

**FIFTY STATES OF
ACHIEVING THE DREAM:
State Policies to Enhance Access to and
Success in Community Colleges
Across the United States**

Kevin J. Dougherty and Monica Reid

with the assistance of

Peter Crosta, H. Kenny Nienhusser, and Nathan Walker

**Community College Research Center
Teachers College, Columbia University**

April 5, 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank Richard Kazis of Jobs for the Future, Kay McClenney of the University of Texas at Austin, Paul Lingenfelter and Matthew Gianneschi of the State Higher Education Executive Officers, and Sylvia Soholt of KSA Plus Communications for their very helpful comments on this report. However, any remaining errors of omission and commission are our own.

In carrying out the Community College Research Center State Policy Audit, we have incurred many debts. We wish to thank Al Ronca and Jamie Munjack of SRBI, Inc. for their care and thoughtfulness in fielding the survey that was one of our key sources of information. We also wish to thank Margaret Rivera of the American Association of Community Colleges, Paul Lingenfelter of the State Higher Education Executive Officers, John Jackson and Alexis Smith of the NAACP, Rosalind Gold of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, and Abeo Anderson of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators for helping us secure the names and contact information for members of their associations. We also wish to thank George Boggs of AACC, John Jackson of the NAACP, Eliezer Rivera of NALEO, and Martha Lamkin for providing letters of endorsement for our survey. In constructing our questionnaire, we greatly benefited from the advice of Katherine Boswell of Salt Lake Community College and formerly of the Education Commission of the States, Patricia Windham of the Florida Department of Education, Frank Renz of the New Mexico Association of Community Colleges, Paul Lingenfelter of the State Higher Education Executive Officers, Kay McClenney of the University of Texas, and Julie Bell of the National Conference of State Legislatures. Finally, we wish to thank Michael Solomon of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission and Gary Andeen of the Oregon Independent College Association for their help and advice in acquiring data on state spending on student aid.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2003, the Lumina Foundation for Education launched a major initiative, “Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count,” to increase student success at community colleges. The initiative aims to help more students earn certificates, degrees, and transferable credits and focuses on colleges with high enrollments of low-income students and students of color. A key means to improve the performance of colleges is through enhancement of their capacities to gather, analyze, and act on data on student outcomes, including data on students grouped by race, income, age, sex, and other characteristics.

From the beginning, a central component of this effort has been state policy. In each of the states where Achieving the Dream colleges are located, the initiative is working with a lead organization—typically the state community college system office or state association of community colleges—to develop policies that will enhance student success.

To help guide that policy effort, the Lumina Foundation commissioned an audit of state policies affecting access to, and success in, community colleges. As a first step, in-depth analyses were conducted of the initial seven Achieving the Dream states: Connecticut, Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia (Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser, 2006; Dougherty, Marshall, & Soonachan, 2006; and Dougherty & Reid, 2006).

The second step, to supplement the in-depth analyses of the seven Achieving the Dream states, was to survey all 50 states on selected state policies. This paper reports the results of that 50-state survey. In the following, we describe what policies the 50 states have in place with respect to key community college practices in three main areas: access, success, and performance accountability. Despite the huge growth in higher education in the United States over the last 100 years, large differences in college access still remain, particularly by income and race. Therefore we examined how states differ on the following policies affecting access: tuition, state student aid, and outreach through dual enrollment programs. But even if students gain access to the community college, success within the community college remains an issue because many community college entrants leave higher education without a degree, with this number particularly great for low-income and minority students. Therefore we examine the following state policies that affect student success: remedial and developmental education, transfer of general education credits, and baccalaureate granting by community colleges. Finally, we examine state policies toward performance accountability because it pertains to both access and success. States are increasingly using measures of community college performance in facilitating both student access and student success as ways of monitoring and rewarding colleges. Therefore, we examine state performance accountability policies, analyzing whether state appropriations to community colleges are allocated on the basis of institutional performance (in the form of performance funding) and whether state bodies and community colleges are using performance outcomes to devise new access and success policies.

We drew on a variety of sources in order to ascertain which policies states have in place. First, we surveyed well-placed observers in each state: heads of the state community college board or other state agency with purview over community colleges; local community college presidents; and state legislators and staff. We also personally interviewed by phone and e-mail state and

local community college and higher education officials in almost all the states. (We refer to these two sources of information as the Community College Research Center State Policy Audit. For a full description, see Appendix 1.) We also analyzed the contents of the State Policy Inventory Database Online (<http://www.wiche.edu/Policy/SPIDO/index.asp>) and of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies and local community colleges. We also drew on existing surveys of state policies with respect to the state policies of interest to us.

For the evaluation of the effectiveness of the state policies, we drew primarily on our State Policy Audit Survey.

Looking across the state policies affecting access to and success in community colleges that we reviewed, we find some that are nearly universal among the 50 states. Virtually all the states provide student aid, support dual enrollment programs, aim to facilitate the easy transfer of general education credits, and collect and publish data on how well community colleges help their students succeed.

That said, even these nearly universally supported policies demonstrate great variations by state in their details. While South Carolina's ratio of per FTE student aid to tuition for community college students stands at 41.4%, Wyoming's is only 0.7%. Similarly, states vary greatly in how they support remedial and developmental education. While virtually every state supports remedial and developmental education in community colleges, states are nearly evenly divided on whether or not they require community colleges to do placement testing and whether or not they assign students to remediation if the placement scores are not high enough.

If the policies above are widely supported, although they differ greatly in their implementation, there are other access and success policies that are much less widely supported by states. We have investigated them because they represent important emerging areas of state policy activity. Only 10 states make undocumented immigrant students eligible for in-state tuition and even fewer allow them access to state student aid. Furthermore, only 13 states have authorized community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees. Finally, while performance reporting is nearly universal, performance funding is provided by less than a third of the states.

In several instances, the nine Achieving the Dream states follow much the same pattern of state policy provision as do states across the country. The average community college tuition in the nine states is \$2160, a bit below the national average of \$2481. Twenty-two percent of the nine Achieving the Dream states explicitly allow charging in-state tuition for undocumented students, while 20 percent of states nationwide do this. Finally, 56 percent of the nine states mandate that community colleges conduct entry-level testing, which is the same proportion for states across the country.

On the other hand, the nine Achieving the Dream states do deviate from the national pattern in several instances. The seven states with valid data are above average in their FTE student aid to tuition ratios, with means of 17.2 percent (uncorrected for residence and migration) and 20.7 percent (corrected), while the national averages were 13 and 16.9 percent, respectively. The Achieving the Dream states are more likely than states generally to provide double funding for dual enrollment, 56 percent versus 28 percent. The Achieving the Dream states are less likely to require remedial placement for students failing entry-level testing than are all 50 states together, 22 percent versus 44 percent. The nine states are also more likely than states generally to have policies for the transfer of general credits even without an associate degree (100 versus 72 percent). Furthermore, the nine states are more likely to allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees, 44 percent versus 26 percent among all states. Finally, the Achieving the Dream states are considerably more likely to have performance funding than is the case for states generally: 78 percent versus 28 percent.

In addition to investigating the relative prevalence of certain key community college policies across the states, we also examined how the effectiveness of those policies was judged by state and local community college and higher education leaders. We found some important variations. First, state policies sometimes differ considerably in how effective they are perceived to be. State student aid programs and policies with regard to early outreach and the transfer of general education credits are viewed as highly effective by about one-third of all our respondents, while state remediation and accountability policies are viewed as highly effective by only one-seventh of our respondents.

Second, the actors in this arena consistently differ in how they evaluate the effectiveness of these policies. On average, state community college and higher education officials consistently give more favorable ratings than do local community college officials to the effectiveness of state policies for student aid, outreach, remediation, general education transfer, and accountability. This gap in perception may indicate that state officials have an overly rosy perception of how well state policies are serving the interests of minority and low-income students. Such a perception may be a barrier to further state policy development and to reforming existing state policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Deciding What Is Policy	2
Access Policies	
Tuition	3
Student Aid	5
Outreach to Potential Students: Dual Enrollment	11
Success Policies	
Remedial and Developmental Education	14
Articulation and Transfer	19
Baccalaureate Granting	22
Performance Accountability Policies	25
Summary and Conclusions	29
References	31
Appendix 1: Survey Procedures	36
Appendix 2: Questionnaire for Survey of State and Local Community College Officials	39
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Survey of Legislators and Community Group Leaders	49
Endnotes	55

In 2003, the Lumina Foundation for Education launched a major initiative, “Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count,” to increase student success at community colleges. The initiative aims to help more students succeed, and focuses on colleges with high enrollments of low-income students and students of color. A key means to improve the performance of colleges is through enhancement of their capacities to gather, analyze, and act on data on student outcomes, including data on students grouped by race, income, age, sex, and other characteristics.

From the beginning, a central component of this effort has been state policy. In each of the states where Achieving the Dream colleges are located, the initiative is working with a lead organization—typically the state community college system office or state association of community colleges—to develop policies that will enhance student success.

To help guide that policy effort, the Lumina Foundation commissioned an audit of state policies affecting access to, and success in, community colleges. As a first step, in-depth analyses were conducted of the initial seven Achieving the Dream states: Connecticut, Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia (Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser, 2006; Dougherty, Marshall, & Soonachan, 2006; and Dougherty & Reid, 2006).

The second step was to survey all 50 states on selected state policies. This report conveys the results of that survey, describing what policies the 50 states have in place with respect to key community college practices in three main areas: access, success, and performance accountability.

Despite the huge growth in higher education in the United States over the last 100 years, large differences in college access still remain, particularly by race and income. For example, among 1992 high school graduates, 75% had enrolled in some form of postsecondary education by the year 2000. However, the enrollment figures for Hispanics, Native Americans, and those in the bottom quartile in socioeconomic status (SES) in the eighth grade were only 70%, 66%, and 52%, respectively (Ingels, Curtin, Kaufman, Alt, & Chen, 2002: 21).¹ Therefore we have examined how states differ on the following policies affecting access: tuition, state student aid, and dual enrollment.

Even if students gain access to the community college, success within the community college remains an issue because many community college entrants leave higher education without a degree, and this number is particularly great for low-income and minority students. For example, among first-time students entering college in 1995-96, 47% of those entering public two-year colleges had left higher education by June 2001 without a degree. But the figures for non-Hispanic Blacks, Latinos, and those with parents who had a high school degree or less were even higher: 61%, 52%, and 52%, respectively (Berkner, He, & Cataldi, 2002: 12, 61).² Therefore we examine the following state policies that affect student success: remedial and developmental education, transfer of general education credits, and baccalaureate granting by community colleges.

Finally, we have examined state policies toward performance accountability because it pertains to both access and success. States are increasingly using measures of how well community

college facilitate both student access and student success in order to monitor and reward colleges (Dougherty and Hong, 2006). Therefore, we have examined state performance accountability policies, analyzing whether state appropriations to community colleges are allocated on the basis of institutional performance (in the form of performance funding) and whether state bodies and community colleges are using performance outcomes to devise new access and success policies.

DECIDING WHAT IS STATE POLICY

A key question confronting a study such as ours is how to define state policy. We define a state policy as an authoritative action by state government. This authoritative action can include requiring, funding, and regulating the actions of community colleges.

In requiring that policy involve authoritative action by state government, we do not restrict this to action by the state legislature. State government also acts through such bodies as state boards coordinating community colleges and we include their actions—if they apply to all the community colleges — as state policy. If there is only one community college in the state but it has multiple branches, as in Delaware and Vermont, we treat the policies of that community college as state policy if the policies apply to all branches of the community college. However, we do not treat as a state policy the fact that all the community colleges in a state may choose to act in common – for example, by all testing students for placement at the time of entry -- if this is their own choice and is not mandated or financed by the state.

We drew on a variety of sources in order to ascertain which policies states have in place. First, we surveyed well-placed observers in each state: heads of the state community college board or other state agency with purview over community colleges; local community college presidents; and state legislators and staff. We also personally interviewed by phone and e-mail state and local community college and higher education officials in almost all the states. (We refer to these two sources of information as the Community College Research Center State Policy Audit. For a full description, see the Appendices.) We also analyzed the contents of the State Policy Inventory Database Online (<http://www.wiche.edu/Policy/SPIDO/index.asp>)³ and of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies and local community colleges. We also drew on existing surveys of state policies with respect to the state policies of interest to us.

For the evaluation of the effectiveness of the state policies, we drew primarily on our State Policy Audit Survey. We will be reporting the evaluations by state and local community college officials, state legislators, and leaders of organizations representing the African-American and Latino communities. We should note that the response rates for the state legislators and community representatives are low. As a result, they are not separately broken out but are included in the tables under “other respondents.” For more, see Appendix 1.

