WILLIAM J. HUGHES
CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY
THE RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

POLICY STEERING COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Higher Education Strategic Information and Governance (HESIG)

September 25, 2013

Darryl G. Greer, Ph.D.
Senior Fellow, Center for Higher Education
Strategic Information and Governance
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

STOCKTON
NEW JERSEY'S
DISTINCTIVE
Public College

WILLIAM J. HUGHES
CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY
THE RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

Agenda for September 24 – 25 Meeting, HESIG Policy Steering Council

September 24

6:00- 7:00pm	Reception at the Seaview
7:00- 8:00pm	Dinner Welcome – President Saatkamp

September 25

8:00am	Breakfast in Campus Center Meeting Room 5
8:30am	Introductions – H. Kesselman, Provost and Executive Vice President HESIG Mission & Day's Objectives – D. Greer
9:00am	Topic #1 – Trends Affecting the Future of Higher Education Provocateur – D. Jones (NCHEMS)
9:15am	Discussion
10:15am	Break
10:30am	Topic #2 – Measuring and Articulating the Value of College Provocateurs – D. Hurley (AASCU); R. Hendricks (NJ Secretary of Higher Education)
10:45am	Discussion
12:00pm	Lunch
1:00pm	Topic #3 – Making Governance More Effective Provocateurs – J. Wellman (NASH, AGB); R. Novak (AGB)
1:15pm	Discussion
2:30pm	Summary, The Role of HESIG – D. Greer
3:00pm	Adjourn

STOCKTON
NEW JERSEY'S DISTINCTIVE Public College
101 VERA KING FARRIS DRIVE, GALLOWAY, NJ 08205-9441
609-626-3542 • www.stockton.edu/hughescenter

Meeting Summary

Higher Education Strategic Information and Governance (HESIG)

Policy Steering Council

September 25, 2013

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

The Higher Education Strategic Information and Governance (HESIG) Policy Steering Council Meeting Summary
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
September 25, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND MEETING FORMAT

The Higher Education Strategic Information and Governance (HESIG) Policy Steering Council is supported by a grant from the Stockton President's Strategic Initiative Fund. HESIG deeply appreciates the support of President Herman Saatkamp and his executive staff in providing funding and guidance for the meeting. Special thanks, too, are extended to Provost, Executive Vice President Harvey Kesselman and the Academic Affairs team, CEO of External Affairs and Institutional Research, Sharon Schulman, Director of the William J. Hughes Center, Dan Douglas, and the staff of the William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy for significant assistance. Finally, the meeting could not have been successful without the outstanding planning and support efforts of Aliyah Montague.

The second annual meeting of the Council was facilitated by HESIG Senior Fellow, Darryl Greer. A briefing book was distributed prior to the meeting, with background materials to support topics under discussion. The meeting agenda, list of Council members, discussion questions and an introductory essay, as well as HESIG's mission statement and 2012- 2013 accomplishments are appended. More information, including bios on Council members, can be found in the briefing book, and at www.stockton.edu/hughescenter/hesig.

HESIG acknowledges the generous contributions of national experts Dennis Jones, Dan Hurley, Richard Novak, and Jane Wellman, who led discussion topics, and to New Jersey Secretary Rochelle Hendricks who consulted on the meeting agenda. The Council was not asked to reach consensus about agenda topics; but instead to provide candid advice about how HESIG might address them, within its mission. Central questions throughout the discussion were: What needs to get done; who is responsible; and what role can HESIG play?

FINDING SOLUTIONS, BUILDING PUBIC TRUST IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

The HESIG 2013-2014 initiative, "Finding Solutions, Building Public Trust in an Era of Change," in partnership with others, aspires to facilitate state and national reexamination of critical policy issues affecting college opportunity. The Council advised HESIG to continue its' mission- focus on recommending strategic policy action; promoting public engagement for constructive change, using scientific polling; and serving as an "honest broker" by convening educational and policy leaders to find solutions, free of political and institutional self-interest, in service to the broader public good.

National data expert Dennis Jones, President of the National Center for Higher Education Management Information Systems led a discussion of economic, demographic, and technology trends affecting higher education. Key factors included New Jersey's unique autonomous governance structure and a rapidly changing college-bound and college-completion population, including older adults.

Other expert policy analysts leading discussion topics included Dan Hurley of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and Richard Novak and Jane Wellman, both of the Association of College and University Governing Boards.

