

Student Success: Statewide P-16 Systems



SHEEO

Table of Contents

Preface	v
Authors' Biographies	vii
Executive Summary	1
Early Outreach	9
Curriculum and Assessment Systems	27
High Quality Teaching	37
Student Financial Assistance	47
Data and Accountability Systems	63
Appendix	71
Case Study Teams	77

Preface

The SHEEO P-16 Initiative, which has produced these essays, was conceived in the summer of 2000 in discussions of SHEEO staff, the SHEEO K-16 Committee, and staff of the U.S. Department of Education. As we proceeded we found ourselves naturally attracting and being attracted to colleagues in other associations working on the same agenda – improving access to and success in higher education. Most prominently, these include our partners in the policy component of the Pathways to College Project – The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and the College Board.

The project has received support from four U.S. Department of Education programs – GEAR-UP, Higher Education Act Title II – Teacher Quality Enhancement, PT3-Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education. The project also received support from the Pathways to College project; Pathways to College is a consortium of 19 organizations and associations focused on improving the participation and success of under-represented groups in higher education. Pathways, described in more detail in the appendix, has been supported by a growing group of private foundations and the U.S. Department of Education.

The initiative has included "case studies" of P-16 activities in five states – California, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, and Rhode Island – organized primarily by the staff of each state's higher education agency. It also has included full-day discussions of P-16 issues involving educators and policymakers in Washington, Tennessee, Montana, and Indiana. The project also is sponsoring four two-day regional seminars (now in progress), each of which will help policymakers from a dozen or so states develop strategies for improving student participation and success. All of these activities have informed these policy essays.

The biographical sketches that follow introduce the authors of the essays, who collectively have accumulated many years of wide-ranging policy experience. While we have different perspectives, we share a passionate belief that only comprehensive, well-integrated state systems can meet the educational needs of the next generation. We have influenced each other, and we have many intellectual debts, especially to those who participated in the project. (A list of participants in the state case studies and of others who have contributed in various ways is contained in the appendix.) Despite the many contributions from our colleagues and friends, the authors of each of the essays bear sole responsibility for the views therein.

Paul E. Lingenfelter
Executive Director
State Higher Education Executive Officers



Early Outreach

by Terese Rainwater and Andrea Venezia

Pre-college outreach programs were developed essentially to ensure that students who are traditionally underrepresented in postsecondary education have the same opportunities to attend and succeed in college as do students who are traditionally considered "college-bound." Young people whose parents possess relatively more wealth and education are far more likely to attend and succeed in college than are students whose families are not advantaged in those ways.¹ Pre-college outreach programs try to ensure that students enrolled in those programs have the opportunities and support necessary to prepare for, and succeed in, college.

While almost all high school students plan to attend college, students with more financial resources tend to have additional sources of information about the range of opportunities, academic preparation requirements, and the availability of student financial assistance. Students with those advantages are more likely to have:

- Parents who can help with studies or hire a private tutor if students have difficulty in school;
- Opportunities to visit a college campus;
- Teachers and counselors who view them as college bound;
- Schools with more resources; and
- The ability to pay for college in whole or in part, more information about financial aid, and more support with filling out the required financial aid paperwork.

Young people whose parents have *not* attended college and who are poor must often overcome the absence of *all* these supports in order to enroll and succeed in postsecondary education. Pre-college outreach programs work to

The authors gratefully acknowledge the expert review and comments of the other policy brief authors, and of Gordon Davies, Jan Kettlewell, and Stephen Portch.

compensate for these inequalities by providing academic tutoring, college visitation opportunities, a cohort of peers, high expectations, financial aid advice and counseling, and other related programmatic components.

The United States has a history of providing high-quality public education to a privileged elite. Early on in the nation's history, African American slaves were excluded from schools. Even as a broad system of public education emerged in the nineteenth century, in retrospect it is "clear that the system of public education that emerged in the United States was inherently unfair to Germans and the Irish, to Catholics and Jews, and, of course, to African Americans and Native Americans who were at first excluded from the common schools" (Hiner 1998). In the 1950s and 1960s, pre-college outreach programs were formally established to address these issues. Such programs were first supported by religious entities and foundations, and then, through the authorization of the Higher Education Act in 1965, also by the federal government. Literally hundreds of pre-college outreach programs are now financed by federal, state, and local governments, as well as by business, non-profits, and individuals. A few of these programs are described briefly in this paper, and more comprehensive descriptions of the field are available in other sources (i.e., The College Board 2001; Cunningham, Redmond, and Merisotis 2003).

**Ideally, all students would
receive the curricular
opportunities, support, expectations,
and information they need
to prepare well for college
simply by working hard
to complete
their K-12 schooling.**

Since there are severe inequalities and capacity problems in our nation's schools, pre-college outreach programs will continue to play an important role in providing educational opportunity for the foreseeable future. It is clear, however, that these programs in themselves are not enough. Ideally, all students would receive the curricular opportunities, support, expectations, and information they need to prepare well for

college simply by working hard to complete their K-12 schooling. Because the nation has not yet attained this ideal, there is a continuing need to support programs that are providing high-quality, essential services to students, while at the same time increasing the capacity of K-12 schools to provide all students the opportunity to prepare well for college.

The Purpose of this Paper

Throughout the country, pre-college outreach programs have tended to be ancillary units – efforts that are not an integral part of either postsecondary education institutions or state education policy structures. As John Tafel, Vice Chancellor for the Ohio Board of Regents, observed about the state's education systems, "Ohio was program rich and system poor" (Tafel and Eberhart 1999). This brief statement captures the essential problem still facing pre-college outreach in the United States. Special programs exist because the underlying educational system does not meet the needs of all students. This fundamental problem may be ameliorated with "add-on" efforts, but it cannot ultimately be solved without systemic change.

We believe that systemic reform – a comprehensive approach to embedding the best principles of excellent outreach programs in routine practice – is required because the scope of the need dwarfs the capacity of existing programs and any imaginable expansion of them. Our paper analyzes current pre-college outreach programs in a P-16 framework, asking the question: What could pre-college outreach look like in a P-16 education system? P-16 is defined here as an integrated system of education stretching from early childhood (the "P" stands for pre-kindergarten or pre-school) through a four-year college degree ("grade sixteen").

A central goal of P-16 is to raise student achievement by getting students ready for school, raising standards, "conducting appropriate assessments, improving teacher quality, and generally smoothing student transitions from one level of learning to the next" (Rainwater and Van de Water 2001). A theory behind P-16 reform is that aligned, coherent policies – from student transition-focused policies to teacher education and professional development programs – will create a more seamless education system that will allow all students to meet higher standards and move easily from one level to the next. A systemic approach to P-16 education offers the hope that all students will know what is expected of them as they transition from

We believe that systemic reform is required because the scope of the need dwarfs the capacity of existing programs and any imaginable expansion of them.

grade to grade – and that there will not be as big a division between secondary and postsecondary education as there is now.

