

**Public Higher Education Reform Five Years After
The Kellogg Commission
on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities**

John V. Byrne
Former Executive Director
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities
and
President Emeritus, Oregon State University

January 2006

**National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
And the
W.K. Kellogg Foundation**

Executive Summary

The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land grant Universities existed between January 1996 and March 2000 in order to create an awareness among public universities of the need for higher education reform. The Commission, consisting of the presidents and chancellors of 25 major public universities, produced six reports and held numerous meetings on campuses throughout America urging a return to the educational values and dedication of the past. The commission called for discussion and actions on campuses to reinvigorate the student experience, improve student access, energize and enhance partnerships with the public served by the university, address the role of public universities in a learning society, and attend to the culture of the campus. A final report called for a renewal of the partnership of the public university with the society it serves. At the time of their release all of the reports were well received by academe throughout the United States.

Now, five years after the Commission's final meeting it is appropriate to address the lasting impact the Commission had on higher education reform. An assessment is presented here of the influence of the Commission based on thirty-five responses to a letter sent to presidents, chancellors, and friends of public higher education. The presidents and chancellors were requested to express their views on the effectiveness of the Commission and to share examples of transformative changes on their campuses during the past five years. If possible, they were to relate those changes to the recommendations of the Kellogg Commission.

All who responded indicated the work of the Commission was important to creating an awareness of the need for higher education reform. Several respondents said the Commission had stimulated and shaped discussion at a national level and had catalyzed action on their campus. Further, in a number of cases the Commission had validated changes already in the process of implementation on their campus. In commenting on the importance of the Commission, phrases were used such as: "provided a wake-up call", "generated an important national discussion", "accelerated the process of transformation", "provided a clear articulation of issues", "improved an understanding of academic issues", "emphasized the importance of 'learning, discovery, and engagement'", and "served as a guide for reform". Several presidents called for an on-going Kellogg Commission-type effort to continue to stimulate reform.

These campus leaders pointed out that the primary areas of change influenced by the Commission included engagement with society, internationalization of the campus with particular attention to overseas opportunities for students, holistic learning including residential and in-service learning, undergraduate research opportunities, and distant and lifelong learning. A number of campuses had revised their curricula with specific attention to the general core and to capstone in-service experiences. Several institutions reviewed and revised their guidelines for promotion and tenure in keeping with academic changes and greater engagement with society. Many indicated greater emphasis on diversity and attention to campus culture in general. Examples of these reforms are presented in this report.

All who responded stated that at their university significant change was underway. A small number of universities were truly innovative in the changes they were making; most had adopted changes already implemented at other universities. All were attempting to better meet the educational needs of the 21st century society they serve; all indicated the work of the Kellogg Commission had directly or indirectly been of benefit to them and to higher education.

Public Higher Education Reform Five Years After the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities

Introduction

June 1996: “Unprecedented problems confront our campuses. We face seismic shifts in public attitudes. We are challenged by new demographics and exploding technologies. We are beset by demands to act “accountably” toward students, parents, communities, and taxpayers. An increasingly skeptical press questions our priorities....We must take charge of change. That is what the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities is all about.”¹

With these words the Kellogg Commission introduced itself to the academic world. The purpose of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities was to increase the awareness of public university faculty and administrators throughout the United States of the urgent need for higher education reform. The Commission, consisting of the presidents and chancellors of twenty-five major public universities,² met between January 1996 and March 2000. A group of lay advisors met with the Commission, providing a societal reality check. The Commission produced six reports³ and held numerous meetings on campuses throughout America, focusing on the educational values, principles, and dedication that made American public higher education successful in the past, the envy of educators throughout the world. Recognizing that we live in a new age and a different world, the Commission called for reforms to prepare America’s universities for effective service to society in the 21st century. The Commission’s first five reports urged discussion and actions on campuses to reinvigorate the student experience, improve student access, energize and enhance partnerships with the public, address the role of public universities in a learning society, and attend to the culture of the campus. Its sixth and final report called for a renewal of the partnership of the public university with the society it serves.

Now, five years after the Commission’s final meeting, it is appropriate to ask the following questions and to answer them: “Did the Commission make a difference? Did it have a lasting influence on public higher education in America? And if it did, what was that influence?”

¹ “Taking Charge of Change: Reviewing the Promise of State and Land-grant Universities”, Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-grant Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges, June 1996

² Appendix A: Kellogg Commission and Advisory Committee members

³ Appendix D: List of reports published by the Kellogg Commission

In order to assess any influence the Commission may have had, a letter was sent by Peter Magrath, President of the National Association of State and Land-grant Colleges (NASULGC), Graham Spanier, Chairman of the Kellogg Commission, and John Byrne, Executive Director of the Kellogg Commission, to the presidents and chancellors of forty universities, requesting their views on the effectiveness of the work of the Commission.⁴ The letter was also sent to thirty-one other people who had been involved in the Commission's deliberations. The presidents and chancellors were asked to provide examples of transforming changes on their own campuses and where appropriate to relate those changes to the recommendations of the Kellogg Commission. Thirty-five responses were received; thirty-one of these were from presidents and chancellors.⁵ The assessment of the influence of the Kellogg Commission presented in this report is based on the letters received.

