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POSTSECONDARY SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT DISCUSSION

MR. FRAGA: So Lisette and I put together a tentative agenda, which I'd like to go over with you. One, to give you an update on the second symposium that we held and where we are with the essays and what work needs to be done. Two, what might the next set of three policy domains be that we might focus on if we have a subsequent symposium. I'm not suggesting that we're committed to a subsequent symposium or anything of that sort. There's a lot of work to be done, but it's something I'd like to consider us discussing.

I'd like to see if we might better understand and integrate some of our work with the White House's priorities on the reauthorization of Higher Education Act and set some advice as to how we might approach that.

And then lastly, Lisette mentioned the possibility of convening a meeting, which our subcommittee would be very appropriate to consider, of Latinos and Latinas who focus on education reform. And Lisette can talk a little bit more about her -- her idea and strategy behind that.

Does that sound like a reasonable agenda for our half hour?
MS. GARCIA: Can I ask something?

MR. FRAGA: Of course.

MS. GARCIA: I think with the upcoming rating system, we should be prepared to look at it and see what reactions we have to it and make sure the White House hears those reactions. And we're not sure when that's coming out. When's it coming out?

MS. TALWALKER: So we're looking at probably late fall.

MS. GARCIA: Late fall. So I think we as a subcommittee should be prepared for that.

MS. NIEVES: Yes.

MR. FRAGA: That was one of the -- As you well know, Milly, that was one of the policy domains, but we'll get to that and discuss the policy domains.

Anything else anyone would like to suggest? We do have one -- one guest.

And you are? Will you identify yourself?

MR. CRUZ: Sure. My name is Daniel Cruz. I drove down from Dallas. In Dallas, I'm part of a nonprofit called Education is Freedom. We help students get into college.
MR. FRAGA: Welcome.

MS. NIEVES: Luis, you had another one too that we were talking about proposing to the group, is really looking at this notion of educational technologies that support the persistence of Latinos, particularly looking at the increased financial incentives of colleges to take on technology. So we'd -- we'd actually like to see who's -- It's not what do we think of it. That's not the issue. It's about saying who was doing this that it's moving the needle for Latinos. And that could -- That doesn't have to be a two-day. That would be a three-hour thing or something.

MR. FRAGA: So a very quick update on where we're at and the work to be done on our second symposium -- from our second symposium. We have all of the essays and all of the responses. I think we may be missing one respondent from the first panel, the panel on two-year institutions. But otherwise, all the rest are there. We need to -- Lisette and I need to go through them and develop the specific policy recommendations that we can derive from the essays and from the discussions.

I would very much welcome -- I think Lisette would as well, but I'm not going to speak
for Lisette, because I know her too well. That's a joke; everyone's supposed to laugh.

MS. NIEVES: I laughed.

MR. FRAGA: I would appreciate your taking the time to read those essays and the responses and letting us know what you think the possible recommendations are that we can derive from these essays, including things like there are dimensions of these issues that were not considered that you think are very important for us to consider. So I don't want us to be entirely restricted to what is already written.

We did ask each of the paper-writers to develop their own policy recommendations, the original paper-writers to develop their policy recommendations. But if you think there's something very significant that's missing, we'd like to consider that as well.

Again another update, based upon our recommendations from the first symposium, we did get a very, I think, appropriate and supportive response from the Department of Education and from the White House that helped us understand what work was already underway that was consistent and fully aligned with the recommendations that we made.
before. So I think we contributed -- maybe modestly, but contributed, I think, to thinking and to the prioritizing that occurred.

MS. TIENDA: Can I just ask a question? Where were -- Where was the deviation? If we're basically reenforcing, then the net value is not that great. Where did we mediate --

MR. FRAGA: I don't think that's right, Marta.

MS. TIENDA: Huh?

MR. FRAGA: I don't think that's right. I think that what we're doing is, where we're enforcing -- excuse me for interrupting you, but just on this individual point -- by our saying we think it's a priority too, we're letting the White House know they're on the right track. So the net value is adding our endorsement to the work that has already gone on or that is continuing that we think is an important priority as well.

MS. NEIRA: Fine. So where did we not -- Where were we not totally aligned? Were there any areas?

