into education.
26 The general theme will be covered today by a very

1 interesting panel moderated by Jay Pfeiffer from
2 Florida.

3 On accountability and assessment, there's
4 been also far-reaching dialogue about accountability
5 and today we will focus on the measurement of
6 institutional performance and assessment of teaching
7 and learning and we will hear from a broad array of
8 participants.

9 We're in an era of accountability where
10 everything we do is subject to intense scrutiny, and
11 when it involves public purposes of course it should
12 be. Advances in information and communications
13 technology allow us to do more to review and analyze
14 our actions and decisions. We can and must apply
15 these innovations to make significant improvements in
16 the productivity and efficiency and efficacy of our
17 colleagues and institutions. I can write it better
18 than I can say it, thank you.

19 We have a distinguished panel to address
20 this theme, moderated by Peter Ewell. Please begin.

21 MR. PFEIFFER: Mr. Chairman, I'm Jay
22 Pfeiffer. I'm with the Florida Department of
23 Education. I want to thank you and the Commissioners
24 for allowing me to join three great colleagues here to
25 present to you this morning.

26 I feel compelled here right at the

1 beginning, being that I am in Indianapolis and I am
2 from Florida and I am an alumnus from the University
3 of Florida, to supposedly referred to pass on the
4 basketball game, but I won't.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. PFEIFFER: I have provided the
7 Commission with two documents that I'm going to
8 referred to. One is a written statement. I will
9 referred to that very briefly. The second is a set of
10 data and I will go over the set of data to kind of set
11 a context for our panel this morning.

12 It seems that as I listened yesterday and
13 as I read the materials that the Commission has
14 considered, that one of the things that is a crucial
15 piece of the deliberations that you're undertaking,
16 are the data that underpin all of this. The data that
17 are necessary to tell the stories of the flows of
18 students into and out of the education system. My
19 statement's a little bit about those data.

20 Now in education circles, particularly in
21 education data circles, Florida's education data
22 system is kind of considered the Cadillac of state
23 systems. We have long had individually identifiable
24 student data for public schools, workforce programs,
25 adult education programs, community college programs
26 and university programs in Tallahassee within the

1 Department of Education.

2 In addition to having these kinds of
3 resources, we have established a practice with partner
4 agencies of joining these data with other agencies
5 that have data that basically complement, I almost
6 said complicate, they do that too, the education
7 process. We have data relationships, for example,
8 with our state labor agency which allow us to look at
9 employment results of our students as they are in
10 education and as they exit the education system. We
11 worked closely with our workforce programs, vocational
12 rehabilitation. Our children and family services
13 agencies and a variety of agencies like that.

14 Now in working with those agencies and
15 working within our own department, in days past when
16 we were asked to join these data to look at things
17 longitudinally, to look at the flows of students from
18 K-12 into postsecondary, that's a pretty hard process.

19 These data were all designed in separate boxes,
20 separate governance boxes with different purposes and
21 different data elements and different conventions.
22 And so every time you pulled this data together you
23 had to kind of consider all of those conventions and
24 come up with the rules to bring them together. It's a
25 hard process.

26 But, the results are data that show a

1 picture that really is not a very well informed
2 picture. That is, the picture of what happens to
3 students as they flow through K-12 -- as they flow
4 into postsecondary, as they move back and forth into
5 the labor force and out of the labor force. Those
6 pictures piqued the interest of our legislature and
7 our governor and that, in addition to increased
8 pressure to be more accountable in the state of
9 Florida, the legislature authorized the creation of a
10 K-20 education data warehouse.

11 To build this data warehouse we had to go
12 through all those little difference that I talked
13 about in bringing data together. We had to come up
14 with the rules and the processes to bring it together.

15 And at this point we've finally done that. And we
16 are just now beginning to reap some of the benefits of
17 having student level data in a K-20 repository.

18 It's getting to be the go to place in
19 Florida for things that people want to know about
20 education.

21 I've outlined in my statement a number of
22 types of services with some examples of applications
23 of the data warehouse and I'll highlight the types of
24 things that I chronicle, if you will, in that
25 statement.

26 One is that a lot of what we do feeds

1 consumers. And by consumers I'm referring to students
2 and their parents, for younger students, adult
3 students. I'm also referring to teachers. Providing
4 information to students and teachers to facilitate the
5 decisions that they make sometimes everyday as they do
6 their jobs and as students consider careers. We also
7 have a variety of education and workforce
8 accountability and public reporting mechanisms,
9 reports and other kinds of things that I've referred
10 to. The kinds that I've highlight is what I refer to
11 as feedback reports. We have a very robust high
12 school feedback report where every high school can see
13 what happened to their students after they left the
14 high school. Every community college can see what
15 happened to their students as they left the community
16 college and either went into the upper division in the
17 university system or into the workforces.

18 I've also highlighted in those comments
19 that having these resources has piqued the interest of
20 private and independent postsecondary institutions who
21 kind of want to avail themselves of those resources,
22 too. And we've worked with them to integrate some of
23 their processes into what we do.

24 The final piece that I referred to is
25 policy evaluation and research. The department does
26 research using these data on its own, but we have

1 limited staff resources. So what we've done is
2 increasingly provide anonymized data sets, often
3 aggregated data, sometimes anonymized individual data
4 to researchers and universities and foundations for
5 them to do research with a *quid pro quo* arrangement.
6 They do research that helps us in forming policy, that
7 helps us evaluate the effects of programs that we
8 have. From a data guy prospective, this stuff is
9 extraordinarily cool. Data are very detailed. We
10 have lots of information about the students and about
11 their accomplishments, their progress, their
12 attainment, those kinds of things.

13 Because we built all these things over
14 time, there's fair demand on our staff to work with
15 other states, to work with the department, to work
16 with foundations and other organizations to assist
17 them in not only understanding what we have but
18 provide guidance about how they might have some of
19 this kind of stuff, too, technical assistance.

20 And in that process we've learned a few
21 things. And my recommendations are very high level
22 recommendations but nonetheless result from those
23 experiences.

24 One recommendation is that -- I heard a
25 lot of talk here yesterday in testimony about
26 institutional interest. Heard a lot of talk about

1 federal interest. There's also a state interest in
2 this. We invest a lot in this system. And so one of
3 the things that I would urge you to do as you consider
4 more robust data requirements is really look at a
5 state role in doing this. If we are talking about
6 accountability in higher education, we all ought to be
7 talking the same language. We don't want the state of
8 Florida to be saying one thing about its institutions
9 and the federal government saying something different,
10 or at least something that has nuances that appear to
11 be different, it confuses the public, it doesn't help
12 inform.

13 The second piece is really -- it almost
14 gets in the weeds a little bit, it has to do with
15 what's called FERPA. The Family Educational Records
16 Protection Act. Virtually anywhere you go, whether
17 it's at the institution level, whether it's with an
18 MIS guy buried in a school district or at the state
19 level, FERPA is raised as a barrier to building the
20 kinds of data systems and the kind of relationships
21 that I've referred to. FERPA needs to be administered
22 different, ladies and gentlemen. It needs to be
23 administered in a way where we inform states about
24 practices, about ways that they can build these
25 systems but importantly to protect the privacy and
26 confidentiality of the records that are in our charge.

1 We have done a lot of that on our own as a
2 state. We need to do it as a nation so that we can
3 build these systems and we can be better informed
4 about what we're doing.

5 I'm going to shift gears really quick and
6 try to set a context for my colleagues on the panel.
7 I'm going to referred to this set of charts that are
8 in your materials that were given to you this morning.

9 We, in the last year in Florida, formed a
10 higher education access task force that was comprised
11 largely of leaders of our institutional boards of
12 governors, people like you from the private sector and
13 people like you who represent a variety of interests,
14 focusing on Florida. One of my initial charges was to
15 define the pipeline, come up with ways that the task
16 force could look at the pipeline, the flows of
17 students and kind of as we initially started
18 describing it, one of the things that becomes real
19 apparent immediately is that there's about as many
20 ways to describe the flows as there are students
21 flowing. We have a system that provides lots of
22 points of access and lots of opportunities to move in
23 and out and around the education systems.

24 Forgive me, Mr. Chairman, but a colleague
25 of mine used the analogy saying that it's not a
26 pipeline, it's like a climbing wall. You kind of go

1 up this way and then you scurry over and then you go
2 up a little and then maybe down a little and then back
3 over. So it wasn't easy to describe this flow except
4 that we tried to do it in a way that highlighted three
5 issues. And this little set of charts describes those
6 three issues.

7 The first, the light blue one. One of the
8 things that the task force was concerned about is
9 increasing access to higher education in Florida both
10 in terms of increasing the number of people in higher
11 education but also increasing the proportion of people
12 who participate in higher education. One of the first
13 things we talked about is Florida is a growing state.

14 It's a fast growing state. We get about 1,000 new
15 citizens a week and they're not all old people, a lot
16 of them are young people, looking for jobs. We have
17 very low unemployment in Florida. So there's pretty
18 good employment opportunities there right now. And
19 what this basically means is that if we do absolutely
20 nothing in Florida with postsecondary education, we're
21 going to have to accommodate more people. We're going
22 to have to accommodate more people coming out of high
23 school. We're going to have to accommodate more
24 people who are the people who are coming out of high
25 school but delay their postsecondary education for a
26 year or two and we're going to have to create room for

1 more people who are adults. And the idea was that any
2 policy that the access task force, the acronym was ATF
3 by the way, that the access task force, anything that
4 they would do that would increase the flow of students
5 would add on to that automatic increase that we would
6 have to accommodate. So that was one thing. Just the
7 fact that we talked about these three population
8 groups informed people. But most people just tend to
9 think of going to high school, coming out of high
10 school and popping them into postsecondary.

11 The second set of charts, the colorful
12 ones on the second page, deal with two issues. One is
13 persistence and one is postsecondary attainment. The
14 persistence one is a little hard to look at, it's real
15 colorful. That's one reason it's hard to look at, the
16 other reason is it's pretty complicated. To look at
17 this particular chart we had to go back in time
18 because it looks at longitudinal data. It looks at
19 the class that graduated from Florida public high
20 schools in 1996. You will see that about 50 percent
21 of those students who graduated with standard
22 diplomas, about 90,000 of them back in 1996, started
23 into postsecondary in Florida the year after that
24 graduated. You also see in the second year, that's
25 the yellow piece of this bar, the second year we lost
26 about 10,000 of them that moved out of the

1 postsecondary system. At the same time we picked up
2 6500 that weren't there the first year. When you go
3 to the third year it starts getting complicated. We
4 lose about 6,000 of the original group. We lost about
5 half of the people that entered in the second year, we
6 picked up some people from the first year who weren't
7 there in the second year and we picked up some people
8 who weren't there in the first or second year. And
9 that you can see that it gets more and more
10 complicated.

11 Two points. One is the overall
12 participation of this class over time is dropping.
13 The second is, that it's increasingly characterized by
14 students who are stopping in and stopping out. And
15 one of the troubles that we have with students that
16 are stopping in and stopping out is that they are less
17 likely to complete postsecondary education when they
18 do that, even though the system is really set up to
19 accommodate it.

20 The second chart, the pie. This asks the
21 question for the same class, what did they attain,
22 what's the highest level of any kind of educational
23 attainment 10 years after they graduated from high
24 school. The startling thing to the task force and to
25 others is that for this class of 1996, 90,000
26 students, 70,000 of those -- 70 percent, excuse me, of

1 those students 10 years after they graduate, their
2 highest level of attainment is what they got when they
3 left high school. Even though most of them
4 participated in postsecondary, most of them have no
5 postsecondary credentials. That leads us to the labor
6 market, which is the last slide.

7 Pretty controversial conversation there,
8 pretty difficult conversation because we get into
9 stuff about supply and demand and what does that mean
10 and how do you measure all this stuff. We tried to be
11 pretty basic, we tried to use pretty basic sets of
12 information to describe what the demands are for
13 levels of postsecondary attainment over time. Most
14 recently -- the usually available data to states are
15 ten year projections. Those ten year projections
16 showed that of the fastest-growing occupations in
17 Florida, most of them require a postsecondary
18 credential but less than a bachelor's degree.

19 However, when we go out to the 23rd and we
20 engaged in a little effort with the Florida Council of
21 100 employer organizations with the state legislature
22 and tried to take these projections out to the 23rd,
23 take them out a little longer term. And interestingly
24 we see some shifts. Still a lot of demand for those
25 occupations that require an education less than a
26 bachelor's degree but the proportion of demand made up

1 of people who need a bachelor's degree and higher
2 kinds of credentials is increasing rapidly. So the
3 demands in the labor market in these new occupations
4 is ratcheting up in terms of postsecondary
5 credentials.

6 With that, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to
7 basically move to my colleagues on my left.
8 Interestingly, because of these data resources in
9 Florida, we have arrangements with each of these
10 fellows. We've been able to share information and
11 share resources back and forth, kind of a quid pro quo
12 for both parties. We are right now negotiating a
13 process with the College Board where we will provided
14 through our data warehouse, data that complements
15 their very robust research on articulation and the
16 importance of the test scores that they administer.
17 And at the same time we will have those resources in
18 our data warehouse.

19 I'd like to introduce you all to Gaston
20 Caperton.

21 GOV. CAPERTON: Thank you very much. I
22 was asked to talk about our advanced placement
23 program. The College Board is a national not-for-
24 profit membership organization of more than 5,000
25 colleges, schools and universities with the
26 challenging mission of preparing and connecting

1 students to college success.

2 The College Board's most powerful teaching
3 and learning program is its advanced placement
4 program. Its underlying goals are excellent and
5 equity. As a set of 38 college-level courses taught
6 in high school, AP represents the highest standards of
7 academic excellence in our high schools. The three
8 principles and values of the AP program are quite
9 simple and straightforward.

10 First, AP supports academic excellence.
11 AP represents a commitment to high standards and
12 enriched academic experience for students and for
13 teachers.

14 Two, AP is about equity. We believe that
15 every student should have access to AP courses and
16 should be given the opportunity to prepare for these
17 courses.

18 Three, AP drives school wide academic
19 rigor. Schools that use AP for setting high standards
20 for all students see significant return in the overall
21 quality and intensity of academic programs.

22 The most important message I could leave
23 with you today is AP is not for the aggrieved. It is
24 for the prepared. Students who are ready to work
25 hard, put in extra time and effort and who have
26 quality teachers leading their AP courses, will

1 succeed in AP and will be well-prepared for college
2 success.

3 Our data shows there are many more U.S.
4 students who can succeed at AP math and science
5 courses if they're simply given the chance. This year
6 in the U.S. we anticipate more than 100,000 students
7 will earn a grade of three or better in an AP calculus
8 exam. But our research shows that based on
9 performance on the PSAT, at least 600,000 students
10 could be taking and succeeding in AP calculus. The
11 same gap exists in AP physics, AP chemistry and AP
12 biology. This means that there are literally hundreds
13 of thousands of high school students in the U.S. who
14 are able to succeed in rigorous AP courses that are
15 not enrolled in these courses.

16 There are three major obstacles preventing
17 students from learning at this higher level.

18 One, the lack of AP teachers in the
19 school; two, the lack of adequate encouragement and
20 support to take AP courses; and three, the lack of
21 hard work and high expectations.

22 Both the President and the members of the
23 Senate and House have proposed legislation and funding
24 that would drastically expand AP participation and
25 success in math and science. This is extremely -- we
26 believe this is an extremely important opportunity for

1 our nation. AP math and science students are more
2 likely than other students to major in science and
3 math and engineering disciplines than students whose
4 first exposure to college-level math and science
5 courses are in college.

6 Our research shows that AP math and
7 science courses prepare American students to achieve
8 at a level of proficiency that exceeds students in all
9 other nations.

10 I ask, if I may be a little presumptuous,
11 as you prepare your final report to the Secretary and
12 the President you consider the following
13 recommendations.

14 Urge Congress to fully fund the
15 President's request to support AP expansion including
16 the training of 70,000 new AP teachers in math,
17 science and world languages over the next five years.

18 Two, urge all colleges and universities to
19 support AP programs by training more AP teachers;

20 And prepare students for -- urge all
21 colleges and universities to support AP programs by
22 training more AP teachers; and

23 Three, urge all high schools to offer four
24 AP courses, prepare students for AP and have an open
25 door policy which allows every student to succeed in
26 AP.

1 The College Board believes that AP has a
2 tremendous potential to drive reform in a powerful way
3 in our nation's schools. No single program can have
4 as strong an impact on the overall student and teacher
5 quality as AP.

6 In closing, AP is not for the elite, it is
7 for the prepared. AP is about high expectations and
8 hard work. Thank you very much.

9 MR. PFEIFFER: Mr. Chairman,
10 Commissioners, I would comment on Mr. Caperton's
11 presentation by pointing out if you put those charts
12 that I've shown you on persistence and attainment, you
13 will see that students who have participated in
14 advanced placement programs are very highly qualify
15 and in terms of that attainment pie, nearly all of
16 them attained their postsecondary credentials. So
17 used that kind of as a context.

18 The next presenter is Peter Joyce, the
19 manager of CISCO Systems Workforce Development
20 Program. We have a great project with CISCO in
21 Florida that is basically looking at science,
22 technology, engineering and math disciplines. CISCO
23 is promoting the participation of young women in those
24 disciplines in Florida. We've been able to use
25 research that we worked with the Ed Trust on and
26 research that we've actually worked with the

1 University of South Florida on to support the aims of
2 this project. Peter.

3 MR. JOYCE: Good morning. In my role at
4 CISCO I'm often invited to speak to school groups and
5 so when I speak to an elementary school group I always
6 start with a big greeting, like I just did, and
7 usually get back a melodious good morning, Mr. Joyce.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. JOYCE: When I speak to high school
10 students and I start with that greeting I usually get
11 some sort of grunt. And then finally when I speak to
12 college students or higher education students and I
13 say good morning, everybody writes it down.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. JOYCE: You won't need to write things
16 down since I have submitted my remarks and they're
17 included in your briefing book. I want to be sure
18 that I thank the Chairman, Mr. Miller, and the
19 Commission, Secretary Spellings and her staff, both
20 those inside and outside the door, you've done a great
21 job and certainly have made me feel welcome. And I
22 also appreciate in part that CISCO has an opportunity
23 to share our perspective as you make recommendations
24 aimed at maintaining the competitive edge of America's
25 higher education system in this dynamic global
26 economy.

1 Some may ask why a company is represented
2 at this meeting, no less talking about articulation.
3 I guess it's best defended by a revision of the old
4 line, and no offense to the Commission, but it's about
5 the workforce stupid.

6 The Education Research Institute at UCLA
7 recently reported a 60 percent decline in computer
8 science and undergraduate enrollment between 2000 and
9 2004. Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau
10 of Labor Statistics, predicts that IT related jobs
11 will grow 45 to 68 percent between 2000 and 2012.

12 CISCO Systems believes it has a stake in
13 higher education and wants to support an education
14 system that excites young people about technology.
15 CISCO wants to foster an education system that works
16 in partnership across grades and with employers. To
17 shore up an education system that insures that we have
18 the high skilled people who can support our industry
19 into the future.

20 During my time today, I will provide you
21 with a brief overview of our company, describe a
22 global education initiative we launched nine years
23 ago, and outline the lessons learned that should be
24 considered as you move forward with your charge.

25 Some of you know that CISCO was founded in
26 1984 by a small group of computer scientists from

1 Stanford University. As a result, the company
2 maintains a special place in its heart for higher
3 education and education in general.

4 In those early years, the multi-protocol
5 router was known to a few who had a specialized
6 knowledge of the backroom network operations of IT
7 centers. And today, networks are an essential part of
8 business, education, government and home
9 communications, and CISCO Internet protocol, or IP
10 based networking solutions, are in the foundation of
11 these networks. CISCO hardware, software, and service
12 offerings are used to create Internet solutions that
13 allow individuals, companies, and countries to
14 increase productivity, improve customer satisfaction,
15 and strengthen competitive advantage.

16 At CISCO our vision is to change the way
17 people work, live, play and learn. If there's one
18 message, a take away message I'd like to offer today,
19 it's the fact that contrary to popular opinion, the IT
20 industry is alive and well. It took 38 years for the
21 radio to reach 50 million users. But in just four
22 years, the Internet had that same number of users.

23 CISCO's tradition of IT innovation
24 continues with industry-leading products in the core
25 areas of routing and switching, as well as advanced
26 technologies. Today we have Canadian surgeons who are

1 performing medical procedures on patients 2,000 miles
2 away using robotics and a spider network that maintain
3 a constant connection. Buses in New York City are
4 using CISCO mobile routers to send real-time
5 information from a network engine to indicate
6 mechanical problems, thereby eliminating any
7 unexpected difficulties or delays.

8 Even the adoption of IP telephones have
9 extended beyond large corporate customers and have
10 moved into the homes through our Linksys brand. With
11 more than 34,000 employees worldwide, CISCO remains
12 committed to creating networks that are smarter,
13 faster and more durable.

14 As the Internet made its way into our
15 everyday lives, schools across all levels turned to
16 CISCO for assistance in designing and building
17 networks. Despite very good intentions, it became
18 clear that schools needed to build the internal
19 capacity to support these networks. So CISCO, aimed
20 at providing a solution to this challenge, launched
21 the CISCO networking academy program, a comprehensive
22 e-learning program that provides students with
23 Internet technology skills. The networking academy
24 delivers web based content, uses on-line assessment,
25 student performance tracking, hands on labs,
26 instructor training and support, and preparation for

1 industry standard certifications.

