



State of Connecticut

The Connecticut General Assembly

The Planning Commission for Higher Education

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 1800
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591
PHONE: (860) 240-0271 / FAX: (860) 240-8833

Judith K. Resnick, Chairperson

Revised Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

3:00 p.m. Room 1E

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. by Judy Resnick.

The following commission members/designees/guests were present: Vagos Hadjimichael, Booker DeVaughn, David Walsh, Jason Jakubowski, James Maroney, John Bennett, Judith Resnick, John Shemo, Liz Caswell, Lindy Lee Gold, Dennis Murphy, Sally Reis, Judith Greiman, Roberta Willis, Danté Bartolomeo, and Kevin Witkos.

Judy Resnick welcomed everyone back and introduced the Commission's newest member, James Maroney.

James Maroney introduced himself.

The rest of the members introduced themselves.

Judy Resnick reminded the members that at the last meeting in October they discussed waiting until after the election to move forward. She went on to say that they had gained the support of the all of the caucuses and extended NCHEMS' contract.

The minutes from the last meeting were approved.

Judy Resnick said that she will be turning the meeting over to Dennis Jones and Aims McGuinness to talk about this last phase of the draft plan that the members have in front of them. She continued that she also wants to prepare the members for the product that will be presented in February. Judy stated that based on conversations today she would like members to be able to take this material and do some friend raising, that part of what members might want to do is help others understand what is proposed and make sure that the members bring as many people on board as possible. She commented that in

February what the members will see is a report that is very focused and less outlined, more professional looking and still usable as a document for others.

Aims McGuinness said that the discussion at the last meeting had a lot to do with finance and that the next part of the discussion was about the goals, particularly 'Goal 1', which focuses on reaching 70% of the population having a post-secondary education. He went on to say that the comment they all agreed on was that this goal should be expressed in terms of substance and 70% as being an indicator, so the way it was reworded was to put the substance upfront and then the points that follow from that are an elaboration and clarification of what the meaning is. Aims continued that the question is now whether that reflects the essence of the discussion at the last meeting.

Judy Resnick asked the members if they wished to comment.

Vagos Hadjimichael said he agreed with Aims' comments.

Judy Resnick asked if anyone had any further comments regarding Aims' remarks.

Aims McGuinness said that he thought there was a general agreement during the last meeting regarding the overall plan and asked for any final comments before the members go to the next phase, as Judy Resnick described.

Judy Greiman asked if when Aims asked whether the new document says what the members discussed, is he referring to the goals themselves as opposed to the commentary.

Aims McGuinness replied it was in reference to the plan as a whole. He suggested that he go over the plan section by section.

Judy Greiman stated that she was trying to determine if Aims is asking if the members agree with the bulleted and numbered text, or do the members agree with the commentary.

Aims McGuinness asked if anyone had any comments on the commentary.

Judy Greiman said, yes, she has comments on the commentary and referred to commentary on page 5. Judy said there is a paragraph that talks about the independent college sector, and makes assumptions that have not been vetted with the sector. She gave an example that the assumption that this sector would not want to do the same percentage of additional degrees as they currently do is just NCHEMS' assumption and that there may be some institutions that may be willing to increase, there may be some that may not be able to because of space or other reasons. Judy wanted to be sure that the members are aware that none of the assumptions have been vetted on the private or public side.

Dennis Jones said that it should be looked upon as a scenario that will help achieve the goal rather than say this is a target for everyone. He went on to say that it was put out there in an attempt to say – this is how a big a step it is and if you take that step it's interpreted into these numbers.

Judy Greiman shared that she agrees, and indicated that her sector may be willing to do more than the 25%, but that is a conversation that has not been discussed yet. She continued that increasing the for-profit sector is a significant policy issue that she hopes we don't automatically necessarily say that's a good thing. Judy wanted to make sure the Commission was approving the overall goals, not the commentary.