MR. FRAGA: Well, there are areas that we recommend action to be taken where no action has been taken. We recommend, for one example --
there are many that we can identify based on a number that we can identify. Not many, but a number that we can identify. What were they called? Evidence-based innovation -- innovation consortium that was a recommendation for how to enhance academic competence where practitioners and scholars, particularly at two-year institutions, but not just at two years institutions, could have regional opportunities to share discussion and best practices and thinking of structuring that in a significant way to try to facilitate that scalability and then outreach that occurred. I don't think anything has occurred with regards to that.

We also recommended on the empowering Latino families component that there be a national competition where universities and colleges that are already involved in parent engagement, parent involvement -- at the postsecondary level, not at K-12 -- or those who want to get involved, would have an opportunity to receive some additional funding either to moderate their work, expand upon their work or initiate a new set of activities that would occur. That -- That has not been a part of the agenda so far. We think that's -- that's
critically important. You know, how much money, and, you know, would it be on the agenda -- You know, all of the appropriate policy considerations to consider, we appreciate that, but we haven't been able to move the needle on that.

MS. TIENDA: But oftentimes it's not really money. So if you think about parent to parent, it's middle-class parents and not middle-class parents, and parents with kids in college and parents -- college-educated or non-college educated parents would get -- You could have a big return without having to say we need money to do this. Because the money is not there, so --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MR. FRAGA: And that was a very important party of our discussion. And we addressed that, and we considered that, we used the models and identified models of institutions that --

MS. TIENDA: Great models.

MR. FRAGA: -- have done magnificent work with relatively limited funds on the basis of developing those sorts of relationships.

Lisette.

MS. NIEVES: Yeah. And the key part
about the models that we've identified, they were endorsed by the president -- the president of the college that gave them space to make it happen. And I think that's an important thing to talk about: Where do you have enormous influence?

One area where we didn't get any leverage and support on was looking at a national kind of advisory council on looking at remediation. And that was something we talked about because it was a -- it's a huge issue. How do we combat the counterincentives or incentives some colleges use? It's their money-making arm. It doesn't get them -- It's the truth. And so how do we think about this?

Again, I don't -- I don't want to scribe intention. I'm just talking about outcome. But there's -- We -- It varies so much across county in a state. I can't imagine the variance across the country. If we really are at a crisis, how do we think about this in a way to really deal with it? And by even making that as a statement, right -- making that as a statement as a national group, I think that could help elevate this to something that it's all of our children we should be concerned with. It's not just other people's children.

MR. FRAGA: So other areas that we
might consider focusing on, what we have -- would
generally describe as policy domains. I'm trying to
think of a term that was directed enough but not so
restrictive that it was just about an individual
piece of legislation. What do you see as the
important issues in postsecondary education for
Latinos? Yes. Ricardo.

MR. ROMO: Well, certainly, one of
them, as we see a decline in state funding, a
serious decline, all across American. You know,
we're down to maybe 20 percent of our funding.

MR. FRAGA: Yeah.

MR. ROMO: We cannot expect the state
all of a sudden to turn around and say, "We made a
mistake. We're going to fund you back at 30
percent" anytime soon. It might happen one day.
But it's not going to happen anytime soon.

So in the meantime, everybody's
concerned about affordability. And if the state
reduces us, then we have to go up slightly with a
tuition increase. We're at 8000, and we're told,
"No. Zero. You cannot go up at all." So the
regents met this last month. No tuition increases
this year. We might get a little bit next year, but
we haven't gotten any for quite a few years.
So what could the federal government do? Well, my good friend here says Pell grants. I mean, there's less money now. There's less money for the universities. The government isn't going to give any money but maybe (inaudible). And so I think that we just need to have a sizeable increase and kind of -- or find ways to support our -- to support our students, because there will be no more money in the family. Forget it. I mean, if they're poor now, they're going to be poor next year.

MS. TALWALKER: Am I allowed to ask clarifying questions?

MR. FRAGA: Sure.

MS. TALWALKER: So I'm curious about the state thing. Basically every single year in the budget, we've tried some attempt at stabilizing state funding or creating incentives for states to not continue to divest. We may not have exhausted every possibility in terms of shining a spotlight on states -- And this discussion has come up a little bit in the context of ratings, which appropriately has been pointed out. Right? So how much can you colleges accountable for these investment decisions that are outside of the college's control.