2 Launched in October of 1997 with 64
3 education institutions in seven states, the networking
4 academy program has now spread to more than 150
5 countries. Since its inception, more than 1.6 million
6 students have enrolled at more than 10,000 academies,
7 a bit more than our 64 that we started with I would
8 say.

9 Academies are located in high schools,
10 technical schools, colleges, universities, and
11 community-based organizations. I like to say wherever
12 you have an Internet connection and motivated
13 students, you can have an academy.

14 In the U.S., we have about 4,000
15 academies. About 45 percent of those are at the
16 secondary level, about 45 percent are in higher
17 education, community colleges, as well as four-year
18 colleges. And then about 10 percent are in homeless
19 shelters, job core centers and other non-traditional
20 settings.

21 Initially our fundamentals of networking
22 course was created to prepare students for the
23 associate level certification, CCNA. Given the high
24 demand, we next launched the advanced networking
25 course, which is aligned with the network professional
26 level certification, CCNP. All this is alphabet soup,

1 I'm sure. We also handed courses in wireless and
2 security. Eventually, we expanded our program at the
3 entry-level to include courses on the basics of
4 hardware and software which are aligned to CompTIA's
5 A+ certification and a course on infrastructure
6 essentials. And this is sponsored by Panduit, one of
7 our business partners, and the course is aligned with
8 their new certification.

9 When the academy program was first
10 designed, we created a three-tiered system to grow and
11 support participating schools. I like to refer to it
12 as the Amway pyramid. Education institutions are
13 given designations based on the level of training that
14 they'll be providing in the program. So industry
15 experts at CISCO train the instructor trainers at the
16 CISCO Academy training centers, who are at the top of
17 the pyramid, and the training center instructors train
18 regional academy instructors, regional academy
19 instructors train local academy instructors, who then
20 educate students. Also, any of those levels can also
21 be educating students at the same time.

22 Using this three tiered model helps
23 provide instructors the training they need in close
24 proximity to where they are located. Education
25 institutions may play a role at one or more of these
26 trainings levels, as I just noted.

1 It's often said that elementary schools
2 don't talk to high schools, high schools don't talk to
3 colleges and colleges only talk to God. The impact of
4 the CISCO networking academy field structure has
5 fostered the development of deep and unique
6 relationships between education institutions. The
7 standardized curriculum has led to an effective
8 articulation models between high schools and colleges
9 whereby students are able to accelerate the
10 progression of their learning. Many of our partner
11 colleges have either worked with CISCO volunteer
12 engineers to host cooperative activities that engage
13 students in their learning and serve as a vehicle to
14 provide information for educating students about
15 career pathways and to the information technology
16 industry.

17 The Internet has the power to change the
18 way people learn and the CISCO academy program is in
19 the forefront of this transformation.

20 Having described our expertise in
21 technology and how this knowledge led to an
22 extraordinary initiative with learning institutions
23 around the globe, let me share for general lessons
24 from our experience.

25 Lesson one. Unprecedented partnerships
26 are the ultimate goal. Our business model is based

1 upon a concept which we refer to as our ecosystem.
2 It's a network of partnerships with companies that
3 serve as our channel for product and service. We
4 depend on these partners for 95 percent of our
5 revenue. They allow us to reach into markets we could
6 never take advantage of alone. When the academy
7 program was launched, we never imagined that we would
8 be fostering the development of unprecedented
9 partnerships between high schools, community colleges,
10 four-year colleges, as well as community-based
11 organizations. Our tiered model opened the door for
12 many new relationships. Many of our training centers
13 and regional academies reach out to their school
14 partners to provide technical support. This is a
15 people to people relationship where partners share
16 pedagogical practices, equipment and technology
17 innovations. These relationships have also fortified
18 new or existing articulation agreements. The partners
19 co-run recruitment efforts, they often worked with
20 CISCO and our business partners to host joint events
21 such as a career fairs and even technical competitions
22 which helps students see the direct connection between
23 institutions and the workplace.

24 These relationships go beyond the paper
25 thin articulation agreements that are often alluded to
26 when referring to partnerships.

1 Lesson number two. The programs industry
2 standardized curriculum provides a lot of value. Our
3 course content is standardized and the assessments are
4 taken online, which offer a direct bridge across
5 secondary and postsecondary, as well as between
6 community colleges and four-year colleges. More
7 importantly, this shared curriculum creates a system
8 with various entry and exit points, offering
9 accommodations and flexibilities for incumbent workers
10 and dislocated workers.

11 As we added courses, both introductory and
12 advanced, we continue to build a pipeline along career
13 pathways.

14 Lesson three. Certifications establish
15 credibility and accountability. Each of our courses
16 is aligned with industry certification. These
17 portable certifications are designed to maintain
18 quality within our industry. However, in a multi-
19 level education system, these certifications also
20 validate a student's knowledge and skill set.
21 Students can move from course to course, from
22 institution to institution, efficiently progressing
23 without duplication.

24 Lesson four. Clear pathways help
25 encourage postsecondary education. Nine years ago,
26 there were many students who would finish their CCNA

1 certifications in high school and attain jobs in the
2 industry. As the industry has matured, the skill
3 requirements have been raised, and today, most jobs
4 require some level of postsecondary education. It has
5 become more important than ever that institutions
6 ensure that students understand the sequence of
7 learning necessary for careers in our industry. The
8 best way to do this is to formalize the connections
9 between courses and institutions through articulation,
10 dual enrollment, and credit granting across continuing
11 ed and degree programs.

12 When I began my presentation, I asked why
13 a company like CISCO would be speaking at this
14 meeting. I said then that we had an important stake
15 in education and an investment in our industry's
16 future workforce. The future is hard to predict, even
17 for a technology company. We often refer to working
18 in the dog years around CISCO. The technology, and
19 therefore, the respective skills, are changing
20 rapidly. But one thing is certain in this rapidly
21 changing dynamic global economy, partnerships between
22 industry and across education institutions,
23 particularly in higher education, will be a critical
24 success factor.

25 Thank you very much for your time and
26 consideration.

1 MR. PFEIFFER: Thank you, Peter. Mr.
2 Chairman, commissioners the next presenter is Richard
3 Kazis, who is a senior vice president with Jobs for
4 the Future. I mentioned in my presentation that we
5 have worked with organizations to kind of present our
6 Florida data model, if you will, and provide
7 communication with other states about how they might
8 do it. Jobs for the Future has been a great asset in
9 helping us do that. Richard?

10 MR. KAZIS: Thank you very much. It's a
11 pleasure to have this opportunity to speak with you
12 today. I want to congratulate the Commission on two
13 things from yesterday. One is I thought that the
14 process at the end of the day with the stickies and
15 the non vote vote I thought was very encouraging in
16 terms of the priorities -- the three top priorities
17 that came up, access and success for all students,
18 expansion of financial aid, and lifelong learning.
19 That was encouraging.

20 Second, I want to congratulate you for
21 what my father used to call is its flesh, which means
22 sitting flesh.

23 So the topic this morning is articulation,
24 how the pieces of the education system have not been
25 together, the challenges that this poses for higher
26 education and how the situation can be improved.

1 Broadly, it's about the alignment and expectations,
2 standards, courses, programs across different
3 education levels and sectors. It's critically
4 important obviously in terms of improving college
5 readiness. It's critically important also in a world
6 where mobility, time constraints, geographic
7 considerations and student choice are making it far
8 more common for the college experience to involve
9 multiple courses taken at multiple institutions over
10 many years.

11 Today I want to share with you lessons
12 that we are learning in my organization, Jobs For the
13 Future, from two ambitious foundations funded
14 initiatives that bear on strategies to improve
15 articulation and alignment. These are the early
16 college high school initiative, funded by the Bill and
17 Melinda Gates Foundation; and the Achieving the Dream
18 initiative, led by the Lumina Foundation for Education
19 here in Indianapolis.

20 Now, I will say my remarks are somewhat
21 from the ground up, but I hope that they lead to some
22 useful perspective and recommendations for the
23 commission's consideration. The early college -- you
24 have this in your testimony, but just quickly though,
25 the early college, high school initiative has already
26 created over 80 small new schools that combine

1 secondary and post secondary learning in the same
2 institution, resulting in both a high school diploma
3 and an associate's degree or significant credits
4 towards an AA degree. The plan is for about 200 new
5 schools by 2011. They are being created by dozens of
6 organizations. Some are state groups like the new
7 schools project in North Carolina, some are national
8 groups like the National Council of La Raza and the
9 Woodrow Wilson foundation. Our organization, Jobs For
10 the Future, is the lead organization coordinating the
11 efforts to build new schools. The second initiative
12 I'm going to talk about and draw lessons from is
13 Achieving the Dream. That's a post secondary
14 education reform initiative involving 35 colleges,
15 community colleges, and seven states, Connecticut,
16 Florida, North Carolina, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas and
17 Virginia. Their focus is on using the analysis of
18 outcome data -- student outcome data to develop
19 institution wide reform strategies to improve student
20 success, particularly for first generation, low
21 income, minority students. And in this initiative how
22 overall, jobs of the future, is to focus on the
23 policies and support for the institutional change.
24 Each initiative leads to a different said policy
25 issues and concerns.

26 A couple of words before I jump into that.

1 If we think of articulation as a "process which
2 enables students to make a smooth transition without
3 delay, duplication of courses or loss of semester
4 credits," which is something I got off of one
5 college's web site last week when I was trying to
6 figure out what people really mean when you say this.

7 If you think of articulation in that way, there are
8 plenty of articulation disconnects that the Commission
9 needs to think about and address and that posed
10 obstacles to post secondary success. Peter hinted at
11 one, which is the articulation of industry
12 certificates in college courses and programs.

13 There are challenges in, also not talked
14 about in the day or so, between articulation between
15 more traditional institutions and the for-profit set
16 of higher education. Articulation across multiple
17 institutions in the same state and across states. And
18 of course, the ones that I'm going to focus on and
19 that you have focused on to some extent already, the
20 alignment of K-12 and postsecondary learning and the
21 alignment and articulation between two and four-year
22 institutions. The costs, obviously, in terms of
23 proficiency, retention, completion are very high. And
24 it's a particular challenge, all of these mis-
25 alignments and mis-articulations, in terms of a group
26 that we haven't spoken of that much in the past day

1 and a half, which is adult learners. And we haven't
2 spoken about explicitly adult learners for whom
3 setbacks in the accumulation of credit for an ease of
4 access to learning is an extremely high barrier to
5 persistence and success.

6 The poor alignment between K-12 and
7 postsecondary institutions is familiar ground to the
8 Commission. Mike Cohen from Achieve, David Conley of
9 the University of Oregon have testified before you,
10 and Kati Haycock focused like a laser on these issues.

11 But the impact of unpreparedness and
12 underpreparedness for college work is critically
13 important to meeting the goal that the Commission has
14 put at the top of your list there yesterday afternoon.

15 Being academically unprepared to succeed
16 in higher education is among, of course as you know,
17 the strongest predictors of failure in college. More
18 powerful than socio-economic status, race or gender.
19 Huge numbers of unqualified or minimally qualified
20 students from all economic backgrounds enroll in
21 college but the majority of these never earn a degree.

22 Not surprisingly, lower income students are
23 especially likely to be unqualified, academically
24 unqualified for college and not to complete.

25 So the two initiatives I'm talking about
26 today, early college high schools and Achieving the

1 Dream and lessons I'm drawing from them, point I guess
2 to two themes that I'd like the Commission to think
3 about and some recommendations on doing something
4 related to these issues of preparation and alignment.

5 First is the theme that there is a real
6 power to the college experience in high school. And
7 not just for those who start high school likely to do
8 well. And I'll get to some points about that in a
9 minute that come out of some of the work that we've
10 been involved in. And the second is that improvement
11 in college success, particularly for students in
12 community colleges, requires far more attention to the
13 alignment of data systems across educational and
14 employment sectors and increased state and
15 institutional capacity to use data well for the
16 improvement purposes rather than just for compliance
17 purposes. And this is something that Jay is the
18 expert on.

19 So, first, on the power of college in high
20 school. You have had testimony and there's certainly
21 a lot -- there's almost like I guess a growing kind of
22 consensus around a certain number of reforms like
23 aligning high school exit tests, graduation
24 requirements, college placement tests and improving
25 the signals that high school students and teachers get
26 about what it takes to succeed in college. So the

1 alignment of the tests and the signals.

2 Second, set a rigorous core curriculum as
3 a default. It's probably something that you've been
4 talking about.

5 Third, greater transparency about the
6 expectations and quicker intervention to help those
7 who are struggling while in high school, through
8 giving a college placement exam to students while they
9 are in high school and to start crafting an
10 intervention that can actually help those who are
11 behind get ready for college by the time they leave
12 high school.

13 And to do this requires higher education
14 leaders and front line experts in higher ed teaching
15 and learning to get involved in both the alignment
16 process but also in the intervention.

17 Our organization agrees with these
18 suggestions, but I want to go one step further, if I
19 may. And that is to talk specifically about the power
20 of college and high school. This includes advanced
21 placement, obviously, a subject that Governor
22 Caperton, you know, just spoke to you about. It
23 includes a range of programs often called
24 postsecondary enrollment options or dual enrollment,
25 and includes schools where the integration of college
26 learning and secondary learning is a basic component

1 of school design.

2 Clearly the public likes this idea. They
3 are rushing for AP course, they're rushing for dual
4 enrollment. Forty states have dual enrollment
5 legislation. The potential, I guess, that people see
6 in possibly shortening their route to college, more
7 academic rigor, more interesting courses, more cost
8 savings, a leg up on college. Parents like it, kids
9 like it. And it's a train that is moving in a lot of
10 different directions.

11 Most of the beneficiaries of these efforts
12 are already the college bound. They're the kids who
13 are doing well. They're the B students and above.
14 And there's a risk, and I'm glad to have heard
15 Governor Caperton's comments, but there's the risk,
16 right, that these kinds of efforts bringing college
17 into high school will actually exacerbate inequities
18 rather than accelerate opportunity for all.

19 But we in our work, and my testimony kind
20 of goes through a number of different programmatic
21 innovations that seem to hold some promise for helping
22 those who start out in high school behind
23 academically, to accelerate their learning and to take
24 college courses while in high school as part of a
25 comprehensive strategy and program of getting them
26 college ready.

1 I talk about, in the testimony, and I'm
2 going to skip the details for time's sake, the College
3 Now Program in New York City involving 200 high
4 schools and 17 CUNY campuses, two-year and four-year
5 campuses, talk about the beginnings of some evidence
6 from the early college high schools that we are
7 working with, and the Gates Foundation has funded,
8 including the first cohort LaGuardia Middle College in
9 New York, where 75 percent of the students in the
10 first cohort are on track to get their high school
11 diploma and an associate's degree by this summer, five
12 years after they started high school. And these are a
13 cross section of New York City public school kids,
14 many low income -- well, the majority low income and
15 minority.

16 And also mentioned in there, the
17 University Park Campus School in Worcester, which I
18 think, Kati, you've been to. Which is an incredible
19 partnership between the Clark University and the
20 Worcester public schools. And an amazing school that
21 has scored at the top of urban schools in
22 Massachusetts on MCAS performance, on kids going to
23 college in their first three graduating classes. So
24 you can get the details there.

25 But why am I telling you all this?
26 Because people say, well, pilots, you know, we don't

1 care about pilots. Single schools are great, pilots
2 are easy and we're not about -- high school we're
3 about fault, so why are you telling me this.

4 I think there are two things that I want
5 to emphasize. One is that the key to the success of
6 these programs and schools is that the kind of
7 personal -- the alignment comes alive. Because
8 alignment is coming alive in the personal, regular
9 interaction across secondary and postsecondary
10 sectors. The expectations, the signals, the
11 transparency is not just the policy framework, but
12 it's in the day-to-day running of these programs in
13 schools. It's in the day-to-day discussions about
14 teaching and learning and about quality and about
15 performance.

16 And the second reason, which is a little
17 more squishy is these schools -- these college and
18 school models are sowing the seeds of something
19 important. The outlines of which I don't think are
20 yet clear. They blur the boundary between secondary
21 and postsecondary learning, they make higher education
22 a routine expectation and end point, they raise all
23 kinds of questions about the financing of higher
24 education, assumptions about what college learning is,
25 assumptions about what's the default expectation we
26 should have of minimum expectations of education.

1 I mean there's something going on here
2 that has bigger implications than the individual
3 schools and their results for kids.

4 So I want to just -- okay, I want to
5 propose, quickly, a few things that the -- areas for
6 the Commission to consider, some recommendations
7 around these kinds of strategies to bring college and
8 high school -- or college into high school. And they
9 include -- the truth is that most of our work is at
10 the state level because that's where most of the
11 rubber hits the road in this kind of work, and so a
12 lot of these recommendations are actually probably
13 more state recommendations and it might be interesting
14 to think about how you turn -- how does the federal
15 government encourage these kinds of opportunities.

16 But one, I think, important thing would be
17 to reward and encourage dual enrollment programs that
18 make college and high school not just a course by
19 course option and not just something for those kids
20 who are already on the road to success, but that are
21 part of a comprehensive, high quality college
22 readiness strategy.

23 Second, the possibility of creating
24 incentives for colleges and universities, particularly
25 those with education schools, to create new high
26 schools like University Park to locate high schools on

1 their campuses, to promote collaboration and
2 deliberation about college readiness skills and
3 expectations.

4 I think as the federal government has, in
5 a creative way, looked at strategies to promote a core
6 curriculum in high school, one idea might be to
7 consider specifying that a core curriculum in high
8 school include some amount of college course work
9 while in high school.

10 So that's a couple of ideas. Let me --
11 I'm running a little late here. Let me quickly go to
12 a second set of points and I'll make these quickly
13 because Jay actually, in his remarks, made a lot of
14 them and Jay exemplifies them.

15 But the second initiative that I wanted to
16 talk about is the Achieving the Dream Initiative, as I
17 said you have some materials. There are 35 colleges
18 in seven states pursuing data driven institutional
19 change, strategies with support from state teams on
20 how do you move this from pilots to more systematic
21 state led or institution -- state supported
22 institutional change strategies.

23 These colleges have all started -- have
24 made a comment to saying we're going to use data about
25 student outcomes to figure out how we can improve the
26 progress of our students through the institution and

1 how we can improve student success. Well, the first
2 thing they realized was they don't have a lot of data
3 that helps them figure out how to do that.

4 The head of the community college
5 association in New Mexico has said I look at the IPEDS
6 data, the student right to know data, first-time,
7 full-time, and find that 90 percent of the students in
8 my community colleges are not in that data base. So
9 anything I'm learning from them, I'm not learning
10 about the part-timers, I'm not learning about most of
11 the adult students, I'm not learning about the core of
12 my business.

13 Okay, so Achieving the Dream, colleges and
14 the state systems in which they operate, have found
15 that they can't -- they don't have enough information
16 about students coming in, about what's happening to
17 students when they're there and about where they're
18 going. Where they're going in the work force, where
19 they're going when they transfer.

20 The two particular areas of weakness, one
21 is developmental education and information about
22 students coming in from adult basic ed or from ELL and
23 then going into and through developmental ed, and the
24 second is information about transfer students once
25 they leave the two-year college, what kind of
26 information can they get from the four-year schools

1 back about the performance of those students so that
2 they could actually improve what they're doing and
3 aligned better.

4 So this raises, I guess, four
5 recommendations or areas of recommendations that I'd
6 like to leave you with.

7 One, is the need to strengthen
8 longitudinal student data systems that connect K-12,
9 two and four-year higher education, the UI employment
10 system and the non-credit postsecondary learning
11 systems like adult ed and workforce programs, much
12 like Florida has been able to build over the past 20
13 years.

14 That would lead you to the question,
15 right, of should this be a national student record
16 data system or leave it to the states right now. I
17 know what Jay would say, and he will say. Jay will
18 say leave it to the states. And I would say leave it
19 to the states -- well, I would say actually, probably
20 at some point there should be a national unit record
21 data system but only if the states are involved in its
22 design, only if the states actually get the
23 information coming back down, rather than it all going
24 up. Only if it strengthens the states and the
25 institution's ability to improve and use data for
26 decision making, rather than use it for the kinds of

1 analyses that are further removed from practice. So
2 that's one point.

3 Second point, I think there's a need to
4 encourage additional indicators of student progress,
5 particularly for underprepared students, so that we're
6 not acting as if -- so that IPEDS information is not
7 the only way to know what's going on in these
8 institutions and to kind of make public what's going
9 on. So that the story is more robust and more
10 nuanced. And states in Achieving the Dream are
11 actually exploring developing some supplemental
12 indicators from developmental ed through into a
13 semester of college and trying to test that across
14 seven different states.

15 Third issue that Jay mentioned was the
16 issue of privacy and how the FERPA and privacy rules
17 can be clarified by the federal government, how they
18 can clarify, hopefully in ways that promote rather
19 than restrict access to information and data for
20 research purposes, for decision making and improvement
21 purposes, particularly around the transfer students
22 into four-year institutions.

