

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

The Reminiscences of

Arthur E. Levine

Columbia Center for Oral History

Columbia University

2013

PREFACE

The following oral history is the result of a recorded interview with Arthur E. Levine conducted by Bethany Rogers on June 25, 2013. This interview is part of the Carnegie Corporation of New York Oral History Project.

The reader is asked to bear in mind that s/he is reading a verbatim transcript of the spoken word, rather than written prose.

3PM

Session #1 (video)

Interviewee: Arthur E. Levine

Location: New York, NY

Interviewer: Bethany Rogers

Date: June 25, 2013

Q: Good morning. I'm Bethany Rogers, and this morning I'm sitting here with Arthur [E.] Levine, and we're going to talk a little bit about your experience and relationship with the Carnegie Corporation [of New York]. By way of starting, I wanted to ask you to tell me a little bit about your professional background, just to set a context for your work with Carnegie. I know that, for example, you have a large reputation as a voice in higher education and teacher education. If you could, for the record, just fill us in on sort of how you got to be the expert in those areas, and then we can take it to the intersection with Carnegie.

Levine: Very quickly, I grew up in a small town called the Bronx [New York], and I went to Brandeis [University] as an undergraduate. I got my doctorate at SUNY Buffalo in sociology and in higher education, and immediately after college, a friend and I wrote a book about American higher education undergraduate curriculum. My whole career rests on that book. My first job after graduate school was working with Carnegie. I was hired by a group called the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education in Berkeley, California, which was headed by Clark Kerr, who had been head of the University of California system. I had this wonderful job being hired to write books about colleges and universities. When Clark retired, Ernie [Ernest L.] Boyer came and took his job at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Ernie got Clark's furniture and Clark's library and me. I worked there for several years, again, working with Ernie on books on higher education.

After that I became president of a small liberal arts college named Bradford College in northern Massachusetts. It proves that if you write enough and you speak enough, you get offered all kinds of jobs for which you're highly unqualified. I loved that job. It was a chance to try to take everything I'd been writing about and turn it into a college curriculum and direction the university ought to follow. After Bradford—I did that for seven years—for five years I was a professor at Harvard [University] in higher education, and headed that program, and ran summer programs for senior college administrators, and other people of that ilk. Then, after five years of that, I went off to Teachers College at Columbia [University], where I served as president and professor for twelve years. Now I'm at Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, and I'm president there.

Q: Okay. So I have a couple follow up questions and then I'd like you to tell me a little bit about the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. So when you were writing the books on higher education, what were some of the big ideas? I know Clark Kerr is often credited with being a real towering figure in the field, who came up with this system of education—the state system, for example, in California—what were some of the big ideas that you were discovering, writing about, and was it primarily research, or were you also beginning to create programs or change the California system?

Levine: Yes. Clark Kerr was a historically important figure. It's rare that a person comes with the right abilities and the right skills at the right time. Clark Kerr essentially got to create the modern American research university. The first was really in 1876 at Johns Hopkins [University]—Clark

arrived at the University of California as its leader in the early '50s. It was the post-war era. Higher education was a critical ingredient in industrial America; we needed more kids educated. Clark got to take the then hot house research university and do, essentially, what Henry Ford did. He multiplied it and he created nine across the state of California. The next thing that he did was, create something called the master plan. And what that did was bring together all of California higher education, which was booming. It was said that at least once a week a new college opened its doors during that period. Clark saw all this heading into chaos, unless there was a plan and the California master plan was one that guaranteed universal access to higher education to people in California.

There was an elite sector of the University of California, and that enrolled the top twelve and a half percent of all high school graduates. Then there was a selective sector, which was a California State University's four year. They couldn't offer doctoral degrees. They took the top third of all students who graduated from high school. Then there were the community colleges, which were open door. In essence, this created a system whereby there was a place for everybody in California higher education. It was the first universal access institution in America. Then Clark got to name this thing. He gave a lecture at Harvard in '63, and he called this enterprise the multiversity in a book called *The Uses of the University*. So here's a guy who got to create it, to organize it, and to name it. After he was fired by Ronald [W.] Reagan because of Berkeley [University of California, Berkeley] student unrest. Clark said he came to the University of California the same way left it, fired with enthusiasm.

So he was then asked—Alan [J.] Pifer who was president of the corporation—called him about twenty minutes later. He really did call him within twenty-four hours, and asked him to head a national commission on the future of higher education, which ended up lasting from 1967 to 1980. What Clark got to do there was finish the model. In essence, look at what are the things that are missing? So for example, he got to create Pell Grants which provided financial aid to kids all over this country to go to college. He got to talk about the future of community colleges, liberal arts colleges, research universities. He got to design state programs, he got to create alternatives like the three year degree, which the Corporation funded, and alternatives to help people go to college. He was, in that capacity, responsible for the ultimate decision regarding affirmative action in the U.S. during that period, the [Allan] Bakke case. In preparation for the Supreme Court's decision, Clark commissioned a study and policy report on affirmative action with the goal of providing grounds for the Court to support it. They adopted this position and cited the Carnegie council report. So it's not often—I can't think of another case in history in which an educator got to create it, to name it, to organize it, and then find its weaknesses and try to eliminate them. Clark Kerr, in this capacity, created the industrial era university.

Q: Absolutely. It sounds like Carnegie was very important then in allowing, or providing, the support for him to be able to go back and rethink, or strengthen those areas that he wasn't happy with.

Levine: You bet. Yes.

Q: Okay. So those were many of the same ideas that you were writing about at the time.

Levine: Actually, I was a staff member who got projects—go write a book about this, go write a book about that. So the issues I was working on during that period were undergraduate curriculum. So I did a volume for them on that. I started writing about undergraduate attitudes, values and experiences. That was the first of three books I ended up writing about current undergraduates and their educational needs over the next thirty-five years, and I also did a book for them on ethics in higher education.

Q: So one of the interesting things, too, listening to your trajectory, is this idea that you had the opportunity to be part of this think tank, and really exploring and researching. Then you decided to take it on yourself to try to implement some of these ideas within the context of a single college. Can you talk more about that process?

Levine: Sure. After finishing at Carnegie and going to work at The [Carnegie] Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching [CFAT], I wrote a book with Ernie Boyer about general education. If you write enough, you get offered all kinds of opportunities to speak and to consult. Being sort of this whippersnapper—I must have been, when I went to work for Ernie Boyer I was thirty-one, and I left him at thirty-four—and what had happened was, after working with universities around the country, with the impatience of youth, what I thought was watching presidents do these things, I can do them better, faster myself. I need to be a college president.

So my next job was being a college president. The way I got that job was—Ernie was strongly supportive, Clark was strongly supportive—but I needed an institution that was in such serious trouble, they couldn't get anybody else. Then, not being modest, remember I'd never worked on

a campus to that point. All I'd been was a consultant and a writer and a researcher and little Bradford College was having real problems. I think they probably offered the job to most of the people in the Boston phone book before turning to me. When they offered me the job, what I really wanted a chance to do was try some of the ideas that I'd been writing about. I basically believed that you could drive the future of an institution with a curriculum and a mission. So Bradford had been the school that had been a women's college—a two year women's college—and then it became a four year college, then it became a coeducational college. By the time I arrived it was in deep financial trouble, and it had no mission whatever having gone through all those evolutions, so the faculty were quite willing to make changes. I wrote a proposal for something called the Bradford Plan for a Practical Liberal Arts Education.

