

# **Forging New Partnerships: Implementing Three New Initiatives in the Higher Education Act**

Friday, June 25, 1999

Falk Auditorium  
The Brookings Institution  
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, DC

*\*uncorrected transcript\**

**M. Armacost:** I'm Mike Armacost and it's my pleasure as president of The Brookings Institution to welcome you all today.

We are delighted to be able to host a continuing series of programs on higher education and public policy in that field. And looking through the program for this morning, I was delighted to see that three of the participants — Mike Timpane, Art Hauptman and Lois Rice — were among the architects of the Brown Center on Education Policy that was established in the early '90s. And Mike Smith, who will be the keynote speaker this morning, did a very seminal paper for us that helped chart the program of research which we've pursued in the field of K through 12 education reform.

In a way that remains the heart of our activities. And yet, we're pleased that grants from the German Marshall Fund, the College Board, Miriam Carliner Fund has permitted us to continue remaining active on issues that relate to higher education.

We have tended to focus, as you would expect from an institution like Brookings, on the federal role in higher education. We've dwelt very heavily on the ways in which the college aid and other instruments can help assure a high participation rate by low income students, and we've looked at — particularly at vehicles like the income tax credit, tuition tax credit, that can supplement other instruments to accomplish that purpose.

We continue to publish in this field — a book by Art Hauptman, Larry Glido *[ph]*, The College Aid Quandary, and Lois published a brief on the tuition tax credits last year.

This session today will focus heavily on implementation. That, likewise, is in keeping with our institution, which has, throughout its history, emphasized not only legislative initiatives but particularly how the performance of government is affected by the execution. So in looking at three important initiatives in the Higher Education Act — to me, this is thoroughly consistent with our charter and very important to the quality of higher education. And I wish you well in your session today and will drop by throughout the day to participate.

Let me turn it back over to Lois Rice.

**L. Rice:** Thank you, Mike.

As Mike has just noted — thank you — as Mike has just noted, today's forum represents a continuation in a series of discussions sponsored by the Brown Center relating to the federal role in higher education. But today, we're moving beyond concepts and ideas, as Mike also indicated, to actual legislative provisions that must be implemented.

And too often, implementation is the forgotten element of the public policy process, lost after the shouting and the emotion of legislative enactment has subsided.

We hope to rectify that tendency today by examining three initiatives that were included in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act last year. Each seeks to address critical policy concerns — namely, improving the chances of at-risk youth to go to college through the GEARUP program; addressing a series of difficult issues relating to the growing role of distance learning in higher education, and particularly how it can relate to non-traditional students; and improving teacher quality. All of these efforts are so critical to improving the quality of education, particularly the education of the low-income, minority and disadvantaged students.

Each initiative also requires a new set of partnerships — between states; among business, higher education institutions, local communities, and elementary and secondary schools.

I've worked both in the higher education policy world and in the corporate world. And I must say I've become rather impressed, though business moves slowly, with the efforts that business has made in the last decade to join with schools and local communities, and with state agencies, to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. In fact, the business community, in my view, has been much more concerned with its pipeline and the quality of people it might recruit for its workforce than our higher education institutions have been in the pipeline of the students they're going to recruit to their institutions.

So these partnerships between schools and colleges are — and other entities — are at the heart of each of the initiatives we're going to focus on today.

A principal goal of the forum is to identify early on — what are the possible obstacles to success of these initiatives and to find ways to overcome them.

These issues include questions of funding; program design and regulation. For example, how much funding is needed to test the viability of these initiatives? What are the tensions with existing programs that already have constituencies and advocates? Is the legislation well designed? Or will the inevitable compromises that accompany the legislative process and the implementation process serve to inhibit the progress of these initiatives? What issues have arisen in how the Department of Education is carrying out the legislation? Are certain aspects of the legislation being emphasized at the cost of ignoring other key elements of the programs?

In addition to these general questions, we've asked each of the panelists to consider two more specific questions. First, is it possible that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is up for reauthorization in this Congress, is it possible that it could be modified to improve the chances of success of these initiatives in higher education? Can we, as we're fostering partnerships between higher education and local schools, think — possibly for the first time — of a partnership between ESEA and higher education?

I feel there is a clear opportunity as we move towards the reauthorization of ESEA for integrating the federal role in different levels of education, a goal that has often been discussed, but rarely acted upon.

Second, are there ways in which we might simplify and rationalize the student aid process to increase the chances of success of each of these initiatives? This also is a recurring, but unachieved, goal — the notion of having a financial aid system which students and their parents can readily understand and university officials can efficiently administer.

As to the format of the panels today, in each case, we've asked two administration officials to begin the discussion. One will describe the thinking behind the initiative, and the other will describe the current status of the program — what type of participants have been applying for it? How many applications have been received and how they are going about selecting and making the awards?

Then the panelists have been asked to respond to these administration presentations, identifying areas that might require further elaboration and suggesting ways in which improvements can be made. We've asked each panelist to keep their remarks to five to 10 minutes to allow for a high level of audience participation.

To speed things along, we're going to pass out shortly bios on each of the panelists and other speakers so our introductions will be brief.

Let me conclude on a personal note.

I have been devoted to broadening education opportunities — particularly for low-income and minority students — all of my professional life, whether it be in the higher education arena, or in the corporate arena. We've made much progress, including the evolution of Pell grants, the explosion in student loans, the campus-based aid programs, and the trio programs of student support. But for all the money we've spent, and all the effort we've expended, we still have glaring gaps between rich and poor and between the traditional college student and non-traditional learning.

Today, in 1999, the gaps in the college participation rate of students from the lowest income groups compared to those from the highest are as wide as they were in 1970, and that was even before Pell grants.

These new initiatives, in my view, have the potential of finally breaking down the barriers to higher education by complementary — complementing and supplementing the existing student financial aid programs and other support programs. That's why I'm so glad to welcome you here today.

But before concluding, I want to give some special thanks and appreciation to the people who have made this forum possible: David Carliner [ph] — I'm not sure he's here — who has funded the Miriam Carliner Fund here at Brookings in honor of his wife who was, for a long time, an official at the Department of Education, and he has devoted, in her memory, funds to higher education policy analysis here at Brookings.

I also want to thank the College Board, the German Marshall Fund, and the other sponsors that Mike also mentioned earlier.

I also want to particularly thank my collaborator, who also worked with me on the tuition tax credit and meshing those programs with student aid publication, Art Hauptman, who has been my collaborator in this effort and in so many others in the past.

Also, a number of my colleagues here at Brookings — Kathleen Elliot Yinug — Kathleen, raise your hand — who has put this whole thing together; Ron Nessen and Robert Dabrowski, many of the people here at Brookings, as well as Mike Armacost, who despite efforts, I think, to move away from higher education policy, has helped me to stick in there and move ahead.

I also want to thank a number of the people in the Department of Education whose enthusiasm for having this forum really allowed it to happen.

Before introducing our next speaker, I want to just mention one wonderful change in our agenda. In the first panel, which is GEARUP, we are going, as your original program announcement indicated, we are going to have with us Steve Zwerling, from the Ford Foundation. We welcome you, Steve. I know you've had a difficult week, and I'm delighted that you showed up this morning. Thank you for coming.

It's now my pleasure to introduce our first speaker.

I guess, when you get older, your relationships with a number of people become almost incomprehensible that it's — you know, I've known David Mandel over here; I worked with him for 30 years; and Mike Smith reminded me this morning, who I'm going to introduce — Lois, just say that we've worked together for 25 years. Well, it's true. We have worked together in one incarnation or another for 25 years, and also, Mike is a special friend.

Marshall Smith, as he's known officially, is the acting deputy secretary and undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Education. He and Secretary Riley — I think, he — Mike, first of all, has the distinction of being the longest acting deputy secretary in the history of the department. And he and Secretary Riley also have the distinction, having been — Secretary Riley the longest secretary and Mike the longest active undersecretary of the Department of Education. That has been, frankly, despite all the criticism, one of the most stable departments in the government, particularly during this whole regime.

I also want to just mention that Mike has initiated and carried out for 25 years, either in the public sector, when he was dean at the School of Education at Stanford, or working in other places, in public service, as well as in public service, he has shown a consistency and a commitment to performance, to change, to daring new directions. And he's even had the audacity on several occasions to come to us at Brookings and say — Look, we need a little help. Can we just meet informally, maybe even at the Cosmos Club for breakfast.

Anyway, Mike is going to set the tone for this conference, and I want to welcome him, both as a friend, a colleague and a leader.

Thank you, Mike.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION.]*

**M. Smith:** Thank you, Lois.

It's been a good 25 years, I think. A lot of exciting, interesting things have gone on, both in Brookings, and I think Washington over those years, and I think we're entering into an era now when we're going to move a notch up. It's going to be a little bit different in terms of — I think, in terms of the way that we think about public policy, and the way that we think about the relationship between the federal government and colleges and universities, state departments of education, and so on.

And there is a real change, I believe, in the federal role over the past few years. And a lot of it is exemplified in the programs that you're going to be talking about today because they're, in some ways, a very different set of programs than we've had before; in other ways, they are conceptually similar, but they're being implemented in a different style and with a different conception about what the end point might be.

I'll be fairly brief. I want to touch on three general points, and then raise a couple of issues that would be great if you could think about during the day, as well as the issues that Lois laid out, which I thought was a good agenda for the conference, and I certainly look forward to seeing the results of the conference if you can begin to get at some of the questions that Lois asked — how can these programs be improved over time? How can these programs really have the kinds of effects that we all want them to have? How do we take these programs to scale?

And in many ways, those are some of the same questions that I'm going to address over the next few minutes.

The three ways that these programs signal different roles in ESEA are fairly straightforward.

Lois mentioned the first one, and I think it's the most important one. And that is that the three programs that you're talking about fit the — that you will talk about — fit beautifully into the overall conception of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They fit into the K to 12 mission of the department. And they fit there in a principled way. That is, the fundamental purposes of those programs — to increase access to students moving on to college, to provide opportunity for all students so they can achieve to high standards, to begin to establish sets of understandings of students about their future and about the kinds of decisions that they'll have to make in their lives — these are all themes that permeate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And one way — Lois, you asked whether or not there were ways that we could change the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or perhaps the administration's proposal to better link to these programs — in many ways, they are very tightly linked right now. That's not to say that we couldn't improve them. I'm sure we can and, with your help, perhaps we will in the near future or Congress — Congressman Fattah is here — and there are other folks in Congress who are interested in improvements.

I believe that the kinds of ideas that can come out of this conference can really help.

But the notion that we are emphasizing in these three programs the same purposes, the same sets of strategies in many ways — that is, improving teacher quality, for example, is one of the major themes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; bringing standards into the classroom and moving

students to the point where all students, not just a few, but all students take advantage of the kinds of opportunities that schools give, take the kinds of courses that will move them, that will move them into a position where they can apply to colleges and get into competitive colleges is a fundamental part of GEARUP.

Providing the kinds of opportunities to students in remote places — we still have something like 35 to 40 percent of our high schools in this country don't have a calculus course. They don't have a physics course. They don't have some of the foreign language courses. These are — many of these schools are in urban areas — are in rural areas, but a few are in urban areas as well. And the kinds of work that can go on through the distance learning program, the strategies that could be looked at, trying to understand better the quality of those programs, and so on, can all feed into reforms at the elementary and secondary level.

So we have already established a link in purpose. And beyond purpose, I think we've also begun to establish a set of institutional links, which is really my second point, and the point that Lois mentioned.

And here, I believe it's almost for the first time — certainly the first time in such a concrete fashion — in the Higher Education Act, it's been a specification of the institutional relationships — institutional relationships — between higher education and elementary and secondary education. Both in GEARUP and certainly in the teacher training programs, you have specified in the law those sets of relationships.

In the past, in some very good programs that exist in the Higher Education Act, the trio programs in particular, you have a relationship that's based on students being in the schools, in the K to 12 schools, and the higher ed organizations coming in to give a hand. And we certainly have that same set of relationships going on in the college work-study tutoring programs. But we don't have the formal relationships, the formal institutional relationships, established in order to have both entities learning from them.

Now, it's an interesting time for all of this. Certainly, it's not only the Higher Education Act that is promoting these kinds of institutional relationships. All one has to do is go to California and talk to any of the chancellors of the California universities about what they're doing with K to 12 schools. They're doing it in a post-affirmative action era. They're doing it because they're motivated to do it because of that. They're also doing it, I believe, because they're motivated by a real sense of commitment to working in the schools and other places.

So that the GEARUP relationships, the teacher-training relationships all fit into a larger pattern that's beginning to emerge all over the country of strong institutional relationships between colleges and universities on the one hand and K to 12 school systems and individual schools on the other hand.

Relationships between those two entities are only part of the story, though. The relationship to the private sector is also powerful, and specified in these programs and coming out in many of the proposals for the programs.

I'll mention just one. It's not normally thought of as the private sector, although it is, and that is the relationship between the GEARUP program and the Ford Foundation, as Lois mentioned a little bit earlier. There, we've formed a linkage, a bonding, that is truly extraordinary.

The Ford Foundation has been interested in issues of the GEARUP nature for a long time, and when they saw that GEARUP passed, they approached us and then we got into a good conversation with them about establishing a relationship where Ford would be able to go out and do a variety of things around information sharing with potential applicants, putting together lists of exemplary programs, a whole bundle of things that often it takes the federal government a little more time to get ready to do. They could do it quite quickly, and they could do it, in part, because they'd already been working in these areas.

And over the period of time from the passage of the program to the first actual applicants coming in with proposals, Ford was out there — I don't know how many times, but a large number of times — with the department, talking to people all over the country about the nature of the program, stimulating better ideas, stimulating better proposals, stimulating interest in the idea in general, and so on.

This is a strategy of a sort that we've also followed in the department with another program — the 21st Century Schools Program — which is an after-school effort. And we've done it there with the Mott Foundation. And it turns out to be a really great model. It's not going to work for every program, but when there is that kind of interest by a foundation in a federal program, it is a wonderfully synergistic activity that we can all enter into because the foundations have — foundations can pay for coffee, for example, when groups come together, and sometimes even lunch.

*[LAUGHTER]*

We can't do that. And they can do well more than that, obviously, but they are much more nimble. They are much more like the private sector in that regard. And so they can act quickly and they can feed back information and so on, and make the programs really come alive to potential applicants.

Now, the third area here, which is a somewhat different role for the department, is the nature of really of the implementation of the programs themselves. And in this case, what's happening is that the programs, because they're new, are able to begin to move in a directions sometimes that some of the older programs have a harder time doing because there's been an established set of procedures for many of the tried-and-true programs in the department, not just in the Higher Education Act programs, but in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And the business of the department typically in these areas has been to process grants. It's been very — there's been a lot of routine processes that go on. You take in applications. You process the grants. You process the applications. You bring people together to hold peer reviews and so on, and you do that during much the part, the bigger part of the year. You may do a little bit of monitoring in order to make sure that the money is being spent correctly. But by and large, you're not collecting outcome data from the particular projects. We haven't been really working with those projects in a way where we pass out good information and share exemplary practice.

When we have an evaluation, it's an evaluation that's really on the time schedule of the evaluators rather than on the time schedule of the people implementing the program. You know, so you'll start an evaluation perhaps in the first or second year of the authorization of one of these things. You'll go out and collect this large, large sample. You'll spend two or three years analyzing this and writing up reports and getting them cleared and so on, and it will be just in time for the next reauthorization of Congress.

So during that five-year period of time, you've learned nothing specifically that you can feed back into the programs — nothing. It's incredible. So we've not, either from the monitoring process of feeding back information there, and not from the process of the formal evaluations.

Now, all this can change, and it can change not because we've invented the Internet in the administration, but because the Internet came in in 1993 really and began to play a prominent role in the activities, not first of the government, but first of the private sector. And now the government is beginning to emulate much of the private sector in many of the same ways. And the department is moving in that direction with all deliberate speed.

We are trying to put into place the automation using the Internet of most of the routine processes of the department. Now, what does that mean?

Well, it means that, by and large, you're going to be able to apply for applications; you're going to be able to get information, apply for applications for programs, fill out applications, send them in, have them processed, have peer reviews that are done by some sort of distance communications, have a grant awarded, and then, basically, get information on a rather instantaneous basis about the implementation of projects — all through the Internet.

It used to be that when I'd get on a plane and I'd say I was from the Department of Education, you know, in response to a question — generally, I try to burrow down in the plane seat — but in this case, somebody asks you a question, so you respond. And then, I typically would turn around the question. I'd say — they'd ask — What do you do there? And I'd say — Well, what do you think the Department of Education should do?

And what you'd get would be the response that — Well, we think they ought to tell us about what are the most effective practices in schools. What makes schools work. How can we get our information from my school, the school that my kids go to or my grandchildren go to or whatever? How can you get it out there?

And I'd say — Well, we churn out lots of books and we do all this other stuff and so on, knowing all the time in my heart that there were 95,000 schools out there, 8,000 colleges and universities, 2.5 million teachers, and that it was impossible for us to reach out to all of them.

Well, extraordinarily, it's not impossible today to reach out to all of them. It may be impossible to have them all respond, but it is not impossible to reach them all — through the Internet, using the web, carrying out the provision of information in ways that we could not have imagined in the past.

And as we all know, it's not going to be too long before that pipe that now serves our web through the telephone lines and so on in our homes is going to be replaced. It's going to be replaced by much thicker pipes that deliver much more information, much faster, and with much more fidelity. And the kinds of things that we're going to be able to do with the web, which fits into the distance learning program, but it also fits into the general strategy of the department in ways of reaching out and thinking about how to serve a public out there.

The kinds of things that we can do will be truly extraordinary. They will go way beyond what the very best in business can do right now and they'll go way beyond it within the next three or four years.

So at the department, we're trying to move to a point where, like many businesses, we're going to automate those routine processes on the one side, and on the other side, we're going to create a system of customer service that reaches out all across the country — not just to our grantees, but to all of the people that we'd like to serve.

So it's not just the folks that would get a trio grant. It's all the folks that might like to get a trio grant or might think about it. Or it's also the students out there who may be at a school where there's no trio grant or it may be to the presidents or to the parents of the kids or whomever. It's all accessible to everybody and it's accessible in a forum and a fashion which allows them to interact and do it on a continuous basis, late at night, early in the morning, whenever they might want to do it.

So there is an amazing change that's going on. And I think it would be terrific if you all would talk about that change, think about that change, think about how it affects the implementation of programs and so on.

Let me leave you with two final thoughts.

First, as an issue to continue talking about — and Lois has really already mentioned this — it's the issue of how do we keep prompting this beginning that we've gotten on a communication, a real communication, between higher education institutions and K to 12 districts and schools and so on. And I hasten to say that this is, as I said before, this is not just a communications that's been stimulated by any federal programs. It's a communication that's been stimulated by lots of activity out there by colleges and universities. The question is how do we keep that going. How do we make it pay off.

We have tried to do this for 25 years or 30 years. I mean, there have been fits and starts and many of you have participated in those efforts and come back disappointed often at the end of the efforts because, for some reason or other, while the initial passion was there, it began to die out. Somehow it didn't get rewarded. Somehow, the environment wasn't right. How do we get that environment right? How do we get the incentives right to make that continuously happen?

And the second issue that I'd like you to think about really has to do with the purpose of the programs. And here, I'm thinking, I think, more about GEARUP and the teacher programs. These are somewhere in between demonstration programs and service programs.

We don't expect them ever to be universal service programs. There's not going to be enough money in the budget to fund all of the really good ideas and take it up to — take them up to scale through federal funding. What we'd like is something different, I think. And let me just try it.

It seems to me that what we want to do is to, first, examine the quality of these programs, have a sufficiently immediate evaluation, have good indicators to feed back outcomes, and so on, so we have a kind of a continuous, ongoing record of what's happening with those programs and whether or not they're working.

Second, we need to somehow use the capacity that I just talked about — that is the capacity to put out information — gather information about the programs and put it immediately back out to all the programs — how are they implementing a program in Kansas? You get some information about what's happening in Kansas. You get some information about what's happening in Sacramento. You get some

information about what's happening in Newark. And if it's good information, where people have tried to tackle a problem, that information shouldn't just be filed away. That information should be passed back out to all the people who are out there in all other parts of the country working hard to try to implement the programs.

They should understand that, in fact, others are going through the same efforts and they should try to learn from those others. We're trying to do this in the 21st Century Schools Program. That is, we're trying to feed back information from people who've been working on problems back out to all the people in the field. We're trying to do in the comprehensive school programs, both in ESEA — we should be trying to do that in the higher education programs we're talking about here as well.

Third, there is a — I think a kind of an interesting theoretical problem in social change, which a lot of people have tried to address over time. And it goes something like this. If you have a set of good ideas, and you try them out in the field, and you improve them over time, and you get some reasonable results for them, how do you create an environment where those ideas spread? And where they spread with enough fidelity so that they keep up the same kinds of effects that the programs that have been more in the incubator — the kinds of characteristics that those programs have had? How do you turn a set of ideas into things that travel from one place to another?

You know, there is a kind of a growing set of theories, complexity theory and chaos theory, that have come out of the hard sciences and biological sciences, which discuss issues around complex, adaptive organisms. And one can think of colleges and universities as complex, adaptive organisms. One can think of school systems in the same way. That when they're put in the right kind of environment, they will flourish. They will try to figure out ideas. There'll be connections made between them, networks turn out to be tremendously important when you look at the way that organisms grow and when you look at the way institutions grow and people learn and so on. That is human networks, connections of ideas, the flow of ideas, and so on.

But it also needs — there needs to be some watering. When you're dealing with organisms, somehow you need to keep fueling them somehow. You need to keep making that environment work so that they can actually grow and change and improve and learn from other things over time.

How do we create that kind of environment in the long run, rather than having just a set of 200 or 500 programs of this sort? How do we create an environment in the country where, if these programs are working, we have 1,000 of them — one for each higher ed institution?

OK. Let me leave you at that. I have one other task to do, which is a great honor here.

Several months ago, I was in Philadelphia at a GEARUP session that Ford was sponsoring, along with the department. And we were there and giving some talks and information and so on to people in the field. And one of the folks there was a congressman, a young congressman, who had sponsored the GEARUP program, been the inventor in many ways of the GEARUP legislation, from Philadelphia.

And he rushed in because he had a vote that was going to happen midmorning or late morning in the House, gave a rousing talk and then rushed out again. But he had made time during that day, when he

had a vote to do, made time during that day to come downtown to speak to a significant number of people and a fairly large number of people interested in this program because he was committed to it.

Congressman Chaka Fattah has — knows something about the interconnections among organizations and levels of government. He's worked in the city government. He's worked in the state government, in the state legislature. And he's been in the Congress since 1995, where he has been an active leader in lots of education issues, and a particularly active leader in this one.

It's my great honor and pleasure to present to you Congressman Chaka Fattah.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF REMARKS.]*

**Rep. Fattah:** Let me thank the — I'm just going to call him the deputy secretary — acting is —

*[LAUGHTER]*

But I want to really thank Brookings and the Brown Center for hosting this because I think this is — the real challenge that faces us now is how we have a focused implementation process for a new initiative like GEARUP.

I want to suggest that GEARUP is really the result of a partnership forged — that is to say that the Clinton administration, the White House, the Department of Ed, almost unanimous elements within the higher education community around the country, and for a host of other youth-serving entities, wide-ranging, from the Boys and Girls Clubs, to many elements of the civil rights community, that supported this initiative as we moved it through the legislative process.

And so that not only is the focus of the program itself how we build partnerships to impact the lives of children, but it is the result of a very successful partnership. And I want to just thank all who have played a role in it.

Let me say a couple of things.

One is that early intervention is something that is not a new invention. That is to say that, back home in my district in Philadelphia, we have had a number of programs — and I'll just mention one or two — but I'm on the board of the Philadelphia Futures, which is an entity in which individuals who are adults in our city get the opportunity to sponsor one child to go to college from what we call our neighborhood comprehensive high schools. That is to say that they are high schools that are not magnet schools.

These are the kids who live in that community and, in the first 500 of them, not one dropped out of high school after getting a commitment that someone was going to pay for their college. And then 94 percent of them went on to college. It's an amazing statistic. And the — Ruth Hair, who was the president of our school board, who did rather well in the stock market, decided to take the school that she had been principal of when she was the first African American to be a principal of a school in Philadelphia. She was in her 80s at the time when she made this gesture. But she went into the school and she promised every sixth grader that she would pay for them to go to college.

And we know the story of Eugene Lang and there are other examples all around the country where young people have been given some assurance that, if they take the necessary steps and put forth the work, that they, in fact, will have the opportunity to have a substantial future in terms of building a career that they can be proud of and that the entire community can benefit from.

What's different here is that we have, in terms of federal policy, been able to move this legislation through, have a program, have it fully funded, so that we can take this — what is a proven result, even though limited examples exist around the country. We know it works — and to give it more of an opportunity to build the kind of scale that would have a societal impact.

When we see examples like the son of Bill Cosby, who was — wanted to be a teacher, his life was cut short by a young man who was an immigrant from Russia, or the son of the chair of the board of Time

Warner, who was a teacher in New York City whose life was cut short by a young man who was a former student of his, we I think get the point that we can't build a future in this country with one set of young people who assume they have nothing to look forward to, and therefore act in reckless ways that endanger themselves and others, and another set of young people who just automatically assume that they have the brightest of futures.

I have a daughter who's getting ready to start at a top-tier law school and my son has never even missed a day in school in his education in Philadelphia, and he is going to be a high school senior next year. And there are families in which young people grow up and there's no other expectation other than they're going to go to college.

I mean, it's really not even a point of discussion. The point of GEARUP is to create the expectation that, for the young people in low-income circumstances, in middle schools in this country, that we expect for them to be 21st century scholars. That's why we named the certificate — they're the 21st century scholar certificate.

Different from some of my colleagues who wanted to pass the Juvenile Predators Act — that's an assumption that there are future generations of young people who are born to act in antisocial ways, and that the society has to protect itself from these young people, and that there are certain things that we need to do. And there are certain guarantees that the Congress would implement, in terms of mandatory minimum sentences. This is an absolute guarantee that you can have a multi-year scholarship to a juvenile or adult penitentiary, and all of our states had a fairly enormous cost.

In the state of New York — I mean, we're talking about \$70,000 a year to incarcerate a juvenile. So the focus of GEARUP is how do we focus on rewarding the behavior that we want young people to move in terms of a direction. And so the idea is to, first, let them in on a big secret, and that is if they actually went to school, got good grades, did their best, they could go to college in a country in which we have the finest higher education institutions anywhere in the world.