Aims McGuinness asked Dennis Jones if this relates to the development of the annual reporting process, and the indicators that would be part of that. He went on to say that there is a process there that they have to have a conversation with people about before we decide on that. Aims said you would want to report on the progress you are making toward the 70% and whether these sectors are affecting your progress. He went on to say that was one of the next steps NCHEMS thought needed follow up. Aims said the next step would be a discussion about the nature of the annual accountability report.

Dennis Jones said that was consistent with what he just said.

Aims McGuinness said that they had talked about once the plan is approved that there needs to be a process where there is public reporting on the progress towards the goals. He went on to say that part of the progress will be the progress that of each of the sectors needs to make in order to achieve these goals. Aims said there needs to be a process in which there is a discussion with a number of stake holders about what that annual accountability report looks like and the indicators. He continued that would be a good time to re-engage people in particular targets sector by sector.

Judy Resnick commented that she believes the document in front of the Commission is more of a projection of a scenario, and that there is a lot of work to be done.

Judy Greiman agreed that they should be all reporting and showing where they increase and that it's great to have everyone in the conversation, but she wanted to be clear that this commitment has not been made and the conversation has not been had.

Dennis Jones stated that when they talk about accountability later, one of the things that NCHEMS is going to suggest is that this year this Commission puts together the first of an accountability report. He went on to say that it will become the basis for an on-going conversation about both targets and performance, but that the metrics be explicit in the first instance. Dennis stated that is what NCHEMS is trying to put in place, a set of metrics that tie to the goals and to open up the conversation amongst the providers, the legislature and the executive branch of government about how we move the needle.

Aims McGuinness shared that they appreciate the new legislators on the Commission participating and that part of this conversation is meant to be a basis for framing the kind of questions to ask during the process of your hearings when an institution or system comes before the legislature and shares their plans, you can then ask: how does what you are proposing contribute to these goals and what indicators do you have and how do they correlate to these goals. He went on to say that will be the way it will be useful, buy connecting with what the legislature does.

Booker DeV Vaughn asked to go back to page 4, and asked for clarification regarding the wording "degrees or certificates of value."

Dennis Jones said that this was language that NCHEMS took from both the Gates and Lumina Foundations. He went on to say that it is increasingly clear that certificates are an important part of the education obtainment ladder. Dennis stated that there is also the reality that certificates are an area in which institutions; if they want to get into the body count business can really pump up the number of certificates without meaning, any 4 courses creates a certificate. He commented that they tend to be certificates that are employer accepted and have a 3rd party assessment associated with them, rather than any combination of credits that an institution defines to be a certificate. Dennis indicated that "of value" means it has value in the market place. He went on to say it is a credential that has meaning.

Aims McGuinness added that the certificate should also have some value for the student in terms of the education ladder in which they are participating and is not a dead-end feature so they are building an education plan.

Judy Resnick commented that certificates mean a lot of things to a lot of people and that there is always the question around the purpose, for example in the college of technology at the community colleges there are content driven certificates in manufacturing that are specialty areas so the courses hang together and they hang together around an area where there is a career ladder and it provides a point of entry, but there are times when we define certificates as a mix and match of things that are not necessarily connected and not connected to an end point in the market place and also aren't part of a career path.

Dennis Jones stated that this is a topic that is being discussed all over the country because there aren't good definitions; there aren't good practices that sort out what's of value and what isn't. He continued that in the states that have gone to some form of funding that attaches to production of certificates there is a history of institutions pumping out a lot of certificates that don't have value, just because it's a currency that gets counted, so it's important to protect against that. Dennis shared that neither the student nor the outside world are served by it if it doesn't have quality, if it doesn't have meaning behind it. He went on to say that NCHEMS is trying to find the words that say that.

John Bennett shared his concern about 4 course certificates having time limits associated with those courses. He continued that there ought to be some sort of a sustaining certificate registration or something similar that institutions also have a yearly refresher or a 2 year refresher so they don't lose their value.

Judy Resnick reminded the Commission members that when they first started their intent was to create a strategic plan that provided a framework for institutions to take action, but that the prevue of this Planning Commission was not at the institutional level. She went on to say that is left best to institutions and the systems that run them as long as what they do can be directly related to these goals; how does what we do relate to those goals and that's a decision that is not at a level of a state-wide strategic plan for higher education, that's at the intuitional level, but point well taken.

