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THOUGHT AND ACTION CALL FOR PAPERS

Submissions for Thought & Action, NEA's peer-reviewed journal of higher education, are due by March 1. This year, the review panel especially invites articles or essays for a Special Focus section entitled, "The Value of an Open Door." Consider: Are we fulfilling the nation's implicit promise to deliver a high-quality higher education to all who qualify, regardless of race, gender, or income? For more information, including guidelines around length and style, visit www.nea.org/thoughtandaction or email questions to the editor, Mary Ellen Flannery, at mflannery@nea.org.

NCHE ELECTIONS AND VACANCIES

Elections will be held on Friday morning, March 2, 2012, before the second session of the NCHE Regular Annual Meeting (RAM). This year there are four offices are up for election: Secretary/Treasurer; Membership Chair; and two at-large Executive Committee seats. The NCHE RAM begins Thursday evening, March 1, at 7 p.m. at the Palmer Hotel. NCHE agenda, click here.

SUPREME COURT TO RULE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The U.S. Supreme Court today agreed to consider whether the University of Texas at Austin has the right to consider race and ethnicity in admissions decisions. Those bringing the case hope the Supreme Court will restrict or even eliminate the right of colleges to consider race in admissions – a prerogative last affirmed by the Supreme Court in 2003 in a case involving the University of Michigan’s law school. To read Inside Higher Ed's full coverage of the Supreme Court's decision, please visit: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/21/supreme-court-takes-affirmative-action-case
CRACKDOWN ON FOR-PROFITS

Sacramento has upstaged Washington as the hot spot for policy debates over for-profit higher education.

While federal scrutiny over for-profits continues, some of that energy has shifted to states. And a recent flurry of activity in California has many observers wondering if the Golden State will be where advocates for tighter regulation of the industry make their next play.

What’s clear is that California has serious money problems, and lawmakers are looking for cost savings wherever they can find them. That includes spending on Cal Grants, likely the nation’s most generous state-based financial aid system. With a maximum annual grant of $12,192, state spending on the program has swelled to $1.6 billion from $915 million over the last eight years. Go to http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/23/california-contemplates-crackdown-profits for story.

MICHIGAN LAWMAKERS MAY BLOCK GRAD ASSISTANTS’ UNION DRIVE

The Michigan Legislators is trying to block graduate research assistants at the University of Michigan from unionizing. AnnArbor.com reported that the Michigan Senate voted Wednesday to define the graduate assistants as students, ineligible for collective bargaining. Michigan's Board of Regents has backed unionization rates for the students, but many administrators have criticized the union drive. Read more: http://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2012/02/23/michigan-lawmakers-may-block-grad-assistants-union-drive#ixzz1nFL9ZX2I

BUDGET WOES WORSEN FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

California's community colleges face an unexpected $149 million budget cut this year because of low property tax revenue and a "dramatic" increase in the number of students who qualify for tuition waivers, Jack Scott, chancellor of the 112-college system, said in a written statement. The shortfall, which would represent a 2.75 percent decrease in the system's overall budget, follows $502 million in previous cuts. Scott said colleges would have to cope by further reducing course offerings, borrowing more money and eliminating jobs.

The Community College League of California told the Los Angeles Times that the state typically picks up the slack when the system's tuition and tax revenue lag. But a spokesman for Gov. Jerry Brown's Department of Finance said the gloomy predictions were premature, according to the newspaper. Read more: http://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2012/02/22/budget-woes-worsen-california-community-colleges#ixzz1nFM5v73O

A BETTER APPROACH TO 'GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

On February 9, Senator Ron Wyden, Democrat of Oregon, introduced a bill on the Senate floor entitled the “Student Right to Know Before You Go Act.” The bill gained bipartisan and bicameral support when it was introduced in the House by Duncan Hunter (a Republican from California and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education).

Hunter and Wyden have been working together to increase the quality of educational data and improve transparency in measures of the success of colleges and universities. This proposed legislation was the product of this work. While its chances of passage are likely low, it is a smart piece of legislation that could help transform our expensive and inefficient system of postsecondary education.

A key provision of the bill would support states in expanding or creating postsecondary student level data systems that include measures of student success in the labor market (including average individual annual earnings by educational program, degree received and educational institution) from all institutions within the state, public and private (nonprofit and for-profit). It presents a much smarter approach to measuring what is called “gainful employment” than the U.S. Department of Education has managed so far. Read
THE RISE OF DIFFERENTIAL TUITION

A longstanding tradition in American higher education -- that undergraduates are charged the same tuition, regardless of major -- is eroding, especially at doctoral universities.