MR. ROMO: Right.
MS. TALWALKER: But I'd be curious to know like if there was another way you thought we should be approaching that conversation or counsel that we could be giving as to the impact of these kinds of -- this kind of divestment on the student populations. Because the pell grant cuts two ways, which is, we've -- we've successfully increased all the investments from the conversion to the loan program into increasing the maximum pell grant award. We've tried to maintain the maximum pell grant award. Some of that is included having to cannibalize or Congress cannibalizing some aspects of the program designed in order to -- to meet that max. It's -- It's hard to know if it's possible given the political climate to see significant increases in the pell grant just based on what has happened over the past couple of years. But this question around the state responsibility and finding -- we have very little bit leverage there, but we -- that seems to be an area of common agreement.

MR. ROMO: Okay. So here's -- here's the bad news. The bad news is that we have an extra billion dollars in the state treasury because of the wealth of this state. I mean, we got oil coming out
of our ears. And so we have quite a bit of money. And just there's too many things to fix. So, yes, they're going to maybe look at higher education and they'll talk about it. But ultimately, it'll go to highways and prisons and hospitals and something else. I don't -- I don't expect too much change.

So the bad news is, there is -- it's not for a lack of money anymore. I mean, we -- we're going to have -- Just us, the University of Texas System, it's -- it got an extra billion dollars in the last 12 months off the oil. Just the UTS -- Just the UT System. And so the UT System has money, but they're prevented by constitutional deals from handing out that money to anybody else but A&M and Austin, as you know. So -- So the rest of the schools, that billion doesn't do any good. And we're part of the system, but we don't benefit from it. So that's the bad news. There's money there, but it's just --

You know, what do they do with some of the ivy league schools? They finally said, "What are you doing building up this endowment forever? Do something with it." And they said, "Okay. We'll start giving some scholarships away." And the ivy league schools (inaudible) said, "Okay. Let's start
giving kids scholarships."

Because you're already at $20 billion; what is it that you're going to do with this money?

MS. TIENDA: But make no mistake that disproportionately -- It's not going to the lowest of the lows.

MS. NIEVES: No, it's not.

MS. TIENDA: When I did the analysis of the all administrative data, the biggest increase is in the applicant pool, and the top ten were in the wealthiest, not the lowest.

MS. NIEVES: Yes.

MS. TIENDA: And so UT had a slight increase in the poverty, the lowest quartile applicant pool, but the fastest growth was in the 10 percent with the highest income. So -- So what I worry about -- and this is one of the under -- as we continue to discuss these things in racial and ethnic terms and group specific, the underlying class stratification is being pulled in ways that doesn't matter all these things -- That's why I asked the question. It's not that I have any problem with validation. What I worry about is the common (inaudible). I'm driven by -- In my old age, I think about, what's the common (inaudible)? What
would happen -- What would not have happened?

Because after the fact that we convened and we pushed. And it only takes one flea to make a big dog scratch eventually. So if we keep gnawing at one or two issues that we think are really important. And so align with affordability.

I always talk about the college squeeze in terms of demography; that is, Texas did not expand its number of slots relative to the number of students. Most of the expansion was in two-year colleges. So the college squeeze had a double dimension, but blame it on affirmative action, top 10 percent or whatever you want, but that wasn't the problem. The fundamental was the college squeeze that was with slots and number of students.

We have the same thing happening now on the economic side with the -- with the squeeze taking place with the budgets that are being squeezed in tuition. And they won't allow you to raise that. And as long as that happens, guess who's going to be able to come?

MS. GARCIA: So I would like to add to that, because I'm in California with the California State University System. And so we are
not allowed to raise tuition under this new governor for the next four years. At the same time, we are still operating with a budget of 2007. And I turned around by myself at our campus 20,000 eligible applicants to Cal State Fullerton. Now, who are they? At Cal State Fullerton and California State University, it is your lower income, underrepresented students. And so here we are, it's a degeneration of California, they are place bound, they cannot go, and they cannot go to Texas, they cannot go anywhere else. This is where they --

MS. NIEVES: It's just a handful.

It's just a handful. And it doesn't make a difference.

MS. GARCIA: And it doesn't make a different.

And the other thing that I'd like to add is IPEDS. You know, we keep talking about first-time, full-time freshman. Well, let's look at the Latino population. They don't normally go first-time, full-time freshman. At least not at Cal State. So are we really tracking who's graduating and what's happening? Because I was on the committee of Student Success with the community colleges. They made this recommendation two years
ago, and we're still dealing with IPEDS exactly the same way.