Overview:

“The Commission was one of the most effective efforts undertaken over the past several decades to refocus dialogue and programs on higher education, particularly public higher education....It is readily apparent that it [the Commission] changed the nature of the discussion.”⁶

Every response indicated the work of the Commission was important in creating an awareness of the need for higher education reform and that significant change or reform had been taking place at their institution. Several respondents said the Commission had stimulated and shaped discussion at a national level and had catalyzed specific action on their campus or that the Commission had validated changes already in process. Regarding the importance of the work of the Commission, they made comments such as: “provided a wake-up call”, “generated an important national discussion”, “accelerated the process of transformation”, “provided a clear articulation of issues”, “improved an understanding of academic issues”, “emphasized the importance of ‘learning, discovery, and engagement’”, and “served as a guide for reform”. Several presidents called for an on-going Kellogg Commission-type effort to continue the work of stimulating reform.

These campus leaders pointed out that the primary areas of change occurring on their campus included engagement with society, internationalization of the campus with particular attention to overseas opportunities for students, holistic learning that includes residential and in-service learning, undergraduate research opportunities, and distant and lifelong learning. Several indicated their faculty had revised their curricula with specific attention to required general core academic courses and to capstone in-service experiences. In keeping with academic changes and greater engagement with society, a number of institutions revised their promotion and tenure guidelines. Many respondents indicated greater emphasis on diversity and attention to campus culture in general. A small number of universities were truly innovative in the changes they were

⁴ Appendix B: letter

⁵ Appendix C: List of Respondents

⁶ The unattributed quotations included in this report are from the responses received from the presidents and chancellors.

making; others adopted changes already implemented at other universities. All respondents indicated the work of the Kellogg Commission had directly or indirectly been of benefit to them and to higher education in their attempt to meet the educational needs of the 21st century society they serve.

Fifteen institutions (48%) included transforming changes in their strategic, long-range, or academic plans. All respondents (100%) reported changes in the student experience; eighteen (58%) had revised their admissions standards and processes or had taken steps to improve retention; twenty-two (71%) had adopted or re-invigorated their engagement with society; fifteen (48%) highlighted changes in lifelong and/or distant learning; and fifteen (48%) indicated some effort to address the fragmentation of their campus culture. Several highlighted efforts to integrate all learning activities and to create a student-centered campus. “The six Commission reports clearly articulated the critical issues that face NASULGC universities and provided a sound blueprint for needed reforms.”

The following assessment is organized according to the topics covered in the first five Kellogg Commission reports.

The Student Experience

The work of the Kellogg Commission started with the student experience. In its first report, “Returning to Our Roots: the Student Experience”, the Commission stated:

“ (1) Our institutions must become *genuine learning communities*, supporting and inspiring faculty, staff, and learners of all kinds. (2) Our learning communities should be *student centered*, committed to excellence in teaching and to meeting the legitimate needs of learners, wherever they are, whatever they need, whenever they need it. (3) Our learning communities should emphasize the importance of a *healthy learning environment* that provides students, faculty, and staff with the facilities, support, and resources they need to make this vision a reality.”

Included in the list of action commitments cited in that report were: “address the academic and personal development of students in a holistic way” and “strengthen the link between discovery and learning by providing more opportunities for hands-on learning, including undergraduate research.”

Nineteen institutions (61%) highlighted both holistic approaches to learning and also an increase in opportunities for study abroad experiences. Sixteen institutions (52%) emphasized efforts to provide more opportunities for their undergraduates to participate in research as part of their learning experience. Several respondents cited programs in which students learned by providing services to the community (service learning) and mention was also made of efforts to create learning communities among students. Roughly a third of the replies indicated they had revised or were in the process of revising their curriculum, particularly the general education core requirements.

Holistic Learning includes learning a student experiences outside the classroom and laboratory as well as inside. It involves the development of the student socially, academically, and intellectually. Efforts to couple learning outside the curriculum with that inside include the use of specialized living arrangements dedicated to particular academic and other interests. These have been instituted at a number of universities. For example, the University of Georgia has a residence hall for language immersion, Oregon State University's Weatherford Hall houses a program in which students develop their own businesses, and Purdue University involves students in entrepreneurial activities and engagement in their "Discovery Park".

Freshman seminars designed to create learning communities of new students are successful in improving student retention at the University of North Carolina, Washington State University, and Northern Illinois University, among others. Several universities organized freshman seminars or discussion groups about books that all new students are required to read before entering the university. Jump-start programs held during the summer before students matriculate are successful not only in giving freshman an early taste of college life, but also in helping them develop relationships with other students and in creating student learning communities that can provide support during their first year on campus, and later too. These have been successful at the University of West Virginia and the University of Alabama at Birmingham, for example. All of these programs enhance the development of students outside the boundaries of the academic curriculum.