A FRAMEWORK FOR HESIG PRIORITIES

Last year the Stockton HESIG Council made recommendations on helping to improve college **affordability** and **completion**. This year the emphasis is on the issues of defining **college value** and improving **governance accountability**. Some of the Council's top advice includes:

On college value:

- Define value in a manner that relates directly to the educational needs and aspirations of students served and others supporting higher education, especially recognizing the rapidly changing college-bound population.
- Partner closely with K-12 policy makers and business leaders on emerging national core academic standards and new assessment tools for school completion and college readiness, a matter on which Stockton currently plays a state leadership role.
- Assure that college value is tied explicitly to measureable, mission-related educational outcomes, and especially to degree completion and affordability.
- Communicate the educational and economic value of college in a manner that is understandable to citizens and diverse constituencies that is transparent about cost, and emphasizes public benefits.

On governance reform:

- Engage boards of trustees actively on strategic trends, and emphasize internal policy reform needed to achieve long-term mission- related goals.
- Expand partnerships that engage new business approaches and educational delivery technology, and help boards understand their changing role and scope of authority.
- Actively work with the state to strengthen the composition of boards, trustee education and self- evaluation, the trustee appointment process, and appointment of highly qualified citizens to new affiliated organizations.
- Involve others from business and nonprofit backgrounds to provide guidance on good governance practice from outside of higher education.

During 2013-14, HESIG will hold two regional "roundtables" of New Jersey college and policy leaders; conduct a second Stockton scientific poll on accountability issues; and continue analyses of "best practices" to promote positive college policy reforms.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION HIGHLIGTS BY TOPIC

Topic #1- Trends Affecting the Future of Higher Education

New Jersey's colleges and universities are among some of the most productive in the nation, in terms of degree production for revenue from all sources. Yet, much more needs to be accomplished to achieve the national goal of 60% of New Jersey citizens completing at least two years of postsecondary education by 2025. Indeed, notwithstanding the state's degree productiveness, and highly educated population, New Jersey has the 6th highest "achievement gap" to overcome, to meet the 2025 goal.

Accordingly, the state must continue to shift its policy focus from simply college access to one of completion, especially for adults and the emerging population, which will consist of greater numbers of ethnic and racial minorities and new immigrants. This is especially important as the state faces for the next decade a 10% decline in the number of high school graduates that are college bound, following more than a decade of growth in college-bound traditional aged students.

Key questions for meeting the challenge of demographic change include: How is college financed; how is it kept affordable; how are new educational delivery models integrated; what is the effect on educational quality, and perceived value; and how are colleges held accountable for outcomes and sustaining public trust?

Given New Jersey's special governance structure, built on a foundation of institutional autonomy, the Council stressed the need to focus policy formation on "purpose" rather than "power" relationships, and on "cooperation" as well as "competition."

The Council made several suggestions regarding these challenges:

- Use college autonomy, providing greater flexibility to manage change as a strength to focus individual institutions on policy solutions to help accelerate college completion; especially for traditionally disadvantage and adult populations.
- Simultaneously, use autonomy and existing state coordinating structures (Secretary, Governor's Council, Presidents' Council, and Sector Associations) as a means to further cooperation with others, to partner with the state on broader programmatic policy change, and to strengthen data analysis and college performance/educational assessment capacity that enhances the ability to meet statewide needs.
- Recognizing the needs of a changing college-bound population, actively cooperate to revise institutional and state-level budgeting practices that facilitate productivity, affordability and integration of new business and educational delivery models that are equitable, understandable and sustainable, and that serve a public agenda for higher education.

Topic #2- Measuring and Articulating the Value of College

Council members acknowledged that, as reflected in opinion polls and international comparative studies, citizens continue to have high aspirations for postsecondary education, and place high value on its importance to future opportunity. Yet, more questions are being raised by citizens and policy makers about the "return on investment" for the cost of college, and the appropriate balance between private and public benefits derived from a college education. Some members stressed that the renewed focus on value has been accelerated by public disinvestment (state funding cuts relative to other expenditures), rising tuition and loan indebtedness, and success on extending college access, not by a conscious public policy decision to diminish higher education's importance.