The purpose of this brief is to consider how the principles and practices of good early outreach programs might be embedded in state educational systems. The paper will describe what we have learned from the characteristics of several programs, describe the components of typical outreach programs, describe and analyze a few examples of statewide efforts, and propose a means of working toward a more systemic approach to early college outreach.

What Research Says About Pre-college Outreach Programs

One of the unique problems facing pre-college outreach programs is the number of programs that exist, the significant length of time programs have been in operation, and the relatively small amounts of information researchers have about those programs. In fact, until The College Board released the results of The National Survey for Outreach Programs (NSOP) in 2001, researchers were not sure how many programs existed nationally. Approximately 1,110 programs participated in the study, 465 of which were federal programs, including Upward Bound, Talent Search and GEAR-UP (Swail and Perna 2001). On average, programs have been operating for eleven years, with a multitude of goals and objectives regarding student and program success, and numerous strategies to achieve those ends. Included among program goals are that students should persist in high school, graduate from high school, improve high school grades, apply to college, attend community college, attend a four-year institution of higher education, and graduate from college.

In order to reach those goals, programs employ a variety of strategies. Programs recognize that gaining

access and achieving success in postsecondary education require more than money. Research shows that reliance on financial aid for college access and completion does not provide students all they need for postsecondary success. Money is important but it is only part of the answer. As Perna and Swail (2002) write:

[A] review of relevant research – plus the fact that gaps in access and completion have not been closed despite the resources the federal government has dedicated to closing them – suggest that merely making financial aid available for students to attend college is not enough to ensure that all students have equal access to the benefits associated with earning a college degree.

Perna and Swail also report that of those programs that participated in NSOP, 90 percent listed encouraging college attendance, college awareness and college exposure; 84 percent listed building students' self-esteem; 81 percent listed providing role models; and 73 percent listed college completion as important program goals.

What else is needed for pre-college outreach success? Recent research by Patricia Gandara (2001) sheds light on the components shared by the best pre-college outreach programs. Successful pre-college outreach programs have:

- A primary person who monitors and guides the student over time. This could be a teacher, mentor, counselor, or program director.
- Good instruction coupled with a challenging curriculum that is carefully tailored to students' learning needs.
- Long-term versus short-term interventions. The longer students participate in a program, the more benefits they report from having been in the program.
- Cultural awareness of students' background. Many programs find that they have more success with some groups of students over others. Establishing cultural connections with students may be due, in part, to staff background and experience.
- Positive peer support. Students are more likely to succeed when they have a peer group that provides academic, social, and emotional support.

- Financial assistance and incentives. For many low-income students who identify postsecondary education as a goal, scholarships and grants can make the difference between realizing that goal or not (Gandara 2001).

**Research shows that
reliance on financial aid
for college access and
completion does not provide
students all they need for
postsecondary success.**

The components listed above provide policymakers and educators with an idea of the attributes shared by successful programs, but there are several gaps in the research. Gandara lists one: research is unclear whether one kind of professional – a teacher, guidance counselor, or mentor – has more success with students than another. Researchers also do not know empirically the impact of each component on students either individually or in combination (Swail and Perna 2001). Does having a mentor, financial aid, and longevity in a program produce better results than having quality instruction, challenging curriculum and peer support on student success? Or is the presence of long-term programs the most important component? Researchers also seek to discover the number of students who qualify for outreach programs versus the number of students who are able to participate. Perna and Swail (2002) report that "although 11 million American are eligible for services through TRIO programs, only 5 percent of those eligible are being served due to limited federal funding for these programs." How many students qualify for but cannot participate in pre-college outreach programs? Finally, research is unclear about when students should begin participation in a program. Are students who begin pre-college outreach programs in seventh grade more successful than students who begin in the ninth grade?

Given the magnitude of needs that pre-college outreach seeks to address, we believe that more research needs to be done so that K-12 education systems can learn from successful outreach programs and embed effective practices into schools systemically. The next section outlines attributes of some major programs.

Components of Existing Outreach Programs

Table 1 lists a variety of types of programs. It is not an exhaustive list, nor is it a perfectly representative snapshot of the types of programs currently in existence. Rather, it provides basic information about some of the largest programs, and programs from the case study states.

Our survey of the Pathways case study data included a broad range of programs, including GEAR-UP, I Have a Dream, the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program, and the Children's Crusade of Rhode Island. The students served in every case are educationally and economically disadvantaged, beginning in some cases as early as third grade, though most target students in the middle and high school years. In some cases the lead agency is federal; in other instances a state or regional government provides funding and oversight; and some are operated and supported by non-profit organizations.

The components of the programs are as varied as the goals they seek to achieve: they include tutoring, mentoring, counseling, parental involvement activities, curriculum and staff development, and financial aid. Some of the most comprehensive programs, such as the El Paso Collaborative, incorporate many attributes of systemic perspective, including whole-school reform, teacher professional development, accountability, technical assistance, and parent support.

There is a great deal of variability of services, in terms of content and duration, provided by pre-college outreach programs. Most programs identify a cohort of students and provide supplemental tutoring and activities geared toward college preparation. Some, such as TRIO, offer relatively intensive opportunities, start later in a student's life and do not connect to schools as much as the Children's Crusade or the El Paso Collaborative, for example. Others, such as GEAR-UP, are not as intensive, but can start earlier in a child's life.

One key element is evaluation. Of the programs listed in *Table 1*, two had enlisted the help of an external evaluator, and three others had been evaluated by an external group. While external evaluations might not always lead to program improvement, they are a good indicator of whether or not programs are getting the information they need to understand how well they are serving students' needs. One example of an external evaluation is that conducted for Rhode Island's Children's Crusade.

