Over past 25 years, we’ve made a lot of progress on the access side.
Immediate College-Going Up

Recent High School Graduates

Most High School Grads Go On To Postsecondary Within 2 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Postsecondary Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entered Public 2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered 4-Year Colleges</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Postsecondary</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College-going up for all groups.
College-Going Increasing for Recent* High School Grads at All Income Levels

* Percent of high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school

** Due to small sample sizes, 3-year averages used for Low-income category

Immediate* College-Going Increasing for All Racial/Ethnic Groups: 1980 to 2005

* Percent of high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school

But though college-going up for minorities, gains among whites have been greater
All Groups Up In College-Going from 1980-2005, But Gaps Also Increase

And though college going up for low-income students, they still haven’t reached rate of high income students in mid-seventies.
## College Going by Family Income, 1973 – 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Mid Income</th>
<th>High Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note:
Income data were not available for 1974.

Highest Achieving Low-Income Students Attend Postsecondary at Same Rate as Bottom Achieving High Income Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level (in quartiles)</th>
<th>Low-Income</th>
<th>High-Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First (Low)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth (High)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NELS: 88, Second (1992) and Third Follow up (1994); in, USDOE, NCES, NCES Condition of Education 1997 p. 64
But access isn’t the only issue:

There’s a question of access to what…
Figure 4: Distribution of Beginning Postsecondary Students by Institutional Type and Race/Ethnicity: 2003–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Vocational/Proprietary</th>
<th>Public Two-Year</th>
<th>Public Four-Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of National Postsecondary Student Aid Study: 2003 – 2004 (NPSAS) by Ken Redd for the Education Trust
And what about graduation?
Black and Latino Freshmen Complete College at Lower Rates
(6 Year Rates; All 4-Year Institutions)

Overall rate: 55%

And from 2-year institutions?

Lower still.
California Community Colleges: Success Rates for Degree-Bound Freshmen*

Shulock, Nancy. Excludes students who did not complete at least 10 credits.
The result?

Increases in college completion not commensurate with increases in college going.
College Going vs. Completion of BA or Higher, White

- Immediate College-going refers to the percentage of high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school. Percent attaining their BA refers to the percentage of 25-29 year-olds with a BA or higher.

Immediate College-going refers to the percentage of high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school. Percent attaining their BA refers to the percentage of 25-29 year-olds with a BA or higher.


- Black College-Going
- Black Completion
Immediate College-going refers to the percentage of high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school. Percent attaining their BA refers to the percentage of 25-29 year-olds with a BA or higher.

Add it all up...
Different groups of young Americans obtain degrees at very different rates.
Some Americans Are Much Less Likely to Graduate From College

**Bachelor’s Degree Attainment for 25 – 29 Year Olds by Race, 2005**

- **White:** 34%
- **Black:** 18%
- **Hispanic:** 11%

Some Americans Are Much Less Likely to Graduate From College: B.A. Rates by Age 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young People From</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High SES Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young People From</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low SES Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES is a weighted variable developed by NCES, which includes parental education levels and occupations and family income. “High” and “low” refer to the highest and lowest quartiles of SES.

These gaps threaten the health of our democracy. But they are also especially worrisome given which groups are growing...and which aren’t.
There is Rapid Growth Among Groups Who Already Are Under-Represented

Projected Increase in the Population of 25-64 Year-Olds, 2000 to 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Projections
Not surprisingly, our international lead is slipping away

We’re still relatively strong (although no longer in the lead) with all adults.
U.S.: 3rd Out of 30 Industrialized Nations in Overall Postsecondary Degree Attainment (B.A. & A.A.)

Percent of Adults Ages 25-64 with Associates Degree or Higher

But the U.S. is 9th out of 30 countries in the percentage of younger workers with A.A. degree or higher.

… and the U.S. is one of only two countries where there is no increase in college attainment among younger workers.

To reach top performing countries

WHAT’S GOING ON?