Now the truth is that even though they're going to get a certificate and it's going to identify financial resources, that it's actually not a new commitment or an additional commitment. These are programs that many members of the Congress and all of us involved in these efforts are very proud of — these vehicles that provide choice and access to college in terms of Pell or student loans or work-study. These programs exist. The problem is that, for many of the young people who are going to be the beneficiaries of GEARUP, is that they have no idea that already in place are vehicles for them to be able to afford a college education. And so we want to crystallize that information.

Secondly, the program design has a lot of intertwined and mixed purposes, mixed motives, to it. The bait, obviously, is the additional resources that could be made available. But in the legislation, there are requirements that the middle school has to create gateway courses that are actually focused at giving young people the course work that they need to be successful in terms of proceeding along the academic pipeline, if you will, and that the high school that these kids feed into also have to make a similar commitment.

So we are talking about curriculum change that is critically important, because we know that, you know, if we want kids to be successful in the SATs, they have to have, you know, geometry, and the other courses that will enable them. And we also know that, for most low-income students, only about 15 percent of them ever get exposed to the courses that would be normally associated with preparing kids for college.

So we have curriculum changes. We have partnerships that marry up higher education institutions with middle schools, but also provide the requirement that there be community-based involvement by business and civic and community organizations in those relationships. And additionally, what is critically important about the private sector initiatives that have happened successfully around this country is that it is the mentoring and the tutoring assistance that is important.

And so that is also included in the program design. There is a lot of excitement about GEARUP. I think we all know that this could be the signature program of the higher education reauthorization. This could be a historic Rubicon that we cross in terms of putting together K to 12 with higher education in a meaningful way that continues to evolve and to improve a relationship that is very, very important.

We talk about this pipeline issue a lot. While we are — GEARUP puts us right on focus to really expand the number of young people from communities in which a disproportionate number of them don't go on to college, and it's like to move them through this pipeline.

The other feature of GEARUP that is, I think, very important is that it is a program in which all of the young people have to be involved and exposed to. That is it is not some person, teacher — and we saw in the film, there could be all kinds of people who sometimes intervene positively in the lives of young people — that select some person and says, while you might have a future, we're going to provide you an opportunity.

This GEARUP says we're going to take every single person whose in this grade in this school and we're going to expose you to the courses that are needed, to the tutoring assistance that you may avail yourselves of, mentoring. We're going to burden you with the knowledge that there's financial assistance for you to go on to college. And we're going to challenge you to make choices about your life that can improve your life chances. And that young people will have to, in essence, select themselves out rather than — because there are lot of young people who we all point to and say — Well, isn't this great. This is a successful person who came out of a difficult circumstance.

The real secret is that there are many, many more young people who could be as successful, but we have to create the environment in which we let them know that we expect for them to be successful and that there is going to be the wherewithal built around them so that they can be — so that they can move in that direction.

You know, the president, who was very, very helpful in moving this forward, talked about that bridge to the 21st century. Well, this is — GEARUP is like in my mind a signpost showing you what direction that bridge is. And it also provides a ticket so that these young people can move over — over that bridge into the 21st century because, without a higher education, I think we all understand that their life chances are going to be diminished.

More importantly, and moreover, it diminishes their life chances for — collectively, the entire community and the entire country because it is not just their individual success or failure. All of those outcomes have costs or benefits for our society.

And I want to make mention of the fact that this did not happen just because of our efforts in the House. We had some help from my colleagues in the Republican Party. This was a bipartisan effort in which — and without the courageous votes of a few Republican colleagues of mine on the Education Committee, we may not have been able to move this forward.

So I do want to mention that and to say that, uniquely, this is a program from design to passage and signing it into law was not changed except for the name. And some of you may be familiar with that whole debate. So we have what we intended to have as the law governing GEARUP.

So we don't have a lot of excuses for not being able to implement the program in a way in which it should have the desired impact. So that's not a fall-back position that we can take.

And I want to just thank a number of individuals — particularly Claudia Farris [*ph*], my chief of staff, who worked very hard on this; and Bob Shireman [*ph*], who used to have a different title, who also worked extraordinarily hard on this; and Pauline, who you're going to hear from a little bit later, has been really one of the key people in the department.

There are many others that I could name, but I think that it's important that this not be in any way focused on as some kind of accomplishment that did not happen because of, you know, that it happened because of the collective work of a lot of people. And I want to thank the Ford Foundation for its work in helping make sure that the implementation of GEARUP and the knowledge of it across the country has been made, I think more meaningful because of the Ford's commitment, which continues to this day and beyond.

So, there is a lot of possibility. It's early in the morning as we sit here on Friday at Brookings. And for these young people, it is early in the morning in terms of their possibilities and potential. And GEARUP can play a role. There are opportunities within the Elementary and Secondary Reauthorization that — where we can continue to try to improve the circumstances of K to 12 education, which is really the focus of GEARUP. It's to get K to 12 as seeing itself really as just part of a pipeline that launches kids forward and it is not for — I think there's a lot of expectations that in, particularly low-income communities, that somehow a high school diploma is the ceiling, something that should be glorified as a major achievement in a young person's life.

That may have been so for generations past. But it is — it has to be nothing more than the floor in terms of academic achievement for young people moving into the next century.

We have our work to do in terms of implementation. And there are other issues, I think, for us to address inside the reauthorization that we're working on now, and we'll try to take advantage of those opportunities.

I want to wish you well. I'm going to be here for some part of the panel. At some point soon, I'll have to go because we have a vote on the floor. But I want to thank Brookings for hosting this, and I look forward to seeing the results of the entire session.

Thank you.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF REMARKS.]*

**L. Rice:** Thank you so much, Representative.

You're a wonderful father of this program, and I guess father of your son as well.

I'd like to move right along and, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, we're going to have two people make very brief remarks. Mike probably took some of your time, Pauline, but I'm not going to cut you short.

And I'm going to introduce people — I'll introduce the two department people at one time, and the others individually and very briefly.

Pauline Abernathy, was formerly — as a very young woman actually. I'm not going to tell you how young. She's typical of a lot of the very, very bright people who have come into this administration.

Pauline, before coming to the Department of Education, was with the National Economic Council. Presumably, she worked with you, Bob Shireman *[ph]*?

**B. Shireman [sp]:** She preceded me.

**L. Rice:** She preceded you. OK.

And she — since she's been in the department, she's been working very closely with — as an advisor to the deputy secretary, the acting deputy secretary, Mike Smith. I think we're going to drop that from his title sooner or later.

And she's been very much involved, too, with GEARUP in particular. And she's the liaison between the GEARUP program and the undersecretary's office.

Ed Fuentes, who is going to talk about this program implementation. In fact, I think it would be good if you could move down one, or maybe even all of us can move over just a little bit, so maybe we can put you, Steve, at the corner, so that people in the back can see each of you.

Ed is the director of the GEARUP program in the Department of Education. And prior to this appointment, he was the director of the National Institution on the Education of At-Risk Students. He's had various positions in the department — secretary for the Educational Research and Improvement Section of the department.

And prior to government service, he worked in education research at the Research Triangle in Durham. We have quite an array of institutions from which our speakers have come today.

Dr. Fuentes holds a Ph.D. in educational psychology from Stanford, and I'm pleased to say as a good Yale mother and stepmother and wife that Pauline comes from Yale.

*[LAUGHTER]*

So, Pauline, why don't you begin.

**P. Abernathy:** Thank you. Can you all hear me because I speak real quiet?

It's a pleasure to be here with the congressman. As he said, the GEARUP legislation was the product of many people's efforts and bipartisan on both the House and Senate sides. But there is no doubt in my mind, and I think anyone else's mind here, that we would not be here, there would not be a GEARUP program but for the congressman's efforts.

I was asked to speak a little bit about the motivation and history behind the program.

Congressman Fattah and the administration both had a strong interest in informing students at high-poverty schools about the financial aid that's available to them. But as the College Board and many others have found and lots of research has shown, financial aid is not enough, that while financial aid is essential to getting kids to college, it's not sufficient, and that it's not enough for the kids who drop out of school in middle school or in high school, not enough for the kids who don't have algebra or geometry in middle schools.

Research, again, shows that low-income children, who don't take algebra and geometry in those middle grades, are three times less likely to make it to college. So that told us we needed to start earlier and get involved in the middle schools and making sure they are offering those courses, to also make sure that the teachers and the counselors...

*[TAPE CHANGE — PORTION OF EVENT MISSING.]*

— those students can go to college and are doing the types of work we saw on the video earlier.

And also reaching out to the parents to make sure that they, too, understood that their children could go to college and what was involved in making that happen.

So we set about designing a program that would do all of those things, that would work in the middle schools, providing comprehensive services, trying to attack the low-expectation culture that pervades in many low-income schools, and working with whole grades of students no later than the seventh grade providing professional development, working on the curriculum where it was needed, leveraging college resources, partnering with the colleges and the community partners, leveraging their resources and their involvement, reaching out to parents and providing scholarships wherever possible.

Senator Jeffords then stepped up with the experience of a small state program. You'll be hearing more about the NIS program, which provided comprehensive services and also scholarships for the same goal, and that NIS program became what is now the state GEARUP grants.

And these different ideas were melded together in the final legislation. And without much effort at all, we had 300 — over 300 college presidents endorsing this concept, as well as over 60 organizations, both from K through 12, and the higher education community, civil rights community, community groups rallying around this concept.

And as a result, in just one year — in fact, less than a year — it went from legislation to law to be funded at \$120 million.

This was all based on not just some ideas, but on some programs that exist that have developed proven results. I hope Steve will talk a little bit about some of the programs that the Ford Foundation has funded,

which really have just dramatic outcomes. But I've now known him long enough to know that he is usually too modest to do so. So I will just briefly tell you a little bit about one of those programs, which is Project Grad, which is a college-school-community partnership that started in Houston, Texas.

And as a result of that partnership and the efforts there, they have more than tripled the percentage of middle school students in one feeder system that are passing the statewide math tests. They have tripled both the number of students taking the SAT and the percentage scoring over 900, again, in that feeder system. They have increased the number of students graduating from high school by 64 percent. At the same time, they've also increased five-fold the number of students going to college.

It is really remarkable. Likewise, I Have a Dream Program, started by Eugene Lang in the 1980s has just produced remarkable results in city after city around the country. Ninety percent of the first I Have a Dream class of students in New York City graduated from high school or received the GED, whereas the projected graduation rate was just 25 percent.

Likewise, in all of the I Have a Dream projects in Chicago together, they've produced a 69 percent graduation rate in schools with a predicted 60 percent dropout rate. And of the 66 percent of the graduates from the Chicago program continued their education, 22 percent found jobs, and 10 percent took vocational education.

And there are — I could go on and on — but won't. But that this combination of comprehensive services, academic support and scholarship has really produced some dramatic results.

And that's the experience on which GEARUP was based.

Lois had asked, and the question has come up in Washington much more than in the field — how does GEARUP differ from trio? And the answer is there are some important differences, but they're really complementary. And when we go out to the field, when we did the technical, people were there and were excited and understood how, and saw how the two programs can work together to make incredible synergy.

Some of the differences I'll just mention briefly are that GEARUP is starting and really focused in the middle school. The partnership grants start no later than the seventh grade. Talent search operates in the middle schools, but most of the services are in high school, and for students out of school, and in fact, the trio programs overall — less than 5 percent of the funding goes for students in the middle schools. The rest is for high school students and college students, of course.

So there's a different focus there, but that's not a fundamental difference. A fundamental difference is that GEARUP, as the congressman said, and you'll be hearing from everyone here, is really about transforming schools, and leveraging systemic changes in the schools. And so it works — again, the partnership has to work with whole grades of students.

Another difference is GEARUP is also a partnership program that demands a match and leverages non-federal resources from colleges, from the community and business. Again, that's in part an effort to ensure those kind of systemic changes that really require a larger community buy-in to make those changes.

There's also a state component in GEARUP, which you'll be hearing about.

And finally, a scholarship component in the 21st century certificates in GEARUP, which are another difference.

But again, I want to go back to the fact that, in the field, there's really tremendous excitement about how the two programs work together. And that's a fact that's often lost here in Washington.

You'll be hearing from, again, people with experience from both GEARUP, NIS and trio here.

I wanted to close with just a few of the comments that we have heard from people from the trio program about GEARUP and trio.

One talent search director was quoted in the Chronicle of Higher Education saying, "I'm excited to see what it's like to work with all the students in a grade level, to reach out to those kids who don't know that we can help them. In my opinion, GEARUP is long overdue."

Another trio director has said, "The GEARUP concept is one of the most exciting amendments to the Higher Education Act." And yet another said, "GEARUP will serve the students in ways no other programs can or do. It is imperative that GEARUP be funded."

And I really think that, as the programs or the grants are awarded, we are going to see that playing out around the country and that both programs will be strengthened, that the students in both programs will be better served by the two programs working together.

Thank you.

**L. Rice:** Dr. Fuentes.

**E. Fuentes:** I'll be very brief because we're all running over, and I'll just try to give you an update on what's happening.

When the — and I'll do it chronologically.

The application package was put out three days before I started and was released on March 1st, but there was an attempt in the package, and I think especially to echo the will of the Congress. The criteria in the package looked towards early intervention, raising expectations and requirements to get to college, academic preparation, and school changes and partnerships that will sustain the program after the grant ends.

After it was released, about a week, we had 11 workshops nationwide that were sponsored by the Ford Foundation. They were very successful. They were free applications. They were for people who wanted to apply but needed further information. People who were on the dais were people very knowledgeable about how to build partnerships and were very — had lots of experience on how to make these programs work, programs like the GEARUP.

Twenty-four hundred people attended those workshops. Later we had a teleconference with 435 links. It was my television debut. If you've ever been startled by hearing your voice for the first time on a tape

recorder, you haven't experienced teleconferencing. It pales in comparison to see yourself on something like that.

And we had a department web site to give out information, where we've had over 48,000 hits — 48,000 inquiries about the application process.

The Ford Foundation also had a web site, and it was quite innovative. It had a chat room where people could interact.

So up until the application itself, I mean, before the deadline, we had many, many mechanisms to get people informed, give them the information they needed to apply.

The deadline for this application was April 30th.

A few numbers.

We received 632 partnership applications, 42 state grant applications. We have \$75 million for partnership applications, federal funding, available, and \$45 million for the states. But the total dollar value in the first year of funding that people asked for in those applications is over \$250 million for the partnership and over \$92 million for the states. So they are — the dollar value of the applications was much greater than the amount of money available. The demand is much higher than the money available.

If you take that over five years, the total amount of money that was applied for is \$1.7 billion. So the demand is out there.

There's a matching fund, a matching requirement that Pauline talked about. We give up to \$800 and then the partnership has to match in cash or kind another \$800 per child per year.

If you do the mathematics, we can serve something roughly like 94,000 kids in the partnership with that \$800 per child with \$75 million.

However, the amount — the number of children that would be funded — I mean, that would be served under these partnerships if we had the money that was asked for would be over 300,000. More than that, the people are not really asking for \$800 a person. The average is somewhere — right around \$600.

So in fact, we're talking about over 400,000 — 422,000, roughly, children, who would be served if we had all the money that people are asking for.

In these partnerships, we've done a rough count and there's over 4,600 partners that are involved in these applications. That's quite a list. We have — and it was talked about before — businesses, lots of trio people, chambers of commerce, the College Board — and you'll hear from the College Board — lots of partners are from the College Board, the NAACP, and Girls Scouts and Boy Scouts of America, Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

So it's a very, very representative sample of different service organizations and businesses that are coming together. Also, even things like fraternities and sororities and colleges who are going to provide mentoring as partners.

One out of five colleges in America are part of these applications. That's pretty startling in itself.

We are engaged in a two-tier process for review for the partnerships. Because there are so many applications and because the disparities between the amount of money that's applied for and the amount of money that's available, we have to winnow them out and, through this two-tier process, try to in the first tier identify those that are further — worthy of further consider, those that are the best, and then have a second tier to get through those and rank them and then make the awards.

We began our process on June 1, and it will go all the way to the 30th of June.

The state applications is a much smaller pool. We received 42 of those out of a possible 53. That can be done a straight one-tier process of review. And it's going on simultaneously with the second tier of partnerships, which is going on right now, and will also be finalized on June 30th.

What have we learned about? We've learned some things about what people are looking for in the — during the first cut. We had some, you know, by sitting in review panels, we've gotten a feel for what people are looking, what reviewers consider worthy of — applications that had features that were worthy of further consideration.

They were impressed by clear and compelling need, and gaps in services, and a plan for filling that need, filling those services. They were impressed by plans that have clear description of plans that will lead to program improvements and will be sustainable after the end of the grant with systemic change in the school, and enduring partnerships among the community and the school in the future of higher education.

They liked applications that provide convincing ways that parents will be involved in schools, and teachers with their children. And they liked plans that laid out specific and quantifiable goals that they would meet over the course of the grant, and the impact the proposed program would have on the lives of children. That's what they looked for. That's the kind of descriptions of the ones that made the first cut.

So, when we get through with this review in June, we'll begin to process the various grants. We'll start to do negotiations and finalize them. And we will hope to make some announcements in late — very late — July 30th, July and early August.

But that's not the end of it. To ensure quality, to ensure that this program is successful, we'll have a series of workshops for the grantees, technical workshops for program improvement and to share information also sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

We're going to monitor these things, not just for compliance, which sometimes too often happens, but we're going to be monitoring to provide technical assistance and improvements.

The applications also provide for accountability. They have to — the successful grantees must provide information on how they're meeting their goals and their success. And we'll also have a separate contract that I think is being put out for bid right now on the impact evaluation so the report will tell us about the overall impact of these programs.

And we're still talking to other sources — private sources, foundations — about broadening that kind of information. Evaluations should be more informative so that you have more feedback to identify the

features of successful programs and how you make these things enduring partnerships and feed them back into the grantees in the field for the next go-around.

So our mission is we need to be providing information and support — to support applicants' need to design proposals, select and fund the best of them through a thorough and thoughtful peer review, and provide the programs that we do fund with the kind of technical support that leads to success.

That's where we are right now.

**L. Rice:** Thank you very much.

**E. Fuentes:** You're welcome.

**Rep. Fattah:** Let me introduce our next panelist — Steve Zwerling, who I referenced in my remarks. He is currently the senior director of the Ford Foundation for education, media, arts and culture. More importantly, he is a strong supporter of GEARUP.

Let me introduce our next panelist — Steve Zwerling, who I referenced in my remarks. He is currently the senior director of the Ford Foundation for education, media, arts and culture. More importantly, he is a strong supporter of GEARUP.

And it's actually been helping to make a difference for this program.

He came out of the public school system. He's got a — you know — a great resume, but he's actually doing something to make a difference. So I won't bore you with that.

Steve.

**S. Zwerling:** Thanks so much.

It's really a pleasure to be here among a lot of old friends and new friends.

I was wondering at first why Lois invited me to be a part of the panel and —

**L. Rice:** Are these mikes on? I guess they are.

Oh, I'm sorry.

**S. Zwerling:** I'm from Brooklyn and I can talk without a microphone and be heard in Yankee Stadium talking across the Brooklyn Bridge from Ebbett's Field.

So I promise to talk a little louder so you can hear me down there. And it's looks like it's working.

OK, good.

I was wondering why I was included in this panel. Mike Smith, I think, tee'd it up to me and said that, among other things, the Ford Foundation is providing the coffee and the lunch money for -

*[LAUGHTER]*

— GEARUP-related activities and one of my fantasies, actually, is to one day be in the restaurant business, so Mike has placed me appropriately.

So, yes, we're providing some coffee money. We're providing some lunch money. No doubt about that, but I wanted to spend a few minutes telling you why the Ford Foundation really is involved in GEARUP and why it is sort of a bit of a crusade for us.

That's because, for the past four decades, the foundation — among others — has been seeking to fund better ways to reform and transform schools and colleges in order to help more low-income students than we would like to see move successfully through the educational pipeline into and through college successfully — not an unambitious goal, and an aspiration for us.

And we've moved across those decades through a series of stages of funding different kinds of things. But I think I would sort of divide them into two — this is oversimplifying, but we could talk about this if you'd like — two kind of stages.

The first stage I'll call sector-specific grant-making, grants that we made to say elementary schools that will improve elementary schools or middle schools or high schools or community colleges, different and separate sectors of the education system. The second, more recently, during the last decade or so, are initiatives that we've been funding that we might call cross-sectoral, that attempt to bridge across the sectors of the education system.

So let me briefly tell you about some of the stuff that we've been up to.

During that first stage, where we've done sector-specific grant-making, back in the early '60s, for example, we funded efforts — some of them turned out to be unsuccessful, even some would say fiascoes — to help reform the governance of schools, put a lot of effort, a lot of ideas, a lot of money on the line to help decentralize large, cumbersome, bureaucratic school systems in the belief that, if you would put more power and control in the hands of local communities, that failing schools would be transformed.

But that focus pretty much exclusively on elementary and middle schools.

Then we applied resources to the evaluation of existing reform models — again, sector specific. So for example, we took a lot, are taking a look at the accelerated school reform model. We've funded some evaluation work of some of the NASDAQ schools; again, all of it pretty kind of sector specific, again, all worth the goal to help more kids from low-income backgrounds move successfully through the full education system.

We, for a couple of decades, supported efforts to prepare the next — the current and next generation of elementary and high school teachers to hopefully see them to be more diverse and better prepared for changing communities.

We've also in a sector-specific way funded constituency groups that are external to schools, community-based organizations that advocate — advocate school change, school reform, that would increase the prospects and chances of kids from low-income backgrounds as they attempt to move through the school system.

And all along the way, like you, like Lois cited, we've been keeping an eye on the data.

And the data, frankly, continues to be very discouraging. Although there are pockets of excellence and success, when you look — as you know better than I — at the aggregated data on how kids do, particularly when you break out how Hispanic kids do or low-income kids do, that the gaps in some instances are worse and more critically of concern because, as we all know, it's essential, as the congressman and others have said, for people to get considerably more than a high school education in order to be viable in the current and future economy.

So we've been quite frustrated along with you about some of the results of even some of the work that we've been funding — although we've learned a lot and, as I indicated, like you, have been able to identify things that seem to work, but generally at small scale.

Back to that in a second.

Thus, in the second wave of work, we began to — and again in the context of this data — began to feel that we needed to work more cross-sectorally, across various sectors of the education system, in part because kids do not experience schools the way funders make grants. And they don't say — Well, I'm now in this grade and therefore these are the kinds of things, the special projects that I need. And also the interconnections between elementary and middle schools, and middle schools and high schools, and high schools and community colleges, and two-year colleges and four-year colleges are very often abrupt and incoherent and not in good alignment for people, particularly who come from backgrounds where they don't have the kinds of support that more affluent kids kind of have.

So we, for the last decade and then some — and Judith Eden [*ph*], when she was the president of Community College of Philadelphia, was a big part of a lot of the cross-sectoral work that the foundation funded.

A couple of examples — community college, high schools, which attempted to sit on the intersection between high school and community college. For example, the work that we did to strengthen the transfer function of community colleges, cross-sectoral work that attempted to sit on the intersection between two and four-year colleges — again, providing bridges.

The data still was not terribly encouraging. And in more recent years, we've begun to think that we need to think about K through 16 kinds of efforts. We're getting closer now to GEARUP and our interest in GEARUP, feeling that, since the kids experience the educational system differently, as I've suggested, than the way educators and funders often think, that we needed to try to bring more coherence to the reform work, more alignment.

So I say that a lot of the stuff that we've been funding recently is — follows an aligned reform strategy to help align reform efforts in a way that youngsters experience schooling in a more comprehensive and coherent way. This is very different than the more constituency-based reforms approach where there's a sort of a silver-bullet belief, that if you fund this intervention at this point in a kid's life, they're immunized and will then go on successfully and constituencies get built up, as you know, around particular approaches.

And what we've been trying to do and it's hard work is to get various people who are involved in reform efforts to really get in alignment and work together. It's a real challenge, obviously, because resources are scarce — federal, foundation, what have you. And to ask people to work cooperatively together often means that they have to kind of work in a kind of sharing way rather than a competitive mode.

We're attracted to GEARUP for obvious reasons which should be evident from the kinds of things that I've just said. It is one of the very few — I don't know enough about federal programs, I'm embarrassed to say, that really does straddle key sectors of the education pipeline — middle school, minimally, middle school, high school and college. It does call for alignments in curricula, approaches to curricula, and methods of teaching.

In addition, of course, it has all kinds of other very powerful bells and whistles that demonstration work at small scale — the sort of thing that we saw in the video — have demonstrated to be critical — mentoring, raising awareness, parent involvement, after-school activities, what have you.

And as you've heard through the morning, some of the funding that we've made available to help GEARUP thus far has provided opportunities for potential grantees to learn about excellent programs that are GEARUP-like, to help strengthen their proposals. And as the congressman said, we will be providing — we have already provided funds for the first year's convenings.

The grantees, the GEARUP grantees, will meet in a series of technical assistance workshops though the course of the first year and beyond because we're committed to stay with this for the long haul. And we know it takes a lot of time to do this kind of thing well.

In a sense, we're trying to provide some of the connective tissue that makes an initiative work. An initiative means a lot of people in a lot of different places trying to do similar kinds of things but in different ways. And so there's a tremendous opportunity for them to learn from each other and to learn from each other's practices and to help build a field that we're calling education reform, as opposed to school reform, in that it focuses on the entire K through 16 education pipeline.

Now, a word about that, about the future of GEARUP and the secondary — Elementary and Secondary Education Act because, as some of the friends up here — Pauline has heard this a lot from me, enough so that she'll probably now switch off her hearing aid, and Ed Fuentes has heard this a lot, and the congressman has even heard me, you know, sing this song before, but some of the rest of you haven't.

As much as I'm passionate about GEARUP and these kinds of efforts, I think that it's necessary, but not sufficient, in that to begin work no later than the seventh grade — and I don't know what all proposals are looking at that have come in. My own guess is that we probably don't have a lot of proposals that start at the pre-K level and go all the way through. They're probably sixth grade, seventh grade to 12th grade, something like that, and in part because the funding is available, hopefully for five years, and you want to take the cohorts all the way through the 12th grade.