One thing that can happen that I think it helped, when in the first year, I think, of the Obama administration we got dollars to help public universities, was the maintenance of effort, where we said, "You cannot -- If you are going to take this money, you cannot lower your budget." So that maintenance of effort is critical. And I really believe that if we're going to move the needle, the dollars should be going to institutions that first enroll, retain and graduate low-income and underrepresented students. And we're not -- We have to be ready to deal with that.

MS. NIEVES: We're dealing with them in the New York situation, where for the first time, and all the data supports it too -- for the first time ever, we have actually more students that can go to the four-year colleges. Right? We do. We don't have enough seats for them. And what we've done is create this racialized two-tier system. Very clear. Harvard has a higher percentage of African Americans than some of our four-year colleges in New York. That's not acceptable. This is where the people are going to go.
So they're lucked out for a few reasons. And I would say what's happened because of the state funding is that -- It's not even as much the state funding; it's the idea of public colleges straying away from their mission of who they're supposed to be serving. Right? And this is a huge issue. There's no reason why you need to have a 12- or 1300 SAT to go to the City University of New York four-year college. There's no reason. You have decided you do not want Latinos, African Americans to go there. And that has nothing to do with their persistence. We know that their school grades make a bigger difference.

But what we're seeing at a time when we're seeing more movement in access, we're seeing a closing up of these four-year opportunities. And I think we cannot ignore that. And I know you've convened many colleges together, but none of them have been honest in the public colleges of how they have closed the door on opportunity.

And so I'd add this other piece too. People do not want to touch this one. We know class-base strategies help Latinos, people get more in, but they do not help African Americans in the same way. And we know that data's come out. So I
just want to put those two out there, because we have seen this. And so this has nothing to do with state funding as what are the -- what are the decisions that are being made that to me are an assault on the population we're trying to get through the pipeline.

And so many -- It's not about under-matching, overmatching, whatever. I'm tired of matching, you know. I'm sick and tired of it. It is about, I can't get into Hunter, I'm going to BMCC. Because I want to go somewhere, but I can't leave. And let me tell you, that's ridiculous. So there's got to be a way we think about that. And it's the state's mission -- public colleges who have really left -- left what should be their obligation, moral obligation.

MS. GARCIA: And in California, the community colleges are so overcrowded, they can't get the classes.

MS. NIEVES: Well, that's the issue.

MS. GARCIA: So then they're using up their pell. They can't get into the four-year institutions.

MS. NIEVES: And they're not guaranteed a slot. Unlike Texas. We could learn
something from the Lone Star state. In New York, you are not guaranteed a slot if you successfully complete two years of that to go into a four --

Could you imagine? What have we said about opportunity in New York?

MR. FRAGA: Just on this issue of affordability and -- and cost, one idea out of the box that I've talked with a few people about that I think might be one way to at least initiate conversation -- there would be tremendous amounts of pushback -- is to take a second look at federal funding for research that goes to research-intensive institutions that allows their budgets to be supplemented very sizably on the basis of having faculty who have no interest in working with first-generation students.

Now, don't get me wrong. I'm not suggesting that we should withdraw funding. What I'm suggesting here is a balance between the total package of funding that research-intensive institutions receive from the federal government with -- with those institutions who are actually serving first-generation students, who receive far less dollars per student because of the way in which we have structured both our financial aid system and
our research funding situation from the federal government. That's a very touchy issue.

And I've been researching (inaudible) institutions all my life and well appreciate how dependent university budgets are and how faculty success is intimately tied to getting those high-dollar research grants that allows them then not to have to worry about any first-generation students and be rewarded for that within those institutions. We have to have a better system unless it's going to -- unless we accept the consequences that Lisette is referring to, that Milly is referring to and the continued stress on our institutions that serve first-generation students. We have to open up that conversation.