23 And finally, I think it's one thing to
24 build all these data systems, it's another thing to
25 create systems that people know how to use and where
26 there's capacity at the institution level and at the

1 state level for using information for decision making.

2 And some strategies around how to strengthen research
3 capacity in a data driven world I think would be worth
4 considering.

5 That you very much for this opportunity to
6 speak with you.

7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Jay, we're
8 scheduled to go on about another 30 minutes with this
9 panel. I know, Governor Caperton, are you okay to
10 stay through this just for that period of time?

11 GOV. CAPERTON: No problem.

12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Good. Why don't you
13 interface with the Commission and get questions and
14 answers.

15 MR. PFEIFFER: Yes, sir.

16 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: I should say that
17 this is a fantastic topic for this Commission, for the
18 following reason.

19 Imagine the higher ed system as a one huge
20 organization. Articulation is the degree to which we
21 can bring efficiency to that system. And I get this
22 from all sides. Melinda Gates is on our Board and
23 Gerald Levy, the former Chancellor, started the
24 schools that Richard referenced. Associate programs
25 in high school is a wonderful way to build confidence
26 in students who are not yet considering going to

1 college. But I ask anyone on the panel to offer
2 advice to the following question. How do we link the
3 issues of articulation to the issues of affordability?

4 That is, in fact, if we can make the
5 system between different levels of our higher ed
6 system and between large employers, employers in
7 general, and our system, in essence we will be
8 bringing down the cost of higher education if programs
9 are efficiently transferred through the system. And
10 this became a huge issue in the higher ed
11 reauthorization between for-profits and not-for-
12 profits. But that link is hard to make for people.
13 Because it goes right at the proprietary nature of our
14 system. And I'd be interested in any insights into
15 how you think we can frame that issue well for the
16 public concern with our remarks on this.

17 MR. PFEIFFER: Panel?

18 MR. JOYCE: I would just say something
19 about cost and I think that the -- one of the issues
20 is about motivation I think. And particularly when we
21 start talking about different populations. And I
22 think articulation, when you can show that the career
23 pathways are really transparent and folks know what
24 the pathway is, I think that provides motivation. And
25 motivation will bring self-initiative to pursue
26 postsecondary and continue.

1 And I think some of the numbers that
2 Richard point to and Jay on retention in the system,
3 are kind of disturbing. I mean I think that those are
4 the people we need to not only provide access, but we
5 need to make sure that students stay in the program.

6 In our program, we've, for that same
7 issue, and we tried to bring sort of the application
8 of technology to kind of make it come alive, as
9 opposed to the dry stuff in the classroom. That, I
10 think, is aspiration to young people and that will
11 help with cost. I'm not saying cost isn't important,
12 but I think motivation is certainly a key first step
13 to dealing with the issue of cost.

14 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: In the end, someone
15 takes a program at an institution, spends their time
16 and money, I spoke with a woman last night who is
17 having this experience herself, and that those credits
18 are not easily transferred to the next institution
19 they go to or they have difficulty finding an
20 efficient use for those credits, we as a system have
21 spent more money than we otherwise would have needed
22 to.

23 Now, that's, you know, a cherry picked
24 example, but it's a massive waste in our system today.
25 And that's really what I'm trying to get at right now.

26 MR. KAZIS: Two different thoughts. One

1 is on the -- your point is primarily about adult
2 learners and the patterns of, you know, course taking,
3 a little here, a little there, or a program here in a
4 for-profit and then I want to then go on and learn
5 something else. What do I do with it. So I mean
6 there's a lot of issues in that -- I think it's really
7 critically important because of the nature of how
8 course taking is changing, has changed. So I think
9 you're on to --

10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does that effect the
11 cost? I think that was the question. He's trying to
12 get to the affordability thing.

13 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: I'm a broken record
14 on affordability as defined by how much it costs.

15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Cost or affordability is
16 the question.

17 MR. KAZIS: Well, it's easy to identify
18 the problem, yes, of course it effects the cost in
19 that if I'm taking a course here and I can't use it
20 any more, that's a huge waste. You're absolutely
21 right. I don't know -- how do you grab onto what
22 you're doing --

23 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Well, that was my
24 question to.

25 MR. KAZIS: I know. I know.

26 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Okay.

1 MR. KAZIS: Can I just make one other
2 point that's more about the K-12 to postsecondary
3 piece of that?

4 A lot of parents who are looking for --
5 and kids who are taking college courses in high
6 school, are thinking that there's a cost benefit to
7 them. I'm not sure whether there is. They might make
8 it through college in three years. I don't think so.

9 I think they'll just go to the next level in the way
10 that many kids use AP. They don't cut the fourth
11 year, they use it for more opportunity.

12 But I think that from a societal viewpoint
13 and you think about cost and affordability and value
14 per -- you know, as cost per degree, the retention
15 issues that Peter talked about.

16 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: One final point. If
17 we were to be so bold, this Commission could say
18 college is now a three year experience and the year
19 that you're not having in college is going to be had
20 in high school, it's going to transfer into the next
21 institution. You would bring the cost of higher
22 education down. That might not be a good thing, but
23 that is addressing the issue and it is tied up in
24 articulation as defined by the -- and that's a bold
25 statement that I'm not necessarily making but is an
26 example of what I'm trying to get at. You go to

1 Oxford for three years after spending, you know...

2 MR. PFEIFFER: Similarly what we had in
3 Florida, one of the things that they struggled with
4 was performance measures that deal with graduation
5 from a four-year institution --

6 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Right.

7 MR. PFEIFFER: And graduation from
8 community colleges is continuing to decline.

9 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: And I just would --
10 I think some of the Commissioners would be amazed at
11 how well high schools are teaching the first year of
12 college in their high school building where they have
13 controls and where young adults as they move on are
14 not as easily -- it's really a wonderful development
15 that's happening, it's just not well known yet.

16 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: May I?

17 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, Dr. Vedder.

18 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: On this point, which
19 I agree with a hundred percent. Charlie Reed of the
20 California State System made a comment that the 12th
21 year is a vast wasteland or something to that effect,
22 the senior year in high school. Which kind of relates
23 to this whole high school/college interface.

24 If, in fact, high school/college
25 integration is a key to improving access to lowering
26 attrition, to lowering costs simultaneously, why

1 aren't we doing more of it? The only question I have
2 is research oriented. What does the statistic say
3 about outcomes? Are outcomes of people that go
4 through these programs materially better, worse, the
5 same, than those who don't? So it's an empirical
6 question to me. If, in fact, the results are
7 positive, as you seem to be hinting based on limited
8 research, I would think that this would be an area,
9 picking up on Jonathan, where we should absolutely be
10 pushing very strongly.

11 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: But, Richard, you're
12 going to have to have territory. Why wouldn't the
13 answer be that you go to high school, they've got to
14 wake up and you're either not going to quit high
15 school to get the job.

16 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Are you against the
17 idea?

18 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: You just don't pay
19 enough attention here to and that one thing but that
20 -- is there --

21 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Hey, Bob, I thought
22 you used to agree with me all the time. We're in a
23 bad trend here.

24 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Let me go back to
25 the panel because the other thing that -- two quick
26 things. One is I appreciate you used the word

1 alignment. I would like us not to use the word
2 articulate. Articulate is a bad verb, align is a good
3 verb. Align tells you what you've got to do.
4 Articulate says what the hell are you talking about.
5 So I am really appreciative that you used the word
6 align.

7 But the question I have is, even yesterday
8 when we talked about under-represented populations,
9 adults and the like. But almost an urban comment
10 about it. What do any of you know about, in this
11 alignment issue, about where we are on kids, the 27
12 percent or so, that are still in what might be called
13 rural areas of this country? Do you guys do your work
14 in rural communities

15 MR. KAZIS: No, we mostly do not.

16 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Jay, you have a lot
17 of still rural areas in Florida, what's it look like
18 in Florida?

19 MR. PFEIFFER: Basically, one of the
20 aspects that we have in Florida is a community college
21 system that said early on that no individual in
22 Florida would be further than 50 miles from a campus.
23 And they've largely accomplished that.

24 The difficulty that I guess we see from a
25 data perspective is that up in the panhandle where I
26 live where there are still very big rural areas,

1 people do go to community college but it stops there.

2 It does look a little different. So I think that
3 you're correct, there is a

4 GOV. CAPERTON: You know, I lived in a
5 rural state most of my life. And I've lived in New
6 York for the last eight years, so I've seen a little
7 bit of both. And I think the thing you've got to
8 remember, and we really have to put an emphasis on
9 this, it's about good leadership in a school, it's
10 about good teachers in a school, it's about high
11 expectations for the students in those schools, and
12 it's about a lot of hard work.

13 You've got to get back down to the
14 fundamentals of what it's all about. It's not about
15 the kids where they come from, it's not about their
16 parents, it's about what kind of opportunity you give
17 them once they get in that school. And too many
18 Americans, particularly poor Americans, don't get that
19 in urban areas or in large cities or small cities.
20 It's about are we going to really be serious about
21 improving our schools. And that's about teaching and
22 learning.

23 And standards and assessment are a bread
24 sandwich if you don't get teaching and learning in the
25 middle of it. That's what we've got to really focus
26 on in my opinion.

1 MR. PFEIFFER: The little slides that I
2 showed you, the colorful bar chart and the pie chart,
3 increasingly I'm being asked to present those.

4 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: I actually have two
5 questions, one for Jay and one for Peter. Jay you
6 have a major system in Florida from a data
7 perspective. I wanted you to give an example of the
8 impact of the data, something that you did different
9 in Florida because you had access to that information.

10 And then for Peter, you gave information
11 in your testimony about the AP courses for African-
12 Americans and Latino Americans. But I didn't see
13 anything in there about women, females. And I
14 wondered if you had any information on that from an AP
15 standpoint.

16 MR. JOYCE: I'm about workforce, not AP.
17 If your question is about AP, he can probably catch
18 that.

19 MR. PFEIFFER: The impact that comes to
20 mind are impacts that deal with the policies that
21 effect the flows of students primarily through K-12.
22 And the example that I would give is the inauguration
23 a few years ago of a new retention policy for third
24 grade, where students who did not score particularly
25 well in reading in the third grade were not to be
26 promoted.

1 And data informed that decision, data are
2 basically used now to continuously evaluate the impact
3 of that decision and also to create alternatives other
4 than the state assessment that allow people under
5 certain circumstances to be promoted.

6 That was a controversial subject and it
7 would just actually -- we just provided data to the
8 state legislature to help inform them about some bills
9 that they're working on.

10 GOV. CAPERTON: As it relates to the
11 minority population, if you look at the statistics we
12 have in Florida, actually I think you'd be pretty
13 encouraged by it. We start at a very low base but the
14 percentage growth is the greatest growth that we have.

15 And I'd like to send to the Commission, if
16 this gentleman would allow me, the information that
17 would give you more detail on that.

18 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Okay, thank you.

19 GOV. CAPERTON: The second question you
20 asked is about women. The real problem we have in our
21 schools today is about men that are not getting
22 prepared to go to college --

23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I really appreciate
24 that.

25 GOV. CAPERTON: That is the great problem.
26 No, it's a very big problem, let's don't laugh about

1 that. That's a very critical part of American society
2 that we are not addressing as a huge problem. And we
3 used to think it was about minority populations but
4 it's also about white population today. It's a huge
5 problem.

6 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: If you have the
7 data, we would appreciate that.

8 GOV. CAPERTON: I will give you that data.

9 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Kati. Kati Haycock.

11 COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: I want to address a
12 bit of Rich's question about the data and try to
13 gather some of what was said in this panel and what
14 Carol Twigg actually talked about yesterday.

15 When you sort of step back from this trend
16 that these gentlemen have talked about, that is, you
17 look sort of over the last 20 years and you ask sort
18 of what's been the major change in the high school
19 curriculum, the fact of the matter is the thing that's
20 changed most, I mean the fastest growing part of the
21 high school curriculum has actually been AP, dual
22 enrollment in other college level courses.

23 Meanwhile, the fastest growing part of the
24 college curriculum has actually been remedial or
25 developmental or high school level courses.

26 So my evil twin occasionally says, wait a

1 second, does it make sense for each of us to be
2 reaching over and doing each other's business? What's
3 the impact like on the kids. Until you start looking
4 at the data.

5 And my evil twin has learned from the data
6 that what is in the end is important, and you've heard
7 it in what Jay said as well as what Gaston and Rich
8 said, what turns out to be important in expanding both
9 access and success is momentum. And the most recent
10 study from the Department of Ed looked at sort of
11 what's the most likely circumstances to get students
12 through to a bachelor's degree is completing 6 to 12
13 college credits while still in high school. That
14 creates some momentum that turns out to be very
15 powerful in getting students not just in the door but
16 out with a degree.

17 And again, you've heard the same thing in
18 what Carol said yesterday, is when students get slowed
19 down by failing or simply withdrawing with credit from
20 those introductory courses, that slows their momentum
21 and ends up vastly increasing the likelihood that they
22 will never get a certificate or a degree.

23 So as we sort of think about where we're
24 headed as a group, remembering the importance of
25 creating early momentum and keeping it going turns out
26 to be something we really need to think about, and

1 that is the kind of scene as we get to the
2 recommendation phase, will be important for us to
3 think about.

4 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Dr. Vest? Thank you,
5 Kati.

6 COMMISSIONER VEST: I was in Europe last
7 week and was reading some of the press there about the
8 immigration events in the United States. And they
9 quoted -- and I wish I could remember who it was, they
10 quoted a European diplomat talking about the
11 experience with immigration in his country. And he
12 made the following statement. We opened the gates to
13 admit the workforce and human beings showed up. And I
14 can't get that out of my mind and I want to thank
15 Governor Caperton for reminding us that we can look at
16 all the numbers and so forth we want, but at the
17 heart, this is about human beings.

18 Having said that, Jay, I first want to
19 thank you. That was really a very compelling
20 discussion showing why it is so important for us to be
21 able to track individuals through assistance, and also
22 to thank you for pointing out properly, in my view,
23 that FERPA need not be a barrier to learning the
24 things that we need to learn about logistics.

25 My question, Jay, and I realize I'm sort
26 of reasking the same thing that several people have

1 been dealing with, you made the statement that
2 dropping in and dropping out demonstratively leads to
3 the lower likelihood of graduation.

4 Now, every time you learn something by
5 asking questions, you raise more questions. How much
6 do you know about why that is. You talked about the
7 ability that maybe that some of these kids literally
8 want to take a course here, a course there. What do
9 we really know?

10 MR. PFEIFFER: Not much. From our surveys
11 that are done nationally that indicate that kids drop
12 out for financial reasons. I think that there's three
13 or four items that rank up very high that have to do
14 with job opportunities, family obligations and things
15 like that.

16 I do see -- what we do try to look at to
17 stop out, if you will, is what happened. We try to
18 look at things like whether or not they get a job,
19 whether they become employed, whether they stay in the
20 state, whether they become dependent on other
21 services.

22 By and large what we see was through the
23 stop out is that they work. That shouldn't be a
24 surprise because most of them are working while
25 they're in postsecondary. About 60 percent of the
26 students who are in postsecondary are working at the

1 same time.

2 There is almost like an economic kind of
3 cycle sometimes. People in Florida, as you know for
4 the last two years, have been kind of hammered by some
5 hurricanes. Not like Louisiana and Mississippi this
6 past year, but we've had some disruptions. Those
7 disruptions though have really done some interesting
8 things in our labor forces. There's been some fairly
9 high paying opportunities for people to work on the
10 cleanups and the repairs. And as a result,
11 postsecondary enrollment, especially in community
12 colleges, immediately dropped. There's job
13 opportunities there where people can make money. So I
14 think there's a correlation there that has to do with
15 supporting oneself while they pursue postsecondary
16 education. So I think that there is kind of a dollar
17 -- those would be the main ones, at least that I
18 observed.

19 COMMISSIONER VEST: Well, I just think
20 it's really important that somehow we continue to
21 pursue this because in order to draw what the policy
22 is, what is it that you get from this information that
23 helps you improve our size and improve our system. We
24 need to understand that --

25 MR. PFEIFFER: The whole issue of the
26 hurricanes has been one of interest that I think as a

1 country we can learn about. By having the kind of
2 data sets and employment kinds of things. We haven't
3 done enough and I don't think we're doing enough to
4 really look at how these have impacted people not only
5 in postsecondary but secondary as well and how that
6 also then correlates with the things that have
7 happened.

8 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Governor Hunt?

9 GOV. CAPERTON: Could I speak to that just
10 a moment, please? Mr. Chairman, could I speak --

11 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Sure, please.

12 GOV. CAPERTON: We have at the college
13 board created what we call inspiration awards which we
14 give to three schools every year, that are schools
15 where most of the students come from very low income
16 families. And when you look at most of these schools,
17 and we've been doing this for four years now, those
18 students will achieve extremely well. The best kids
19 will go to the best schools in the country, the next
20 will go sort of down to the last -- maybe the last 20
21 percent who won't go to college will end up going into
22 the Army or some place so they get a post education,
23 post high school education.

24 Now, those students learn in those school
25 environments, they -- those schools we almost can tell
26 you what the formula is. They have a good leader,

1 they have very high expectations for the kids, they
2 all work very hard, and they leave there with those
3 same kind of values and those same kind of beliefs
4 that they can work hard and they can be successful in
5 school.

6 So I think it really gets back to some
7 pretty fundamental things that makes schools really
8 work. And I don't mean to over-emphasize that. But
9 you have good data in those schools, which is
10 important. You've got to measure. But you really
11 have to have the fundamentals of leadership and good
12 teaching to really create an environment where a kid
13 leaves that school with a commitment and an
14 understanding that they can succeed and they have to
15 work hard.

16 And so I think that you can make this
17 thing real fancy and you can go around it all, because
18 it's a lot easier to do a lot of these things that
19 really get down to the hard part, and that is, getting
20 really great teachers in the schools, getting great
21 leadership in the schools and really having a belief
22 that kids can all do well.

23 That's hard work. That's what's really
24 tough about this thing.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNT: Mr. Chairman, I want
26 to commend all of our presenters for very good

1 statements. And I've had a chance to work with most
2 of your kinds of efforts.

3 But I want to say I spent yesterday, and
4 I'm sorry I wasn't here, but with our state
5 legislators in North Carolina and our K-12 and
6 community college and university folks. And just out
7 of those discussions I heard the president of the
8 community college system say that now, I think he said
9 70 percent of our students are women. And our
10 university -- our state university's 15 campuses, 60
11 percent of the students are women.

12 We really have a boys problem or male
13 problem. It's a huge problem. It's not our job to
14 tend to that, it's all of our job. You think of all
15 the -- if we had the same -- let's say same number of
16 boys, males, going on as we do girls going on, think
17 how much better off America would be.

18 And, Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we think
19 about all this, you know I come from a state
20 perspective as a lot of us do around here, but I hope
21 we're going to continue to think about how do we
22 advance America. How do we help this nation do
23 better.

24 Here on an articulation or alignment
25 panel, that's one of the things we're looking at. And
26 I would say to you, if we're going to -- as we think

1 about articulation, what is it about? It is to ease
2 and to help transition, transfer, moving on.

3 Now, we have to know how we're doing in
4 that. And so the information that you all are getting
5 in Florida, Jay, really is interesting to me. I
6 didn't know you were doing it. I gather that you may
7 be doing it best. And what I want to urge, Mr.
8 Chairman, is that as a nation we do it well. And we
9 find out ways we can help states to do it. And the
10 federal government, our national government, our
11 American government, can do that.

12 So I want us to look for way that we can
13 help. I want us to make recommendations about how we
14 can help. And some of them are going to cost money,
15 of course. But it's to do better.

16 Jay, how did you get that started? I mean
17 let's assume we do it at the state level. I'm going
18 to go back to North Carolina and push harder on it.
19 But that's like complicated. Did the legislature
20 mandate it? Did you get all the systems together and
21 agree on it? How did it happen in Florida?

22 MR. PFEIFFER: It started in Florida about
23 20 years ago, Governor. And it was the legislature.
24 And one of the situations you have in a fast growing
25 state is the population of students at all levels
26 grows. And if you don't have an appropriation process

1 that'll respond to that growth, you're going to lose
2 each year, you're going to lose ground each year.

3 And so the legislature began about 20
4 years ago to work toward processes where we would
5 monitor on a regular basis the number of students
6 coming in. And to do that we needed state data
7 systems that would enable it.

8 Part of what we did in trying to implement
9 these systems, I used quid pro quo a minute ago as
10 kind of way of doing business for me. If we're going
11 to have school districts, community colleges and
12 universities to report data to the state, they ought
13 to get something out of it. And so among the things
14 that we tried to look at would be ways that we could
15 build data systems founded on what they already
16 collected locally, not inventing something new, but
17 that would provide them with services. The initial
18 services that they were mostly interested in was
19 easing some of the things that the legislature
20 required them to do. So if we could do that and we
21 could reduce the level of constantly coming back to an
22 institution and saying, quick, we need this data, and
23 we could do it ourselves, that relieves the burden.

24 Also now more and more we're getting in
25 now to try to provide them back information that ties
26 all this stuff together along the lines that I've

1 suggested. But that initial impetus was funding in
2 Florida.

3 If we were to start it today and the
4 funding imperative was not as crucial a factor as it
5 was 20 years ago, I think the quid pro quo talk would
6 be where we would focus. What is in this that we can
7 do together that helps us together. How can we do
8 things that help institutions and civilians? How can
9 we do things that also answer questions that
10 legislations and governors have. And, incidently,
11 what the federal government needs as well.

