

**Subject:** RE: Media Query Deadline Noon Friday RE: your support for Ann Weaver Hart's DeVry board seat

**Date:** Thursday, March 10, 2016 at 7:30:27 AM Mountain Standard Time

**From:** Eileen Klein

**To:** Alaimo, Carol

Carol Ann-

Thanks for your note and the opportunity to comment.

I have not discussed the matter with Dr. Hart.

I do not consider DeVry a competitor of the public university system and I don't think the public does either. I see colleges like DeVry as an important market option for students, particularly those for whom a university education is not a good fit for their personal ambitions or aspirations. In Arizona, students need more options than ever to pursue education and skills training after high school, especially with the vast number of jobs now requiring postsecondary education as a minimum requirement.

Debates over tax status and private versus public ownership of educational institutions sidestep meaningful discussion regarding the true challenge facing all of American higher education today: how to deliver high quality learning at an affordable cost. It's important that institutions like DeVry have strong leadership, transparency and accountability to be sure they deliver value to students, not just shareholders, particularly since DeVry benefits from taxpayer dollars. I hope that is the role Dr. Hart will play on the DeVry board.

I do not question Dr. Hart's commitment to the University of Arizona. It is strong and the university's brand or status hardly will be undone by her decision. In fact, in this rapidly changing landscape of higher education delivery, done right, both institutions can learn from one another as a result of her appointment.

The Arizona Board of Regents holds each of its presidents to account for their performance and conduct. Terms are outlined both in contract and policy. Board policy requires each president's contract include "An explicit condition that the role of president is primary, and although outside activities are permitted, they must not conflict with or interfere with the individual's successful accomplishment of the responsibilities as president."

Having said that, as representatives of the public, the board should always consider the impact of its presidents' outside activities on the universities. While I don't think a post hoc review of this particular decision is warranted, further review by the board about its notice and approval process is welcome to ensure we are operating unequivocally in the interest of the public and the students we serve.

Eileen

---