Undergraduate Research was also cited as an important learning experience by a number of presidents and chancellors. Students are given hands-on experiences in the discovery of new knowledge at many universities. The University of New Orleans reported that students engage in research with senior faculty in all seven of the university's colleges. Auburn University provides year-long and semester-long competitive research fellowships. Northern Illinois University provides funds for creative activities by undergraduates in the arts as well as in scientific and technical research. Several universities, including Portland State, the University of Wisconsin, and Rutgers University, also make funds available to undergraduates for the conduct of research. The University of California at Davis reports that sixty percent of their undergraduates participate in research with faculty. At the University of Georgia, selected freshman are involved in research as soon as they are accepted to the university. A number of institutions, such as North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University (North Carolina A&T), Wisconsin, and Arizona State hold symposia at which students present the results of their research. Student research papers are published in the "Journal for Undergraduate Research Opportunities" at the University of Georgia. The School of Life Sciences at Arizona State has three distinct levels of research experience: *apprentice*, *researcher*, and *fellow*. In this program, *apprentices* work on a faculty-initiated project, *researchers* participate in the design of experiments, and *fellows* design and implement an independent research project.

International study abroad programs are coming of age. In the past, it was difficult to convince undergraduates that an overseas educational experience could pay off with great dividends to their future careers. Today, more and more universities are expanding opportunities for American students to experience other cultures, learn other languages, and appreciate the global

dimensions of social, political, economic, and environmental issues, and more and more American students are taking advantage of these opportunities. Several presidents mentioned that the Kellogg Commission stimulated them to revisit their international goals and ultimately to expand them. Iowa State University, Michigan State, UC Davis, University of Georgia, and Purdue all report an increase in the number of students studying overseas. Some schools, such as Georgia and Minnesota, have set goals for a certain percentage (some as high as 50%) of their undergraduate students to participate in studies in other countries.

Virginia Tech, Iowa State, University of Georgia, University of Nebraska, Maryland Eastern Shore, and Auburn report increases in the number of educational partners overseas. Arizona State offers a winter session overseas program and Wisconsin has short-term international programs of three to four weeks. North Carolina A&T offers an international certificate for completion of a study program involving international courses and a study-abroad experience. Oregon State University offers a dual degree program in which a student may obtain a degree in his/her discipline along with an international degree. Oregon State also has an active international internship program in which a student can participate as an intern in a company or agency abroad.

A number of universities recently reorganized their administrative structure in order to be more effective in administering their international programs. Penn State combined its Office of Undergraduate Studies with its Office of International Programs. The University of North Carolina created the position of Associate Provost for International Affairs two years ago, and, at about the same time, launched the construction of its Global Education Center, a \$34 million, 82,000 square foot building to house all their international activities. Other notable international activities include eight federally funded National Resource Centers at the University of Wisconsin, which are designed to train students in critical world languages and area studies. Wisconsin also initiated a "D.C. Semester in International Affairs", which provides a small number of students with an internship experience in international offices, embassies, and governmental agencies in Washington, D.C.

Student Access

"The 'Putting Students First' focus of the first report effectively set the stage for a complete re-thinking of how we are fulfilling our missions, and, I believe, has resulted in major changes in our approach to student learning with a much greater emphasis on doing all we can to help students succeed."

Student Access has long been considered an area for improvement at many universities. In its second report, "Returning to Our Roots: Student Access", the Kellogg Commission expressed its concerns about the need to improve in three areas related to student access: the policies and procedures by which students were admitted to institutions; diversity on campuses; and the success of students once admitted. The Commission recognized that admission to a university is not the only challenge facing students, but access to success within the university and

subsequently in life are. In order to provide access to success the Commission called for programs to meet the needs of both non-traditional and traditional students; to build new partnerships with public secondary schools; to validate admissions requirements; to encourage diversity; to improve inter-institutional transfer and articulation agreements; and to enhance support services to ensure that all students succeed in achieving their educational objectives. More than half the institutional leaders who responded emphasized their efforts to streamline admissions procedures, including working with high schools to better prepare students for university admission. In several cases they noted programs which pay particular attention to students who are disadvantaged due to socio-economic factors.

As the Commission discussed the issue of student access it quickly became apparent that the issue was not only access or admission to the university, but also access to success after a student is once admitted, i.e. retention. The Commission focused its discussions on admission and transfer policies and procedures, and on the means to enhance the retention of students. Fifteen of the responses (48%) highlighted changes in admission and retention efforts.

At a number of institutions, such as Nebraska, New Orleans, North Carolina, and Oregon State, admissions standards have been changed to accommodate more students. The University of North Carolina has eliminated binding early decision by applicants and gives every application for admission two readings. At Oregon State the “Insight Resume” has been added to the admission and scholarship application process. It consists of six short-answer response questions designed to assess student characteristics such as motivation, ability to set and achieve goals, and ability to meet personal adversity. By assessing these “non-cognitive variables” officials at Oregon State believe universities can achieve more accurate predictions of academic success. With the leadership of Rutgers University New Jersey has adopted a web-based, state-wide transfer system, “NJTRANSFER”, that helps community college students select courses, learn about 4-year degree requirements, and transfer information for virtually every college and university in New Jersey.