We all know — the Department of Ed, everybody in this room knows — that you've got to have kids up to grade level in reading and other things by the third grade. Otherwise, a lot of the later interventions are really, really challenged to work against almost overwhelming odds. And there are, of course, wonderful

examples — the trio program and others — that do beat the odds, but still not for enough people. If they were working well enough, the data that we're all aware of would look a lot better than it really does.

So my fantasy — and I hope I live long enough to see this — is for the federal government, in spite of the way Congress does its legislation, in spite of the way the Department of Education is organized in K-12 — they are organized in a sector-specific way and, in my view, that doesn't make any sense at all. I would love to see a GEARUP legislation — GEARUP legislation to become truly K through 16, and to really bite the bullet and say — Look, this is not about the way we're organized in Congress, not about the way we're organized at the Department of Education, not about all of these sort of lobbies for particular programs, the Head Start lobby, forgive me, the trio lobby, and I'm sure there'll be a GEARUP lobby, you know, that will emerge, and they'll all be out there hustling, looking for their slice in competition with each other.

What about the possibility, the fantasy, that we would acknowledge that it's a K-16 issue. It's not a seventh grade-to-high school issue. It's not a Head Start issue. But it's about all of it. If we think about the kids, that it's about them, and it's not about us — and the us includes me, not just others — the us includes me, too, because we do our thing too much in the old, kind of sector-specific way, too, in spite of what I've said — but if we think about the ways the kids experience life, including school, it would seem to me that we need to sort of really break down some more of the barriers that separate the various education sectors so that we can really provide a comprehensive and coherent experience for kids who desperately, desperately need it.

**L. Rice:** Thank you so, so much, Steve, and thanks again for making the sacrifice to come.

I — just to make a comment — I'm delighted that you're thinking of K through 16. But I also, particularly now that I'm the mother of a brand new — not-so-new but of an under-two-year-old — grandson, and you see the developmental aspects of children — you forget with your own children and where they were, but you remember it almost better as a grandmother, it seems to me — you have that to look forward to — it just seems to me that we should be thinking of a continuum. We should even be broadening our thoughts — particularly now that we have all — so many more adults going back to school, nontraditional learners, learning on new technology, that if we could sometime even get from where we are today to K to 16, that would be an enormous leap, but somehow down the pike.

It will be long after I'm gone and you probably, too, we may think of education really as a continuum.

So thank you so much for that.

We're going to have two other speakers and then we're going to open this up. We are running behind time, so I'm going to encourage, particularly our speakers — and I hate you cut you back at all, so — I'm sure you'll be brief and help us all out because we do want to get involved.

Linda Shiller is our next speaker. Linda is the director of the outreach programs at the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation, and she's been there for the last six years.

Sixteen? Oh. Terrific. It says six on the little piece that I — I apologize about that.

She also is bridging, in many ways, the gaps that we've been talking about a little bit earlier between some of the concerns or the lobbies or whatever the certain sector programs. She has applied — oh, you have a trio grant? You are a trio program?

**L. Shiller:** We have two trio programs.

**L. Rice:** You have two trio programs and you're also — you recently applied for a GEARUP program.

**L. Shiller:** State.

**L. Rice:** It was a state. So you sort of epitomize all of the good things that are going on in support services, and I thank you very much.

**L. Shiller:** Thank you.

I guess I'd like to start out with a story — a story of collaboration in Vermont. Vermont is a small state and it's fairly easy to collaborate.

Let me tell you a little bit about trio and the programs called NIS that Pauline mentioned earlier.

We've had two trio programs in Vermont that are statewide — a talent search and an EOC, which serves the adult population. So that helps with that continuum because the trio programs do serve the adult population as well.

The NIS program was developed over five years ago as a program that Senator Jeffords wanted to see in terms of improving early intervention. It's called the National Partnership Program. It's longer than that. I won't actually go into the whole thing. But in any case, there are only nine states that currently have this program. We were one of the first six.

Vermont currently serves 500 students through this program, starting with fifth grade and following students to 12th grade, very similar strategies to the talent search services, except that there is a scholarship component, and the mentoring aspects of this program were greatly enhanced.

So the story is that, under one roof, we have a trio talent search program and this NIS program, which is really now becoming the state GEARUP grant, living side-by-side, working together under one roof successfully for the past five years.

And I have been asked here today to talk about the possibilities for trio and GEARUP working together. So let me tell you what I think are the ingredients for success that we experienced in Vermont for the past five years.

These programs work side-by-side, collectively, enhancing each other. They share joint activities, professional developing and training, as well as best practices and evaluation methods.

We were able to leverage resources and build community partnerships between both programs and with other trio programs in Vermont as well. And we also shared program dissemination and marketing opportunities successfully.

All of these can and should work as methods to promote trio and the GEARUP programs, to build a solid bridge between both of these programs together — and I really believe that it can happen. And I think it can happen for many reasons.

I think that GEARUP, as a new program, a new initiative, has a lot of new ideas and creative ideas to bring to the table, new ways of thinking about how to deliver services, new partners and personnel working for the same mission that trio has been working on for several years.

Trio, on the other hand, has been around the campus for many, many years, and has had successful strategies and successful ways to delivery services. So if we take the old and the new together, we can enhance what is currently being done now and create great new strategies for promoting basically the same goal.

And let me talk about that for a minute. I'd like to talk about the similarities between both programs. There are a lot of differences, but there are also a lot of similarities.

Similar goals, in that both have the best interests of disadvantaged families and students in mind with respect to aspirations, opportunities for higher education and financial aid availability. They're both college-access programs. Of course, trio has retention and graduate programs as well. And both of them, when you look at them side by side, especially with my experience with the NIS program, have very similar service-delivery strategies, such as college visits, mentoring and tutoring, parent involvement, academic support.

Those are basically the core of the services in terms of direct services. Now, I'm not talking here about the services offered to the schools in terms of professional development. But those are a lot of the similarities.

I think that, as I said, there are differences. I'm going to just address the state GEARUP grant because that does mirror the NIS program, and I think Juliet will talk about the partnership.

But in terms of the state grant, the state grant allows the project to serve priority students versus cohort students, to serve individuals who meet the criteria. That's very similar to the NIS program and to the current talent search program that we have right now.

The state grant requires a scholarship component that can also be awarded to trio students, and it does not require a formal agreement between schools and post-secondary institutions, although I'm hoping that a lot of the state programs will provide that.

I think that the state grant — and this is my own opinion — has the opportunity to provide more comprehensive services to the individual students and families.

I also think that the following things need to happen in terms of the opportunity for these programs to grow together, work together, live together, to again meet the same goals.

I don't know how many of you are aware of the fact that, currently, trio programs only serve 8 percent — I think — is it 8 percent?

Eight percent of the eligible population. So when we think about the similarities between the programs, as well as the differences, and if we have concerns about duplication and competition, I think we need to think bigger than that in terms of how do we serve all of the students who really deserve the same opportunities to aspire to a good future.

So here are my ideas. Here are the ingredients that I think in terms of how trio and GEARUP can work together to enhance each other's success.

Effective communication and information dissemination is really crucial. We need to develop campaigns on the local, state and even the national level to educate the public and key people and community members about both initiatives and to, basically, dispel any inaccurate assumptions that may exist.

I think that the opportunity for joint training and professional development opportunities are also essential.

The council, for example, plans to address GEARUP implementation by offering several GEARUP workshops at its national conference for trio individuals and is planning to invite the new GEARUP community. I think that's a perfect example of how trio is opening up an opportunity for new grantees to learn about successful projects and collaborate and meet each other to start a successful implementation process that would happen after the implementation trainings.

I think that, again, this is a great example of how programs and projects need to work together. The other initiative that's happening right now is one called Connect Ed, in which the College Board and the council, Sallie Mae and several other foundations are sponsoring, to bring together people from all over the country who provide successful college access programs.

And again, this is a great opportunity to replicate and sustain existing successful strategies — again, the same as what we're trying to do with GEARUP. So that's another example.

Joint programming and shared resources. In Vermont, we've had tremendous success with activities and successful strategies as well as resources for both projects. We host regional career fairs for both trio and NIS students, field trips, parent workshops, mentoring activities. We've hired tutors to work with participants in both projects. We've hired and asked trio students who are not in our current trio program, but other trio programs, around the state of Vermont to act as mentors or tutors for students. We have a joint summer program for the students as well and that's been very successful.

I'm really confident that local and state GEARUP and trio projects can find ways to collaborate on the service delivery, and I think that it takes a lot of work to develop that and a lot of openness, a lot of dialogue, a lot of meetings which I'm sure we all love, but they have to happen in order for this to happen.

One more area that I'd like to mention before I close, and that is advocating for student aid. I think that there's a tremendous opportunity here for both project to speak about the need for both an easier student delivery program — student aid delivery program, as well as more financial aid for these needy students.

Both programs are going to continue to deal with a lack of financial resources that are available for the lower-income students, and they can work collaboratively to educate and advocate for more aid for these students.

It's been mentioned earlier today that less students are continuing their education. We've done surveys in Vermont and I'm sure that it's not news to any of you that the one major factor that is keeping students from being successful in terms of staying in college and not just attending college is the lack of financial resources. We're seeing students with huge loads of debt with really no way to be able to pay that money back.

One thing that we're excited about with GEARUP is the scholarship component for the state grant, and we feel that that has worked very well with NIS and we've been able to give some of that money to our trio participants with success. And we're looking forward to that.

But we want to make sure that the post-secondary institutions can also work hard to make sure that the students have their needs met and to accommodate the scholarship component that they will receive. There's a lot of work to be done there and I could probably speak for a whole day about that issue alone, so I think I will close.

**L. Rice:** Linda, thank you so much for a number of healthy, helpful suggestions.

Our final speaker before we open it up for discussion is Dr. Julie Garcia. She joined the University of Texas system in 1992 after serving as president of Texas's Southwest College — I love these names in Texas — for six years. While at TSC, she was recognized as the first Mexican-American woman in the nation to become a president of a college at a university. We applaud you.

Dr. Garcia is responsible for developing a unique partnership between the University of Texas-Brownsville and the Texas university system, which was designed to consolidate resources, increase efficiency and eliminate barriers, thus improving the educational system in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

Dr. Garcia has also served recently as chair of the American Council on Education, and she is currently, as well, a vice chair of the congressionally-mandated Advisory Council on Student Financial Assistance.

So, I think we're going to let you speak for ACE, UT or the advisory council — whatever you choose. Thank you, Dr. Garcia.

**J. Garcia:** Thank you so much. And there's a real disadvantage to being the kind of clean-up hitter, as you understand. And I know that you're probably thinking of break time and not of one more story.

But I thought that I'd take just a few moments to take advantage of being so designated as clean-up hitter to talk about some of the things that haven't been talked about even though I could spend some time affirming what has already been said and clearly articulated.

But I thought I'd say a little bit about two efforts that might evidence for us what you learn from working in partnerships, and what we have then discovered to be the pitfalls and some inefficiencies, and then some wonderful successes as a result of that — two short stories.

The first started out in 1987 with a challenge grant then sponsored by the Department of Education. The challenge grant allowed for a community college — this was Texas Southwest College. By the way, Texas Southwest College is appropriately named. We are the southernmost tip of the state of Texas. Our college campus is located one block from Mexico.

So when you think of our name, think of our location as well, and that might surprise you.

We're famous — or infamous, depending on who you talk to — for where the hurricanes hit, and we're also infamous or famous for being one of the poorest communities in the nation where well over 50 percent of our population does not have a high school degree.

We have the highest unemployment rate, lowest per capita income. And the list goes on and on. And so, if you hear of us from time to time, it's usually not in the positive sense.

In 1987, we decided to challenge, with the Department of Education opportunity grant. We had to raise \$1 million in 18 months in order to get \$2 million back. The intent of this program was very, very simple. We saw what you described today. That is students were coming to our college without those skills necessary to do well. So we were flunking them out, 80 percent or more out of our college algebra class, and saying to the student "You've made a mistake; you shouldn't have come here in the first place," instead of what we all would like to see done.

So at that point, we decided we had to go back into the high schools, into the junior highs and figure out a way to better help guide those students. And the plan was very simple. We would take the \$1 million that we would raise, the \$2 million that would be matched by the Department of Ed. That corpus would be guarded for 20 years. Half the interest that would be generated from the interest would go back to reinvest in the fund. The other half could be spent.

It would be spent then on scholarship dollars — scholarship dollars good for tuition upon graduation at the community college — Texas Southwest College — if you met, first, the criteria, if you took the more rigorous courses and if you made As and Bs in those courses.

We thought this would do three things — try to stop the dropout rate from bleeding our community as it has because we started out in seventh grade and most of our dropouts are in ninth grade; point to those more rigorous courses and teach parents and students about which ones to aim towards; and decrease dependency on financial aid.

This was 1987. To raise a million dollars in our community, when to raise \$100 for the United Way was a great challenge, was unthinkable. As a matter of fact, we had many folks up and down the stream at the Department of Ed tell us — you might want to challenge for less because if you don't make your challenge, you don't get anything at all.

We knew. We had run the numbers. Our community was the fastest growing community in the state of Texas. Our state is one of the fastest growing states in this union. So to do less for less students was not going to have the impact that we knew we had to try and have.

So we challenged for a million. The story of how we raised that money is interesting because we raised it with car washes and black tie dinners. We would get a donation from the Knights of Columbus. I'd put it in the newspaper. The newspaper allowed us, you know, free advertising, so they partnered with us.

The moment I put it in the newspaper, the auxiliary of the Knights of Columbus would call and say — I have some money, too. The Democratic Women would give us money. We'd put it in the newspaper and the Republican Women would call us.

[LAUGHTER.]

And they had money as well. We went to every group we could think of in our community. I would drive down the street. People would — a fellow rolled down his window one day — I was parked next to him — and he said, "Are we going to make it?" Because we all knew — we had spent a bit of time marketing and everybody knew the deadline. He said, "Are we going to make it?" And I said, "Of course we are." And he said, "Oh, thank goodness." And he drove off and I thought, "Oh, my God, how are we going to make it up."

[LAUGHTER.]

Toward the end, we had gone to every — I call them animal groups — you know, all of the Elks and the Lions and all of those groups ...

[LAUGHTER.]

— and — in a kind way — we had gone to every group we could think of.

Children at one of the elementary schools — sixth graders who you might think would have no notion of what we were talking about, no notion of college, no notion of scholarships — went without eating lunch for three days. The cafeteria staff was furious. The principal called me and was furious. They were saving their pennies. They came to my office and you know those cafeteria, huge jars, where they have this mayonnaise — this huge — that was full of pennies and nickels that those children had saved for three days.

Well, I asked the young man when he came to my office with this little group to deliver that, "Do you know what you did?" And he said, "Yes." And I said, "Well, what were you doing?" And he said, "We were earning dollars for going to college."

It was such a simple notion for folks that it was easy to pick up and to support.

The first ones to give money on our campus were the janitors, the maintenance staff, at the college. They pledged to give us \$1.72 over every two-week pay period. That total would end up being \$100 at the end of this time that we had set out. They were the easiest to convince. They needed no convincing. They needed no analysis. They knew that their lives had been greatly affected by not having a higher education. The easiest ones to convince and first ones to give you money.

It was easy then to go to the Rotarians and ask for money because we had already had benefactors like our own maintenance staff.

A long story, short version. The last week we had not made our goal. And we were in pretty much of a panicked state because this whole community had decided, you know, this was either sink or swim. We decided to go to the television stations and ask for time. That's — remember, 1987, we didn't have 100

cable stations, thank goodness. We had just a couple, so we went to them and asked for some time. We had testimonials. We had people ready to answer phones, and we started a campaign on a Sunday night. The deadline was Saturday.

Sunday night, people eating pizza, waiting for the phones to ring. We're on television. No phones ring. We ate pizza and went home.

On Monday night, the phones started ringing and they never stopped. The last day, on Saturday, television cameras were there because they're always there when they think you're going to fail. And this pretty much had been decided in many parts of our little world. And a lady came to our office. She had a child in her arms and a child in a baby carriage.

And she had walked — and if you've ever been in south Texas — this was in July — if you've ever been there in July, to walk from your car to your building — she had walked about seven blocks from Orcensia [ph] Street, which is close to our campus. She had the babies, and she came up, and of course, television cameras turned to her and she proceeded to turn around and walk off.

So I went out and caught her and I said "Can I help you?" And she said "I came to give you some money." She took out of her purse — her pocket — a \$5 bill. And you know, if you've ever put money in your pocket and it gets kind of crunched up. She didn't want to give it to me crunched up, so she was trying to iron it out, the whole time she was talking to me.

Now, remember, I had raised money through everybody I could have found and it didn't bother me any more to ask people for money. This was the first \$5 that I did not want to take.

I asked her, "Why are you giving me this money?" She said "Because it is the only hope that I have for my children's education." She understood what many of us argue about, have discussions about, try to dissect, try to analyze, and then finally don't understand very well. That community raised \$1 million.

Now, let me go fast forward. Since then, we have had over 15,000 students earn scholarship dollars by taking the tougher courses and come to collect their scholarship dollars on our campus.

[APPLAUSE.]

Thank you.

I tell you — thank you.

[APPLAUSE.]

I tell you that story not because it was one of a kind, as has been mentioned here. I think you can find many such stories. We could never have done that without a Department of Education incentive. We simply could not have done it without the dollars. We could not have done it without a huge community effort. And I don't know that I've ever participated in anything at the state or at the national level or at the international level that has been quite so compelling or so impactful in the community as that one community effort was.

And it required a community effort — not in the stipulations from DOE — but to make it happen. Now you've got a program in GEARUP that is saying — We've analyzed some of these programs, and I think these are important things to make sure you include.

My message to you with regard to that story is partnerships can work. Community efforts like that can be much more powerful than a few statistics on paper.

The negative of the program — we prepared some students so well, they were recruited out of our community and are now at probably some of your universities, and we're now dealing with that second tier of students trying to help them. We've gone back. We've redone the program.

Every superintendent we've dealt with has said "Please make it more rigorous." They said it in private, and most recently had a press conference and they've come out in public asking us to continue to make it more rigorous curricula requirement, exit exams, whatever it takes to make sure that those students use that carrot in a positive way.

A second notion — we have had — we have seen great changes in industry. The health care industry had to make huge changes because of the marketplace. Communication industry — remember when we didn't — when we knew who we were dealing with when we picked up the phone? Today, you don't know what company you're dealing with.

It used to be very simple. That marketplace changed. And most recently, deregulation of utilities. The marketplace changes. Industry changes.

The marketplace for higher education has changed dramatically. We've all heard the demographers from Harvard and everywhere else telling us what we look like and what we're going to look like. But the academic industry is frozen. We have not altered ourselves and how we do business and how we provide services and how we think to meet this new marketplace.

So the second story is simply about our partnership. We are a partnership between a community college and a university.

We discovered, as in some of the studies that Steven mentioned earlier that Judith did, students in community colleges had a wonderful opportunity to come in. As a matter of fact, we know that most minorities and most nontraditional students and women start out in community colleges nationwide.

What we also discovered was that they weren't going on to a baccalaureate degree in the kind of numbers or even in the wishful thinking numbers that we would have liked. So we decided to eliminate all of the barriers between the traditional community college and university, form a partnership, and I am the president of this partnership, get it accredited by a regional accrediting agency and higher education coordinating board, get it through a legislature, get a governor to support it, and then have people provide us a chance for experimentation.

What I can tell you briefly is that happened in 1991. Every level of graduation has increased — certificate, associate, baccalaureate and masters. At the masters level, we've increased graduation by 246 percent. There is a time when the line has been blurred between secondary school, K through 6th or six through

12, community colleges and universities. And I think that any kind of plan — GEARUP, the trio program — that helps schools like us that are poor and that need additional resources to go out and experiment in communities, anything like that helps spur this kind of experiment.

I'll conclude with one comment about Texas. Texas is in the news a lot these days for lots of reasons, as you all know. But one of the good things that came out of our legislature this year was a scholarship program aimed at just this. And its acronym is TEXAS but its name is the Toward Excellence Access and Success. And it's going to try and provide dollars, and it's funded at \$100 million. And it is founded to attract those students to the rigorous courses, that maintain a GPA at the conclusion of their high school graduation, meet certain need requirements. And if they do all of that, then proceed on to higher education.

It's an idea that's so simple, we should have done it a long time ago as a state. We have now done that. I think it portends good things for our state.

If you look at the Rio Grande Valley, we are a preview of what the entire state will look like by the year 2030. The negative part about that is that we must change our characteristics if we want to say that Texas will look better than we do at this time. And so I think this is one of those efforts in that regard.

I'll conclude with one statement about the Ford Foundation.

Twenty-five years ago, I was very young — hard to believe — I had two babies, two years old and three years old, and I wanted to work on a doctorate. The Ford Foundation had grants that were available for — at that time, Hispanics and other students — to work on a doctorate. They were hoping that folks that continued on would go back to their communities and have some impact. I'm a native of Brownsville, Texas. And I am the president of the institution where I once was a student. So I don't think I've ever told you that, Steven, but I thought I'd take advantage to thank you.

**S. Zwerling:** Certainly. The program still exists, by the way.

**J. Garcia:** Yes. Well, it's a good program.

[APPLAUSE.]

**J. Garcia:** Thank you.

**L. Rice:** Congressman Fattah has to leave. And we just want to thank you so much for your contribution.

[APPLAUSE.]

Red light. We are truly running behind time. I think I'll shorten the break that we were going to take between the two panels. So feel free to move in and out as you need to.

I'd like to move right in now to some audience reaction to the panelists. And one of the things I'd just like to begin with, and maybe address to you, Dr. Garcia, as chairman or vice chair of the student aid panel, is what are the hopes for any simplification of the student aid process down the pike?

**J. Garcia:** Our hopes are that the Department of Education will be very successful in trying to streamline that process. I don't think there's an individual campus president, or, looking at from the national perspective, we have heard, especially on that committee and in testimony, such powerful testimony as the need for simplification in this regard. And folks believe that, for example, the on-line services that Mike Smith talked about today is the direction to go.

I might suggest one other thing, though. And I know lots of things are being suggested very specifically. But one of the things that works in our case is local qualification for some of these programs. And you know how you have empowerment zone opportunities where you say I know if I focus on these zones that I'm going to hit the educational disadvantaged, the economically disadvantaged student 99.9% of the time. Perhaps we can look at pre-qualifying some communities in that same way so that we would not be so worried about qualifying each and every student, but, in fact, qualify a zone, an area, and so that we would immediately eliminate a huge amount of bureaucracy. We've seen it work with empowerment zones. I'm sure you all know of other examples where that concept might apply. But we would like to see you take something like that and install it in this program.

But I don't think there's any more important issue than we've heard about as a committee.

**L. Rice:** Thank you. Why don't we move. If you'd like to speak, sort of the Brookings' tradition is to put your card in a vertical position, and then we'll call on you.

John?

Let me say one thing. Would you please identify who you are at the outset.

**Participant:** John Childers, the College Board.

There appears to be a difference in expectations and hopes for GEARUP between our two major speakers this morning. Congressman Fattah hopes it will be a program that will make a real societal impact. Deputy Secretary Smith said it's a program that will never be universal, but you hope to draw some lessons from some of the projects that can be sent out to all schools. The history of Trio, as we've heard this morning after 30 years and \$600 million a year, is that it reaches 8% of the population, eligible population. Will GEARUP be a program that really makes a societal impact or a program that reaches just a few fortunate students who happen to be in the right place?

**L. Rice:** Should I direct that to you, Pauline?

**P. Abernathy:** I don't think there actually is a disagreement between what Mike and the Congressman said. What Mike, as you pointed out, was saying is that the idea is to have GEARUP leverage changes that are universal through how schools use Title I, how they use their other monies. While it may never be another Title I, but, if it's successful, it won't need to be, because it will help transform schools and create this kind of systemic changes in how they use their own monies and other federal monies to teach kids.

So I heard both of them, and I heard them saying the same things.

**L. Rice:** Anybody else wish to ...? Steve?

**S. Zwerling:** Let me chime in with sort of a more general response to, I think, a very acute question.

I don't think it's a money issue at all. I don't think Trio is about money. Forgive me. I don't think GEARUP is about money. Forgive me. It's about ideas and about ways of working and reforming the ways in which we work. I don't believe for a minute that an urban school system that spends, on average, 7,000 to \$9,000 per kid per year can't come up with the small change required to sustain Trio kinds of efforts, GEARUP kinds of efforts, and other kinds of effective practices. In my view, it's not a money issue; it's an idea issue; it's a commitment issue; it's an allocation of existing resources issue.

**L. Rice:** Chancellor Orbach.

**Participant:** I would like to ...

**L. Rice:** You have to identify yourself.

**Participant:** Yes, sorry. I'm Raymond Orbach, Chancellor of the University of California, Riverside.

The concept of K through 16 has been addressed and we were talking about the idea of what I would call transparency between segments. We have, in California, worked out through legislative and collaborative programs a lot of interface between academic programs. And I would urge you to go beyond that in the conceptualization. It's easy to have a set of courses count if you fulfilled them in one sector and then have them transferred to the other. But what you're talking about, it seems to me, is actually bringing the university, for example, into conjunction with K thru 12 in an interface that makes the separation invisible or transparent. And it means sharing resources in yet another structure — namely a vertical structure — where the integration of faculties and facilities enable both sectors to profit from that relationship.

So it's more than simply a confluence of curricular structures. It really is, in that sense, a partnership.

**L. Rice:** Identify yourself, please.

**Participant:** My name is David Mundell. I'm an old colleague of Lois's. I'm here from IBM Research, but at a different part of my life I ran a number of partnerships at the local government level.

I'm struck by the role of incentives; you know, the teacher giving and the guidance counselor giving incentives to the kids in that school in the Bronx. "You do this, frankly, or else." You do this, or when you come within 20 feet of my office, you will be in trouble. Your community had an incentive which basically said we raise a million dollars, or we fail. And my background in running local partnerships with some federal money suggests that it's the federal government almost never gives long-term incentives for performance. In fact, at one point I argued with regional administrators who wanted to prevent me from giving incentives to grantees because that would be profit. That would not be reimbursement for expenses; it would be profit.

And I wonder in the GEARUP program where we look at five year proposals, and maybe this is where the Ford money can go beyond coffee. Maybe the federal money can't go beyond that. Is there a way to reward partnerships, community and state level partnerships, that do better the first year than others, that change awareness, that do better the third year to change high school completion rates, that do better the fifth year to change college-going and college continuation rates; reward them with more money, more

accolades, more success. In the absence of that, in the absence of those incentives, running these partnerships is a very tiring activity. Making them succeed over time is an impossible activity. And nowhere in the legislation, nor in these things which my colleagues wrote, former colleagues wrote, do I see a reward at the community or at the state level, a reward for performance over time. And I don't know how and if, under the legislative terms or under the foundation terms you can do that. But you need to do that.