12 Does that kind of get at it a little bit?

13 It was hard. I mean we met with local people and had
14 to hammer back and forth. You know, there was a
15 reluctance to report anything to the state. And tried
16 to build relationships that we have to continually
17 build. You have to continually grow around to make
18 sure that we're all comfortable with one another.

19 COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: Just a paragraph on
20 -- you haven't mentioned the fact that --

21 MR. PFEIFFER: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: That's really
23 important.

24 MR. PFEIFFER: Oh, maybe the segue into
25 that, Kati, would be the pie chart that showed the
26 highest attainment levels. Basically one of the

1 things that we've done in looking at this is to look
2 at participation in the labor market around those
3 earnings levels, and there's some fairly interesting
4 things that come out. This is basically the class of
5 '96 that I just mentioned. By their highest levels of
6 attaining. What are they earning in the Florida labor
7 market ten years after they graduate from high school.

8 There's some pretty good things. There's some things
9 you expect, that people that have a bachelor's degree
10 earn more than people that drop out. That's a good
11 thing.

12 But there are some things that are a
13 little bit frightening and actually deal with the
14 things that we were talking about here.

15 Twenty thousand dollars a year is the
16 national average for all workers who are drop outs.
17 That means after ten years, they've reached the
18 pinnacle of their earning ability on the average.
19 High school graduates in Florida whose highest level
20 of attainment is a standard high school diploma, ten
21 years after they graduated from high school are
22 earning a little more than \$28,000 a year in Florida.

23 The national census based average for all
24 workers, regardless of age, including World War II
25 veterans and the like whose highest credential is a
26 high school diploma, is about \$28,000. That means ten

1 years out of high school if you haven't gone past your
2 high school diploma, you have basically out stripped
3 yourself in the labor market. You're not going to
4 earn more unless you do more.

5 And what you see then in the people who
6 have attained postsecondary credentials, based on the
7 census data, is there's earning potential yet to go
8 that has not yet been realized in those data.

9 Does that kind of get at it? The labor
10 market stuff is great. We can -- when we talk about
11 the kind of demands that I showed you, when we talk
12 about occupations that are in demand, we can actually
13 relate the disciplines that people take to the job.

14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: We're going to take one
15 more question, and that does require data that --

16 MR. PFEIFFER: Kati unleashed me, sir, I'm
17 sorry.

18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: No, actually that's a
19 very important point. There are other states that
20 follow people into the labor force. In Texas we do
21 have the unit record system that goes through K
22 through 20 or whatever. So there are a lot --

23 MR. PFEIFFER: I've heard a lot with Texas
24 on that.

25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Pardon?

26 MR. PFEIFFER: I've heard a lot with the

1 state on that.

2 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think it's proving the
3 point that several people made, that critical data is
4 to inform policy and it needs to be with the student.

5 We have one more -- time for one more
6 question.

7 COMMISSIONER GRAYER: We are reliving
8 history in some sense and I want to try to tie
9 together the male education issue and the momentum
10 one.

11 In the '40s after the GI Bill, there was a
12 left behind group of population that wasn't going to
13 college. And of course the solution was vocational
14 high schools. A lot of money was poured into high
15 schools that would train students when they came out
16 for better and higher paying jobs, trades.

17 In today's market place, that might not be
18 any longer enough. And that momentum question ties
19 directly to the notion that high schools can gain in
20 their high school experience associate level education
21 and get that momentum, not only towards a high
22 education degree but a higher paying job.

23 And, Governor Hunt, if you want to think
24 about policy that can actually be enacted, money that
25 could be directed into the nexus of high schools and
26 community college systems, for-profits, but mostly

1 community college systems where the large number of
2 students actually end up, that would be a specific
3 place to address a policy and financial commitment to
4 gain momentum for boy, men students, towards a higher
5 paying job in their high school life.

6 No different than going to a vocational
7 high school in 1947 so you could become a pipefitter
8 and get a high school degree. And that would be a
9 great place to think about a policy statement for our
10 Commission.

11 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. That's a
12 really fine way to end. Does anybody have one more
13 comment they want to make?

14 I can't thank you enough for the
15 presentation, Gentlemen. Personally, I happen to
16 think this is one of the most important or urgent
17 issues, whether you call it some fine tuning alignment
18 or articulation or both, and it's very valuable that
19 you've presented your stuff today, thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I'd like the spots to
22 stay in its place and we'll be on a timely basis for
23 the next presentation. There's a lot of material to
24 cover, it's very critical and we're going to try to
25 get out early. So let's pursue it.

26 (Off the record.)

1 CHAIRMAN MILLER: That's a powerful group
2 you've got assembled there and we have a lot to cover.

3 I think organizationally you're going to have a
4 couple of people make presentations and have some
5 questions, is that fair?

6 DR. EWELL: Yes, I'll explain that. Yes,
7 sir.

8 CHAIRMAN MILLER: All right, good. Take
9 off.

10 DR. EWELL: Okay, I'm Peter Ewell from the
11 National Center for Higher Education Management
12 Systems. I believe I've been selected to ride herd on
13 this group, largely because for the last 25 years I've
14 been involved with assessment and accountability
15 conversations at every level, with the federal
16 government, 28 states, all of the regional accrediting
17 organizations in one way or another and over 400
18 institutions.

19 And when I started this work I was as big
20 as Peter McPherson. So it's been quite a ride in
21 terms of having the scars to prove that.

22 I think there's good news and bad news in
23 all of this. I think the bad news is this stuff is
24 hard. Colleges have been allergic to it. It's been a
25 real difficulty in getting the conversation started.
26 It's hard work because the technical side of this, as

1 you'll see, is not easy to assess collegiate learning.

2 The good news is I think that there are
3 signs that we are reaching a tipping point where
4 institutional leadership is stepping up and saying
5 we've really got to address that.

6 What I intend to do is -- you have some
7 opening comments from me, which I'm going to only very
8 briefly gloss to set the stage for this. And then
9 we're going to do this in three blocks. What I'd like
10 to do is have the folks who are involved in developing
11 tools for gathering evidence of student learning make
12 a presentation and that's Roger Benjamin and Steve
13 Klein from Council on Aid to Education and RAND
14 Corporation for the collegiate learning assessment,
15 and George Kuh for the National Survey of Student
16 Engagement.

17 Then you can question them a bit and we
18 can have a discussion about tool development, if you
19 will.

20 Then I'd like Peter McPherson from NASULGC
21 to go because I think he's advancing what is, I think,
22 a fairly unprecedented proposal where colleges and
23 universities are taking the lead on trying to come out
24 on this issue. And then turn to Anne Neal and Kevin
25 Carey to talk a little bit about the kinds of things
26 that parents and trustees and so on want to know and

1 some of the vehicles for getting that done. Do that
2 as a block and then you can discuss it. That's the
3 choreography for how I want to work this thing.

4 Let me start out by saying that, Mr.
5 Chairman, you billed this session assessment and
6 accountability. It said on my program simply
7 accountability. We certainly are going to be talking
8 mostly about assessment. But I want to remind the
9 Commission that there are other things that we ought
10 to be accountable for, too. Even though the center of
11 gravity, if you will, of this stuff is going to be
12 about the bottom line of learning.

13 And you made a commitment, or at least the
14 beginning of a commitment, with your I'll connect the
15 dots that you used to do the stickies.

16 The primary priority is really the one of
17 getting a larger proportion of our young adults to a
18 postsecondary credential and then picking up on what
19 Jim Duderstadt said yesterday, with a credential of
20 world class quality. And so, you know, you have to
21 put all those things together and the assessment part
22 of the conversation is not only do they get through
23 but how do we know that we have something of value at
24 the other end.

25 And I just want to consistently remind you
26 that if that is the national goal of moving more

1 people to a credential of quality, you need to have a
2 number of things in place. First of all, and I won't
3 spend any time on this, it's in the testimony and
4 you've heard it, we're not doing so well with that.
5 There's some troubling signs in terms of international
6 comparisons that we're falling behind in terms of
7 credentialling. We're now number seven in the world.

8 There's some softness in the international assessment
9 data that indicates that the credentials may not be as
10 valuable as they once were. You've all seen the
11 National Assessment of Adult Literacy data. What you
12 may not have seen is the few samples of college
13 students that took that. And they did a little better
14 but they didn't do nearly as well as I would have
15 liked them to have done in that exercise.

16 The first point I'd like to make is that
17 we still don't know anything systematic as a nation
18 the way we do for K-12 with me, about what that level
19 of learning looks like. Peg Miller and I did a
20 demonstration project about 18 months ago with five
21 states that I think demonstrated that we could have
22 profiles of learning that could fulfill that role at
23 the state level. I think that it essentially proves
24 that it could be done. I think some very simple
25 things could extend that work if there were, for
26 example, a pot of money at the federal government

1 level that would match state efforts in trying to
2 gather those kinds of data, and so that they could
3 benchmark their progress. That would be a good thing.

4 I think that we could extend the ceiling
5 of the National Assessment of Adult Literacy into
6 higher levels of skill than are now tested for, so
7 that we can see what the educational capital looks
8 like at the high end, at the world class end, as Jim
9 was talking about. And extend the sample sizes so
10 that states can get some of that information, too.

11 And all of that is tied in with certainly
12 something that I very much support, which is a
13 National Longitudinal Student Tracking Capacity that
14 needs to be tied, as Jay said, to the state level as
15 well. Because the states are really where the action
16 is on this.

17 Now, let me turn to the fact that
18 graduating more citizens with a credential is our
19 collective goal. But different institutions can
20 contribute to that collective goal in different ways.

21 And I think that we need to appreciate that we have a
22 diverse higher education system that's been doing very
23 well by us. And that the kinds of contributions that
24 individual institutions make are going to be different
25 in that regard.

26 One way of taking that into account is the

1 value added kind of model that we'll hear some about.

2 But I think that I learned enough in this business to
3 know that a robust college level assessment system is
4 one that's going to be tailored to that institution if
5 its faculty is going to make any difference.

6 So everybody ought to be accountable for
7 documenting what their contributions are to that
8 bottom line. The way they do that ought to be
9 benchmarked in some way to some external standard.
10 But I don't think that you should be expecting a
11 cookie cutter approach with regard to assessment
12 because that's not going to get faculty involved.

13 I think another example in here is -- or
14 another point in here is that we do have, despite the
15 sort of glacial progress on this issue, a number of
16 pretty good examples of what an assessment system
17 could look like at the institutional level that
18 informs good practice and discharges accountability.
19 But there are very, very few incentives in the system
20 right now for colleges to be any good at this. The
21 presidents aren't rewarded for it. It's a thing you
22 have to do. It's not something that is like winning
23 football games and like bringing in research stars and
24 so on. So we need to pay attention to the question of
25 what is going to get institutional leaders to sit up
26 and take notice. And I'll have a thought about that

1 in a minute.

2 So what to do. I think that one of the
3 pieces here, accreditation got beat up pretty bad in
4 some of the conversation around yesterday and in some
5 of the paper that was flying. But I think we do need
6 to recognize that what progress has been made in this
7 issue over the last ten years is largely attributable
8 to regional accreditation. I mean they have kept the
9 issue alive. They have been responsible for what has
10 happened on college campuses in all of this. And I
11 think that they need to get some credit for it and I
12 think we need to build on that base.

13 Because accreditation is terribly under
14 capitalized to do this job. There really is not much
15 resource there in terms of teams that know what
16 they're doing when they go to a campus and then try to
17 look at what a college is up to in terms of the basic
18 sort of research capacity for knowing how to assist
19 institutions to move along that path and so on.

20 So you might give some thought to saying
21 if the federal government is going to rely on this
22 particular mechanism to move forward, how are you
23 going to get them up to a point where they can do it
24 very, very well.

25 If that were the case, I think that you
26 would want accreditors to do some additional things

1 that they do not now all systematically require. One
2 is, as I mentioned, to benchmark -- ask institutions
3 to benchmark what they do to some external standard.
4 It doesn't all have to be the same. But I think that
5 it is incumbent upon institutions to be able to show
6 that they are measuring up to something that is other
7 than what their faculty says is the level that they
8 want to be. And I think also accreditors, and they're
9 coming pretty close to this now, should publicly
10 disclose those results or should at least have the
11 institutions publicly disclose those results. Those
12 are all conversations that you moved toward I think
13 yesterday.

14 Finally, let me say that we've made a lot
15 of progress in the technology of all of this and
16 you'll hear some of this in a minute. But I want to
17 remind you that it's not just all about technology.
18 The measurement instruments are only a small part of
19 the problem. That we have instruments that you're
20 going to be hearing about that I think are the best
21 there are that we currently have. That doesn't mean
22 that they can't be made better. That doesn't mean
23 that there aren't a lot of other things that are
24 beginning to emerge to take advantage of web based
25 technology, of the simulation capacity that we can
26 use, and that aren't widespread. So I think that you

1 shouldn't confine yourself to these particular ways of
2 doing things in thinking about it.

3 Most importantly of all, I think -- I've
4 been saying this for years, we've had a lot of data
5 and we haven't been using it. We've had a lot more
6 information than we've had the political will to do
7 something with. And I say political saying that not
8 just in terms of what people in legislatures are
9 doing, but in terms of institutional leaders. And
10 that's why I find Peter McPherson's proposal
11 intriguing. Because I think that this is one that may
12 be showing a bit of a change in the way that goes.

13 Last comment. There's a building
14 constituency I think of presidents who are willing to
15 take risks on this and, Bob Zemsky, it's because of
16 the market. It's because I think they're saying we
17 need to send market signals that we're responsive to
18 this stuff and people are beginning to ask for it. So
19 I think that we're going to have a growing groundswell
20 of the public asking questions like what's your NSSE
21 results look like, how are you doing on the CLA? And
22 that that may be moving things forward.

23 With that, let me turn it over to Roger
24 Benjamin of Council on Aid to Education and Steve
25 Klein from RAND.

26 DR. BENJAMIN: Thank you, Peter. And I

1 want to thank Mr. Miller and the Commission for this
2 opportunity to talk a little bit about the CLA.

3 I chose in our brief comments to focus on
4 the principals, the structured focus, some findings
5 and Steve Klein, my colleague, who is the research
6 director of the Council for Aid to Education is going
7 to talk about that. And then I'll talk a little bit
8 about where we are and the next steps.

9 I hope you've all got the slides that
10 we're going to be briefly speaking from. And at the
11 end there's some frequently asked questions. No
12 approach is without flaws and issues to deal with and
13 I've listed some of the basic questions there. So I'm
14 going to start with Steve.

15 DR. KLEIN: Thank you. And thank you for
16 inviting me.

17 There's a very basic principal in testing
18 which goes something like this. What you test and how
19 you test will influence what teachers teach and
20 students learn. I'll repeat that. What you test and
21 how you test will influence what teachers teach and
22 students learn.

23 And that principal effects throughout the
24 whole education system. Twenty-five years ago we had
25 the senior partners of the major law firms in
26 California and other states were very concerned about

1 the product that was coming out of the law schools
2 because they were spending so much time teaching these
3 law school graduates how to be lawyers. The other end
4 of the spectrum was there are many people in the
5 minority bar who were concerned that the kinds of
6 questions that were being asked might be fine for an
7 appeals court but didn't have anything to do with the
8 store front law that they were practicing.

9 And they got together, and I'm sensitive
10 to this because of Governor Hunt's question earlier
11 about how did this all come about, how were you able
12 to achieve all this. Well, these two factions, these
13 two opposite ends of the political spectrum got
14 together and said what we should do is we should build
15 problems or performance tasks that students would take
16 on the bar exam. And include those on the exam and
17 score them. These problems would have to do with
18 practical applications. So students would have to
19 write a letter to an opposing counsel or to a client
20 or do a points in authority speech, something that
21 actually lawyers do. And we put that on the bar exam
22 and where did we get the pushback? The pushback came
23 from the deans of the law schools who said we don't
24 teach this. And the chairman of the committee, I'll
25 never forget this, said now you will.

26 And that's what I mean about the tail

1 wagging the dog. I have to mention that the Chairman
2 of this Commission is from Texas and Texas, on their
3 bar exam, they have a question about oil and gas
4 leases. Trust me, the students in Texas study oil and
5 gas leases. Not a surprise.

6 So what you put on your exam, what you
7 test and how you test for it in terms of the kinds of
8 measures that you use is going to influence
9 construction.

10 Now with that in mind, let me turn to my
11 presentation. What I'll talk about are some of the
12 principals driving the kinds of measures we're using,
13 what distinguishes this feature from some other
14 measures that are out there. Given the amount of time
15 we have, I won't say too much about the measures
16 themselves, but we have those materials available for
17 you. I'll talk a little bit about reporting results
18 and then I'll turn it over to Roger to finish off.

19 And since you have all the slides in front
20 of you, I won't spend a lot of time on them. We can
21 go to page 2 and talk about one test cannot assess
22 overall quality. It would be ridiculous to suggest
23 that one measure or even a battery of measures is
24 going to assess all the things that higher education
25 strives to achieve. It doesn't make sense to use one
26 test and say this is how good your school is based

1 upon this test. Colleges have different missions,
2 students have different majors, the situation is very
3 different than what we see in K-12 where there's a
4 unified curriculum, basically, and so on. So it
5 doesn't make sense to talk about that.

6 But the fact that you can't measure
7 everything doesn't mean you can't measure some things.

8 So some things are important that do cut across
9 institutions. When you look at the mission statements
10 of universities and colleges and schools, they talk
11 about a number of things that they want all their
12 students to be able to do. Included in some of those
13 things are things like writing and critical thinking
14 and problem solving, so on. And those are things that
15 cut across disciplines. They're not tied to a single
16 discipline. And if they are important, why not
17 measure them.

18 So with that in mind, you ask the question
19 if we are measuring them, how do you go about doing it
20 and what kinds of things are you going to look at?
21 And in order to do that, you need benchmarks. Because
22 you can't measure progress unless you know where you
23 start. It's that simple. You can't talk about
24 improvement unless you have some baseline to see how
25 much you've improved from.

26 And so you need some baseline measures.

1 And the kinds of questions that you want to ask is how
2 much did our students improve? And you also want to
3 know, is that improvement average, is it good, is it
4 not so good? So you need to have some sort of
5 benchmark to compare our improvement to somebody
6 else's improvement to get some sense of what's going
7 on. Is it adequate?

8 My fourth point in terms of principals
9 driving the CLA is you have to use the results
10 appropriately. We did not see the results being used
11 to rank or rate schools. We haven't measured
12 everything that's important. We've measured some of
13 the things that are important but not everything
14 that's important. I wouldn't use these tests to rate
15 schools by themselves. But I don't see why you
16 couldn't include this information as part of an
17 overall index system. Like many things -- you're
18 going to look at access, you're going to look at
19 graduation rates and so on. One of the things that
20 you might look at is the kinds of results that we're
21 talking about. So it's one of many things.

22 And it can be used to identify effective
23 practices, it could be used for -- the results can be
24 used to improve learning and instruction. And my
25 point about it affects what's studied and what's
26 taught.

1 In order to have measures that will do all
2 these things, they've got to be valid, they've got to
3 assess important skills that are relevant to what
4 students need. And it's not just what they need in
5 their major, but as citizens. To be able to function
6 in our society and to be able to help in our society,
7 people need to have certain types of skills that we
8 expect of our college graduates.

9 The test has to be fair. It has to be
10 given under standardized conditions. It has to be
11 calibrated so the scores aren't effected by somebody
12 having an easier or more difficult test. People in my
13 field spend a lot of time doing that, worrying about
14 those kinds of issues. And it has to be cost
15 effective.

16 In the past it was generally prohibitive
17 to use open-ended measures on a large scale SA test,
18 constructive response kinds of measures. That has
19 changed. We now can do that very well. We train
20 people how to be readers and we do it -- they can do
21 their reading. I must say that Peter was involved in
22 that recently, sat in on one of our training sessions
23 for readers. And in those sessions, which I think
24 Peter would agree, it's pretty rigorous training.

25 One of the first things we do is we have
26 the readers take the test themselves. So they get a

1 feel for the perspective -- what the students are
2 like. And, Peter, I have your results. So we'll talk
3 about that later.

4 There's certain features of the measures
5 that are different than what you'd normally see when
6 you think about large scale tests. We rely, like I
7 said, on open-ended measures. They're work samples of
8 the kinds of tests that we'd expect somebody to be
9 able to do. They're engaging. Students are drawn
10 into them. They're applicable to students who have
11 different majors, that cut across the whole spectrum.

12 The school is the end of the analysis, we're not
13 really focusing on students, individual students,
14 although we give them their results back. Our primary
15 interest is on how well the school is doing.

16 We have a very large battery of measures.
17 We can't give all of them to every student. And so
18 we use a technique called matrix sampling. Some of
19 you who are familiar with NAPE, we do the same thing
20 on NAPE. So it's using that same methodology, quite
21 frankly. Having each student take only a portion of
22 the total battery and then putting the results
23 together to get a score for the school.