Helping students achieve success within the university is a common high priority and special efforts are made by most universities to help incoming students adjust to their new environment. Portland State University offers special seminars for transfer students which are similar to freshman indoctrination seminars. The University of Minnesota monitors student progress and issues “midterm alerts” to help students address academic problems. The University of Nebraska has produced a multi-media orientation CD for new students. The University of Alabama at Birmingham promotes orderly progression within the university through a specific program of consistent advising. Florida International University, primarily a commuter university, proposes creating Virtual Student Centers using information technology to build student learning communities and to provide support services in an on-line environment. The centers will be organized around student majors such as Engineering, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Nursing. They report that students will be able to communicate directly with other students, find study partners, access faculty-generated tutorials, become involved in research projects, learn more about career opportunities in their major, and receive advising as they plan their term-by-term program - all online.

Other efforts to improve student retention include the academic success courses at Iowa State, the student “scorecard” system adopted at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, and West Virginia’s “Regents Bachelor of Arts Program”, offered only to students who have been out of high school for more than five years. Freshman seminars, interest groups, and other devices to create small group “learning communities” are all designed to improve student retention and were mentioned in the section on the student experience.

Engagement

“It is important to reiterate the positive role the Commission took to probe the issues that are vital to higher education. Further, its work signified our collective commitment to excellence and responsibilities to those inside and outside the academy.”

The Kellogg Commission’s third report, “Returning to Our Roots: the Engaged Institution” received considerable attention and has been widely utilized. The Commission recognized the extensive contributions of service that universities have made to the people of our nation, but concluded that even greater service is possible and that it is time to go beyond outreach and service to what the Commission defined as “engagement”. In the report, the Commission stated,

“Engagement goes well beyond extension, conventional outreach, and even most conceptions of public service. Inherited concepts emphasize a one-way process in which the university transfers its expertise to key constituents. Embedded in the engagement ideal is a commitment to sharing and reciprocity. By engagement the Commission envisioned partnerships, two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table.

The engaged institution must

- * be organized to respond to the needs to today’s students and tomorrow’s;
- * bring research and engagement into the curriculum and offer practical opportunities for students to prepare for the world they will enter;
- * put its resources - knowledge and expertise - to work on problems that face the communities it serves.”

The Commission urged that engagement as defined by the Commission become a central part of each institution’s mission; that each institution develop an engagement plan which would include interdisciplinary scholarship, research, and learning opportunities; that they provide incentives to encourage faculty involvement, and that they secure stable funding for engagement.

As reported by the responding institutions, it is in the area of engagement that the Commission has had its greatest impact. At several institutions, virtually all the Commission’s recommendations concerning engagement have been implemented. Engagement is now recognized in the mission statements of a number of universities and the administrative structures of several universities have been modified to create leadership positions for

engagement at the Vice President or Vice Provost level. These universities have engagement plans and provide incentives for faculty involvement. However, some universities have adopted the term “engagement” but have not implemented the Kellogg Commission’s definition of engagement with respect to the aspect of “mutual sharing”. Several universities use the term “engagement” interchangeably with the term “outreach”. To the Commission, engagement involves sharing, working in partnership with segments of society, and is a two-way process. “Outreach” implies a one-way communication from the university out to society.

Although the term “engagement” may not appear in their mission statements, virtually all the institutions responding were committed to some type of outreach, public or civic service, or engagement. A few of the institutions do endorse and implement the concept of partnerships and sharing with the communities they serve, a critical element of the Kellogg Commission’s definition of engagement. Several universities have created relatively high level offices to administer their engagement activities. Michigan State’s Office of Outreach and Engagement is administered by an Assistant Provost; Purdue’s Office of Engagement by a Vice Provost; Ohio State’s Office of University Outreach by a Vice President; and Georgia’s Office of Public Service by a Vice President.

Several universities have created plans for engagement or have included engagement as part of their university strategic or academic plan. Wisconsin-Madison and New Hampshire are examples of institutions where this is the case. At New Hampshire “outreach scholarship” is one of five university goals. At Wisconsin-Madison “Amplifying the Wisconsin Idea” (“the Wisconsin idea: the borders of the university extend to the borders of the world”) is one of the university’s five strategic plan priorities. Every public university and college in Wisconsin is now engaged in serving the citizens of the state and the world.

A number of universities include specific initiatives as part of their engagement plans. Arizona State (ASU) refers to their program of engagement as “embeddedness within the community”. They point to their partnership with Phoenix in creating a new ASU campus in the center of the city. Among the special initiatives they cite is the Stardust Center for Affordable Homes and the Family, a new research center established to work with the community to create permanent affordable homes for working families and to study the effects of family services on neighborhood stability.