Table 1

Inventory of Some Major Pre-college Outreach Programs ²

Program Name and lead funding agency	Students Served/Scale	Systemic/Programmatic Affecting an entire school or system across grades and subjects / Focused only on selected students	Components of Program
GEAR-UP Federal and state funding	Middle school students from traditionally underrepresented families. Serves whole grade levels of students beginning no later than grade 7 and continues through grade 12. In 1998-1999, there were 102 programs, with an average of 2,585 students served per program.	Combination – a program that focuses on systemic change for a limited group of students. Does not affect change in an entire school or district.	K-16 partnerships. Programs include: comprehensive services (tutoring, mentoring, counseling), parental involvement activities, curriculum and staff development, financial aid, postsecondary education information, college preparation, counseling, and college visits.
TRIO Federal funding	Economically disadvantaged, first-generation college, and disabled students. In 1998-1999, there were 2038 TRIO programs, with an average of 349 students served per program.	Programmatic	Includes Educational Opportunity Center, McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement, student support services, talent search, partnership program, staff training, Upward Bound (including math and science).
Project Grad Non-profit	Affects 57 urban schools and approximately 34,000 students in Houston; 25,000 students in 15 schools in Los Angeles; Atlanta program will eventually reach out to 16,000 students; numbers not available for sites in Columbus, Nashville, and Newark.	Programmatic	Scholarships, MOVE IT Math, Communities in Schools, Success for All, consistency management and cooperative discipline. Focuses on creating a solid foundation in reading and math, self-esteem development, providing resources, and offering scholarship support.
I Have a Dream Non-profit	Economically disadvantaged elementary schools (continues through college). In 1998-1999, there were 26 programs with an average of 121 students served per program.	Programmatic	Mentoring, tutoring, enrichment.
El Paso Collaborative State and regional funding	Students in El Paso's three large local school districts (approximately 86 percent of those districts' schools). Over 160,000 students in three urban and nine rural districts are served by professional development, leadership, policy, parental engagement and other systemwide initiatives (PK-16) supported by the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence.	Systemic	Standards-based, aligned assessment and standards, whole school reform, teacher professional development, teacher preparation, aligned policies K-16, clear accountability, technical assistance, administrator professional development, district support, parent support and education, and outreach to business and civic leaders.

Table 1 (continued)

Inventory of Some Major Pre-college Outreach Programs ²

Program Name and lead funding agency	Students Served/Scale	Systemic/Programmatic Affecting an entire school or system across grades and subjects / Focused only on selected students	Components of Program
Early Academic Outreach Program (CA) State funding	Educationally disadvantaged students in California. Approximately 85,000 students served.	Programmatic	High-level curriculum, academic advising, test preparation, residential programs, Saturday Academies.
Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement (MESA -- CA, AZ, CO, MD, NM, OR, UT, and WA) State funding	Educationally disadvantaged students and students from groups with low eligibility rates for four-year colleges. Serves elementary grades through college. In 2001-2002, MESA served the following numbers of students: 24,854 pre-college students in California, 3,030 in Colorado, 4,500 in New Mexico, and 4,935 in Washington. Oregon has served over 5,000 students total. Utah is currently serving over 3,000 students. No numbers were available for Arizona and Maryland.	Combination – a program that focuses on systemic change for a limited group of students. Does not affect change in an entire school or district.	MESA classes, summer programs internships, career and academic advising, student conferences, Saturday Academies, mathematics and science competitions, tutoring and mentoring, teacher professional development, parent workshops and conferences, student workshops and conferences, and student leadership development.
PUENTE (CA) State funding	Educationally underserved students (54 community colleges and 36 high schools). Cumulatively, Puente has served approximately 20,000 students directly and 280,000 indirectly.	Programmatic	Teaching, counseling and mentoring.
College Reach-Out Program (FL) State funding	Educationally disadvantaged, low-income students in grades six through twelve. In 1998-1999, 7,869 students were served.	Programmatic	Motivate students to pursue college, develop basic skills, strengthen student and parent understandings of the benefits of college, and supplemental instruction.
Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program State funding	Economically disadvantaged eighth, ninth, and tenth graders (families must earn under \$50,000). Calculating the cumulative number served (for the classes of 1996-2006), 28,620 students have been/are being served.	Programmatic, combined with some systemic GEAR-UP activities.	Helps students pay for college and requires them to take 17 units of college preparation curriculum, maintain a 2.5 GPA or better, complete homework, not do drugs, use alcohol, or commit crimes, attend advising sessions, apply for other financial aid, and attend program activities.

Table 1 (continued)

Inventory of Some Major Pre-college Outreach Programs ²

Program Name and lead funding agency	Students Served/Scale	Systemic/Programmatic Affecting an entire school or system across grades and subjects / Focused only on selected students	Components of Program
Children's Crusade (RI) Non-profit with state and federal funding	Economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 12. Approximately 17,000 students have been reached by the Crusade. Approximately 500 students/year currently go through the program.	Combination – a program that focuses on systemic change for a limited group of students. Does not affect change in an entire school or district.	The Crusade offers different components for each grade level. These include: before and after school literacy activities, tutoring, community service, diagnostic testing and exam practice, college visits, identification of colleges, college application support, advising, college planning, attendance and grade monitoring, and weekend and summer sessions.

Very few of these programs can be called systemic in the sense of being fully embedded in schools or colleges. Only one could be classified as truly systemic in nature – the El Paso Collaborative. Three showed evidence of combining programmatic and systemic approaches – GEAR-UP, MESA, and the Children's Crusade. The others offer more programmatic services to students.

Some of the state-level efforts are described in more detail in the next section.

State-Level Pre-college Outreach Efforts

State programs in Florida, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island provide different models for pre-college outreach that can be helpful in considering the components of a more systemic approach. For each state program identified below we discuss the program goals, target populations, means of funding, eligibility criteria, and other factors that warrant consideration.

Florida

In 1983, the Florida Legislature established the College Reach-Out Program (CROP).

The program's purpose is to motivate and prepare educationally and economically disadvantaged students in

grades six through twelve to pursue and successfully complete postsecondary education.

CROP participants are students who otherwise would be unlikely to seek admission to a community college, state university, or independent postsecondary institution without special support and recruitment efforts. Factors used to determine student eligibility include: the family's taxable income; family receipt of temporary assistance under the Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency (WAGES) Program in the preceding year; family receipt of public assistance in the preceding year; the student's cumulative grade point average; the student's promotion and attendance patterns; the student's performance on state standardized tests; the student's enrollment in mathematics and science courses; and the student's participation in a dropout prevention program.

CROP serves approximately 9,300 students through ten state universities, twenty-six community colleges, and seven independent postsecondary institutions. Funds are appropriated by the Legislature to the Department of Education and allocated competitively to postsecondary institutions around the state.

Community colleges, universities, and independent postsecondary institutions that participate in the program must provide procedures for continuous contact

with students from the point at which they are selected for participation until they enroll in a postsecondary education institution. Program activities must support the following goals: (1) Motivate students to pursue a postsecondary education; (2) Develop students' basic learning skills; (3) Strengthen students' and parents' understanding of the benefits of postsecondary education; and (4) Foster academic, personal, and career development through supplemental instruction. In addition, each program must have an evaluation component that provides for the collection, maintenance, retrieval, and analysis of data required by the state.