ACCESS POLICIES

With regard to access, we looked at state policies addressing tuition, student financial aid, and dual enrollment programs. Tuition and financial aid are of immediate concern, given that both significantly affect whether and where students go to college (Heller, 1999; St. John, 1991). In the case of tuition, we examined not only its average level but also whether a state has policies extending in-state tuition to undocumented immigrants. In the case of state financial aid, we analyzed the extent of aid available per student in community college compared to the average tuition level in those colleges. Furthermore, we examined whether undocumented students are eligible for state aid. Thirdly, because outreach is so important for low-income and minority students, we looked at state support for a particularly promising initiative—dual-enrollment programs which allow high school students to take college-level courses and get high school and college credit.

TUITION

There has been much discussion in recent years about the impact that tuition increases have on access to higher education for less advantaged students (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2004; National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2006). And very recently, the question has been raised whether undocumented immigrants graduating from a state's high schools should be allowed to pay in-state tuition rates, rather than much higher out-of-state tuition rates.

As both observation and research find, community college tuition affects enrollment, and the impact is greater for less advantaged students (Heller, 1999; St. John, Hu, & Weber, 2001; Terenzini, Cabrera, & Bernal, 2001). For example, Heller (1999) found that during the years 1976 to 1994, a \$1,000 increase in average community college tuition (in constant 1994 dollars) led to an average drop of 2.1 percentage points in the proportion of a state's population age 18 to 24 years old enrolled in community colleges.⁴ However, the drops were even larger for non-white students, particularly Asian students (Heller, 1999: 76, 79). Similarly, an analysis of college entrants in 1982 found that the impact of tuition increases is considerably greater for students whose socioeconomic status is low than for those with a higher SES: an increase of \$1,000 in tuition led to a 3.4% drop in all college enrollments for students in the bottom quartile in SES compared to a 1.4% drop for students in the top quartile (Terenzini, Cabrera, & Bernal, 2001: 11).⁵

As Table 1 shows, states vary greatly in their average in-state tuition and required fees for full-time students in community colleges. While the national average for tuition and required fees during the academic year 2005-06 was \$2481, the California community colleges charged the least – \$780 on average – while the New Hampshire colleges charged the most: on average \$5689. Average tuitions in the nine Achieving the Dream states ranged between \$1191 in New Mexico and \$3011 in Ohio (Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2006: Table 9).

Table 1: Average Instate and Out-of-State Academic Year Tuition and Required Fees for Full-Time Community College Students, 2005-06					
	Instate Tuition and Fees	Out-of-State Tuition and Fees		Instate Tuition and Fees	Out-of-State Tuition and Fees
Alabama	\$2,700	\$4,830	Montana	\$2,503	\$6,835
Alaska	\$3,335	\$11,108	Nebraska	\$1,884	\$2,445
Arizona	\$1,584	\$6,917	Nevada	\$1,643	\$6,558
Arkansas	\$2,088	\$3,839	<i>N. Hampshire</i>	\$5,689	\$12,955
<i>California</i>	\$780	\$5,310	New Jersey	\$2,934	\$5,709
Colorado	\$2,434	\$9,810	New Mexico	\$1,191	\$2,989
Connecticut	\$2,536	\$7,568	New York	\$3,257	\$6,469
Delaware	\$2,196	\$5,130	No. Carolina	\$1,264	\$7,024
Florida	\$1,915	\$7,011	North Dakota	\$3,202	\$6,157
Georgia	\$1,733	\$6,397	Ohio	\$3,011	\$6,317
Hawaii	\$1,520	\$7,310	Oklahoma	\$2,165	\$5,273
Idaho	\$1,894	\$5,840	Oregon	\$2,980	\$6,710
Illinois	\$2,237	\$9,657	Pennsylvania	\$2,849	\$7,935
Indiana	\$2,822	\$6,705	Rhode Island	\$2,470	\$6,700
Iowa	\$3,056	\$4,379	So. Carolina	\$3,124	\$6,571
Kansas	\$1,939	\$3,014	South Dakota	\$2,393	NA
Kentucky	\$2,352	\$7,056	Tennessee	\$1,493	\$8,807
Louisiana	\$1,902	\$4,243	Texas	\$2,096	\$3,286
Maine	\$2,732	\$5,162	Utah	\$2,096	\$7,187
Maryland	\$3,057	\$7,162	Vermont	\$3,912	\$7,824
Massachusetts	\$3,477	NA	Virginia	\$2,135	\$6,581
Michigan	\$1,988	\$4,098	Washington	\$2,445	\$7,653
Minnesota	\$4,042	\$5,783	West Virginia	\$1,803	\$6,533
Mississippi	\$1,692	\$3,662	Wisconsin	\$4,237	\$12,937
Missouri	\$3,051	\$4,151	Wyoming	\$1,818	\$4,574
U.S. Average	\$2,481	\$6,420			
Note: States in bold are ones participating in the Achieving the Dream initiative in 2006. States in italics are the ones highest and lowest in average tuition.					
Source: Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (2006: Tables 9 and 10).					

In-State Tuition for Undocumented Immigrants

One area of great divergence among the states is whether undocumented students are allowed to pay in-state tuition and fees as opposed to the usually much higher out-of-state rate. As Table 1 shows, this difference in treatments makes a real difference for students. Out-of-state tuition and fees in 2005-06 averaged 2.6 times as much as in-state tuition and fees (\$6,420 versus \$2,481). Nationally, the Urban Institute estimates that about 65 thousand undocumented immigrant students graduate from high school each year but only 13 thousand enroll in college (Protopsaltis, 2005: 2). A major factor in this low enrollment may be that undocumented

immigrants – besides not qualifying for federal student aid – rarely qualify for in-state tuition and state student aid.

As Table 2 indicates, ten states have passed legislation to provide in-state tuition for undocumented students: California, Illinois, Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Utah, and Washington.⁶ California and Texas were the first to do so in 2001. Typically, in order to qualify for in-state tuition, these states require undocumented immigrants to have spent at least two to three years in high school in the state and to have graduated or received a GED (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2005; Biswas, 2005; Fischer, 2004; Protopsaltis, 2005).

	Instate tuition			State student aid
	Are undocumented students eligible?	Are students required to have attended high school in state?	Are students required to have graduated high school or earned a GED?	
California	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	
Illinois	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	
Kansas	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	
Nebraska	Yes	Yes		
New Mexico	Yes	Yes - 1 year	Yes	Yes
New York	Yes	Yes - 2 years	Yes	
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes - 2 years	Yes	
Texas	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	Yes
Utah	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	
Washington	Yes	Yes - 3 years	Yes	
Note: States in bold are ones participating in the Achieving the Dream initiative in 2006				
Sources: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2005); Dougherty, Reid, and Nienhusser (2006); Fischer (2004); Protopsaltis (2005).				

STUDENT AID

Beginning in the early 1970's, state student aid programs began to grow rapidly under the impetus of federal incentives and the growing emphasis on a policy of high tuition/high aid (compared to the tradition of low tuition/low aid) (Heller, 2002). State student aid rose from around \$200 million in 1969-70 to \$7.3 billion in 2004-05 (National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs, 1971: Table 1; idem, 2006: Table 3).

State student aid expenditures affect enrollment rates in a state, both in community colleges and public higher education more generally (Heller, 1999; St. John, Hu, & Weber, 2001; St. John et al., 2004; Terenzini, Cabrera, & Bernal, 2001). St. John et al. (2004: 11) found that a \$1000

increase in state need-based grant aid was associated with an 11.5% rise in college enrollments during the 1990's.⁷ Similarly, in a study covering the period 1976 to 1994, Heller (1999) found that a \$100 increase in spending for grants per population 18 to 24 was associated with a significant increase in community college enrollments for blacks, though not for other racial or ethnic groups or for students generally (Heller, 1999: 79).

Table 3 below gives the states' spending on student aid for community college students expressed as an aid to tuition ratio.⁸ This ratio contextualizes state spending on student aid by dividing that spending by a state's number of full time equivalent (FTE) public two-year college students and the average resident (in-state) tuition and fees for full-time community college students.⁹

Two things need to be kept in mind about these data. States do not always report the sectoral distribution (say between public two-year and four-year institutions) for all their student aid funds. Hence, we focus on the figures for those states where at least 80% of the sectoral distribution of state student aid funds is known. In fact, we do not report state student aid spending for community colleges when the known sectoral distribution is less than 80%. Secondly, a complication with using state enrollment figures is that sometimes a sizable number of students in state institutions are from out of state and not eligible – at least initially -- for a state's student aid funding. Consequently, using enrollment figures for all students rather than just for state residents going to college instate leads to an underestimate of the funds really available for state residents. Therefore, the table also provides aid to tuition ratios that correct for the proportion of enrollments that are made up of in-state students. However, that correction has its limits since the available federal figures for student residence and migration are reported only for all freshman college students in a state, and are not broken out for community college students specifically. Because of their more local intake, it is likely that community college students include a higher proportion of in-state residents than do colleges generally. Hence, the true aid to tuition ratio probably lies between the two figures, uncorrected and corrected.

As can be seen in Table 3, states vary enormously in how much of the average community college tuition their state student aid system covers. The uncorrected per FTE aid-to-tuition ratio ranges from a low of 0.7 percent for Wyoming to a high of 41.4 percent for South Carolina, with an average for all the 36 states with valid data of 13 percent. Meanwhile, the corrected aid to tuition figures range from 1.4 percent (Arizona) to 51.1 percent (South Carolina), with an average of 16.9 percent. The seven Achieving the Dream states with valid data were above average, with their mean per FTE aid to tuition ratios for community college students being 17.2 percent (uncorrected) and 20.7 percent (corrected).

Respondents' Evaluation of State Student Aid Programs

Despite this enormous variation, our respondents for the most part judged their state's student aid programs as being pretty effective in fostering greater access to the community college. Eighty-four percent judged state aid as being very or somewhat effective in fostering greater access for low-income students and for minority students.¹⁰ However, there were some differences of opinion among our respondents. Local community college officials were considerably less likely

than state officials to rate state student aid as very effective and somewhat more likely to rate it as ineffective for minority students (see Table 4 below). The “other respondents” include state legislators and representatives of community organizations. As discussed in the appendix, our response rates for these two groups unfortunately were too low to warrant breaking out their views separately.

Our respondents are generally less sanguine about the *adequacy* of state financial aid than about its effectiveness. Only 26% and 20% view state financial aid as meeting two-thirds or more of the financial need of low-income students and minority students, respectively. State and local community college officials did not differ sharply in their views of the adequacy of coverage, though state officials tended to have a somewhat more jaundiced appraisal than did local officials.

Needless to say, these contrasts must be taken with caution. We are aggregating data across states but the various constituencies we are discussing above do not necessarily have similar distributions across the various states.