**L. Rice:** Laws can always be amended over time, as you well know, David. But you raise a much more generic question, which is what are the other missing elements either in the legislation or in the way that you've heard so far today about it being implemented. I, in part — and I may be wrong — showed that film early this morning because I just didn't — I saw some reference to guidance counseling, et cetera, et cetera, but I just didn't see quite enough. Maybe that missing link, maybe it isn't a strong enough link. I'm not sure. But, see, this may be something that occurred to you.

**S. Zwerling:** Quickly, another terrific set of points, David.

I think, by definition, funders are in the rewards business, because everything we do is by competition of one kind or another. So that's part A. And so you get in and you get a grant for a period of time, and then you have to show results in order to get a supplement and a renewal, et cetera. But yours is a subtler point than that. And I don't have a lot of wisdom about how to build that in.

There are obviously examples at the state level. A number of states have experimented through the years with discretionary money to reward, say, community colleges that do a particularly good job of beating the odds and helping people transfer at rates, say, higher than expected or anticipated to four year colleges. And they get a certain amount of money.

In New York State, for example, there's so-called Bundy money, as you may know. And that is a substantial sum of money. I think at this point it's about \$5,000 for every baccalaureate degree graduate that you produce. So there's a real incentive to hopefully not just pass people through the system, but to provide with a quality education and to push the numbers so there's a real incentive.

So those are some of the kinds of things that we might be thinking about.

**J. Garcia:** I'd like to respond for just a second, because you hit right at the core of part of the problem. You're absolutely right. These partnerships are very time consuming and very difficult and require a tremendous amount of skill on the people's part at all levels to maintain and to guard.

Two things. One is our fund, for example, in our little endowment program has grown to \$5.7 million. Our greatest hope and fear at the same time was that we would be so successful that we would have to go out and raise more money, because more students came and earned those scholarship dollars than our fund would generate.

The challenge grant said you could not apply for another challenge grant for ten years. I kept watching the clock thinking, okay, 1997 it's time. We can go back. By that time the challenge grants were gone. It was a huge disappointment for our folks, because we had counted on somehow showing the success of this program and being able to come back and then ask for additional dollars.

So I would encourage folks to listen to that advice. It's to the core.

The second point is with regards to state funding and successful partnerships. Our community college university partnership could show that we saved 52% of administrative costs as a result of this coalition and eliminating redundancy and all the kinds of things you do when you do that kind of work. When we presented that data, one of our regents said "What reward did you get for this?" And we responded "Zilch, nothing." Then her response to me was, "Then, why would you continue to do this?" Well, why would anyone want to go down a path that was very difficult to go down, you can imagine, if there're no rewards on the other side.

So I would simply affirm that those — that that's a very key part, both at the state and federal level, and at DOE funding levels.

**L. Rice:** Arnold.

**Participant:** I'm Arnold Mitchem. Like Lois, but not as effectively, I've dedicated most of my life to the interests of low income and minority students in higher education.

And I'd sort of like to follow up on the comments that David made. One of the troubling realities in American life, particularly if you look at polls and other evidence, is that minorities and whites often have different perspectives of reality, with all the attendant implications. As I think about GEARUP and Trio, on the one hand, it's wonderful. It's almost like I've died and gone to heaven to see that we finally, as a society, come to the conclusion that appreciates the value of early intervention programs. I remember a time when they were considered just peripheral. So now it seems that they're on center stage, and we've made some progress, and that's great.

But the issue really, I think, and where I disagree with Steve to some extent, unfortunately comes back to money. The issue is sustainability, to reward, create incentives; just to pay for substance and services. And that is something, it seems to me, that all of the principals who are involved and who've directed GEARUP so far need to pay much closer attention to than I think they have so far.

Let me just make one comment with respect to implementation, the matching requirement. Big problem. From my point of view, it's a big problem, first, because of the philosophical problem. But I feel that the federal government has a responsibility to provide equal educational opportunity in our society, and there shouldn't be a match. But hold that aside.

As a practical matter, raising this much money in a match requires, based on my experience, specialized staff and a lot of time. And if I understand the legislation, it requires a 50% match by the end of the grant. That can be hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars. And I suggest that that's going to be a real problem, or we're going to lapse into a practice we have here in Washington, which is just blue smoke and mirrors. And I hope this program doesn't go down like that.

Thank you.

**L. Rice:** Moving down the table, we've probably got room for two more based on what I see. Scott?

**Participant:** I'm Scott Swail with the College Board.

The College Board has a vested interest in these programs because, sort of the way I put it, they're like the fingers in the dike of opportunity for a lot of kids. Where the schools may not be able to serve everyone, these programs often step into place and catch a lot of the students that otherwise would just fall through.

But I want to make a couple of comments. First, I would like to agree with Steven that it is an idea thing, but it is a money thing as well. And I think foundations do provide a reward for programs that are put together. I think GEARUP is necessarily a reward system for work done in the proposal process of putting together a consortium.

I do caution, however, that in this age of political soundbites that everything is outcome based. We're attaching the outcomes of programs to whether they get future funding, and that is appropriate. But I think we have to be cautious on that, because we found out in GEARUP and other programs, linking desired effects with outcomes for these populations especially is very, very difficult. And if we just put concrete reasons on their outcomes, "If you don't do this ...," we're going to be hard pressed to find it. When we want to say that after the first year we want to give a reward for these outcomes, or after the third year for others, it's very difficult that you're going to show that, because they may take multi-year effects.

So all I'm saying is that it's not as simple as it sounds. It is much more complex. And I just warn a cautionary note here that it is a difficult process that we've all had to — we've tried to work before, but it is not simple, and we have to work harder. And we should just keep that in mind.

**L. Rice:** That's a useful comment. I can't see who the next card is. Is that you, David?

**Participant:** Yes.

I think it's going to be really important to address a number of these issues on how well we evaluate this program. David, we couldn't reward performance if we didn't know whether we had it or not in the program and which programs were better and which ones weren't. And so I think to Scott's point here, it's also very important that we have interim measures. But it's also very important that very quickly we have some idea. We obviously have a lot of interest and need for the program. We've got about four to five times as many applicants as we'll be able to fund. Then the question is going to be, to sustain this and to make it of interest to people in the Congress for continuing funding is how quickly are we going to be able to demonstrate to the external population what works and what doesn't, and how quickly are we going to be able to demonstrate to the participants what's working and what isn't.

So we're going to need some very different ways of looking at this along the lines of what Mike Smith was talking about in his opening comments about how we determine success in this early on. We don't have the luxury here of waiting 20 years for a program evaluation. We aren't going to probably have 20 months. And so I think it's going to require some clever interim measures. I think there are interim measures, yes. We want them to go to college. In fact, we want them to succeed in college. This may be the best persistence program, college persistence program that's come along in a long time. But we've got to have some interim measures, one of which is whether they stay in school. You know, if they're from Brownsville, maybe just staying in school is a pretty strong indicator, given the past records there.

So I think there's an awful lot on the evaluation side that we have to do differently in this program than we've done in the past.

**L. Rice:** I couldn't agree more, David. And I think that this is possibly still yet another role, Steve, that we could turn over or share some responsibility with the Ford Foundation to help to set up some of these criteria for evaluation as we go along.

**S. Zwerling:** Actually, it's one of the things that we're talking with the Department of Education about, about the possibility of partnering with them in regard to not only a design, but also provide some funds.

**L. Rice:** Terrific. Terrific. They can't solicit you, but I can.

I just want to thank the entire panel. Sorry we're running a little bit late. Rather considerably. But we will take, I think, a ten minute break and return.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF PANEL ON GEARUP.]*

**M. McLaughlin:** Hello. Welcome back to the second session at this Brookings meeting. I am Maureen McLaughlin, Deputy Assistant Secretary at the Department of Education for Policy, Planning and Innovation in Post-Secondary Education. I am delighted to have the opportunity to be here at the conference today overall and to have the opportunity to chair this wonderful panel on distance learning.

With respect to the overall objectives of the Brookings' conference, I want to say that it's wonderful to have a conference where people are coming together to talk about implementation of new initiatives.

Over the past few years, I've worked on a number of pieces of legislation, starting with the sort of idea generation through working with Congress to have the piece of legislation enacted. And then also, I've had the opportunity and privilege to work on some of the implementation issues. And I really do see, having gone through that entire process, that while a good, solid, well-written piece of legislation is essential, it is not the answer that you will have a perfect program or have exactly the intended results that you wanted. The implementation, how you design your regulation, what processes you involve in terms of designing specifics, the application packages, the review processes: all of these, what you might call nitty-gritty details of how you get a program up and running really have major impacts on the final effect of the legislation.

We also heard some this morning about partnerships with a variety of players, including foundations, that are another way that you help to influence the effectiveness and the breadth of the effectiveness of programs. So I really am delighted to have the opportunity to be here today on a program that brings together design of new programs and implementation. But, let me move on to distance learning, which is the topic of this session and sort of change gears, because the focus of this session on distance learning is quite different than the session that you just heard on gear up and early intervention programs.

What I'd like to do is very briefly talk about what we were trying to achieve when we designed the administration proposals on distance learning, and then turn it over to my colleagues to talk, both more specifically about the programs and implementation, and what they're doing out in the field.

For us in the Department of Education, distance learning is really a means to an end. What we are concerned about is access to higher education, broadening opportunities for people throughout the country to have additional opportunities to get the kind of post-secondary education that they want and need for their particular objectives, and that distance learning is a way to expand those opportunities to people who might not have had the opportunities, or opportunities of a different kind that are not limited by place or time.

And so really distance learning, which has lots of very intricate details and technical issues, is for us a means to an end, a means to provide additional access to Americans for post-secondary education opportunities and lifelong learning.

When the administration put together their proposal on distance learning, we had really that objective in mind, which was to expand opportunities for distance learning and expand access. And we had two pieces in our proposal that were complementary, but different pieces of the distance learning direction. The first was to look at the rules and regulations for student aid eligibility and to put distance learners on a

more equal footing with traditional learners in terms of their eligibility for student aid to help pay for their educations. And the second was the learning anytime, anywhere partnership program.

What I'm going to do is talk very quickly about the distance learning and then turn it over to Brian Lekander, who is running the LAAP Program to talk about LAAP.

When we put together our proposal on the student aid rules and regulations, the rules and regulations for student aid delivery were designed with a traditional model in mind, and not only were they designed with a traditional model in mind, they had many safeguards and constraints to prevent abuse that many felt might occur if you didn't have a very well laid out and fairly rigid model.

And what we wanted to do was to be more flexible on those rules and regulations to allow distance learners to be able to have more access to student aid and therefore more access to education, but to do it in a careful and considerate way that ensured accountability for students, for institutions, and for taxpayers.

So we suggested some fairly broad changes in certain rules. For instance, there was a rule that if you had more than 50 percent of your students or your courses in distance then you were ineligible for student aid. We suggested relaxing that rule and relaxing it for degree granting institutions, which we hoped was a careful way to provide more eligibility for distance learning, but to do it in a careful and cautious way starting at degree granting institutions and see how it moved.

Many, however, were still concerned that even what we thought was some careful ways of dealing with accountability issues, some were still concerned that there was too much potential for abuse. And the compromise in this area was to have a distance education demonstration program. So what we have is a program where 15 institutions for the first two years, or a consortia of institutions, will be granted waivers for certain rules and regulations to be able to try out more eligibility for student in distance learning, and for us to be able to evaluate what happens and what the effects are before we move ahead in a larger way.

So we will select 15 institutions or a consortia of institutions, and that processes selecting those institutions is just about done. The department will be announcing the institutions and consortia who will participate in the demonstration program in the next day or two or three. So we're very close but we can't say who they are today.

That was a process of people sending in applications and then having expert peer viewers come in and review the proposals and select a set of institutions and consortia that would allow us to tryout different things and to have a broad representation of types of institutions across the country.

So we will be using that as an opportunity to learn, to do an evaluation which we will then submit to Congress, and we also have the ability to up the number of institutions or consortia in the third year by another 20. And the expectation is that the evaluation will help to look at different issues and set the stage for what kinds of changes we would want to do in student aid eligibility in the future.

These second part of our approach on the distance learning, which was a complementary approach, was the Learning Anytime, Anywhere Partnership Program. This is a competitive grant program that was

designed to tryout new partnerships, to leverage federal dollars for change, to experiment and spur innovative uses of technology to provide learning opportunities anytime, anywhere. And in this case, we put forward the proposal and the end proposal that was enacted by Congress was almost verbatim the proposal that we had put forth.

So what I will do it is let to Brian Lekander, who is the person in charge of implementing the LAAP program, talk with you about how we're implementing it, where we are in terms of implementation, and how different decisions on how to carry out the competitions affect the kinds of work that we are doing.

Brian is a member of the FIPSE staff, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, who had worked on many issues related to distance in the past and is now running the LAAP program.

Thank you. Brian.

**B. Lekander:** Okay. Thanks, Maureen.

Good morning. The Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships, as Maureen suggested, is really interested in funding partnerships among colleges and universities, but also involving the business sector, community agencies, school districts, any player that might have a stake in post-secondary education. And the program is really focus upon a particular subset of distance education that we are calling anytime anywhere learning, meaning we want to make it possible for students to be able to access programs literally anytime and anywhere. We will be relying upon technologies such as the Internet, or the CD-ROM, which can enable students to work at anytime of the day or night. They can work around their other life commitments, if they have children, jobs, whatever.

But, also we want them to be able to have programs that are self-paced, where they can enroll at anytime of the year, make progress based upon their achievements, and have those recognized so that they can finish at any given time, so that they won't, in other words, be bound by the restrictions of the traditional academic calendar.

That, we think, is particularly important for folks such as those who have been displaced from jobs or people in the welfare rolls, for example, people who need quick retraining where they don't necessarily have the luxury of waiting around for the academic calendar to pursue their education.

I just want to say a few things about how we actually made some implementation decisions about the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships. First, we made a conscious decision to model LAAP very much on the FIPSE comprehensive program, which has over a quarter century of track record in fostering innovative educational reform projects. And there are several key elements of the comprehensive program that we wanted to carry over. One is that we wanted to have an open competition that was not prescriptive and that was what we call field responsive. In other words, we wanted to be able to respond to the ideas that arose from the field rather than specifying strict models for which applicants would have to follow.

Secondly, we have adopted a two-stage application and review process. Applicants first submit brief preliminary proposals which are reviewed, and a select number are invited before we actually receive the final proposals. Now the purpose of this is really two-fold, I think. One is to encourage people, through a

relatively easy gateway, to get their ideas at place so that we can hear them. We can learn from them, reviewers can see them.

Secondly, when you have the second step, you have the opportunity to provide feedback to those applicants. So they get the benefit of the comments of the reviewers and the proposal can then evolve into a stronger thing than maybe how it started.

Finally, I think one of the key things that FIPSE has always emphasized that we wanted to carry over into LAAP is an emphasis not only on program sustainability and growth, but also on ongoing program evaluation, so that we are mindful of how and whether students are learning and how certain kinds of models on the institutional programmatic level are working as well.

With all of these things in mind, we still had some major decisions to make about how actually to define priorities, and for that we very quickly did, using list serves and other rapid means of communication, did a survey of the field and we got well over 100 responses that were all very carefully written from people all over the country, most of whom were from colleges and universities, but a lot of whom were from technology companies or potential employers of higher ed graduates and so on.

And I just want to share with you a couple of these salient pieces of advice that they shared with us, and that we tried to reflect in our priorities. First, they all agree that the time was ripe, the technology has developed sufficiently to really focus on this anytime anywhere paradigm. But, to do this institutions need to be pushed a little bit, because they need to undergo a kind of cultural shift. There's a lot of things, or ways of operating, I guess, everything from a basic 15-week semester to notions that they're serving students in relatively small geographic regions that have shaped the way institutions are structured and the way in which practice as developed. And in some cases, I guess, these could be called structural things or policy things. In some cases, it's just a matter of habit. But, in any case, they're barriers to anytime anywhere education.

So, we want to provide some incentive in the LAAP program for institutions to rethink things a bit, so that they are really constructing programs with an aim to serving student needs, and in particular adult student needs, as opposed to relying strictly on traditional academic practices in taking those things for granted.

Secondly, we were advised that partnerships were a real good thing here because institutions can't do this kind of education alone. The programs are just too expensive and complex to mount, and institutions going it alone are liable to make the mistake that if they build it, students will just naturally come, and that may not work in a world where it more and more competitive in higher education. So we were encouraged to do was only to fund those things which really encourage sharing and use partnerships to implement programs on a large-scale. Partly so that they would be large enough to attain student enrollment that were sufficiently large to recoup development and operating costs, but also so that the programs would have a broad enough reach that it would prevent the need for individual institutions to unnecessarily duplicate what others are doing. We didn't want a situation where a whole lot of nearby providers especially are all doing the same thing and leaving lots of student needs undealt with.

Finally, I'd like to emphasize that we were told that doing this, promoting this kind of partnership arrangement, we would raise a whole series of new problems that institutions would have to deal with.

For example, if you are in a joint venture how do you share development costs, and correspondingly how you distribute revenues, who gets what? How might you deal with certain kinds of problems with the student, like in showing credit reciprocity. All of these kinds of things are things that we hope that LAAP projects would deal with, in addition to just developing the curricular programs and degree programs.

But we also thought that the goal should be always to serve students and to make their experience navigating this changing higher ed environment as seamless as possible, so that they wouldn't necessarily see any adverse effects from these changes in institutional policy, they would have the flexibility to draw from different providers, and they would be supported by a full range of student services. So that's what we were generally aiming for when planning the LAAP competition.

Let me just give you a quick update on where we are at. We had a deadline, the preliminary deadline, on April 2nd and we received 653 applications. This was substantially more than we had anticipated. It was a large enough group to include almost 4000 partners. That means any of the partnering organizations, it might be colleges, it might be systems, it might be businesses. Approximately 45 percent of the applications had business and industry partners, and the grants leveraged a cost share of about 150 percent of the actual federal requests.

Of the 653 proposals, we've invited 122 of those to the final round. We just got those in last Friday, and we are just beginning the review process to determine the actual award winners. By the end of July, we hope to make approximately 25 awards averaging about a million dollars per grant. And these grants will be about three to five years in length. Hopefully most of them will be three years.

Within the applicant pool there is a tremendous variety. We've got, in addition to projects that create programs, we've got projects that specifically address support services, that address accreditation of distant education programs, and we've got a tremendous variety of topics that they deal with as well, everything from vocational subjects, like training firefighters and heating and air conditioning maintenance workers onto teacher education, most of the allied health fields, nursing, as well as the sort of traditional liberal arts subjects as well.

**M. McLaughlin:** Thank you. Brian.

As you can see from what Brian says, the interest in LAAP has really been phenomenal, far more than we had expected, and we've really been quite excited about the quality of the proposals that have come in and are looking forward to the final decisions.

Our next panelist is Mary Beth Susman. And Mary Beth is going to talk about, as she put it, the reality of what goes on in one state in these issues. And Mary Beth, when I asked her how she would like me to introduce her, indicated that a good way to introduce her was that she is the only person in the United States to have headed two virtual universities, two virtual institutions. So that is her claim to fame. She was head of an institution in Colorado and is now in Kentucky.

Thank you.

**M. Susman:** And five years ago I couldn't spell distance education, but it tells you where we are in this. We are down the road with delivering anytime anywhere education. I think it was Dr. Garcia mentioned

how our colleges need to change, and sometimes we'd call it a paradigm shift. I think paradigm shift is too wimpy a word. We are in orbital shift here. Instead of students having to go around department to department, division to division, class to class, gathering their curriculum and services, we are going to have our institutions revolve around our students. In virtual education, we think of a student as being stationary, somewhere, someplace. And all of the things which the student needs in order to get a higher education comes to them, in fact they pull it out from where they need it and when they need it. It requires it in our education institutions sort of a eureka phenomenon.

One of the things that — putting content on-line and putting courses on line is one of the easiest things in the world you can do. In fact, there are 100,000 courses on-line right now. It's like a parallel universe going on out there. The most difficult thing is putting those student services on-line. There are 43 things a student has to do before they ever see a professor in a classroom. They have to find out to what they want to do, what course they want to take, what degree that they want. They need to have admissions, they need enrollment, they need financial aid, they need all of the things that you do that wrap around curriculum. Trying to get that anywhere anytime is one of the most difficult things to do. Actually, in Colorado we were fortunate to have some FIPSE funding to do electronic student services.

In my next life, I want to be Walter Annenberg, and create the TV Guide to distance learning, because what we can't do yet is, while there are 100,000 courses on-line out there, we can't get the student step one to the end step. Where do I start, where do I begin, where is the predictability and the way in which I can get from where I am to what I want to do? Now, TV Guide took all this video that's out there, all the possible videos, and made predictable sense of it. That this time of day you can get this, and this time of day you can do that.

In virtual education what we have to do is allow all anywhere anytime education that makes sense to the student. We have to put up degrees and certificates not just courses, and we have to decide, too, my sense is, since both organizations I've been associated with were consortium, you really can't do it as one single institution, you have to do it has a lot of institutions together.

Number one, you can share the cost of constructing curriculum, and of providing student services, we are so used to aggregating everything we do in education that we think we have to provide everything to the student. And distance education is about disaggregating it. The teacher doesn't have to be in the same room, nor does the content have to be where the teacher is, the student doesn't have to be where the student service person is, or where the financial aid person is. But, when we have these consortia, we have to lower our trade barriers.

In age of NAFTA and European Union, when whole countries can decide on common currencies and trade barriers, we still have higher education institutions that won't accept each other's credits. And if you're going to use a lot of these things, so a student is hanging out there with all kinds of credits and wants to transfer them to somewhere. I think that what the technology is going to require us to do is to think about making common currency of curriculum so that transferring institutions and employers, if you take an English 101 you ought to be able to do a five paragraph essay, period, amongst other things. But, you ought to be able to be sure that the person has been able to do that. That's why Western Governors' is creating competency based curriculum.

I see a time when accreditation is going to flow to students, not to institutions. And students are going to have lists of things they can do and carry around smart card and whip their card for transferability. I see also, although I love Dr. Garcia's idea of empowerment zones for financial aid, I see financial aid perhaps flowing to the individual student and the student is going to be able to choose among hundreds of thousands of choices of where they want to go and how they want to go.

In education, although we've often hated to call students customers, I don't know, we just get all itchy when we start using market terms, but we have to start thinking in market terms about customer service. When a customer can choose among 100,000 courses, what can we do to make that customers stay with us, and how can we make sure that they have a successful educational experience, and how do we make sure that everybody has access to it.

The building a huge classroom space with wonderful video-conferencing sometimes I think is probably not where our money needs to be spent. We need to get people with laptops. I carry around our whole college experience in my laptop, so will the students. They will carry around, in their information appliance, they will call up and talk to their teacher through their information appliance. Time is coming next year when your phone rings in your house, you're going to answer your televisions set, and you're going to be able to communicate with people that way in information appliance.

We found students are going to school at the grocery stores because grocery stores set up workstations. So, I call up King Supers in the mountains of Colorado, I said do you realize you're now a higher education site. And the president just all excited about that, and he said, I'm a higher education site? I said, yes, we have a student who says he goes, picks up a carton of milk and goes to class from the grocery store. From our churches, from our recreation centers, from anywhere that a student can get on the Internet, they should be able to go to school.

We started age-grading people in the earlier part of the century. At six years old, you're going to first grade, at seven year old, you're going to read. And we're sort of stuck there. You have to be a certain age before we will even let you have access to anything else. You don't get to move forward or move back. High school students can click on and take college courses. Now, here's something scary, that means they may bypass the AP exams, and the AP courses, because they can click on and get a college transcribed course, if there isn't an age requirement for them to take the course, and they can successfully complete, why would there be an age limit.

In terms of where we're going, and it's not really distance education, we say that because I think it's a term we all understand, it's really distributed education. It's education anywhere, anytime. And we find the first people to take advantage about it are students on our campuses. Half the students that enroll in Internet programs are students already on a campus. When we developed courier service from the library, we discovered that students in the dorm across the street from library were opting to pay the \$25 to have the library book given to them in their dorm room.

We are sophisticated consumers, we expect ATM machines so I can bank every day. We can get home mortgages over the net. We've just become very good at expecting that we can get the things that we need when we need it. And I think that that's where education is going. It's a complete shift of everything we have ever done before and just trying to organize it is one of the biggest challenges that we have.

**M. McLaughlin:** Thank you, Mary Beth.

Our next speaker is Bob Albrecht, who is the chancellor of the Western Governors' University. And he is going to talk about some of the issues that you run into when you cut across state lines when you're dealing with starting up an institution like the Western Governors' University.

Thank you, Bob.

**B. Albrecht:** Thank you, Maureen.

While they set up the projector, I'd like to relate an anecdote, something that happened to me on an airplane, of course, soon after I joined Western Governors' University. I was sitting next to a woman with two small children, one in the other seat and the second one in her arms. And after the children settled down and went to sleep, we talked about her career situation, her educational situation, and so on. It turned out that she is the computer center director for four medical facilities in the Santa Barbara, California, area. She has a high school education, with two children, subsidized housing, and essentially four jobs, at least for medical facilities that she's trying to support the computers, she obviously can't take time off to go to a campus. What she can do is take distance learning through various technologies.

I was particularly struck by this conversation because Western Governors' is a competency-based degree granting institution, which means that not only could this individual come to Western Governors' University and find the resources she needed, the content she needed to move forward in a degree program, but also because we're competency-based, we can assess her learning, determine where she is on the track through a curriculum and, in effect, give her credit for that, and then help her complete that degree. It is very likely that a person like this individual could complete a two-year degree in less than half of what would take her on a campus, and perhaps even a baccalaureate, again, at a considerable time savings.

Western Governors' University was founded in 1996, it's a private, nonprofit, competency-based degree granting institution. And I'd like to tell you a little bit more about that before get into some of the financial aid and other issues which Western Governors' University raises.

