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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?
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>TOTAL</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>

Roles of Different Sectors In The State’s System of Higher Education

Distribution of Total 12-month Unduplicated Undergraduate Headcount: 2008-09

<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>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - U.S.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Shortfalls Without Educating Adults?

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>

Higher Education Performance in Illinois

- Declines in performance since mid-to late-1990s
- Gaps in performance within the state:
  - Lower in Chicago
  - Lower for Blacks and Hispanics than Whites
  - Lower for those with low- than high- family income
High School Graduation Rates in Illinois Increased Somewhat

http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew/index.html; Illinois State Board of Education,
http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getSearchCriteria.aspx
But, College Participation in Illinois Declined

Chance for College in Illinois by Age 19, 1992-2008

College Affordability in Illinois Has Declined

Change in Constant Dollars, 1999 - 2009

College Completion in Illinois Has Increased but Remains Below Top States

Change in Completion Rates, 1998 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Bachelor’s Degree Completion Rates</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes are Lower for Blacks and Hispanics than Whites in Illinois

Percentage of Adults Age 25 to 34 in Illinois With at Least an Associate’s Degree, 2007

- **White Non-Hispanic:** 49.6%
  - 54,572 more degrees needed for Blacks to reach parity with Whites in degree attainment

- **Black Non-Hispanic:** 28.1%
  - 121,809 more degrees needed for Hispanics to reach parity with Whites in degree attainment

- **Hispanic:** 17.6%

Importance of Improving Performance in Illinois: Workforce Demands

Projected Growth in Jobs in Illinois By Level of Education Required: 2008 to 2018

No More than H.S.: 148,000
Some Postsecondary Education: 418,000

Importance of Improving Performance in Illinois: Demographic Trends


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Demographic and Housing Estimates, 2005-2009
Need to Improve Performance in Chicago

Chicago is home to 22% of the state’s population

“Quite frankly, if you’re going to make any in-roads in the areas that need improvement - the low percentage of 18 to 24 year olds enrolled in college, for example - you’ve got to go to Chicago. When the whole population of the state is projected to increase only 6% in the next 20 years, if you’re going to make any advancement as a state, you’ve got to get it from Chicago.”

(State Policy Expert)
Need to Improve Performance in Context of Fiscal Resource Constraints

- Declines in state revenues = Declines in higher education appropriations
- Temporary tax increase approved, January 2011
- State budget cuts projected to continue due to projected structural deficits
Structural Budget Deficits = More Cuts

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

Explanations for Performance in Illinois

State Planning and Leadership:
- Inability to establish shared goals and priorities

Strategic Use of Available Fiscal Resources:
- Failure to allocate available resources strategically to meet state goals & priorities
Clearly defined and shared statewide goals and priorities for higher education in Illinois?

IBHE’s 10-year strategic plan:

*The Public Agenda for College and Career Success*

- Comprehensive BUT does not identify priorities or specific measures

Forces contributing to lack of shared statewide goals:

- End of “system of systems”
- Political corruption and inattention to higher education by state leaders
- Lack of accountability for higher education performance
- Challenges coordinating across sectors and levels
System of Systems Dissolved

Illinois Board of Higher Education, created 1961

• Before 1995:
  • Worked with leaders of 4 “systems”
  • Presented “united front” on higher education issues
  • Example of success: Priorities, Quality & Productivity Initiative

• After 1995 Reorganization:
  • Works with leaders of 9 systems and universities
  • Focus: respond to Legislature, generate reports, perform regulatory responsibilities
  • Signals of challenges:
    • Perceived to be “weak and ineffective”
    • High rates of turnover of executive director and chair
Political Corruption & Inattention to Higher Education by State Leaders

**Perception:** Limited capacity for state higher education leadership

- Last governor to actively support higher education served more than 10 years ago
- Legislature partisan, lacking consistent and substantive leadership
- State higher education agencies and institutions act independently
- Appointments to higher education boards of questionable caliber
Actors perceive limited state capacity to establish shared goals and priorities for improving higher education:

“There is almost no identifiable intentional public policy toward Illinois higher education at this moment. We have had 10 years of Governors who really haven’t cared about higher education policy. We really haven’t had anybody in the General Assembly that cares about higher education policy. And quite honestly, we have not had the capacity within the Illinois Board of Higher Education to lead on higher education policy.”

(Institutional Leader)
Higher education perceived to be low priority for Governors over past decade:

“When Blagojevich was Governor, he had an anti-higher education mentality. Everybody’s strategy was to keep your head down, don’t do anything that will call attention to you because then you’ll be in the line of fire. He really set higher education back in a big way.”

(State Policy Expert)
Lack of Accountability for Higher Education Performance in Illinois

Incentives for institutions to improve performance

- At time of our data collection:
  - None
  - Some state leaders interested but skeptical that possible

- Recent developments:
  - Higher Education Finance Commission report, November 2010
  - Performance funding bill passed and signed
  - IBHE charged with developing implementation proposal

Use of available data to identify & achieve state priorities

- Some strengths
  - High School Feedback Reports

- Weaknesses
  - Use of data (Education Sector, Data Quality Campaign)

- Beginning Illinois Longitudinal Data System
Challenges Coordinating Across Education Sectors and Levels

High school - college curricular alignment
- Exam required for high school graduation
- Some institutions have set cut scores
- PARCC state

Transfer and articulation
- Illinois Articulation Initiative, 1993
- Some success - but challenges remain

Role of P-20 structure
- In statute (2007)
- No funding
- No appointments until 2010
Dimensions of Strategic Allocation Of Available Resources

- Policy Shift Away from Need-Based Student Aid
- Declining Support for Students in Independent Sector
- Lack of Planned Approach to Tuition
- State Appropriations Not Aligned with State Priorities
Policy Shift Away from Need-Based Student Financial Aid

- Strong historic commitment to need-based aid (MAP)
- Shortfalls in funding in recent years
  - General Assembly reduced funding for MAP by $200 million in July 2009; funding restored
  - Continued shortfalls: Available $$ awarded on first-come, first-served basis
- IBHE identified options to improve use of MAP funds
  - No consensus on how to proceed
Declining Support for Students in Independent Sector

Historically:

- MAP and other state grants used to promote enrollment in private colleges and universities

More recently:

- Some programs cut
- MAP remains primary lever BUT declining share of MAP $$ go to students in this sector
Lack of Planned Approach to Tuition

Individual institutions set own tuition
  • Tuition = increasing share of educational costs

Truth in Tuition Policy, effective 2004-05
  • “Puts 4 years of tuition increases in every single year” (State leader)

State leaders frustrated by rate of tuition increases AND lack of links between appropriations, aid, and tuition
State Appropriations Not Aligned with State Priorities

- State appropriations for higher education increasing at slower rate in Illinois than nationally
- No incentives for performance in funding formula
- Support for research eliminated (State Matching Grant)
- Lack of resources to expand pilot programs (College and Career Readiness Pilot Act, Baccalaureate Completion Grants)
- IBHE adopted “investment approach” to budget requests BUT not effective in holding line on cuts
Conclusions For Illinois

- Need for improved performance
- More funding is not enough
  - Performance declining before economic downturn
- Need to develop policy leadership capacity
- Some promising steps: Higher Education Finance Commission report
  - Reform MAP
  - Performance funding requirement
- Question: State leaders able to achieve consensus on statewide goals and priorities, coordinate and collaborate, and strategically use available resources?