John Bennett suggested that a bullet should be added at the bottom of the targets for 'Goal 1'. "Improve the quality of education to address the needs of the State. The documentation of the improvements will be the responsibility of the institutions both in terms of their choice of metrics, the data supporting the metrics and the justification that they've met the metrics."

Dennis Jones shared that he is a little bit lost on the intent. He asked John Bennett if that was a statement about the quality piece and if that's the case; if the point was about quality, the conversation they had before the meeting was, one of the useful things to do in this is to essentially charge the faculty groups with coming up with a set of metrics that can be used alongside the ones NCHEMS is proposing to chart the extent to which quality is or is not being degraded by an emphasis on more students with more credentials. Dennis went on to say that is a faculty job, that they ought to be expected to come up with things that can be measured, not something like 'we know quality when we see it, trust us.' He continued that it has to be something that you can track over time

John Bennett shared that what he was trying to say.

Dennis Jones stated that kind of language can and should become part of the document.

Aims McGuinness indicated that the ConnSCU and UCONN would be the arenas in which that would occur in terms of engaging the faculty. He commented that how that might occur in the independent sector, they'll let Judy Greiman resolve that in some way. Aims thinks there could be a benefit of having cross sector discussions but didn't want to get into the details of that. He told John Bennett that NCHEMS will come back with a little bit different wording, but the same intent.

John Bennett pointed out that from his experience as a teacher at the University of Connecticut, he believes the accrediting requirements of universities and various programs are on-going and they have been for years and years. He guessed it was a matter of cherry picking some of the stuff that's already being done. He went on to say that the data is already being collected, but it's just a matter of using it differently.

Sally Reis agreed that that is exactly the case. She continued that UCONN is in the process of vetting new certificate programs and have been for the last 4 years; mainly online and mainly 12-16 credits in critical need areas. Sally indicated that UConn hopes in the next 5 years to add an additional 1,000 students and believes this is a very doable goal.

John Shemo commented that internships are referenced on the top of page 6 and asked if internships were referenced anywhere else in the document.

Aims McGuinness said that he hasn't done a search, but that work based learning is referenced.

John Shemo said that internships are a very effective way of getting graduates into jobs and staying in Connecticut. He went on to say that the issue of internships is very important and would be important to reference them under Goal 1, in addition to where it is referenced now, under Goal 2.

Aims McGuinness confirmed that John's comments are really consistent with his conversations throughout the state with business people, particularly within Fairfield County a lot of the discussion dealt with getting people to stick within their area.

John Shemo said getting graduates to stick within their communities isn't an issue for the community colleges and not much of an issue for the state university system, maybe a little more of an issue for UCONN and it is certainly that much more of an issue for the privates. He shared that he thought the Commission needed to speak to that.

Dennis Jones said although they don't use the language of internships, in the recommendation about revamping the state student financial aid program, NCHEMS does make explicit recognition of a need for an earn-and-learn program, which is a work-study program that has internships. He suggested that the implementation part of how they do this falls better under the finance piece, than it does as a goal in its own right.

John Shemo said he didn't agree entirely with Dennis, but he would like to call the internships out beyond the finance piece.

Aims McGuinness said he and Dennis Jones found in summarizing, the policy of Connecticut is that there are really important things that need to go on, such as internships, and then when you look back on the way the system is financed, the question is, are there any incentives for that to take place for either institutions, or students.

David Walsh commented on the internship program, agreeing with John Shemo entirely, sharing that internships are incredibly valuable, especially for the student who gets out and finds out what the

community is really like. He believed it was much more than financial and disagreed that internships can't be structured in a way where both the institution benefits financially and students continue to graduate. David said internships allow students to make contacts that will help them throughout their lives. He went on to say that because of a shortage of professionals in some state agencies and because of financial constraints, getting good students who are seniors, or graduates to work, is a win-win situation because students get valuable experience and knowledge and the institutions benefit from the work that they can do. David shared that he believes internships are much more than something that should be included under the financial aspect of making education affordable.