It was formed by a Western Governors', we now have 19 states and territories represented, but it's governed by a board of trustees that has four Governors, three higher ed reps, and four corporate and public representatives. The sorts of degrees and certifications that we offer today, based on competencies, an associate of arts, an associate of applied science in network administration, associate of applied science in electronic manufacturing technology. This summer will begin offering a master of arts in learning and technology, and about next January we will have a baccalaureate degree that we offer as well. Again, all are competency-based, meaning that we don't transcript student credit hours. What we transcript are the assessments that the students take. The degrees, in turn, are made up of something we call domains, which are roughly equivalent to the assessments. So a student has to take nine major assessment areas, for example, in order to earn the associate of arts degree.

Who sets up the curriculum, and so on? We have faculty members, generally drawn from other institutions, who make up our program councils, our assessment council, and a coordinating council. Coordinating council is rather like the faculty senate, it represents the faculty on the program councils and

assessment councils. The members of the assessment council, on the other hand, made up of experts in tests and measurement.

Typically, we use recognized national assessments, the KLEP [sp] exams, for example, CAP exams, and so forth, for the assessments to chart our student's progress. Again, student's progress is measured by the work they do on the assessments.

Let's take a look at one of those competencies credentials just to give you a little more sense of how Western Governors' University works for the student, and it's very much a student centered institution. And, by the way, we call our director of student services a director of customer services.

The curriculum design for the AA degree, for example, is accomplished by WGU faculty members. The assessment of attainment of competencies is measured by WGU faculty members as well using national assessments. The content provision for those students who need additional work in courses we draw from our partner providers. Most of those are credited institutions, Washington State University, Eastern New Mexico University, the University of Indiana, and so forth. However, we also draw from some non-accredited companies such as Novell and Microsoft in areas such as the associate of applied science.

The associate of arts curriculum, if you look it over, is a very traditional curriculum. Collegiate math and quantitative skills, collegiate language and communication skills, cross-disciplinary skills, a distribution component, and so on. So the degree is an equivalent to a credit-based degree, but the accomplishments are measured by competencies of the students rather than seat time, a rather unfortunate term. So, the student is transcribed by the assessments that she completes.

When we look at federal financial aid from a Western Governors' University perspective, we immediately have some serious problems. By and large, we don't offer assessments on a 30-week per year basis. The assessments are offered when the students are ready and able to take those assessments. Cost of attendance is also a very different matter, because the students pay for different sets of element than in a typical traditional institution. But, the federal aid regulations, as many of you know, in the past were always and still are written in terms of 30-week terms, particular cost of attendance, credit-based with disbursements based on those, and satisfactory academic progress measured in terms of student credit hours, academic calendars, number of years, and so forth.

A competency-based program, a competency-based education, has different standards of measurement. We find that when we go to talk to our friends in the corporate world about how corporate education and training works, and about what they expect from the employees, they look at competency-based education and immediately recognize it as the kind of education to which they are accustomed.

On the other hand, when we deal with our friends in the academic world and talk, as I am doing a lot of now, about transfer articulation and how can Washington State University recognize the competency-based AA from Western Governors' University, the first questions that are asked is, well, how do we translate these domains and assessments into a credit-based environment, because to all of us who grew up in this system of school systems and this educational culture, those are the familiar terms.

However, when the possibility of the demonstration sites came along, we were able to begin working with a people in the Department of Education to talk about what are the equivalents in a competency-based

institution to the credit-based, calendar-based traditional academic institutions. Our purpose was always to remain accountable, always to keep in place all of the safeguards against fraud and abuse which in the past have caused some difficulties, and over the past few months we have been able to find those equivalents.

Let me give you one example. Satisfactory academic progress, I think everyone would agree, is a necessary measurement to anybody who is on financial aid, and for that matter anybody going through an educational institution. The student as well as the institution, in the case of financial aid the government, needs to know whether that student is making satisfactory academic progress. Well, if there's no academic calendar, and no student credit hours, how can those things be measured?

Well, they can be measured in terms of, first of all, the activities in which the student engages, be it courses, be it assessments, whatever. Secondly, what is the completion of those activities not according to a calendar set by the institution, but according to a calendar of expectations within the activities? Third, there are a set of expectations on how quickly the student will move through the whole program. Here we do get back to a calendar, but it's the twelve months calendar, not be academic calendar. And as long as those things are recorded so that an auditor can come in and say, I can't see how that student has progressed, we have an equivalent record to the more traditional transcript, and that's the approach that we've taken in working with the department on financial aid. It's also the approach that we've taken in working with all of our students. So we're setting up essentially a student centered record of progress and we believe, and I think that the record-keeping will substantiate this over the long run, we believe that this is a new way, another way of tracking student progress and eventually of having the student earn their degrees in this way.

We are particularly interested in one of the relatively recent developments in K-12, namely, competency-based education and transcripting, which is now occurring in a number of states. I'm told particularly along the West Coast. And, of course, we're finding that some of the competency-based transcripts coming out of K-12 feed very nicely into what we are doing in Western Governors' University and now some of the traditional institutions are recognizing that we, as a supplemental institution, are working in that same vein.

Finally, I want a point out with respect to the student-centeredness of Western Governors' University, that we have always been regarded by our founders, by our board, as an institution which is directed toward the so-called mid-career student, the nontraditional student, 25-30 years and older, and a competency-based institution allows that mid-career person to move more rapidly through the same kind of degree programs as the younger traditional students.

Thank you.

**M. McLaughlin:** Thank you very much, Bob.

And last but not least is Sally Johnstone, who heads the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, an international group that is situated at Ritchie in Boulder, Colorado. Sally is going to wrap up the discussion on distance learning and then we'll open it up for questions and discussion.

**S. Johnstone:** Thank you, Maureen.

And to do that, I'm going to provide you with both a little more energy, perhaps, because my content is not as specific as my colleagues here who have been dealing with a bunch of institutions, but also with a single strand with regard to that. Our organization looks at a lot of things and we try to track and pay attention to and help colleges and universities, particularly those that are in the more traditional sector, to move in this regard. Although we've had our hands in both of these institutions in trying to help them to get started.

What I'd like to do is point out some very general trends that we are seeing, and notice I'm qualifying this, some very general trends. This is tough to do real quickly. I think we're beginning to certainly see the beginnings of students to starting to shop electronically, both for courses that are out there, and they are sitting at their homes and they need retraining, but also on campuses. And this has been the surprise to a lot of people, if the class they want isn't available they go back to their dorm or to their home and they shop, and then they come back to the campus and say, okay, transfer this in.

Institutions, I would like to suggest to you, are beginning to adapt. But, this is not a simple process, and I think Mary Beth's comment about it not being a simple transition by any stretch is a very good one. We also are seeing that traditional institutional models may not really be the best for this kind electronic delivery, it gets all balled up and it's too expensive and it doesn't quite work right. We're finding that academic and support services are starting to be unbundled, they're being torn apart. Different people are doing different kinds of things and in fact different organizations are doing different aspects of this. We are beginning to see new organizations developing to provide what I would suggest are the profitable parts of this transitional enterprise that is becoming higher education.

Certainly, the core courses, those courses that are used everywhere and by lots and lots of people, it's worthwhile for private industry to come in or groups of colleges and universities to come together to create those. But, what happens to the less popular courses? And that, I think, is where it's critical that we look for some roles for government. In addition to that, the administrative services are out there, they are developing, it's working.

We're finding that institutions are forming consortia, and Mary Beth has been head of two of these now or is head of one, and was head of a previous one. But, they are doing this, as she's said, to sort of share resources, and for gaining a greater competitive edge. Certainly, we're finding also that many of the older state funding and policy issues work against consortia forming. But they are doing any way or they are trying to do it anyway. They are struggling. Most institutions are members of multiple consortia, trying to sort out how this is going to work. It is also the case that institutional policies are absolutely a barrier to this, as both of my colleagues have talked about with regard to particularly articulation. And that puts the student at a disadvantage, they get caught in the middle of all of this.

In fact, this has gotten so complex and so much of a free-for-all that we have begun a process of trying to come up with a kind of taxonomy for virtual universities. And this is just an abridged version of this, more of it you can find later and I'll give you a website, if you are interested. But, we can talk about a virtual university or college, that is, it grants a degree, but there's no physical presence.

And there are a number of examples of those. We can talk about a virtual university consortium where no degree is granted but the institutions agree to work together and, in fact, figure out how to not put the

student at a disadvantage because they are articulating among themselves with regard to sharing credit. We can also talk about academic services consortia where no degree is granted, they are academically accredited institutions working together, but they have not reached a stage where they are ready to articulate credit among them. Again, a slight disadvantage to the student, but if the student is well-informed, then it can work.

We can also talk about a university information consortium, and this is kind of the most popular at this point in time of the many that we're finding springing up. And I have dozens and dozens of examples of these. But, where no degree is granted, there are no real coordinated services, but these are academically accredited institutions that are beginning to link electronically.

Let me speak for just a moment about this LAAP program. And, in the interest of disclosure I want to say that my organization, the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications at Ritchie, is an applicant and so we'll see what happens. But, in addition to that, we were also making a lot of comments about what this should be. And the notion here is that the current round is focusing, I think, to elaborate on Brian's comments, on the development of products that, quite frankly, aren't going to be developed otherwise. They aren't the most profitable products. There is no immediate gain. There may be a long-term gain. There is a lot of gain in maintaining this, but is not something that venture capitalists are going to look at first-hand, and go, oh, yes, I'm going to put the research into this to make it work. And we're also finding that they are focusing on things that no single institution can do.

Let me speak for moment about some of the issues with the distance learning demonstration projects for student financial aid, and reiterate some of the points that Bob has made, but go a tiny bit beyond that, I hope. Some of the challenges, I think, for administering a new version of financial aid have to do with the multiplicity of models that are out there. This is not a unitary environment. This is an environment in which lots of institutions, and a lot of different groups are trying things in lots of ways, and to try and come up with a coherent way of dealing with that, and one that is supposed to map to an older structure, based on an older system, I think, is quite a challenge. The notion of the open entry that Bob was talking about, certainly time-independent learning modules becomes another issue.

And then we have some state experiments that I think throw this up in the air as well. The state legislature in Utah very recently, this past session, basically said to high school kids, if you come out of your high school graduating with the equivalent of two years of college, whether you've done that through AP exams, or whether you've done it with the links that you can now get in your high school to colleges and universities that will help you electronically to earn course credit, if you come out with two years of college, the legislature will ensure that the last two years is paid for by a state institution in that state. Interesting, well, I don't see that happening in a lot of states, but I could see it as a model that's developing, and calls into question how we begin to fund all of this from a governmental entity.

Another of the issues that comes up, that I believe Mary Beth mentioned, and certainly Brian did as well, is the notion that we still don't have anything but really the most rudimentary experimental policies with regard to who shares the cost on what when we talk about institutions collaborate with one another. And then we get to pricing, what a mess right now. Let me just give you some examples, very quickly, and I don't mean to pick on the specific examples, these are just exemplary of what's going on out there.

We have very inconsistent models and philosophies that are reflected in state policies with regard to, let's pick the simplest, in state versus out-of-state tuition. Some states, for a distance learning student now, will charge and demand that all institutions charge a full out-of-state rate if the student can't be documented as a resident of the state. Then we have other states, I'm using Maine here as an example, but it's not the only one, that's say, in essence, the distance learning student is not using other resources, consequently, let's go ahead and not charge in-state tuition. Well, some smart student is at a campus, out-of-state student is choosing to register at one of the campuses in Maine as a distance learning student, thereby paying in-state tuition, and no one has resolved that yet.

Then we can have interstate agreements, so that student now is taking a distance learning course from an institution in North Dakota and, if they happen to live in South Dakota, Montana, Saskatchewan, or Manitoba, they are paying 125 percent of in-state tuition. If they're in Minnesota, it's 110 percent, and if they are in Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming, or Washington, they're paying 150 percent of in-state tuition. All others are paying 167 percent of in-state tuition. How does a student figure this out?

Other states are ignoring the distinction altogether and allowing institutions to act as market entities. In other words, they can charge whatever the market allows. When we talk about the role of, I think, the federal programs in this certainly it's to continue to stimulate the kind of development we've already talked about. And I think when we talk about any potential changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they need to reflect, or perhaps hopefully would reflect, this trend toward colleges and universities actually reaching into the high schools and beginning to offer programs.

In addition to that, I think we do need to have support for new policy development, because it's very crazy out there and people are trying hard to figure out how to do this. One of the big losers in this at the moment, I would suggest, are students. And to that end, we take this rather seriously, the notion of treating students, if you will, as consumers, but they need to be informed consumers.

It is a very confusing environment at the moment. And I'm throwing this up here because I can't hand it out to you. We gave it to Prentice-Hall to publish for us, but it's materials that we put together that become, literally a way in which we can help students begin to understand what they need to know, what questions they need to ask and how they can become, good consumers in this particular world. This is the website I promised you, if you're interested in any of the other research work we do. We link to a lot of work in this arena, but please take the website and go for it.

And thank you, Maureen. And I think I did it.

**M. McLaughlin:** Sally told me she had timed it and it was 10 minutes, and it was 10 minutes and 10 seconds, so you are quite good.

Given the shortage of time, why don't I turn it over to the audience and open it up for questions. We heard quite a few stimulating thoughts here. Some similarities across presentations and differences.

Yes.

**Participant:** I would like to ask the last speaker, do you see a day in which students will be able to put together their program or their degree based on courses that they take all over the country, based on what a particular professor that they may have read may have specific information or whatever?

**S. Johnstone:** I think that's already happening to some extent. And the gentleman to my left, if you're looking at him, is actually heading an institution that was designed to do that, to enable students to shop, if they're smart enough to do so, and know how to do this, and find the individuals with whom they want to work. And basically instead of coming to institution with a bouquet of different course credits, they can come to the Western Governors' University, and basically establish their competencies, regardless of where they've chosen to study. That's one solution to that.

I believe that in the coming years we're going to be finding other solutions that are put together by far more creative minds than mine to be able to figure out ways in which that can work together.

**Participant:** One last question. To whom would the student then pay? Would Washington setup in office where everything would be funneled through D.C.? I mean, that's a horrible thought, but maybe that may be the only solution?

**S. Johnstone:** You know, because I'm from the provinces, and don't live within the beltway, those of us outside the beltway have very different perspectives on this. And I would never see something that that would be the norm for higher education. I think we will still see this within the states, but there are at least a dozen projects that I'm aware of right now within the states, Kentucky being a good example with Mary Beth's program, and others as well, that are trying to figure out how to do that centralized concept within the state to sort of leverage the investments the state has already made in its own institutions.

We may find that regionally, but I kind of doubt in a country this large and this diverse we're going to see a federal system in that sense.

**M. Susman:** If I can say little bit, that's one of the services that Kentucky Commonwealth Virtual University is going to provide, just the billing. Sort of like the airlines, you can travel on a lot of airlines, but you only get one bill. And when you debundle services, it's possible to be the billing agent for numerous universities. And we are going to be working on doing that, and the student can get a degree from a lot of institutions, compile it together.

**Participant:** What troubles me about the virtual —

**M. McLaughlin:** Can you identify yourself, please?

**Participant:** My name is Mary Janney, and I work with a group of college students who are on welfare and making their way through college. And what troubles me about the Virtual University is that there is absolutely no personal contact, and I know that with the students that I work with, and I'm sure there are a lot more like them, they need guidance. They need interaction with people to get into a system. And I don't see it in the Virtual University.

**M. Susman:** One of the confusions that we have is that it is either going to be on the Internet or face-to-face. And if we apply the technology correctly we will apply it aptly where it is necessary to do. Another

confusion is, even though you are on the Internet you have a lot of interaction with the faculty and the other students. And, in fact, they are discovering on the Internet a kind of Cyranno effect. When you're on the Internet nobody knows you have a big nose, they don't know you're fat, they don't know you're thin, black, white, and that minorities students, anecdotally, there is no rigorous research yet, seem to be performing better in those environments because they can talk from the middle of themselves. In fact, communication on the net tends to be very much more personal than it is in face-to-face. It doesn't mean that mom on welfare doesn't need some human hand-holding. And you just figure out how to provide that as well. You use the Internet when it is convenient for that student, and you use human contact when it is convenient.

**S. Johnstone:** There are, by the way, developing a number of I'll call them alternative models. In some of the states, they're trying to sort through communities centers where they cannot afford to have full-blown institutions in every quarter, or every place within the state because of population and cost issues. They are creating community centers that are designed to allow for some on-site instruction, certainly the kind of human contact and the guidance that we saw occurring, and so critical in the film we saw this morning. But, in addition to that, it allows this much lower cost facility, if you will, to have the ability to pull in resources. Granted, they are guided resources, but pull in resources from any place that it's appropriate. So that the student is not put at a disadvantage with regard to the socialization issues. And I would suggest that this is not designed, and work that we're talking about here is not really at the level of trying to talk about 18 to 22 year olds, and yet we are finding kids on campus who are going to campus, being on campus, but accelerating their time to degree, because they are choosing to pull in these resources.

**B. Albrecht:** Another model for that that we are experimenting with now is having small cohorts of students in a particular location come together, they support one another, and they get the content, the educational content that they want from anywhere around the country. So, it combines the two things, the small cohort, but the use of distance learning and technology to get the content that they want. So, I think that one of the most exciting things about distance education today is the limitless number of ways in which the packages can be put together as the consumer would like to have them delivered.

**Participant:** My name is Joan Stramanis [sp], and I am a member of the LAAP team, so I am not critical of what you're doing. I just want to ask a question of the practitioners that comes from the earlier question. I'm not so much worried about social interactivity by distance, I'm worried about interaction with the physical world. And I am particularly interested in science education and practice, and I worry about laboratories, I really believe that hands-on, lab-rich education is the right way to go.

And there's seem to me a degree of tension between what you're describing and this new trend toward more laboratory-rich education in science. So I would just like to know also about community and global education, which seems to require immersion in a certain kind of community. And some tension with the idea of this student as a fixed point, and the services revolving around the student.

So I would use like some comments from practitioners about how you've solved some of these problems.

**B. Albrecht:** Well, I think that, first of all, there is no solution to all of the problems that you've described. It has long been true that traditional institutions don't offer the same laboratory alternatives, lab science alternatives, across all of those institutions. I'm afraid it calls to mind a visit that I made five years ago, I

guess it's five years ago, with my daughter to in a very good institution. And I walked into the chemistry lab and realized that it was the same chemistry lab that I had seen more than a couple decades earlier when I went to college.

So there is no way that distance education or anything else is going to level the playing field for the laboratory science, or for international education, or for anything else. What I hope we will do is expand opportunities, so that the person who otherwise would have no exposure to lab science may have a simulation. It doesn't mean, I hope, that the student would stop with that. But it provides an opportunity of a particular type, and the same with the other things that you raise.

Furthermore, distance education, the label doesn't work so well anymore, but technology and distributed education, is finding new opportunities and going in new directions almost every month. For example, in the textbooks, I have seen CD-ROMs now in the sciences that far surpass what we had some years ago in many classrooms. I think in the meantime, it is up to the consumer to find what opportunities they need, and it's up to the institution, through counseling and through some kind of TV Guide is it, Mary Beth, to help the student have some sense of the enormous richness what is now available to them.

**M. Susman:** I have a little bit different thought about that. And, again, what I think is that while the technology allows us great deliver mechanisms, it also suddenly is a technology that can increase learning in ways that we have never had before. And we can create the simulations for students before they get to a lab that actually reduces the time that they need to have in the lab. I'm not saying that the lab experience goes away, because I do believe kinesthetic moving of things actually increases learning. But, when you can create these simulations on a computer where the student has to manipulate a keyboard or a mouse, and say that's the class you have before you go to lab, the student comes to the lab more prepared through these simulations than they did in a traditional classroom.

I reminded of the visible human project University of Colorado, and I know your lunch is coming, and I'm sorry to bother you with this, but they took a person, he was dead already, and they frozen him, and then sliced him millimeters thick, millimeters, and then photographed him. And had created a database of photographs, it takes two weeks and 24 hours a day to download, but you can construct a knee with your little laptop, and you can deconstruct a knee. You can construct an ear, and deconstruct an ear. And they now have a virtual glove and I've had my fingers in it, you know, and you put this glove on and you can pick up a scalpel, and you can cut through this thing. And you have the resistance, I don't know how they do this, you have the resistance against your fingers that you've just cut and then it bleeds. Excuse me, I know lunch is coming.

And they think that this will be able to replace cadaver labs, very expensive things, for physical therapy, for allied health sciences and, in fact, give cadaver lab experiences that those sciences never had an opportunity to have. That is an appropriate use of what we can do in science.

**M. McLaughlin:** Ray next, then Art, Donna and David. Then we'll break for lunch.

**B. Lekander:** I was just going add that I think it's easy to think that this education always means it has to be automated or on-line, which is certainly not the case. If you're an engineer, for example, in a retraining program may be there is a way in which you can use your work site for the laboratory facilities. If you are

a teacher in an in-service teacher education program, maybe you can use a local school site. Even if the educational provider is remotely located, maybe certain kinds of clinical or hands-on education can still take place in the normal way. So it's just the way in which that is supervised or the relationships between, say, lab proctors versus instructors. I mean, maybe those are the kinds of things that go virtual.

**Participant:** Ray Orbach, University of California-Riverside. I really don't think this is much of a problem, because now in many universities the laboratories are, in fact, on computers. We now simulate things in chemistry and physics that are much better done on a computer than they are in those same laboratories you visited 20 years ago or 30 years ago. So, in fact, this distance learning will enable students to do nonlinear dynamics, which you just can't do in laboratory, they can do chemical reactions, they can play with different chemicals, things blow up, but it's on a screen. There is a great deal more that one can obtain through these electronic means very often than one can through physical manipulation. So I don't see this as a problem at all.

**M. McLaughlin:** Art?

**Participant:** Art Halpin. I was thinking about Mary Beth's comment. I guess as long as we don't have carpaccio for lunch, we'll be okay. So I wanted to ask panelists on the student aid issue, we're talking about different models, what would be your opinion of moving to a model for students aid which essentially the common denomination was money. That it is that you determine your eligibility for financial aid based on how much you paid for the education, or for the assessment. I mean one of the issues on the student aid side is, what do you do with these assessment fees which are not similar to what we have on the traditional side.

One way of dealing with that is to say, well, how much did you pay for those assessment fees, and that denominates what you should be eligible for aid. So, rather than try to move to the traditional crosswalk, why don't we just sort of keep it in the medium of what you paid?

**B. Lekander:** One of the common elements in this process is credentialing. And what students are paying for, by and large, are credentials. Now, learning varies enormously from class to class, program to program, and student to student. So one can argue that the charge, or what the student pays, is for the credential as opposed to what the traditional labels suggest is being paid for. So I think that this kind of system works very well, and a works across any number of models in learning and financial aid.

**M. McLaughlin:** Donna?

**Participant:** Yes. I just had two comments, I think. One is, as a science major at a very large Ivy League college, I would say that the interactions with our professors was much less personal than what I've seen students having today on the Internet while they're in colleges. Homework over email, interactions, comments on every line of their paper or lab work. Colleges, most of them, are still traditionally geared to have very large lecture halls to weed out science and math majors, and there's no interaction with your professors. You're lucky if you can talk to a TA. So I think on the whole Internet interaction, and email interaction with professors is really creating that personal contact that's never existed, and the same with labs, with all the simulations with labs, they're being used in colleges. The labs I took, they could have been longer and it wouldn't have made any difference, they were just handouts, fill out the form, do this,

you didn't know why, you didn't get into any kind of intellectual understanding of what you were during. Therefore, I went into public policy. I'm no longer in science.

My other question was just maybe for a different discussion, one that's not about higher ed. But, I'm real interested in what's happening with distance learning in high schools. And one of the unfortunate trends I've seen is, distance learning in high schools is used a lot to say there's only one AP physics professor in a rural large geographic area, so all the students will link in and get the benefits of the professor. The unfortunate thing is it kind of works against freeing up the time for learning, because all these schools that may be otherwise would have gone to block schedules or longer periods, have to do AP physics one time, one day of the week, et cetera. So it's kind of putting barriers in there. I'm just interested if you had any comments on the?

**S. Johnstone:** I think that's true not only with regard to the K-12 environment, or certainly the high school environment, but it's true in the University environment, too. On the one hand, it can create flexibility, and we can move beyond that, even in the secondary environment. If you begin to look not at let's set the kids down in front of a TV set and make this live, every time, each day, but instead move to a more asynchronous, or not in real-time environment, we did some work with the Cal State system five plus years ago where several of the campuses were collaborating to work with high schools. And a tried a number of modalities, and it's no surprise that what the kids in the high schools preferred were the asynchronous activities, because as soon as you move it into that synchronous environment, then you're messing up bus schedules, and you're messing up other things that they want to do. And it's, of course, the same kids that are taking the AP courses or the college courses that are also on the sports teams and are on the debate team, and everything else, so that they're pulled in too many directions, and they need to have the flexibility to work in a non-real-time environment.

**M. McLaughlin:** David, our last question.

**Participant:** We began this panel talking about the fact that in higher education we are behind, or the sector, not we anymore, the sector is behind technologically. And coming from a company that builds this stuff and installs it, I would agree with you. But, I think the key lesson that we have learned every place else is that the mix of individual personal hands-on and technology always, from a standpoint of customer service, learning satisfaction, and cost, wins.

Now, we have examples where every time we go into a company or a sector, people often say, well, really what the customers want is that intimate, personal interaction. We find, time after time, the customers tell us, we don't get it from our customer service people. If we had an answer from some technology, 90 percent of time, and 10 percent of the time we relied on a person, we would be much happier and the organization would have to spend less to serve us.

Now, Mary Beth brought up an example which will disturb lunch for some people, and she talked about physical therapists. Let me assure you, in medical schools today we are training surgeons, surgical students, residents, and interns with a mix of computer-based, touch-sensitive technologies, cadavers, and real people. This mix of technologies, people in the operating room that are still live, people on the operating table that are dead, and non-people that let a sell something, this mix is much more effective and much less expensive than training clearly solely on live people, and much more effective in terms of

skills learned and cost and risk rates than simply training on a combination of live people and previously alive people. We find the mix of technology and person to person interaction always wins.

**S. Johnstone:** I think that's an excellent point, and that's certainly what we are seeing in terms of preferences for when faculty are making decisions, and certainly when students are making the decisions, too.