Table 3: State Student Aid Going to Community College Students

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	State Student Aid Going to Community College Students (2004-05 unless indicated)	FTE Public Two-Year College Enrollment (fall 2004 unless indicated)	Average Tuition & Fees for Resident Public Two-Year College Students (2004-05 unless indicated)	State Residents as Percentage of All Freshmen Higher Education Headcount Enrollments in State	Proportion of State Student Aid Reported Broken Down by Institutional Sector (as percentage)	Ratio of FTE Community College Student Aid to Average Tuition for Community Colleges (as percentage)	
						Uncorrected for Student Migration	Corrected for Student Migration
Alabama	NA						
Alaska	NA						
Arizona	\$1,421,101	103,510	\$1,407	71	99.4	1.0	1.4
Arkansas	\$2,820,695	29,949	\$1,982	84	100	4.8	5.7
California	\$75,071,000	750,326	\$ 780	89	95.4	12.8	14.4
Colorado	\$18,798,087	46,476	\$2,274	82	87.1	17.8	21.7
Connecticut	NA						
Delaware	\$818,104	8,089	\$1,998	59	95.2	5.1	8.6
Florida	\$65,959,464	163,945	\$1,777	79	98.1	22.6	28.7
Georgia	NA						
Hawaii	NA						
Idaho	NA						
Illinois	\$62,065,049	207,711	\$1,993	88	99.1	15.0	17
Indiana	\$18,438,720	40,949	\$2,661	78	98.8	16.9	21.7
Iowa	\$3,920,898	54,865	\$2,920	72	100	2.4	3.4
Kansas	NA						
Kentucky	\$32,550,906	50,292	\$2,208	78	100	29.3	37.6
Louisiana	\$2,264,712	34,192	\$1,837	85	100	3.6	4.2
Maine	\$2,400,816	7,916	\$2,040	73	82.2	14.9	20.4
Maryland	\$8,552,759	67,965	\$2,875	80	97.7	4.4	5.5
Massachusetts	\$23,957,372	52,297	\$3,385	62	100	13.5	21.8
Michigan	\$43,164,876	120,501	\$1,994	91	89.3	18.0	19.7
Minnesota	\$43,352,479	73,952	\$3,822	82	99.3	15.3	18.7
Mississippi	\$4,337.42	55,114	\$1,562	85	100	5.0	5.9
Missouri	NA						
Montana	\$485,846	6,194	\$2,318	76	100	3.4	4.5
Nebraska	NA						
Nevada	NA						
N. Hampshire	\$612,045	7,250	\$5,283	52	95.7	1.6	3.1
New Jersey	\$38,778,006	99,531	\$2,771	92	100	14.1	15.3
New Mexico	\$9,552,556	36,272	\$ 896	83	99.7	29.4	35.4
New York	\$151,635,374	194,276	\$3,080	81	95.6	25.3	31.3
No. Carolina	NA						
North Dakota	\$324,772	7,123	\$2,816	58	84.1	1.6	2.8
Ohio	\$39,562,307	111,748	\$2,876	87	100	12.3	14.1
Oklahoma	\$20,573,412	41,307	\$2,041	83	100	24.4	29.4
Oregon	\$9,311,703	49,836	\$2,834	79	98.3	6.6	8.3

Table 3: State Student Aid Going to Community College Students

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	State Student Aid Going to Community College Students (2004-05 unless indicated)	FTE Public Two-Year College Enrollment (fall 2004 unless indicated)	Average Tuition & Fees for Resident Public Two-Year College Students (2004-05 unless indicated)	State Residents as Percentage of All Freshmen Higher Education Headcount Enrollments in State	Proportion of State Student Aid Reported Broken Down by Institutional Sector (as percentage)	Ratio of FTE Community College Student Aid to Average Tuition for Community Colleges (as percentage)	
						Uncorrected for Student Migration	Corrected for Student Migration
Pennsylvania	\$15,136,586	78,279	\$2,635	77	93.9	7.3	9.5
Rhode Island	\$2,001,441	9,277	\$2,310	41	99.1	9.3	22.9
So. Carolina	\$58,116,619	50,414	\$2,785	81	99.9	41.4	51.1
South Dakota	NA						
Tennessee	\$22,672,673	50,759	\$2,193	80	100	20.4	25.5
Texas	\$70,923,434	325,959	\$1,552	92	88.8	14.0	15.2
Utah	NA						
Vermont	\$866,611	2,508	\$3,696	32	93.4	9.3	29.2
Virginia	\$16,071,764	83,857	\$2,006	76	98.3	9.6	12.6
Washington	\$70,738,316	120,901	\$2,313	86	100	25.3	29.4
West Virginia	NA						
Wisconsin	\$20,926,461	65,565	\$3,945	85	100	8.1	9.5
Wyoming	\$147,934	11,559	\$1,724	50	100	0.7	1.5
U.S.						13.0	16.9

Sources: (1) National Association of State Student Grant Aid Programs (2007) and Oregon Independent Colleges Association (2007); (2) and (4) National Center for Education Statistics (2005); (3) Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (2006).

Table 4: State Student Aid: Views about Effectiveness and Adequacy

	Low income student aid - effectiveness					Low income student aid – coverage				Minority student aid - effectiveness					Minority student aid - coverage			
	VE	SE	SI	VI	DK	High	Med	Low	DK	VE	SE	SI	VI	DK	High	Med	Low	DK
State higher education board	6	4	2	1	1	3	3	7	1	6	6	1	1	1	3	4	6	2
State community college board	6	1	1	0	1	1	4	2	2	3	1	0	0	3	0	3	2	2
Other state agency	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>7</i>
	43%	29%	11%	4%	14%	14%	29%	36%	21%	35%	35%	4%	4%	23%	12%	27%	35%	27%
	50%	33%	13%	4%		18%	36%	45%		45%	45%	5%	5%		16%	37%	47%	
Community college presidents	8	31	5	1	0	11	9	18	7	5	24	3	3	0	8	10	13	4
Other local CC officials	9	15	4	1	1	4	10	10	6	6	13	4	0	1	2	5	10	7
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>11</i>
	23%	61%	12%	3%	1%	20%	25%	37%	17%	19%	63%	12%	5%	2%				
	23%	62%	12%	3%		24%	31%	45%		19%	64%	12%	5%		21%	31%	48%	
<i>Other respondents</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>8</i>
GRAND TOTAL	44	71	19	3	7	31	42	44	27	30	62	13	4	10	19	37	37	26
	31%	49%	13%	2%	5%	22%	29%	31%	19%	25%	52%	11%	3%	8%	16%	31%	31%	22%
	32%	52%	14%	2%		26%	36%	38%		28%	57%	12%	4%		20%	40%	40%	

Key: VE = very effective; SE = somewhat effective; SI = somewhat ineffective; VI = very ineffective; DK = don't know or no answer.

Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.

OUTREACH TO POTENTIAL STUDENTS: DUAL ENROLLMENT

One type of outreach program that has attracted considerable attention in recent years is dual enrollment, in which high school students can earn college credit for college courses taken either at colleges or at high schools. There are a number of studies that find dually enrolled students are more likely to graduate from high school and go on to college, but these findings must be taken with caution, since virtually none of these studies controls for differences between the kinds of students enrolling and not enrolling in dual-enrollment programs (Bailey & Karp, 2003; Johnstone & Del Genio, 2001).

To determine whether states had dual-enrollment policies, we drew on our survey, interviews with state higher education officials, analysis of the State Policy Inventory Database Online (<http://www.wiche.edu/Policy/SPIDO/index.asp>) and of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies, and review of data from the surveys conducted by Karp et al. (2004, 2005), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (2006), and the Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success project (2005).

As can be seen in Table 5, virtually all the states have dual-enrollment policies,¹¹ but these policies vary greatly in their details. The details we focused on pertain to the degree of state financial support for dual enrollment. Some states try to remove financial disincentives to dual enrollment in two ways. One is by double funding, that is, by allowing both the high schools from which students come and the community colleges that they take courses from to count dually enrolled students in the calculation of state aid. This policy reduces the disincentive to high schools to give up their students and to colleges to take them. The second state financial incentive is to pay students' tuition, rather than having students, their high schools, or the community colleges assume this cost. By our calculation, 14 states provide double funding and 9 pay students' tuition, in whole or in part. These figures are somewhat higher than those in Karp et al. (2005) and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (2006).

The Achieving the Dream states are somewhat more likely than states generally to provide double funding for dual enrollment, 56 percent versus 28 percent. However, they are little more likely to pay student tuition (22 percent versus 18 percent).

Table 5: States with Dual Enrollment Policies

	State Has State Dual Enrollment Regulations?	State Provides Double Funding (to CC and HS)?	State Pays Tuition for Student?		State Has State Dual Enrollment Regulations?	State Provides Double Funding (to CC and HS)?	State Pays Tuition for Student?
Alabama	Yes			Montana	Yes		
Alaska	No?			Nebraska	Yes		
Arizona	Yes	Yes		Nevada	Yes		
Arkansas	Yes			New Hampshire	Yes		
California	Yes	Yes		New Jersey	Yes		
Colorado	Yes	Yes		New Mexico	Yes	Yes	
Connecticut	Yes		Yes, sometimes.	New York	No?		
Delaware	Yes?			No. Carolina	Yes	Yes	
Florida	Yes	Yes		North Dakota	Yes		
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ohio	Yes		
Hawaii	Yes			Oklahoma	Yes		
Idaho	Yes			Oregon	Yes		
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes	Pennsylvania	Yes		Yes, sometimes.
Indiana	Yes		Yes	Rhode Island	Yes?		
Iowa	Yes			So. Carolina	Yes		
Kansas	Yes			South Dakota	Yes		
Kentucky	Yes			Tennessee	Yes		Yes
Louisiana	Yes?			Texas	Yes	Yes	
Maine	Yes		Yes	Utah	Yes		Yes
Maryland	Yes	Yes		Vermont	Yes		
Massachusetts	Yes			Virginia	Yes	Yes	
Michigan	Yes			Washington	Yes		
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes	West Virginia	Yes		
Mississippi	Yes			Wisconsin	Yes		
Missouri	Yes	Yes		Wyoming	Yes	Yes	

Note: States in bold are ones participating in the Achieving the Dream initiative in 2006.

Sources: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success (2005); Karp, Bailey, Hughes, and Fermin (2005); Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (2006).

Respondents' Evaluation of State Outreach Policy

Our survey asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of their state policies affecting outreach programs (if ones were present in their state) in aiding college access, including both dual enrollment and early intervention programs similar to the federal GEAR UP program. On the whole, our respondents evaluate the state policies for outreach pretty favorably, with three-quarters rating them as medium to high in effectiveness in fostering greater access to the community college by low-income students and students of color. However, state community college and higher education officials give considerably more ratings of high effectiveness (50 and 46 percent) than do local community college leaders (29 and 23 percent) (see Table 6).

Table 6: State Outreach Programs: Views about Effectiveness									
	Minority students – policy effectiveness				Low income students – policy effectiveness				
	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK	
State higher education board	7	3	3	0	6	3	4	0	
State community college board	4	4	0	0	4	3	1	0	
Other state agency	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>	
	50%	35%	15%	0%	46%	31%	23%	0%	
	50%	35%	15%		46%	31%	23%		
Community college presidents	15	19	14	0	13	18	16	1	
Other local CC officials	6	14	5	0	4	15	6	0	
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>1</i>	
	29%	45%	26%	0%	23%	45%	30%	1%	
	29%	45%	26%		24%	46%	31%		
<i>Other respondents</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2</i>	
GRAND TOTAL - All respondents	47	52	32	2	44	49	37	3	
	35%	39%	24%	2%	33%	37%	28%	2%	
	36%	40%	24%		34%	37%	28%		
Notes: DK = don't know or no answer.									
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit									

SUCCESS POLICIES

With regard to success, we examined state policies involving remedial and developmental education, transfer to four-year colleges, and provision of the baccalaureate degree at community colleges. Remedial education (also called developmental education) is crucial because so many low-income and minority students come into college with inadequate academic skills (Parsad & Lewis, 2003). But what state policies ensure that students will receive the remedial and developmental education they need? We have looked at state policies affecting mandatory remedial testing and placement at college entry. Transfer to the four-year college has become increasingly important as states want more students to attain a baccalaureate degree but yet doing so has become more difficult because of rising university tuitions. Therefore, states increasingly encourage baccalaureate aspirants to start at community colleges because it is cheaper for both the students and for the states (Robertson, 2005; Wellman, 2002). Finally, baccalaureate provision by community colleges themselves has increasingly attracted attention as a means of addressing the interests of students who may face difficulty in transferring either because they are place bound or are interested in applied fields that the state universities do not offer baccalaureate degrees in (Floyd, Skolnik, & Walker, 2005).

REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Many low-income and minority students come into the community college with academic skills inadequate to successfully tackle college-level work. As a result, virtually all community colleges offer remedial education (also called developmental education, foundation courses, or in Florida, college prep). In 2000, according to a federal survey, 42% of all first-year community college students were taking remediation (Parsad & Lewis, 2003).¹²

Given the ubiquity of remediation, it is important that community college students have ready access to high quality remediation. Unfortunately, the research on remediation has not reached definitive conclusions on what kind of remediation works best with what kinds of students and what is the most effective role for state policy in fostering effective remediation (Dougherty, 2002: 312-314; McCabe, 2000; Merisotis & Phipps, 2000; Perin, 2005; Roueche & Roueche, 1999; Roueche, Ely, & Roueche, 2001).

State remediation policy has centered on such matters as mandatory assessment and placement of students.¹³ Therefore our analysis here is focused on these two questions: Do the states mandate that community colleges conduct placement testing of students at or near entry to the community college, or do they leave this to local discretion? Secondly, if students do not pass this placement test, do the states require that community colleges place students in some form of remediation, or again do they leave this to local discretion?

In analyzing state policies on remediation, we draw on responses to our survey, interviews with state and local community college officials, analysis of the State Policy Inventory Database Online, examination of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies and local community colleges, and review of the results of the 2001 national survey by Jenkins and Boswell (2002a, b) and the analysis by Long (2006).

Table 7 reports our findings. We find that a little more than half the states mandate placement testing for students, with 28 clearly requiring it, 19 clearly not requiring it, and 3 states unclear. We include as states having a state remediation policy those in which there is a statewide community college (the only community college in Delaware, Rhode Island, and Vermont and one of two in Indiana) and it has mandated placement testing for all its branches. We treat these community colleges as essentially state systems and the decisions of their boards to be state policy.