Booker DeVaughn added his voice with those supporting internships. He also wanted clarification as to what the concept "earn-and-learn" meant.

Dennis Jones said the up-side to an internship is that they are paid, but they also have academic credit associated with them. He went on to say that they are of a quality that says it's not making copies and coffee, but that it's real learning in the context of employment. Dennis said that the language is intended to reflect that kind of criteria.

Vagos Hadjimichael noted that the term "earn-and-learn" is not new and he has seen it implemented in several places, for several years, that it doesn't necessarily go with internships, it could be learning at a 4 year institution. He said it was like a tri-pod type contract between the student, the employer and the institution and is not necessarily an internship.

Aims McGuinness said that reflecting on conversations of the Commission, a lot of the members have made the point that there is a lot going on right now in terms of the ways the institutions are engaged within the communities, so to say nothing is happening is a misstatement. He went on to say that they have found, and there is a good deal of research on this, this has to happen in a much more systematic way, supported both by institutional policy and state policy to really make a difference. Aims continued that projects of one sort or another may not really add up. He continued that in many cases what has to happen in Connecticut is collaboration across sectors that both private and public institutions have to be engaged. He said it's hard to develop indicators around this and that part of it is recognizing what is already going on, and then, making sure the state is getting out of the way and making sure the incentives are in place for the kind of commitments and collaborations are in place to make a measurable difference.

Aims McGuinness then moved the discussion onto the third goal of affordability.

Danté Bartolomeo asked where Connecticut is ranked in comparison to the national average of student debt.

Dennis Jones said that the national average is around \$29,000 and Connecticut is around \$32,000. In terms of the rankings, Dennis said off the top of his head he believes Connecticut is probably around the upper 30's. He said he can get the actual statistics.

Liz Caswell asked whether NCHEMS would bifurcate the amount of student debt, in terms of undergraduate students and graduate students, given what is known about the amount of debt graduate students seem to incur.

Dennis Jones answered that they're dealing with undergraduate students only.

Aims McGuinness said they've summarized a review of the policy audit and that the essence comes down to page 10, Policy Recommendations. He went on to say that the first recommendation is for the

General Assembly to adopt the goals as the overall framework for higher education in Connecticut, and make clear the goals are consistent with the units. Aims continued that if you look at the goals already underway for ConnSCU and UCONN there is a pretty good alignment.

Judy Greiman shared that she thinks there is something missing in the target in number 3. She commented that what she is struggling with is that she thinks that affordability for Connecticut residents is a good goal, but she thinks what might be missing in the target is that our financial aid policy isn't necessarily designed to keep Connecticut residents here and making it affordable. Judy went on to say that she's not sure if it's possible that the actions you'd need to do to reduce the amount of average student loan would get to that. She wonders if there is another target.

Dennis Jones said that one way of saying it is an increasing number of Connecticut high school graduates would attend college in state as a way of reflecting whether it's affordable or not. He asked whether that is one way Judy's question can be interpreted. Dennis commented that it's not inconsistent with keeping graduates here; it's keeping students here before they go to college.

James Maroney said that looking at Goal number 3, we set a target on tuition for only the 2-year schools, yet we're trying to erase the overall loan burden of all students whether they're attending 2 year, 4 year, public or private. He continued that he doesn't know if that's been talked about before he was here, but it just doesn't seem to go that we're only addressing the tuition problem for the 2 year schools, not looking at the 4 year schools.

Dennis Jones indicated that the intent was that tuition being most affordable at the most open access institutions; and that becomes the community college, but one doesn't have to confine it, one can talk about at the access institutions generally and that would be community colleges and largely the CSU institutions.

Sally Reiss added the regional campuses.

Dennis Jones continued to say that there is a way we can frame that just as well in the terms of access institutions rather than just 2 year institutions.

