
From: Mark Miles [mailto:mmiles@cincorp.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 10:52 PM
To: marklub@aol.com
Cc: Todd Huston; Allan B. Hubbard
Subject: Re: Last nights agenda

Allright. I'll concentrate on single malt

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 18, 2010, at 10:48 PM, "marklub@aol.com" <marklub@aol.com> wrote:

Could agree with all But as Shane and Mutz will tell you, MD has shown little or no interest in workforce training/education.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Mark Miles" <mmiles@cincorp.com>
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 2010 22:28:41 -0500
To: Todd Huston<thuston@doe.in.gov>
Cc: <MARKLUB@aol.com>; <ahubbard@eaindustries.com>
Subject: Re: Last nights agenda

Unlike Lubbers I can't construct an adequate higher ed treatise in an email. I agree w his comments about IU/PU and the regional schools. Like Todd Im very concerned about Ivy Tech. It's headed in the right direction but I saw some info saying there r 120,000 students and 10,000 get a certificate or two year degree. Indiana MUST get to the point of expecting 60%+ to have a 2 year degree or more. We have 20 counties with less than 25% and the state average is about 40%. This is the single most important metric determining per capita income. I think we have to get this up and the income will follow... and we'll cut costs of society taking care of these people. Young people aren't getting enough ed and the incumbent workforce requires more skills. People like Hubbard create wealth and jobs but employers will not locate good jobs here if we don't increase educational attainment. If MED wants to be a national leader in ed I think his program must address these issues. I don't think we have to wait till we rework the higher ed structure.

Can't wait for our next session. Let's do it soon and decide next steps (and remember them the next morning).

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 18, 2010, at 10:02 PM, "Todd Huston" <thuston@doe.in.gov> wrote:

Mark M: That is a great question and well worth consideration.

Mark L: I am becoming very concerned about how much we think alike. I couldn't agree more about IU and Purdue and, in particular, the regional campuses. I am not nearly as confident in Ivy Tech but believe that their performance is largely based upon the business model the state has used to fund them which rewards enrollment and not successful completion of a certification or diploma. As you have noted, we have to make the discussion about funding and completion. Also, we must engage the business community to assist Higher Ed in understanding what the market requires and not let them offer options for students with no long-term economic gain for the student or state.

I told Al that I would shoot him an agenda for our next meeting and I will get that out no later than tomorrow evening.

Thanks,

Todd

From: MARKLUB@aol.com [<mailto:MARKLUB@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 5:07 PM
To: ahubbard@eaindustries.com; mmiles@cincorp.com; Todd Huston
Subject: Re: Last nights agenda

1. if we are having sour mash and scotch with you, we need to start at 4:30, which is fine by me.
2. as john mclauchlan used to say ... you have lurched into the truth. it is the very presence of excellent higher ed that begets the demand for best and brightest.
thus how important it is that purdue and IU up their games radically not at the snail's pace they are doing. i can't prove it, but I know this is the single most important thing we could do to sling shot our economy. MD won't think this worth the fight unless it has some principled nationally transferrable principles behind it, thus the voucher on grad idea.

I agree with much of what Lubbs says. Now that would be a very interesting discussion to have some evening over sour mash and Scotch!!! I remain convinced the best econ dev tool is attracting the best and brightest. And the difficult q is how to do that. Think about how different our state would be if HBS were in Plainfield!!!

----- Original Message -----

From: MARKLUB@aol.com <MARKLUB@aol.com>
To: mmiles@cincorp.com <mmiles@cincorp.com>; Al Hubbard;
thuston@doe.in.gov <thuston@doe.in.gov>
Sent: Thu Feb 18 12:19:11 2010

Subject: Re: Last nights agenda

Do you think the poor post-secondary rates is a supply problem or a demand problem?

perhaps at the low end -- certification, 2 yr degrees, etc, it is a supply prob, i.e. students not going on. But from what I can glean, this is being attacked pretty effectively by a robust Ivy Tech -- and could be greatly enhanced if IU and Purdue got OUT of the extension campus business (more on that below).

As for the 4 and 4+ yr degrees, I have to believe that ours is a demand problem -- not enough businesses that require these degrees OR that can compete effectively for the best of them. Thus a significant net out-migration.

Assuming that we are doing everything possible on the economic development side -- low taxes, workforce development, etc, then the single best way to fix is to radically and rapidly change the Purdue and IU organizational templates. You have all heard me talk about this for 17 years, so I won't go into it again. But if you want many more 21st century enterprises, you must have many many more graduate students at these two universities. The system is rigged against that and the inertia of these two institutions will never get off the dime without a BIG push.

As to extension campuses, (1) if they are going to exist, only one school should have them -- and that should be IU; (2) they shouldn't exist -- they are a remnant of the 1960s deal between Fred Hovde and Herman Wells and have no place in the present system EXCEPT as a nefarious and quality dragging vehicle for generating local political support for IU and Purdue; and (3) All but the following should be absorbed into the Ivy Tech system: IU SE at New Albany, Purdue Fort Wayne, and IUPUI should become stand-alone universities. At IUPUI, the medical school should remain part of IU, all other graduate programs should go with the new Lugar University, including the law school, informatics, spea, etc.

While mostly this is all inside Indiana problem -- and a complex pot of political goo -- it can be wrapped in big picture policy.

In a world as mobile and as technologically enabled as ours, it makes NO SENSE for the state to directly subsidize universities. There is no better place to make vouchers work (think GI Bill). However, the voucher backed by state tax dollars shouldn't go as an entitlement to 18 year old citizens who may or may not end up living here. Rather, the state should pay for college grads who take jobs here -- which can obviously be calibrated to the kind of degrees (and jobs) you want to subsidize.

Mutz is VERY eager to engage on this subject -- and it would be NATIONAL news, not that MD would be interested in that. It addresses the larger question of American productivity in a fundamental and fundamentally different way -- and as you both know, American productivity -- the capacity to produce more for less i.e. the capacity to produce a profit -- is at the heart of fiscal policy. Absent robust economic growth, our fiscal dilemma cannot be solved.

OK, thanks for this diversion Miles, now back to work. Enjoyed the company last eve.

Enjoyed the discussion (and the scotch). Wanted your reactions to another thought/question about defining the public policy agenda for what we hope will be the political opportunity following the Nov elections.

The question is: shouldn't Mitch be focused on an education agenda that is broader than k-12?

I don't mean to complicate this, and I do feel strongly that k-12 is the highest priority, but don't we need to address the broader pipeline as well? Indiana is close the national average for HS graduation rate but well below for certificate, 2 yr, and 4 yr degrees and there is no doubt about the correlation between post high school attainment and per capita income. Lumina would be a key funding source for developing the broader agenda and I'll bet the Commission leadership would pitch in too. Wouldn't Mitch want a broader goal??? Sent from my iPhone