Many in higher education would like to believe that this is mostly about lousy high schools and stingy federal and state policymakers.
They are not all wrong.
Low Income and Minority Students Continue to be Clustered in Schools where we spend less…
## Nation:
### Inequities in State and Local Revenue Per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Poverty vs. Low Poverty Districts</td>
<td>-$907 per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Minority vs. Low Minority Districts</td>
<td>-$614 per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** The Education Trust, The Funding Gap 2005. Data are for 2003
...expect less
Students in Poor Schools Receive ‘A’s for Work That Would Earn ‘Cs’ in Affluent Schools

…teach them less
Fewer Latino students are enrolled in Algebra 2

Source: CCSSO, State Indicators of Science and Mathematics Education, 2001
African American, Latino & Native American high school graduates are less likely to have been enrolled in a full college prep track.

Full College Prep track is defined as at least: 4 years of English, 3 years of math, 2 years of natural science, 2 years of social science and 2 years of foreign language.

...and assign them our least qualified teachers.
More Classes in High-Poverty, High-Minority Schools Taught By Out-of-Field Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High poverty</th>
<th>Low poverty</th>
<th>High minority</th>
<th>Low minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: High Poverty school-50% or more of the students are eligible for free/reduced price lunch. Low-poverty school -15% or fewer of the students are eligible for free/reduced price lunch.

High-minority school - 50% or more of the students are nonwhite. Low-minority school- 15% or fewer of the students are nonwhite.

*Teachers lacking a college major or minor in the field. Data for secondary-level core academic classes.

Poor and Minority Students Get More Inexperienced* Teachers

*Teachers with 3 or fewer years of experience.

Note: High poverty refers to the top quartile of schools with students eligible for free/reduced price lunch. Low poverty-bottom quartile of schools with students eligible for free/reduced price lunch. High minority-top quartile; those schools with the highest concentrations of minority students. Low minority-bottom quartile of schools with the lowest concentrations of minority students.

While we’re making some progress in addressing these problems in elementary schools...
NAEP Reading, 9 Year-Olds: Record Performance for All Groups

Average Scale Score


African American  Latino  White

Note: Long-Term Trends NAEP
Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress
NAEP Math, 9 Year-Olds: Record Performance for All Groups

Note: Long-Term Trends NAEP

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress
We have not yet turned the corner in our high schools.

Gaps between groups are wider today than they were in 1990.
NAEP Reading, 17 Year-Olds

Average Scale Score


Note: Long-Term Trends NAEP

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress
NAEP Math, 17 Year-Olds

Note: Long-Term Trends NAEP

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 2004 Trends in Academic Progress
And no matter how you cut the data, our performance relative to other countries isn’t much to brag about.
US 15 Year-Olds Rank Near Middle Of The Pack Among 32 Participating Countries: 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>U.S. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>14TH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PISA 2003: US 15 Year-Olds Rank Near The End Of The Pack Among 29 OECD Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>U.S. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20\text{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>24\text{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19\text{th}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2003: U.S. Ranked 24th out of 29 OECD Countries in Mathematics

U.S. Ranks Low in the Percent of Students in the Highest Achievement Level (Level 6) in Math

U.S. Ranks 23rd out of 29 OECD Countries in the Math Achievement of the Highest-Performing Students*

* Students at the 95th Percentile

U.S. Ranks 23rd out of 29 OECD Countries in the Math Achievement of High-SES Students

Even in problem-solving, something we consider an American strength...
PISA 2003: Problem-Solving, US Ranks 24th Out of 29 OECD Countries

So yes, preparation is part of the problem.
And so is government support for financial aid.