The University of Georgia recently developed five major initiatives: a Latino Initiative; Economic and Community Development; Poverty and Economy; Internationalization/Globalization; and Service Learning. The Poverty and Economy Initiative addresses ways to battle persistent poverty in the historic Black Belt of the southern U.S., involves research and public policy, and is funded from both government and private sources.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill bases significant engagement in the Carolina Center for Public Service, the Public Service Scholars Program and the APPLES Service Learning Program (Assisting People in Planning Learning Experiences in Service). They point out that collectively these three programs and centers “integrate engagement with research and teaching, connect the community and the University in addressing a wide variety of problems and issues, coordinate and make coherent the institutional engagement enterprise, and help

prepare students for the complex challenges they will face in their careers and as responsible citizens.”⁷ The APPLE Service Learning Program, which began prior to the creation of the Kellogg Commission, is a student-led organization funded by student fees. The students identify community needs, then plan, implement, and evaluate their efforts. Faculty provide guidance but it is a student-run program. Each year more than thirty-six faculty from sixteen departments incorporate service learning in their curricula. The program involves 750 students and 130 community partners. This program is an excellent example of the integration of learning, discovery, and engagement.

Among all the examples of engagement cited by the respondents partnerships with schools and school systems are notable. A few examples: Arizona State’s ALPHA Partnership Program, designed to reach students from pre-kindergarten to high school in order to enhance the performance of Arizona’s students; the University of Kentucky’s Great Schools Initiative, a partnership between the University of Kentucky (UK) and the Lexington public school system in which sixteen deans work with school educators, parents, and students to encourage healthy living and successful learning; Oregon State University’s SMILE Program (Science and Math Investigative Learning Experiences), a partnership between OSU and fourteen Oregon school districts - mostly rural - to provide science and math enrichment for under-represented and other educationally under-served fourth to twelfth grade students; the Northern Illinois University NIU-P20 initiative that included dozens of programs and hundreds of partnerships with public school districts and community colleges in northern Illinois to improve teacher preparation and student performance at all levels.

Innovative ways to serve and to cooperate with the public characterize the engagement efforts of public universities throughout America. Engagement, outreach, and civic service are all critical elements of public university missions, whether specifically included in the mission statement or not, and are defining characteristics of the public university of today and tomorrow.

Beyond individual universities, there is evidence of the importance of engagement. Committees, councils, and commissions devoted to engagement now exist within the structures of educational associations such as NASULGC, AASCU, and ACE. Several community colleges have adopted engagement as part of their missions; new journals are focusing on engagement; and a National Review Board to address the “Scholarship of Engagement is now in place.”⁸

The Learning Society

“We share a commitment to engage in a process of reinventing higher education to better serve a broader segment of our population....The Kellogg Commission reports have had a profound effect on our

⁷ Letter from James Moeser, Chancellor, UNC

⁸ “University Engagement in 2005.” John V. Byrne, a report to NASULGC in March 2005, based on a presentation at the 2004 NASULGC annual meeting. Available on request from <john.byrne@oregonstate.edu>.

understanding of higher education in America.”

Recognizing the growing demand for educational opportunities by people throughout the United States and noting the increased capabilities to deliver such opportunities through information technology, in “Returning to Our Roots: The Learning Society” the Kellogg Commission called on universities to take the lead in creating a true “learning society:”

“...our challenge in our emerging Information Age is two-fold. First, we must ensure that the remarkable growth in demand for education throughout the lifetime of virtually every citizen can be satisfied; second, we must demonstrate that we can meet this need at the highest level of quality imaginable, along with the greatest efficiency possible.”

To summarize the Commission’s definition, a learning society:

- * values and fosters habits of lifelong learning, ensures that there are responsive and flexible learning programs, and that learning networks are available to address all students’ needs;
- * ensures that all of its members can participate in learning communities;
- * recognizes the importance of early-childhood development and creates organized ways to enhance the development of all children;
- * recognizes the importance of information technologies as tools for enriching learning by tailoring instruction to societal, organizational, and individual needs;
- * stimulates the creation of new knowledge through research and other means of discovery and uses that knowledge for the benefit of society;
- * values regional and global interconnections and cultural links;
- * fosters public policy to ensure equity of access to learning, information, and information technologies; and
- * recognizes that investments in learning contribute to overall competitiveness and the economic and social well-being of the nation.

The Commission called on universities to make lifelong learning a part of their core missions and that these missions should include partnerships of higher education with the pre-kindergarten through 12th grade communities as well as post-university educational opportunities. In short, new learning environments were called for.

A dozen universities reported they had recognized this challenge by creating administrative offices for educational outreach, and lifelong and distant learning. Advances in information technology now make it possible to extend education to learners of all ages in all locations and at the times the learner desires. Special on-line courses have been developed for K-12 teachers and for senior citizens.

Through the use of information technology Michigan State offers specialized graduate level programs available on a world-wide basis. Responsibilities for delivery reside with the academic colleges and include such areas as educational technology, youth development, food safety, nursing, criminal justice, turf grass management, and more. The University of New Orleans partnered with Louisiana State University to deliver programs leading to the Bachelor of General

Studies, making use of the internet, compressed video, telecourses, and videotape, as well as more conventional correspondence. At Nebraska the university's extended education efforts include the "Nebraska Academy", which delivers on-line courses to high-school students.

Oregon State's "OSU K-12 Online", a service provided by the university's "Ecampus", offers flexible learning experiences for high school students to fill gaps in their high school education or to jump-start their college experience. Ecampus provides a number of services on-line, including access to the OSU library, on-line tutoring, and technical support.