**Participant:** In every sector it works, there is no reason it should be different.

**M. McLaughlin:** Thank you very much.

I would like to thank the panelists. You did a wonderful job of spurring some very lively conversation and thank you very much.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF PANEL ON LAAP AND DISTANCE LEARNING.]*

**H. Aaron:** I'm Henry Aaron. I'm a senior fellow here at the Brookings Institution and was formerly director of economic studies at the time the Brown Center was created. This morning Lois mentioned that with the passage of years, she finds that she's bumping into people she has known for a very long time. And she mentioned somebody whom she had known, Mike Smith, for, I think, twenty-five years.

The first time I met Ray Orbach was forty-eight years ago. I was a high school sophomore. He was a high school senior. We went to the same high school. And he had a great distinction. He drove a car and was driving to a debate, which was my first, and I was privileged to be a passenger. We've bumped into each other and been acquainted on many occasions since, not least because he had the good sense to marry one of the more attractive members of my class in high school. And also because during my period in graduate school when he was an assistant professor of physics at Harvard, he and his wife were very gracious host and hostesses to a hungry graduate student, who would agree to drive out, pick up lobsters, which they would then prepare for dinner. I can't resist telling one story about his children, who are now — the eldest is now forty years old. At that time, they were, of course, much younger. I arrived early one afternoon, deposited the lobsters, which had to be left some place until dinner time and Ray, I think, it was decided they should go in the shower stall, just off the kitchen, which sounds like an innocent choice except by dinner time the lobsters and his children had bonded, making dinner a traumatic occasion.

Well, that may have been the high point but Ray went on and has done a few other things. He became a professor of physics at the University of California at Los Angeles [*UCLA*]. He then combined his teaching and research with administrative duties and became provost at UCLA. In recognition of his accomplishments there, he was asked to become chancellor at the campus of the University of California at Riverside [*UC-Riverside*]. And has, I think, compiled a record of extreme distinction in an area about which he's going to talk this afternoon. And that is the way in which a university can become a force throughout the educational system — not only at the higher educational level but influencing schools that train the students, whom the universities will then have to educate.

Some of you may know he was the subject of a marvelously adulatory article in *The New York Times Magazine* that recognized what he has accomplished in precisely those areas. And for that reason and for personal reasons, it's a real pleasure to have the chance to introduce Ray Orbach.

**R. Orbach:** Thank you, Henry, for that very kind introduction. I warned you that if you didn't introduce yourself, I would. Henry is a distinguished economist, has headed the economics department here at Brookings, is internationally known for his work, and a very good friend. And it's just great to be back and see you, again, and be reminded of those wonderful lobster dinners, though my children could not watch the dismembering of the animal after they got to be friends with it.

It's my very great privilege to be here and I want to thank Lois Rice for inviting me to the day. It has been a most informative day and I've learned a great deal. And the nice thing about being the luncheon speaker but having the lunch somewhere else is that the luncheon speaker actually got to eat lunch, which I had given up any hopes of under a previous understanding. So thank you for the lunch. I guess I should thank the Ford Foundation. We were told — oh, no, okay.

It's a fascinating issue that we are discussing today. It's the issue of excellence, which has been implied when we speak of higher education, and access, which is a commitment that this nation leads all others

in achieving. I'll be talking about the melding of the two. Many times one will read that diversity is a requisite for excellence in higher education. I truly believe that. I would like to talk with you about a partnership that we have had with our two counties but really the entire state of California and, then, how that plays out. It plays out not only in the numbers game — how many underrepresented minority students do you have on the campus, but also how that changes the nature of the campus; how the campus develops and profits from the richness that diversity brings. Some of the materials outside on the table may look strange to you. There was a collection of material from a conference titled, "Diversity and Aesthetics: Difference and Aesthetics." This is an attempt to take the richness of ethnic studies, gender studies, this remarkable student population, and bring that into coincidence with our sense of values. The quality of the institution, quality of the fields, that's what's going on right now at UC-Riverside. And so for us diversity on our campus is not a luxury or a numbers game, it's an essential element in our curricula program. And so when we have done what we have with a community and we are blessed with a wonderful community around us, there's a great deal of self-interest in it, not only for access but also for quality. And it's those two elements that I want to bring together in my presentation.

At UC-Riverside, we have a long tradition of reaching out to help k through 12 schools and underrepresented students. Our efforts are now paying great dividends for us. Next fall, this coming fall, we will enroll a freshman class that will numerically be the most diverse in the University of California. We will have twenty-seven percent of our freshmen who are underrepresented minority students — African American, Native American, Chicano and Latino students. And everyone of them is eligible to enter the University of California — that is they have graduated in the top one — eighth of their high school graduating class. They have chosen our campus. It is a campus of quality. We have about 11,000 students at UC-Riverside. There was a recent study by the Association of American Universities [AAU] that showed that our graduates rank number twentieth in the United States among all public and private research universities in receiving the doctorate. Out of the top sixty institutions in the AAU, we rank twentieth and we're not even a member of the AAU. But it gives you an idea of opportunities that our students have and our commitment to quality. We're not finished. Our students are coming close to mirroring the population of California. But we are by no means at that point. Hence, the term underrepresented. It's something that we would like to eliminate at UC-Riverside and that is what we are working towards. We're fortunate to be generously supported by the Department of Education, the State of California, and the University of California among others.

Let me describe our region a little bit to you. It has the somewhat pretentious name of inland empire. It is composed of two counties, Riverside and San Bernardino County. It has a population of three million. We are the only California campus in those two counties. And within ten to fifteen years, it will have a population of five million. It is the most rapidly growing area in the state of California. Our current student body, as I said, is about 11,000 students. Our average family income is the lowest in the University of California system. It's half of the family income average for the highest family income in the UC system. Our student population is budgeted to double by the year 2010 so we will be a campus of 21,000 students in a little over ten years. That increase is somewhat frightening but it also is an opportunity as we move into the new century to develop a curriculum, which reflects the richness of our community. It is a heavily Hispanic and black community. The Caucasian population is certainly not the majority in our two counties

and ceases now to be a majority in the State of California and soon in the United States. We want our student body to look like the face of California and we believe it will be the future of California.

Our work with the schools started in the early nineties. In 1990, our region had a six percent eligibility rate for the University of California. That is half of the state average. In 1996, another study was taken and our community, our two counties, had an eligibility rate of 8.1 percent, still not 12.5 percent but that's a thirty-five percent increase in six years. This was caused by the partnership between the University of California, Riverside and the k through 12 schools and the parents in our region. This year the number of African-American students will increase by fifty-six percent since 1997. The number of Chicano, Latino students will be up by over seventy percent. All of these students are fully eligible for the University of California. They are among the highest achieving students in their communities. It is a fantastic group of students. And any university in the nation would be thrilled to attract and we are privileged to have them.

Our success in enrolling this diverse student body is a direct consequence of an array of outreach efforts to help all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, to become eligible for college admission. It is also a testament to the efforts of our region's schools, their students, and their parents. Our coordinated efforts are anchored by early academic outreach, which this coming fall will reach more than 10,000 students in a 150 schools. Our program counselors work closely with the students, their parents, and school counselors. They provide information on college preparation, a workshop on college entrance exams, tours of our campus, and seminars on the admissions' process and financial aid. Each summer we bring ninth, tenth, and eleventh graders to campus for residential programs that give these students a taste of college life and, hopefully, inspire them to excel in their high school studies. UCR students, faculty work with them providing role models for academic life. For high school seniors who graduated in 1998, more than fifty-seven percent of those who participated in our early outreach program were University of California eligible — the top one-eighth of the high school graduating class in the State of California.

A critical dimension of our outreach initiative is the involvement of parents in the early stages of their children's education. It is important to empower the parents, many of whom have not gone to college and for whom their child will be the first one in their family to receive a college education. Beyond good grades and test scores, we inform them that inspiring to enter the University of California means that their children must complete a prescribed high school curriculum — a curriculum that should begin in terms of preparation in the fourth grade of elementary school.

To address the specifics we created a booklet called, "Keys to Your Future," which is located on the desk outside. We have printed over 90,000 copies of these booklets and they are both in English and in Spanish. The booklet tells parents what they should do. And if you go through the booklet, and we bring these booklets to the schools, there is a page of instructions for the parents. And then the booklet goes through year by year from the fourth grade through the twelfth what their children should be achieving in their curricular work; and finally at the end has a table of what is required to become eligible at the University of California. It is delivery, which we make personally. We visit schools, school boards, and community groups. Our traveling team utilizes simultaneous translation through infrared earphones to those who prefer Spanish to English. I personally attend those presentations, many to communities with high proportions of disadvantaged students, and speak frankly about what is required to obtain

preparation for a UC education. Many times the principal is sitting in the office and I will ask the students, depending on their grade, how their progress compares with our recommendations. And if their hands don't go up, I then inform their parents, who are sitting there that they need to go to the principal's office the next morning and ask why their child is being robbed of a college preparatory program. This booklet and our counselors give the parents the knowledge they need to make sure that their children aren't being tracked. It is an opportunity for the schools to measure their performance against a set of litmus tests. And, most of all, it's an opportunity for the schools and the parents and the university to work together to make sure the children have opportunities to come to the university.

One of the most important features, as has been discussed this morning, is the issue of financial aid. We are talking to families, many of whom are below the poverty line. And when I talk about the university and the importance of coming to the university, there's an awful lot of "Oh, yeah but I can't possibly afford it." And so a university education is not credible to the families. We have structured our financial aid, and this chart is also outside on the table, so that any student, independent of family income, can come to the University of California, Riverside, graduate in four years, and if everybody contributes, not incur debt. We expect every student to work fifteen hours a week during the school year and then during the summer. That provides roughly \$5,000 towards their college education. That's the blue bar. And then a year at UC-Riverside is \$12,500, covering everything books, room and board, tuition, travel, other expenses. And we create this chart so that for family whose income is between 0 and \$15,000, we provide the remainder of the \$12,500 in grant aid. Then we follow the federal guidelines for family income in terms of what parents need to contribute and the amount of our grant aid or scholarship aid, not loan, diminishes in proportion as the family income increases and their contribution increases.

This is also turning out to be valuable for families who have young children. For example, if someone has an income of \$32,000 a year, federal guidelines say they should contribute \$1,000 a year to their children's education. Their child is ten years old, that means they need to save \$4,000 over eight years or \$500 a year. That's a very different thing than telling a parent they have to save \$50,000 for four years. And it enables families to plan. Study after study has shown that the poorer the family, the more in absolute terms they believe that college costs. And what this is is an attempt to show that everyone can come; and that the financial side, everyone has to contribute, is feasible and that their children can graduate on time and, if everyone contributes, without debt.

We've established an office of parent outreach. A six session course entitled, "Education: A Family Affair," is offered to parents who want to learn more about higher education and financial aid. There are sessions that explore ways in which parents can help inspire their children to greater academic achievement and identify potential troubles early so they can get their children back on track.

We also coordinate the three Riverside County schools' The Upward Bound Programs. One of the most visible and successful national enrichment activities. It is highly successful with those who are traditionally the least successful academically — at-risk students, particularly those from low-income families. Like many Upward Bound Programs, we offer a four-week summer residency in campus residence halls for high school freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. Of this spring's Upward Bound high school seniors, eighty percent have been accepted to a four-year institution. Our own students contribute significantly to this program. They're vital to our success. These ambassadors return to their high schools, and

remember they look like their high schools to share their college experiences and inspire their student colleagues to pursue higher education. As role models, these are perhaps our most effective ambassadors. Their diversity encourages others.

Student volunteers direct service to at-risk youth through our University East Side Community Collaborative and our Americorp team. These two programs have reached more than 2,000 youth with after-school tutoring and enrichment activities. Through Americorp, alone, students from UCR and the surrounding campuses have completed more than 70,000 hours of community service and received \$148,000 in scholarships to invest in their own education. This summer we, again, will have more than 200 low-income students on our campus for a program combining sports activities and an awareness of higher education and career opportunities. In order to carry on these functions with a full commitment from our campus, we have created an organizational structure on our campus which we call the Alpha Center — The Academy of Learning through Partnership for Higher Education. The Center is a hub of outreach that contains several spokes. We have a school/university partnership program in which six school districts have engaged. Each partnership is fashioned to meet the particular needs of a school district. One high school has created a thirty-day intersession program between semesters, focusing on the high need areas of mathematics and language arts. Teachers from two local school districts are teaching in our own teacher credential program, teacher preparation program, exposing our students to the real world challenges they face in the classroom. In other districts parents are involved with the schools and UC-Riverside in creating the activities that will best address the needs of their children. This is an integrated program, which feeds off the entire fabric of the campus. It is a program in which our faculty, our students, and staff are fully engaged. We have built in an evaluation component through our School of Education so that each of our efforts is monitored and evaluated with regard to effectiveness. We have created an organization, which we believe has been successful for outreach.

However, the wonderful increase in the underrepresented student enrollment at UC-Riverside is more than just a numbers game. When these students assume the mantle of leadership that we expect in the community, state, and nation, they will need to have participated in the finest education experience offered anywhere. If these students find the campus cold, unfriendly, their curricular experiences foreign to their own interests, cultural backgrounds; if they are alienated, they do not feel a part of the learning process, we will have failed them. And this is a group of students for whom we cannot fail. We have structured support services for these students through specific programs identified with their ethnicity and gender. We have also created an atmosphere on campus that is welcoming and warm and we believe this is one of the major reasons these students have voted with their feet in order to come to UC-Riverside.

Fortunately in terms of curriculum, the arts, humanities, and social sciences are addressing a structural question. A confluence, a theoretical revolution within the academic disciplines, especially effecting those areas, has transformed the subject matter and methods of study of all forms of cultural expression. Assumptions upon which critical evaluations of cultural forms had been based previously have been called into question and in many cases discredited. Within the context of this theoretical reformulation, the growing awareness of cultural diversity of the United States, both in the present and throughout its history, has generated a remarkable expansion in the lists of texts and artifacts counted as worthy of study. Many scholars have recognized that most cultural productions by women and members of ethnic minority

groups were suppressed and excluded from main stream culture previously because the established aesthetic criteria had been formulated in ways that privileged the works of white male artists and writers.

The challenges of developing a curriculum that expresses the richness of ethnic and gender studies are enormous. They involve nothing short of a construction of an entirely new set of principles for evaluating productions of art within a context of the fullest possible grasp of the aesthetic principles of the cultures, which contribute to these works. They involve, as well, the creation of new terminologies and explanations for how and why elements of creative production affect us as they do.

To do this, we need not only study the history of the arts in various parts of the world but also we need to examine our own contemporary cultures and perceive how our minds are currently being formed and reformed by the technology, knowledge, human interactions around the globe that are instance openings to new channels of communication, responses, and understandings of these processes. That is a tall order and this last fall we had a conference on difference and aesthetics, which began to probe this intellectual sphere. This coming year we'll be offering courses to this diverse student body, which will then turn into a set of seminars at the freshman and sophomore levels to engage this diverse group of students in the academic program to enrich the program with their own experiences and their own contributions that they can make.

The issues of diversity and excellence are intertwined. What we're trying to do at UC-Riverside is to show that one is a precondition of the other. To work with a school so that we have a diverse population. To work with our faculty and students to develop new concepts, new ideas, new sets of values that they can feel they have been a part in terms of their construction and which they can enjoy in their classroom experiences. This is, we believe, one of the most exciting periods in the development of the intellectual base of higher education that any of us has gone through. And we hope within the next ten years as we double our population, we will create the new structures that will bring these students into the aesthetic framework of disciplines to which they have contributed and which, we believe, will influence and benefit the entire academic community.

Thank you very much.

Lois has given me the opportunity to answer any questions, and I'll do my very best. Yes.

**Participant:** I have a question. I would just like a copy of your presentation today. I think it would be very valuable and I just commented to my colleague here, and I really think the model that you're developing not only changes the culture but you're creating a new tradition should be acknowledged. And I would like to see your program, your model replicated in other universities across the country as they grapple with the same change of demographics.

**R. Orbach:** Thank you.

**Participant:** So your presentation will be available.

**R. Orbach:** Yes, I will make it available to Lois. In the interest of time, it's a little shorter than what you will receive but there are outside copies of the text to which I was referring.

It's an uncomfortable process because we're challenging the value structure. And you've heard all the arguments about western civ and how can you move away from that and are you watering down the curriculum. We're trying to go beyond that and to use the diversity products of the wonderful programs in ethnic studies, black studies, Chicano studies, gender studies, the insights that these programs have given to bring them into the main stream. Someone referred to those programs as studying foreign language literature in translation. Unless you know the language, unless you are familiar with the background that it is based on, it's almost a foreign element is added on. We want to eliminate the adding characteristic and make it an integral part.

Yes.

**Participant:** How have you encouraged —

**L. Rice:** Identify yourself, please.

**Participant:** Oh, sorry, Sally Clausen, Southeastern University Louisiana. I'm interested in knowing how you — what incentives that you provided for faculty, particularly maybe traditionalists, who may have needed to spend more time cultivating this change in culture with their peers. Were there special incentives or did it just flow naturally from your leadership?

**R. Orbach:** Well, that's very kind to attribute it to my leadership. I'm afraid it's really due to the academic leadership of the campus. Emery Elliott, who's a distinguished professor of English and a figure in American studies around the world, has been the one who put the conference together. If it were just a service function, then I think you would be quite right. You would have to then provide some kind of incentives for people to move away from what they would really like to do and perform a service. But this is integral to the nature of the humanities and arts right now. There has been a period of twenty years of deconstruction. I'm using very general terms. And what this group of scholars is attempting to do, not just from UC- Riverside but from all over the country and indeed in the world, is to reconstruct the discipline. But to put it back together, not based on the same set of principles that went into fifty years ago, but rather in the context of the modern world and all that we've learned over the past decades as these programs have matured and developed.

So this is faculty driven. It is an effort that arises out of faculty commitment to discovery and taking the new theoretical models and actually addressing the fundamental issue. Is what I am doing important? Does this find itself at the center of my value structure and others? So it's almost a missionary zeal that the faculty is approaching this with.

The wonderful thing about our campus is that they're doing it in conjunction with the students. And we have the diversity that will fuel, I believe, this enterprise directly. But I'm just fortunate to have faculty around me who are committed to their discipline, but to opening it up.

**Participant:** Kenneth Cooper, *Washington Post*.

I'm wondering if you agree with conclusion of *The New York Times Magazine* writer in that your integrated outreach program is a replicable substitute for affirmative action.

**R. Orbach:** One of the things I have studiously tried to avoid is getting caught in the cross fire between those who are for and those who are against affirmative action. And, in fact, Jim Traub in that article does quote me correctly when I say that I am, in fact, in favor of affirmative action and, frankly, the loss of affirmative action in California has made my life more difficult. Issues of financial aid, for example, are ones that I believe I ought to be able to allocate on the basis of ethnicity and gender, but I can't.

I have tried to stay out of that debate because in some sense it's irrelevant. The issue for me is the fourth grade when students are starting using their reading to learn, and dealing with all students in all environments means I don't have to worry about it. What I'm committed to is to bring those students, that richness, that excellence that is out there into our university, into higher education. And so to be honest, I don't pay much attention, except I feel a little uncomfortable when I'm caught in the cross-fire. But it's not an issue.

The issue is really can we reach out to the children — low-income, disadvantaged — and give them the opportunity to develop themselves into the future leaders. If we don't, if these students don't become the leaders of our community, state, and nation, I don't think democracy can flourish. I think it is essential that we have participation of our entire community in a leadership position or we won't make it. So to me affirmative action is important. And it is a tool, which I wish I had to use. When it comes to outreach, the most important thing is the children and reaching them early and helping them to realize their own potential.

**Participant:** If I might follow up. In the case of your peers as university presidents whose institutions are in areas, counties that are less demographically diverse than yours, do you think they could do what you have done and have the same effect on diversity, campus diversity?

**R. Orbach:** The answer is they are doing it and yes they can be very effective. California is a very diverse state, and I have to also say that we don't just focus on our two counties. We have taken our group to Los Angeles, to Orange County, to San Diego. We're going to the northern part of the state, which is a rural area. We've gone to the central part of the state, the valley. We are going all over to try to bring the very best students to our campus. And every one of my dear colleagues in the university is doing exactly the same thing. They are recruiting in our area to bring students to their campuses. That competition is proving a very valuable resource for students all over the state.

**L. Rice:** Lois Rice, Brookings.

I wonder if you could elaborate just a little bit more on your efforts to change the curriculum, such as vouchers, charter schools —

**R. Orbach:** Thank you. We, indeed, are focusing precisely on substance and on the quality of the programs. We work very closely with the schools. When we visit the schools we follow up with our own counselors going out and following the courses. We also during the days that they have available will bring the school teachers to our campus to discuss in their own areas of interests their curriculum and, with our faculty, our curriculum. And that brings a binding between the two that recognizes the content issues that they face.

I referred very briefly to my litmus test that I provide. And that is that I expect every school in the eighth grade to offer algebra one to all students. And when I ask that question of all the eighth graders, "how many of you are not taking algebra one," it is their parents that I go to and tell them to talk to the principal. Because if you don't take algebra one in the eighth grade, you can't take calculus in the twelfth grade. And that means your options are severely limited when you start thinking about college. It's even preferable to have algebra one in the seventh grade, but it doesn't mean that all children prosper taking algebra one in the eighth grade. And this is where the schools have been so inventive, where they've literally restructured the year. Indio High School, for example, insists that every ninth grader take algebra one because in that school district they haven't offered algebra one in the eighth grade in the middle school. And about half of the students fail. And then they structure the school year where they have about one month where they do nothing but algebra one for that one half. And for others there are enrichment programs. And then those students go back and complete the algebra sequence and about half of them make it.

So by the end of the first year, three quarters of this very diverse student body has succeeded in algebra one.

In Cochela High School, which is close by and even poorer than Indio High School — both of these high schools are about ninety to ninety-five percent Hispanic--many of the children are involved in farm work in the fields. And they choose their academic year to fit in with the harvest so that the children can come. Principals, I find, are the most important element besides the teachers in this quality process. And so these schools, which are in very disadvantaged areas and under very difficult conditions, are now competing with one another. We received a phone call from Cochela High School that they sent more students to the University of California this year than Indio High School did. I cannot explain how wonderful that is. What a change from six years ago when they were hardly sending anybody to the University of California. Now, they are in competition. Now, there is an expectation that the children of those two areas can go to the university. It's that kind of credibility that we want to instill in the schools for the parents and for the children.

Thank you very much.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF LUNCHEON.]*

**M. Timpane:** We're going to proceed without break to the next panel session, which has to do with improving teacher quality, recruitment and preparation, all of which are encompassed by Title II of the Higher Education Act. My distinguished panel I will introduce very briefly and all at once, so that we can have an uninterrupted time together.

Terry Dozier, who also will speak first, and must I know leave at some stage, is a special adviser on teaching to the Secretary of Education Dick Riley, and has been so for six-plus years now. Before that, she was a high school teacher in South Carolina and the National Teacher of the Year while in that capacity. And while she began I think as someone to promote dialogue and communication among and between teachers and policy makers, she's become far more than that and sits at the heart of an extensive policy development process which has emerged in the department over the past several years around the questions of teachers and teacher education and of which Title II is just the latest part.

Next to her is David Imig, who has been — roughly speaking — has been the chief executive officer of the America Association of Colleges of Teacher Education — roughly forever. *[Laughter.]*

**D. Imig:** Thanks, Mike.

**M. Timpane:** *[Laughs.]* So long that it took the unfortunate happening of the gentleman's passing for anyone to remember who had this job before David did. And David is a highly regarded and much-loved figure in the Washington policy scene and obviously will represent the perspective of the schools of education and the people who train them.

On my immediate right is Barnett Berry, who is starting a regional center — an offshoot of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future in North Carolina; has paid particular attention to the policies and capacities of the states in that region to respond to some of the opportunities that are present in this act and will speak about that. He is also, as has everyone I've mentioned so far, been a teacher himself earlier in his career.

Next on over is Ed Crowe, who is the director of the Title II Teacher Quality Programs in the Department of Education, who will be supervising the effort to award the considerable resources that will be going out for us to take advantage of this opportunity. Ed — a confluence of North Carolina influence. Ed had his doctorate from the university of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as well in political science.

And finally, on my far right, is Sally Clausen, who is the president of Southeastern Louisiana University. She has taught at both the K to 12 and higher education levels, been Louisiana's Commissioner of Higher Education and Secretary of Education, among other things, and has given a great deal of leadership to this and associated issues having to do with her university's relationship with the region she serves. So those are our five panelists. Each has a distinctive perspective.

And I will just say one more word about the opportunity that Title II presents. First of all, it's the rediscovery by the federal government of a mission that it used to think it had. And was wrong. David wasn't really head of AACT forever, because it was I think perhaps even longer ago that the federal government was interested actively in these issues: teacher corps, teacher centers, education professional development at, all disappeared from the repertory. And this is an issue that the federal

government has been unhappily absent from for a very long time. And it's obviously a time of great need and opportunity, which I believe that Terry will cover and tell us about in more detail.

It's also a time in which people are deeply concerned about the relationship of higher education with the schools. And to a decade or more of skepticism about the performance of the schools has been added perhaps an even deeper skepticism about whether or not higher education is going to be able to be of any significant assistance to the schools. So in the larger realm of education policy, it's an extremely salient issue at this time.

So with that context in mind, let's just begin right away and ask Terry Dozier to begin to set the policy, history and framework for us, from her position in the Department of Education. Terry.

**T. Dozier:** Thanks, Mike. As Mike said, my role changed pretty dramatically in 1997. I was asked to leave the department's initiative to ensure a talented, dedicated and well-prepared teacher in every classroom, one of the goals that the president laid out in his 1997 State of the Union address. And in that capacity I'm responsible for coordinating everything that the department does around teacher development and to promote excellence in teaching.

We started by designing, developing a strategic plan. and you're going to be getting a copy. We have basically six objectives, the first of which is to strengthen the recruitment, preparation and support of new teachers. And clearly, when we looked out our six objectives — the other ones focusing on strengthening standards for the profession, improving professional development, strengthening school leadership kind of the traditional role — research, development, dissemination and increasing awareness and measuring our progress around teacher quality — it was very clear, as Mike said, that the federal government really had not done very much to address that first objective in a very long time.

Kind of coincidentally, we had an opportunity to begin to address this, with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that was scheduled before Congress in 1998. And so we began thinking about this.

While we had that as a policy vehicle, it was far from certain that in fact, we would be able to put some federal focus on the front end of teacher development, because, as Mike pointed out, although there has always been a piece in the Higher Ed Act that deals with teacher development, in 1992, when the Higher Ed Act was reauthorized, it was reauthorized with a multitude of small, disconnected programs that really represented kind of everybody's best ideas and then some, and had generated virtually no support.