Typically, a requirement for mandatory testing only applies to students enrolling in the credit program. Even when there is mandatory testing, states typically allow students to provide SAT or ACT scores in lieu of being tested on a placement test such as Compass or Accuplacer.

It should be noted that mandating placement testing does not always mean that it occurs. There is substantial evidence that colleges informally exempt students. A study of two community colleges in Florida found that one did not test most occupational students and, when it did test students, it waited until they had declared a major. Examining two colleges in Texas, that same study also found that one of those colleges did not assess students' writing skills (Perin, 2006).

With regard to mandatory placement, the balance tips toward more states that do not require it. Twenty-six do not require it, 20 do, and four are unclear. This shift comes from states that, while they mandate placement testing, do not mandate remedial placement for those not doing well on the test. These states include California, Connecticut, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Texas.

As with mandatory testing, even when remedial placement is mandated, it does not always mean that this occurs. An analysis of Florida data has found that between 20 and 25% of students who do not pass the College Placement Test do not end up in remediation (Calcagno, 2006). Similarly, a state official in a Midwestern state informed us: "Most of our institutions have their registration set up to comply with mandatory placement, though it is not foolproof. The part that isn't foolproof is that students can sometimes work their way around the lock-outs [on registering for higher level courses in the area needing remediation]. Also, students register prior to final grades in courses and this gap sometimes allows students to get into courses, too."

In their remedial policies, the nine Achieving the Dream states both follow and diverge from national patterns. Fifty-six percent of the nine states mandate that community colleges conduct entry-level testing, which is the same proportion for states across the country. However, the nine states are considerably less likely to require remedial placement for students failing entry-level testing than are all the 50 states together, 22 percent versus 44 percent.

Respondents' Evaluation of State Remediation Policies

On the whole our respondents did not evaluate their state's remediation policies as all that effective in fostering greater success on the part of low-income students and students of color in community college. Only one-seventh rated state policy as highly effective in aiding either group and nearly two-fifths rated their policy as low in effectiveness. Local community college

officials had even less favorable views than state officials, though the differences were not very large (see Table 8 below for more).

These evaluations must be treated with caution, however. We discovered in our intensive policy audits of the first seven Achieving the Dream states that our interviewees often had a hard time distinguishing their opinion about state policies toward remediation from their opinion about community college remediation practices themselves (Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser, 2006). They tended to have strong opinions about the relative effectiveness of remediation as an instructional practice, and these opinions seemed to color their impressions of state policies influencing those practices.

We found an interesting difference in evaluation between states that did or did not require mandatory placement for students failing the placement exam. As can be seen in Table 9 below, in those states where placement was mandatory, our respondents viewed the state's remedial policy as more effective in aiding student success. However, this higher evaluation was not due to more respondents saying the remedial policy was highly effective but rather fewer saying that the state's remediation policy was of low effectiveness. Mandatory placement could result in a more effective state policy but it could also simply lead to a perception of greater effectiveness.

Table 7: States Requiring Testing and Placement for Remedial/Developmental Education					
	State Mandates Placement Testing?	State Mandates Remedial Placement if Student Does not Pass Test?		State Mandates Placement Testing?	State Mandates Remedial Placement if Student Does not Pass Test?
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Montana	No	No
Alaska	No?	No?	Nebraska	No	No
Arizona	No	No	Nevada	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	N. Hampshire	No	No
California	Yes	No	New Jersey	No	No
Colorado	Yes	Yes	New Mexico	No	No
Connecticut	Yes	No	New York	No (SUNY CC's)	No (SUNY CC's)
Delaware*	Yes - Del. Tech. and CC	Yes - Del. Tech. and CC	No. Carolina	Yes	No
Florida	Yes	Yes	North Dakota	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes - technical colleges and Univ. of Georgia CC's	Yes - technical colleges and Univ. of Georgia CC's	Ohio	No	No
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Oklahoma	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	Yes?	Oregon	No	No
Illinois	No	No	Pennsylvania	No	No
Indiana*	Yes	Yes	Rhode Island*	Yes - CC of Rhode Is.	Yes - CC of Rhode Is.
Iowa	No	No	So. Carolina	Yes? - technical colleges	No - technical colleges
Kansas	No	No	South Dakota	No?	No?
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Tennessee	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Texas	Yes	No
Maine	No	No	Utah	No	No
Maryland	Yes	Yes?	Vermont*	Yes - CC of Vt.	Yes - CC of Vt.
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Virginia	Yes	Yes
Michigan	No	No	Washington	No	No
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	West Virginia	Yes	Yes
Mississippi	No	No	Wisconsin	Yes - U. Wis. centers; No - technical colleges	Yes - U. Wis. centers; No - technical colleges
Missouri	No	No	Wyoming	No	No
<i>Notes:</i>					
* Rules enacted by one community college but it operates as a statewide agency with multiple campuses. In Indiana, there are two community and technical colleges and the rules apply to the far larger one: Ivy Tech.					
Yes ? Indicates that we think state rules are in place but we are not certain. No? Indicates that we think state rules are not in place but we are not certain.					
Sources: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; Jenkins and Boswell (2002a,b); Long (2006).					

	Minority students – policy effectiveness				Low income students – policy effectiveness			
	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK
State higher education board	0	9	7	1	0	10	6	1
State community college board	1	4	3	1	1	4	3	1
Other state agency	0	3	2	0	0	3	2	0
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>2</i>
	3%	52%	39%	6%	3%	55%	35%	6%
	3%	55%	41%		3%	59%	38%	
Community college presidents	6	23	34	3	6	23	34	3
Other local CC officials	2	17	10	4	2	18	9	4
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>7</i>
	8%	40%	44%	7%	8%	41%	43%	7%
	9%	43%	48%		9%	45%	47%	
<i>Other respondents</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>1</i>
GRAND TOTAL - All respondents	21	69	62	10	21	71	60	10
	13%	43%	38%	6%	13%	44%	37%	6%
	14%	45%	41%		14%	47%	39%	
Notes: DK = don't know or no answer.								
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit								

	% of all respondents saying highly effective for low income students	% of all respondents saying medium effective for low income students	% of all respondents saying low effective for low income students	% of all respondents saying highly effective for minority students	% of all respondents saying medium effective minority students	% of all respondents saying low effective for minority students
States with mandatory placement	10%	59%	30%	11%	63%	25%
States without mandatory placement	14%	38%	40%	12%	36%	43%
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.						

ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER

Policy leaders and community college scholars have long identified improved articulation and transfer arrangements as a key means of improving student attainment of the baccalaureate degree (Dougherty, 1994, 2002; Ignash & Townsend, 2001; Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985; Knoell & Medsker, 1965; Wellman, 2002). Transfer problems are a major reason that minority and low-income baccalaureate aspirants do not achieve a baccalaureate degree at the same rates as their more advantaged peers, since a majority of disadvantaged students start in community colleges (Dougherty, 1994: chap. 4; Wellman, 2002). An analysis of the Beginning Postsecondary Student survey of 1989-90 (BPS: 90) and the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) finds a substantial gap in transfer rates between students differing in socioeconomic status, even when we control for differences in high school test scores and educational and occupational aspirations at the time of college entrance (Dougherty & Kienzl, 2006).¹⁴

In analyzing state policies on general education transfer, we draw on responses to our national survey, interviews with state and local community college officials, analysis of the State Policy Inventory Database Online and websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies and local community colleges, and review of the state surveys by Ignash & Townsend (2001) and Wellman (2002).

In our survey, we focused on whether states have policies to facilitate the transfer of general education credits. This state policy can take various forms, whether defining a specific bundle of courses (often dubbed a “transfer module”) that transfers across all public community colleges and four-year colleges or, somewhat more loosely, letting each public college define its general education core within certain limits and then requiring other public colleges to accept these courses toward fulfilling their own core requirements. Because the majority of community college transfer students do not enter a four-year college with an associate degree in hand, our primary interest was in state policies that did not require an associate degree in order to guarantee transfer of general education credits. However, we did accept -- as partial accomplishment of the desideratum of more friction-free general education transfer -- state policies that do guarantee transfer of general education credits for community college graduates with associate degrees in specific programs.

These state transfer policies differ in their source, scope, and authoritativeness. Most binding are policies that are products of statutory action and apply to all parts of public higher education. Somewhat less authoritative are agreements between the state community college system and the state four-year college system(s). A good example is California. Even less comprehensive and binding are agreements between the community college system as a whole and individual four-year colleges, as in Virginia and Washington. In all these cases, at least one of the signatories to the agreement is a state agency, if only the community college system. We have not included as state policy any voluntary agreements between individual community colleges and individual four-year colleges, as in Nebraska.

Table 10 below reports which states have state policies for the transfer of general education credits. We found that 37 states have some strong provision for transfer of general credits, with another 9 states allowing for students who transfer with an associate degree to receive general education credit. Four states definitely have neither arrangement.

The nine Achieving the Dream states are more likely than states generally to have policies for the transfer of general credits, even without an associate degree (100 versus 72 percent).

Respondents' Evaluations of Transfer Policy

When we asked state and local community college officials¹⁵ about the effectiveness of state policies governing transfer of general education credit in aiding student success, less than one-third rated those policies as highly effective (though nearly one-half rated them as of medium effectiveness) for low-income students and students of color. Interestingly, local community college officials were more polarized in their evaluation of the effectiveness of state general education transfer policy than were state officials. Whereas three-fifths of state officials gave a medium rating, only two-fifths of local officials did the same. Instead, a somewhat higher percentage of local than state officials rated the effectiveness high and a considerably greater percentage of local than state officials rated the effectiveness as low (see Table 11 below for more).

Table 10: States with General Education Transfer Policy			
	State Guarantees Transfer of General Education Credits?		State Guarantees Transfer of General Education Credits?
Alabama	Yes	Montana	Yes
Alaska	Yes	Nebraska	No - voluntary accord between individual colleges.
Arizona	Yes	Nevada	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	New Hampshire	No
California	Yes	New Jersey	No
Colorado	Yes	New Mexico	Yes
Connecticut	Yes - state CC system agreement with CT State Univ.	New York	Yes
Delaware*	Yes - with U. Del., Del. St. U.	No. Carolina	Yes
Florida	Yes	North Dakota	Yes
Georgia	Yes - U. Ga. Community colleges; technical colleges	Ohio	Yes
Hawaii	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only#</i>	Oklahoma	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only</i>
Idaho	Yes	Oregon	Yes
Illinois	Yes	Pennsylvania	<i>Yes - AA gen ed now; state implementing non-AA policy</i>
Indiana*	Yes - being implemented	Rhode Island*	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only</i>
Iowa	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only</i>	South Carolina	Yes
Kansas	Yes	South Dakota	Yes?
Kentucky	Yes	Tennessee	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	Texas	Yes
Maine	<i>Yes? - AA gen. ed only</i>	Utah	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Vermont*	Yes - CC of VT agreement with individual four -year colleges
Massachusetts	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only</i>	Virginia	Yes - state CC system agreement with individual four -year colleges
Michigan	No	Washington	Yes - state CC system agreement with individual four -year colleges
Minnesota	Yes	West Virginia	Yes
Mississippi	Yes	Wisconsin	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only.</i>
Missouri	Yes	Wyoming	<i>Yes - AA gen. ed only</i>
<i>Notes:</i>			
Yes? Indicates that we think state rules are in place but we are not certain.			
* Rules enacted by one community college but it operates as a statewide agency with multiple campuses. In Indiana, there are two community and technical colleges and the rules apply to the far larger one: Ivy Tech.			
# AA general education only indicates that the state general education transfer guarantee only applies when a student is transferring with an associate of arts or sciences degree.			
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; Ignash & Townsend (2001); Wellman (2002).			

Table 11: State General Education Transfer Policies: Views about Their Effectiveness								
	Minority students - policy effectiveness				Low income students – policy effectiveness			
	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK
State higher education board	4	6	0	0	3	6	1	0
State community college board	0	5	1	0	0	4	2	0
Other state agency	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
	26%	63%	11%	0%	21%	58%	21%	0%
	26%	63%	11%		21%	58%	21%	
Community college presidents	7	10	7	1	7	10	7	1
Other local CC officials	4	4	1	1	4	4	1	1
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2</i>
	31%	40%	23%	6%	31%	40%	23%	6%
	33%	42%	24%		33%	42%	24%	
GRAND TOTAL	16	26	10	2	15	25	12	2
	30%	48%	19%	4%	28%	46%	22%	4%
	31%	50%	19%		29%	48%	23%	
Notes: DK = don't know or no answer.								
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.								