A recent American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) Task Force report (Creating a New Compact Between States and Higher Education, 2013) was used as an example of making college a higher state priority, and building greater public trust. Highlights of the discussion to improve defining and communicating the value of higher education in an era of change included:

- College value should not be defined simply as an economic benefit/workforce development matter, but also in broader terms about its intrinsic value to individuals and public benefit for a prosperous, civil democracy.
- Value should be aligned with a broad statewide agenda and with the needs of citizens with aspirations for college, especially minorities, first-generation and adult students.
- Colleges should improve how they communicate and demonstrate college value by clarifying purpose for different constituencies with different expectations of need; in short, define value based on outcomes for different audiences, including students, parents, policy makers, and businesses.
- Institutions should refrain from defining value from a defensive position driven by lost public revenue, cost constraints, and emerging new educational technology, and instead stress resilience, adaptation, transparency, and willingness to embrace new cost and educational delivery structures that enhance quality as well as affordability.
- In light of the national movement toward a K-12 Common Core Standards, and the outcomes assessment movement on school completion, college and workforce readiness, colleges should especially partner with school leaders and policy makers to provide leadership on this important agenda.

The Council advised HESIG to: help bring greater coherence to consideration of quality, value and financial reform, for example on the issue of performance funding of colleges; add to the understanding of the public benefits of college, informed by citizen input; complement the significant role Stockton is already playing in facilitating New Jersey higher education engagement of the school completion/college readiness/ assessment agenda, closely tied to reducing the educational achievement gap; and promote public consideration of college value in concrete ways tied to greater transparency regarding cost, pricing and expected outcomes, rather than in the abstract.

Topic #3- Making Governance More Effective

The Policy Steering Council focused HESIG's attention on New Jersey's special institutional and state governance structures, and the need to help address governance accountability in a concrete manner, not abstractions about campus autonomy v. state control. Regarding trustee governance much of the discussion took place within the context of the recently announced AGB National Commission on University Board Governance. Changes in who goes to college, how it is financed, how it is valued and held accountable, raise significant questions about: the role and scope of responsibilities of boards of trustees; new thinking about faculty involvement in "shared governance;" the structure and functional capacity of governing boards; how they relate to and support presidents; and how they establish policy to achieve missions.

- Members stressed that governing boards, in an era of change, will need to reassess not only traditional principles of campus governance, but also take on new responsibility for a broader strategic perspective on institutional accountability aligned with a larger public agenda. Accordingly, governing boards should have an understanding of trends affecting the institution beyond a college's immediate boundaries; focus squarely on changing board authority as new partnerships are created; examine overlapping responsibilities of the board as a policy body with other organizations, and help the president to sort out increasingly complex administrative responsibilities, including with new "helping organizations" created through private partnerships.
- Furthermore, boards should ask how they help an institution interpret and communicate the broader public interest. This will require that the board, with significant leadership from the president, examine how to consult with other constituencies in support of policy decisions. In this respect, the role of the president as chief executive and as a trustee is especially important to provide leadership on trustee education and development.
- On the state level, the Council advised continued close cooperation and coordination among the Office of the Secretary and others to create the resources needed to conduct objective analyses of trend data and to inform governing bodies about interactive goals and desired policy outcomes. The state can assist by making timely appointment of highly qualified, non-partisan citizen trustees, who are responsive to particular needs of a college, as well as aware of the broader state context within which the college operates.

HESIG is especially encouraged to: engage and involve in its work a broad set of individuals from outside of higher education, including from business and nonprofit organizations, who might share useful perspectives on governance accountability; encourage regular evaluation of board and presidents' performance capacity based on state and national standards of best practice; prepare analyses, conduct scientific polling, and disseminate information that provides greater awareness of trends affecting governance, that provide a context for policy considerations, that add value to governing boards, and that aid boards in engaging citizens and others outside of higher education.

Appendix A

HESIG Policy Steering Council Members 2013-14

- Robert Altman, Trustee, The College of New Jersey
- Peter Caporilli, CEO, Tidewater Workshop
- *Jessica Carey, Student Senate, Chair Legislative Policies & Gov't Affairs, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Carmen Jordan-Cox, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, Rowan University
- Daniel Douglas, Director, William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Stanley Ellis, Trustee, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Darryl Greer, Senior Fellow, William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy
- Martin Grogan, Executive Associate for University Budgeting, Rutgers University
- *Rochelle Hendricks, Secretary of Higher Education, State of New Jersey
- David Hespe, President, Burlington County College
- Dan Hurley, Director, State Relations and Policy Analysis, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Dennis Jones, President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
- Claudine Keenan, Dean of Education, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Harvey Kesselman, Provost and Executive Vice President, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Michael Klein, Chief Executive Officer, New Jersey Association State Colleges and Universities
- Aliyah Montague, Staff to the Council, Master's Degree Candidate, Higher Education Administration, Drexel University