While Florida's CROP program is of limited size, it appears to have many of the crucial components of pre-college outreach programs and policies in place, including: well-defined goals and objectives for statewide pre-college outreach; and systematic ways to identify and target students, collect student data across segments, allocate funds, evaluate programs, and report data.³

Oklahoma

In 1992 Oklahoma established the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP), which is a centerpiece of its outreach efforts. OHLAP is a systemic program that seeks to increase student preparation for and participation in postsecondary education through a college scholarship incentive. In the following year Oklahoma also began implementing a systematic effort to use the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) series developed by ACT to provide widespread, voluntary, diagnostic testing in English, math, reading, and science reasoning to students in grades eight and ten. In addition to OHLAP and EPAS, Oklahoma, with GEAR-UP support, recently launched a broad program of public outreach, using mass marketing techniques to increase awareness of college.

EPAS is designed to help schools align curriculum, evaluate instructional programs, use student achievement data to improve college success, and prepare all students for postsecondary opportunity. In 1993, four school districts participated in the EPAS program. In 2001, 244 school districts and thirty-seven private schools participated in the program. The use of EPAS has helped students improve their preparation for college, increased their enrollment in college preparation courses, and improved their performance on college admissions exams. In addition, more students of color who participate in the EPAS program are planning to go to college. EPAS and the public outreach programs benefit all students in the state and are especially help-

ful in reaching students with limited access to information and help in preparing for college.

OHLAP's original design was to reach primarily economically disadvantaged students in urban centers. As the program came to enjoy to a broader state commitment, its target expanded to include students whose family income is \$50,000 or less. Recent changes to OHLAP eligibility have produced large gains in student participation. In the 2000-2001 school year – and the first year available to students whose family incomes are \$50,000 or less – almost 9,500 students enrolled. The OHLAP Year-End 2000-01 report noted, "nearly as many students enrolled in OHLAP in one year as the first eight years of the program combined (9,500 for 2000-01 compared to 10,800 total for 1992-93 through 1999-00)." (Year-end report 2000-01) This report also noted nearly 50 percent of the first cohort of OHLAP students (1996 high school graduates) completed college in comparison to 33 percent of all first-time, full-time first-year college students (Mize and Fair 2002).

Supported largely by state funds but partially by federal GEAR-UP dollars, the program offers full tuition at a public two- or four-year institutions or a partial scholarship at an accredited private college or university. The program pays only for the hours in which students are actually enrolled and is available to students for a maximum of five years.

In order to ensure that OHLAP students are prepared for college-level work, participating students must complete a 17-unit core curriculum which includes the following classes: four years of English, two years of laboratory sciences, three years of math, two years of history, one year of citizenship skills, two years of foreign language or computer technology, two additional units from any of the subjects previously mentioned, and one year of fine arts or speech. To qualify for the scholarship students must enroll in the eighth, ninth, or tenth grade and meet several program requirements, including:

- Complete the seventeen-unit core curriculum based on college admissions requirements;
- Graduate from high school;
- Maintain 2.5 GPA or better in the required core in high school;
- Maintain 2.5 GPA or better overall in high school;
- Complete required homework;
- Attend school regularly;

- No drug or alcohol use;
- No criminal acts;
- Family income must not exceed \$50,000; income is not reevaluated after initial eligibility is determined (Mize and Fair 2002).

The Oklahoma early outreach program does not provide intensive services to substantial groups of students, but more than many state efforts, it has a "systemic" feel. Its EPAS and public outreach efforts reach virtually all students, and OHLAP is available to all students with financial need who work to meet the program requirements. These statewide initiatives are supplemented by local programs, which provide more direct services to individual students.

Rhode Island

In 1990 the Rhode Island Commission for Higher Education promoted the creation of the Children's Crusade, arguing that a substantial public commitment is necessary to increase access to higher education for poor children (Brandeis University 2002). The goal of the Crusade is to increase the number of poor students successfully enrolling in and completing a postsecondary program by providing a long-term intervention beginning in the third grade with programmatic supports (mentoring, tutoring, etc.), coupled with a strong state commitment in the form of tuition incentives. The Crusade is a nonprofit organization supported by multiple funding sources including state and federal dollars.

From the first year of the program until the 1995-96 school year (when all qualifying third graders could participate), enrollment grew from 2,800 students annually to over 3,300. In response to an audit that stated the Crusade was "impossibly large" and would not be able to meet its scholarship commitments, the Children's Crusade was redesigned to meet the needs of 500 students annually in the most economically distressed school districts. In addition, the Crusade moved from primarily a "mentoring" model with a few other support services, to an intervention model based on developmentally-oriented, highly individualized student programs supported by a wide array of options, including summer enrichment camps, scholarship counseling, and tutoring (Brandeis University 2002).

The Children's Crusade is unique among pre-college outreach programs for several reasons. First, since its inception the program has had a strong postsecondary education component. In addition, the Crusade has

emphasized the importance of starting college preparation early in a student's academic career by beginning in the third grade. The Crusade has also undertaken an independent external evaluation, made the findings of that evaluation public, and responded to the evaluation by creating a publicly available strategic plan. Finally, The Crusade is responsible for creating the College Access Alliance of Rhode Island (CAARI), a network of Rhode Island programs that seeks to increase postsecondary opportunity and access for all of the state's students.⁴

The Crusade is an interesting model because it evolved from an initial broad statewide commitment to young students to a more intense but less systemic commitment to 500 students. Since the Crusade was downsized over time, its evolution suggests an important question: Can we discover ways to incorporate the techniques developed in the Crusade in all schools so that the education system is more successful for all third-grade students in Rhode Island?

Some of the states we examined have a number of pre-college outreach programs, or widespread education reforms that attempt to link K-12 and postsecondary education; in the two instances that follow we describe general characteristics of programs in California and reforms in Oregon. This information may be useful for states embarking on wide-scale reform.

California

California has a very diverse population of students, and a relatively tumultuous policy environment in which K-12 assessments and other reforms change frequently, depending on the governor or political party in power. The status of pre-college outreach programs reflects the overall nature of education policymaking in California. There are dozens of programs, with a variety of funding streams, goals, objectives, and populations of students being served. For example, the University of California (UC) System runs approximately fifteen pre-college outreach programs and partnerships, not including individual campus-based efforts. These include:

1. Student-centered programs that provide tutoring, mentoring, academic preparation, college counseling and other services directly to K-12 students;

2. School partnerships that offer curriculum development, direct instruction, community engagement and other assistance to many of California's lowest-performing schools;
3. Professional development programs to increase the skills and effectiveness of teachers and administrators;
4. Programs that help community college students plan for transfer and advise students about graduate and professional school study.⁵

In 2001, more than 97,000 students participated in UC-led student-centered programs, nearly 100,000 teachers were served by the professional development programs, and UC-school partnerships extended to 256 California schools. More than one-half of UC's partner schools are elementary schools, and more than one-fourth of all students participating in UC outreach programs are below the ninth grade. These programs have played a role in preparing students for college enrollment: participants in UC outreach programs now account for 30 percent of African American UC freshmen and 33 percent of Latino UC freshmen. Both the California State University and the Community College System run their own pre-college outreach programs, and there are numerous not-for-profit programs throughout the state as well.