What we did is dramatically change the nature of what liberal arts looked like. We created a general education program, and that program was based not on the disciplines, but the commonalities people share. The planet, language, values, and so on. Second, we had an advising session called freshman inquiry, in which students wrote an essay, and we helped them plan their futures, meeting with a panel of faculty, students, administrators. We also had a broad major. The rest of the world was changing quickly and we thought it needed to be interdisciplinary. We also added to that an internship and a practical minor. What we knew at that time was—if you put the other group of liberal arts courses—let's say you put together some arts courses, and some science courses—you could prepare someone to work in the area of scientific illustration. Then if you give them an internship, they could apply it and if there were junior and senior projects they could integrate it.

And that was what we did. We knew at the time that liberal arts graduates could get jobs if they had internships, had practical minors, and could demonstrate what they were capable of doing in a project. So we used this to try to move this school forward. I think our stationary said, a practical liberal arts education. We worked the media, we worked foundations, every piece of literature we put out focused on this new curriculum. I think my favorite result was this: I still remember an article in the *Christian Science Monitor* that said there were four colleges in America doing important things in general education. They were Harvard, UCLA [University of California Los Angeles], Princeton [University], and Bradford. I remember saying, I hated seeing those other three colleges build their reputations on our accomplishments. So it was really an opportunity to see whether you could build a college by means of an education project, and it worked for us.

Q: Okay. So the kind take away from that was that you were pretty successful in being able to—and were there any particular aspects of that—I mean, was it a small enough college, I mean, what were the things that you understood that worked in your favor when you look back?

Because when you say driving change through curriculum and mission, that's something that sort of was a theory of action that you say, yes, that worked out, that was right.

Levine: The pieces fell into place. The economy wasn't bad. If you'd go to foundations and say, I've got this brand new idea, and they'd put money into it. You could use the grants to generate press. You could use the curriculum and the press to generate admissions. You could use it all to drive development. Faculty were really excited about doing this so we built this amazing teaching faculty and recruited a student body who were interested in the program. Though it

didn't always work that way. I remember talking to a student from our first class who graduated with the program, and asking her, so why did you come to Bradford? She said, because I always wanted to go to a college that had a pond.

[Laughter]

Q: Right. You can just think it through so far before—

Levine: So we dumped the curriculum and went with the pond for every other student.

Q: There you go. So no disrespect to Harvard, but I want to skip over that piece to ask you a little bit about your stint at Teachers College and then Woodrow Wilson.

Levine: Sure.

Q: I'm assuming that, obviously, once you decided to go to Teachers College, had teacher education already become a focus of yours?

Levine: No. When I got called by Teachers College, I had no idea why they were calling me. I didn't know much about it.

Q: Okay.

Levine: I thought about going there for grad school but I couldn't afford it. I remember reluctantly writing to them and saying, I can't come. I wasn't much of an undergraduate in terms of grades, and I certainly wasn't somebody they wanted to give a major fellowship to. So, given all that, I was sort of amazed—my area was higher education—that they were interested in me as a candidate. I said, I think you got the wrong guy. I'm don't know much about K-12. They said, it's only a third of what we do. Another third is psychology. Every applied psychology program is at Teachers College—clinical, developmental, organizational, et cetera. There are programs in nursing administration, programs in higher education, and policy. Teachers College has five thousand graduate students. It's the largest graduate school of education in the country, certainly the largest elite graduate school of education in the country, so my interest in teacher education grew while I was there.

Q: Okay. Can you talk about any of the things that you understood—

Levine: No [said jokingly].

[Laughter]

Q: Let me start that again. Would you be willing to talk about any of the things that, while you were there and you were getting to understand teacher education, maybe framed some of the views and ideas that later on you've expanded on with your association with Carnegie and with Woodrow Wilson?

Levine: Yes. I was there for twelve years. In my early years at Teachers College, we reorganized the college, redesigned its programs, made key hires, developed an online unit, rethought the library and journals, created a public school, raised lots of money, and rebuilt the board. I'd found that people were increasingly critical of education schools. When I first arrived at Teachers College, people would come to me in media, in government, in foundations, and said, you know, I'm hearing all these bad things about education schools. I had to assure them it wasn't true of Teachers College. As my time there progressed, they were no longer saying they were hearing these things. They would ask me, how come education schools are doing such a terrible job?

My last years I carried out a study. I'd gotten support from, let's see, Annenberg [Foundation], Kauffman [Foundation], Wallace [Foundation] and Ford [Foundation] for a study of education schools in America. We turned out a series of reports. One on teacher education, one on school leadership, and one on the education of researchers. They were very, very critical of education schools in each of those areas. When Woodrow Wilson [National Fellowship Foundation] came, suddenly it was an opportunity to go beyond throwing bricks, a chance to try to fix it. Can you make it better? That was why I went to Woodrow Wilson. It's not enough to write policy reports. If you want to change things—and I'm sort of the '60s leftover, which is to say, I went to college at the time in which a generation of baby boomers believed they could change the world.

Q: Right.

Levine: I chose education after taking the med [medical] boards, the law boards, the GREs [Graduate Record Examination], the Miller analogies [test], the business boards, the national teacher exam, the State Department test, the Boston teacher exam, and I think a number of others. For several years, the Educational Testing Service [ETS] had large posters of me in every room.

[Laughter]

I ultimately decided education was maybe the slowest, but the most powerful way to change the world, so I chose education. For those reasons, teaching stood out as an area, so it was not enough simply to be able to be at the helm of an ed school. The question was, how do you create real change that might last? Teacher education was the first area we chose.

Q: Okay, so let me just close out that by asking, Teachers College is a fairly exemplary elite school of education. Were your thoughts that, by making changes there, it wasn't going to penetrate broadly or deeply enough across other kinds of institutions? Like creating, in other words, a model out of Teachers College? Can you just explain a little bit more about the thinking of leaving an ed school that had some teacher preparation programs—I know it's a small piece—to go then to a foundation that wasn't directly involved? What—

Levine: Yes.

Q: —the thought process was.

Levine: Thought process was several fold. One, I had written this report on the condition of, say, teacher education, and they'd gotten broad national exposure. Much more than I expected, I think. So it put me prominently in the field of teacher education—remember, teacher education is not my field. My field is higher education. I know about colleges and universities and their students and their curriculum and things of that ilk. I was not an expert in teacher education. I'd been a substitute teacher in the Boston schools for some parts of a year. I'd never been a real teacher. So suddenly I had—Teachers College is a wonderful, wonderful, wonderful podium from which to speak on issues and be heard nationally. It's less good in terms of creating broad scale change. It was now an environment in which broad scale change was possible, in which the right organization could carry it out, in which the topic had gained currency nationally. It was being broadly discussed, it was time which something could be done and I thought at a much larger scale than a single institution.

Q: Okay. Then tell me a little bit about why Woodrow Wilson was sort of an optimum place to be able to do that?