One way to think of getting at that that I've suggested in a couple of arenas is for us to think about looking at institutional capacity. What's the size of the endowment, and what's the size of the budget for athletics? You can see where I'm going with this, right? The size of the endowment -- to look at the endowment, not as a way to eliminate federal funding, but to balance the amount of funding that then is available to go to institutions that are serving the future of our
population, right? Of our country and the economic growth of our population and country. And doing it on the cheap because the federal government has a different distribution formula that has allowed research-intensive institutions to become dependent upon that type of -- I don't know, we don't have a -- What's the equivalent higher education term to corporate welfare? Higher education research welfare. You know, whatever -- whatever -- whatever our term would be. And for those institutions that devote sizable amounts of private donor money to athletics, which they have the full right to do, that that also be included -- I can say this now that I'm not at the University of Washington but now I'm at Notre Dame, which it's both, so -- has a large endowment and a lot of money for athletics -- to use that as part of the resources that they can choose to spend how they want, but don't -- don't then allow for the federal government in a sense to continue to contribute through financial aid or through research-intensive institutions when they're making a choice to invest their money in that way. We don't have -- To my knowledge, we don't have that conversation. I understand the pushback, but without that conversation, we know what the
consequences are going to be --

MS. TIENDA: There can be no sacred cows.

MR. FRAGA: -- for first-generation communities and postsecondary education.

MS. TIENDA: You can't level a playing field with a sacred cow.

MR. ROMO: Yeah. When you turned on the TV two days ago as I did, three days ago, and it said, okay, we're in this new stadium. They remodeled it with $430 million. The stadium was already there with 80, but they needed to bring it to a hundred. $430 million for a stadium.

But here's on another side here -- and this is part of -- what you folks look at -- HSIs. Okay. So we have a little presentation on it. HSIs graduate 40 percent of all the Latinos who graduate from college in America. So there's schools out there HSI --

Getting back to this institutional capacity and so forth. There are ways which you can tell these agencies, you know, "Is your money going all to other schools?" You can investigate, which is a good investment because we're going to be training 40 and more in the future. Maybe 50
percent soon of all Latinos. And so, you know, I
served on the ACU board and went around knocking on
doors. I don't know what the solution is, but it
is -- it is something they -- They are responsive.
If you talk, for example, the Department of the Navy
and you say to the Navy, "You know, you can't send
90 percent of your money to schools that are already
powerhouses" --

    MR. FRAGA: That's right.

    MR. ROMO: -- "or 99 percent of your
money to the powerhouses. You can work with schools
and let them build up some programs and put" -- so
that -- And they're -- And they're responding. The
Navy actually is going to do a little bit of
projects with us. And we have some -- some agencies
respond and others be just like, "Nah" --

    MS. TIENDA: Until they lose their
competitive edge. And then suddenly they're going
to be at your doorstep.

    MR. FRAGA: Just a time check -- I'm
sorry, Lisette. Go ahead.

    MS. NIEVES: There were some other
topics we talked about in our first actual convening
that we haven't touched on in a while. And one was
the emphasis on persistence through the undergrad.
We're actually losing a huge pool that could potentially be graduate students. And I throw that out there because we met quite a few of them along the way. And this notion of what does it mean to build the intellectual capital of Latinos, it's not just looking at the freshman; again, looking beyond that.

And so what are we doing that are interesting things as far as advanced acceleration programs that can get folks to go into graduate work? We can -- Patterns show that we consume higher ed differently. We do it piecemeal. We don't do it all in one chunk. So if we know that, then how do we think about alternative pathways even at the end of a bachelor's to continue folks -- It's just another way of thinking about this. And I think it's -- this question is about what is the whole pipeline for Latinos. And I know that's not our priority.

MS. TIENDA: Well, I've actually done work on that. I've done the BOB, and I've used data that actually uses a whole new (actually) file pretending it's the series of cross-sections. And it turns out that African Americans and Latinos have a higher transition into postgraduate training.
I've looked at the completion rates. I've looked
at, you know, impact by delay and then splice this
thing and probabilities. So it's not a problem.
The problem is that the pipeline is small.

So it's conditional on graduating
from high school, times getting into college, times
getting out of college. Once you do that -- And
it's not because they have higher scores or anything
else. It's (inaudible) factor. You've already
screened on persistence and drive and determination.
They have a higher rate of going, and it persists
across the ten years postcollege degree. But the
differences that are big are: What was your type of
institution? If they come from comprehensive or
liberal arts colleges, they have much lower levels.

MS. NIEVES: See, well, this is --
Well, that's my background, those two areas, where I
see there isn't this kind of counseling or support
to transition folks to go further. That's -- And
it -- And most of HSI -- Where are we talking about
where Latinos are graduating from now --

MS. TIENDA: Exactly. That's where
it's missing.