The number of programs and the number of students involved in them is an indicator of the energy and commitment devoted to early outreach in California. But it is important to place these data in the context of the demographics of the state. According to the 2000 census, California has 6.9 million youth between the ages of five and eighteen. Of the state's population, 26 percent are born outside the U.S., 39 percent have a language other than English spoken in the home, 46 percent are white, non-Latino, and 14 percent of the population (4.8 million people) live below the poverty line. The huge size and continuing growth of California make it especially urgent that educators and policy-makers find ways of using the accumulated knowledge of these programs to reach more students.

Oregon

The 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* raised concern about student performance nationally and called for higher standards and greater accountability. Oregon responded by re-thinking its educational system and developing in 1984 the "Oregon Plan for Excellence." This plan contained the seeds for the

1991 Oregon Educational Act for the Twenty-first Century, legislation that mandated the development of the current standards, assessments, and certificates. Important legislation from that act includes the authorization of benchmarks for all students, assessed in third, fifth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades; the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM), issued after grade ten; and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM), issued after grade twelve.⁶

In reaction to the 1991 legislation, the Oregon University System (OUS) developed the Proficiency-Based Admission Standards System (PASS) to reform the admission process for Oregon's public universities. The goals of this reform were to ensure that students meet a high standard of academic preparation prior to matriculation into an OUS institution, and to develop an admission system that focuses on proficiencies rather than time spent in a classroom.

Although the CIM, CAM, and PASS have different histories, philosophies, and overall goals, they are often viewed as part of the same education reform package. They are, however, two distinctly separate, but interrelated, sets of reforms. Philosophically, these reforms could create a system in which all students are prepared for college or the workforce (through the completion of a CAM), and most if not all are prepared for college (by meeting PASS proficiencies). The reality, however, is different, since development of the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) has stalled multiple times, and PASS has been implemented in approximately sixty schools with two to four teachers being trained per school (Bueschel and Venezia 2001).

Oregon's experience illustrates the challenges of systemic reform. While a detailed analysis of the Oregon experience is beyond the scope of this paper, one clear lesson is that systemic reform will take persistence and time.

One clear lesson
is that
systemic reform
will take
persistence and time.

The Problem with the Status Quo: Areas of Concern and Obstacles to Change

A major problem already discussed in this brief is that the current focus is on programs and not on systems. Another central issue facing pre-college outreach programs is determining whether or not they work. Who is served? How well are they served? Are more students college-ready? Are more students enrolling in and completing postsecondary education? Compounding this problem is a lack of program information. There are few rigorous, independent, program evaluations. One external evaluation cited in this policy brief, by Brandeis University for Rhode Island's Children's Crusade (2002), summarized challenges many evaluators face:

How to define a "Crusader experience" presented a stubborn problem for this evaluation. No Crusade cohort has received consistent treatment every year, and even within cohorts there are significant differences in Crusaders' experiences. Programs offered one year by community service providers might or might not have been repeated the next year. Sites have changed. Some Crusader programs report difficulty meeting their recruitment goals and acknowledge that Crusaders may participate in other, non-targeted programs. The nature of the individual supports have also changed year to year.

While these are definitely evaluation problems, it is difficult to tell how these changes have impacted students and the overall goals of the Crusade. The evaluation continues: "But it is the seventh-grade cohort that shows us whether the Crusade holds promise in the long run as a college access strategy for Rhode Island; whether the new strategy – with its myriad adaptations to individual lives and needs – appears to be developing in a positive way." Even though the variations made it a difficult program to evaluate, the evaluation's overall view of the Crusade is positive: "If one had to project the likelihood of success from institutional flexibility and growth, and reported enthusiasm of its 'new' lead cohort, it is hard not to bet on this organization."

The Crusade stands out because it had an external evaluation conducted, and it used that information for program improvement, but this process also points to an inherent tension. In order to conduct rigorous and useful evaluations, evaluators need good, longitudinal, consistent data and intervention strategies. Programs, on the other hand, need to have a level of professional autonomy and flexibility to meet the needs of indi-

viduals. We can not solve that tension here, but we do believe that programs must reconcile these issues so that they can be evaluated, improve their practices, and be sure they are serving students well.

While external evaluations might not always lead to program improvement, they are a good indicator of whether or not programs are getting the information they need to understand how well they are serving students' needs.

Program variability is not necessarily an inherent weakness, and it might not be possible to have a model of best practices. But pre-college outreach programs must hold themselves accountable for results with a rigorous, visible system for measuring outcomes. They must improve over time, and it is reasonable to compare similar programs with each other.⁷

Currently, there are many evaluation-related problems in the field. These issues have been cited throughout the literature on pre-college outreach programs; many of the programs share similar obstacles and problems (Gandara 2001, Tierney and Hagedorn 2002). These shortcomings are often due to a lack of resources, and many of these issues are well-documented. They include:

- The fact that students who need services may not be reached;
- A programmatic structure that cannot change whole school, system/district, or state cultures because of its limited focus;
- Programs selecting students who show "promise" instead of working with all students or focusing on students who have the greatest need;
- The failure of programs to articulate their goals and objectives in measurable ways;
- Lack of rigorous evaluations;

- Difficulty in comparing sites within one program because there are different goals, objectives, and other characteristics;
- Lack of good data collection procedures and methods of tracking students after they leave the program.

This latter oversight is particularly problematic for programs that focus on getting students to college; they often do not know if their students were academically or psychologically prepared for college.

Another major issue before policymakers and educators is to examine data from key student transition points in their states. A first step in this direction is to examine areas of student transition from pre-school through postsecondary education and calculate real and unmet need. Depending on the state, the data reveal different policy issues. For example, in Georgia and Oklahoma, for every 100 students that begin the ninth grade, only eleven will complete a postsecondary degree. On the surface, it appears that these two states have the same problem, and indeed both states may seek to address the number of students who successfully complete their degrees. A more in-depth look

**In a true P-16 system,
public education is
constructed from the
point of view of the student
– not the practitioner
or administrator.**

at the data suggests that the end of the student pipeline is not where these states should concentrate their policy efforts. In Georgia, for every 100 students who begin the ninth grade, fifty drop out before high school graduation (Ewell, Jones, and Kelly 2003). The problem in Oklahoma is different and manifests itself in the number of high school graduates enrolling in post-secondary education. For every 100 students who begin the ninth grade, thirty-six will not go to college even though they have graduated from high school (Ewell, Jones, and Kelly 2003). The message here is that one solution does not fit every state. States need to examine their data to find areas of success, existing gaps, and unmet needs.