James Maroney asked if one way of both lowering costs and getting more returning adults into the system is by looking at prior learning assessments as more of a detail than a goal.

Dennis Jones shared that it's a path to the goal.

Aims McGuinness said the whole question about financing is deeper than what was reflected here and they're both issues that have come up under the category of talking about finance and the next steps on what happens to student financial aid. He went on to say that one of the real gaps NCHEMS identified are the students who are caught in the gap between those in Adult Ed and those in Developmental Ed who cannot meet the Developmental Ed requirements. Aims continued to say that whole group gets caught in a whole set of special projects because they are not eligible for federal student aid, and that it is a large population in Connecticut and that there needs to be some way to serve that population. He mentioned that if you talk about affordability, affordability for that group is to get them into the kind of certificates we've been talking about and to get into the pipeline to get further education is really a priority.

Dennis Jones said that one of the things that is true about Connecticut is when you find a problem, you'll find a boutique solution to it, you will find a pilot program for it, you will find something small that never goes to scale. He went on to say that part of the thing NCHEMS is trying to say in this section is that

there needs to be a bigger framework for the finance policy, that institutions in systems will have lots of different ways to get there. Dennis commented that trying to cherry pick those and put them into legislation just furthers the boutique nature of solution and hopefully what would get created is an environment where institutions would figure this out and create an environment where in their own self-interest they would do prior learning assessments and a bunch of other things that matter to students and keep the cost down. He continued that trying to put that into legislation, in our experience, is that in a lot of states, it drives the cost up because every program has to have administrators etc. and they don't get put inside the true workings of the institutions and because of that, they don't get sustained over time. Dennis said that when the money goes away, which in inevitably does, the program goes away and at the end of the day not much has happened. He stated that what we're trying to suggest on the finance side is that there be a structure that lets systems and institutions to find their own paths to solutions.

Lindy Lee Gold said that middle college is addressing that and community colleges are doing early assessments, so we are on the road.

Aims McGuinness moved the discussion to bottom of page 10, which deals with adopting the goals. He said that looking at current statues they have a whole variety of interpretations of what goals might be and hopefully NCHEM's recommendation is that there is a real clean up clarification point so there is no question about what the goals are and that they form the basis for the kind of conversation legislators can have with the institutions about progress. Aims continued that their hope is to connect this immediately with things that are useful in terms of the policy making process.

Aims McGuinness pointed out that NCHEMS didn't begin with a certain subject that time has been spent on that relates to an entity. He went on to say that they began with finance, followed along to talking about regulation and deregulation, and then the issue of policy, leadership and accountability. He continued, that they put the issue of finance up first because, while we had a discussion about an entity, that most of the members agree that at this time we should just agree on the fact that there needs to be some point to carry this conversation ahead, but that coming to a decision about how that is going to be handled right now is going to be difficult.

Dennis Jones stated that in simple language there needs to be put in place, both the Legislative and Executive branches, a framework for a higher education budget that has 3 components, putting student financial aid in will make it 4. He continued that the first is base funding, the funding that says how do you maintain the investment in the capacity that you've already created. The second is a state investment fund that says if you are to accomplish these goals what additional capacity has to be created. The third part is capacity utilization, which rewards the institutions for contributing to the goals as established. He went on to say that this applies differently to different institutions, for example UCONN will get rewarded for its contributions in research more so than ConnSCU will. Dennis said that it's the part of the budget that says that there really is a direct connection between out-comes produced and funding levels at the institutions and systems. He explained that 30 states now have such provisions in their funding models at one level or another. Dennis said that what NCHEMS is recommending is that the state move toward a funding model that has those 3 components, and further that there be put in place some kind of a step that goes the next step in asking how the state is going to pay its share of meeting those goals. He continued that there needs to be a state level strategic finance plan for higher education that goes 10 – 15 years into the future and recognizes the fact that it puts pressure on the student financial aid programs because all of the students that have to be brought into the system to get to these kind of goals are going to be poor, they are going to be low-income, they are going to be first generation, they are going to have all of the problems associated with being high-needs students, so the question "how does one put together a financing plan that has both tuition and state

appropriations and student financial aid and institutional productivity all as part of the mix; how do those come together in something that is affordable to students and tax-payers?”