Penn State restructured its lifelong and distant education program by combining "Continuing Education" and "World Campus" to provide a coordinated approach to serving adult learners through both credit and non-credit programs. A Vice President for Outreach will be responsible for this program and for two new initiatives, "The State-Wide Center for the Adult Learner" and the "Continuing Education and Work Force Training System". Penn State has also developed a new "Blended Learning Initiative" which will develop new courses and degree programs for delivery utilizing on-line World Campus courses, on-line courses shared among Penn State locations, and hybrid on-line courses taught on campus.

The University of Northern Illinois (NIU) is another institution that has adopted Blended Courses as part of its distant/lifelong learning programs. These courses combine face-to-face meetings with on-line lectures, computer chat groups, role-playing exercises, group projects, and simulations, and can lead to a Bachelor of General Studies degree in the university's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Using blended courses, NIU also offers a Bachelor of Science degree for Registered Nurses and undergraduate and graduate certificates in Geographic Information Systems.

In addition to these formal on-line courses, a number of universities offer expanded non-credit programs for adult learners who have educational needs for career development or simply find learning to be a valued recreational activity. The latter is the case for learners in Oregon State's Academy of Lifelong Learning (ALL), a self-supporting program affiliated with the Oregon State Alumni Association.

Campus Culture

"In essence, the Kellogg Commission's work has validated our efforts for reform."

The Commission noted the fragmentary nature of the campus culture today, commenting that the university had become a "multi-versity". In many ways, the singular ethos common to colleges and universities in the past has been weakened and in some cases lost completely. In its report, "Returning to Our Roots: Toward a Coherent Campus Culture, the commission states: "The university has become an institutionally fragmented aggregation of departments. The primary loyalties of scholars are increasingly directed away from their immediate colleagues, students, and institutions toward national and international societies and associations of their disciplinary peers."

In suggesting strategies to help universities unify and enhance their missions and culture, the commission called for re-examining what the university stands for, an articulation and implementation of its core values. The strategies:

- * start with values and mission
- * foster institutional coherence;
- * reinvigorate academic governance;
- * develop administrative leadership;
- * redefine the nature of acceptable scholarly work;
- * reinforce the integrity of tenure;
- * align athletics and academics; and
- * end with values: put learning first.

Teaching, research, and service have characterized the past mission of public universities. In its report the Commission recognized a different mission for the universities of today and tomorrow: “the growing democratization of higher education, the greater capacity of today’s students to shape and guide their own learning, and the burgeoning demands of the modern world require us to instead think of learning, discovery, and engagement.”

Only a few replies referred to efforts to modify the culture of campuses. Review and modification of promotion and tenure guidelines was mentioned by only five respondents; alignment of athletics with academics by four; two universities reported efforts at faculty development. Efforts to integrate learning, discovery, and engagement, and to become a truly student-centered university were cited by only four respondents.

Nevertheless, efforts to reform the student experience, including distant and lifelong learning, improving diversity, and enhancing access and retention, all contribute to the modification of the culture of universities making these changes. The universities that stand out from all the others focus on their fundamental values and consciously change their missions in recognition of the needs of all learners. They are well on the way to becoming truly student-centered universities.

Concluding comments

Shortly after the final meeting of the Kellogg Commission in March 2000, thirty-two public universities participated in a survey to determine their position relative to the recommendations of the Commission.⁹ Participants in that survey included faculty, mid-level administrators, and presidents and chancellors. The respondents reported that generally reform was more advanced in the areas of student access and campus culture than in those of the student experience and the learning society. Respondents thought more attention was needed to lifelong learning and engagement, and faculty in particular felt greater attention should be devoted to the student experience and to campus culture.

⁹ “Public Higher Education Reform 2000 The Results of a Post-Kellogg Commission Survey” by John V. Byrne; available at www.nasulgc.org/Kellogg

From the replies to the current survey it seems apparent that those earlier impressions were noted and actions taken. During the past five years, significant changes have been made in the student experience, specifically with regard to holistic learning, international experience, undergraduate research, and service learning. Lifelong and distant learning are being addressed today at most universities.

The engagement of universities with the societies they serve has also undergone significant change. Leading universities have re-organized their administrations to better focus on service to society, faculty involvement in engagement is being recognized, and at a number of institutions promotion and tenure guidelines have been reformed in recognition of the importance of faculty involvement in engagement, with incentives provided. Engagement has become part of the core mission of several universities.

Whether the Kellogg Commission was directory instrumental in leading institutions to make these changes is hard to determine. The Commission did stimulate discussion, it did validate changes already underway, and it did provide a general guide to valuable reform in higher education. Because the positions taken by the Commission focused on the basic elements of higher education and learning, most of its recommendations will be valid for some time. The Commission dealt primarily with values and principles that should be inherent to the public university. As such the reports of the Commission may never be out of date. They will wear well over time and will bear repeated readings.