A New Way of Thinking About Pre-College Outreach

Conceptualizing, developing, implementing, and evaluating pre-college outreach programs that are part of a broader P-16 system is important because the approach to student learning becomes one of student success over time, as opposed to piecemeal programs in which students are treated for impending "failure." It is the difference between prevention and stopgap after-the-fact efforts. In a true P-16 system, public education is constructed from the point of view of the student – not the practitioner or administrator. Therefore, from the student's perspective, how does the system look different? It would have the following characteristics:

- The gaps in knowledge, skill, and ability levels from one grade to the next are reduced.
- The need for college-level developmental, or remediation education, is diminished.
- The student can trust that she will be prepared to enter the next grade ready to succeed.
- Students do not need to guess how to get into college, how much college costs, or how to meet these costs. They learn about those issues throughout the course of their K-12 years and are thus able to make educated choices about their futures.
- Students do not need to guess what courses they need to take to prepare well for college.
- Students have college mentors and advisors at each level of education; every teacher is a college advisor; every school counselor is an advocate for equitable opportunities throughout K-12 and for student success after high school.
- Student achievement is addressed throughout K-12, and also in the critical early years – pre-K-3. In these years, students learn the basic skills that they will apply in later grades. In short, these fundamental skills are literacy based. From K-3 students learn how to read, after third grade students read to learn.⁸

Comparing programmatic responses – efforts that do not reach all students – to systemic reform could look like this:

Examples of Programmatic and Systemic Policy Responses

Programmatic	Systemic
Tutoring	→ High quality curriculum and instruction
Mentoring	→ All educators trained to mentor
Cultural sensitivity	→ Cultural and individual sensitivity
Evaluation	→ P-16 data collection, usage, and accountability
Programmatic/local policies	→ State policies with flexibility for local needs
Annual testing	→ Diagnostic assessment
Remediation	→ High standards and college preparation opportunities for every student

In short, an ideal pre-college program would not be a program at all. Rather, it would be a coordinated, cohesive, seamless system of education in which all students are prepared for postsecondary opportunities. This does not mean that 100 percent of high school graduates will or should go to college. It does, however, mean that 100 percent of students who graduate from high school will be prepared to go to college if they so choose, and will be able to make informed decisions about their futures. In many ways, pre-college programs are a response to a system that is not working. There should be no need to extend outreach to a few students; all students should be prepared to go to some form of postsecondary education. However, that is a description of an ideal world that we might never see. While we struggle with these issues in the real world, it is important to support pre-college outreach programs that provide high-quality essential services to students, while at the same time working to ensure that all students have the opportunity to prepare well for college.

Who needs to be involved? Every sector of education must be involved; ideally, this should not be a set of reforms driven from the top down. While many pre-college outreach programs are sponsored by postsecondary institutions, some institutions and systems of postsecondary education continue to behave as though they are completely separate from the public school system. Teachers must seek not only to help students learn the subject material at hand but also to prepare students for postsecondary success; pre-col-

lege outreach must be based in rigorous curriculum; state structures must be in place to support quality teaching; financial aid must be available for students to take advantage of postsecondary education; and educators must be held accountable for student results with data-driven diagnostic and accountability systems. The sectors are all connected.

Policy Recommendations

What steps are needed for a state to progress from a programmatic to a systemic approach to pre-college outreach? Below are two sets of policy recommendations – one for the short term and the other for the long term. This paper proposes that states move away from programmatic outreach programs and toward systemic state systems; however, it is not proposing an elimination of programs until all students are served well. Since that day may be long in coming, some form of pre-college outreach programs will be needed. The recommendations listed below account for these issues. In this time of economic scarcity, it is crucial that states view college preparation and P-16 reform as investments – investments that can help drive state economies and improve the quality of people's lives.

Short-term recommendations:

- Engage K-12 and postsecondary education in a discussion regarding P-16 reform; develop goals and a set of desired outcomes. Plan a strategy to meet those goals.
- Develop a clear message and stick to it (an example is the Education Trust's College Begins in Kindergarten).
- Develop a public engagement strategy regarding P-16 reform and outreach.
- Establish recognizable, transparent, and predictable policies between education sectors. Achieving this goal will require working with postsecondary education to ensure, for example, that its entrance standards are clearly articulated.
- As a state pursues its P-16 work, it must develop, or continue to support, pre-college outreach programs to assist students during the implementation of P-16.
- Develop and implement diagnostic testing programs based on high standards for all students.

- Have measurable, articulated goals and objectives.
- Mandate that all state-funded programs collect relevant data and conduct external, rigorous evaluations.
- Use evaluations as diagnostic tools that improve services offered to students and increase student success.
- Fund evaluations, and provide technical assistance to programs.
- Involve the business community early.

Long-term recommendations:

Watson Scott Swail and Laura Perna, in *The College Board's 2001 Outreach Program Handbook*, proposed four long-term policy recommendations that are consistent with this paper's perspective. They are:

- Ramp-up current outreach activities to reach more of our youth.
- Improve the instructional quality and delivery of outreach programs.
- Expand opportunities for networking among programs.
- Link outreach programs directly to our schools and long-term systemic plans.

We also add the following:

- Address course-taking patterns; make sure all students have access to college preparatory classes and are prepared for the next stage of schooling. For example, students must participate in algebra by the end of eighth grade.
- Improve data systems at the state level. States need to connect their K-12 and postsecondary data systems together, and connect those with data systems from large-scale pre-college outreach programs. Evaluations must be conducted both in the short term and in the long term. States must be able to answer the questions of how the pre-college outreach programs help students today and how they help students fifteen years from now.
- Improve data systems at the programmatic level. Pre-college outreach programs must collect data

on their students and analyze the data to understand if they are achieving their goals and serving students well. As with state-wide data systems, evaluations must be conducted both in the short term and in the long term by programs in order to improve their effectiveness.

- Work with education programs, unions, and associations to train teachers and counselors in ways that make it possible for them to include effective college preparation and advising in every high school classroom.
- Once good evaluations are completed, use that information to change state policy, by eliminating what does not work and incorporating what does into the education system as a whole.