Levine: Woodrow Wilson had started right after World War II. It's a fellowship organization. Historically, its mission has been to identify and to develop very talented people to address the key social issues facing this country. When it began, the difficulty was that there were a tidal wave of GIs [military personnel] coming back after the second World War, and not enough professors to educate them. So Woodrow Wilson created fellowships and the notion behind it was that they would give these people who never, ever, ever would have considered becoming

professors, to go to doctorates and then join the Academy. Then there were programs for understaffed fields, for underrepresented populations, for stress points in the academic career. An example would be a pre-tenure program for women which provided money for women to do research, needed because the biological and tenure clocks are competing against each other. This gave women more of an edge in terms of the capacity to be ready for tenure.

There had also been programs that worked with teachers, professional development, brought people to universities who couldn't get there normally, and worked on early colleges. When I arrived, I wasn't quite sure where Woodrow Wilson was to go in the future. When I spoke to the board, what I suggested was that America didn't need more professors. What we really needed, and the largest challenges in education, was the achievement gap at the interstices between higher education and K-12. I thought that a major program could be created. If you look at the achievement gap and you ask, what makes a difference in kids' lives? Well, the biggest impact a school can have on student achievement is a strong teacher. Three years strong of teachers makes an enormous difference in kids' lives. So I thought, would it be possible to apply Woodrow Wilson's stature to teachers?

I can boast about this because I had no responsibility for this whatever, and it occurred before I arrived. Woodrow Wilson Fellows—there are twenty-one thousand now—have won thirteen Nobel prizes, thirty five MacArthur awards, Pulitzers, National Book Awards. They've won everything you can think of—Fields Medal, Poet Laureate, Academy Award—any of those things would have made my parents really proud had I won any of them. In any case, the question was, could you take an organization of that kind of stature and apply it to a profession

that didn't have status? Could you create the equivalent of a Rhodes scholarship for teachers? We didn't do that. We created a merit scholarship for teachers. We never got to the Rhodes level, but we did create a merit scholarship for teachers. The idea was, could you attract really, really strong people to have careers in teaching, ask them to take a master's degree, and make a commitment to teaching for a minimum of three years? That was the initial thought. It became far more developed later.

Q: Okay. So Woodrow Wilson, it sounds like, has a really interesting approach then. It was providing a means by which you could change some aspect of higher education, particularly around the faculty, it sounded like. And so is this, in some ways, departure or real difference? Because it sounds like you're doing programmatic work that's much more hands on in a way.

Levine: Yes. This was a wide departure. The program that was funded by Carnegie was an intermediate step. Can I just describe the Carnegie program and then I can take you to this one?

Q: Perfect.

Levine: Okay. When I came to—

Q: This is the Teachers for a New Era?

Levine: No. We weren't part of that.

Q: Okay.

Levine: Carnegie had already done work in the project. That project was over by the time we arrived just about—no, not quite, but we weren't part of Teachers for a New Era.

Q: Okay. There were ideological links, or no?

Levine: Okay. I had been an adviser to—I'd been a Carnegie fellow. When Vartan Gregorian arrived he appointed four or five people, and he said, you're now Carnegie Fellows. You will come and you will help us with anything we want advice and counsel on. I kept being asked to help out teacher education projects because Teachers for a New Era was on. When I got to Woodrow Wilson, my Carnegie Fellow days were over. I asked for help to create a program which would recruit top students and send them to top education schools, have them teach in high need schools around the country, and Carnegie funded that. Vartan Gregorian got Annenberg to join in, and we had \$6 million with an emphasis principally upon teachers of color. That was the first iteration of our fellowship. So it's very similar to other fellowships—high ability people, fellowships to go train to enter—not the Academy this time, but high need public schools.

Q: So you were just describing the first iteration of the program, which was quite similar you said to some other kinds of programs.

Levine: That Woodrow Wilson had done, historically.

Q: Right.

Levine: What was interesting about this program—or maybe what was most important for us in terms of Carnegie—they took a chance. Here's a fellowship organization that wasn't known for this area. Here was a brand new program, which may or may not have worked. We'd identified four universities that we wanted to work with—Stanford [University] and University of Washington [Seattle, Washington], University of Virginia and University of Pennsylvania. Several had been part of the study that I had done earlier, were thought to be excellent programs, and so were added to the mix. Carnegie took a real chance.

Q: Why do you think they did that?

Levine: Lack of judgment. No. [Laughs] I think part of the reason was, I was a known quantity. Woodrow Wilson was known quantity in terms of what it had achieved over time, and I think the need was high.

Q: Do you think there was something alignment between Carnegie's interest and this is one of the ways we move into creating a stronger teaching core? I mean, was there an—

Levine: Definitely.

Q: —alignment of ideology too?

Levine: Definitely.

Q: Okay.

Levine: Yes and maybe that's the first thing I should have said, which was, this was an area that Carnegie had moved into. It had actually put a marker. This was a time in which Carnegie had said, teacher education is one of the biggest issues facing the country, and we're going to put a lot of money into studying it, into changing it, into working with top institutions to make teacher education in American better than it is now.

Q: Does this stem—I mean, I think the history probably goes—but does this latest iteration, do you think, come from, in part, the '86 report?

Levine: I think it's a piece of it. Certainly, a significant piece of it, but the president at Carnegie changed in the interim. Vartan Gregorian wasn't president in '86.

Q: Right.

Levine: But he had been at Brown [University], and at Brown he certainly worked on teacher education. It was a fortuitous combination of events. His arrival here, the emphasis on teacher education—we were in the middle of a national reform movement in education. He pushed teacher education to the fore and created what amounted to a very ambitious program, unlike any

that existed in that time, and pushed it forward and made a real effort to try to change teacher education in America, which was noted by practitioners, policymakers, universities, school districts and the press. It was an extraordinary effort, which was national, had research, had policy and had practice all working together. That's very unusual.

Q: Yes.

Levine: So in light of that, we were consistent. We weren't a major focus of what was going on there. We had a program that was working in the same area.

Q: Right. Right. I realized it wasn't your program, but can you speak a little bit more specifically about what actually—when Vartan got here, he shaped as kind of the mission for that large kind of thrust of work?

Levine: Yes. He's a fascinating figure. Vartan's a man who had what amounted to a superb fit for an organization in ways they probably weren't even aware of at the time. Here was a guy who was coming—and he certainly had the right credentials—my God, the man had been provost at Penn, he'd been president at Brown. Those are pretty good credentials. But he was also Armenian at a time in which the United States moved from a national to a global stage in terms of our everyday lives, and here was a man who was global. Beyond that, it was a time which we were thinking about lifelong education in ways we'd never thought about it before, and which the half-life of knowledge was getting shorter and shorter and shorter. Things needed to be done in different kinds of ways than they had been, with an expectation that people would need

to continue to renew their education throughout their lives. And he was a librarian. The guy headed the New York Public Library.

Q: Right.

Levine: Beyond the academics, here was a person who had the experience in using the non-traditional institution, a library, as a major educator, and had the capacity, the experience, and the background to think globally. There were other presidents of the foundation who thought globally, but he came from a global world. He lived in a global world, he was a product of a global world, which brought a perspective nobody had brought to this organization before, with the possible exception of Andrew Carnegie who came with the same background.

Q: Right.