BACCALAUREATE GRANTING

In recent years, some states have moved to allow community colleges themselves to offer baccalaureate degrees, particularly in applied areas. These programs have been seen as especially useful in addressing the needs of place-bound students and of applied fields that the universities are insufficiently addressing (Dougherty, 1994; Floyd, Skolnik, & Walker, 2005; Floyd, 2006).¹⁶

In analyzing state policies on baccalaureate granting, we drew on responses to our national survey, interviews with state and local community college officials, analysis of the State Policy Inventory Database Online, examination of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies and local community colleges, and review of the reports by Floyd (2006) and Glennon (2005).

As Table 12 shows, 13 states have state regulations allowing community colleges (or two-year university branches) to offer baccalaureate degrees, typically in technical fields.¹⁷ However, in nine of those states the permission applies only to one institution. For example, in New Mexico,

only Northern New Mexico Community College has been granted the right to offer baccalaureate degrees, on the basis of the unique needs of its locality for more baccalaureate degrees and the absence of nearby public four-year colleges. Only four states have authorized more than one two-year institution to offer baccalaureate degrees: Florida, Nevada, Texas, and Washington. For example, in Florida, the Legislature authorized the State Board of Education to approve the offering of baccalaureate degrees in certain applied fields at selected community colleges. At this date, eight Florida community colleges are authorized to offer baccalaureates (Copa, 2007; Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser, 2006; Florida Statutes, section 1007.33 and 1004.73; and Floyd, 2006).¹⁸

The nine Achieving the Dream states are more likely than states generally to allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees: 44 percent as versus 26 percent.

Respondents' Evaluations of Baccalaureate Policy

It is difficult to get respondents' evaluation of the effectiveness of state authorization of community colleges to give baccalaureate degrees. As noted above, in nine of the 13 states involved, only one college is authorized to give a baccalaureate degree. Therefore, our respondents in those states quite commonly indicated that there was no state authorization and we therefore ended up with only 16 respondents in those 13 states offering an evaluation of the state baccalaureate policy. Among these 16 respondents, the modal rating was one of medium effectiveness in fostering student success: 56% gave this rating with respect to low-income students and 53% did so for minority students (see Table 13). However, our number of respondents is so small as to make these statistics almost meaningless.

Florida	Eight community colleges.
Hawaii	One community college: University of Hawaii at Maui.
Indiana	One community college: Vincennes University.
Louisiana	One two-year university branch: Louisiana State University at Alexandria.
Minnesota	One community college: Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College.
Nevada	Two colleges: Great Basin College; Community College of Southern Nevada.
New Mexico	One community college: Northern New Mexico Community College.
New York	One community college: Fashion Institute of Technology.
Oklahoma	One two-year university branch: Oklahoma State University at Okmulgee.
Texas	Several community colleges.
Vermont	One technical college: Vermont Technical College.
Washington	Several community colleges.
W. Virginia	One two-year university branch: University of West Virginia at Parkersburg.
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; Floyd (2006); Glennon (2005).	

	Minority students - policy effectiveness				Low income students - policy effectiveness			
	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK
State higher education board	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State community college board	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0
Other state agency	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0
	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
	0%	50%	50%		0%	50%	50%	
Community college presidents	1	1	3	0	1	1	3	0
Other local CC officials	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	1	4	3	0	1	4	3	0
	13%	50%	38%	0%	13%	50%	38%	0%
	13%	50%	38%		13%	50%	38%	
<i>Other respondents</i>	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	1
GRAND TOTAL – All respondents	2	9	5	0	2	8	5	1
	13%	56%	31%	0%	13%	50%	31%	6%
	13%	56%	31%		13%	53%	33%	
Notes:								
* DK = don't know or no answer.								
* Evaluations restricted to respondents in the 13 states with state policy allowing community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees. We received evaluations in eight states.								
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.								

PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY POLICIES

Beginning in the 1990s, state governments actively joined the performance accountability (PA) movement. The leading theme of this movement has been making higher education institutions perform better by focusing not on enrollment growth but rather on gains in student outcomes. The most typical form this accountability effort has taken is performance reporting, in which states collect and report data on how well institutions are performing on such measures as retention, graduation, transfer, and job placement. Less commonly, states supplement performance reporting with performance funding, in which some portion (typically small) of state funding is tied to institutional performance by means of an explicit formula (Burke & Minassians, 2003; Dougherty & Hong, 2006).¹⁹

In analyzing the current state of state performance accountability policies, we drew on responses to our survey, interviews with state and local community college officials, and analyses of websites maintained by state community college and higher education agencies, the state survey by Burke and Minassians (2003), and the report by Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser (2006).

At present, virtually all the states have a performance reporting system, in which they collect and publicly report data from community colleges. However, performance funding is much less common, encompassing only a third (15) of the states (see Table 14 below).²⁰ The nine Achieving the Dream states are considerably more likely to have performance funding than is the case for states generally: 78 percent versus 28 percent.

Performance funding is less common nationally than at its height in 2001, when as many as 19 states had performance funding (Burke & Minassians, 2003: 5).²¹ A key factor in this decline was the fiscal crisis of state governments in the early years of this millennium. In the face of straitened revenues, states such as Illinois eliminated their performance funding systems and others cut back sharply on how much state higher education funding was allocated on the basis of performance measures (Dougherty & Hong, 2006).

Table 14: States with State Performance Accountability Systems

	State has Performance Reporting?	State has Performance Funding?		State has Performance Reporting?	State has Performance Funding?
Alabama	Yes		Montana	Yes	
Alaska	Yes		Nebraska	Yes	
Arizona	Yes?		Nevada	Yes	
Arkansas	Yes		New Hampshire	Yes	
California	Yes		New Jersey	Yes	
Colorado	Yes	Yes, but not funded	New Mexico	Yes	Yes, but not funded
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	New York	No	
Delaware	No		No. Carolina	Yes	Yes
Florida	Yes	Yes	North Dakota	Yes	
Georgia	Yes		Ohio	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	Yes		Oklahoma	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes		Oregon	Yes	Yes
Illinois	Yes		Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Yes		Rhode Island	No	
Iowa	Yes		So. Carolina	Yes	Yes
Kansas	Yes	Yes	South Dakota	Yes?	Yes?
Kentucky	Yes		Tennessee	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Texas	Yes	
Maine	Yes		Utah	Yes	
Maryland	Yes		Vermont	Yes	
Massachusetts	Yes		Virginia	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes		Washington	Yes	
Minnesota	Yes		West Virginia	Yes	
Mississippi	Yes		Wisconsin	Yes	
Missouri	Yes		Wyoming	Yes	
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit; Burke and Minassians (2003); Dougherty, Reid, & Nienhusser (2006).					

Table 15: State Accountability Policies: Views about Their Effectiveness

	Use by state govt. to improve its own access and/or success policies				Use by state govt. to push community colleges to improve their access and success efforts				Use by community colleges to improve their own access and success practices			
	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK	High	Med	Low	DK
State higher education board	4	3	9	1	5	4	8	0	9	5	3	0
State community college board	4	4	0	1	4	4	0	1	4	3	0	2
Other state agency	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	0
<i>Total state HE and CC leaders</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
	34%	24%	34%	7%	34%	31%	31%	3%	55%	28%	10%	7%
	37%	26%	37%		36%	32%	32%		59%	30%	11%	
Community college presidents	4	15	18	21	3	16	24	15	24	15	6	13
Other local CC officials	2	14	4	11	2	13	8	8	7	16	3	5
<i>Total local CC leaders</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>18</i>
	7%	33%	25%	36%	6%	33%	36%	26%	35%	35%	10%	20%
	11%	51%	39%		8%	44%	48%		44%	44%	13%	
<i>Other respondents</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>0</i>
GRAND TOTAL - All respondents	22	56	39	36	25	55	48	25	61	52	20	20
	14%	37%	25%	24%	16%	36%	31%	16%	40%	34%	13%	13%
	19%	48%	33%		20%	43%	38%		46%	39%	15%	
Note: DK = don't know or no answer.												
Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.												

Table 16: Impacts of Performance Funding on Perceived Policy Usage

Percentage of all respondents who say that community colleges use accountability data to the following degree to improve their own access and success policies:

	High usage	Medium usage	Low usage
States with performance funding	47%	27%	6%
States without performance funding	37%	37%	14%

Source: Community College Research Center State Policy Audit.

RESPONDENTS' EVALUATION OF ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY

We asked our respondents to assess the degree to which their state government and community colleges use state-collected data on community college performance to improve state policy and community college practice in service of better access and success for minority and low income students. For the most part our respondents did not see a high degree of use of community college performance data by state government. As can be seen in Table 15, only 19% rated “use by state government to improve its own access and/or success policies” as high and only 20% rated as high the degree of “use by state government to push community colleges to improve their access and success efforts.” One-third gave low ratings on both questions.²²

Local community college leaders were much more skeptical than were state community college and higher education leaders about how much state officials use performance data to shape state policy or push community colleges. This gap in perception between local and state community college officials appeared as well in our in-depth policy audits of the first seven Achieving the Dream states (Dougherty, Reid, and Nienhuser, 2006; Dougherty, Marshall, and Soonachan, 2006; and Dougherty and Reid, 2006). For example, when asked how data from the state’s performance accountability system influences state policy, a local community college official in Texas replied: “I don’t think it is used at all...I don’t think it is used at a state level. Certainly reports are completed, but there are no consequences attached to those reports.” And in Ohio, when asked about whether data were used to identify and act on problems with success and access, a local official replied: “I think it’s ancillary. I think it’s not anecdotal..., but it’s not the primary driving force. I think the data analysis typically is done in terms of determining the subsidy distribution as compared to can we really understand what’s going on within our state.”²³

We found a more favorable evaluation of the impact of community college performance data on the actions of community colleges themselves. Among all our respondents, 46% rated “use by community colleges to improve their own access and success practices” as high and only 15% rated it as low (see Table 15). Not surprisingly, our respondents who lived in states with performance funding were more likely than respondents in states without performance funding to view community colleges as making extensive use of data to frame their own local access and success policies (see Table 16).

As before, state community college and higher education officials had a more favorable impression than did local community college officials of the degree to which community colleges use data to frame local practice. The latter were considerably less likely to see themselves as making high use of state-collected performance data than were state officials. These differences between state officials and other actors, including local community college officials, in their evaluation of the utility of state-collected performance data may reflect the fact that state-collected data reflect the informational priorities of state officials and are seen by local officials as an imposition. This gap between local use of state-derived and locally-derived data has also been noted by Morest & Reid (2006).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have reported findings on the prevalence and perceived effectiveness across the 50 states of several key state policies affecting access to and success in the community college. The access policies include community college tuition (including availability of in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants), state student aid (aid in general and aid specifically for undocumented immigrant students), and early outreach to potential students (particularly in the form of dual enrollment). The success policies involve remedial and developmental education, transfer of general education credits, and baccalaureate provision. Spanning both access and success, we have examined state performance accountability systems. Our concern was to establish whether the various states have a particular policy in place and whether well-placed observers in those states judge the policies as effective.

Looking across the state policies affecting access to and success in community colleges that we reviewed, we find some that are nearly universal among the 50 states. Virtually all the states provide student aid, support dual enrollment programs, aim to facilitate the easy transfer of general education credits, and collect and publish data on how well community colleges help their students succeed.

That said, even these nearly universally supported policies demonstrate great variations by state in their details. While South Carolina's ratio of per FTE student aid to tuition for community college students stands at 41.4%, Wyoming's is only 0.7%. Similarly, states vary greatly in how they support remedial and developmental education. While virtually every state supports such education in community colleges, states are almost evenly divided on whether or not they require community colleges to do placement testing and whether or not they assign students to remediation if the placement scores are not good enough.

If the policies above are widely supported, although they differ greatly in their implementation, there are other access and success policies that are much less widely supported by states. We have investigated them because they represent emerging areas of state policy activity. Only 10 states make undocumented immigrant students eligible for in-state tuition and even fewer allow them access to state student aid. Furthermore, only 13 states have authorized community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees (and usually this authorization only applies to one college). Finally, while performance reporting is nearly universal, performance funding is provided by less than a third of the states.

In several instances, the nine Achieving the Dream states follow much the same pattern of state policy provision as do states across the country. The average community college tuition in the nine states is \$2160, pretty close to the national average of \$2481. Twenty-two percent of the nine Achieving the Dream states explicitly allow charging in-state tuition for undocumented students, while 18 percent of states nationwide do this. Finally, 56 percent of the nine states mandate that community colleges conduct entry-level testing, which is the same proportion for states across the country.