Both the federal government and state governments have shifted more and more of their aid resources toward more affluent students.
Figure 2: Federal Tuition and Fee Income Tax Deductions

Distribution of Savings by Family Income Level, 2003

- $50,000 - $99,999: 37%
- $30,000 - $49,999: 11%
- $15,000 - $29,999: 8%
- $100,000 - $199,999: 34%
- <$15,000: 11%

Maximum Pell Grant Coverage of Cost of College

1975: 84%
2005: 36%

East
West
**Figure 3: Distribution of State Grants**

**1994-1995**
- Non-Need: 13%
- Need-Based: 87%

**2004-2005**
- Non-Need: 27%
- Need-Based: 73%

**Source:** National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs, 2005
But colleges and universities are not unimportant actors in this drama of shrinking opportunity, either.
For one thing, the shifts away from poor students in institutional aid money are MORE PRONOUNCED than the shifts in government aid.
Students from Families with Income < $40,000, 1995:
56% of Institutional Aid,
38% of students on Public 4-Year Campuses

Note: These numbers reflect outcomes students in four-year public colleges.

Source: National Postsecondary Student Aid, (2003-2004) data analysis conducted by Jerry Davis for the Education Trust
By 2003, Aid and Enrollment Had Declined For Students from Family Income < $40,000

Note: These figures are for students in four-year public colleges.

Source: National Postsecondary Student Aid, (2003-2004) data analysis conducted by Jerry Davis for the Education Trust
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20K</td>
<td>$3,446</td>
<td>$4,027</td>
<td>$5,240</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 - $39,999</td>
<td>$4,723</td>
<td>$5,430</td>
<td>$6,254</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>$1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 - $59,999</td>
<td>$4,360</td>
<td>$5,982</td>
<td>$6,633</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 - $79,999</td>
<td>$3,386</td>
<td>$5,705</td>
<td>$6,486</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 - $99,999</td>
<td>$2,561</td>
<td>$4,761</td>
<td>$6,472</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>$3,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 Plus</td>
<td>$1,359</td>
<td>$3,321</td>
<td>$4,806</td>
<td>254%</td>
<td>$3,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Avg. Institutional Grant Aid per Full-Time Dependent Undergraduates by Institutional Type and Family Income
### Table 3: Avg. Institutional Grant Aid per Full-Time Dependent Undergraduates by Institutional Type and Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20K</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td>$838</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 - $39,999</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>$777</td>
<td>$1,139</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 - $59,999</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$706</td>
<td>$906</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 - $79,999</td>
<td>$371</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>$581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 - $99,999</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$494</td>
<td>$754</td>
<td>285%</td>
<td>$558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 Plus</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$619</td>
<td>$781</td>
<td>227%</td>
<td>$542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is true even in our most prestigious public universities.

Flagships and other Public Research Extensive Universities
Flagships spend more money on aid than their students receive from either federal or state sources.

They could choose to cushion the effects of increased cost on poor students. But they don’t.
Big increases in spending on high income students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $20K</td>
<td>$196.6</td>
<td>$171.0</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 - $39,999</td>
<td>$187.0</td>
<td>$288.3</td>
<td>$101.3</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 - $59,999</td>
<td>$122.2</td>
<td>$229.2</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 - $79,999</td>
<td>$82.5</td>
<td>$259.6</td>
<td>$177.1</td>
<td>214.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 - $99,999</td>
<td>$25.2</td>
<td>$147.3</td>
<td>$122.1</td>
<td>484.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>$50.8</td>
<td>$257.3</td>
<td>$206.5</td>
<td>406%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$664.3</td>
<td>$1,353</td>
<td>$688.4</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typical institutional grant recipient in low-income family now gets LESS than typical grant recipient in high income family.