Jason Jakubowski said that theoretically what Dennis is saying is absolutely correct. He continued on with 2 points, first with regard to base funding under finance, there has to be a separate thing for Charter Oak, unless NCHEMS comes up with some very neat way to fix it, especially with the Governor’s “Go Back to Get Ahead” initiative. He went on to say that the other piece is how this would work in conjunction with the state budget process, which is a pretty rigid process.

Dennis Jones stated that these things play out differently in different states, but at the end of the day, those that seem to work basically say ‘so much of the budget is going to go into each one of these buckets,’ and then we have a conversation about what goes on inside those buckets as step 2, but when you have a set of funds that say ‘we are setting aside 6% of whatever we appropriate for outcomes’ the whole question about the investment fund can be up in the air. He continued that there are increasing conversations that say because of things like Charter Oak and program requirements that we maybe ought to trade off some of the facilities’ money for investment in something else, so the whole notion of the investment fund gets broadened when states think about how those funds get thought about.

Lindy Lee Gold said that she understands the incentive to attain the metrics for the public sector schools, but when looking at this plan NCHEMS is expecting the private institutions to embrace it and some of them may in their own enlightened self-interest, but there is no other reward for them either achieving the goals we set out nor assistance to them for the buy-in. She stated that she sees that as problematic. Lindy went on to say that regarding the goal of having students stay in-state, we have a better chance of retaining them if there is some reward to them for staying in state, it absolutely embellishes those chances by a lot.

Dennis Jones indicated that in the outcome based part of the plan there are rewards for both public and independent institutions for increasing the number of degrees produced, so it’s not just a public sector set of incentives and rewards.

Lindy Lee Gold asked how public funds could be used in that way, particularly if they are denominational institutions.

Dennis Jones responded that this is like the Bundy Fund in New York covering all institutions, they have a provision that says that every undergraduate, every Baccalaureate program, every degree award to a New York State resident by any institution in the State of New York, private, public, denominational gets an X amount for the production of that degree and it runs not afoul of any law or prohibition.

Aims McGuinness said that NCHEMS had not gone into the details of that, and that in early discussions there was talk about weighting that by Pell-eligible and it also could be Connecticut residents. He continued that there are ways of narrowing that so that there is real clear accountability to the institutions to use those funds.

Dennis Jones stated that the reality that NCHEMS is trying to reflect is that half of the degrees produced in this state at the Baccalaureate level come out of the independent sector. He continued that at the certificate level there is a higher proportion than that and that this state can’t function only on the basis of its public sector institutions, so when you start thinking about policy you have to wrap your head and hands around the full set of providers and give them a reason to play or you can’t get to these goals. Dennis went on to say that what NCHEMS is trying to do is find ways that are not all that complicated to in fact recognize that reality.

Aims McGuinness said that NCHEMS' experience is that these kinds of changes cannot be made unless there is a felt need in the state to deal with it, so the members are going to work with fundamentally the same budget framework that Connecticut has always worked with. He went to say that there are 2 or 3 things that are going to be on the agenda whether the Commission exists or not, or makes its recommendations. Aims said first is the whole problem of the connection of student financial aid and tuition and affordability which in many states is dealt with as a separate issue, not necessarily connected with the rest of the finance policy. He went on to say that the second issue is the needed to be made long term commitments that are in the investment category and recognize that they aren't just simply one-off initiatives, that they are fundamental to what is happening, in fact something like NextGenn is really in that category. Aims said that these are major strategic investments and they are part of the financing plan. Aims stated that the third reality is that there will be pressures whether this Commission exists or not for far more of an emphasis on outcome based funding. He shared that NCHEMS' experience is that it's not a good idea to deal with that just so it's a train on its own track, but to really deal with it systematically and relate it to the elements that Dennis talked about. Aims said that there will be a need within the current budget framework to have a little bit more rationality of it and to put the pieces together in a way that will be helpful for the governor and legislature to have the consistency over time about how the pieces fit together. He indicated that he doesn't think they are talking about wiping out the process as it is.