Levine: So those were all wonderful. And then add one more piece, which is Vartan Gregorian knows everybody in America. I remember once sitting in a planning session with him for a conference he was going to have. We talked about one session, and the group agreed that it would be terrific to have a U.S. senator—a particular U.S. senator—and thought it might be hard to get him. He said, well, let me see. So he got on the phone and he called him. It was clear they were old buddies, and they knew each other well. Then a moment later we talking about the keynote and he suggested that Justice [Sandra Day] O'Connor might be the right person. Next thing I knew, he was asking his assistant, get Justice O'Connor on the phone. It was clear he

knew her too, and she knew him. He got her to change her appointment that day to be able to speak at this conference.

Then they wanted the president of Princeton on a panel, so he made that phone call. He didn't get her. She, I think, had a board meeting that day and seemed unwilling to give up her board for Vartan. At some point in the course of the conversation, we mentioned a major leader. He asked his assistant to call her. She said, it's the middle of the night there. We can't call. He reluctantly said "tomorrow."

Levine: So he had the capacity to knit together people from business and academia and government and all of our other major social institutions in a way that's essential today. He kept this foundation vibrant in ways that its endowment shouldn't have allowed. In an age in which other foundations are being created that have considerably larger endowments, Vartan Gregorian has been the person who identified issues, brought together the players to be able to work on those issues, and was willing to take the risk in terms of programs. He did something else. This is an age in which change is ubiquitous. Everything's changing. I think all of us are a little like Rip Van Winkle. You go to bed one night, you wake up the next morning it's as if twenty years of change have occurred.

Q: Right.

Levine: He identified a number of issues in higher education that we ought to cherish, that are historically important, and shouldn't be lost in the deluge of changes that are coming. He

invested in the liberal arts. What are the liberal arts in the twenty-first century, which are well over one thousand years old? Which were products of the first universities. The trivium, quadrivium, have continued through to the present. What do the changes of today mean in terms of the body of knowledge and skills that should constitute the liberal arts. How do we keep the liberal arts, and in fact, modernize? How do we manage to have the liberal arts have one foot in the library and one foot in the streets?

He also chose teacher education. That's not a sexy topic.

Q: No.

Levine: He managed to put it on a front burner for the foundation, he created a bold program in the area, and he made it a program that we knew about all across America.

Q: So let me ask you, and I don't want to beat it to death, but I'm curious to hear the details of the BOLD [Building Opportunities for Leadership and Development] Program, and then also a little bit of where you think, again, the ideas were coming from? Because it's very interesting to look at some of the critiques from your reports, for example, and some of the ideas that have been spearheaded by Carnegie and others who've been leaders in this are very, very aligned. So I'm just wondering what was in that zeitgeist? What were some of the ideas, and then what were the particulars of that Bold Program?

Levine: Vartan talks to everybody. I don't know of an idea that's floating around that he hasn't had contact with in some fashion. The Annenberg Institute and [Theodore] Ted [R.] Sizer—who was one of the giants in teacher education—worked with him. He couldn't have asked for better education prior to coming here. In the time since, it's clear that he has spoken to people in government and the other sectors where it mattered. He came with this notion that education would—and teacher education in particular—be an issue that he focused on. This program identified high performing schools of education, provided them with very large grants—I don't remember the size—to try to improve their programs, study their programs, and move their programs forward as national models. The program went on for—there are better people to talk to about this than me—but the program went on for a number of years. [Daniel] Dan Fallon who was the education leader here led that program. There was nobody in education who didn't know about New Leaders for a New Era. Actually, New Teachers for a New Era. Some of them even knew the name correctly, unlike me.

[Laughter]

Q: Okay. So that actually does lead us then a little bit to the—back to the Annenberg teaching fellowships. So can you talk a little bit more about—you talked about the genesis of the program.

Levine: After a few years, it became clear to us that the Carnegie-funded program was preparing some very good teachers and we had very, very strong people applying to the program, but there was no additional leverage. We also had a fair number of people of color applying to the program. The difficulty was this: we'd send them off to Stanford, and they might practice

anywhere across the United States. There was no capacity to enlarge beyond the numbers that we were enrolling. And we started asking the question, how can one have maximum leverage? Given that this was our starting point. The answer that we came to was, focus on states. Also, focus on high need areas. So whereas, with Annenberg, it was teaching in any area, with the successor we decided it ought to be a state program, and it ought to focus on the highest need areas which were the STEM subjects—science, technology, engineering and math. What we would do is put together the elements that seemed strong in the Annenberg, Carnegie program, and we would augment them.

I went to see [James B.] Jim Hunt [Jr.], former governor of North Carolina, about this program and said, I'm thinking about moving it to this state. He said, go to Indiana. Go meet [Mitchell E.] Mitch Daniels [Jr.]. So he arranged that, and we created a new kind of program. The first element was focus on the state because very small numbers make very large differences. For instance, we now have programs in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and New Jersey. We found that with one hundred twenty STEM teachers in Michigan, we can fill every vacancy in Detroit, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Benton Harbor, Battle Creek, and Muskegon. We found in Ohio we can fill every vacancy in Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Dayton, Toledo, Akron, and several rural areas with one hundred twenty teachers. So it's huge impact for very small numbers if you focus on whole states. So we went into the state and we built a coalition which became terribly important. The coalition consists of the governor, the chief state school officer, the state education executive officer, legislators on both sides of the aisle, universities, schools, unions, philanthropy, and whatever other stakeholders stood out in that state. That was real important for a variety of reasons. It provided program continuity. So this coalition meant, if anybody left we

simply replaced them in the coalition, including the governor. It also meant that when universities said we can't change, the state won't allow it, there was somebody from the state at the table who'd say, yes you can.

The other things that we did were recruit high ability people, ask them to take a master's degree at a participating university, ask them to teach for three years in high need schools after, give them a fellowship. The element that was different was we went to universities then and said, if you want to participate in the program you have to throw out your existing STEM teacher education program and start over, and here is what we want it to look like. We want to focus on outcomes, and again, we saw this in New Teachers. What we want in addition is full-time clinical programs for programs co-constructed by universities and school districts, to give the school district what it needs as opposed to what you think it needs. Beyond that, we wanted arts and sciences and education to partner in doing this, which is also a direct take from New Teachers. Additionally, we asked for third-party evidence based assessment, which was something we also got from New Teachers. Finally, we asked for three years of mentoring, based upon the research that New Teachers had done.

Q: So like an induction.

Levine: Yes.

Q: Okay.

Levine: Every student would have three years of mentoring once they began teaching. We offered universities incentives to change their program. We wanted skin in the game on their part, so we asked them to match it. We give them \$500,000, and they had to match \$500,000. When the program was successfully in place, we gave them fifteen to twenty fellowships at \$30,000 apiece plus \$6,000 for mentoring for each student for three years. So it's about a \$2 million package and high accountability. The president would sign an MOU [memorandum of understanding]. The school superintendent would sign an MOU. They had eighteen to twenty-one months to get the program successfully in place. If they didn't, they didn't get the fellowships. But more than that, they were likely to get a phone call from the governor or the philanthropy. We had two universities that didn't deliver in the time frame. After those phone calls they created excellent programs.

[Laughter]

Levine: So this essentially was our program taken to a different level, guided by the things that had been learned in New Teachers for a New Era.

Q: So in that regard, even though New Teachers was an on the ground project, I mean, it's almost as though you treated it a little bit as R and D [research and development].

Levine: Yes.

Q: You used the evaluation of that to help you restructure or rethink for the second round.