24 It's all paperless. It's paperless test
25 administration, scoring and reporting. We control for
26 input, which is also a distinguishing feature. So

1 we're not saying, you know, here is your score
2 relative to all the other schools on some absolute
3 scale. What we're saying is how well are you doing
4 relative to the input that you have. Where did your
5 students start and how much progress did they make.
6 So we're focusing on improvement and on progress. And
7 we're seeing whether your progress is consistent with
8 that of other institutions that are like yours.

9 And so we're reporting results in terms of
10 value added. We use different kinds of measures. We
11 have essay kinds of prompts, make an argument, break
12 an argument, we have these performance tasks which are
13 these real life types of problems, these work sample
14 type problems. And to give you a little feel for it,
15 on page 5 there's a sample prompt of the kind of essay
16 that we're using. Where we give students a short
17 quote or statement and then we ask them to defend
18 their -- agree with it or disagree and explain why.
19 What's their rationale. And we scored that in terms
20 of whether they can express their ideas, whether they
21 can back up their ideas and so on. We could talk
22 about the details in scoring.

23 If you look at page 6, there's another
24 kind of prompt called a break in argument prompt where
25 it gives students an argument, it's laid out and then
26 we ask them to critique it. What's right or wrong

1 about it. For example, they might discover that a
2 person is assuming that correlation means cause, which
3 I heard a little bit about this morning actually,
4 listening to some of the statements. But we can talk
5 about that, too. I'm taking on more than I can handle
6 probably here.

7 And then the performance test, which
8 you've got to see to appreciate. What the students
9 get is a computer screen, when they're looking at
10 their computer screen, on the left hand side of the
11 screen there's the question, a play in which to record
12 their answers and on the right hand side of the screen
13 there's what we call a document library. And it has
14 various documents that they look at and that they have
15 to integrate the information from in order to answer
16 the question. And so they might be working with
17 letters, newspaper articles, research reports, so on,
18 a whole variety. We purposely make what's on the
19 right hand side of the screen very diverse. And they
20 have to integrate information from different documents
21 to present a coherent argument. So that gives you a
22 feel for what the performance tests are like.

23 We use two definitions of value added,
24 both are important. One is how much improvement
25 occurs within the institution over time. So between
26 freshman and senior year. How much gain is there on

1 these measures.

2 The second definition has to do with
3 whether that improvement is more or less than what
4 you'd expect given the improvement at other
5 institutions. Both are definitions of value added,
6 both are important.

7 If you look at figure 1, and we're sorry
8 about the size of this, but each of the -- along the X
9 axis, the horizontal axis at the bottom is the
10 students' ACT score at the school. So it's the mean
11 ACT score at the school. If the school uses the SAT,
12 we convert it over to the ACT. So the X axis is the
13 ACT score average at the school, the vertical axis, Y
14 axis, is the CLA score. Each of those circles
15 represents a college. And the circle that's filled
16 in, the dark circle, is your school. So this is a
17 sample school report showing where you are.

18 And if you look at this, you can see that
19 there's a pretty strong relationship between a
20 school's average ACT score and its score on our
21 measures.

22 But some schools are above the line and
23 some schools are a little bit below that line of the
24 expected. And if they're well below or well above,
25 you might want to take a look. Now, this picture on
26 page 7 is for freshmen. So this is before the school

1 had an influence. And what you're seeing is some
2 students are doing better than others, or some schools
3 are doing better than others, which may be due to
4 something in their selection process and not
5 necessarily they're imposing it but self-selection as
6 well.

7 So there's something going on. Schools
8 don't actually start at the same place. And you can
9 see there's quite a range. Those of you familiar with
10 the ACT scales can see there's quite a range here in
11 terms of the schools in our sample.

12 Turn to the next page, page 8, the -- now
13 the figure goes from blue to red and we're talking
14 about seniors. This has nothing to do with blue
15 states and red states, trust me on that.

16 They have the same picture and your school
17 is again showing up as the solid dot. What this tells
18 us, again, is that some schools are doing better than
19 expected and some schools are not doing as well as
20 expected, but most are doing about on the expected
21 range.

22 The figure at the bottom of the page is
23 the most important. This compares seniors to
24 freshmen. And the first thing that jumps out at you
25 is that the bar for -- the line for seniors is well
26 above the line for freshmen. In terms of educational

1 effects, these are big effects. The statisticians
2 call this one and a half standard deviation
3 difference, that's a big effect size.

4 To give you some feel for that, if you
5 reduce class size in public schools in half for three
6 years, you've got an effect size of a quarter of the
7 standard deviation. This is six times bigger, okay?

8 So it gives you some feel for what's going
9 on here. And we could talk about what the sources
10 are. One of the other things which is interesting is
11 that schools that started off really well in terms of
12 their freshmen, score higher than seniors at other
13 schools. If you draw a horizontal line through this
14 picture, you will see schools where the freshmen are
15 doing better than the seniors at other schools. But
16 relative to expected, the story is not so stark.

17 We could get into more detail about how to
18 look at these things but I'm sensitive to Peter's
19 request that we keep it short. But I do have your
20 scores here, Peter. I'll turn it over to Roger now.

21 DR. EWELL: And, Roger, do pick it up,
22 thank you.

23 DR. BENJAMIN: I guess the next slide on
24 page 9 talks about the program participation and that
25 just allows me to say that this -- we've been at this
26 for six years. Peter indicated quite properly that

1 this is hard work. But we are in our sixth year and
2 the internet, when you get the test administration
3 details worked out, does allow you to go to scale and
4 we're doing that now.

5 But there are other potential sources or
6 uses of the CLA that I list here. I'll just note
7 quickly that systems like the University of Texas, the
8 Council on Independent -- Consortium of Colleges lead
9 by the Council of Independent Colleges are working
10 together to develop best practice responses to the
11 scores that they get.

12 A couple of schools are investing heavily
13 in new inquiry based pedagogical models and they're
14 using the CLA to study the efficacy of these
15 investments by comparative research projects.

16 You can, if you use more testing time, use
17 the CLA for individual students' score results. And
18 some institutions are clearly beginning to use this
19 kind of approach for accreditation.

20 We're focused on our model. It's a value
21 added model that looks at the institution and we're
22 really focused on using it for improving teaching and
23 learning. The market's going to decide how this kind
24 of approach is used in the future.

25 Finally, the frequently asked questions do
26 note a number of issues. Steve, say something about

1 motivation which is one topic that always comes up and
2 then we'll quickly turn it over.

3 DR. KLEIN: Right. One question that
4 always comes up is student motivation. There are many
5 aspects to that. One is if we can get the students
6 into the room to take the test, motivation generally
7 is not an issue because the test is so engaging. You
8 walk in, you give the test and you can hear the
9 computer keyboards going almost right away.

10 Nevertheless, students who are more highly
11 motivated probably do better. That makes sense. When
12 we ask students how hard they tried, we see a
13 relationship, not a very strong relationship, but
14 there is some relationship between their scores and
15 how hard they said they worked. But that's after the
16 fact. We don't know if that's just saying that, you
17 know, they saw the problem, saw how hard it was, they
18 say, well, I didn't try that hard.

19 So we don't know which came first. But
20 nevertheless, let's assume for the moment that
21 motivation is a factor. It's certainly true in K-12
22 education that motivation is a factor and people say,
23 well, you can look at state test scores when students
24 aren't motivated. There's no stakes for the students
25 to take the test. Except for a high school graduation
26 test, there is no stakes attached to NAPE or statewide

1 tests, whether the TOS in Texas or California's test
2 or whatever it is.

3 One assumption which is made is that,
4 well, that's probably true across schools and states
5 in the same way. That why would we think that
6 motivation is higher in some places than it is in
7 others. Well, that's probably not a terribly safe
8 assumption, but it's probably not terribly wrong
9 either.

10 So on that scale. The other part though
11 is some schools may start including these measures in
12 capstone courses. And the students could be highly
13 motivated. And we think that would be wonderful, if
14 schools started doing this. And as schools' scores
15 went in, in part, because they're teaching this and
16 requiring the students to be able to write well,
17 what's so wrong with that?

18 So we can talk in more detail about
19 motivation but there's many aspects to it. But I
20 think it's probably a good thing that motivation has
21 some impact on this.

22 DR. EWELL: Let's turn to George Kuh from
23 Indiana University, the needed Hoosier in the room, to
24 talk about the national survey of student engagement.

25 DR. KUH: Thank you, Peter. I want to
26 thank the Chairman and the Commission for a chance to

1 be with you this morning. And we're delighted you're
2 in Indianapolis, home of a number of motor races, the
3 500 mile race. We do grand prix events here and so
4 on. And this is a town where a lot of people know a
5 lot about fast cars. And one of the things they've
6 learned over the years is that just racing doesn't
7 make a car go faster the next time. You can figure
8 out where you are in the pack after a race, but
9 knowing it doesn't necessarily tell you what you need
10 to do to go faster the next time.

11 Go faster to perform better requires the
12 review of lots of things. Many of which are evident
13 long before a race starts. How the car is built or
14 set up, the race track conditions, the preparation of
15 the driver, the racing team and so on. And so it is
16 with assessing and improving the quality of
17 undergraduate education. We certainly need good
18 outcome measures like CLA and the other things that
19 are out there and are coming along.

20 But knowing the result of a race, knowing
21 the test score doesn't point you to the kinds of
22 things that teachers and learners have done to produce
23 the test scores. That's the reason the Baldrige
24 criteria, for example, exquisitely requests the
25 linkage between processes and outputs. You can't
26 increase quality or efficiency appreciably without

1 having those connections.

2 And so we need to know how students spend
3 their time and what institutions devote their
4 resources to in order to meaningfully connect test
5 scores, outcome measures, with the learning activities
6 associated with the scores.

7 For the last seven years my colleagues at
8 Indiana and our kind of sister counterpart at the
9 University of Texas at Austin have been collecting
10 data annually from hundreds of thousands of students
11 at hundreds of colleges and universities around the
12 country to discover the extent to which students and
13 institutions are doing the things that matter to
14 desired outcomes of the college. And these
15 institutions, not all but a lot of them, in increasing
16 numbers, are actually using the data to change what
17 they do.

18 I have submitted, as others, written
19 testimony and a pile of other materials that describe
20 these two projects, the National Survey of Student
21 Engagement, NSSE. And I'm speaking today also for
22 Kaye McClenny who directs the community college survey
23 of student engagement, the CCSSE. Both of these ask
24 very similar, in fact there's substantial overlap
25 intentionally, questions about student engagement.
26 And by that we're talking about the time and effort

1 that students spend on things that are related to
2 desired outcomes of college.

3 And the reason we're spending time talking
4 about student engagement is because not only do we
5 have direct links with outcomes but there are other
6 issues like graduation rates, student satisfaction and
7 so on. The premise is really simple. The more time -
8 - very complicated algorithm, the more time students
9 spend studying, the more they learn. The more they
10 practice and get feedback, very important, the quality
11 of the writing or problem solving, the more adept they
12 become in these areas. The very act, Lee Shulman our
13 friend says, of being engaged as to a foundation of
14 dispositions that people can call on the rest of their
15 lives for learning, personal development and so on.
16 These two surveys are relatively short, intentionally
17 so. And they're, for that reason, relatively
18 inexpensive to use. They collect information though
19 about a variety of activities about which we need to
20 know more. Reading, amount of writing, amount of --
21 the nature of students' interactions with their
22 teachers inside and outside the classroom, with
23 diverse peers and so on.

24 But most important, institutions when they
25 get the data can take almost immediate action to
26 address areas where they're not performing very well.

1 So this is not a battery of instruments, tests for
2 example, like CLA that assess outcomes directly. But
3 they provide information every school needs if they're
4 going to try to do something about the outcomes.

5 Both these projects are now self-
6 supporting. Both were generously supported by
7 foundations, the Pew Charitable Trust, the Lumina
8 Foundation for Education and so on, but today the 560
9 schools that are using NSSE this spring, they're
10 willing to pay for the data because they find it, we
11 think, so useful.

12 We were talking about technology a moment
13 ago. I should mention that we're surveying about a
14 million randomly sampled students this spring and most
15 of those students are going to respond on the web. In
16 fact, over the last seven years the proportion of
17 students responding via the web has flip-flopped. It
18 was 20 percent in 2000 and now it's 80 percent and
19 growing.

20 Well, why are schools paying for the data?
21 Because we present it in user friendly format. We
22 make the data almost impossible to ignore when it hits
23 the campus because of the kind of benchmarking efforts
24 that are used. And the benchmarks are differentiated
25 according to schools with different sizes, different
26 missions, different types of students. And so

1 institutions can quickly identify areas where their
2 students, relative to others, are not performing well.

3 And we provide peer comparisons. So the University
4 of Michigan is not necessarily comparing itself
5 against Wabash College but it's looking at Ohio State
6 -- or I guess Michigan has no peers, excuse me.

7 COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: At least not in
8 Ohio.

9 DR. KUH: Small colleges can pick
10 aspirational groups or groups that they think they are
11 pretty much like. And schools get their own data.
12 And with the Institutional Review Board approval, they
13 can actually link individual student data back -- we
14 were hearing about the Florida experience, at the
15 college level they can link into the data back to the
16 course taking patterns of students, other experiences
17 that they've had and so forth. It's very important
18 for faculty, for example, to see data broken out by
19 major field. Because now we have the faculty member's
20 attention, whereas an institutional number, my eyes
21 glaze over.

22 Now, just because a school knows where
23 it's falling short doesn't mean that it's going to
24 address that area or certainly resolve it. But it's a
25 lot more likely, I think as Peter indicated earlier,
26 that faculty are going to pay attention if they can

1 identify their students, their discipline and compare
2 it against places that are like them. Peers working
3 elsewhere.

4 I might just mention, for example, a group
5 of research universities, AAU institutions, have been
6 looking at student level scores for the last several
7 years as part of a consortium. This does not get
8 reported publicly, but that means the folks at
9 Colorado Boulder can go in and look at their English
10 majors and compare them against Indiana University,
11 University of Wisconsin and so forth. There's some
12 state systems -- I shouldn't say some, there are many
13 state systems now using NSSE and CCSSE in some form.
14 Kentucky, for example, adds some NSSE data to its own
15 alumni satisfaction survey to feed one of its five key
16 indicators of progress. The University of Texas
17 system is using it; as is, may I say, A&M in the room?
18 South Dakota. The Florida Department of Community
19 Colleges of Workforce Education also use NSSE data,
20 along with student academic progress indicators.

21 Two short relatively straightforward
22 surveys. But we don't prefer to think about these as
23 surveys. We think about these as a way of changing
24 the way we think about what matters to undergraduate
25 learning and personal development. It's a different
26 way to talk about what matters to students' success in

1 college.

2 And we're learning some things, for
3 example, about what strong performing institutions do.

4 Places that have higher than predicted graduation
5 rates and also higher than predicted engagement
6 scores. With the great support, generous support of
7 Lumina, we studied 20 very diverse kinds of
8 institutions around the country and we report some of
9 that. We've got a book out, I spared you that, but we
10 have a set of small very short briefs that can be used
11 with different groups on campus to talk about these
12 common factors and conditions. Like setting forth
13 clear pathways or, as we heard earlier, maybe how does
14 one negotiate the climbing wall when one hits college?

15 There are specific things that
16 institutions do and some of these -- most of these
17 institutions also had another common feature which we
18 ended up calling positive restlessness. We've got a
19 longer generic term for that. But I mean back to when
20 Jim Duderstadt was Provost, the Chief Academic Officer
21 at Michigan, he along with his colleagues launched a
22 very ambitious set of initiatives. And Michigan, as
23 an example, conducted six major studies of the
24 qualities of undergraduate experience over about a 15
25 year period. We can see this happening at these other
26 high performing institutions.

1 Another thing we're learning, just
2 recently with a smaller project, is that engagement,
3 that is, these kind of -- being highly involved in the
4 kinds of activities that NSSE and other instruments
5 measure, seem to benefit lower ability students more
6 than the highest ability students. In other words,
7 there's a compensatory effect here. Students coming
8 in with lower ACT scores, for example, who are more
9 engaged, see their grades end up being higher than you
10 would otherwise predict. This is very powerful and
11 very important, given the kinds of challenges we're
12 facing with a broader, deeper pool.

13 Well, what can the Commission do? You've
14 been told to do a lot of things, I'll add three more.
15 First, I think you could recommend that the Department
16 of Ed and other funders, private foundations as many
17 have already stepped up, dedicate more resources to
18 further develop and refine these kinds of instruments
19 and develop additional ones. We need more support to
20 do validation and data integration. I mean we've seen
21 how the state of Florida has done this, we need to do
22 the same thing in higher education. This will help us
23 learn more about the teaching and learning practices
24 that work better in different kinds of settings, with
25 different kinds of students.

26 Second, you can endorse or somehow push,

1 induce, require the development and adoption of a
2 common template that colleges and universities can use
3 to display student success indicators. I mean we've
4 talked about some of these generic ones, persistence
5 in graduation rates, could include CLA and other
6 outcome measures, engagement scores. But we also
7 ought to see things like transfer rates and course
8 completion rates and degree/certificate completion
9 rates and so on. This will allow students, parents,
10 other interested parties to better understand what's
11 going on inside an institution and look across
12 institutions.

13 And finally, I was taken with -- Governor
14 Caperton spoke of a bread sandwich, you know. And
15 without teaching and learning, you know, inside, we
16 don't know very much about what's going on. But we've
17 also have to know more about the lunchroom in which
18 this sandwich is being consumed. Or more about the
19 race track, if you will. Because these vary, these
20 conditions vary from one place to another. What I'm
21 talking about here is we aren't going to improve the
22 quality of undergraduate education unless we take
23 cultural change on college campuses seriously. That's
24 the biggest challenge in my mind. It's an amorphous
25 challenge, but virtually every study of a high
26 performing organization in the for-profit or not-for-

1 profit-sector comes back to this same conclusion, that
2 it's the culture that these organizations create that
3 makes the difference in terms of whether teachers will
4 take -- I mean I'm astounded to learn that the lowest
5 expectations for high school student performance are
6 by their teachers themselves. Families expect more,
7 the students themselves expect more. And as we've
8 been talking about, this takes leadership and so on.

9 There are frameworks to do this work. We
10 ought to know, for example, whether the curriculum is
11 organized in a way and delivered in a way that
12 facilitates students' success or create obstacles. We
13 know, for example, that math course, Gateway math
14 classes on college campuses, can be a huge block for
15 students moving through.

16 Well, let me just conclude by saying that
17 NSSE and CCSSE are widely used we think because
18 they're relatively inexpensive. They make them easy,
19 the data easy to interpret. And they provide, we're
20 told, meaningful relevant performance indicators.
21 They're not perfect but no instrument, as Steve said,
22 is.

23 But in combination with outcome measures
24 and other performance indicators, student engagement
25 data revealed the means and the methods that can
26 improve many dimensions of student success and

1 institutional performance.

2 DR. EWELL: Thank you for both of those.
3 Let's open it up for at least a bit of discussion.
4 Jim?

5 COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: Yes, I want to
6 commend the groups because I think these are very
7 valuable tools. I'm trying to figure out in my own
8 mind whether if we use, for example, magnetic
9 resonance imaging as an analogy, whether we're at the
10 research stage in understanding human anatomy or
11 whether we're ready to, in a clinical practice,
12 diagnose.

13 But let me kind of put one issue on the
14 table. For the last several years I've been chairing
15 a National Academy study that's been looking at the
16 impact of technology and we've held hearings and
17 meetings on a number of college campuses. And one of
18 the first things that always comes up is how different
19 the current generation of student is and how they
20 learn and how they think.

21 Multi-processing, always on communication
22 skills with instant massaging. Taking a lot of
23 different things and putting them together, rapid
24 context switching. These are kind of the world in
25 which these kids live because they've been born and
26 raised in a media intensive environment. And it's not

1 the same way we think, it's not the same way we teach
2 and it may not be the same things that we're trying to
3 measure. But for these folks in a very rapidly
4 changing global society based on knowledge, maybe
5 those are better skills.

6 And so the fundamental question I have is
7 whether we're still trying to measure skills that are
8 valuable in the 20th century world taught by 19th
9 century institutions for citizens of a quite different
10 society. And with that in mind, I very much support
11 the last recommendation you made. I think we've got
12 to stress the importance of investing heavily in
13 understanding how what we're learning about cognitive
14 science, you know, the kind of world these kids are
15 living in and the way that they're evolving, fit into
16 higher education. That's going to take research. And
17 I think that will be very important to you folks, but
18 I think it has to be done. I'd be interested in your
19 responses.

20 DR. KLEIN: Two responses. First is we
21 agree with you a hundred percent. That's why the
22 document library lets students use the computer and
23 they have the document library where they're working
24 with very different documents.

25 We used to worry about whether this was
26 measuring the same thing as what students were getting

1 on paper. That question is long gone. Because this
2 is the way they learn.

3 The other thing is that by looking at the
4 schools that are well above or well below that
5 regression line, that expectation line, tells you
6 where to look. Let's go to those schools, let's do
7 the research of going to those schools that are well
8 above or well below and see what they're doing
9 differently. And let's take a look at NSSE scores at
10 those schools. And that's why -- George and I have
11 published together, so we're on the same page in this
12 stuff. That these things are complimentary measures,
13 it's not one or the other. That we think that this is
14 the kind of thing to look at as to why schools are
15 above or below and maybe visiting some of those
16 schools.

