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What We Know about State Higher Education Performance

**Measuring Up** - Biennial state-by-state report card

- Identifies state performance on indicators of:
  - Preparation
  - Participation
  - Completion
  - Affordability
  - Benefits

- Does not reveal:
  - Reasons for high or low performance
  - Reasons for changes in performance
Overarching Research Question:
What is the relationship between state policy and higher education performance?
Research Questions

1. What is the **performance** of higher education? How has performance changed over time?

2. What is the **context** that informs higher education performance? How are aspects of context changing? How does the state context influence the policy options considered?

3. What **policy levers** have been used?

4. What is the **relationship** between **policy levers** and higher education **performance**?
Methods: Case Study Research

5 States
- Georgia
- Illinois
- Washington
- Texas
- Maryland

Data Sources
- Quantitative data
- Reports and documents
- Interviews

Data Analysis
- Case study report for each state
- Cross-case analysis
## Number of Interviewees Per State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Higher Education Leadership</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Political Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 and P-16/P-20 Education Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Research/Philanthropic Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase in Degrees Required to Reach International Competitiveness Goals by 2020

Annual Increase in Degrees for 55% of 25- to 64-Year Olds to Have at Least an Associate’s Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Current % of Adults with College Degrees</th>
<th>Annual Percentage Increase Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - U.S.</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analyses by National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 2010
## Roles of Different Sectors in the State’s System of Higher Education

Distribution of Total 12-Month Enrollment in Degree-Granting Institutions: Fall 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Public 4-year</th>
<th>Public 2-year</th>
<th>Private NFP</th>
<th>Private For-Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - U.S.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2010*
32 of 50 states cannot reach international competitiveness goals without increasing degree attainment among adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Need to Educate Adults?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (2008)
Higher Education Performance in Georgia

Despite modest improvement, Georgia’s performance is below the national average.

Low performance masks even worse outcomes for Black, Hispanic, and low-income students.

Difficulties in transfer and articulation between the Technical College System and the University System of Georgia.
High School Graduation Rates in Georgia have Increased Slightly

Graduation Rates

Percentage

1998 2008

Education Week

2010

GA Department of Education

N/A*

*Data are not comparable across years due to a change in definitions

College Participation in Georgia has Grown

Percent of 18 to 24 Year Olds Enrolled in College

- Nation
- SREB Median
- Georgia

College Affordability in Georgia has Declined

Change in Constant Dollars, 1999 to 2009

- Median Family Income: -7%
- Public 4-Year Tuition: 49%
- Public 2-Year Tuition: 30%

Georgia Trails the Nation in Bachelor’s Degree Completion Rates

Change in Completion Rates, 1998 to 2009

- **1998**
  - Georgia: 42% (Six-Year Bachelor’s Degree)
  - Nation: 52% (Six-Year Bachelor’s Degree)
  - Georgia: 23% (Three-Year Associate Degree)
  - Nation: 29% (Three-Year Associate Degree)

- **2009**
  - Georgia: 47% (Six-Year Bachelor’s Degree)
  - Nation: 56% (Six-Year Bachelor’s Degree)
  - Georgia: 29% (Three-Year Associate Degree)
  - Nation: 29% (Three-Year Associate Degree)

Outcomes are Lower for Blacks and Hispanics than Whites

Percentage of Adults in Georgia with at Least an Associate's Degree, 2007

- **White**: 50%
- **Black**: 30%
- **Hispanic**: 20%

50,000 more degrees needed for Blacks to reach parity with Whites in degree attainment.
46,000 more degrees needed for Hispanics to reach parity with Whites in degree attainment.

Importance of Improving Performance: Workforce Demands

Projected Growth in Jobs in Georgia by Level of Education Required: 2008 to 2018

- No More than H.S.: 160,000
- Some Postsecondary Education: 306,000

Importance of Improving Performance: Demographic Characteristics & Trends


- **Black**
  - U.S.: 12%
  - Georgia: 29%

- **Hispanic**
  - U.S.: 15%
  - Georgia: 8%

Source: U. S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Demographic and Housing Estimates, 2005-2009
Challenge to Improving Performance: Fiscal Resource Constraints

Declines in state revenues =
Declines in higher education appropriations

2011-2013 budget reduces appropriations to public 4-year institutions by 24% over 2007-09 and assumes 20% increase in tuition

State budget cuts will likely continue given projected structural deficits
Structural Budget Deficits = More Cuts

Projected State and Local Budget Deficit as a Percent of Revenues, 2016

Source: Don Boyd, Rockefeller Institute of Government, 2009.Courtesy of Dennis Jones and Jane Wellman
Explanations for Performance in Georgia

Strong state policies on economic development and workforce readiness

Absence of sustained policies to improve preparation, transfer, and data use

Weak linkages between state finance and state goals/priorities
Theme 1: Strong State Policies on Economic Development and Workforce Readiness

State policies are sustainable and encourage effective partnerships between higher education and industry.