Levine: Very much so. Here was this program then—\$50 million had gone into this program. It's the best laboratory in America to see what worked and what could be better.

Q: Right. Right. So we chatted about this a little bit beforehand, but I want to go back to it. Ford did something very similar to this in the 1950s, where they decided, first of all, apparently, they asked Abraham Flexner about how to change teacher education, and he said, stay away, it's a morass.

Levine: I didn't know that story.

Q: Yes, it's a great story. He used saltier language than that.

Levine: I'm sure he did.

Q: But he said, the only way I can imagine is to choose a state that's a relatively small state, and get all the pieces working together.

Levine: Yes.

Q: So you're talking about collisions—

Levine: Was this Arkansas?

Q: It was Arkansas. Right. It wasn't accepted very well locally, and it turns out the top guy, I guess, left or something like that. So I guess, the main point I wanted to ask about is, how is what you're doing different than some of the efforts that have been made in the past? We could talk about this. There's a long history of these efforts to innovate in these ways. How is this different do you think?

Levine: Do you know something, we've gotten to build on what everybody else has done, so we spent a lot of time looking at the Arkansas effort and what did and didn't work there. So can I tell you that everything about our program works? No. We learned a lot. Our program is best in New Jersey. We started in Indiana. Boy, did we make fun potholes in what we were doing. So Ohio and Michigan, which followed, are better than Indiana. And New Jersey's better than all three of them. When we go into Georgia that's going to be even better yet, because we keep learning about the program, what we could be doing better. There are small things and there are big things. Initially we asked each institution to appoint a director half time, and we found that our half time directors had two or three other half time jobs. So now it's a full time director. We asked universities to match the grants. Now we ask them to match it with financial aid. So it's a whole series of issues that have played themselves out in terms of strengthening the program and what we ask of it. We've done a lot of evaluation, so we got to build on those.

What's different? I think there actually is one big difference we haven't talked yet, but I'll come to that in a moment. The coalition is critically important. That coalition makes the program sustainable. It also builds the presence in the states and all the doubters, or the people who could

doubt, are really elements the coalition, or members of the coalition, could talk to them. We also work press very, very hard through the coalition. So we've got a lot of coverage in the state. Every year the governor would announce the Fellows. The governor would hold a press conference announcing the creation of the program, attended by all the other people in the coalition.

We never intended to spend all of our future in any of these states. We wanted to get a program going and have it institutionalized. So the first four institutions we began working with were in central Indiana. They were Purdue, Indiana University dash Purdue University comma Indianapolis, Ball State—which is the biggest teacher producer in the state—and University of Indianapolis. We then, as a next step, began expanding throughout the state asking local communities to join us in the expansion. So we're soon to be in the northeast, northwest, and southeast. Still haven't made it to Evansville in the southwest.

The Lilly Endowment invested perhaps \$15 million in this project. The governor of Indiana invested \$3 million. As funding was drawing to a close, we went to the legislature and we spoke to the legislators we've known all these years, and asked them to create the program for themselves. We didn't want a nickel. Just institutionalize the fellowships. The legislature adopted the program, and the governor signed it.

So our program has now been wholly, at least for the next two years, institutionalized by the state of Indiana. We will play the role of coach. And Indiana wants to continue to use the name Woodrow Wilson for the fellowship, then we'll serve as an accreditor. But our job in Indiana

will be done. So it was never—our goal was never to have a short term program. The goal was to create something with legs that could really stand. We've worked very, very hard on getting to the finish line, in terms of the program.

The other thing that happened was, each of the institutions we worked with, created their own program. So Purdue, for example, was educating rural teachers. That's not the same as training teachers for Indianapolis. The programs needed to be different, the mentoring needed to be different. It's one thing to have teachers five miles apart. It's another thing to have them one hundred fifty miles apart. That needed to be far more digital. So they've created different kinds of programs that each meet the Woodrow Wilson standards, which will also give us a chance to study what works.

The other surprise we had was this. One day one of our governors called me and said, I have a bill on my desk, do I sign it or veto it? I haven't gotten any more phone calls like that. But we do get phone calls now from governor's staffs. We do get phone calls from legislators. We do get phone calls from state higher education executive officers and their staffs, and chief state school officers and their staffs. We play a role in policy in each of the states that we're in, which was a role we never anticipated. Part of the reason is we have no dog in the hunt. We don't benefit no matter what they do. Our money comes from other sources, and it doesn't matter. They're guessing that we might have some expertise in education, and they turn to us for advice.

When we started this, we thought you can probably get good people to go become teachers. Then we thought, maybe you can change universities too. We've also found you can have an impact

on policy, and we're betting you can have an impact on schools. What would happen if we provided a program for HR offices in which we help them figure out who to hire? What would make the most effective hires for them? So the capacity of fellowship, to have an impact on education, potentially, is really, really high. We don't know what impact we've had yet. We know that, after three years, ninety seven percent of our teachers are still teaching. We know that principals say nice things about them. We don't have the hard data yet on what difference they actually make in classes.

Q: So what will the metrics for success be? Obviously, some data that shows that teachers have raised achievement scores? Have—what else?

Levine: We're asking for achievement data. We're asking, how do the teachers we prepare compare to peers in terms of learning in their classrooms? Retention. Our goal really isn't to get Fellows for a three-year term. We want it to be their career.

Q: So longevity will also be—

Levine: Yes. Retention is very important to us. A third issue of import to us is the degree to which universities have sustained the programs that we've created, but sustaining really doesn't do it for us. We want the programs to diffuse. So—oh, I forgot that—so in New Jersey, for example, we've told the New Jersey institutions we want a diffusion plan on day one. We want to know how they're going to take what you're doing in this program and move it to the STEM undergraduate program. We want to know how they are going to move it to the other teacher

education programs. We want a defined model for how this is going to be accomplished, and we will monitor this. If it's not successful and they're not doing it, then your fellows will be at risk in terms of whether we can continue the program. So, yes, we've looked at sustaining and diffusing and other kinds of issues.

Q: In terms of—you sort of have answered this question—but one of the things I was thinking was—

Levine: That's as good as I do.

[Laughs]

Q: I don't buy it. Context. I mean, I think the seductive belief that you can kind of develop a program and then it's just plugged in all these different places and will work, has been one of the things that people have said, oh, that actually isn't so true. So what are the, kind of, accommodations you've made around context? You talked about letting universities develop their own programs that meet a set of guidelines, which clearly allows them to then meet the particular needs. Any other?

Levine: Yes. We spend a year before we even agree to go to a state. We meet with every population you can think of. Certainly everybody in the coalition. The governor has to invite us. Then we have the governor set up appointments with all these other groups, and basically tell the group, this is just a test. You do us as big a favor if you're saying no, is if you say yes about

whether this program makes any sense in the context of your state. It's really a year of interviews. Then we make a decision about whether to go into the state. The fundraising occurs at the same time to make it possible. The next part of those ingredients—oh, another one of those is, choosing the institutions and identifying the geographic areas we'll target for student placement. So we do site visits and we do research.

However, we recognize we don't come from your state, we don't know what goes on in your state as well as the people who live there. We're asking you to guide us in missing the potholes. What do we need to do? The idea isn't to create a program in which one size fits all, the idea is to create a program that works for your state. So for example, in Indiana we started with four universities. In Ohio we have seven because Ohio is geographically and demographically dramatically different than Indiana.