Although authorized at \$446 million, only one program in 1997 was actually funded, a very small minority teacher recruitment program at \$2.2 million. So, as Congress began to think about and focus on the administration on the reauthorization of the Higher Ed Act, I need to set some context about why suddenly — because we had this lack of interest and involvement in supporting teacher quality, teacher education — suddenly did things turn around.

I think there were a number of factors. First was the fact that as a nation, we had committed — and every state, really — had committed to raising standards for students. This was an effort that was underway in all states. It had been sustained.

And very quickly, policy makers were beginning to understand — it took them a while, but at all levels — that if we were going to raise standards for students, we had to focus on the teachers who would be delivering those standards. If we were going to make sure that the students that potentially will attend UC Riverside have the background that they need, the knowledge and the skills, we have to make sure that the teachers can teach to these higher standards.

I think also in 1996, there was a very important report that was issued by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, chaired by Governor Hunt. The commission had spent two years studying the teaching profession and had uncovered some very disturbing facts, and identified basically five major barriers to successful education reform directly related to the quality of our teaching force. And again, you'll get copies of this.

But very quickly: painfully slipshod teacher recruitment; major flaws in teacher preparation — which, of course, would be our focus; unenforced standards for teachers; inadequate induction for beginning teachers; and finally, the lack of professional development and rewards for knowledge and skills for our teaching force. So that was another factor. This was a much-publicized report, disturbed many people as they looked at the findings.

The third factor was, quite honestly, the changing demographics of the American teaching force, and what appeared to be a looming crisis on the horizon. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, we will need to hire more than two million teachers in the next decade. We've got about a million teachers ready to retire in the next five years, we've got the largest student population in our schools in the history of our country.

Over half of the two million teachers needed will be first-time teachers — newly prepared teachers. So it was clear that the quality of our schools in the next century would rest, to a large degree, on the quality of these new teachers that we prepared.

And then finally I would say that some very compelling and exciting but also frightening research coming out of Tennessee and Texas, that confirmed what parents have always known: that the teacher a child gets makes a huge difference in that child's achievement. And this research showing that teachers are in fact the single most important in-school factor in explaining student achievement.

So I think all of these factors combined explain why there was such a tremendous interest suddenly in 1998 in the reauthorization of the Higher Ed Act as a policy vehicle by which we could begin to address teacher quality.

I will say, however, having worked in this area — and Mike pointed out that I came to the department as a 20-year classroom veteran. And as a social studies teacher, having the opportunity to work up close in helping to craft a piece of legislation and shepherd it through Congress, I would have to redesign all of my lesson plans on how a bill becomes a law. *[Laughter.]*

But despite this great interest in focusing on this, it was far from clear — while I think everybody agreed we had to do something to improve teacher education, it was far from clear what that should be. And I want to just share several kind of disturbing kind of issues that surface very quickly as we began talking with people in a tremendous outreach effort, because it will explain a caution I give you at the very end.

First of all, I want to tell you that not everybody was convinced that we could improve teacher education. I mean, some people quite honestly said that the schools of education were the problem and therefore could not be part of the solution, and so that there were voices out there saying that the answer is "Avoid teacher education altogether, and just simply have teachers with an academic degree."

There were some in the K-12 community that felt that institution of higher education had not been responsive to their needs and their concerns in the past — that teacher education was far too focused on theory and not enough on practice, and that in fact often K-12 educators were treated with a condescending attitude when they wanted to talk about how we might improve teacher education.

And quite honestly, there were some radical proposals on the table to say "What we ought to do is give the K-12 schools — the districts — the money, and let them decide who — or if — they would work with higher education.

And then of course, teacher educators themselves who were very frustrated, and rightfully so, because traditionally, teacher education had been viewed, on many college campuses, as a stepchild of the university, had been underfunded, had been, you know lacking in prestige. The fact that we had so many institutions in America that prepared teachers — quite diverse institutions and the quality of those programs very diverse — led to a very difficult challenge, in terms of developing something that the entire higher- ed community could support.

But despite kind of these problems, clearly, the Clinton administration believed that we had an historic opportunity to dramatically change the way in which we recruit, prepare and support America's teachers. And we were determined not to squander that opportunity. We concluded very early on that we had to develop a proposal that would be coherent, that would be conceptually defensible. We could not afford another hodge-podge of little, small disconnected programs that would not generate funding support.

And we also decided, very early on, that we had to focus title to what became Title II of the Higher Ed Act, on pre-service education: the beginning — the recruitment, the preparation and support for new teachers, not only because we were going to be preparing record numbers of teachers in the next decade, and also because Congress was very seriously looking at duplication in federal programs, and we didn't want to replicate what could already be done, in, for example, the Eisenhower Program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I think the Higher Ed Act obviously argued for a pre-service focus. And we had the opportunity, if we needed to improve in- service — you know, the professional development for veteran teachers — to do that with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act, which we are involved with now. And one reason I'm going to have to leave early today — and I apologize for that.

And quite honestly, we decided we wanted Title II to be a catalyst for change in higher education, because the reality — despite kind of these other voices out there — the reality was that most new teachers will continue to be prepared on our university campuses. So we wanted to design something that would address this.

We set out, in a very systematic way, to get input and feedback from all kinds of organizations and individuals and institutions. We talked with people who have been working on a national level, all the

organizations that had been working long and hard to improve teacher quality, with the researchers who have been kind of synonymous with research in teacher education. We studied our own programs both present and past. We looked back to the old Teacher Corps programs, and so forth; looked at the National Science Foundation — even the medical federal programs that were designed to bring qualified doctors into poor rural areas — to learn, you know, the lessons learned.

We talked to the foundation world. We even held for the first time a forum on attracting and preparing teachers for the 21st century, where we brought the state "Teachers of the Year" together to talk with deans and presidents of institutions that prepare teachers for very candid discussions about what we ought to do.

And finally, of course, in Washington, D.C., you must reach out to all of the education groups, the organizations here, representing both K-12 and higher ed, and of course the Hill.

Despite some of the tension and the controversy, our outreach efforts really did yield some very strong points of consensus. And we tried carefully to build that into our proposal. First and foremost, very clearly, that the preparation of teachers must be a university-wide commitment. It is not the responsibility of the schools of education. It must be the entire university's responsibility.

Second, that you must have strong collaboration. And that collaboration must be across the university campus, with arts and science faculty and ed faculty working together to ensure that teachers have the content-knowledge they need to be effective in the classroom.

But also strong collaboration with the K-12 school systems to ensure that they are equal partners in this preparation, and that teachers are well-prepared — prospective teachers — for the realities of today's classroom, and have strong teaching skills.

Another point of consensus: More clinical experience is needed at a much earlier point in the program of teacher preparation and integration of theory and practice.

Support for teachers in the first three critical years. We can't just prepare teachers in the universities, say good-bye to them, and then send them to a district where they'll be given the toughest assignments with no support. We were losing 22 percent of teachers in the first three years, and in some of our high-poverty communities, as much as 50 percent.

Several other things we've learned is that we had to begin to invest in identifying and rigorously evaluating such practices in teacher education, so we could speak confidently about those programs that were effective. One of my frustrations when people would question me about "Well, who's doing a good job?", is I really ended up having to say to people, "Well, John Goodlatte thinks so-and-so is," or Linda Darlingham [*ph*], and I didn't have the kind of evidence that I would have preferred and to be very comfortable with.

Another very strong message: We needed to concentrate the funding. We could not dribble a little bit of funding out to a lot of institutions. If we were going to make a difference, we had to concentrate funding and we had to sustain the effort. One-year, two-year, even three-year grants would not be enough to show the results we wanted. We needed to have at least five years.

And then finally, we needed to make sure that we avoided models of excellence that would become "islands of excellence" — to be held up and hope that others would copy. But we've done that in the past at the federal level. It hasn't been effective. So we tried very hard to promote the concept of networks with these K-16 partnerships we wanted to build.

With recruitment, we wanted to say — and we learned that loan forgiveness alone is not sufficient. It's a very popular policy approach, but not enough to get teachers where they're needed the most. And we ultimately settled on a "grow-your-own" approach that the foundation world has supported and had some good evidence worked.

I will tell you we struggled quite frankly with the role of states. We knew they played a critical role in setting the policy context, a comprehensive approach to teacher quality. They're there to strengthen to teacher licensure, to hold programs accountable for the quality of teachers they produce, ensure that student standards are aligned with teacher standards. But we were afraid that if we began listing all of these things, we'd be back to that old model that wouldn't get support.

In the end, I think the legislative process I think yielded the right balance We have three competitive program. And Ed Crowe's going to talk a little bit more about those that lay out the role for states for these partnerships and to address teacher recruitment.

I will say that the administration sees these programs as absolutely critical. We are requesting an increase in funding for the program. We have built our ESEA — Elementary-Secondary Ed proposal — to address teacher quality on the good foundation of the Higher Ed Act so they work in tandem — the two Title II's. And for example, we're giving hopefully in our proposal, in the ESEA money to states to address teacher quality comprehensively. Through our competitive grant programs, we'll identify some good state models for that.

ESEA will focus on in-service, but we're building the bridge by insisting that we maintain partnerships between institutions and school districts, and we're asking to focus those partnerships on induction — those first few critical years where you have that intersection.

I will also tell you there's great interest on the Hill with the Title II program. They're watching very carefully the implementation of these programs. As many of you know, there is a strong accountability piece that Congress inserted into Title II where states and institutions must report on how their graduates do, on state licensing exams.

And I have to tell you: Congress is extremely serious about this accountability. I hope that universities and colleges will seize the opportunity to use this in a positive way, to talk about other ways to be held accountable that are much richer than passage rates. But, you know, I just need to tell you, this is very serious.

To try to help in this area, we are also funding the development of a national awards program for model teacher preparation. And we're looking not at input, but at results. We want to know: are there places out there that could show us evidence that they are producing effective teachers, and we are not limiting it to traditional teacher ed programs. If a Teach for America or a school district that wants to prepare its own teachers can show us that evidence, we are welcoming it.

And I would just like to reiterate what Mike said. As a teacher, I'm used to teacher-bashing. I was not prepared for the depth of cynicism that I faced when I tried to talk about our proposal on teacher education. We were almost sunk before we got started, because we were talking about identifying best practices. And even people that I would call, quote, "friends of education," just said "There are no good practices."

Now, I knew that was not a true statement. But the cynicism is very deep. I do believe this is our last opportunity to show that a higher education has a role to play in teacher education, because, as I mentioned earlier, there are other proposals out there, waiting to say "We tried, we gave you the money, it did not work. And therefore, now we can go with these more radical approaches."

So, we are committed, but we're also committed to making sure the money's well-spent. And I know Ed will talk more about that later.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you, Terry. I think we will take a couple of minutes for questions for Terry, since I know she has to leave. Then we'll proceed to Ed. So if there are one or two questions of Terry that will otherwise of necessity go unanswered, let's hear them now.

**T. Dozier:** Although we do have some people in the room here that were heavily involved with our proposal as it went through Congress, so I'm sure other people can answer anything that might come up later.

**M. Timpane:** Okay. Thank you, Terry. We'll turn next to Ed Crowe, in order to talk about the implementations, just as Terry suggested he would. *[Laughs.]*

**E. Crowe:** Yes, thanks. Well, Terry mentioned the research from Texas and Tennessee that confirms the belief of parents that good teaching matters. And I think that's as good a starting point as any to frame the objectives and the current status of Title II.

To begin with, I think there's a common-sense aspect to this, which is that parents want a teacher for their children who has sufficient subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills to understand that child's strengths and weaknesses, and help him or her achieve to their full potential. And I think they want a team of professionals in the school to work with that teacher to make sure these things happen. That's an outcome, and that's a hope I think that most parents have.

But as an outcome, it's now a random occurrence in the United States, not a systematic, predictable result of the billions of dollars we spend in higher education and K-12 education. That's the opportunity I guess that Title II has to try to make a difference there.

As Terry said, there are three grant components to Title II. The first that I'll mention, to tell you what it's about and where we are with it, is the state grants component. It's designed to offer competitive grants to improve the quality of the teaching force in a state through systemic policy and practice changes. Some of those should include: strengthening licensure and certification standards; implementing reforms to hold institutions of higher education accountable for preparing teachers with strong content-knowledge and quality teaching skills. And note I said "institutions of higher education," not colleges of education.

Third, establishing or strengthening alternative pathways into teaching for highly qualified prospective teachers. And fourth, improving linkages between higher education and the schools on a system-wide basis in the state.

The state component of Title II will award \$33.3 million in grants later this summer to approximately 25 states for a three-year grant period. Each state grantee must match 50 percent of the Title II funding, and that's part of our overall institutionalization strategy. We recognize that this kind of change, turning a ship around, takes more than three years. And our funds in all three programs are designed to leverage the use and reallocation of other money toward teacher quality improvement in the country.

Now, what needs to change at the state level? Well, many states currently have weak licensure and certification policies. Their main functional purpose really is to place a body at the front of every classroom. This is done through low expectations for teacher education programs, no accountability, licensure test cutoff scores that are designed to ensure that almost every student passes, and disjointed or non-existent support systems for new teachers.

We think that the key to success to change this at the state level is the leadership of top state policy makers: the governor, key legislative leaders, head of the higher education, the head of the K-12 system, and others, including business leaders. The changes we seek I think cannot happen without the involvement of those kinds of people at the state level. And we expect to see their direct hands-on involvement in the Title II state grants that are funded by the department.

Second component, teacher recruitment, aims to attract and support strong new teachers into teaching by awarding grants to states or to partnerships. The grantees must provide scholarships as well as academic and student support services while students are studying to become teachers. Nine point six million in federal funds will be awarded to about 25 grantees by mid-summer. And for new teachers produced by these projects, effective support systems in the schools where they teach is also a required element of funded projects.

While the scholarship and financial aid assistance, as Terry said, is important, in fact the in-school support systems and the post-graduate support systems are in many ways far more crucial to the success of teachers. The turnover rate of 22 to 50 percent, depending on the school district, is in many ways a reflection of the lack of support that new teachers get when they reach the classroom.

The Partnership Grant Program, which is the component that most directly involves higher education institutions, is intended to focus on the comprehensive redesign of teacher preparation programs. By law, the partnership must include the teacher education program, college of arts and sciences at the same institution, and one or more high-need school districts. Now, it may seem odd to some people that a law specifies that arts and sciences must be involved and it must be at the same institution, but in fact, when we've done workshops around the country informing potential applicants about the program, one of the questions has been whether the college of arts and sciences has to be at the same institution as the teacher program. And my response has been that while it might be easier if they were not, in terms of dealing with those barriers, in fact, not only does the law require it, but of course, so does a successful program.

In practice, we hope that the partnerships that are presented to us as applicants will be as creative and as innovative as possible in the scope of the partnership itself and in the ways they propose to address the preparation of high-quality teachers. We've invited proposals, for example, from partnerships that involve more than one institution, that involve all segments of the campus, and has the active support of top campus leaders. Mike talked at the beginning of the rediscovery of teacher education as a role for the federal government, and that's probably the right term for higher education. Meeting the challenge requires from college presidents, provosts, and even trustees, and it probably calls for structural changes on the campus to overcome the barriers that now exist between arts and sciences and the education programs. The partnership grants will be awarded in late summer to approximately 25 grantees, and will award a total of \$33.3 million.

Now, I think the successful element of this is, or the threshold issue for higher education, is the mission question. And so, for those of you who are involved in higher education, either as college presidents or provosts, it seems to me that your sustained involvement in this change process is really the critical element of success. What we need to see is the institutionalization of a set of values that shows that the entire campus is involved in the change process. And secondly, I think the leadership of chief executive officers, as we heard at lunch, is critical to real partnerships with public schools, that it isn't simply a side activity of faculty, who often are punished for being involved in that.

Without top campus leadership, teacher education will continue to languish as a marginalized activity in many places, and that means that higher education institutions will continue to turn out graduates who are unprepared to be effective teachers, and that those students of those badly prepared graduates will come to our campuses in the future not ready for college — thus perpetuating the high remediation rates and low graduation rates that many institutions have to deal with.

Finally, the awarding Title 2 grants is only the start of the partnership with the grantees themselves. We recognize that this is enormously difficult work or else we wouldn't need the program. And so, the Department will be establishing close working partnership with the grantees, providing technical assistance and networking grantees, working in other ways to ensure that they can meet the challenges that exist in their state or on their campus. We also recognize that successful teaching is only possible within schools that have a strong structure of support for teachers and students, and that's why the administration's request in ESEA, in professional development for teachers and school leaders, is also a vital element of the success of the program.

Thank you.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you very much, Ed. Our next three panelists will both respond and reflect from their particular experiences and expertise on the opportunity that Terry and Ed have just spelled out, both in general and in particular. And we'll start with David.

**D. Imig:** Mike, thank you. Lois Hart, I thank you for the opportunity to do it, and I also want to commend you for hanging in there on a topic that sometimes results in exactly what's happened.

The federal role in teacher education goes back to 1912. Smith-Hughes in some sense set a precedent for teacher education being a federal concern, but the highlighter, the most significant piece of legislation

that's ever addressed this was the Education Profession's Development Act, which in some sense was a second cousin to the original authorization of HEA. And as Mike said, EPDA had a number of programs that were well-funded initially and did a number of extraordinary things.

What, in some sense, Title 2 represents is a totally different strategy in what I call the federalization of teacher education in two ways, one Congressional policy making now is in an arena that's traditionally been the preserve of states and local education agencies, in terms of teacher licensure and in program approval — roles that traditionally have been performed by states now, suddenly, are to be overseen by the federal government. And the second thing, there is a very definite intervention into LEA policy when it comes to hiring practices, the types of people and the procedures to be followed, particularly with a great concern of this Congress and this administration having to do with out-of-field teaching.

The other thing that this Congressional policy did was penetrate to the heart of the institution of higher education in terms of making recommendations around program design, curriculum content and student expectations. And it does so, really, without an outcry from colleagues in higher education or most other places. One illustration of this: the way that we typically prepare elementary teachers today, when an elementary teacher teaches five classes to first grade youngsters, the expectation is that they will in effect have five minors as a part of their subject matter knowledge. What this piece of legislation does is essentially say, no, that's off the books. What we're going to now do is expect states and institutions to redesign their elementary ed program so they have a subject matter major. That kind of intrusion, or that kind of program expectation, I think represents a very intriguing kind of penetration into the heart of the institution.

Why teacher education in this reauthorization? It's because David did such a good job with his colleagues, both at One DuPont Circle and also on the Hill, and there were Title 4 issues. And so it left, in some sense, a vacuum that many, many members of Congress decided to fill, as well as the administration in terms of attention on teacher ed. Teacher education became the focus, and there were an extraordinary range of bills. The issues and concerns that Terry outlined I think are exactly appropriate in terms that they were quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative had to do mainly with a perceived shortage of available teachers to replace a million teachers in the next five years, plus the growth of the system, plus class size reduction expectations and needs. And then there were any number of qualitative concerns having to do with the quality of beginning teachers that grew partly out of both a late development, which was the Massachusetts Teacher Test, but equally important, the surfacing, if you will, of Bill Sanders work out of Tennessee.

The dominant policy vehicle that we all assumed was going to carry this was the NCTAF Report, the National Commission report that Barnett will talk about in a minute, but it had the endorsement of both Democrats and Republicans. It was widely supported on the Hill. Linda Darlingham had done a phenomenal job of intervening in a variety of settings to make sure that that became the focus.

ACT was franchised to represent the higher education community in terms of putting together a coalition in writing a set of prospects for what this could be. And we did so in combination with ASCU, NICU, CIC and ACE. But we also invited the chiefs of state boards and the NEA because of their Professional Standards Board's interest to be a part of that same coalition. And we approached this in a way that we

went to the Hill, and Senator Frist and Representative McCarthy introduced legislation that we championed and believed needed to be done. It essentially was different than the administration's in the sense that it was a heavy reliance on a state presence and we believe that chief state school officers should receive monies and then in turn reallocate it through grant competition within the states to build institutional partnerships.

The second thing we believed very strongly in was a capacity building thrust having to do with partnership grants. We wanted to see many IEG LEA's. Terry talked about this as the "dribble out" approach — that was ours. And the third thing that we thought needed to be done was a much heavier presence around minority teacher recruitment concerns. And we sought in a variety of ways both to maintain the present very small, very tiny piece of authorization that is there, but we also wanted to see a much greater presence for that at the heart and soul of this.

We had three surprises on the way to the legislation. First, the quantity debate that we thought would be paramount was switched over to a quality debate. Fordham, Heritage re-cast the debate as we went into this. Checker, Diane were extraordinarily effective on the Hill in terms of recasting what the discussion should be about.

The second thing that happened was the fact that ed thrust began to surface the Sanders work, particularly the work having to do out of Tennessee and Texas and North Carolina, and what we thought was going to be a capacity building thrust became much more of an accountability thrust. And then I think the third thing that surprised us was the tenaciousness of Terry around what we saw as an effort to build partnership, when we saw as needing to be done was an institutional building. The administration very clearly wanted to champion the idea of pilots or demonstration sites, or much more of an effort to create a limited number of places that could represent the very best. What we were trying to do, obviously, was to spread resources.

What we got, I think, as Ed explained a minute ago, were three very interesting grant programs — one to build capacity of the states, the second to build these unique but very important partnerships, and the third to take on the task of building a recruitment capacity to bring more people into the system.

We also got something we didn't expect, and that has to do with Section 206, which is an endless array of reporting requirements, not by ed schools, necessarily, but by institutions of higher education that now have to report on pass rates of students on various types of assessment, to the states. The states in turn compile data, draw comparisons, and make recommendations to the secretary, and the secretary now is obligated to make an annual report to the Congress on the quality of teacher education.

Problems unaddressed — there were two issues that we never found a satisfactory response to. Mike is going to take care of these. One is we're going to see class size reduction or we're going to see professional development. And I think the community has an obligation. Everything we're trying to do right now to build coalitions across K-12 and with higher education is to prevent any possible separation.

The connections between higher ed and the schools, the connections around professional development, the connections and the importance of expanding — and the expectations and the need for higher education and ed schools to be more accountable is what we're about.

Thank you.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you David. Barnett.

**B. Berry:** Thank you very much, Mike. I'm going to provide just a very brief context for the work of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future just a bit more than both Terry and David supplied here.

The Commission, with the launch of its report in 1996, "What Matters Most," posited a pretty transformative, a very transformative blueprint for totally changing the way we recruit, prepare, license, pay, develop, evaluate teachers, and also the schools in which they work, so the knowledgeable teachers can actually be put to good use. The foundation, the funders who pushed the Commission and the good work of those 26 commissioners said "Do not let this well-written report stay on a dusty shelf, go do it." So, since 1996, now 14 states have become involved in a formal state partnership network to begin to put the pieces of the teacher policy puzzle together. In addition, now nine urban school districts are involved.

If you guys cannot tell, y'all, I'm from the South, and now we have four partner states in the region, and now launching, as Mike mentioned, a new center, an off-shoot of the National Commission, that's going to focus on alliances and support for not only the four state partners in the region but also other states that want to work together in a like kind way.

Now, I've had — what I'd like to do in the next few minutes, just in a few minutes, is speak to some issues that I've been fortunate enough to kind of uncover, unravel over the last couple of weeks. As a part of our new center, what we're trying to figure out, in Ed's and Terry's state partnership grant proposals, of those seven or eight southeastern states, what's going on there? Well, I had the privilege of reading these proposals and begin to do a diagnosis even before these folks get funded, and I have some ideas, and I'd like to put those on the table for us to consider, in light of these matters in terms of school-university partnerships. And I think there are some pretty profound lessons to be learned already.

Basically, in my diagnosis of these eight reports, or your proposals, excuse me, I found basically four major issues at hand. One, state proposals for what they want to do, there's far more convergence than divergence. You're almost struck like a brick on your head at how much similarity there is and what the states want to do. However, to point number two, it's clear from these proposals that the capacity for these states to deliver on their four priorities or their eight priorities vary greatly from state-to-state. Point three, some states appear to be very good and have lots of strength from certain aspects, of maybe the teacher licensure, whereas another state is much better off in focusing on teachers' professional development. So, you can see where there can be some marriages made for sure.

And finally, and related to all these, it is clear that if we can figure out how to bring some states together, we can do a heck of a better job very quickly, because virtually all of the knowledge that needs to be in place, put together a more systemic approach to teacher development so that every kid gets a highly qualified, caring, competent teacher, by the year 2006, which is the Commission's goal. We can do so if we can find ways to bring folks together.

Let me tell you some of the four big issues that I found out in the initial analysis that I've done. First of all, every state — well, virtually all the states want to launch teacher quality data centers. Three of the states

already have the beginnings of the architecture and the like. But guess what, none of those states seem to know what the other states are beginning to do. This is especially interesting in light of the complexity of the indicators that the states want to address. For example, every state wants to collect good data on out-of-field teaching. Guess what? Every state has a different definition for what out-of-field teaching is right now. Every state wants to have very good data about teacher tests, as required also by the Higher Education Act. Guess what? Every state, even though there's more similarity from the South from the rest of the country, every state uses different tests, with different cut scores, and the like. Huge problems.

Even on a more simple-minded note here, every state calls different teachers with different characteristics or qualification a different type of teacher. Some states use the exact same labels for different qualifications and the vice versa, some states using the same sort of label, or different labels for the same qualifications. So, when we start thinking about where states are, how well we're doing, there's a lot of cross-state pollination or alliance work that needs to be done in this area.

The second major area that the states want to work on is performance based education licensing and induction systems. I could speak for 30 minutes just on this issue right now and the issues involved here. But a good one, I know one that David Imig is very involved with and is interesting in pursuing, is already pursuing, is that performance based license systems require performance based education. Performance based education requires new teaching and learning strategies in higher ed. It requires instructional modules. It requires scoring rubrics for higher ed faculty to use to judge how their candidates are performing. Well, the thirteen-hundred-plus institutions of higher ed in this country that prepare teachers, all do no have to prepare all these modules all independent of each other — a huge issue.

Next big issue, every state wants to really work on what they probably consider one of their greatest needs, is the content-specific teaching knowledge — not just content, content-specific teaching knowledge of their in-service teachers. Not a state has an idea about how to inventory what their teachers really know relative to their K-12 standards and assessments. Not a state really has a way to inventory what their teachers really need to know and be able to do.