That is the finding of a new survey by the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute. Researchers checked the websites of every public institution that awards bachelor's degrees, and then surveyed some of the institutions identified as having differential rates. A total of 143 public colleges or universities were found to now have differential tuition policies. That figure includes 29 percent of bachelor's institutions, 11 percent of master's institutions, and 41 percent of doctoral institutions.

When further analyzing the doctoral institutions, the institute found that a slight majority of flagship universities now have differential rates.

Up until 1980, differential tuition rates within an institution were largely unheard-of, although some colleges did charge laboratory fees associated with certain courses. As state appropriations failed to keep up with growing enrollments and higher education expenses, many public institutions started to charge more for certain programs, arguing either that they cost more to offer, that student demand was greater or that students in these fields were on a track to better-paying jobs than were those studying other fields. But the policies have sometimes been controversial, as some educators have argued that students should be encouraged to pick fields based on their academic interests, not the price tag. Read more:

http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/21/study-finds-increasing-numbers-public-colleges-differential-tuition#ixzz1NnNk1fR

SHAME IS NOT THE SOLUTION

Last week, the New York State Court of Appeals ruled that teachers’ individual performance assessments could be made public. I have no opinion on the ruling as a matter of law, but as a harbinger of education policy in the United States, it is a big mistake.

I am a strong proponent of measuring teachers’ effectiveness, and my foundation works with many schools to help make sure that such evaluations improve the overall quality of teaching. But publicly ranking teachers by name will not help them get better at their jobs or improve student learning. On the contrary, it will make it a lot harder to implement teacher evaluation systems that work.

In most public schools today, teachers are simply rated “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory,” and evaluations consist of having the principal observe a class for a few minutes a couple of times each year. Because we are just beginning to understand what makes a teacher effective, the vast majority of teachers are rated “satisfactory.” Few get specific feedback or training to help them improve.

Many districts and states are trying to move toward better personnel systems for evaluation and improvement. Unfortunately, some education advocates in New York, Los Angeles and other cities are claiming that a good personnel system can be based on ranking teachers according to their “value-added rating” — a measurement of their impact on students’ test scores — and publicizing the names and rankings online and in the media. But shaming poorly performing teachers doesn’t fix the problem because it doesn’t give them specific feedback.

Value-added ratings are one important piece of a complete personnel system. But student test scores alone aren’t a sensitive enough measure to gauge effective teaching, nor are they diagnostic enough to identify areas of improvement. Teaching is multifaceted, complex work. A reliable evaluation system must incorporate other measures of effectiveness, like students’ feedback about their teachers and classroom observations by highly trained peer evaluators and principals.

Putting sophisticated personnel systems in place is going to take a serious commitment. Those who believe we can do it on the cheap — by doing things like making individual teachers’ performance reports public
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— are underestimating the level of resources needed to spur real improvement.

At Microsoft, we created a rigorous personnel system, but we would never have thought about using employee evaluations to embarrass people, much less publish them in a newspaper. A good personnel system encourages employees and managers to work together to set clear, achievable goals. Annual reviews are a diagnostic tool to help employees reflect on their performance, get honest feedback and create a plan for improvement. Many other businesses and public sector employers embrace this approach, and that’s where the focus should be in education: school leaders and teachers working together to get better.

Fortunately, there are a few places where teachers and school leaders are collaborating on the hard work of building robust personnel systems. My wife, Melinda, and I recently visited one of those communities, in Tampa, Fla. Teachers in Hillsborough County Public Schools receive in-depth feedback from their principal and from a peer evaluator, both of whom have been trained to analyze classroom teaching.

We were blown away by how much energy people were putting into the new system — and by the results they were already seeing in the classroom. Teachers told us that they appreciated getting feedback from a peer who understood the challenges of their job and from their principal, who had a vision of success for the entire school. Principals said the new system was encouraging them to spend more time in classrooms, which was making the culture in Tampa’s schools more collaborative. For their part, the students we spoke to said they’d seen a difference, too, and liked the fact that peer observers asked for their input as part of the evaluation process.

Developing a systematic way to help teachers get better is the most powerful idea in education today. The surest way to weaken it is to twist it into a capricious exercise in public shaming. Let’s focus on creating a personnel system that truly helps teachers improve.  