Q: Right.

Levine: In New Jersey, we went with five institutions and had two cooperate because they hadn't had a history of cooperation. They needed to. So we used the fellowship for that agenda item. The governor had tried to get them to merge. The legislature, they were heated in terms of disagreements with each other. We told the two universities, you don't get into the program unless you do it together. And they did it. So there are a lot of agendas that go into this, and it's shaped, particularly, for the state. We make sure the fit works. People know about us before this happens. We're pretty comfortable with that. We work with the institutions on developing their program over that eighteen to twenty-one month period.

Once the program's in place the first year, it's a beta. It needs fundamental changes, so we work with them on the changes. It takes three years to get the right program in place, so we do—it's a lot of successive approximations, and a lot of homework, and a lot of meetings, before we walk into a state and say, okay, we're here.

Q: So you're sort of seeding some things that will help to build their capacity in a variety of ways, but the hope is that when you leave, and the money leaves, that it's been institutionalized to the degree that it's actually going to change how they prepare teachers in that state?

Levine: Yes.

Q: Okay. So is the next step, then, more states?

Levine: Ultimately, we're thinking we'd like eight to ten states total. We initially concentrated on the Midwest but began thinking, wouldn't it make more sense to have one state per region of the country and try to use that state as a beacon. Instead of defusing strictly within the state, let's diffuse to the states around it. We figure eight to ten will cover the whole country.

Q: At this point, how does that dovetail with the agenda that Gregorian is promoting here at Carnegie? Has it continued to sort of move kind of hand in hand?

Levine: It has, interestingly. I feel sort of like we've been passed off. What happened was New Teachers was concluded—

Q: Right.

Levine: 100Kin10, which is the program designed to get one hundred thousand new science, math, technology and engineering teachers in the next ten years, has taken hold and Carnegie's been a leader in terms of creating that program which works closely with other foundations around the country, and with the federal government. We've now become part of that, which is because we're working on STEM teachers and they're working on STEM teachers.

Q: So it sounds like you got an answer, though, to the question—but I was thinking, the numbers are so small, when you think about how teaching is such a mass occupation, right? You have a lot of—I mean, this is an unkind characterization—but mills, really, that are generating teachers. Right? But you have this tremendous—I think it's something like over four million, right, teachers in America. So you start to think, wow, it's a drop in the bucket. Yet, you've sort of figured out a way to begin to affect change in the system, not just sending more teachers out, but actually trying to think about, how do we leverage this to change how the institutions prepare them, how they're supported when they get to the schools—which I think are huge, huge changes. I guess, based on that, one of the questions I would ask you is, from your vantage point, as someone who's shared philosophies and the kinds of innovations that Carnegie has also promoted, why has it been so hard to change teacher education? I mean, why do we have this long, long record of efforts to change it, and yet, at base, we sort of—many of the critiques that are in your reports, are the same things that James Conant wrote in 1963. Why has it been so hard to change?

Levine: I'll say, you're right. The same critiques have been offered over and over again, and they sure go a lot further back than James [B. Conant] and the Conant Reports.

Q: Yes.

Levine: But what's happened this time, and what makes it seem even more urgent—Sputnik [satellite] certainly did that—but what's happening now is, the United States is in the middle of a transition from a national analog industrial economy to a global digital information economy. And all of our social institutions, every one of them, were created for the former.

Q: Right.

Levine: So we sort of look at them, we say, eh, government isn't working so well anymore. We look at them and we said, financial institutions are really troubled—oh, look at health care, oh, goodness, look at the schools. Look at—it's all a mess—media. We're asking two questions now, do we repair it, or do we replace it? In every one of those sectors we're asking those questions. Except in government, because if we try to replace it that's called treason. But other than that, all the others we're doing that. We have a whole series of experiments now which are occurring in both baskets. Once upon a time, what happened is, teacher education could probably have dragged its feet long enough for the reform movement to pass and America would move on to the next crisis. This time it's not going to happen. All the social institutions have got to be re-adapted.

What's going to happen here is, and what's happening in teacher education right now, is—well, let's see, the latest report came out in the middle of June 2013, and gave terrible ratings to teacher education programs all around the country.

Q: Oh, the, what was it—NCTQ?

Levine: Yes, NCTQ, National Council on Teacher Quality ratings. Regardless of what one thought about this study—and I had grave qualms about it—the findings weren't any different. Except what is different now, is that four bills are working their way through Congress that would regulate teacher education. Two of them would set up academies which would allow non-universities to grant education degrees—teacher education degrees and principals degrees. Most if not all states have alternative routes into the teacher programs. What's also happening now is, we're seeing spin offs and new kinds of organizations—the Relay Graduate School of Education which spun off from Hunter [College], and is now a freestanding university. There are charters that are offering teacher education programs. There are the Boston public schools that created a program to educate teachers.

So what we're finding right now is, regulations are changing, paths to becoming a teacher are changing, new organizations are springing up, new methods are being accepted. Teach for America has done very, very well saying that we're preparing teachers in different ways that are inappropriate now. And that what they really need are to be very smart and six weeks of instruction. Whether one agrees or disagrees, they've been very successful in doing that. What's

clear now is teacher education, which was once a monopoly of universities, is no longer a monopoly, and there's a very real danger of losing its franchise. I think that'll be a bad thing if it happens, but it's only a question of whether teacher education is going to wake up and smell the flowers.

Q: Yes.

Levine: They are under attack in teacher education.

Q: Absolutely.

Levine: More and more of what they do is moving to other sectors, and the question is whether it'll survive. The Accreditation Association, which is called CAEP [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation], just developed new standards which focused on outcomes. Whoever would have thought that an accreditation association focused on student learning in graduates classes as being mandatory proof point?

Q: Right, because NCATE [National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education] is very concerned with inputs.

Levine: Right. NCATE is what merged—NCATE and TEAC [Teacher Education Accreditation Council]—

Q: Right.

Levine: —the two accrediting associations merged to form CAEP. So it's all up for grabs now. The only question is, when we reach a final solution, will education schools be part of it? I'd like them to be, because they know educate ninety percent of all teachers. And, it's the the [William] Willie Sutton principle—when asked why he robbed banks, he said it's because that's where the money is. Why would you fix ed schools? Because that's where the students are. Second, ed schools are self-sustaining to the extent that, if you pay to fix them once, and they stay fixed, student then pay tuition. Other programs you have to keep putting money in and support them year after year after year after year. They're not self-sustaining. Third is, ed schools have all these faculty who are in disciplines—science, math, history, and French. If we're going to have students teach those subjects, they need content and only universities provide that. Fourth, the research doesn't give good evidence that anybody is better than anybody else, non-universities versus universities in preparation. I guess the last piece for me is, the one thing we've learned through the Woodrow Wilson program is, that education schools and teacher education programs really can change. For all those reasons, I hope it'll persist, but there's no reason to believe that it will be.

Q: Right. Right. I was thinking I had two questions as you were talking, and one was, I mean, it is very much let a—I never know if it's one thousand or whatever—a lot of flowers bloom. Right? In all these different ways. Which is an interesting contrast when you think about what you started out talking about in terms of Clark Kerr and the need for kind of a system. But it feels like maybe you were in this moment of just trying to figure out what the right system

should be, or maybe this is the upheaval before the system. But as someone who spent some time looking at teacher education, I see how some of these things will work in the more elite universities. But when I start to think about the institutions that produce really the bulk of teachers, the Michigan States [University], the CUNYs, these kinds of places, there are so many constraints in terms of the kind of applicants, the—it just is an interesting question that the funding, all of those things, how do you break those log jams? How do you change those places?