On the other hand, the nine Achieving the Dream states do diverge from the national pattern in several instances. The seven states with valid data are above average in their FTE student aid to tuition ratios, with means of 17.2 percent (uncorrected for residence and migration) and 20.7 percent (corrected), while the national averages were 13 and 16.9 percent, respectively. The Achieving the Dream states are more likely than states generally to provide double funding for dual enrollment, 56 percent versus 28 percent. The Achieving the Dream states are less likely to require remedial placement for students failing entry-level testing than are all 50 states together, 22 percent versus 44 percent. The nine are also more likely than states generally to have policies for the transfer of general credits even without an associate degree (100 versus 72 percent). Furthermore, the nine states are more likely to allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees, 44 percent compared to 26 percent among all states. Finally, the Achieving the Dream states are considerably more likely to have performance funding than is the case for states generally: 78 percent versus 28 percent.

Differences in state political culture and group mobilization may be particularly important in explaining state differences in community college policymaking. The relative strength of egalitarian sentiments and the degree of mobilization by groups representing low-income students and students of color are likely to be important in explaining differences in funding for state student aid (particularly need-based aid going to community colleges) and in whether such aid and in-state tuition are made available to undocumented immigrant students. Meanwhile, differences across states in the strength of sentiment about the desirable autonomy of local governmental bodies, including community colleges, may be important in explaining whether states mandate remedial testing and placement and pursue performance funding.

Besides investigating the relative prevalence of certain key community college policies across the states, we also examined how the effectiveness of those policies was judged by state and local community college and higher education leaders. We found some important variations. First, state policies sometimes differ considerably in how effective they are perceived to be. State student aid programs and policies with regard to early outreach and the transfer of general education credits are viewed as highly effective²⁴ by about one-third of all our respondents, while state remediation and accountability policies²⁵ are viewed as highly effective by only one-seventh of our respondents.

Second, the actors in this arena consistently differ in how they evaluate the effectiveness of these policies. On average, state community college and higher education officials consistently give more favorable ratings than do local community college officials to the effectiveness of state policies for student aid, outreach, remediation, general education transfer, and accountability. This gap in perception may indicate that state officials have an overly rosy perception of how well state policies are serving the interests of minority and low-income students. Such a perception may be a barrier to further state policy development and to reforming existing state policies.

REFERENCES

- Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success. (2005). *National inventory of academic pathways*. Urbana: University of Illinois, College of Education. Available: <http://www.apass.uiuc.edu/states/profiles/FL%20Profile.pdf>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities . (2005). *Should undocumented immigrants have access to in-state tuition?* Washington, DC: Author.
- Bailey, T., & Karp, M. M. (2003). *Promoting college access and success: A review of credit-based transition programs*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Biswas, R. R. (2005). *Access to community college for undocumented immigrants*. Boston: Jobs for the Future.
- Burke, J., & Minassians, H. (2003). *Performance reporting: "Real" accountability or accountability "lite": Seventh annual survey 2003*. Albany: State University of New York, Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- Calcagno, J.C. (2006). Evaluating the impact of developmental education in community colleges: A quasi-experimental regression-discontinuity design. PhD. Dissertation, Columbia University.
- Center for the Study of Education Policy. (2006). *Recession, retrenchment, and recovery: State higher education funding and student financial aid*. Normal, IL: Illinois State University.
- Copa, N. (2007). Personal communication.
- Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dougherty, K. J. (2002). The evolving role of community college: Policy issues and research questions. In J. Smart & W. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 17, pp. 295-348). New York: Kluwer.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Hong, E. (2006). Performance accountability as imperfect panacea: The community college experience. In T. Bailey & V. Morest (Eds.), *Defending the community college equity agenda*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Kienzl, G. S. (2006). It's not enough to get through the open door: Inequalities by social background in transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges. *Teachers College Record*, 108(3), 452-487.
- Dougherty, K.J., Marshall, J., & Soonachan, A. (2006). *Achieving the dream in Ohio: State policies affecting access to, and success in, community colleges for minority and low-income students*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=468>

- Dougherty, K. J., Reid, M., & Nienhusser, H. K. (2006a, February). *State policies to Achieve the Dream in five states: An audit of state policies to aid student access to and success in community colleges in Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. Retrieved September 15, 2006, http://www.achievingthedream.org/images/index03/State_Pol_to_Achieve_Dream_5_States_2-27-06.pdf
- Dougherty, K.J., Reid, M., & Nienhusser, H.K. (2006b). "Helping Students Enter and Succeed: Access, Success, and Accountability Policies in the 'Achieving The Dream' States," *Community College Journal*, vol. 77 (2006) pp. 42-47. <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=456>
- Dougherty, K.J. & Reid, M. (2006). *Achieving the Dream in Connecticut: State policies affecting access to, and success in, community colleges for minority and low-income students*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=472>
- Floyd, D. (2006). Achieving the baccalaureate through the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges* #135: 59-72.
- Floyd, D., Skolnik, M., & Walker, K. (Eds.). (2005). *The community college baccalaureate*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Glennon, K. (2005). *Community college baccalaureate degrees: A review of issues, policies, and other states' programs*. Phoenix: University of Phoenix.
- Heller, D. (1999). The effects of tuition and state financial aid on public college enrollment. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(1): 65-89.
- Heller, D. (2002). State aid and student success. In D. Heller (ed.), *Condition of access*. Westport, CT: ACE-Praeger, pp. 59-72.
- Ignash, J., & Townsend, B.K. (2001). Statewide transfer and articulation policies: Current practices and emerging issues. In B.K. Townsend and S.B. Twombly (eds.), *Community Colleges: Policy in the Future Context*, pp. 173-192. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Jenkins, D. & Boswell, K. (2002a). *State policies on community college remedial Education: Findings from a national survey*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Jenkins, D. & Boswell, K. (2002b). *2001 community college remediation and workforce policy surveys: Executive summary*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Johnstone, D. B., & Del Genio. B. (2001). *College-level learning in high school: Purposes, policies, and implications*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Karp, M.M., Bailey, T., Hughes, K., & Fermin, B. (2004). *State dual enrollment policies: Addressing access and quality*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Karp, M.M., Bailey, T., Hughes, K., & Fermin, B. (2005). *Update to state dual enrollment policies: Addressing access and quality*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Kintzer, F. & Wattenbarger, J. L.. (1985). *The articulation/ transfer phenomenon*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC ED 257 539)
- Knoell, D. & Medsker, L.L.. (1965). *From junior college to senior college*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Long, B.T. (2006). Personal communication.
- Lumina Foundation for Education. 2004. *Collision Course: Rising College costs Threaten America's Future and Require Shared Solutions*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
<http://www.luminafoundation.org/issues/collegecost/CollisionCourse.pdf>
- McCabe, R. (2000). *No one to waste*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Merisotis, J., & Phipps, R. (2000). Remedial education in colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education*, 24(1): 67-85.
- Morest, V.S. & Reid, M. (2006). "Balancing Research and Reporting: Influences of State Accountability Systems on Community College Institutional Research Capacity." Paper presented to the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Anaheim, CA.
- National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs. (1971). *3d annual survey: 1971-72 undergraduate comprehensive state scholarship/grant programs*. Washington, DC: Author. <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx?categoryID=3#>
- National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs. (2006). *36th annual survey report on state-sponsored student financial aid 2004-2005 academic year*. Washington, DC: Author. Available: <http://www.nassgap.org/viewrepository.aspx?categoryID=3#>
- National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs. (2007). *Annual Survey Query Tool*. Washington, DC: Author.
<http://www.nassgap.org/customquery/CQB01ListQueries.aspx>
- National Center for Higher Education and Public Policy. *Measuring Up 2006: The National Report Card on Higher Education*. San Jose, CA: Author.
http://measuringup.highereducation.org/_docs/2006/NationalReport_2006.pdf
- Oregon Independent Colleges Association. (2007). *OICA Factbook*. Portland, OR: Author.
<http://www.oicanet.org/FactBookPDFs/FactBook>

- Parsad, B., & Lewis, L. (2003). *Remedial education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in fall 2000*. NCES 2004-010. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Perin, D. (2005, Spring). Institutional decision making for increasing academic preparedness in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 129, 27-38.
- Perin, D. (2006). Can community colleges protect both access and standards? The problem of remediation. *Teachers College Record* 108 (3): 339-373.
- Prince, D., & Jenkins, D. (2005). *Building pathways to success for low-skill adult students: Lessons for community college policy and practice from a statewide longitudinal tracking study*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Protopsaltis, S.. (2005). *Undocumented immigrant students and access to higher education: An overview of federal and state policy*. Denver, CO: Bell Policy Center.
- Roueche, J. D., & Roueche, S. (1999). *High stakes, high performance*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Roueche, J. D., Ely, E. E., & Roueche, S. D. (2001). *In pursuit of excellence: The Community College of Denver*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- St. John, E. P., Hu, S., & Weber, J. (2001). State policy and the affordability of public higher education: The influence of state grants on persistence in Indiana. *Review of Higher Education*, 42(4), 401-428.
- St. John, E. P., Chung, C., Musoba, G. D., Simmons, A. B., Wooden, O.S., & Mendez, J. P. (2004). *Expanding college access: The impact of state finance strategies*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education.
- Terenzini, P., Cabrera, A., & Bernal, L. (2001). *Swimming against the tide: The poor in American higher education*. New York: The College Board.
- Townsend, B. K. (2005). A cautionary view. In D. Floyd, M. Skolnik, & K. Walker (Eds.), *The community college baccalaureate* (pp. 179-190). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2006). *2005-06 tuition and fee rates: A national comparison*. Olympia, WA: Author. Available: <http://www.hecb.wa.gov/research/issues/documents/2005-06TuitionFeesNationalComparison.pdf>
- Wellman, J. (2002). *State policy and community college-baccalaureate transfer*. Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, Stanford University.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (2006). *Accelerated learning options: Moving the needle on access and success*. Denver, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. http://www.wiche.edu/Policy/Accelerated_Learning/report/ALO.pdf

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY PROCEDURES

In the following we describe the procedures used for our survey of state and local officials who would be knowledgeable about state community college policy in their state. We discuss who was surveyed and what procedures the survey followed. This discussion is followed by the texts of our survey questionnaires.

WHO WAS SURVEYED

We surveyed four groups of people: state community college and higher education officials, state legislators and their staff, local community college officials, and leaders of groups representing various minority and low-income communities. We were interested in the views of the community leaders because we wanted to know not only whether their state had certain policies in place or not but also how well those policies were seen as meeting the needs of minority and low-income students.

State and Local Community College Officials

The state and local community college officials we surveyed included state community college directors and heads of the state higher education board, heads of the state community college association in the twelve states with such an association, and community college presidents.

Of the 79 state community college directors or state higher education executive officers we surveyed, we received responses from 30 (38%). Of the twelve state community association heads, we received responses from eight (67%). And of the 214 community college presidents we surveyed, we received responses from 92 presidents or staffers they had designated (43%).²⁶

The community college presidents we approached were heads of colleges that have a high proportion of minority and/or low income students, that is, where at least one-third of the student body is either of minority background or receives a Pell Grant. After determining which colleges fit these criteria, we divided them into three categories: urban, suburban, and rural (small town). We determined the mean proportions of minority and low-income students for each of these categories of colleges and picked two colleges that had the smallest combined deviation from the median proportion minority and median proportion low-income for their category. The aim was to end up with six colleges in each state. However, in some states we sampled a smaller number of colleges because the states did not have any colleges that are, say, suburban colleges with at least one-third of students who are low-income or of minority background. In the end, we ended up with 214 colleges in our sample.

Legislative and Executive Branch Officials

We surveyed the chairs of the legislative committees for community colleges, higher education, or education in each house of the legislature. Of 112 surveyed, we received responses from 25 (22%). We also surveyed prominent African-American legislators associated with National Black Caucus of State Legislators.²⁷ Of the 77 we surveyed, we received responses from 10 (13%). In addition, we surveyed prominent Latino legislators associated with the National Association of Latino Elected Officials.²⁸ Of the 26 we surveyed, none responded.

We also approached governors' educational advisors. We were unable to secure their names and contact information from the National Governors' Association. The NGA did run an announcement in their newsletter for educational advisors, giving the URL for answering our survey electronically. Not surprisingly, we received no responses.

Because of the low response rate for legislative and executive branch officials, we do not separately report their responses in our tables. They are listed under the category "other respondents," along with leaders of state minority and low-income community groups.

Minority and Low-Income Community Leaders

We sought leaders of the African-American, Latino, Asian, Native American, and low-income communities in each state. However, we were able to secure names and contact information only for leaders of the first two groups.