17 DR. EWELL: Somebody made the R&D point
18 yesterday about only one percent or something like
19 that in education compared to some others. I think
20 that is one that you should flag. It makes an awful
21 lot of sense to me.

22 DR. BENJAMIN: Peter, just one more
23 response to Jim because it's a good question.

24 I think, to me, my response is that in the
25 21st century the focus really needs to be a lot more
26 on teaching students how to think. The focus is on

1 equipping the next generation to better able to access
2 structure and use information than only prove facts,
3 which is kind of the way we learned.

4 COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: Yeah. Well, our
5 sense is these kids benefit much more from what used
6 to be called constructionist learning because they
7 build their own learning environments. They're very
8 sophisticated and they may out pace our faculty.

9 COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: A couple of -- an
10 observation and then a question. I really want to
11 commend both RAND and George for really doing some
12 very important work, the sorts of things we've been
13 talking about in the context of what's necessary for
14 institutions to do to determine the learning
15 environment.

16 And I also think it's interesting that as
17 many schools, 500 plus in the case of George and 100
18 plus in the case of RAND, have gone into this without
19 anyone telling them they have to do it. They've done
20 it because they want to improve the learning
21 environment and they want to know how the students are
22 doing.

23 My question is how -- and I'm not sure
24 what the rules are in either case, but one, are
25 schools encouraged or discouraged from publishing the
26 results of these tests, number one. And number two,

1 do you think it's a good idea to have these results,
2 for example, posted on the school's web site or the
3 department's web site?

4 DR. EWELL: Let's start with CLA.

5 DR. BENJAMIN: I mean we certainly don't
6 publish the results. But the University of Texas
7 system recently published their results in an
8 extraordinary report that Gerri Malandra, I don't know
9 if Gerri's here today, I think had a lead role in.

10 And that's a good example. I mean it was
11 a very sophisticated effort. And I commend them for
12 that. And I think we're going to begin to see more of
13 that. Why not? Now, it's tricky business,
14 admittedly. But I think it's a good idea.

15 DR. EWELL: George?

16 DR. KUH: The CCSSE project, the community
17 college project, was founded with the principal that
18 these data would be public. And institutions can go
19 into the CCSSE web site and manipulate data and
20 actually do some of their own comparisons. So some of
21 these data are public.

22 NSSE data we strongly encourage
23 institutions to report. And so out of the 560 doing -
24 - by the way, over 1,000 different four-year schools
25 have used NSSE. So we're at about close to three-
26 quarters of the undergraduate FDE being represented

1 over the course of the project.

2 Earlham College, Doug Bennett I see is
3 sitting behind me, they put all their data on the web
4 site as does Elam University. You can go into the
5 University of North Carolina web site and if you've
6 got a few days, you can find the data. That's true.
7 And that's not a slam at UNC because they were in this
8 from the very beginning.

9 Our institutional research guy at my place
10 got a call five years ago from a father in Ohio and
11 said I found the North Carolina data, I got the Ohio
12 University data and I'm looking for your data, I can't
13 find it. And our guy didn't know what to say.
14 Because no one had ever called him before. And it
15 took us three weeks to go up the food chain to get
16 permission to send out the data.

17 So as with other statements, Peter's
18 opening comment, we are dead set against using these
19 data for simple rankings. This stuff is too
20 complicated, too complex, too interesting and
21 potentially too powerful for institutional chains then
22 to reduce it to a single number.

23 So we'd like to see the data used
24 publicly. My notation about a common template would
25 help schools do this. There is danger lurking in
26 these weeds, however, because the more complicated

1 stuff we put out, the easier it will be for people to
2 misunderstand what the data really represent. And so
3 along with the common template we need some, if you
4 will, rules of engagement. Especially for the media.

5 What can you say and what should you not conclude
6 from these numbers at this point in time.

7 Just finally, it's unfair to ask a school
8 the first time they see the data, in my opinion, to go
9 public very soon until they understand what the
10 numbers mean. What's behind the numbers. You want to
11 give us a chance to figure out what's driving this so
12 that we have a chance to respond.

13 COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Are you trying to
14 -- just to follow up, it's obviously extraordinarily
15 valuable to the institution because it can judge the
16 value of what it's doing. But are you thinking about
17 some way in which if the data is published that it can
18 be interpreted you think in a fair and reasonable way
19 by members of the public who are not statistical
20 experts and don't understand regressions and standard
21 deviations and all the rest?

22 DR. KUH: You're asking are we doing it?
23 Would we like to do it? The answer is, yes, we would
24 like to do it. We've stopped short of doing it at the
25 present time until I think institutions have more
26 confidence that they can go forward without being

1 hammered by a local reporter or some other group.

2 DR. EWELL: Nicholas Donofrio.

3 COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: Yes, just a very
4 simple question and then I'd like your observations.
5 I'll pick up on Jim's point. I'm from industry and
6 I'm terribly worried about what you're preparing for
7 us in terms of how we put these young folks to work.

8 And while all of these measurements are
9 encouraging to me in many ways, since they do address
10 outcomes, individual outcomes, and there's another
11 important attribute if you want to be in the 21st
12 century, as best I can tell, and it's called
13 collaboration. Can either of you address that? And
14 I'd like your comments and thoughts about what are you
15 doing about that or is it maybe not as important as I
16 think?

17 DR. KUH: NSSE has a handful, eleven items
18 that address active and collaborative learning, that
19 is, how a faculty member would set up small groups of
20 students in class and also create assignments outside
21 the class that would bring them together. And this is
22 particular important in the context of working with
23 diverse peers.

24 So we asked a set of questions about this.

25 It's a short instrument. We'd like to ask many more.

26 But of course you see this stuff lining up exactly as

1 you expect. Students who do more, report more active
2 and collaborative learning. On the self-reported
3 outcome side of this where we ask students whether
4 they've developed a capacity to work effectively with
5 others, the more active and collaborative learning you
6 do, the more students say they're doing it.

7 So we have a process measure but we don't
8 have the kind of outcome measure perhaps that you'd
9 like.

10 COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: And I'll ask Steve
11 and Roger, there's nothing inherent in the technology
12 that could prevent doing that kind of thing on a task.

13 It would be perfectly possible, would it not, to put
14 together --

15 DR. KLEIN: There's a whole field of
16 assessment that has to do with assessment centers,
17 which is basically what you're talking about. That
18 there's no prohibition against our going into that
19 area. We're not doing it right now. There's real
20 mine fields in trying to do that in terms of whose
21 work is it and so on.

22 But we have done research on that. Not as
23 part in the higher education but in other areas. So
24 there's really no prohibition against doing it.

25 One other thing to say though about
26 reporting results, if you don't report results you're

1 not going to have an impact. It's that simple. The
2 only way you're going to have an impact is if you're
3 going to get the results out there. First to the
4 schools so they know how to do it and interpret it.
5 And I'd agree with George on that. That this is an
6 evolutionary thing. But eventually, down the line, if
7 you really need to have an impact, you've got to be
8 reporting results.

9 CHAIRMAN MILLER: George's institutions
10 that reports the results would be the top
11 institutions, we know that.

12 DR. KLEIN: Not necessarily. Not
13 necessarily because if we reported in terms of value
14 added and improvement, it's not necessarily the top
15 schools.

16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: No, his institutions
17 though. Okay, go ahead.

18 COMMISSIONER VEST: Excellent
19 presentation, very enlightening. As someone who loves
20 data, I can't help but ask, are these data real?

21 DR. KLEIN: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER VEST: Because I have never
23 seen anything about real people that correlates that
24 closely to a straight line. And in particular, let me
25 finish my question.

26 And I want to learn more about the CLA,

1 but things I know of from the past tend to look like a
2 shotgun hit. Anything correlated with outcomes in
3 college plotted against ACT or SAT scores. And a
4 second part to this question, I think probably most of
5 us are more familiar than anything with the data that
6 appear in *The Shape of the River* by Bohn and Bach.
7 And the number one lesson there that I took away at
8 least is that as a predictor of an individual's
9 performance, SAT or ACT's are not all that great. And
10 that certainly is our experience at MIT.

11 But also in *The Shape of the River* of
12 course they show that the correlation for African-
13 American and Hispanic American students was almost
14 zero; whereas, there was a reasonably strong
15 correlation for white and Asian students in outcome.
16 I just wondered whether CLA has looked at the racial
17 piece.

18 DR. KLEIN: The answer to the question is
19 we have looked at them. The reason that this
20 relationship is as strong as it is, is that we're
21 using the school as a unit of analysis rather than the
22 individual student --

23 COMMISSIONER VEST: That's what I
24 suspected.

25 DR. KLEIN: Okay. If you use the student
26 you would see -- it wouldn't look like a shotgun blast

1 but it would like a much larger ellipse. It would
2 look like a football in terms of the distribution.

3 DR. EWELL: Maybe one more question if
4 anyone has it and then --

5 COMMISSIONER VEST: The racial correlation
6 --

7 DR. EWELL: The question about the racial
8 --

9 DR. KLEIN: Why don't we do that -- since
10 Peter is short on time, we can talk about that. We
11 have looked at that question and the schools seem to
12 behave the same way.

13 DR. EWELL: Bob Mendenhall.

14 COMMISSIONER MENDENHALL: I think these
15 are great instruments. One of the challenges we have
16 as a Commission is to remember that increasingly a
17 large percentage of our student population are not
18 traditional students in traditional classrooms. And
19 both of these instruments kind of assume -- I mean I
20 think they're very effective for traditional students.
21 They don't work well for adult students or on-line
22 students or students in other settings.

23 Are there any plans to adapt, modify or
24 develop different instruments to address what's
25 increasingly becoming a different kind of population
26 in higher ed?

1 DR. KLEIN: I would take issue with that,
2 Bob, because all of our stuff are delivered over the
3 web. All these instruments that we've been talking
4 about, both George and ourselves, are delivered over
5 the web to students.

6 COMMISSIONER MENDENHALL: But, for
7 example, adult students don't have meaningful ACT/SAT
8 scores as a baseline.

9 DR. KLEIN: No, they don't, but we're
10 talking -- we have another measure that we can use for
11 that purpose.

12 DR. EWELL: I think we need to move on.
13 We have a lot to cover.

14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: And in community
15 colleges. I'm sorry to say this quickly, but we're
16 going to hear an alarm in a minute. It isn't because
17 you're over time or anything. It's a city wide
18 tornado alert that they practice on Friday mornings.
19 So nobody move. Nobody move.

20 DR. EWELL: I'd like to turn now to Peter
21 McPherson from NASULGC.

22 DR. McPHERSON: Well, excellent. It's
23 good to be here and I, as all of you, thank you for
24 the presentations just given.

25 Let me begin mentioning something a little
26 different. I chaired the commission to look at study

1 abroad over the last year appointed by Congress. The
2 President proposed there would be a million students
3 per year in ten years. I think some of you have seen
4 that proposal. I strongly endorse it. I think
5 talking about real change in our higher education
6 system, this is the topic.

7 Let me talk about the discussion at hand
8 today. Before you is a paper which we've discussed
9 within our board and some others. We went to all the
10 presidents and provosts of the NASULGC institutions
11 around the country. It is a draft in the nature of
12 things, there will be lots of reactions to it. There
13 will no doubt be other -- another paper and so forth.

14 This isn't usually the process you'd find at Bank of
15 America for example where I worked for a number of
16 years. But it is in fact the way the Academy really
17 engages. And I think it is critical to move some of
18 this discussion in the Academy for, among other
19 things, we'll put together some ideas which will help
20 us improve student learning. As opposed to just being
21 only of value to outsiders -- outside people and that,
22 of course, itself is important.

23 Now, I would say, first of all, that the
24 higher education community knows there are a bunch of
25 issues, the graduation rates and a number of other
26 things I could go into. But I would also say that I

1 strongly believe the Academy, public higher education
2 and other components are prepared to really get at
3 these measures.

4 I was struck at Michigan State when I came
5 there in '93 as President and was there 11 and a half
6 years, there wasn't a major issue that we had before
7 us, where people didn't say how does it impact the
8 students? And the biggest single asset in some ways
9 for the Academy is the idealism of the commitment to
10 have students learn more. Every time it doesn't work
11 out for a student, there's a feeling that we weren't
12 successful.

13 You hear various stories and of course
14 it's not universal, but I've worked in government,
15 I've worked in business and now for many years in the
16 Academy. And there is a commitment to student
17 learning, if you look at our history. We've got
18 problems but I believe we're prepared to really move
19 in and I hope the NASULGC paper reflects a deep belief
20 in doing the very best for our students.

21 Now, what is suggested for consideration
22 is a voluntary system that would potentially vary some
23 by the type of institution. This was discussed at the
24 executive committee of our provost a few weeks ago in
25 San Francisco where I presented my views in a
26 preliminary paper. They came out, as you'll see

1 there, saying, look, we ought to really look at this.

2 They have a summer meeting where all of the provosts
3 would be together to do it. This paper, of course,
4 pushing this on.

5 The paper suggests that you might look at
6 a bundle. I appreciate George's presentation. It
7 does -- the correlation between student engagement and
8 learning is clear. I do think the need that -- as
9 part of a bundle, it does seem to be something that
10 should be public.

11 I like a student engagement because, as
12 George said, you can use it as an administrator and as
13 a faculty. You said, okay, here's things that we can
14 do.

15 It is certainly one of the interesting
16 potential components of a bundle of accountability, if
17 you will.

18 By the way, it seems to me the student
19 might well define the package a little differently. I
20 mean where the university cares about its students is
21 the way they might think about it. And they would
22 look at a school as whether or not there's student
23 engagement.

24 Now, I do think that as part of a package,
25 some way to assess competency is clearly a matter of
26 importance. The CLA is out there in over a hundred

1 schools. I think that Steve would probably say we
2 need more data to figure out just what we're going to
3 do with it, and so I'm not saying let's use the CLA.
4 But I think some kind of competency measurement does
5 make sense.

6 I was pleased that Steve spent so much
7 time talking about the correlation between the SAT or
8 ACT and the outcome of a competency test. In a little
9 different context, we looked at this at Michigan State
10 and compared ourself with universities that had
11 approximately the same GPA test score entering and
12 looked at graduation rates and so forth.

13 It is helpful and it does, if you fall
14 well below or well above, it does tell you that. Now
15 it may not tell you exactly in specificity as to what
16 you might do to improve your score. Now there are
17 some public information items that everybody -- that
18 parents, legislators and I'm sure -- Jim Duderstadt
19 and I have been to -- in fact we testified a long time
20 ago, testified before our -- we felt accountable
21 there, didn't we?

22 COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: That's when they
23 had money.

24 DR. McPHERSON: That's when we wanted
25 money, that's right.

26 But there's a bundle of data that the

1 public probably expects. And there are problems with
2 each but we -- the graduation type, I am intrigued
3 with the unit record system and what's been shown in
4 Texas that maybe there's a 20 point improvement. I
5 think too often we don't really say all the
6 information, we don't report to the public all that we
7 have.

8 So I believe there is a bundle of matters,
9 we've laid it out to our grouping. We're working very
10 closely to NACIQI. Between ourselves and NACIQI it
11 basically is the four year and above public
12 universities in this country. NACIQI, it's an
13 important combination to do this. And I'm confident
14 that in the weeks and months ahead we'll go through
15 drafts and discussions but that a voluntary system
16 looking at some expectation or variance by mission is
17 out there. And I think it's very positive.

18 We are strongly against a federally
19 mandated system. I think it would be -- the strength
20 of American higher education system is its diversity.

21 It's the vitality and the sterilizing fact. We have
22 federal regulation, in my view.

23 I have asked Britt Kirwan to chair a
24 committee on student learning and accountability.
25 Britt was the President of University of Maryland, was
26 then the President at Ohio State and is now back as

1 the head of the Sister of Maryland, one of the true --
2 maybe he wouldn't want me to say it quite this way,
3 but grand old men of public higher education. And
4 Sally Mason, the chair of the provost council of
5 NASULGC will be on that committee. And David
6 Shulenburger, the provost at Kansas. Has been provost
7 there some 13 years. One of those folks that really
8 was key working on accreditation. Will become on June
9 1 the Academic Vice President of NASULGC and David
10 will be the key person working with this committee.

11 We've got something on the table. I've
12 never put anything on the table in the Academy that
13 didn't change some. Sometimes a lot. But I think
14 that this is the process in which we need to engage
15 people and I'm very happy to be here today. Thank
16 you.

17 DR. EWELL: I warned you that I was going
18 to do this, but before opening it up I want to ask a
19 question.

20 Which is basically, we've heard proposals
21 coming forward a lot. What would make us believe that
22 this one is serious and it's going to happen?

23 DR. McPHERSON: Well, one, to my knowledge
24 there has not been a -- NASULGC is the oldest public
25 university association in the country. Some very
26 strong members. It's significant that virtually all

1 the publics are members of NASULGC. It has been
2 clearly a very strong leading public university
3 association.

4 And it is true that some people may think
5 we're kind of leading with our chin. Outside the
6 Academy this may not seem to be, but within the
7 Academy it is certainly that here's where we are,
8 we've got this wonderful group of people to work on
9 the committee, the provost. You'll hear more about
10 this. I can tell you that while I expect to have
11 these ideas change, I'm very serious about, as leader
12 of NASULGC, getting this issue within the Academy.

13 DR. EWELL: Dr. Hunt?

14 COMMISSIONER HUNT: Dr. McPherson, I want
15 to ask you if your association would be willing to
16 give leadership in helping us get a national unit
17 record system?

18 DR. MCPHERSON: Well, what I've said here
19 in the paper is that I am very interested in this.
20 And I want to work through that issue a little bit
21 more. There's some people in Congress I want to talk
22 to. There's been an issue there.

23 I think the unit record system -- we need
24 to figure out how to deal with privacy issues and some
25 other matters. And rather than just endorse it here
26 today, I'd like to work through those matters. But

1 you'll hear more from me about the other --

2 COMMISSIONER HUNT: Well, I want to
3 encourage you to do that. Now, we know we've got to
4 change. We've got to move forward. The world's
5 fixing to run off and leave us. And all of us have a
6 responsibility here. So I just want to indicate to
7 you how urgent I think this is. And really,
8 seriously, it's a wonderful association and I'm a
9 graduate of some of your institutions and proud of it.

10 But of all the associations in America,
11 you all ought to give this leadership maybe more than
12 anybody else.

13 DR. EWELL: Other questions?

14 DR. McPHERSON: It deserves a special,
15 careful paper. It's very interesting. But I am very
16 impressed by the numbers coming out of Texas. And you
17 know the numbers are likely to be that great if you
18 looked at it nationwide. So we don't want to
19 shortchange yourself.

20 DR. EWELL: I would like to move on to the
21 next speaker. Is there a question, I'm sorry?

22 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: If you would, could
23 you give us a time line for your consideration?
24 You've said some decisions are likely to change,
25 others would say this is a grand filibuster. When do
26 you expect to have an answer? We're going to have an

1 answer in August.

2 DR. McPHERSON: I don't think we could
3 expect to have an agreement of a voluntary system over
4 here in three months. But I do think -- I do expect
5 the committee -- we will continue -- this is something
6 over the next several months we'll be more comfortable
7 with. I wish I could tell you. I found when I tried
8 to do that, the university, Michigan State University,
9 that if I tried to set too firm of a date, it didn't
10 help.

11 DR. EWELL: Again, I don't want to cut
12 this off.

13 COMMISSIONER WARD: Peter, I would say I
14 would join you and ask you in saying that the value of
15 academic research, we're probably in a situation where
16 there's a lot of known information that about the
17 value of the data that we've heard today. But I know
18 that you lead -- not lead, but there are some simple,
19 maybe not so simple differences in how fast you go not
20 only with your members but among members who are
21 independents. But I do think that the idea of some
22 sort of response, and maybe the Commission can help by
23 stating kind of that there is value to the future of
24 higher education, an almost indispensability to the
25 future of higher education and that we, in a sense,
26 and the associations have to try our best to move it

1 faster. Though it's fraught with difficulty. But
2 it's your document, I suppose it will come to you.

3 DR. McPHERSON: Well, it's really, one, I
4 recognize that if something is important to do, if you
5 can do it quickly you ought to do it. Again, where
6 you've got several thousand institutions, each of
7 whom, as we all remember we're running these
8 institutions we didn't really think we -- we felt some
9 independence, you've got to work it through.

10 But let's look at this. It would be
11 interesting what sort of reaction I get from having
12 sent this to the presidents last night, a number of my
13 board, a number of other people have seen it before,
14 but it wasn't out there to everybody until last night.

15 I think this position is reasonable. It
16 has a discussion tone, too, about it. But what we
17 ought to realize, and I know all of you do, is there
18 is a -- as this plan made earlier, about a commitment
19 of individuals, overwhelmingly. And for the
20 institutions to do a better job. You know, look what
21 we've done in this country. I don't mean to have the
22 past make excuses for the future, but of course if you
23 go way back to the land grant system of 1862, the GI
24 Bill. But more recently what happened to universities
25 in this country in the '60s and the '70s when you have
26 an explosion of people going to -- in Michigan we talk

1 about sort of the UAW family, that previously hadn't
2 gone. Well, we've got some big challenges now, don't
3 we?

4 All right, when I talk to my friends
5 around the Academy, let's get at them. And this is
6 one part of the issue. It's exciting really, I look
7 forward to this discussion.