Levine: Two different questions. Let me take them one at a time. One is a question about the environment, and the other one's the question about how do you specifically change things given the log jam that may exist. On the how do you change things, this is an extraordinary period of change. We are being whipped about—

Q: Yes.

Levine: —by demographic, economic, technological, and global change. Every social institution's being whipped about. I talked earlier about the fact that it's sort of Rip Van Winkle like, how fast things are changing, and that all of our social institutions are broken. What Clark Kerr did was invent or scale up the university system that was required by the Industrial Age. We're now entering this new environment. Every time—every time, we've only undergone this once before, which is the transition from an agrarian to an industrial society—

Q: It's really the late 1800s, early 1900s.

Levine: Yes. What happened during that period was the historic college no longer worked. They were still teaching the trivium and quadrivium. And turned out that Latin, Hebrew, Greek and Syriac weren't perhaps the most important skills to learn for an industrial era. So what happened was new kinds of institutions were created. So starting in the time after the Civil War, we created the university, which would offer specialize training, which would offer advanced training, which would prepare people for professions like business and engineering that are required by an industrial society. They'd engage in research on real issues, they'd create what amounted to field laboratories to help with the agriculture. What also happened was we created normal schools to prepare teachers. We created technical colleges like MIT and Rensselaer [Polytechnic Institute] to create—Rensselaer was earlier—like MIT to create programs to prepare people for this industrial society. We created junior colleges so we can move this into local communities. We created land grants, which sort of straddled both worlds.

Q: Yes.

Levine: It took until the era of Clark Kerr to bring all this together. So we're talking about a period of, perhaps, eighty years. And then it got ratified, or codified, with the California master plan. Today, we're going to need new kinds of institutions because old institutions don't change very readily. This era is going to push for low cost, universal, outcome based education. It's going to be heavily digital, and we're still yet to invent that. So we've tried all kinds of experiments. We do a MOOCs [Massive Open Online Course]. We do online programs, and we do a host of different kinds of activities and experiments. It's going to come together, there's going to be a type of institution that mirrors this age. It just hasn't formed yet. We're going to

see the same thing happen in teacher education. In terms of the barriers, how do you move the barriers? Moving barriers is really hard. No priesthood has ever been the primary source of its own change.

Q: Right.

Levine: That's what universities are. I suspect the largest push for change will come from the periphery of universities, and the new experiments they try. I think it'll come from outside of universities, but I also think if universities will it, they can make the changes that are necessary. You mentioned Michigan State, they're one of our universities that we're working with, and they've created what amounts to an excellent program. They chose to do it.

Q: How do you reconcile the—and this is one of the particular sort of constraints that I was thinking about—again, this appears more in your lower tier institutions. But the conflict between a focus on clinical preparation, which I mean, it used to be possible to say we don't really know what makes a good teacher, and I think there's still a lot of questions out there. Time and again we see the focus coming back to they really—the clinical piece is critical, right? The clinical piece is also expensive. How do you do right by students when you have—teacher candidates—when you have this press towards low cost, universal, and the reality of a clinical based program being expensive and individuated?

Levine: Do you have any other questions?

[Laughter]

Levine: That's a key question. Part of the problem has been that teacher education has been used as a cash cow, so let's do this at the lowest possible cost.

Q: Right.

Levine: States have to let their universities know this isn't acceptable. You're going to have to invest what it takes to do this right. Every state—and one of the things that I've been urging states to do in my writing is, so here's a time which we're hiring fewer teachers, just because the economy doesn't commit us to hire more. So we need for universities to produce fewer. They also need to stop producing in areas like elementary education, in which we have this huge glut of teachers.

Q: Yes.

Levine: Instead focus on high need areas. Every state—no, most states—have the capacity to reauthorize all their existing programs. What I've been urging states do is close down their failing teacher education programs. This is the moment to do it. We don't need to supply anymore.

Q: A la [Abraham] Flexner.

Levine: A la Flexner. Yes. By the way, Flexner's something I've worked on and I've talked a lot about.

Q: Oh, yes?

Levine: Not only for teacher education, but for higher education.

Q: Well, he certainly was in the right place at the right time for a lot of the changes that happened in the early part of the twentieth century. And had a hand in them.

Levine: Well, Flexner was an accident. Flexner wasn't the important figure.

Q: He rode the crest—

Levine: Flexner was a set-up.

Q: Yes.

Levine: He was a set-up. All the pieces were in place before Flexner ever arrived on the scene. He could have failed. He visited every medical school in the United States and Canada. It would have been possible for him to fail, but he would have had to work at it.

Q: Right.

Levine: Carnegie, the foundation, was supporting it.

Q: Yes.

Levine: The American Medical Association and the states wanted the change to happen. There was a pile of money going into this. They produced seventy gazillion copies of this report, and did all the media work that was necessary. So let's see, you've got the professional associations, the states, the revenue and the publicity, and you got the report that documents what everybody already knew before he wrote the report.

Q: So the coalition had kind of come together.

Levine: Oh, absolutely.

Q: You're saying we're in a very similar kind of moment in teacher education at this point in time?

Levine: Any state can be a Flexner state.

Q: So then, when you think about sort of the focus on the states, and then you think about—because I know one of the questions, one of the aims at least, for Carnegie, has always been how does this effect or influence national policy. So carry this out at the state level, it's a hard

question to ask because there's no national quote, unquote policy on teacher education, but how do you see that playing into a larger policy trend, maybe? That's a way to look at it, the state based work.

Levine: I think the policies are fairly well known. I mean, the policies that ought to work in this area, there aren't a lot of surprises. Those same reports that you talked about, the weaknesses in teacher education also offered a litany of responses in terms of recommendations that looked a lot alike. We know what to do, and now we have the capacity to actually test whether the changes we make will work through student learning. That's a major change which has occurred. The move—industrial societies care about process, so all of our schools look like assembly lines.

Q: Right.

Levine: What we care about is the process by which education occurs, which is teaching. Information economies only care about outcomes. That means we're going to switch now. Process is variable, time is variable, and the commonality is learning. So once you've made that change, we now have the capacity to study any changes we make in terms of practice, in terms of impact on student learning. That's an extraordinary tool.

Q: Right. It sort of changes the whole game. I want to just follow up that with two quick questions, and then move into a couple of questions about your particular relationship with Carnegie. One, do you think that there is the political will at this moment to make some of the changes you're talking about? For example, for state legislatures to say, universities you can't do

this on the cheap for that kind of—there have been a lot of statements by the right people, but the notion of political will among those who make decisions, and those who would be the students, and all of those kinds of things?

Levine: There are chief state school officers in several states who are moving that direction. Kentucky started already, Louisiana started it already, and there are others who I've spoken to in recent times who have as well. So, yes. I think if we don't have it now, we're building toward it.

Q: Okay.

Levine: I'm optimistic about that.