MS. NIEVES: That's the --

(Simultaneous discussion.)
MS. NIEVES: So there has to be something -- So this is -- this is the challenge. I'm not really concerned with -- I've been blessed to go to these -- But I'm really not concerned with the Harvards and Princetons of the world. I'm not worried about that. They do not interest me. I'm concerned of where we see the majority of our young people. And we do see style and tal -- talent stifled even once they have a bachelor's degree, which we know that they can go beyond that. So that's another way of thinking about that.

MS. TIENDA: But it's because of the school -- comprehensive and liberal art schools is where they have lower transitions into graduate school, which suggests -- That has an easy -- It's not easy, but it has a solution, and that is, link up with research. They have -- They don't -- My hypothesis --

MS. NIEVES: Oh, yeah.

MS. TIENDA: The reason I say that (inaudible), all these little pipeline programs --

MS. NIEVES: We can incentivize a lot --

MS. TIENDA: -- and summer programs, that's the implicit hypothesis which nobody
(audible) because they all do these feel-good surveys, "Did you like the program?" And I think, wait a minute, what difference did it make for your life? Show me -- So when I started looking, it is in fact the comprehensive -- those students who attend comprehensive university with no PhD programs, with no research funding, and liberal art schools are the least likely to go on --

MS. NIEVES: So that would be a policy question or policy question we could be thinking about is: How do we set up the incentives and pipelines to do that since that is where the majority of Latinos are consuming higher ed as we speak?

MR. FRAGA: We have two minutes. Darlene?

MS. ROBLES: I just want to add the K-12 perspective. That's why the (inaudible) has me here. No, I think going back to earlier, Ajita, where you talked about that partnership, I think we've done, at least with college, making some decision -- the legislature in California that sub-CSUs now have agreements with your community colleges that they will enter, and they're working on having some content and curriculum and degrees
that match that. So if they get a degree from East LA College, they could get it at Cal State LA where they wouldn't before. They're just not going, going, going.

But I think we have to look at those partnerships that are seamless K-16.

MS. NIEVES: Yes.

MS. ROBLES: Because if not, we're never going to have that pipeline advising to go to get and research.

MS. NIEVES: The Long Beach model. That's a good model.

MS. ROBLES: The Long Beach model, all of those.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MS. ROBLES: We have to focus on that. And the resources, let's take away the money from SC and Notre Dame on that research. They've got enough money for athletics and buildings and anything they want to -- Our president's raising $6 billion. 6 billion. But give -- give those resources and the innovation money to those partnerships with the longitudinal study that it works.

MS. TIENDA: Without the metrics, you just feel good.

MS. ROBLES: The thing is, if they're not expected and required to put those metrics, then they just go on their merry way.

MS. TALWALKER: There's been significant data when I was on the hill this last (inaudible) around this sort of question. Like you know Upward Bound works, but you don't actually -- you cannot demonstrably know why and what aspects of it -- yeah -- and what pieces of the intervention can be isolated --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MS. TALWALKER: Can I ask one small thing on the -- So NSF actually has a (inaudible) track of work around this transition at MSIs undergraduate education. So that might be worth exploring.

But more importantly, it actually led me to another question, which was, backing up the policy recommendations, are there like -- is there a short list of research -- not research questions, but things that you identify where -- where the -- like you're identifying where the gaps are and where you want to focus.
MR. FRAGA: Gaps are in the research or gaps are in the recommendation?

MS. TALWALKER: Gaps are in the --

MR. FRAGA: Policy?

MS. TALWALKER: -- in the -- in the pipeline that would translate to a particular time -- pieces that you want to correct for. And is there a research agenda, kind of, supporting that effort or identify --

MS. TIENDA: Without the evidence base, you really can't argue. So today people are talking about the Latino education -- the Latino teachers, right? And do you know how little research there is on the ethnic -- One of my students is trying to analyze the data. He's really sharp. The data are a disaster. He's found so many errors in the data that the people at Michigan, he's got them all blown away, because everybody's been using this data, and it has gigantic holes. So it's like a person who solved the problem, well, I got the kid who's exposing all of their flaws.