Jason Jubakowski said it's a new, innovative approach that is different than what the state has been used to, he's just curious and eager to see what result comes back.

Roberta Willis asked, when looking at disconnecting from historic cost drivers, which are faculty and administrators, how you separate that out when it's 80% of the cost?

Dennis Jones replied that one of the realities is that when you start with numbers of employees and salaries, which are the 2 things that get built into the base budgets in this state, what you've done is essentially make the legislature responsible for the Human Resources of all the institutions. He continued that it gives the institutions every incentive to see how many more employees they can get and you give them every incentive to see how high the salaries can be because there's no break on that system. Dennis said that if you look at other states that have said we will find a way, whether we benchmark it against other institutions of like kind or do it some other way, to say here's about how much money institutions ought to have, and then they have to figure out the extent to which that goes into salaries vs. some other things. He went on to say that the more that those decisions are made at a state level, the less degrees of freedom you have, and the less likely you are to ever have enough money to do either of the other 2 parts of this funding model because so much of it is locked in.

Roberta Willis acknowledged her frustration with the scenario because she knows that whatever the state doesn't give in that base number will get passed along as an increase in tuition because salaries are built into that as well.

Dennis Jones stated that her remarks presume that there is zero room for productivity improvement in the system. He said he doesn't think that there is an argument that that holds up.

Roberta Willis responded that this is a tough one and it is a conversation that the Commission needs to keep having because as someone who co-chairs the Higher Education Committee and the Appropriation's Higher Education sub-committee, to get your hands around this as a legislator is extremely frustrating because there's only so much you can do.

John Shemo said that the Earn and Learn program doesn't address his interest in seeing students secure longer term appointment upon graduation. He continued that it is a means to help them finance their education while in school, but that wasn't really the point.

Aims McGuinness said that the other points on the last part of this are points discussed at some length, and that he would assume, unless there is any objection, that everyone would agree to work on de-regulation, and there has been extensive discussion about the policy leadership question, and also about accountability, and that the group needs to put together a process for accountability. He continued that unless there are any objections we're ready to move to the next meeting with a draft that follows what was described.

Vagos Hadjimichael stated he had two points that he would like to discuss at the next meeting. The first has to do with the independent and privates. He said that he feels that the discussion on privates has not been extensive enough to recognize the challenges they face and how they can contribute. He stated he would like to discuss it in further detail during the next Planning Commission meeting. The second point is looking at the number of 20-25, why do we go 10 years into the future? Vagos asked if we are looking for incremental changes to degree obtainment and college enrollment, or are we looking to scale up what we do now and then it would have to go faster, rather than incrementally.

Judy Resnick encouraged anyone who has additional substantive comments to send them on. Judy said that the next meeting would be moved to February 17th at 4:00 p.m. in order for Dennis Jones and Aims McGuinness to be able to attend the meeting.

Jason Jakubowski asked if the purpose and expectation at the next meeting is that the members are going to adopt this framework that we agreed to and that everything that the members discussed today will be flushed through, the members will have a new document before the meeting and members can move this on.

Judy Resnick replied that is correct, and said that we do have a lot to do and the members need to move out of plan, into implementation.

Dennis Jones said it's time to get to implementation and part of that is a discussion of the role of the Planning Commission going forward because the major part of its charge was to build a plan and now the question is actually implementing the plan.

Jason Jakubowski said that he thinks it is essential that we do this at the next meeting because we're in the middle of the legislative session, we want to give Representative Willis and Senator Witkos something to deal with, preferably at some point before the session ends.

Roberta Willis thanked everyone for their continued participation and continued interest. She said she is excited to have something that the Commission can implement and cross the finish line.

Judy Resnick also thanked the members for their dedication. She encouraged members to raise any questions before the next meeting in regards to issues that they believe have not been covered. Judy said that it's time to move into the final stages of the planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.