In the case of the African-American community, we received names and contact information for the state conference education chairs of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.²⁹ Of the 29 state conference education chairs we surveyed, we received responses from 8 (28%). In the case of the Latino community, we contacted the 19 state directors of the League for United Latin American Citizens (LULAC).³⁰ Of the 19, 3 (16%) responded.

We were unable to secure names of Asian-American, Native American, and low-income community leaders. We made repeated efforts to reach the Organization of Chinese Americans by phone and e-mail but never received a response. We dialogued with the National Congress of American Indians, but they were unable to help because of other commitments. We contacted the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN). However, their research staff felt that they did not have members who would be knowledgeable about state community college policy.

This lack of response to our survey by community group leaders may be traceable to a belief that their first focus when it comes to educational issues is elementary and secondary education. As a result, such leaders are less informed about and interested in community college matters. This was made clear by interviews we conducted with minority and low-income community leaders in the course of preparing detailed policy audits of the first seven Achieving the Dream states (Connecticut, Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia) (Dougherty,

Reid, and Nienhuser, 2006; Dougherty and Reid, 2006; Dougherty, Marshall, and Soonachan, 2006). We had great difficulty in securing interviews with minority and low-income community group leaders in several of these states. And when we did hold interviews, these community group leaders often made clear that they did not know much about community colleges and did not regard them as of first interest in education. Rather, their focus was on K-12 education. For instance, when asked if community colleges were a hot topic for his organization, a former president of a state NAACP chapter stated: "Not in my experience.... If it was a hot topic nobody communicated [that] to the organization for the time that I was the Education Chair." In keeping with this, when asked what were his chapter's main educational concerns, he listed ones that all pertained to elementary and secondary education: "Our main priority was adequate buildings, competent teachers (not in this order) and ... recruitment and retention of minority teachers.... My philosophy is you can't build a house from the roof down. You have to build the foundation up and the stronger the foundation, the more elaborate the rooms, the more additions you can put onto a house."

Because of the low response rate from community group leaders, we are not able to report their responses in our tables. Instead, they are included in the "other respondents" category and are included in the overall tallies.

SURVEY PROCEDURES

The survey was administered in three waves: e-mail, letter, and telephone. For the phone wave, eight attempts were made to secure a response. The survey was fielded July through October 2005.

Two survey protocols were used. A long version with detailed questions went to state and local community college officials; a short version went to all other respondents. These survey protocols are appended to this report in Appendix 2 and 3.

The e-mail survey was preceded by an e-mail note tailored to various constituencies explaining the purpose of the survey and urging those surveyed to respond. For the state and local community college officials, we sent a letter from Dr. George Boggs, the president of the American Association of Community Colleges. For state officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, we sent a letter from Dr. John Jackson, National Director of Education for the NAACP. The members of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials received a letter from Eliezer Rivera, a member of NALEO's Board and of the state higher education board in New Hampshire. All others received a letter from Martha Lamkin, president of the Lumina Foundation.

For the texts of the survey instruments, see following pages.

APPENDIX 2

SURVEY OF STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE OFFICIALS

Please provide the following information:

Q1. Your Full Name: _____

Q2. Your Organization: _____

Q3. Your State: insert U.S. state list

Q4. What is your current position?

- Official of state Community College board or system
- Official of state higher education coordinating or governing board
- Official of other state agency (please specify):
- President of local Community College
- Other (please specify): _____

Ask Q5 and Q6 if “Local Community College official” in Q4.

Q5. Please indicate the type of location your college is in.

- Urban college
- Suburban college
- Rural or small town college
- Other: (please specify): _____

Please indicate the nature of your student body.

Q6a. What is the approximate proportion of the entire student body that is of minority background (Black, Latino, Native American, Asian)?

_____ (enter %)

Q6b. Are you using...

- a headcount, or
- FTE enrollments?

Q6c. What is the approximate proportion of the entire student body that is eligible for Pell grants?

_____ (enter %)

Q6d. Are you using...

- a headcount, or
- FTE enrollments?

Q7. Please indicate whether your **state** gives financial aid targeted to particular groups of students.

(NOTE: Please consider all forms of state student aid...e.g. - grants or scholarships, loans, work/study, etc. By a general state student aid program, we mean one that does allow, say, part-time students to receive state aid, but the aid program does not specifically mark out or set aside funds for those part-time students.)

	Yes, this group of students DOES receive state student aid. There is a state aid program specifically for them.	Yes, this group of students DOES receive state student aid. They are eligible under a general state student aid program.	No, this group does NOT receive state student aid	Don't know if this group receives state student aid
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Part-Time Students (i.e. – Less than 12 credit hours per semester)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adult Students (i.e. – age 21 or older)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students receiving remediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer students after going to 4-year college	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q8. How effective is that state student aid in fostering greater access to the community college for different groups of students?

(CATI – read-in only those groups that are “Yes” in Q7.)

	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Part-Time Students (i.e. – Less than 12 credit hours per semester)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Adult Students (i.e. – age 21 or older)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Students receiving remediation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Transfer students after going to 4-year college	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q9. What proportion of their needs does the state student aid meet?

(CATI – read-in only those groups that are “Yes” in Q7.)

	Low (0% to 33%)	Medium (34% to 67%)	High (68% to 100%)	Don't Know
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Part-Time Students (i.e. – Less than 12 credit hours per semester)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adult Students (i.e. – age 21 or older)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students receiving remediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Transfer students after going to 4-year college

Q10. Does your state government have the following kinds of policies affecting **access** to the Community College by minority and low-income students?

(NOTE: By *state policies*, we mean such things as (a) state legislation; (b) policies issued by the state Community College board or system, the state higher education board (if there is one), or the state education board or department; and (c) formal agreements among the colleges. Do not count as state policy simply the fact that the Community Colleges do the same thing in common.

By *indirectly funds*, we mean that the college activity gets state funds but not from a program that is specially dedicated to that activity: for example, counseling and guidance programs may get funding from the state but not from a state grant specifically for this purpose but rather from general state aid in support of instruction or student services.)

(Please check all answers that apply)

	YES, state policy exists. State <u>requires</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>specifically</u> <u>funds</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>indirectly</u> <u>funds</u> this activity.	NO State Policy Exists	Don't Know if there is a State Policy
Colleges keeping down their tuition and fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges maintaining open door admissions (e.g. – not requiring high school diploma or minimum GPA or test score)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges reaching out to high school students (e.g. – early outreach programs; dual-credit programs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges offering curricula for non-traditional students (e.g. – Adult Basic Education, English as a 2 nd Language)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Colleges offering convenient access (e.g. – weekend classes, short courses, satellite campuses, distance education)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Colleges offering child care assistance for adult students	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q11. How do you rate the **effectiveness** of each of the following **state policies** in fostering greater access to the Community College by minority students? How about low-income students?

CATI: Only read-in statements that are “State Policy Exists” in Q10 series.

State Policies influencing...	<u>Minority Students</u>			<u>Low-Income Students</u> (below the poverty line)		
	Low	Medium	High	Lo w	Mediu m	High
Colleges keeping down their tuition and fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges maintaining open door admissions (e.g. – not requiring high school diploma or minimum GPA or test	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges reaching out to high school students (e.g. – early outreach programs; dual-credit programs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges offering curricula for non-traditional students (e.g. – Adult Basic Education, English as a 2 nd Language)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges offering convenient access (e.g. – weekend classes, short courses, satellite campuses, distance education)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges offering child care assistance for adult students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q12. What specific actions **should** the state government take -- but does not now -- to increase the number of minority and low-income students entering the Community College? Please spell out these needed policies in detail.

Q13. Does your state government have state policies affecting remedial or developmental education?

(NOTE: *Please treat these as state policies:* (a) state legislation; (b) policies issued by the state Community College board or system, the state higher education board (if there is one), or the state education board or department; and (c) formal agreements among the colleges. Do not count as state policy simply the fact that the Community Colleges do the same thing in common.

	YES, state policy DOES exist	NO, state policy does NOT exist	Don't know if there is a state policy
State requires assessment of student skills at college entry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State mandates which particular test(s) can be used for assessment of student skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State sets specific cut-off scores for passing entry skills assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State requires those with low scores to take remediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State allows students needing remedial education in one subject to take college-level courses in other subjects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State refuses to fund Community Colleges for giving a student more than a certain number of remediation courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State bars students from taking remediation more than a certain length of time or number of courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State bars students in remediation from receiving state student aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State sets specific requirements for determining whether students are considered effectively remediated (e.g. requires exit exam)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State encourages Community College-high school collaboration to improve student precollege preparation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14. How **effective** are **state policies** in fostering successful remediation for the following types of Community College students?

	Low	Medium	High
Minority Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low-Income Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

We would like to ask you what policies your state now has in place in order to influence how well minority and low-income students **succeed once they are in the Community College.**

Q15. Does your state government have the following kinds of policies affecting student **success** in the Community College by minority and low-income students?

(NOTE: *Please treat these as state policies:* (a) state legislation; (b) policies issued by the state Community College board or system, the state higher education board (if there is one), or the state education board or department; and (c) formal agreements among the colleges. Do not count as state policy simply the fact that the Community Colleges do the same thing in common.

By *indirectly funds*, we mean that the college activity gets state funds but not from a program that is specially dedicated to that activity: for example, counseling and guidance programs may get funding from the state but not from a state grant specifically for this purpose but from general state aid in support of instruction or student services.

(Please check all answers that apply)

	YES, state policy exists. State <u>requires</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>specifically funds</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>indirectly funds</u> this activity.	NO State Policy Exists	Don't Know if there is a State Policy
Academic counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Career Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer advising	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging occupational students to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guaranteed transfer of general education credits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Four-Year colleges providing courses at	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Community colleges offering own BA/BS	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Easing student movement from non-credit to credit programs	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q16. How do you rate the **effectiveness** of each of the following **state policies** in fostering greater success of minority students in the Community College? How about low-income students?

CATI: Only read-in statements that are “State Policy Exists” in Q15 series.

State Policies influencing...	Minority Students			Low-Income Students (below the poverty line)		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Academic counseling and guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Career Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-Academic (personal) counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer advising	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encouraging occupational students to transfer to four-year colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common course numbering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guaranteed transfer of general education credits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Four-Year colleges providing courses at Community Colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community colleges offering their own BA/BS degrees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Easing student movement from non-credit to credit programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q17. What specific actions **should** state government take -- but does not now -- to increase the **success** of minority and low-income students who enter the Community College? Please spell out these needed policies in detail. _____

Q18. Does your **state** collect data on Community College performance (e.g. - rates of access, retention, graduation, successful remediation, job placement, etc.)? Please indicate if the data includes separate indicators for minority or low-income students.

(Please check all answers that apply)

	YES, state DOES collect this college performance measure. General indicator, not broken out by student race or income	YES, state DOES collect this college performance measure. Separate indicator for minority students	YES, state DOES collect this college performance measure. Separate indicator for low-income students	NO, state does NOT collect this college performance measure	Don't know if the state collects this performance measure
<i>Access Indicators:</i>					
Percentage of high school graduates attending Community College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify): _____ _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Success Indicators:</i>					
Persistence to the 2nd semester	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Persistence to the 2nd year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Successful completion of remediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Graduation (i.e. - getting a degree or certificate)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer to four-year colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placement in job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Passage of professional licensure exams (e.g. - teacher or nursing exams)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(CATI – Only ask Q19 if ANY “Yes” mentioned at ANY iteration in Q18. Otherwise, skip to end.)

Q19. How does your state use data on Community College performance with regard to either access or success for minority or low-income students?

	Low usage	Medium usage	High usage	Don't know if data is used
Use by your state government to improve its own access and/or success policies for minority and low income students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use by your state government to push Community Colleges to improve their access and success efforts to help minority and low-income students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use by your state government to decide how much money a Community College should get from the state (e.g. performance funding or budgeting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use by Community Colleges themselves to improve their own access and success practices to help minority and low-income students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

We very much appreciate your candid and thorough answers. Please be assured that they will be very useful to our research and that we will keep them entirely confidential.

APPENDIX 3

SURVEY OF LEGISLATORS AND COMMUNITY GROUP LEADERS

Please provide the following information:

Q1. your Full Name: _____

Q2. your Organization: _____

Q3. your State: *insert U.S. state list*

Q4. What is your current position? (choose one)

- Governor's office
- Legislature: member or staff
- None of the above

Q5. Do you belong to any of the following types of organizations? (check all that apply)

- African-American organization
- Latino or Hispanic organization
- Asian-American organization
- Native American organization
- None of the above

Q6. Please indicate whether your state gives financial aid to the following groups of students. Please consider all forms of state student aid (e.g. - grants or scholarships, loans, work/study, etc.)