Summary

Preparation for, and participation in, postsecondary education for all students is a difficult proposition to fulfill. There are educational inequities that result from different perceptions about who should go to college, who is prepared for college, what it means to be college-ready, and whether college is affordable. In addition, the current early childhood, K-12, and postsecondary systems are disjointed and often connected only by policies and programs that are confusing for students and their parents. Currently, students' opportunities to learn and prepare for college are inequitable; since almost all students attend college after high school, it makes no sense to continue to prepare only an elite group of students for the demands of postsecondary education.⁹

There are hundreds of programs, but no system, or center; thus, the programs place the burden of improvement on the student with comparatively little concern for how the system itself might change to meet students' needs. The lack of sound evaluation compounds these problems by making it difficult to assess whether or not the programs are truly meeting students' needs.

A P-16 system with a focus on pre-college outreach for all students would be more focused on prevention and success than is the current system. Success in this context means ensuring that all students who graduate from high school would have the information and preparation they need to succeed in some form of postsecondary education. In order to fulfill the purpose of preparing all students for the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education, states will need to move

beyond a programmatic approach to a more systemic approach encompassing every student in every school. A cautionary note is essential, however: a worst-case scenario would be for states to reduce their support for pre-college outreach programs while not improving and coordinating their current educational systems.

While the need for pre-college outreach programs will probably never be eliminated, this paper urges states and regions to include components from successful pre-college outreach programs (e.g., providing college admissions and course placement information to all students, and ensuring that all students have access to college preparatory courses and tutoring) in every student's day-to-day schooling experiences. Addressing pre-college outreach systemically may be more difficult in the short run, but it is the only way to serve all students equitably. In spite of, or precisely because of the fact that states face shrinking budgets, this is an era that requires us to rethink our current approach to pre-college outreach, and develop new ways of providing postsecondary information and opportunities for all students.

In order to fulfill the purpose of preparing all students for the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education, states will need to move beyond a programmatic approach to a more systemic approach encompassing every student in every school.

Endnotes

¹ See, for example, Mortenson (2000), Gladieux and Swail (1998), Horn and Chen (1998), Berkner and Chavez (1997).

² The following websites were used for this table: www.ed.gov/gearup/, www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/trio/, www.projectgradusa.org/, www.ihad.org/, www.aypf.org/forumbriefs/1999/fb010899.htm, www.epcae.org/,

www.pewundergradforum.org/project8.html, www.ucop.edu, <http://studentservices.fgcu.edu/CROP/>, www.okhighered.org/ohlap/, and www.childrenscrusade.org/.

Also used were: The College Board 2001; Communication Works, LLC 2002; and The Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation 2003.

³ <http://studentservices.fgcu.edu/CROP/>.

⁴ www.collegeaccessri.org/about.htm.

⁵ www.ucop.edu

⁶ Recent policy changes have shifted the focus from grade level performance to overall benchmarks. Rather than grades three, five, and eight, the assessments refer to benchmarks one, two, and three.

⁷ An exception is Mathematica's longitudinal study of Upward Bound. Although this study showed that participants generally have higher expectations, "Upward Bound appeared to have no impact high school graduation or college enrollment." See Myers and Schrim (2000).

⁸ Pre-college outreach programs that start as late as the third grade have started too late. Students who are not on grade level reading by the end of the first grade are unlikely to be on grade level reading by the end of third grade, and if they are not on grade level reading by the end of third grade their chances of graduating from high school are slim. See Juel 1988; Slavin, Karweit, and Wasik 1993.

⁹ See, for example, Venezia, Kirst, and Antonio 2003.

References

Berkner, L., and L. Chavez. 1997. *Access to Postsecondary Education for the 1992 High School Graduates*. PEDAR Report, NCES 98-105. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Brandeis University. 2002. "Every Child Holds the Answer: Rhode Island Children's Crusade." Brandeis University Evaluation, January 2002.

Bueschel, Andrea and Andrea Venezia. 2001. "Oregon Technical Report," for Stanford University's Bridge Project. Stanford, California: Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.

- Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation. 2003. *Investing Early: Intervention Programs in Selected U.S. States*. Montreal: The Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- College Board. 2001. *2001 Outreach Program Handbook*. New York: The College Board.
- Communication Works, LLC. 2002. *Capturing the College Potential of Students from Under-served Populations: An Analysis of Efforts to Overcome Social and Financial Barriers to College*. Prepared for the Pathways to College Network and the College Board.
- Cunningham, Alisa, Christina Redmond, and Jamie Merisotis. 2003. *Investing Early: Intervention Programs in Selected U.S. States*. Montreal: The Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Ewell, Peter T., Dennis P. Jones, and Patrick Kelly. 2003. *Conceptualizing and Researching the Educational Pipeline*. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Gandara, Patricia. 2001. *Paving the Way to Postsecondary Education: K-12 Intervention Programs for Underrepresented Youth*. Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. Working Group on Access to Postsecondary Education.
- Gladieux, Lawrence E. and Watson S. Swail. 1998. "Financial Aid is Not Enough: Improving the Odds of College Success," *The College Board Review*, 185: 16-21, 30-31.
- Hiner, N. Ray. 1998. "The Past and Future of American Public Education." 1998-99 Budig Teaching Professor Address, The University of Kansas, October 2, 1998.
- Horn, L., and X. Chen. 1998. *Toward Resiliency: "At-Risk" Students Who Make it to College*. PEDAR Report, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Juel, Connie. 1988. "Learning to Read and Write: A Longitudinal Study of 54 Children from First through Fourth Grades," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 22: 437-47.
- Mize, Dolores A. and Bryce Fair. 2002. "Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment Systems (EPAS) and the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP): Systemic Approaches to Student Success." NGA Center for Best Practices, Learning Lab, April 16-17, 2002.
- Mortenson, Thomas. July 2000. "College Participation for Students from Low Income Families by State, 1992 to 1998." *Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY*. Oskaloosa, Iowa: Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY.
- Myers D. and A. Schrim. 2000. *The Impacts of Upward Bound: Final Report for Phase I of the National Evaluation*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Services.
- Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program. 2001. *Year-End 2000-02 Report*. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program.
- Perna, Laura W. and W. Scott Swail. 2002. "Pre-College Outreach and Early Intervention." *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 2002.
- Rainwater, Terese and Spud Van de Water. 2001. *What is P-16 Education: A Primer for Legislators*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.
- Slavin, Robert E., Nancy L. Karweit, and Barbara Wasik. 1993. *Preventing Early School Failure: Research on Effective Strategies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Swail, W. Scott and Laura W. Perna. 2001. "A View of the Landscape: Results of The National Survey of Outreach Programs." *2001 Outreach Program Handbook*. New York: The College Board.
- Tafel, Jonathan and Nancy Eberhart. 1999. *States School-College (K-16) Partnerships to Improve Student Performance*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.
- Tierney, William G. and Linda Serra Hagedorn, editors. 2002. *Increasing Access to College: Extending Possibilities for all Students*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Venezia, Andrea, Michael W. Kirst, and Anthony Antonio. March 2003. *Betraying the College Dream: How Disconnected K-12 and Postsecondary Education Systems Undermine Student Aspirations*. Stanford, California: Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.