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/23/opinion/for-teachers-shame-is-no-solution.html?_r=2

NCHE REGULAR ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA

AGENDA
NCHE Regular Annual Meeting
March 1-2, 2012
Palmer HOUSE Hotel
Monroe Room
Chicago, IL

Session 1  Thursday, March 1, 7-10 p.m.
Session 2  Friday, March 2, 8-11 a.m.

1) Call to Order
2) Announcements
3) Adoption of the Agenda
4) Adoption of the Standing Rules
   A. Approval of the RAM Minutes: July 1-July 6, 2011
5) Information Items
   A. Executive Committee Minutes
      1. June 29, 2011
      2. August 13-16, 2011, Retreat
      3. October 23, 2011
      4. December 18,2011
      6. February 19, 2012
   B. Representative Assembly Dates—Washington, DC June 30-July 5
   C. NEA 2013 NEA Higher Ed Conference [Date, Theme & Location TBA]
   D. Emerging Leaders Training
   E. Meet the NEA Advisory Committee on Membership, Friday, 11-12 in Monroe Room
   F. Caucus Meetings: Minority (Spire Parlor), ESP (Water Tower Parlor), and Contingent (Wrigley
6) Reports
A. President
   Jim Rice
B. Vice President
   Catherine Boudreau
C. Treasurer
   1. 2010-2011 Year End Report
   3. Proposed 2012-2013 Budget
   Chris Domhoff
D. Membership Chair
   Andrew Sako
E. Caucus Reports: Minority, ESP, Contingent Faculty
F. Financial Review Committee Session 2
   Chris Domhoff

7) Discussion and Action Items
A. NCHE Elections
   1. Nominations and Candidate Statements (Session 1)
   2. Balloting: Friday, 8-9:00 a.m. Room TBA
   3. Run-off elections, as needed (Session 2)
   Beverly Stewart
B. NEA Candidate Endorsements
   1. Candidate Statements for Executive Committee (Session 1)
   2. Balloting Session 2: 8-9:00 a.m.
   Catherine Leisek
C. Approval of Proposed 2012-2013 NCHE Budget
   Chris Domhoff
D. NEA Hearings: 7:30-8:30 a.m. Likely, Saturday, March 3, 2012
   1. Budget:
      Rebecca Pringle
   2. Resolutions
      Tony Crawford
   3. Legislative
      Bob Gillies
E. NEA-PAC Fundraiser
F. NEA Board of Director: Higher Education Vacancies
G. Advisory Committee on Membership Report
H. Advisory Committee on Membership Strategy Report

8) Special Items of Business
A. For Profit Task Report
B. Advisory Committee on Membership Report

9) Other

10) Adjournment
Monroe Room

Workshop 3:  “Standards of Quality for Online Learning”
Ron Norton Reel, President California Community College Association
Barbara Frank, NEA Academy Staff
Spire Parlor

1:00 – 1:45 p.m.
CYBER SESSION
NEA Online Tools for Bargaining and Advocacy:  HECAS and CUDAS
Sue Clery, Senior Research Associate, JBL Associates, Inc.
Grant Park Parlor

1:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. BREAK
2:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. WORKSHOPS

Gregory M. Saltzman, Albion College
Moderator: Christine Domhoff, Youngstown State University
Monroe Room

Workshop 2:  No one cares but me!  Member-to-member engagement
Blanca Castaneda, Staff Representative, California Faculty Association
Bryant Warren, Organizational Specialist, NEA
Moderator: Colleen Davis, Colorado Education Association
Water Tower Parlor

Workshop 3:  Trends in Faculty Salaries and Retirement Benefits
John B. Lee, President, JBL Associates, Inc. (MD)
Valerie Martin Conley, Associate Professor, Ohio University
Moderator: Catherine Boudreau, NCHE Vice-President
Spire Parlor

2:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
Cyber Session
Rate Your Administrator
Ana Jimenez, Pima Community College Faculty Association
Scott Collins, Pima Community College Faculty Association
Grant Park Parlor

3:45 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. BREAK
4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. OPENING NEA PLENARY
Adams Room