- Larry Nespoli, President, New Jersey Council of County Colleges
- Richard Novak, Senior Vice President, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
- Robert Polakowski, Vice President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (representing John B. Wilson)
- *Jon Regis, President and CEO, Reliance Medical Group
- Herman Saatkamp, President, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Sharon Schulman, Chief Executive Officer of External Affairs and Institutional Research, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Jane Wellman, Executive Director, National Association of System Heads, Founding Director, Delta Project on Postsecondary Costs, Productivity and Accountability
- Linda Wharton, Associate Professor of Political Science, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- *John B. Wilson, President and Chief Executive Officer, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
- David Wolfe, Assemblyman, District 10 (Ocean)

***Denotes a council member unable to attend the meeting**

Appendix B

HESIG Policy Steering Council Meeting, September 25, 2013

Discussion Questions

Topic #1: Trends Affecting Higher Education

1. What trends provide the greatest challenge/opportunity for colleges and universities?
2. What is superfluous, and inhibits finding clarity?
3. How should these trends be connected and communicated to policy makers and citizens, and internally, to lead to action on policy reform?
4. What do colleges need to do to improve strategic planning to address trends coherently?

Topic #2: Defining the Value of Higher Education

1. How should higher education define its purposes and value, qualitatively and quantitatively?
2. How do colleges structure messages to engage citizens and policy makers in a conversation about value, beyond the issue of cost and price?
3. How do colleges enhance the intrinsic and practical value of a degree?
4. How do colleges avoid adding programs and services at the margin to increase value, and instead enhance the core academic experience by reengineering cost, and increasing degree completion?

Topic #3: Governance Reform

1. Given emerging trends, how is the role of the governing board changing in relation to state and federal policy makers; and in relation to internal stakeholders?
2. In advocating less external regulation to provide college leaders with greater flexibility to innovate, what is the role of the board in assuring quality and public accountability?
3. As public colleges create more private partnerships and generate more non-business- related revenue, what is the evolving role of the governing board?
4. In an era of enterprise, greater competition for students and dollars, how does the structure of a board need to change? How does the board hold itself, presidents and others accountable for effective performance?
5. How does a board create new processes to encourage engaging the broader community served by the college?

Appendix C

Centrifugal Forces and Future Directions For Higher Education

A lot can happen in a year; and it seems that it has. While environmental, if not substantive change, is typically the norm, change is happening in American higher education at a more rapid pace than in many years. At the HESIG Policy Steering Council Inaugural Meeting, during June 2012, members identified **core financial support** for colleges and **access/affordability** as the top two issues facing colleges and universities. Sustaining public trust and increasing degree productivity/completion, followed on the list of top issues, with concerns about governance and regulation bringing up the rear as matters of principal concern.

Several new issues, including the **value of college,** and **governance** have joined the mix of "top of mind" concerns about where we are headed as an enterprise, and how we might get there. The big question affecting hope for accomplishing the promise of American higher education rests largely on how resilient and innovative colleges and universities can be in managing the centrifugal forces pulling apart long-standing policies and practices, while sustaining important centripetal values that help bring coherence to higher education's broad public purposes. What is clear on the horizon is that colleges and universities have significant opportunity to shape a brighter future by tackling creatively many of emerging challenges facing them today.

Trends Driving Change

1. Significant Financial Constraints- Perhaps no other issue drives college leaders' worries more than how to sustain financially the core enterprise. Earlier this year Moody's issued a very sobering "negative" outlook for higher education, projecting more limited public financial support, and a significant limitation of colleges' ability to increase net revenue from tuition and fees. Such a projection places great pressure on colleges to constrain cost, reduce dependence on price increases, and to reduce aspirations for facilities that increase debt service. Universities are forced to rethink traditional practices concerning more efficient use of faculty, support services, facilities and the effectiveness of the traditional academic calendar. In brief, in light of growing fiscal constraints, most analysts agree that the basic financial model sustaining colleges for decades requires a major overhaul.