Appendix

The Pathways to College Network

The Pathways to College Network is an alliance of private and corporate foundations, nonprofits, educational institutions, and the U.S. Dept. of Education. Launched in December 2000 and with funding commitments expected to total over \$2 million over the first three years of the project, the mission of the Pathways Network is to focus research-based knowledge and resources on improving college preparation, access, and success for under-served population, including low-income, underrepresented minority, and first-generation students. The associations involved in Pathways represent regional, cultural, and national interests. They include:

- ACT, Inc.
- American Council on Education (ACE)
- American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF)
- ASPIRA , Inc.
- The College Board
- Council for Opportunity in Education
- Education Commission of the States (ECS)
- The Education Resources Institute (TERI)
- Institute for Educational Leadership (IEF)
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC)
- National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National College Access Network (NCAN)
- National Council for Community and Educational Partnerships (NCCEP)
- National Urban League
- Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL)
- State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
- University of California System – EMP Collaborative
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)

The Pathways to College Network is convened by Occidental College and funded by the following providers:

- Daniels Fund
- Ford Foundation
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- GE Fund
- The James Irvine Foundation
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation
- KnowledgeWorks Foundation
- Lucent Technologies Foundation
- Lumina Foundation for Education
- U.S. Department of Education
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
- Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE)
- Nellie Mae Education Foundation
- Sallie Mae Fund

Four organizations comprising the policy component of the Pathways to College Network participated in the case studies, and in planning and implementing the state meetings and regional forums related to this project. These organizations and their key staff participants are:

The College Board

The College Board is a national nonprofit membership association whose mission is to prepare, inspire, and connect students to college and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 4,200 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three million students and their parents, 22,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admission, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Staff from The College Board who participated in this project include: Michelle Booth Cole, Rafael J. Magallan, and Lezli Baskerville.

Education Commission of the States (ECS)

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is an interstate compact created in 1965 to improve public education by facilitating the exchange of information, ideas and experiences among state policymakers and education leaders. As a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization involving key leaders from all levels of the education system, ECS creates unique opportunities to build partnerships, share information and promote the development of policy based on available research and strategies. Staff members who participated in this project include: Terese Rainwater, Spud Van de Water, and Carl Krueger

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

The mission of SHEEO, the national association of state higher education executives, is to help the states develop and sustain excellent systems of higher education. Its fifty-six members are the CEOs of statewide governing and coordinating boards for higher education. Former SHEEO Associate Executive Director, Esther Rodriguez initiated the development of the P-16 Initiative, and other SHEEO staff with significant participation include: Tricia Coulter, Paul Lingenfelter, Hans L'Orange, Gail Miller, Alene Russell, Mary Sweeney, Richard Voorhees, and Susan Winter.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education is a regional organization created to facilitate resource sharing among the higher education systems of the West. Fifteen states are members of WICHE, an interstate compact created by formal legislative action of the states and the U.S. Congress. Staff members who participated include: Sharon Bailey, Cheryl Blanco, and David Longanecker.

The SHEEO K-16 – Teacher Development Committee provided support and guidance to this project from its conception to its completion. Members of the committee during this period include:

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
Robert Barak, Interim Executive Director, Board of Regents, State of Iowa	2001-2002
Diane Barrans, Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education	2001-2002
Linda Blessing, Executive Director, Arizona Board of Regents	2000-2002
Hans Brisch, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	2000-2003
Molly Corbett Broad, President, University of North Carolina	2000-2003
Don W. Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board	2000-2003
Roderick Chu, Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents	2000-2003
Robert Clarke, Chancellor, Vermont State Colleges	2001-2002
Richard A. Crofts, Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System	2000-2001
Kathryn Dodge, Executive Director, New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission	2002-2003
Sandra Espada-Santos, Executive Director, Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education	2000-2001
Gregory G. Fitch, Executive Director for Higher Education, Idaho Board of Education	2000-2001
Warren H. Fox, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission	2001-2002
Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner of Higher Education, Utah System of Higher Education	2000-2003
Judith I. Gill, Chancellor, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education	2000-2003
Bruce D. Hamlett, Executive Director, New Mexico Commission on Higher Education	2000-2002
Judy G. Hample, Chancellor, Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	2002-2003
Lu Hardin, Director, Arkansas Department of Higher Education	2001-2002
Thomas Henry, Executive Director, Wyoming Community College Commission	2000-2001

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
William R. Holland, Commissioner of Higher Education, Rhode Island Office of Higher Education Vice-Chair 2000-01	2000-2002
Jim Horne, Commissioner, Florida Board of Education	2002-2003
Karen R. Johnson, Secretary of Higher Education, Maryland Higher Education Commission	2002-2003
Daniel J. LaVista, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education	2002-2003
Valerie F. Lewis, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Higher Education	2000-2002
Katharine C. Lyall, President, University of Wisconsin System	2001-2003
Michael E. Malone, Executive Director, Alabama Commission on Higher Education	2002-2003
Frank Meehan, Acting Deputy Secretary for Postsecondary & Higher Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education	2002-2003
Thomas C. Meredith, Chancellor, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Vice-Chair 2002-03	2002-2003
Robert L. Moore, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission	2002-2003
J. Michael Mullen, Chancellor, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission	2001-2003
Gregory Nichols, Executive Director, Board of Regents, State of Iowa	2002-2003
Jane Nichols, Chancellor, University & Community College System of Nevada Chair 2002-03; Vice-Chair 2001-02	2000-2003
Phyllis Palmiero, Executive Director, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia	2002-2003
Gerald Patton, Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, New York State Education Department	2000-2002
Robert T. Perry, Executive Director, South Dakota Board of Regents	2000-2001
William Proctor, Executive Director, Florida Council for Education Policy Research and Improvement	2000-2003
Judith Ramaley, President, University of Vermont	2000-2001

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
Paul Risser, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	2003
E. Joseph Savoie, Commissioner of Higher Education, Louisiana Board of Regents	2000-2003
Rolin Sidwell, Deputy Director, Office of Postsecondary Education, Washington DC	2002-2003
Kala Stroup, Commissioner of Higher Education, Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education Chair 2000-2002	2000-2002
James E. Sulton, Jr., Executive Director, New Jersey Commission on Higher Education	2002-2003
Joseph Westphal, Chancellor, University of Maine System	2002-2003
Quentin Wilson, Commissioner of Higher Education, Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education	2002-2003



State Higher Education Executive Officers
700 Broadway, Suite 1200, Denver, Colorado, 80203-3460
(303) 299-3685
www.sheeo.org