At the same time, let me argue that we do know a lot more about professional development that leads to student achievement gains, the kinds of gains that you see in places like Tennessee, Texas, North Carolina, Connecticut and the like. However, we do not have a very good system of putting legs on those ideas and concepts and models. And we can do that, and especially I was very much impressed by the earlier conversation today by Mary Beth Susman, in particular — Kentucky is one of our partner states — on how the virtual university can help start delivering these sorts of models and ideas to the schools and universities in ways that can make a big difference.

A couple more points that jump out at me that I think were worth nothing, and then I'll turn it over to Sally, one is the universities have a strong obligation to do several things, I think, here. One is we can start developing research and field based advanced degree programs that can support cohorts of teachers in schools and school districts working on solving the real educational problems with children and their families. Research and field based advanced degree programs — not ones that are necessarily housed and taught and delivered on our campuses, but actually in the field solving real educational problems.

Universities are good at data collection and research — at least I think they're supposed to be good at that, right Mike? The Commission has pointed this out — this is a big issue here — we do not have an overall shortage of teachers in this country. We all know that, even though we do need to hire 2.2 million teachers over the next ten years. We can produce enough, we just do not produce the right ones in the right fields who will go to the right places. Universities can play a great role, especially in these data centers in the Southeast and around the country, in doing a much better job of identifying the supply, demand and distribution of our teacher ed students in our university systems. I would argue, David, that not all of our 1,300 institutions in this country that prepare teachers ought to all be preparing all the same kinds of teachers. I think some institutions might could get better at preparing some kinds, and ought to be awarded for that. And if a state or region needs certain types of teachers, institutions ought to be rewarded for producing those types of teachers.

And then finally, I will make a note, as Terry already ran off to discuss ESA, I would love Title 1 funding to eventually support school-university partnerships and look in high poverty schools systems and schools in the same way that Medicare has been used to support university-hospital partnerships in medical education. So, the kids that we saw today on that video, that wonderful video early this morning, that school — New Hollow, is that right? All Hollow, excuse me, yes — a fascinating school in the Bronx, those kids would get a lot more money, would follow them, that school would be over-staffed and would be a laboratory for doing the kinds of things we know how to do, and to seriously put some legs on these ideas and knowledge that we do indeed have.

Thank you.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you very much. Now, from the campus itself, Sally.

**S. Clausen:** I can't imagine what would be more challenging than being the very last speaker, at the last part of the day, after a very nice full lunch, when there's been so many other wonderful speakers ahead of me — but, nevertheless, that's my challenge.

**M. Timpane:** That's why we chose you. *[Laughter.]* We knew you could rise to it.

**S. Clausen:** Yes. Thanks a lot for the extra pressure.

I'm going to put a couple of things in context so that you will hear from me why I think it's important from the perspective of a university president that these initiatives are helpful and are going to make a tremendous impact. I'll define for you about little bit about the school and the state. As most of you know, Louisiana has the highest percentage of children living in poverty than any other state in the country. Nothing to brag about, but the reality is there, and we must deal with it, and we must deal proactively with it.

Secondly, we also have significant health-related problems, partially directly correlating with the poverty. But in addition to that, there are other factors. The university that I have served for the last four years is a very traditional campus; 15,300 students, a regional university, open admission, many, many highly accredited programs. The college of business brags about, and rightfully so, that it's nationally accredited, one of only 20 percent in the country. The nursing school has the only graduate consortium in the country.

It's producing outstanding nurses. The college of education has great licensure passage. We are the largest teacher preparation program in the state. We train new principals. So we have much to brag about.

There is another factor, though, when I arrived that I thought was interesting, and that is, because it's open admission, we also have a college of basic studies. And within that is a department of developmental education, whereby we receive those students who are underprepared. About 50 percent of them come from high schools, and they are not prepared to take college-level credit.

Our very best teachers — many of our very best teachers; I need to be very careful — many of our very best teachers happen to be concentrated in that department. As a matter of fact, the department of developmental education has won more awards nationally because they have taken students from almost impossible levels of preparation to commencement. Now, the down side to that is it's taken them much, much longer; somewhere between six and 10 years before they get there. And, of course, that's time and that's money.

The challenge with that is to change that picture, because it is so costly. And most of our teachers, our faculty, are not professionally trained to be teachers. So the success of that program could be emulated across the campus. The challenge was to drive those costs back to public schools and to partner in such a way that the public schools first wanted us there and to keep standards high and expectations high.

The result is, I had to pay a few teachers extra who were volunteering to go into the public schools to work at that change. When I asked them what their barriers were very, very early on in the process, they said, "Very simple: You are. You don't talk about it. You don't look at it. There's no rhetoric about it. And you don't pay us for it. So we're not planning to do it." So they changed me in the process, quickly.

*[Laughter.]*

But, bottom line, in one year's period, we took the schools that were giving us the highest number of remedial students, underprepared students, gave them an opportunity to self-select into a program after they were interviewed, if they wanted to take an extra class that might qualify them to test out of remedial education by the end of the school year and high school. The cost factor was phenomenal. We had to use only three schools because nobody else in that area wanted to participate because it meant extra work.

But the bottom line is after teachers partnered with other teachers where there was an innovative and progressive principal, at the end of the year, ACT scores increased by an average of four points; one intervention, now. Portfolios graded by faculty at the university, who did not have a name on them, 84 percent of the students tested out of remedial education before they got to college, in this case Southeastern. And we've begun to track those students for success.

The bottom line to that is that these teachers were able to partner in such a way that it changed not only scores, but it changed self-esteem of the students. The confidence level changed. Because I started talking about it a lot — went to the school boards, went to the legislature, brought the students who had changed their attitudes and their behavior, brought principals and teachers with me to the board meetings — the focus began to change on attitudes about "This is not bad."

The business leaders saw that this was a cost-effective way to ultimately save money. The social scientists thought that this was a feel-good right thing to do. I found a little more money in my budget that

I could turn around and change the reward system just slightly so that the faculty on campus, who were second-class and third-class citizens because they were, quote, in "developmental education," suddenly became somewhat important. And the culture started shifting slightly.

The challenge then was to get a couple of people from the biological sciences — they're the key members of the faculty because they bring in so much money from grants and research — to add to that a blending of the arts and sciences and education faculty, who would be able to partner together because there was an opportunity for both of them to get money if they worked together, and then they would get even more money if they partnered with a business and a local school system. So they found that not only were they getting recognition, they were getting a little extra money, they were actually becoming the key people on campus.

The bottom line to this is this is possibly transferable to our colleges of education because we have the exact same factors there. It's not fair to ask faculty in the college of education to teach teachers about the socioeconomic challenges of our children who are coming from backgrounds that are so diverse.

Teaching reading really is rocket science when you are trying to teach to a child who has no support, no breakfast, nobody at home that is going to read to them, no books at home, probably, if they decided to read by themselves. So the challenge for faculty is to blend together, to understand that teaching really is the essential profession in all professions. And if we are going to make that impact, that change occur in our school systems, it's going to take the entire university to do it.

So these initiatives give me a little ammunition so that I don't take it immediately out of my budget, but I can say, "Not only are you getting a little recognition here; you're getting some national exposure. You are the very people that's going to change the culture of the entire campus." I need these kinds of initiatives from a principal — I mean, from the president's perspective, because I cannot change behavior alone. And changing the culture in the colleges of education is challenging and it is going to require the resources of everybody.

I'm coupling that with if we can change behavior in this little setting that draws from the most conservative district in Louisiana to the most poverty-stricken, and do so at the last year in high school, when students had already decided they were not going to college, or if they were, they'd already planned to go into remedial education to see if, in 10 years, they might be able to get out, then I believe it can be done much easier and much more cost-effective if we move that down a few grades, and even much more so if we start at preschool and K through 3.

The second component of that is we are wasting, I believe, a lot of resources with our students. In an effort almost out of necessity, because there is also a drinking problem on campus, I pulled the sororities and fraternities together to challenge them. Money, too, was the incentive, of course. And they got paid \$500 a semester per fraternity if they chose service, coordinated service, as a component of their brotherhood and sisterhood.

The bottom line to that is the service was also designated by me, and they had to go into the public schools and read. They didn't have to do anything else. They didn't have to monitor. They didn't have to be big brother or sister. They just had to show up, they had to look nice, and they had to communicate.

I have — in fact, I brought a letter that one of the principals just faxed to me as I was leaving today, and I'd like to read part of it to you, because I invited the superintendent and a few principals to join me. I figured if the students were going to show up at 7:00 in the morning, they were going to be serious. And the only reason they'd show up in the morning is if I fed them. And so you feed them and you pay them and they do pretty much what you want them to.

This comes from Tamman *[sp]* East Side Primary School, and it is from a principal who is one of our more progressive principals. She was delighted to attend the breakfast meeting with all of the fraternity and sorority members, and "Thank you for allowing me to participate. In all my years as an administrator, this is one of the most direct positive changes that I've seen. The children were touched by" — and I call this the Southeastern Reads; I took it from the America Reads that President Clinton initiated — "have begun to lower the rate of absenteeism. Grades are improving. Discipline problems are declining. When we began discussing our extended school program this year, the students wanted to know if the America Reads/Southeastern Reads tutors would be here to read with them. I can say from one principal's perspective that my students, who have no one to read to them at home, no one to come home to at night, no one to wake them up in the morning, no one to prepare breakfast, have been helped through this program significantly. Please continue it. Please use your students and your faculty in the school setting."

The dramatic changes that these are beginning to make is my students are going to bed a little earlier at night. They really are responding, and they're coming back to say, "You know, this has helped me more than it's helped them, and I'm going to be a little bit more involved than you asked me to, because it's kind of neat."

So I guess my closing remark is as we move more forward into the technological revolution — which we all must, because there are wonderful opportunities there — it is very important that we not forget that the human touch, the caring attitude that one sees on another person's face, is going to be so very significant for us to keep those little people from becoming angry because they did not get the right start or the same start that some of their peers have received.

And it is so much more cost-effective to respond to initiatives like this than it is to wait until they get to college, hope that I can provide enough counseling to wipe that chip off their shoulder — if there is one, because they've not received the support — and hope that I can get enough remedial teachers to concentrate on small faculty-student ratio to make a difference. Then I think that I will be able to make an extremely broader impact if we've moved all of these programs down to the high schools and the faculty and staff see that they are rewarded for services as well as for their publications.

Thank you.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you very much, Sally. I think the bookends which Terry and Sally have provided to the panel have been extremely important to recognize. From the kinds of ambitions and hopes that the administration and many others started out with when they tried to construct Title II to the kinds of on-the-ground initiatives, not even funded by Title II yet —

**S. Clausen:** Yet. *[Laughter.]* I'm anxious to respond to Art's invitation.

**M. Timpane:** — that are possible where there is campus leadership and campus initiative. So unless the members of the panel want to comment on what one another has said, I would open it up for any questions or comments that might come from the floor. Robert.

**Participant:** Bob Shireman *[sp]* with the James Irvine Foundation in San Francisco. I wanted to ask about two trends happening in California — they may be happening elsewhere — and what their implications might be for how we're thinking about future training. One is teachers who are getting their teaching credentials from someplace different from where they got their baccalaureate. The two private colleges — the two largest producers of credentials in California are private colleges that have satellite campuses all around the state. These are returning adults. And in most cases they had nothing to do with that institution in the underlying four-year degree.

The second trend is that many of the people in the credential programs are already teaching under emergency credentials in the classroom, and so it's really more like in-service training than pre-service training, yet they're taking the courses that were supposedly designed for pre-service, because that's what they need to get their credentials. How does that affect how we're thinking about teacher training?

**M. Timpane:** Barnett and David.

**B. Berry:** I'll jump quickly into a huge can of worms that you've opened up here. You are now speaking to many of the vexing issues that confront us as we construct accountability systems to try to capture which institutions are doing a better job in producing teachers when, first of all, so many of the teachers out there were not prepared anywhere — that's the emergency credentials — or ones, which is very difficult to track, where they really got their training. And it speaks to those issues I raised in my remarks about how different states use such a vast array of different tests and use different modules of those tests.

So I think what this whole system, this effort is going to do — and I think really maybe the best benefit that may arise from the accountability side of this — is going to force this country to talk much more seriously about how much we've undervalued teacher knowledge and is going to force us to get much more straight about a much more coherent system that we need to create. And so that may be what really arises from this. At least I hope so.

**M. Timpane:** David, do you want to take it?

**D. Imig:** Sure. Bob, I think you raise a whole set of interesting and perplexing problems. Cal State teaches, obviously, one response to this. And I think what the chancellor is trying to do, in creating a distance learning program, an open university model, to cater to the needs of 35,000 teachers who don't have full credentials, is, one, very important, and a very interesting response.

The second thing I'd say very quickly is within that context, it's important to note the disagreement I would have with you is within Cal State, you're not going to take pre-service courses. The intent of that effort is the tailor-made program for people, in some sense starting where you are and meeting the needs that you have to become fully licensed or fully credentialed in the California system.

The third response — and this gets back into the Title II framework — one of the intriguing things that we've been trying to track is the whole development of the guidelines, the regulations that are going to

govern Section 207. There are now 25 pages of definition for four pages of, you know, legalese. And those 25 pages get at the kinds of problems that you're talking about, one of the most intriguing of which is, who ultimately is accountable for the preparation of the teacher candidate?

Now, if National University in San Diego is, in fact, the largest producer in California, and yet the people there that are attracted into the program come from all over the country, who's responsible for that is an issue that we're trying to go back to the people on the Hill and raise. And there have been enormous debates within both the NCES, and there is a parallel initiative that we and ASCU and a number of other groups are doing, trying to get some greater definition and greater precision in these report cards. But the place of record is a big issue when it comes to being held ultimately accountable.

**E. Crowe:** Could I make a comment about that also?

**M. Timpane:** Please.

**E. Crowe:** First of all, I guess, on a less serious note, that ratio of four pages of legalese to 25 pages of definition seems about right; I don't know. *[Laughter.]* But more seriously, I think the question for a state is, their states are allowing people with a variety of credentials or non-existing credentials into classrooms. That is a state responsibility. When you look at state

When you look at state licensure and certification systems, they resemble Swiss cheese often in the variety of ways people can get to the classroom. And I think part of the Title II accountability provisions will make it clear to the public and to policymakers what that block of Swiss cheese looks like in each of the 50 states. Senior state policymakers in many states do not understand how their licensure and certification systems work. They do not understand that a high pass rate does not equal high quality, for example.

Secondly, we hope that the state Title II grants in states that receive them will address these issues first by being candid with themselves about what's wrong with the system, and secondly, looking very hard at solutions that make sense for that state.

**M. Timpane:** Please.

**Participant:** I would be interested to know if your experience at Southeastern University in Louisiana has been thoroughly documented every step of the way, because these are the kinds of examples — and there must be others — that we need to be collecting as vital information as we go ahead to make some basic changes in the system.

**S. Clausen:** Yes, it has. I'll be happy to share it with you in terms of the process and in terms of the results and what we're doing now to expand that university-wide. It has extraordinary implications for my teacher preparation, which I believe is off now to a fairly good start, not that there weren't strong people there before. But they are not asking for a blending of arts and sciences in education. They are now recognizing that they just can't do all that we need to do, and that is to follow our teachers the first three years, to be there when they need to, to be on call, to actually be prepared to receive merit pay based on how well the students achieve out in the schools, because they have trained those teachers. They're

coming along. And it is necessary to have it well documented. Believe me, they've checked me very carefully to make sure it was.

Thank you. I'd be glad to share it.

**M. Timpane:** I'd like to ask a follow-on question to the panel, which is, generally how well document are these kinds of initiatives? I mean is there a body of knowledge out there?

**S. Clausen:** No. No.

**D. Imig:** No, I think that's one of the challenges locally known, but not nationally.

**S. Clausen:** That is a correction too. It's locally documented, but ...

**M. Timpane:** David, you have a few seconds.

**D. Imig:** The important thing that I would want to highlight is what Sally just suggested, and that is that the responsibility of the university, of the college, of the ed school is for the graduates at least three years later. Now those of you with higher education roles, think of the consequences of that. But this is something AECT is embracing. We're saying that we want to be held ultimately accountable, that ed schools should be held ultimately accountable for the success of their graduates with their students three years out, and that every ed school has to be able to begin to document it, not just where their teachers are, their graduates are, but how well those graduates are doing with their kids. And the researchers in the room will immediately say, well, there're a hundred intervening variables that you've got. Right, Art? And yet we're coming back and saying, "We absolutely have to do that. That's the only ultimate accountability measure that the public and the profession can accept."

**S. Clausen:** I'd like to add to that, please. That was the challenge before me, too, when I first had it in the dialogue. But the reason the department of developmental college was successful is because they were held accountable for how well their students advanced. And it didn't matter whether they had 10 jobs or whether they were poverty-stricken or whether they hated school and hated everybody else. They were basically responsible for whether they advanced or not, and they got money whether they did.

So frequently I found my faculty calling them at home, calling the parents, finding out whether they were going to bed at night. They took it upon themselves to figure out how to make that kid move forward. And I don't mean kid in a demeaning way, because 4,000 of our students are non-traditional, over 25 years old, and they have full-time jobs. But the bottom line is they believed they were responsible for them. They got paid for it. And, yes, there were many other variables. But it works.

**B. Berry:** I just want to quickly say, kudos go to both Sally at the institutional level and David at the professional association level. These types of approaches are going to finally help us bring together both the K-12 system and the higher ed system in very profound ways. You know, up until now, teacher ed, if it had failings — I would point to the fact that it's just been teacher ed and school districts are like two ships passing in the night. Even when good work is done on both ends, they just don't match. And now these types of efforts can really take us a long way. And again, kudos to both of you.

**M. Timpane:** Any other questions? That seems like an appropriate last word. *[Laughs.]* As 4:00 approaches, Lois and Art, are we going to take a short break? Yes?

No ... Are we going to have a rolling back?

**A. Hauptman:** Yes.

**M. Timpane:** Thank you.

Let me then just thank my panelists who were both informative and insightful and obedient. *[Laughter.]*

**D. Imig:** The latter being the most important.

**M. Timpane:** The latter being the most — as any teacher will tell you, the latter being the most important, in the sense that they stuck both to their assignment and to their time lines with exquisite precision.

So thank you very much.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF PANEL ON TITLE II TEACHER QUALITY.]*

**A. Hauptman:** My assignment is to wrap up a day long discussion when the temperature in the room, because of the camera lights, is twenty degrees hotter than the weather outside, which is already Washington summer. And it's especially nice to do it when so many of the people before you have been so eloquent and you have to follow them. So in order to avoid that assignment, I'm going to ask if anybody would like to make some comments on the day, and then I'll wrap up.

*[Laughter]*

That's what friends are for.

The forum began with how the three initiatives in the Higher Education Act — GEARUP and Distance Learning and Teacher Quality — represent a break in the tradition in relying on federal student aid as the vehicle for the federal government to support higher education. And I want to begin these concluding remarks on this theme of the change that these initiatives represent. So the first question is, how are these initiatives different from the student aid programs? What is the break in tradition here?

It seems to me there's three principle differences or contrasts. One is the importance of evaluation and feedback in the new initiatives. If I may say, the student aid programs have been notorious in not being performance based. There's almost been a gut reaction to not having to worry about whether or not, for example, students actually complete the programs they start as a function of the student aid programs. By contrast, the new initiatives are critically, in their essence, performance based. And as a result, evaluation and feedback will be much more key in these new efforts than it has been in student aid, and, as David Longanecker pointed out, you can't really reward performance if you don't measure it.

So the first point is that we have to have a commitment to measure it. And I think one of the reassuring aspects of the discussion today is that each of the new initiatives has that component built in. GEARUP has an evaluation component as part of the legislation. There also appears to be a critical need, and a recognition of a critical need, for identifying best practice and what works in terms of GEARUP, and to spread the word and to intervene while the process is going on, that is to find out what's working even as we're experimenting and to recalibrate. And in Distance Learning, the notion of evaluation dovetails exactly with a performance based orientation of especially competency based distance learning. And in the case of the federal student aid demo and distance learning evaluation is critical to see what's working with regards to these other models of student aid.

And in Teacher Quality, Terry Dozier mentioned that identifying best practice is critical. So in these initiatives, we have the foundation at least, if we follow up on it, for evaluation and for feedback, and that really is different from the student aid programs and their history.

The second difference is the importance of building partnerships. This was a persistent theme today, perhaps an over persistent theme, but federal student aid again, in contrast, has typically gone it alone and expects others to follow. The notion of partnerships in the federal aid programs really has been absent. In contrast, all three of these new initiatives are premised to the notion of partnerships that leverage change. Now some of these partnerships are the usual suspects — school/university, public/private, federal/state — but some are less traditional partnerships and those were the ones that were most interesting: Ray Orbach, in terms of the University of California, Riverside, the university

community partnership — the fact that they have involved the community; Sally, in Louisiana, involving the community, something that seems obvious, but we don't tend to do it as much as we should.

One of the, I think, key issues today in terms of GEARUP and Trio was the notion of GEARUP and Trio as a partnership, not as competing interest for scarce funds. So there's a new kind of partnership that I think will be critical to success. And another somewhat less additional is consortia of institutions, particularly in the case of distance learning where it really doesn't make sense for one institution to provide distance learning. It makes sense for a number of institutions to achieve the economies of scale.

And David Mundell raised I think the critical issue, which is what's needed to make these partnerships happen? It's fine for us to talk about it, we always talk about it, but David I think argued persuasively that these — that having a partnership is tough work. It's tough sledding. And you need incentives to sort of keep you motivated to do it. And have we built the incentives into the system to do that?

And then the third major difference, I think between the new initiatives and the student aid programs is that the new initiatives are not student aid. There's an increasing recognition that student aid is not enough. Larry Glido [sp] and Scott Swail have made that case quite persuasively. That's been an argument that's been around for a number of years. The basic point is that student aid is necessary and not sufficient.

Do we have enough microphones now?

And because of these differences between the new initiatives and the student aid, it seems to me there's a need for change in two different directions. One is to use the new initiatives to complement the ongoing student aid effort, to recognize that student aid is not enough and to give it more umph. But it's also important to consider changes in the student aid programs that will enhance the chances of success of the new initiatives.

So what needs to be done to help improve those chances of success? Is it ideas or is it money? We had that question today. And obviously the answer, preferably, is both.

In terms of adequacy of funding, we can't afford to starve the new initiatives, but unfortunately, this puts us in the familiar battle between existing programs with existing constituencies and new programs with future constituencies not yet heard from, but ultimately to be heard from. But we need to recognize that you have to fund a critical mass of partnerships, of projects, to give the new initiatives a chance. So how do we resolve this inevitable conflict between large needs and limited resources? The answer, at least a large part of it, is the partnerships and the collaboration and the matching elements. And this might be the critical difference between the new initiatives and the student aid, the notion that you match, that you get other parts of the community to get involved, and that you build the programs that way.

And then the other theme was the program design and implementation. So we have program funding on one hand, and we have program design and implementation questions on the other. And several principles, I thought, emerged today for guiding both the legislative design and implementation, and Steve Zwerling I thought was very helpful in offering the perspective of the Ford Foundation and the evolution that it's had over time. And he talked about that they have now shifted to what he called an aligned reform strategy rather than a constituency based reform. And he talked about cross-sectoral operation rather

than sector specific as they initially started at the Ford Foundation in the 1950s and 60s. And he also talked interestingly about education reform not just about school reform. So I thought the experiences of one of the major partners was very instructive.

And Ray Orbach in his luncheon speech, when you boil it down, what's been the success of UC-Riverside in increasing the participation of traditionally represented groups? It really comes down to an integrated approach that includes extensive outreach, a rationalized student aid set of policies, centers on campus, and curricular reform and relevance.

And ultimately, all of this is all of this is how do you systematize and institutionalize what has worked in pockets, and how do you go to scale? That's been one of the big issues. And that's where we're really trying to get at here.

But beyond the principles of aligned reform and cross-sectoral focus and comprehensive approaches, what specific things should be done to increase the probability of success? And at least two areas were identified for specific steps, one was issues of simplification of student aid, and the other was possibly modifications in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In terms of the student aid changes it's important to move beyond the traditional discussion that we tend to have in talking about student aid of the need for more funds, and at least to start with the constraint — there are not new funds, what can we do within that constraint?

And I thought perhaps one of the most intriguing ideas today was Juliet Garcia's concept of eligibility zones rather than individual eligibility for student aid, similar to empowerment zones in the housing and inner city developments. Interestingly, that concept of an eligibility zone is very similar to a component of Congressman Fattah's initial proposal, which was to designate an entire cohort of students as eligible for student aid, an entire school if you will, an entire class, rather than to identify individual students. And unfortunately, in my opinion, that proposal seemed to get lost on the cutting room floor of the legislative process, but it has a tremendous potential for streamlining where it can be a very complicated situation. I mean, if you say to somebody, "You are eligible because of where you go to school or where you live, and you don't have to go fill out the financial aid form in order to qualify for this particular set of benefits," that might really change the nature of the debate. And no matter how hard we've over time to narrow down the student aid form, we always seem to end up with more items on it rather than less, so maybe we should think about going in a different direction.

And, in general, the suggestion to make student aid more student based than institution based, to be a mechanism to help students rather than to help institutions finance themselves I think is a concept we need to spend more time on. It was most noticeable today in the distance learning area, and in terms of student — Bob Albrecht's comment about student centered records of progress, and even one suggestion of a student based accreditation process rather than an institution based accreditation process. And finally, in terms of the ES, modifications in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which was forthcoming or upcoming, let me go back with to what Mike Smith began the forum by noting, that there's already a built-in integration in the nature of these programs, but there can be carved out an additional role for the higher education initiatives in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And Barnett Berry mentioned school-university partnerships as integrated into or as part of ESEA for purposes of improving teacher quality. And Sally raised a number of possibilities in terms of teacher compensation and incentives.

And I guess I'll conclude by saying that's in a sense just a start. I mean we really just scratched the surface about what we might do in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And so we hope — Lois and I hope — that this discussion represents more of a beginning than an exclamation point, start for a conversation that hopefully will keep going. Now I'm instructed by her to thank everyone for coming, which is why we have co-collaborators here. And I will. Thank you for all coming. And Lois would you like to say something?

*[REMARK INAUDIBLE.]*

**A. Hauptman:** Today's proceeding are available and posted at the Brookings website, known as [www.brook.edu](http://www.brook.edu). Really, thank you for coming.

*[APPLAUSE AND END OF EVENT.]*