2. Questions About the Value of the Investment- Following several years of intense policy focus on increasing educational productivity and degree completion, the even larger question of the value of college, including private and public cost and benefit, has emerged as a leading concern. Several studies have been published which confirm that individuals that attend college earn more and suffer less from economic downturns than do those without a college degree. A very recent OECD report confirms that this is true on an international scale, and goes farther to illustrate that college graduates not only earn more money in a lifetime, but also enjoy broader personal and social benefits, than do individuals without tertiary education. The OECD analysis finds, too, that the benefit of investment in college outweighs the public and private cost of college, and furthermore that the United States does not spend significantly more on higher education as a percentage of GDP, than most industrialized countries.

Yet, with all of this information, the critical policy question about the overall value of college remains a hot topic among policy makers and citizens, perhaps driven more by the perception of high price/cost, than any other single issue, as well as growth of interest in alternative, lower cost approaches to service delivery. Blurred lines about colleges' missions is another contributor of questions about value, as two-year and four-year colleges extend academic programming, and non-traditional colleges offer a wider variety of degrees. In a nutshell, higher educators and others are grappling with how to define and talk about the value of college, during a time of policy uncertainty. The matter of college value is at the heart of building greater public trust.

3. Concern about Inequity of Opportunity- It is paradoxical that the citizens strongly support broad college opportunity and hold high aspirations to attend college, but increasingly question its value. And it is disheartening, following decades of effort to expand college opportunity for low-income and racial/ethnic minorities, to observe how much more needs to be done to accomplish greater equity in college access, especially to highly- selective private colleges that receive significant public subsidy. Recent studies showing the paucity of low-income and minority students attending and graduating from elite private colleges underscore the need for larger policy examination not only of recruitment and admission policy, but also fundamentally of institutional and national student financial aid and pricing policy.

4. Accountability for Attainment and Completion- Encouraged by foundations such as Lumina and Gates, policy makers are actively considering adopting incentives for colleges to help students complete degrees faster, and performance measures to account for college effectiveness. A majority of the states have adopted, or are considering some form of performance-based budgeting for higher education. Closely tied to the performance/completion agenda, many advocates of college opportunity and policy analysts assertively tie college completion policy to school and college readiness programs to help close

the educational achievement gap for minority and low-income students. Accordingly, colleges are being pushed to be more accountable for retaining and graduating the students they already serve, and to be more effective in partnering with schools and others to increase the chances of historically disadvantaged populations and adults achieving access to college, and degree completion.

5. Uncertainty about Student Financial Aid- Our federal student financial aid structure, built on the foundation of "choice," among many types of colleges faces stronger calls for policy reform concerning both equity and performance. Related to issue # 4, need-based student aid coupled with need- blind admission policy at highly selective private colleges has hindered opening the doors of elite colleges for greater numbers of low-income students. Reform of student financial aid, reigning in loan subsidy and tying Pell Grants to academic performance, are high on the agenda for Congress during consideration of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

At the state level, where only about 10 states account for two-thirds of all need-based financial aid, the slow growth economy and demands on state treasuries from other government agencies, indicate slower growth in these programs, and greater rationing of assistance to fit the student population. Some states, too, are considering linking grants to educational performance measures. A lingering question behind these issues, often not explicitly articulated is: Who pays for, and who benefits from the significant amount of money invested in student financial aid?

6. Governance Reform- Following several years of intense policy focus on accountability for college pricing and educational outcomes, the issue of governance rises as an important topic on the college reform agenda. Policy advocates concerned about college effectiveness are turning more attention to the role of governance in setting educational and financial policy, recognizing that new business models and new educational delivery methods cannot be developed effectively without review and reform of governance practices. As new educational delivery modes evolve, clearly the matter of the role of faculty in academic governance must be addressed.

AGB's recently created Commission on Governance is a case in point. As it relates to quality assurance and reform of business practices during a time of fiscal constraints, and greater competition for students, governance at the institutional and state levels is likely to get more attention. Greater tension between capitals and public college campuses is likely to be fostered by increasing demand from policy makers for more accountability, and on the other hand, colleges' desire for less regulation and greater policy flexibility, as they develop new business practices with limited public financial support.