And we need data before we start pushing that agenda and say, "Well, what is it that we're trying to accomplish?" and not pursue just the demography of education, which I think is really
critical, but all demonstrate what are the benefits? Because that's what's going to actually sell --

MR. ROMO: Let me give you one quick example. So yesterday, I got a request -- Since we're playing Arizona at 7:00 o'clock, it takes a long time to get downtown, they want to know whether or not we can cancel classes after 3:00 o'clock. I said, "I don't think so."

So I wrote a note to my institution (inaudible). I said, "I think it'd be in the hundreds." He writes back, "We would have to cancel 450 classes, and it would impact 11,000 students."

MS. TIENDA: Yeah, the answer is no.

MR. ROMO: The answer's no. But they have no idea. Nobody takes classes after 3:00 o'clock.

MS. NIEVES: Can I add something on this, Luis?

MR. FRAGA: Yes. We've run out of time. Go ahead, Lisette.

MS. NIEVES: But I think part of the purpose of having the symposiums that we saw the people were doing this kind of research that was qualitative, that were in particular Latino researchers that did not have visibility or did not
have recognition. I do want to say that. And some of the stuff that we put out in the first -- at the USC symposium and the second one here were the first time they actually looked at a Latino lens through these popular issues, but most importantly looking at a sub-ethnic lens, which is what we don't see. And when we're talking about regional approaches, that was really important for the Latino population.

So I do say that that's what's -- that's what's been missing. And so that's -- we're not doing this because we just want to see people write things. We're doing it because the research isn't there on that.

So now we know. We know that for Latinos that it actually -- they got a better bang for the buck in a certificate program than even if they went for an associate's degree. We know that. We know that. No one's ever published that before.

MS. TIENDA: Tied to (inaudible).

MS. NIEVES: Right. Of course. It's tied to -- But if we want to move persistence, why aren't those certificate programs stackable so that they can communicate. If we know Latino behavior, is to keep consuming piecemeal. Because there is that mom who's going to come back in ten years and
say, "I may want to finish this." That's what we see. But we don't have those connections.

So we still, you know -- So having that data was really important for us. We didn't have it before. I mean, we know it's tied to the -- We know the reasons for it. But again, when you see it on paper -- we hadn't seen it before compared to other ethnic or racial groups. That was significant for us --

MS. TIENDA: That's the part I kicked out of my data, because (inaudible). But that can be -- That can be known. They have several cohorts that are (inaudible). But you need somebody who really knows how to use --

MS. NIEVES: And we did. And we did get that. Dr. Cardinali did it for us out of Georgetown. And he was well aware of that.

MS. TIENDA: The BME data?

MS. NIEVES: Some of it. And I'll tell you the exact --

MS. TIENDA: He's using really old data. He's using (inaudible) --

MS. NIEVES: No. He's using some --

I'll give you the specifics of what he's using, but I have to tell you that it made a huge distance.
And I think the other piece is the piece that we don't often talk about in some of the work, is the work on Latino families and looking at their role and engagement, which is I know it's not -- it's much more quantitative ultimately sometimes than qualitative, but it's an area people don't often want to talk about, and it's a big piece about thinking about cause engagement. So I would say when you say what are the research questions? That's why we do these things, so...

MR. FRAGA: We did have the focus on empowering Latino families in our first symposium. That's the reason we did it, to try to see what research was available. There's not a lot.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MR. FRAGA: There's not a lot of very good systematic research.

MS. TIENDA: Did you see the book that just came out on the compass, the broken compass? One of them was in my (inaudible). The other one was at UT Austin. And they put out this book, broken compass. It got a lot of criticism, especially by the economists that said, "Oh, my God." But they were saying that parent involvement does not get kids --
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. FRAGA: Yeah, does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MS. TIENDA: And it's just like, what planet are you from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MR. FRAGA: It depends on how you count the data and how you understand it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS. ROBLES: I can name a hundred helicopter parents who made the difference in their children's lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Simultaneous discussion.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR. FRAGA: So given our limited time, if you have other ideas, other thoughts or other great research, if you could send it to Alex or Lisette or myself so that we can think it through, it would be very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MS. TIENDA: (Inaudible) New York conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MS. NIEVES: We're going to be circulating that. We're just getting final drafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MR. FRAGA: We always circulate it to all the members of the commission. We did that on the first time as well. Received zero responses to return. But that's okay. It's to generate ideas, generate questions for anyone who's there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>So I think we're done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Breakout concluded at 2:51 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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