Q: Okay. Then the other question. You've talked about a couple of really important contextual elements in terms of the time, the moment that we're in. I'm thinking there are some other aspects of that context that I wonder if they have any impact. Just thinking about kind of clawing out of this economic recession, the notion of greater inequality, some of those things. How does that increasing diversity, and yet a teaching population that is still primarily over eighty percent white, how do those things, if they do—

Levine: This is—

Q: —enter this vision?

Levine: It's an extraordinary time. You know what they are? Competing waves of change. So if you look at—look at the demographics. Not only are the demographics race, the population's moving. The majority of Americans are now in the red states, which wasn't true in the two thousand census.

In addition, the population's aging like crazy, which has all kinds of impact in terms of social policy. So which one do you want to follow? Forty percent of today's college voters in the last election for president were of color. Almost half the kids in elementary school are of color. Can't ignore that one. But wait. Their teachers are aging out and wait, they're moving to different parts of the country. Or maybe we ought to be hanging on to the technology changes. We have all these other ways to teach. We have all these digital kids and we have institutions that are analog. We have analog schools, analog colleges, populated by white digital immigrants. Okay? Maybe the issue is global. These guys are not going to live in a single country, they're going to live in a world. Maybe the issue is they're preparing for an economy in which the jobs are all changing and the educational expectations are all changing. Every one of these things is hitting at the same time, and it's not obvious as a universal solution to all of this stuff. So we're still grappling with how all this fits in place, while the pace of change actually increases. The problem we're facing most is that a number of these organizations, schools, government, financial industry, health care industry, are all provider driven. However, media is consumer driven, for example.

Q: Right.

Levine: So media's undergone the most profound changes of all because the consumers have said what they wanted. What that's done has left traditional organizations in deep trouble, and at the same time what it's done is, created a raft of now successful alternative organizations. Essentially, we can look at media and see the future of every other organization that's going to occur. From the disintermediation which has characterized that industry, to the changing cost structure, to the changing organizational format, it would be wise to study what's going on there. So the answer is, yes, some pieces do work together. Which is the economy is changing, the demographics are changing. It turns out the fastest growing groups are the groups which we've done most poorly in terms of schooling and education. However, economic development in this country will not permit people who have less than a high school diploma to get jobs.

Q: Right.

Levine: Particularly if there have no skill areas. The end result is, if we expect to remain an economic power, we need those people because there are tens of thousands of STEM jobs now that aren't going filled, or are going unfilled, because we don't have the labor force to fill them in. So all of these needs call for greater equity, greater opportunity, greater results than we've had in the past for the changing population. Our economic future depends upon it.

Q: Well said.

Levine: Other than that, piece of cake.

Q: [Laughs] So if there's anything, I guess, that you wanted to add about the ways in which Carnegie has played a role in the development of your thinking, or—I mean, you talked very specifically about the ways in which it supported the programmatic work that you've done, but just some of the ways that Carnegie has been a part of this wave of thinking that's developed.

Levine: Yes. I basically owe my entire career to the Carnegie Corporation. I'm not kidding. Which is to say, I essentially got discovered by Carnegie after my first book. And was given this dream job. I was now able to write books about topics I cared about. And I got to do that for seven years with two different Carnegie presidents. One being from the Foundation, however. When projects came along over time, Carnegie supported me in those projects, whether it was an issue of *Change* magazine on diversity. Or whether it was building a program at Harvard or Teachers College.

Q: Right.

Levine: Carnegie helped me do these things. So that they have invested in projects that I've worked on, they've moved me forward in terms of thinking and issues. I'm extraordinarily grateful to this foundation.

Q: It sounds like they've also invested in people, though.

Levine: Yes.

Q: Do you feel like there are other people who shared your experience?

Levine: I'm positive there are. I know there are.

Q: Yes.

Levine: With—it's fascinating watching Vartan Gregorian. With Vartan, he held a symposium last fall with *Time* magazine and Gates [Foundation] on the future of higher education. And here's a guy who knows the world's changing. Higher education isn't going to look the way it does now in the years to come. He has the power of his position, his history, and his personality, and has really set off to figure out how to launch the future without destroying the present.

That's an amazing role for a foundation president to play. He can do that in a way that Bill Gates can't, because of the credibility he brings from all of his other jobs. He does that in terms of who he knows and what he can do. I think that he has the capacity, and the likelihood, of being able to help launch the tomorrow that's coming, that he won't live to see. But do it in the responsible way, to inform a field that seems almost deaf to what's going on around it, about the real pressures it's facing, and hold their hands and enable them to move forward.

Q: You make a fascinating point just about, sort of, philanthropy too, and the ways that, by having a leader like Vartan Gregorian, Carnegie has ensured its relevance. Even in the face of the rise of these new philanthropies. I'm asking you to prognosticate here, but what do you think—I mean, as sort of things play out, do you think that the Broad Foundation and the Gates and the

foundations that are sort of newly ascendant, and very powerful in terms of the amount of money, will they be the ones that are sort of setting the agenda, or do you see there being kind of an evening out?

Levine: At the moment Gates needs Carnegie.

Q: And explain. Just be explicit. Why do you think that?

Levine: Carnegie comes with a history and a reputation and a place in higher education. Gates doesn't. They're the new kid on the block with a lot, a lot of money. They are nouveau. Carnegie provides the seal of approval that says it's okay to do this. In the years to come, that won't be necessary. Not next week, not next year, but in the decades to come.

Gates will have staked out its territory and will have that authority and that background to be able to do that. It won't need the partnerships as much. Carnegie will continue to need the leadership to help build other partnerships, to help identify the issues, and to help move a country undergoing profound change in directions that are constructive, and maintain historic commitments at the same time that we're rebuilding the infrastructure by which we carry them out.

Q: Those partnerships are critical to the kind of leverage that you were mentioning earlier.

Levine: Absolutely.

Q: It will be new partners, perhaps, but still the idea that they will work in partnership.

Levine: Yes.

Q: Well, I probably could still think of more questions, but I think I've probably exhausted our time.

Levine: That's really impressive, actually. I can't believe we've just spoken for two hours.

Q: Well, you had a lot to say. It was fascinating, so thank you very much, unless there's anything else you wanted to add.

Levine: You know, you're the only person who told me that's fascinating all day.

Q: Oh, come on.

Levine: It's already one o'clock.

[Laughter]

Q: Well, like I said, if there's anything else you wanted to add, you'd be welcome to do that now.

Levine: Thanks. I haven't got anything more.

Q: But otherwise, thank you very much for your time.

Levine: My pleasure. Thank you. You're a great interviewer.

Q: Oh, I thoroughly enjoyed it. Like I said, really, I did find it fascinating. It's right in my bailiwick, so it was really fun to be able to talk to you.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

100Kin10	34
Annenberg Foundation	10, 15, 22, 23
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	50, 51
Boyer, Ernest L.	1, 5
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education	1
Conant, James B.	34, 35
Daniels, Mitchell E., Jr.	23
Fallon, Daniel	22
Flexner, Abraham	26, 42, 43, 44
Ford Foundation	3, 10, 26
Gregorian, Vartan	15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 50
Hunt, James B., Jr.	23
Kauffman Foundation	10
Kerr, Clark	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 38, 39, 40
Lilly Endowment	28
Pifer, Alan J.	4

Sizer, Theodore R.	22
Teachers for a New Era	14, 15, 22, 24, 25, 33
Wallace Foundation	10