HOPE Grant and accessibility of the Technical College System account for popularity in workforce training and certificate programs.
Georgia Research Alliance

Encourages cooperation among business, universities, and state government

Established in 1990, the Georgia Research Alliance has leveraged $525 million in state funds into $2.6 billion of federal and private investment

Limited institutional membership and sustained state support contribute to strong performance

Workforce Readiness

HOPE Grant provides financial aid for those seeking certificates and diplomas

Quick Start program promotes collaboration between the Technical College System and companies that need workforce education

Synergy between HOPE Grant and Quick Start programs facilitates access and affordability for those seeking workforce training

Theme 2: Absence of Sustained Policies to Improve Preparation, Transfer, and Data Use

P-16 efforts encouraged, but not well supported

Difficulty in transfer from the Technical College System to the University System of Georgia

Needed improvement in data collection/use
P-16 Initiatives During a Succession of Governors

A leader in P-16 efforts since the early 1990s
- Regional and statewide P-16 councils

P-16 efforts remain vulnerable
- Changing P-16 efforts under different governors
- Turnover in Alliance of Education Agency Heads
- Absence of sustained academic and fiscal policies for P-16 programs

Transfer from the Technical College System to the University System of Georgia

Within the University System of Georgia, transfer works well
• Core curriculum

Articulation between Technical College System to the University System is more difficult
• Recent expansion of transferrable general education courses to 27
• Students receiving HOPE Grant for non-degree work are not guaranteed HOPE Scholarship upon transfer

Data Collection and Accountability

Georgia lacks an integrated data system for K-12, University System of Georgia, Technical College System, and Workforce

Individual agencies report performance data and accountability measures
• Education Scoreboard - Governor’s Office of Student Achievement
• System Scorecard - Technical College System
• Enrollment, financial aid, degrees, students, and faculty reports - University System of Georgia

Race to the Top
• $32 million to improve data systems
• Create P-20 data system and interagency data sharing agreement
Theme 3: Weak Linkages Between State Finance and State Goals/Priorities

Finance policies out of sync with higher education goals

Changes to HOPE Scholarship and Grant

Consequences of state finance and enrollment policies
Finance Policies Out of Sync with Higher Education Goals

State leaders have been unable to maintain stable funding for higher education

Governor makes key decisions about higher education appropriations

Legislature’s authority is restricted to approving or reducing governor’s budget request

Funding formulas for USG and TCSG do not incent innovation or productivity
Finance Policies Out of Sync with State Goals

HOPE Scholarship is a merit-based award

HOPE Grant is for non-degree seeking students

HOPE lottery funding not sustainable
  - Nearly $750 million spent on HOPE programs in FY2011

HOPE Scholarship
  - 2/3 of students do not maintain eligibility
  - Students not eligible for HOPE upon admission unlikely to earn it

Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program -
  - Need-based
  - Total funding of $1.5 million

HOPE Programs have been Modified Due to Limited Lottery Revenues

Changes to HOPE Scholarship and HOPE Grant

- HOPE Scholarship is now a partial-tuition award, still requires 3.0 GPA
  - Zell Miller Scholarship is full tuition award, requires a 3.7 GPA
- HOPE Grant students must now maintain a 3.0 GPA
- HOPE for students at private institutions has been reduced

Utility of HOPE program as a tuition-limiting tool has been broken

Signaling effect of HOPE has been complicated by modifications

Changes to HOPE Grant may undermine the state’s effectiveness in awarding workforce certificates

Consequences of State Finance and Enrollment Policies

Few state policies are in place to counteract stratification by race and income

- Blacks and Latinos are disproportionately enrolled in for-profit, TCSG, and less selective USG institutions
- Less selective institutions enroll smaller shares of HOPE Scholarship recipients and larger shares of Pell Grant recipients
- Students in the highest family income quintile receive higher amounts of state grants than those in the lowest income quintile at public 4-year institutions.

Conclusions For Georgia

- Strong support for research, economic, and workforce development
- P-16 efforts have been established, but are vulnerable to leadership changes and budget priorities
- Transfer and articulation between Technical College System and University System of Georgia was problematic, but new policies may address the issue
- Lack of finance policies that incent improvements in performance
- Financial aid policies are likely to increase gaps in performance by income and race