The Commission attempted to outline what the successful university of the future will be. Words from the Commission's final report, "Renewing the Covenant: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement in a New Age and Different World" seem appropriate to conclude this report:

"...If the recommendations in our prior reports are heeded, the shape of today's university will still be visible in a new century, but it will have been transformed in many ways, major and minor. It will truly be a new kind of public institution, one that is as much a first-rate student university as it is a first-rate research university, one that provides access to success to a much more diverse student population as easily as it reaches out to "engage" the larger community. Perhaps most significantly, this new university will be the engine of lifelong learning in the United States, because it will have reinvented its organizational structures and re-examined its cultural norms in pursuit of a learning society."

The responses reported here indicate that a number of America's public universities are well on the way to becoming the public universities called for by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities.

Acknowledgments

This report would not have been possible without the support of Dr. C. Peter Magrath, former President of NASULGC and the originator of the Kellogg Commission, of Dr. Graham Spanier, President of the Pennsylvania State University, who served as Chairman of the Commission. In addition, I express my appreciation to the many presidents, chancellors, and friends of public higher education, who provided information on higher education reform today; they are listed in the appendices of this report. The work of the Kellogg Commission and Advisory Board members served as the basis and inspiration for today's activities in the reform of public higher education. To all of those mentioned above, thank you.

Michael Vahle, who served with distinction as the primary staff during and after the Commission's existence, again provided invaluable logistical assistance from his position at NASULGC in the preparation of this report. Ms. Carol Mason, my valued colleague, was extremely helpful in editing and preparing the report. A very special thank you to Michael and Carol.

Finally, I express my sincere appreciation to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for support of this project, and to Gail Imig, who monitored the activities of the Kellogg Commission for the Kellogg Foundation, for her constant encouragement.

Footnotes

¹ “Taking Charge of Change: Reviewing the Promise of State and Land-grant Universities”, Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-grant Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges, June 1996

² Appendix A: Kellogg Commission and Advisory Committee members

³ Appendix D: List of reports published by the Kellogg Commission

⁴ Appendix B: letter

⁵ Appendix C: List of Respondents

⁶ The unattributed quotations included in this report are from the responses received from the presidents and chancellors

⁷ Letter from James Moeser, Chancellor, UNC

⁸ “University Engagement in 2005.” John V. Byrne, a report to NASULGC in March 2005, based on a presentation at the 2004 NASULGC annual meeting. Available on request from <john.byrne@oregonstate.edu>.

⁹ “Public Higher Education Reform 2000 The Results of a Post-Kellogg Commission Survey” by John V. Byrne; available at www.nasulgc.org/Kellogg

Appendix A

Kellogg Commission Members Year 2000

Graham Spanier, Chair	President, The Pennsylvania State University
Dolores R. Spikes, Vice Chair	President, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
John V. Byrne, Executive Director	President Emeritus, Oregon State University
C. Peter Magrath	President, NASULGC
James F. Barker	President, Clemson University
Daniel O. Bernstine	President, Portland State University
Ray M. Bowen	President, Texas A&M University
Lattie F. Coor	President, Arizona State University
Peter S. Hoff	President, University of Maine
Martin C. Jischke	President, Iowa State University
William E. Kirwan	President-Designate, The Ohio State University
Francis L. Lawrence	President, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Joseph McDonald	President, Salish Kootenai College
M. Peter McPherson	President, Michigan State University
James Moeser	Chancellor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien	Chancellor, University of New Orleans
Benjamin F. Payton	President, Tuskegee University
Judith A. Ramaley	President, University of Vermont
W. Ann Reynolds	President, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Paul Risser	President, Oregon State University
Samuel H. Smith	President, Washington State University
James J. Stukel	President, University of Illinois
Larry Vanderhoef	Chancellor, University of California, Davis
David Ward	Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Charles E. Young	President, University of Florida
Mark Yudof	President, University of Minnesota

Emeritus Commissioners

J. Claude Bennett	President, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Constantine W. Curris	President, Clemson University
Gordon Gee	President, The Ohio State University
Nils Hasselmo	President, University of Minnesota
Frederick Hutchinson	President, University of Maine
John V. Lombardi	President, University of Florida

National Advisory Committee

Roger R. Blunt, Sr., Chair	Chairman & CEO, Blunt Enterprises, Maryland
Paula C. Butterfield	Consultant
Wenda Weekes Moore	Trustee, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Michigan
Donald E. Peterson	Former Chairman & CEO, Ford Motor Company, Michigan
Walter Scott, Jr.	President, Level 3 Communications Inc., Nebraska
Mike Thorne	Executive Director, Port of Portland, Oregon
Edwin S. Turner	President, EST Enterprises, Missouri

Appendix B

Letter to Presidents and Chancellors requesting reform information

April 6, 2005

Dear

The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities held its final meeting five years ago. The Commission's objective was to stimulate the reform of higher education at America's public universities. Its role was to express the need for change and to strongly encourage it. The Commission had neither the inclination nor the authority to impose change; its only lever was the power of persuasion.