	Yes, this group of students DOES receive state student aid. There is a state aid program specifically for them.	Yes, this group of students DOES receive state student aid. They are eligible under a general state student aid program.	No, this group does NOT receive state student aid	Don't know if this group receives state student aid
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q7. How **effective** is that **state student aid** in fostering greater access to the Community College for different groups of students? (CATI – read-in only those groups that are “Yes” in Q6.)

	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat InEffective	Very InEffective	Don't Know
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q8. What proportion of their needs does the state student aid meet?

(CATI – read-in only those groups that are “Yes” in Q6.)

	Low (0% to 33%)	Medium (34% to 67%)	High (68% to 100%)	Don't Know
Low-Income Students (i.e. - below poverty line)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minority Students (i.e. - Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Undocumented Immigrants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q9. Does your state government have the following kinds of policies affecting access to the Community College by minority and low-income students?

NOTE: Please treat these as state policies: (a) state legislation; (b) policies issued by the state Community College board or system, the state higher education board (if there is one), or the state education board or department; and (c) formal agreements among the colleges. Do not count as state policy the fact that Community Colleges simply do the same thing in common.

(Please check all answers that apply)

	YES, state policy exists. State <u>requires</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>specifically funds</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>indirectly funds</u> this activity.	NO State Policy Exists	Don't Know if there is a State Policy
Colleges keeping down their tuition and fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Colleges maintaining open door admissions (e.g. – not requiring high school diploma or minimum GPA or test score)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Colleges reaching out to high school students (e.g. early outreach programs; dual-credit programs)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Q10. How do you rate the **effectiveness** of each of the following **state policies** in fostering greater access to the Community College by minority students ? How about low-income students? *CATI: Only read-in statements that are “State Policy Exists” in Q9 series.*

<i>State Policies influencing...</i>	<u>Minority Students</u>			<u>Low-Income Students (below the poverty line)</u>		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Colleges keeping down their tuition and fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges maintaining open door admissions (e.g. not requiring high school diploma or minimum GPA or test score)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Colleges reaching out to high school students (e.g. early outreach programs; dual-credit programs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11. What specific actions **should** the state government take -- but does not now -- to increase the number of minority and low-income students entering the Community College? Please spell out these needed policies in detail.

We would like to ask you what policies your state now has in place in order to influence how well minority and low-income students **succeed once they are in the community college.**

Q12. Does your state government have the following kinds of policies affecting student **success** in the Community College by minority and low-income students?

NOTE: Please treat these as state policies: (a) state legislation; (b) policies issued by the state Community College board or system, the state higher education board (if there is one), or the state education board or department; and (c) formal agreements among the colleges. Do not count as state policy simply the fact that the Community Colleges do the same thing in common.

(Please check all answers that apply)

	YES, state policy exists. State <u>requires</u> this activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>specifically</u> <u>funds this</u> activity.	YES, state policy exists. State <u>indirectly</u> <u>funds this</u> activity.	NO State Policy Exists	Don't Know if there is a State Policy
Academic Counseling and guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Career Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-Academic (personal) Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Two-year to Four-year transfer assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Four-year colleges providing courses at Community Colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community Colleges offering their own BA/BS degrees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Easing student movement from non-credit to credit programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Remedial or developmental education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q13. How do you rate the **effectiveness** of each of the following **state policies** in fostering greater success of minority students in the Community College? How about low-income students? *CATI: Only read-in statements that are “State Policy Exists” in Q13 series.*

<i>State Policies influencing...</i>	<u>Minority Students</u>			<u>Low-Income Students (below the poverty line)</u>		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Academic Counseling and guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Career Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-Academic (personal) Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Two-year to Four-year transfer assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Four-year colleges providing courses at Community Colleges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community Colleges offering their own BA/BS degrees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Easing student movement from non-credit to credit programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Remedial or developmental education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14. What specific actions **should** state government take -- but does not now -- to increase the **success** of minority and low-income students who enter the Community College? Please spell out these needed policies in detail.

Q15. Does your state collect data on Community College performance (e.g. – rates of access, retention, graduation, successful remediation, job placement, etc.)?

- YES, state does collect data on Community College performance
- NO, state does NOT collect data on Community College performance
- Don't Know if the state collects data on Community College performance

CATI - Ask Q16 only if Q15 is “YES.”

Q16. How does your state use data on Community College performance with regard to either access or success for minority or low-income students?

	Low usage	Medium Usage	High Usage
Used by your state government to improve its own access and/or success policies for minority and low-income Community College students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used by your state government to push community colleges to improve their access and success efforts to help minority and low-income Community College students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used by your state government to decide how much money a Community College should get from the state (e.g. – performance funding or budgeting).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used by your Community Colleges themselves to improve their own access and success practices to help their minority and low-income students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

We very much appreciate your candid and thorough answers. Please be assured that they will be very useful to our research and that we will keep them entirely confidential.

ENDNOTES

¹ The figure for Black, non-Hispanics was 76% (Ingels et al., 2002).

² Meanwhile, among high school graduates in 1992 who entered the community college within the next two years, 62% had secured a college degree or attended a four-year college by 2000, but the figures for Blacks, Hispanics, and students in the lowest quartile in socioeconomic status (SES) were only 51%, 47%, and 51%, respectively (Hoachlander, Sikora, & Horn, 2003).

³ The SPIDO is maintained by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Pathways to College Network.

⁴ This estimate controlled for differences between states in public four-year college tuition, financial aid spending, state unemployment rate, and state fixed effects (Heller, 1999: 73)..

⁵ Based on Edward St. John's analysis of the national High School and Beyond dataset. The study controlled for student socioeconomic background, high school grades, tested ability, and curricular track.

⁶ At the same time, other states—such as Arizona, Nevada, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia, and Connecticut— have considered legislation to provide in-state tuition but those bills have been defeated.

⁷ This study used a fixed-effects model estimating enrollments in multiple years in the 1990's and controlling for differences among the states in population composition (SES, race, and education of adults), structure of the higher education system, public instate undergraduate tuition, and state tax rate (St. John et al., 2004: 10-11).

⁸ For this table, we do not focus on need-based aid for three reasons. First, it is hard to secure reliable state-by-state breakdowns on how much need-based aid goes to community college students. Secondly, a fair amount of state aid is given on the basis both of need and "merit." Finally, some "merit" aid does not always impose stringent requirements for academic performance: the required grade point average may only be a 2.5 or higher.

⁹ To calculate the FTE aid to tuition ratios we used essentially the same methodology used by the Center for the Study of Educational Policy at Illinois State University (2006) to calculate its Aid to Tuition Ratio. We derived state student aid spending for community college students in the academic year 2004-05 from data reported by the National Association of State Student Grant Aid Programs through its Annual Survey Query Tool (www.nassgap.org/customquery/CQB01ListQueries.aspx). To determine per FTE spending, these gross student aid figures were divided by the full-time equivalent public two-year college enrollments for fall 2004, as reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (2005: Table 200). In turn, to determine the purchasing power of this per FTE student aid, we divided the per FTE student aid figures by the average community college tuition and fees for resident students in each state in 2004-05. These figures come from the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (2006: Table 9). States differ greatly in what proportion of their college students come from out of state. Failure to take this into account can lead to understating how much student aid is really available for students in a state since out of state students would typically not be eligible – at least initially -- for a state's student aid program. Hence, Table 3 offers an aid to tuition estimate corrected for the actual number of students who are instate residents. These data come from the National Center for Education Statistics (2005: Table 202). However, as noted in the text, the publicly reported federal figures for student residence and migration are for all college students in a state and not for community college students specifically. Hence, the correction is not as precise as we would like.

¹⁰ All these figures exclude those respondents who did not think there was a state student aid program for low-income or minority students or, if they believed there was such a program, answered "don't know" as to its effectiveness or degree of coverage.

¹¹ We list a couple of states with question marks because we could not determine with certainty if they have state policies or just institutional initiatives.

¹² These figures are, if anything, an underestimate. The federal survey relies on college self-reports and these may be biased downwards for a number of reasons. Colleges may under-report actual numbers in remedial classes out of a desire to not appear substandard. Moreover, many courses may be indeed remedial but not considered or reported so by a college. For example, colleges vary in whether they consider ESL courses as remedial. Moreover, courses that are typically college level may be informally converted into remedial when an instructor finds student skills are too low. Yet, the students in such informally remedialized courses are not reported as remedial. Finally, remedial courses are often given by colleges euphemistic titles and designations that hide their true nature from students and, perhaps not infrequently, the institutional researchers filling out the federal survey (Deil-Amen & Rosenbaum, 2002; Dougherty, 2002; Grubb et al., 1999).

¹³ These issues do not exhaust the important issues that concern state policy toward remedial or developmental education. Also important, but attracting less attention, are such issues as whether remedial education should be a function assigned exclusively to community colleges, what state funding levels should be for remedial education

compared to other kinds of courses, the applicability of state financial aid to developmental ed, whether there should be state-set exit requirements and what form they should take, and what should be done to make sure students do not get mired in remedial education and leave college without a degree.

¹⁴ There is a racial gap in transfer rates, but it is not statistically significant, when we control for differences in socioeconomic status and gender. However, if we compare whites and African Americans of the same social class, high school academic preparation, and educational aspirations (removing the advantage that African American have of higher aspirations than whites of the same social class), then a significant racial gap in transfer rates emerges (Dougherty and Kienzl, 2006).

¹⁵ We did not ask such questions of our other respondents because we believed they would be much less knowledgeable about the existence and effectiveness of specific state policies governing transfer.

¹⁶ The ultimate impact of the community college baccalaureate on community colleges and on students is a matter of great contention. Some have hailed it as resolving many of the structural problems involved in trying to arrange the seamless movement of community college students toward the baccalaureate, insofar as that movement has heretofore required students to move from one kind of institution to a very different one, resulting in a considerable hampering of student success (Dougherty, 2002: 329-330). Others have argued that it may be very difficult to offer baccalaureate programs of any quality and the baccalaureate-offering two-year college may cease to be truly a community college (Townsend, 2005).

¹⁷ Floyd (2006) – but not Glennon (2005) -- lists Arkansas as a community college baccalaureate state. This once was true when University of Arkansas at Fort Smith (once Westark Community College) was once a community college. However, it is no longer a two-year institution and none of the remaining two-year institutions are allowed to offer baccalaureate degrees.

¹⁸ The eight community colleges are Chipola, Daytona, Edison, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, Indian River, Miami-Dade, Okaloosa-Walton, and St. Petersburg.

¹⁹ States also use performance budgeting, in which they state that state allocations will be informed by institutional performance but no explicit formula is used, unlike performance funding (Burke and Minassians, 2003). However, it is difficult to determine the degree to which performance budgeting differs from performance reporting in impact and even process.

²⁰ Burke and Minassians had 14 states with performance funding for community colleges in 2003. They include Texas, where our intensive state policy did not find performance funding. However, we did find performance funding in another two states -- New Mexico and Virginia -- that installed it after Burke and Minassian's survey (Dougherty, Reid, and Nienhuser, 2006).

²¹ Besides dropping performance funding, states also reduced the proportion of state funding for community colleges that was allocated on the basis of performance formulae (Dougherty and Hong, 2006).

²² An interesting feature of these evaluations was how many answered "don't know." Depending on the question, between 13 and 24% of our respondents did not give an answer. We are not sure how to interpret this larger than normal lack of response beyond the possibility that performance accountability systems are simply not a well known part of state's policy landscape.

²³ This is not to say that state officials could not also be skeptical about how much impact performance data have on state policymaking. A state higher education official in Connecticut noted: "Let me also be brutally honest about the state's accountability report... no one knows what to do with it. The policy makers themselves don't have time for that detail, don't understand the detail."

²⁴ We used a four-point scale for evaluating the effectiveness of state student aid, and a three-point scale for the other policies.

²⁵ This holds for evaluations of state use of performance data (whether to craft state policy or to push community colleges) but not for evaluation of community college usage, which receives a more favorable rating.

²⁶ Our thanks to Margaret Rivera of AACC for supplying us with the names and contact information of the state community college directors, the state association heads, and the community college presidents. And our thanks to Paul Lingenfelter of the State Higher Education Executive Officers for the names and contact information of the state higher educational executive officers.

²⁷ We are thankful to Abeo Anderson of the NBCSL for supplying their names and contact information.

²⁸ Our thanks to Rosalind Gold of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials for supplying their names.

²⁹ We are grateful to Dr. John Jackson and Alexis Smith of the NAACP Education Department for their help in this regard.

³⁰ Our thanks to Brent Wilkes, executive director of LULAC, for supplying these names.