Welcome and Acknowledgments
James Rice, President, National Council for Higher Education (NCHE)
CindaKlickna, President, Illinois Education Association
Discussion of Teaching Preparation Proposal
Becky Pringle, NEA Secretary-Treasurer
Short Remarks
Paula Monroe, NEA Executive Committee
Vice President’s Remarks
Lily Eskelsen, NEA Vice President
President’s Remarks
Dennis Van Roekel, NEA President
Emerging Leaders Academy Graduation
Presenter: Christy Levings, NEA Executive Committee
NEA Excellence in the Academy Awards
The Democracy in Higher Education Award
Jeff Lustig, Sacramento State University
The Art of Teaching Award  
Mary Armstrong, Lafayette College  
New Scholar Award  
Luis Ponjuan, University of Florida  
Presenter: Princess Moss, NEA Executive Committee

6:00 p.m.  
Reception – Cash Bar  
Chicago Room [5th Floor]

Saturday March 3rd

7:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.  
Registration

7:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.  
NEA Resources and Candidate Information Tables

7:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.  
NEA Budget Committee Hearing  
Becky Pringle, NEA Secretary-Treasurer  
Spire Parlor

7:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.  
Legislative Hearing  
Robert Gillies, NEA Committee on Legislation  
Sally Pestana, NEA Committee on Legislation  
Water Tower Parlor

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. WORKSHOPS

Workshop 1:  
“American Faculty and Their Institutions: A Multinational Comparison”  
“Faculty Workload and Productivity in Israel: Lessons for Uncertain Times”  
Martin Finkelstein, Seton Hall University  
Henry Lee Allen, Wheaton College, Illinois  
Moderator: Denise Specht, Education Minnesota  
Water Tower Parlor

Workshop 2:  
The Importance of Faculty/Student Relationships in Organizing and Activism  
Theresa Montano, California State University, Northridge  
John Belleci, California State University, Fullerton  
Monroe Room

Workshop 3:  
“Small World: Crafting an Inclusive Classroom (No Matter What You Teach)”  
Mary A. Armstrong, Lafayette College  
Moderator: Lisa Ossian  
Spire Parlor

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. CYBER SESSION

Advanced CUDAS and HECAS Tutorial  
Sue Clery, Senior Research Associate, JBL Associates  
Grant Park Parlor

10:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. WORKSHOPS

Workshop 1:  
“States and Higher Education: On Their Own in a Stagnant Economy”  
William Zumeta, Professor, University of Washington  
Moderator: Andrew Sako, Erie Community College  
Monroe Room

Workshop 2:  
“Bargaining Retrenchment”  
Kristine Anderson Dougherty, Research Manager, State of Florida  
Gary Rhoades, University of Arizona  
Mark F. Smith, Senior Policy Analyst – Higher Education, NEA  
Moderator: Karla Hayashi, University of Hawaii  
Water Tower Parlor

Workshop 3:  
“How Did You Hear That You Might Lose Your Job?”  
Vicki J. Rosser, University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Moderator: Cynthia Schneider, Michigan State University
Spire Parlor
10:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.
CYBER SESSION
Electronic Organizing: Making use of NEA tools to organize, engage, and activate membership
Mayrose Wegmann, NEA Membership & Organizing
Grant Park Parlor

12:15 p.m. – 12:30 p.m.
BREAK

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
LUNCHEON
Adams Room
Introductions:
Jeff Beaulieu, Illinois Higher Education Council
James Grimes, NEA Board of Directors
Speakers:
The Honorable Judy Biggert
The Honorable Jesse Jackson, Jr.

2:00 p.m.
BREAK

2:15 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
OFF-SITE Presentation
Labor History Tour of Haymarket Square
Beverly Stewart, Roosevelt Adjunct Faculty Association
[Meet in Lobby]

2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
WORKSHOPS
Workshop 1:
Contingent Forum
Moderator: Frank Brooks, Roosevelt University
Monroe Room
Workshop 2:
“We can make a change: Empowering members to be activists”
Moderator: Diane Vallera
Spire Parlor
Workshop 3:
“Recruiting and Retaining Latino Faculty Members: The Missing Piece to Latino Student Success”
Luis Ponjuan, University of Florida
Moderator: Gilda Levia-Bloom
Discussant: Theresa Montana
Water Tower Parlor

2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
CYBER SESSION
Organizing with Social Media
Kevin Hart, NEA Interactive Media
Grant Park Parlor

Sunday March 4th
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
CLOSING PLENARY SESSION
Adams Room
Moderator: James Rice, NCHE President
Introduction:
Princess Moss, NEA Executive Committee
Remarks:
James Kvaal, Policy Director, Obama for America
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