During the four years of its existence, the Commission produced six reports designed to aid universities in bringing about change. The first five reports addressed campus issues: the student experience; student access; the engaged institution; a learning society; and campus culture. The sixth report called for a renewal of the covenant - the partnership - between the public and its universities; it addressed learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world. The executive summaries of these reports are available on the web at <<www.nasulgc.org>>.

We believe it is time to assess the effectiveness of the Kellogg Commission in stimulating higher education reform in America and to determine the impact of its recommendations. We hope you will assist us. First, we ask that you consider the transforming activities at your university, during the past five years, that correspond to the recommendations of the Kellogg Commission. As you prepare your response, please consider the following list of issues concerning reform that are addressed in the six reports of the Kellogg Commission. We don't ask that you address each of these issues but rather that you highlight, in a letter of no more than three or four pages, the changes or new approaches most relevant at your institution.

- * holistic approaches to student learning, including integration of academic and non-academic activities and environments;
- * involvement of undergraduates in research, internships, service learning;
- * international education opportunities;
- * admission requirements and transfer agreements;
- * retention and achievement of educational objectives (graduation);
- * diversity and non-traditional students;
- * engagement with off-campus groups;
- * lifelong and distant learning opportunities;
- * promotion and tenure guidelines;
- * curriculum reform;
- * role of intercollegiate athletics.

Second, we would appreciate your opinion concerning the impact of the Kellogg Commission in creating awareness of the need for reform and the direction such reform should take. Was it an effective leader in higher education reform in America? Did it strike a spark?

We would appreciate receiving your response by July 1, 2005. It is our intention to analyze the

collective comments, report the results directly to those presidents and chancellors who respond, and then share the results publicly, without identification of specific universities, at the annual meeting of NASULGC in November, 2005. Please respond directly to Dr. C. Peter Magrath at NASULGC.

Thank you for your frank and thoughtful assistance with this review.

Sincerely,

C. Peter Magrath
President of NASULGC

Graham Spanier
President, Pennsylvania State University
and former Chair of the Kellogg Commission

John V. Byrne
President Emeritus, Oregon State University
and former Executive Director of the Kellogg Commission

Appendix C

List of respondents to letter requesting information on reform

Institutional Respondents

Alabama at Birmingham, The University of
Carol Z. Garrison, President

Arizona State University
Ruth Jones, Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Auburn University
Ed Richardson, Interim President

California, Davis, University of
Larry N. Vanderhoef, Chancellor

Florida International University
Kyle Perkins, Vice Provost for Program Review and Assessment

Georgia, University of
Michael F. Adams, President

Iowa State University
Gregory L. Geoffroy, President

Kentucky, University of
Lee T. Todd, Jr., President

Maryland Eastern Shore, University of
Thelma B. Thompson, President

Michigan State University
Lou Anna K. Simon, President

Minnesota, University of
Robert H. Bruininks, President

Nebraska-Lincoln, University of
Harvey Perlman, Chancellor

New Hampshire, University of
Bruce L. Mallory, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

New Orleans, University of
Timothy P. Ryan, Chancellor,

North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of
James Moeser, Chancellor

North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
James C. Renick, Chancellor

Oklahoma State University
David J. Schmidly, President

Oregon State University
Edward J. Ray, President

Ohio State University, The
Bobby D. Moser, Vice President for University Outreach

Pennsylvania State University
Louise E. Sandmeyer, Executive Director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment

Portland State University
Daniel Bernstine, President

Purdue University
Martin C. Jischke, President

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
Richard L. McCormick, President
Texas A&M University
Robert M. Gates, President
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Charles W. Steger, President
Washington State University
V. Lane Rawlins, President
West Virginia University
David C. Hardesty, Jr., President
Wisconsin-Madison, The University of
John D. Wiley, Chancellor
Wyoming, University of
Thomas Buchanan, Acting President

Individual Respondents

Ted C. Alter, Professor of Agricultural, Regional, and Environmental Economics, Pennsylvania State University
Gordon Gee, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University
James Harvey, Harvey and Associates, Seattle, WA
Francis L. Lawrence, President Emeritus, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

Appendix D

Publications of The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Reports

“Taking Charge of Change: Renewing the Promise of State and Land-Grant Universities”, a brochure calling attention to the Kellogg Commission and the need for public universities to change, June 1996.

Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience, April 1997, 27 pp.

Returning to Our Roots: Student Access, May 1998, 41 pp.

Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution, February 1999, 41 pp.

Returning to Our Roots: A Learning Society, September 1999, 37 pp.

Returning to Our Roots: Toward a Coherent Campus Culture, January 2000, 40 pp.

Renewing the Covenant: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement in a New Age and a Different World, March 2000, 20 pp.

Supporting Documents:

“The Student Experience: Data Related to Change”, (first working paper, 24 pp.), September 1996.

“Student Access: Data Related to Change”, (second working paper, 31 pp.), May 1998.

“The Engaged Institution: Profiles and Data”, (third working paper, 96 pp.), February 1999.

“A Learning Society: Data and Questionnaires”, (fourth working paper, 44 pp.), September 1999.

Please note: All the Kellogg Commission Reports are available on the World Wide Web at www.nasulgc.org/kellogg/statements/default.htm