8 DR. EWELL: Bob, do you want to --

9 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Just to push it once
10 more on a practical level, I guess, you know, at least
11 -- I don't know if all the Commission members saw the
12 earlier draft, I did for whatever reason. I think the
13 draft that you circulated changed the discussion in
14 all kinds of ways.

15 So I would -- I didn't mean that you
16 needed to come to a redesigned system by August. But
17 the more that you get the public commitment -- and I
18 always remember the example that's often talked about
19 about where the European Union came from, it actually
20 came from a conjunction of three countries, very small
21 Benelux countries. We don't talk about them any more
22 that way but we did once.

23 The interesting thing about that agreement
24 is they all agreed that they were going to have
25 Benelux and said to everybody else, now you work out
26 the details. And in some ways you could read that in

1 what he said. You didn't say it quite that way and I
2 wish you would say it quite that way, but the more
3 that you can be public and say that it isn't an issue
4 of whether or not but how and when, I think that would
5 help us that we could have some faith that this train
6 was leaving the station.

7 DR. McPHERSON: Your comments are very
8 helpful.

9 DR. EWELL: Thank you, Bob.

10 DR. McPHERSON: I do remember that
11 history. It was interesting, wasn't it?

12 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, as a known
14 agitator, I want to commend you for taking the
15 leadership less than three months or three months into
16 the job. We're behind you, and probably pretty close.
17 So congratulations on taking that leadership.

18 DR. EWELL: For the last block of the
19 program we're turning to a slightly different set of
20 issues and we'll have two speakers in succession and
21 then open it up.

22 Anne Neal of the American Council of
23 Trustees and Alumni and Kevin Carey of Education
24 Sector. You might explain a bit about what your
25 organizations do so that people have some context.
26 Anne?

1 MS. NEAL: Well, thank you so much. It's
2 a real challenge to try to deal with accountability in
3 ten minutes.

4 The American Council of Trustees and
5 Alumni has been around now for ten years. We were
6 started to be a voice for alumni and trustees across
7 the country for academic freedom, academic excellence
8 and accountability. And in the course of the next few
9 minutes, what I'd like to do is turn away a little bit
10 from what are students learning to what institutions
11 are teaching. Before the Commission is the question,
12 how can we be sure that America's system of higher
13 education remains the finest in the world and I would
14 like to draw the Commissioners' attention to two other
15 areas, academic quality and informed and effective
16 governance.

17 One would think that these values would
18 already be priorities in a universe responsible for
19 preparing our next generation of leaders and citizens,
20 but they are not. Students today in too many cases
21 receive an education in name only. The pre-eminence
22 of our system of higher education is profoundly
23 threatened by an academic culture that has fostered
24 college curricula, where in the words of the American
25 Association of Colleges and Universities, anything
26 goes. Rampant grade inflation that undermines the

1 quality and integrity of college instruction and the
2 prevalent misconception to those who are vested with
3 the ultimate authority for our colleges and
4 universities, namely, college and university trustees.

5 According to a survey by the National
6 Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 84
7 percent of the public believes that a college degree
8 is key to getting ahead. But nearly half, 40 percent,
9 believes that the cost is not justified for what is
10 received. And I think the public is right. Let me
11 outline why.

12 It used to be that all colleges and
13 universities in America insisted on a rigorous,
14 sequential curriculum that ensured students a broad
15 general education in addition to the specialization
16 provided by the major. Students were given a common
17 educational foundation on which to build. This was
18 truly learning for a lifetime.

19 But no longer. Nowadays, virtually
20 unlimited choice has supplanted the concept of a
21 rigorous general education. The Hollow Core, a study
22 by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni,
23 surveyed the Big 10, Big 12, Ivy League and Seven
24 Sisters, to see if they guaranteed exposure to broad
25 areas of knowledge. And we looked at literature,
26 composition, science, math, history, economics and

1 foreign languages.

2 What we found was shocking. Even though
3 there is a general consensus that college graduates
4 must have analytical, writing and quantitative skills
5 to participate fully in our contemporary economy,
6 something that we've been hearing about this morning.

7 Almost one third of the institutions surveyed had no
8 specific writing requirement. Only 38 percent
9 required a course in mathematics; 38 percent failed to
10 require a natural or physical science; and not one
11 demanded that its students study economics.

12 In a democracy citizens must be educated,
13 familiar with their governing system and aware of
14 their history. Yet a mere 14 percent of the colleges
15 compel their students to study American government or
16 history. We live in a global society increasingly
17 shaped by actions and interactions of different
18 cultures and civilizations. Yet nearly a quarter, 24
19 percent of the colleges surveyed do not require a
20 foreign language.

21 Today's colleges give the appearance of
22 providing a core curriculum because they require
23 students to take courses in several subject areas, the
24 so-called distribution requirements. Within each
25 subject area, however, it's not uncommon for students
26 to have dozens, even hundreds of courses, from which

1 to choose, many of them narrow and even frivolous. To
2 use a local example, our study gave Indiana University
3 a D for its general education curriculum since its
4 graduates were not required to complete solid core
5 courses in literature, government, history, economics,
6 math or science.

7 Students can, however, take courses like
8 History of Comic Book Art to satisfy the arts and
9 humanities distribution requirement.

10 To prepare our next generation of
11 citizens, a curriculum should be picked higher than
12 the momentary tastes of 19 year olds. Democracy rests
13 on the assumption that the citizens will be
14 intelligent said educator Robert Maynard Hutchins.
15 That intellects must be disciplined. They must know
16 the difference between honest thinking and soft
17 street, and between reasoning and rationalization.
18 Only by disciplines that teach them these differences
19 can they hope to resist the demagogue and
20 propagandist.

21 Another troubling current in higher
22 education is grade inflation. With only a few
23 exceptions, ACTA's report, Degraded Currency: The
24 Problem of Grade Inflation, shows that persistent
25 grade inflation exists in colleges and universities
26 across the country. Borrowing, if I may from Garrison

1 Keeler, in a world where everyone is above average,
2 indeed far above average, high performance and hard
3 work are undermined. When institutions are unwilling
4 to distinguish among degrees of achievement, future
5 employers, schools and students are left without a
6 realistic picture of ability. Students have less
7 motivation to achieve and we foster, I fear, a
8 troubling need to rely on subjective criteria and
9 connections.

10 And since grade inflation is not in fact
11 uniform, it may subtly encourage a shift away from
12 the more difficult fields, math and science, towards
13 those fields with easier grading, the humanities and
14 social sciences. The problem of grade inflation,
15 thus, may have a direct bearing on the supply of
16 students with higher math and science skills, a
17 national need acknowledged by Congress.

18 When all is said and done, these issues of
19 quality and rigor go to a more fundamental problem,
20 institutional accountability. Who is in charge?
21 Whose minding the store?

22 It's our experience that too few trustees
23 engage or understand what is happening on our college
24 campuses. And this is not unintended. Trustees
25 themselves deserve much blame for failing to step up
26 to their fiduciary obligations. At the same time, the

1 culture of the Academy strongly discourages that
2 engagement. Rather than viewing them as a resource,
3 higher education administrators and faculty often view
4 trustees as meddlers or mavericks who job should be to
5 put up and shut up.

6 Lay governance is designed to bring the
7 informed perspective of citizens to the very heart of
8 the university. However, experience shows that the
9 full promise and actual practice of lay boards are
10 often far apart.

11 If we are to remain the best higher
12 education system in the world, trustees must address
13 the key issues of cost, quality, and accountability
14 and do so without being intimidated by academic
15 insiders.

16 Faculty often claim that trustees who
17 engage in active stewardship violate institutional
18 autonomy and academic freedom. But the unique
19 management model of shared governance with faculty and
20 administrative controls does not mean the academy is
21 exempt from outside input. Institutional autonomy
22 exists not as an end in itself, but as a means to
23 protect the freedom of students and faculty to pursue
24 the truth and to become educated for informed
25 citizenship.

26 While certain governing boards including

1 those at the University of Texas, George Mason and the
2 State University of New York, have, I think, raised
3 the bar for trustee engagement. Not all boards offer
4 the same leadership. Regrettably there are far too
5 few trustees who understand that tradition and shared
6 governance does not supplant their ultimate authority
7 and accountability.

8 So what is to be done? My statement for
9 the record goes into a number of recommendations in
10 great detail and it's my hope that the Commission will
11 give serious consideration to them as it goes forward.

12 Let me now, for a few minutes, review a
13 few of those. If you do nothing else, the American
14 Council of Trustees and Alumni urgently ask the
15 Commission to call upon the academic community, boards
16 of trustees, working with presidents and faculty to
17 review and reform the general education curriculum.

18 At very little cost colleges and
19 universities should engage in a process of curricular
20 self-examination. The prevalent smorgasbord approach,
21 allowing students to pick and choose among hundreds of
22 courses, results in a hodge-podge that fails to
23 prepare students for informed citizenship, diverse
24 careers and lifelong learning.

25 The importance of a coherent connected
26 curriculum has never been clearer since it gives

1 students the broad based knowledge and skills
2 necessary to adapt to changing situations and to
3 compete in the global market place. Moreover, by
4 focusing on a high quality and cohesive general
5 education curriculum, higher ed can help to address
6 the pressing needs in K-12. It's imperative that what
7 students are asked to do and learn in high school be
8 connected to postsecondary course work and
9 assessments. And there's no better place to do it
10 than in a general education curriculum.

11 This I would say is a different twist on
12 the momentum issue that was raised earlier today.

13 Call for an end to grade inflation. There
14 are good solutions to this pernicious trend already.
15 Princeton has halved the number of A's it awards to
16 undergraduates. Colorado now has instituted a policy
17 amongst its publics that they will publicly distribute
18 the grade distributions.

19 Call for an end to federal accreditation.
20 While the system of accreditation evolved to assure
21 educational excellence and competence, there is quite
22 a bit of evidence that in fact it undermines those
23 values and effective governance as well. Under the
24 accreditors watch, and I know you all have dealt with
25 this at some length, colleges have allowed academic
26 standards to slide, the grade inflation come out and

1 accountability to suffer. And when accreditors have
2 sanctions institutions, they have typically pointed to
3 financial issues, even though the ed department
4 already undertakes extensive financial reviews.

5 At the same time there are numerous cases
6 of accreditors imposing extraneous social and
7 political goals. Recently accreditors have even
8 extended their reach into governance. A realm which
9 is properly controlled by statute, charters and by-
10 laws, by sanctioning Auburn University for
11 micromanagement by its board.

12 Now, while I would not say that that board
13 may very well have been working outside its rightful
14 bounds, I think the question, when it relates to
15 federal accreditation is, why should federally
16 approved accreditors, who almost without exception are
17 university administrators and faculty members whose
18 own interests may conflict with engaged trustees, have
19 life and death power over universities that gives them
20 the ability to second-guess boards who are legally
21 responsible.

22 Call for the development of institutional
23 expectations and assessments for student learning.
24 The Commission is already well aware of surveys
25 documenting a serious lack of literacy in our country
26 and reports from the business community that they must

1 retrain. This is where the Commission's extensive
2 focus on assessment is important. Individual
3 institutional governing boards working with faculty,
4 students and other stakeholders, must focus on what
5 institutions are teaching and whether students are
6 learning. The challenge obviously is to get the right
7 information to the right people and to do so in a way
8 that does not require too many indicators and too
9 burdensome information.

10 On the governance front, call on governors
11 and boards to insist on informed trustees. As the
12 highest elected officials in their states, governors
13 are the key to the cultural transformation in the
14 public system. In most states they appoint trustees
15 and state education officials. They can and must be
16 made aware of higher education challenges and give
17 trustees a mandate to address those issues.

18 Call for trustee training. There are
19 training programs for new college presidents and a
20 similar and sustained program should be developed for
21 trustees. In the wake of Sarbanes Oxley and the
22 growing demand to apply strict standards to non-profit
23 trustees, this kind of training is timely and
24 important.

25 Academic culture is very different from
26 the experience of most trustees. If they are to be

1 successful in performing their fiduciary
2 responsibilities, they need training in how to be
3 effective leaders in the unique context of an academic
4 institution. And it's imperative that they remain up
5 to date on central issues, with advice and information
6 not only from insiders but from outside experts as
7 well who can bring both a national perspective and
8 best practices to bear.

9 Emphasize the need for boards to hire
10 presidents who will be agents of change. An era of
11 accountability requires a new style of presidential
12 leadership. Board chairmen should be primed to insist
13 that boards cast a wide net and find innovative
14 leaders who are not afraid to question the status quo.

15 Call for board transparency. In the wake
16 of recent problems at the University of California and
17 American University, public boards should consider
18 annually reporting the compensation of highly paid
19 employees and senior administrators. And once the
20 presidential selection process is completed, boards
21 must make it clear that they will annually evaluate
22 and document the president's performance.

23 Urge the media to pay attention to
24 workings of public and private boards. In the public
25 sector media focus will ensure that governors take
26 their appointment seriously. In the private sector,

1 as in the case of American University, public
2 attention can help expose questionable practices and
3 stimulate corrective action.

4 Higher education is a \$250 billion
5 enterprise and for that reason alone warrants close
6 scrutiny.

7 For too long constituencies such as
8 alumni, trustees and, yes, Commissioners, have been
9 expected to remain outside the walls of the ivory
10 tower, particularly when it comes to issues of
11 academic quality and accountability. There are those
12 inside the Academy who believe they should have
13 autonomy, absolute autonomy. To them the role of
14 trustees, alumni and governor and commissions is to
15 provide support, period.

16 The logic behind the tradition is
17 deceptively simple. Academic decisions should be made
18 on academic grounds. Hence, they should be made by
19 academics. But as I've attempted to outline and as I
20 think we've heard in the course of these proceedings,
21 current conditions in the Academy call for outside
22 scrutiny.

23 The American Council of Trustees and
24 Alumni was launched a decade ago to focus on those
25 conditions and to mobilize thoughtful alumni and
26 trustees on behalf of rigorous general education, good

1 teaching, high standards, low tuition and academic
2 freedom. And alumni and trustees know and understand
3 that to remain competitive our institutions of higher
4 learning must remain focused on academic standards,
5 academic excellence and transparency.

6 Most institutions and their internal
7 constituencies need checks and balances and higher
8 education is no exception. That is why the work of
9 this Commission is so important and why the American
10 Council of Trustees and Alumni are indeed grateful to
11 have the opportunity to articulate the concerns of
12 trustees and alumni. Thank you.

13 DR. EWELL: Thank you, Anne, for that
14 statement. And turn to Kevin Carey of Education
15 Sector.

16 MR. CAREY: On behalf of Education Sector,
17 which as you may not know is a new non-partisan
18 education policy think-tank located in Washington,
19 D.C. that works on a range of issues. Everything from
20 pre-kindergarten through higher education.

21 I'd like to thank the Chairman and the
22 members of the Commission for the opportunity to come
23 and speak today. Particularly because it gives me a
24 chance to come back to my former home in Indianapolis
25 and to catch up with some of my colleagues with whom I
26 used to work on higher education issues in the Indiana

1 State House, just a few steps up Market Street. Which
2 you should all visit while you're here, it's really a
3 beautiful building.

4 In the past months this Commission has
5 heard testimony documenting a number of major
6 challenges facing American higher education today.
7 Other industrialized nations are catching up to and
8 even surpassing our once commanding lead in producing
9 college graduates. Spiraling costs are limiting
10 opportunities for lower income students. Less than
11 two-thirds of all students graduate within six years
12 of starting in four-year colleges. And a study
13 released earlier this year that Peter Ewell alluded
14 to, found that less than half of all college seniors
15 are proficient in measures of literacy.

16 And I would point out that all of those
17 numbers are must worse for traditionally disadvantaged
18 and minority students. Let me just give you one
19 example. This fall, out of every hundred African-
20 American freshman who enroll at a four-year
21 institution, seven will enroll at an institution with
22 an African-American six-year graduation rate of 70
23 percent or more. Twenty-eight, four times as many,
24 will enroll at an institution with an African-American
25 six-year graduation rate of 30 percent or less.
26 Thirty percent or less. I know there are some

1 questions about if you take transfers into account
2 whether those numbers go up, but they don't go up that
3 much from 30 percent to a number that anyone would be
4 comfortable with.

5 And again, if you look at those literacy
6 numbers of college seniors, you'd find that the
7 literacy rates for African-American seniors are less
8 than half of those for white seniors. To the point
9 that it's pretty clear that the achievement gaps in K-
10 12 education, for which we're all so familiar, not
11 only persists into higher education but actually, in
12 some subjects, grow larger by the time students
13 finish.

14 So clearly we have to do much better. And
15 I commend the Commission for the seriousness with
16 which it has addressed these issues. And so I'll make
17 three points. All of which are around the subject of
18 information and transparency.

19 First, it's very clear that the higher
20 education world operates basically in a void of
21 information about quality. Students and parents
22 making decisions about where to go to college have
23 little or no information about which colleges will
24 actually serve them best. All they really have to do
25 -- all they really have to rely on is information from
26 places like U.S. News and World Report which are based

1 almost exclusively on three measures, wealth, fame and
2 exclusivity. That's what those rankings are based on.

3 And they don't really have anything to do with the
4 quality of teaching and learning.

5 And moreover, really I think in most
6 institutions even sort of that flawed U.S. News
7 paradigm doesn't really work very well. I mean if you
8 look at the numbers, the large majority of students
9 attend local public two-year and four-year
10 institutions that are very similar to each other in
11 the sense that none of them have very much money,
12 they're all basically anonymous outside of their local
13 regions and they all admit most of the students who
14 apply. So even that measure didn't even really work
15 very well for all of those.

16 And this vacuum of information about
17 quality really has terribly distorting effects on the
18 market incentives that shape institutional behavior.
19 Wealth, fame and exclusivity are vital to reputations,
20 and therefore that's what people focus on. Teaching
21 students well and helping them earn degrees, by
22 contrast, are essentially very important but they are
23 optional goals for institutions.

24 Which is really why it's so exciting to
25 hear about the efforts of my fellow panelists this
26 morning, people who are conducting really truly

1 groundbreaking work to create solid, empirical data
2 focused on what actually happens in college and how
3 well students are actually learning. And really I
4 would say that supporting their work as well as if
5 other new investments in high quality information
6 about a similar nature to be a major priority for this
7 Commission. Although as an Ohio State graduate I take
8 exception to what he said about the University of
9 Michigan. But I'm willing to put those differences
10 aside, George. That's how important I think these
11 issues are.

12 It's also why the Commission should
13 strongly support opportunities to leverage the
14 potential of information technology to understand more
15 about our colleges and universities. And as we've
16 talked about, one proposal was recently put forth by
17 the National Center for Education Statistics to create
18 a unit record system of collecting higher education
19 data.

20 But we all kind of have observed what
21 happened with that process. While some organizations
22 like, for example, the American Association of State
23 Colleges and Universities, to their credit, supported
24 the unit record system. Others, primarily the
25 Association of Independent Colleges, did not. And
26 unfortunately, this common-sense effort has been

1 temporarily derailed in the name of protecting student
2 privacy. I have to be frank. I think the student
3 privacy argument is disingenuous. The real issue here
4 is not student privacy, it is institutional privacy.
5 NCES was clearly prepared to implement all necessary
6 privacy protections and has a sterling record in this
7 area. The real issue I think quite frankly is that
8 there is a concern felt by some that a unit record
9 system would create new opportunities to shine a light
10 on how well some colleges and universities actually
11 serve their students.

12 And one other thing I would emphasize is
13 that it's important to note that it really doesn't
14 cost that much money to get all this new information.

15 I mean if you look at how much CLA cost, how much
16 NSSE cost, even how much it costs to implement the
17 Florida system, the Cadillac system, I mean new
18 information is not free but in the grand scheme of
19 things, particularly given the scope of higher
20 education, it is not very expensive.

21 The second major point I would make this
22 morning is that all of this important new information,
23 if we can create it, will really only be of value to
24 consumers if it's consistently available for every
25 institution. But it is unrealistic to expect that
26 every college and university will provide all of the

1 needed information about themselves voluntarily. They
2 understand that information is the currency of the
3 realm. They are rational, they are self-interested
4 institutions and they feel -- we cannot expect them to
5 voluntarily release data that puts them in a less than
6 flattering light in the market place. Which is
7 understandable, but it's also not in the best
8 interests of students and consumers. I mean I could
9 kind of draw a parallel. I'm sure that every -- at
10 the end of every financial quarter there are many
11 publicly traded companies that would rather not file
12 detailed financial information with the Securities and
13 Exchange Commission. But we all understand the
14 importance of that kind of transparency to consumers.

15 Historically, requirements for mandatory
16 reporting have always met with some resistance. The
17 existing federal Student-Right-To-Know provisions are
18 a good example of that. But I think it's instructive
19 to note that no one is seriously suggesting now that
20 those requirements be rolled back. After a period of
21 adjustment, people get used to reporting of
22 information and they move forward. Disclosure of
23 vital information about higher education quality
24 should be mandatory and not optional. Again, if
25 you'll return to the parallel in the markets.
26 Publicly traded companies enjoy public benefits. And

1 in exchange for that transparency they have access to
2 capital through the stock market. Just as all
3 institutions of higher education in the public and non
4 profit realm, enjoy substantial public benefits in
5 terms of the financial benefits that we talked about
6 yesterday.