7. Explosion of Interest in Technology- Not too long ago, few educators knew what a "MOOC" was. Within just two years, most individuals around higher education know more than they wanted to learn, with higher education news outlets covering the topic relentlessly. The rapid emergence of interest in Massive Open Online Courses is a proxy for much broader consideration of changing the long-standing place- bound face-to-face approach to delivery of traditional college education. Initial excitement about what MOOCs might accomplish through competency-based, modular e-learning, has cooled, as many private companies and college partners have experimented and learned that new technology in itself may not be the panacea for delivering low-cost "all-the-time" learning to the masses. Huge policy issues beyond course content must be overcome concerning the efficacy of a business model, student equity, and ultimately assessment and certification of learning outcomes. Still public policy makers, together with colleges and university systems (as in CA) are likely to encourage vigorously new modes of delivering higher education, using technology.

8. Demographic Shifts- One of the most fundamental issues providing a platform for reform of higher education policy rests with the matter of which citizens will attend college in the first instance. The demographics and geography of higher education deserve significant attention, too. In some cases colleges themselves may be more attuned to shifts in prospective student populations than are public policy makers. As a recent WICHE analysis indicates, some states will lose population and will experience a downturn in high school graduates headed to college, while others will experience significant increases. Ironically, many of the states facing population increases lack the tax base to expand higher education aggressively, while many of the states shifting to fewer students graduating from high school will have some of the most mature higher education systems with larger student capacity.

Certainly, given the diversity of demographic and financial change facing states, one-size-fits-all policy approaches to college access, affordability and accountability are an undesirable and unlikely outcome. Instead, different states will adopt different strategies to provide college opportunity for their citizens. Accordingly, this suggests that the environment may be rich for analysis of local and regional policy solutions to the challenges facing higher education; and certainly points to the need for assertive engagement of citizens as well as policy makers on a local level, to build support for policy change and mutual trust in proposed solutions.

Darryl G. Greer, HESIG Sr. Fellow, William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy
August 11, 2013

Appendix D

Top Higher Education Policy Issues- 2013

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB)

1. Value of Higher Education
2. Public Policy Mixed Messages
3. Fiscal Constraints
4. Future of Student Financial Aid
5. Student Attainment
6. Quality Assurance
7. Tax Policy

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)

1. Institutional Performance
2. State Operating Support
3. Tuition Policy
4. Student Financial Aid Grants
5. College Readiness
6. Immigration
7. Competency Based Online Education
8. Guns on Campus
9. Economic/ Workforce Development
10. For Profit College Consumer Protection

Appendix E

Higher Education Strategic Information and Governance (HESIG) Mission

The mission of HESIG, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, is to serve as an agent for constructive higher education policy change, by recommending strategic policy action aligned with a public agenda to serve the public good. Guiding principles include: enhancing college access, affordability, college completion, productivity, accountability and public trust. Initially, the Center will focus, partnering with others, on identifying effective models for financing public colleges and building new partnerships to achieve these ends.

The Center, affiliated with the William J. Hughes Center for Public Policy, collects, analyzes, evaluates and disseminates objective, timely empirical information and governance best practices critical to the delivery of quality higher educational service. An important goal of the Center is to inform higher education leaders, policy makers and citizens to help bridge the gap between policy and practice; to align better higher education policymaking with the long-term needs of the citizens, institutions, and the state; to share comprehensive trend and performance indicators; and to promote strategic partnerships, effective trustee governance and public trust.

The means by which the Center informs institutions, policymakers and the public include data-driven publications and web-based information, project engagements, scientific polling, facilitation and training, and unique conferences and forums to convene all parties.

July 2012

Appendix F

Highlights of HESIG Accomplishments 2012- 2013

1. Inaugural Policy Steering Council Meeting June, 2012- Set priorities; refined mission.

2. 1st Technical Advisory Committee Meeting- Advised on scope of first HESIG/ Stockton Poll, February 2013.

3. 1st HESIG/ Stockton Polling Institute scientific poll, March 2013.

4. Published 1st HESIG Newsletter, Winter 2013.

5. Published six OPEDs on a wide range of topics within HESIG mission; the most recent on College Value in NJ.Com, June 2013.

6. Drafted two working papers on public opinion, and emerging higher education policy trends, January 2013.

7. Served on AASCU National Task Force on Making Public Higher Education a State Priority.

8. Engaged by a NJ College Board of Trustees to assist on President's performance evaluation, Summer- Fall 2013.

9. Obtained grant to support 2nd HESIG/ Stockton Poll, and regional round tables of educators and policy makers, July 2013.

8-7-13