7 In both cases the essential bargaining
8 ought to be transparency in exchange for public
9 benefits. But that bargaining is not in place to the
10 extent that it ought to be in higher education today.

11 The third point I would make is that
12 transparency alone is not enough. It's not enough to
13 simply give students and parents access to data.
14 Someone also needs to make sense of that data for
15 them, to boil it down and make it understandable so
16 they can use it to make decisions about where to go to
17 college. That's why U.S. News and World Reports sells
18 so many magazines. That's what they do. In a lot of
19 ways I find a lot of these discussions about whether
20 we should or should not have a national system of
21 higher education accountability to kind of miss the
22 point, we have one already. It just happens to be
23 owned and operated by a for-profit news magazine.

24 So it's critically important that this
25 Commission move not only to provide more public
26 information to consumers, but also to provide

1 practical, understandable tools for consumers to use
2 in making choices. And quite frankly, I don't think
3 there's any reason why those couldn't include
4 rankings. I mean we talked about it a little bit
5 today. And I think the people have made very
6 reasonable statements that it would be wrong, for
7 example, to simply rate all the institutions by NSSE
8 or the CLA. But if you think about what we've talked
9 about over the last couple of days, if you could bring
10 information like the NSSE to the table and information
11 like the CLA to the table and information about course
12 completion, like Carol Twigg talked about, and the
13 kind of graduation rate versus peers information that
14 Kati Haycock and the education staff put together, and
15 the kind of labor market information that the state of
16 Florida can do now and put all those things together
17 into a comprehensive measure and rank institutions
18 that way, I think that would be a real shift in the
19 way that we see institutions today.

20 And finally, I think we need to have our
21 eyes open and acknowledge that in moving ahead on
22 these fronts it's very likely that you will encounter
23 some resistance from the higher education community.
24 Proposals to increase transparency and provide common
25 judgments of quality are often characterized as
26 inappropriate infringements on the autonomy higher

1 education has long enjoyed.

2 Let me be clear. I think the diversity
3 and independence of America's higher education sector
4 has long been one of the system's chief virtues.
5 Responsibility and decision making about how best to
6 educate American college students should be left to
7 individual institutions and the educators who work
8 there.

9 But while the government shouldn't be in
10 the business of telling colleges and universities how
11 to teach their students, it should be in the business
12 of telling consumers, parents, and the public at large
13 how well those students are being educated. It should
14 be in the business of providing real information about
15 quality to higher education market. Autonomy and
16 secrecy are not the same thing.

17 And I think going forward, we all
18 understand that there will be a period of adjustment,
19 greater transparency will be uncomfortable for people.

20 I think it's a simple fact of life that people tend
21 to avoid the harsh light of public scrutiny and
22 accountability if they can. But it's also abundantly
23 clear, again if we look at the data about how our
24 system is working today, that students need far more
25 information about quality than they're currently
26 receiving.

1 So I think this Commission is in a
2 position to catalyze a new era of greatly expanded
3 higher education information. And if it does so, I
4 think the resulting shift in market pressures on
5 institution leaders and individual educators can
6 really give them better reasons to focus their
7 priorities on what matters most, which is helping all
8 students learn and earn a degree. Again, yesterday
9 morning we heard a number of very talented, innovative
10 people present a whole range of ideas about how to
11 reduce costs, to increase affordability, to improve
12 the quality of learning. And there are lots more
13 people like that out there in higher education.

14 But I think that the higher education
15 system has always been slow to embrace these kind of
16 solutions, not because the ideas themselves are
17 unworthy but because the right incentives aren't in
18 place to make people seek them out. You know, I find
19 that people -- they discuss the challenge of bringing
20 these new ideas to the scale. I think there was a
21 communications problem, I think it's an incentive
22 problem. I guess to put it another way, I think that
23 the lack of innovation in the higher education sector
24 is not a supply side problem, it's a demand side
25 problem.

26 And I was thinking a few days ago, just to

1 kind of wrap up, the Washington Post, I live in
2 Washington, D.C., it ran a story announcing the
3 resignation of the President of George Washington
4 University Stephen Trachtenberg, who is by all, I
5 think, kind of contemporary opinion, been a very, very
6 successful president. And what the Post did was they
7 had a few paragraphs that basically summed up his
8 accomplishments in the 20 years he's been the
9 president there.

10 Here's what they said he did. He grew the
11 endowment, the endowment is far larger than it was
12 when he got there; the applicant pool has increased
13 from 3,000 to about 20,000 students and so the
14 selectivity of the institution has become much
15 greater; the academic reputation of the institution as
16 measured by the credentials of faculty is much
17 greater; the physical plant of George Washington
18 University has expanded greatly, somewhat to the
19 discomfort of the people who live nearby I think in
20 Washington; and the basketball team is in the NCAA
21 tournament this year and is doing a lot better.

22 And when I read that, you know, it struck
23 me that that I think is a pretty concise and
24 comprehensive list of the terms of success in higher
25 education today. And so we think about the university
26 leaders who will or will not decide to do all of these

1 things. Good leaders focus on what's most important.
2 They figure out the rules of the game and they play
3 it. And so I think that the challenge that you have
4 as Commissioners is to take all of those ideas that
5 were on the wall yesterday, move them off the wall and
6 move them onto that short list of priorities for
7 institutional leaders. To move them on to the terms
8 of success, on which quite frankly they do not exist
9 today.

10 And the fact of the matter is we have
11 information about some of those things. We know about
12 graduation rates, for example, but, you know, they're
13 not paid attention to as much as they ought to be.
14 And so that's kind of one of the things that we do.

15 But a lot of the things -- and actually
16 another example, we know about how well institutions
17 serve low income students. And I think it's been
18 actually enormously helpful to observe how some of the
19 elite institutions, because there was a lot of
20 publicity about the very low number of low income
21 students, have kind of on their own, there's this
22 dynamic in competition that starts to be generated,
23 where they're voluntarily changing their policies
24 because of that kind of public information and
25 exposure.

26 So I think that this Commission right now

1 -- but the thing about teaching and learning is that
2 there is no information. We don't have that data, it
3 doesn't exist right now to kind of bring into the
4 market. So if this Commission supports the new
5 information about quality that we heard about this
6 morning, if it works to bring that information to
7 consumers in a way that they can use, I think it can
8 really change the way the people see our colleges and
9 universities, change the market incentives that really
10 will ultimately govern institutional decisions and
11 increase that demand for innovation. And students,
12 parents, and really our whole society will be better
13 off for it.

14 So, again, thank you very much for the
15 opportunity to speak today.

16 DR. EWELL: Thank you, Kevin. We have
17 about eight minutes for dialogue. Okay, let's give
18 the Commission a chance.

19 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Yeah, Peter, I must
20 confer, listen to -- these were great presentations I
21 think. I may be a minority of one who feels that.
22 Looking at some of my fellow Commissioners during
23 Anne's presentation reminded me of someone having a
24 hemorrhoid operation, looking like --

25 (Laughter.)

26 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Without an

1 anesthetic. All right, he's asking -- never mind.

2 This Commission has focused on a lot of
3 things. One thing it has said relatively little about
4 is the quality of the outcomes of our students.
5 Relatively little.

6 Now, we get into that some with the CLA
7 test and the engagement test. But what should we be
8 teaching students, what should they be learning, what
9 are they learning? We have paid little attention to
10 this.

11 The word grade inflation was mentioned for
12 the first time, not the first time but I think the
13 second time today, in all of our meetings. Do we care
14 about this? Is it important? I think it is. The
15 decline in adult literacy amongst college students --
16 another survey I've seen shows no value added among
17 students at many colleges on basic knowledge of civil
18 institutions in this country.

19 Are we not going to say something about
20 these issues in our report? I don't know that I can
21 sign onto any report that doesn't say something about
22 these. And certainly something about cost efficiency
23 issues which were not on our top three list that we
24 listed yesterday. And maybe no one cares where I
25 stand, but I do. And I'll be damn sure to have a
26 piece in the Wall Street Journal on it, too, I can

1 tell you that.

2 (Laughter.)

3 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: So I think maybe in
4 the interest of collegiality and whatnot, we need to
5 pay some focus to these. And also what Kevin said,
6 which was very good. Kevin actually picked up on
7 themes that have been made earlier, a little more
8 mainstream in that it -- I guess one of the news
9 people said we are now a mainstream commission. And
10 Kevin's remarks, a little more mainstream but very
11 instructive.

12 DR. EWELL: Other comments or questions?
13 Art?

14 COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Yes. I'd just ask
15 Anne Neal a question. With all your ten years
16 experience in what you're doing, to what extent do you
17 think you had any impact on trustees? I mean actual
18 impact on trustees changing the dynamics at an
19 institution?

20 MS. NEAL: Well, we're working
21 incrementally. I think there's some very good
22 examples of effective trustees. As I said, University
23 of Texas is certainly one good example of a board that
24 really has taken on big issues. I think the State
25 University of New York system has been an exemplary
26 board. They've looked at general education, they've

1 looked at assessments, they've looked at teacher
2 education. George Mason board has looked at general
3 education. Colorado now is engaged in a statewide
4 assessment of its core curriculum. It's doing very
5 good public release of information relating to grade.

6 It's also looking at one of the issues that we heard
7 about earlier today which is the problem for boys.
8 One of the things that's been dictated by the State
9 Council for Higher Ed in Colorado is that people
10 coming out of teacher ed schools know how to read data
11 and know how to understand that there may be different
12 learning experiences for boys and girls.

13 So there's a wonderful example of
14 statewide board, by board, by board, I think taking on
15 many of these important issues.

16 COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: A followup. Anne,
18 is the progress mostly with state universities? How
19 do you do with the private institutions?

20 MS. NEAL: I will say the privates are a
21 good deal less penetrable because trustees, for the
22 most part, are appointees. They come into their job
23 with much more a sense of the work that they are doing
24 is in the public interest. I think we are beginning
25 to see, and certainly this was on the table of the
26 discussions of American University, which is chartered

1 by Congress but is essentially a private, I think
2 there's more and more focus now on non profit size.
3 Whether or not, for instance, a 32, 42, sometimes 60
4 person board. Whether or not those are really
5 governing boards or whether or not they're actually
6 fund raising boards.

7 So I'm hoping if we look as the private
8 sector begins to see more of these issues in the
9 press, that the private universities will take the
10 opportunity to look at their governing structures and
11 to see if there are ways that they can make themselves
12 more effective governors rather than just fund
13 raisers.

14 COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: Thank you.

15 DR. EWELL: Yes, David?

16 COMMISSIONER WARD: Anne, I'd like to
17 continue a dialogue you and I once had because there
18 are two overlapping issues in the Commission and I'd
19 like your reflections on it.

20 One of them is this idea of advanced
21 placement and shortening the cycle time of the degree
22 perhaps to three, three and a half years, because the
23 ways of having some general education met in high
24 school, that's the theory we heard Governor Caperton
25 talk about, advanced placement, as a very systemic
26 approach to this. Or whether advanced placement ought

1 not to be seen as a substitute for college but just a
2 way of elevating the quality of high school courses
3 and there's no gaining credits when you get to
4 college.

5 But as you look at general education, do
6 you feel that its entirety needs to be carried by the
7 college or are there some students who in high school
8 can in fact already have taken that?

9 And the second thing would be that
10 particularly as we deal with the pressure for pre-
11 major requirements in say genetics, bio-chemistry,
12 computer science, sometimes these students want, in a
13 sense, to get there early. It's not because of the
14 potpourri of courses, they're just driven to get to
15 their major very early. I was one of those kids in
16 England actually. I wanted to get to my major and
17 perhaps neglected a little bit. The motive was not,
18 you know -- it was effective motives in other words,
19 rather than -- I missed out on some general education
20 which I got later, but the drive was academic
21 specialization which has got some virtue, too.

22 So I just worry a little bit about as you
23 look at the core curriculum which I actually agree
24 with, that there is a sort of inventory -- connected
25 inventory of knowledge that is the core of what is
26 needed, but where and how it's delivered it seems to

1 me may need some flexibility as you move to higher
2 education or as you have students which were very
3 precocious and are seeking to specialize early. I
4 heard you talk about this a little bit already.

5 MS. NEAL: I remember David and I did have
6 this dialogue over dinner and I'm not sure either one
7 of us got any food that night.

8 In terms of general education, I think
9 it's interesting. If you look at the college
10 catalogs, virtually every institution it espouses
11 general education, the need to have that common core.

12 So my sense is, for better for worse, that most
13 institutions feel a general education is important and
14 that it is a goal worth achieving.

15 I think also if you look at the existing
16 accreditation system one of the criteria that the
17 accreditors go in is to ascertain that there is a
18 general education program at the institutions that
19 they are accrediting. So it seems to me that there is
20 a fairly good consensus that general education is
21 important at the college level and that it provides an
22 opportunity for, if you will, a common conversation,
23 whether it's for the advanced student or for the less
24 advanced student. I think we heard earlier that we're
25 seeing some very interesting trends. On the one hand
26 you've got more kids taking APs, but on the other hand

1 you've got more remediation. And I think that the
2 general education curriculum is a way to incorporate
3 students at all levels into that conversation in a way
4 that also helps you go back into K-12 and have more of
5 an alignment.

6 Certainly there are some students that are
7 going to come in with more training than others. But
8 does that obviate the need for the university to have
9 a curriculum that focuses on general areas of
10 knowledge? It gives students at the college level the
11 opportunity to have that dialogue. I would suggest it
12 doesn't.

13 DR. EWELL: Bob Zemsky is probably going
14 to have to be one of the last comments.

15 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Two quick
16 observations. One, I serve as a trustee. I've been a
17 trustee a long time. Your description doesn't fit me
18 and the members of the board I serve with. That's
19 just an observation.

20 The second observation --

21 MS. NEAL: What's your board, we'll use it
22 as a case in point.

23 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: I'm a long term
24 trustee of Franklin Marshall College.

25 The second observation is this core
26 curricular discussion has been with us for a quarter

1 century now. I know it's a quarter century because
2 that's how long ago Fred Rudolph really did integrate
3 into the college classroom and that's how long ago my
4 group did the statistical analysis that prove all the
5 things he said were right. But that's a quarter
6 century. This isn't something new. And you have to
7 begin to ask, what is the dynamic because it's not a
8 new dynamic. It's been here a long time and it's
9 probably beyond the point where rhetoric is going to
10 change it. We probably have reached a point where if
11 the consumers don't want it, we aren't going to give
12 it to them. And that's a cruel thing to say and I
13 understand that, but that's really what the dynamic
14 looks like.

15 And the idea that we could in some way
16 mandate a return to the core curriculum is just a
17 world that no longer exists.

18 MS. NEAL: Well, let me address that. I
19 think higher education typically comes out with
20 surveys and it looks at what students themselves are
21 seeking when they go to colleges. And freshmen, and
22 if you will if we may call them the consumers, have
23 typically said that they are interested in a strong
24 general education. So I do believe actually that the
25 consumers are seeking that. And I think that, again,
26 and this gets back to accountability, it's incumbent

1 on our institutions not to respond simply to the
2 consumer but to determine what every graduate should
3 know.

4 And to get back to the Governor's question
5 and concern earlier, the national interest in having
6 civic literacy and having students who understand
7 economics and are exposed to broad areas of knowledge,
8 I think that's critical if going forward our higher
9 education system is to remain supreme.

10 And so I think rather than viewing it as
11 to what students what, I think it should be what do
12 students need and how do we get there and how do we
13 engage them in a way that will help them be informed
14 citizens, expert workers and lifelong learners.

15 DR. EWELL: Gerri Elliott.

16 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Yeah, I wanted to
17 talk to Anne and Kevin, I thought your presentations
18 were outstanding. We have talked about transparency
19 on this Commission and said that we need to provide a
20 way for this type of information to get out there.
21 And I truly believe that once you shine the light of
22 day on it, market forces take over and things change.

23 I can't believe I'm actually agreeing with Richard.
24 It's amazing right now.

25 (Laughter.)

26 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: With that, my

1 question though is to both of you. Where is this
2 information? Where is the survey you mentioned, Anne,
3 some of the information you were sharing; where is it?

4 Is it -- is it on a web site somewhere? Is it
5 published? How do you get your hands on it?

6 MS. NEAL: I'll get you one. These books
7 are available certainly on our web site or it can be
8 ordered through our web site, www.goactive.org. And
9 obviously it is our hope to be doing more and more
10 state by state surveys. So that not only do we have
11 the Big 10, Big 12, Ivy League, but we can actually go
12 into the states and analyze the curricula for
13 governors, for citizens, for parents, so that they
14 actually see what is required.

15 And one of the things that is difficult,
16 as we've looked at it and we've been in higher ed
17 forever, trying to read the curriculum and actually
18 figure out what's required and what's not required, is
19 something like reading a medieval manuscript. It's
20 very difficult.

21 So parents do need assistance and help in
22 actually seeing what the school is requiring of its
23 students and not just simply taking of the statement,
24 as most catalogs will say, we believe in a strong gen
25 ed and then in fact there will be a hundred, two
26 hundred courses that might satisfy that general

1 education.

2 COMMISSIONER VEST: I'd like to point out
3 that Anne just, in those comments, put squarely on the
4 table one thing that there has been almost no
5 discussion about here, but absolutely undergirds
6 everything we have talked about. And that is how we
7 strike the balance between a consumerist and
8 utilitarian point of view on the one hand and a
9 responsibility within the Academy, including the
10 governing boards, for the content of what we think
11 citizens need to know.

12 This is a tough issue. And I want to
13 thank you for putting it out there. And I think as we
14 all prepare for our next meeting, we've got to give a
15 little thought to this because the simplistic view of
16 transparency and accountability and metrics and so
17 forth, plays very strongly to this side and not very
18 strongly to this side. And it's a complex issue. And
19 I just want to thank you for stating it with that much
20 clarity and to take my last couple of minutes to put a
21 little emphasis on it.

22 COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Chuck, that was a
23 great closure to the session. Charles had to sneak
24 off, he ask that I facilitate bringing this to
25 closure.

26 Panel, this has been certainly an

1 interesting and an important element and I think a
2 lively discussion that we wish the Commission to
3 consider, this whole notion of accountability. I
4 really want to thank you for your time and energy in
5 facilitating and educating us in this discussion and
6 it will certainly play an important part as we go
7 forward with our recommendations.

8 (Applause.)

9 COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Thank you. We
10 probably have just one last item as a Commission prior
11 to our departure. As was discussed earlier, we
12 certainly had a lively discussion yesterday. I have
13 copies of the results I'd like to hand out for all of
14 us from the Commission standpoint.

15 What you'll find on this sheet are three
16 items. One is a definition of higher education.
17 Another is the shared values we discussed yesterday
18 and thanks to the dialogue and Bob Mendenhall's help,
19 shortened those words up. As well as incorporated a
20 number of other items that everyone came back with.

21 And then on the second page are the
22 results of our key strategy vote that we went through
23 yesterday.

24 I think from my perspective, thinking
25 about this again last night and looking at this this
26 morning prior to running this off, my sense is I think

1 we have a pretty good view of where we are in the
2 shared values. I would go back to Richard's comment,
3 it's not entirely clear we have alignment yet around
4 what the critical actions are. And I think that as we
5 look forward to our meeting in May, certainly we ought
6 to think about what are the key elements necessary for
7 us to be successful implementing that set of shared
8 values.

9 And so I wanted to just leave that with
10 you from a thought standpoint. Cheryl, do you want to
11 kind of give us a rundown on plans for our next
12 meeting, please?

13 MS. OLDHAM: Next meeting you all I'm sure
14 know, May 18th and 19th in D.C. Charles mentioned
15 yesterday there's been some discussion and some
16 thought about an additional meeting sometime in May
17 and he's alluded to sort of doing an informal poll of
18 everybody, June or July, to see if there's a date that
19 would work for everyone. So we'll get to you on that.

20 We don't plan to have, at this point,
21 presenters for the May meeting, as he also mentioned.

22 So it's going to be a discussion for, you know, that
23 length of time. Yeah, Bob?

24 COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Can I make two
25 pleas? One is as the staff comes to the May meeting,
26 that you resist any temptation whatsoever to bring us

1 a draft? That we need to see bullet points and
2 potential recommendations and the like. I think if
3 you try to close this discussion you're going to run
4 into trouble. I thought the kind of thing we did
5 yesterday really worked well and I'm hopeful that more
6 of that will be done in May.

7 And having said that, my second point is
8 to strongly urge a face-to-face meeting as a final.
9 We need one more and we've all given a fair amount of
10 our time to this and I think not to do the last step
11 would really be difficult for us.

12 COMMISSIONER VEST: I'd like to second
13 that.

14 COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Okay, good.

15 Okay, other comments? With no other
16 comments, then --

17 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: I have just one. I
18 want to thank Rick for his leadership at the end of
19 the afternoon.

20 COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER VEDDER: In absentia we
22 should thank Charles, even though he's not here, for
23 he has really put in an enormous amount of time and
24 effort on this. And I've had many arguments and
25 fights with Charles, as many others here, but no one
26 doubts for a moment his great dedication. And I think

1 it should be acknowledged.

2 COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: With that, I
3 believe we're adjourned. Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, at 12:12 o'clock p.m., the
5 meeting was concluded.)

6 - - - - -