**Table 5. Change in Institutional Aid to Grant Recipients at REUs, by Family Income, 1995–2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>% Change 95 to 03</th>
<th>Amt. Change 95 to 03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20K</td>
<td>$3,756</td>
<td>$3,691</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 - $39,999</td>
<td>$2,871</td>
<td>$3,479</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 - $59,999</td>
<td>$2,554</td>
<td>$3,616</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 - $79,999</td>
<td>$2,503</td>
<td>$3,676</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 - $99,999</td>
<td>$1,998</td>
<td>$3,423</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 +</td>
<td>$3,223</td>
<td>$3,823</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So it’s not all about the students. What colleges do is important.
Moreover, what colleges do also turns out to be very important in whether students graduate or not.
Current College Completion Rates: 4-Year Colleges

• Approximately 4 in 10 entering freshmen obtain a Bachelor’s degree within 4 years;
• Within six years of entry, that proportion rises to about 6 in 10.
But graduation rates vary widely across the nation’s postsecondary institutions.

Chart 6
Six-Year Graduation Rate, Entering Class of 1996 Full-Time, First-Time, Degree Seeking Freshmen

Some of these differences are clearly attributable to differences in student preparation and/or institutional mission. But not all…
Some colleges are far more successful than their students’ “stats” would suggest.
### Doc/Research Institutions With Similar Students Getting Different Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Median SAT</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>% Pell</th>
<th>Overall 6 Yr-Grad Rate</th>
<th>White/URM Grad Rate Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>33,975</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>27,711</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>33,901</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Washington</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>25,059</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Minnesota</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>28,273</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Masters Level Institutions With Similar Students Getting Different Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Median SAT</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>% Pell</th>
<th>Overall 6 Yr-Grad Rate</th>
<th>URM 6-Yr Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millersville U of PA</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>6369</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Plattsburgh</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW MO State</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>5043</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan U</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>7831</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Median SAT</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>% Pell</td>
<td>Overall 6 Yr-Grad Rate</td>
<td>URM 6-Yr Grad Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City (NC)</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State (NC)</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>3820</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Ark Pine Bluff</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin State (MD)</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>2691</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Results Online

Welcome to College Results Online

The Education Trust is a national nonprofit that works for the high academic achievement of all students at all levels – pre-kindergarten through college.

This interactive Web tool, created by The Education Trust, allows you to learn more about student graduation rates at four-year colleges and universities.

College Results Online allows you to:
- Examine overall graduation rates and see how those rates have changed over time
- Learn about universities' records graduating diverse groups of students
- Compare the graduation rates of similar institutions - colleges and universities that share many characteristics and serve similar student populations

Our information is drawn from the nation's most comprehensive database of institution graduation rates, the U.S. Department of Education's Graduation Rate Survey.

College Results Online demonstrates that similar schools have vastly different rates of success with similar students.

Additional Resources

Recent Education Trust reports
- Reports and analyses of graduation rates

Other Web sites with related higher education data
- The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education’s national report card on higher education
- National Center for Education Statistics' College Opportunities Online
- National Information Center for Higher Education Policymaking and Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Report</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Median SAT</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>Student Related Expenditures /FTE</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Pct Pell</th>
<th>Pct UR Min</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Of Illinois At Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>IL Public 1,240 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$8,450</td>
<td>20,472</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Florida</td>
<td>FL Public 1,240 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$11,931</td>
<td>32,139</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>TX Public 1,185 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$12,147</td>
<td>33,301</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick</td>
<td>NJ Public 1,190 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25,854</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Georgia</td>
<td>GA Public 1,205 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$8,108</td>
<td>23,780</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Texas At Austin</td>
<td>TX Public 1,230 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$10,328</td>
<td>36,862</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>MI Public 1,125 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$11,531</td>
<td>32,361</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Colorado At Boulder</td>
<td>CO Public 1,165 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$11,107</td>
<td>24,779</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>IA Public 1,125 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$8,385</td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>IN Public 1,145 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$10,177</td>
<td>30,470</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>FL Public 1,150 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$7,163</td>
<td>37,183</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>CO Public 1,105 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$7,551</td>
<td>20,043</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>LA Public 1,125 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$7,811</td>
<td>24,523</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Arizona</td>
<td>AZ Public 1,115 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$10,467</td>
<td>25,033</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>TX Public 1,120 Doctoral/Research Extensive</td>
<td>$7,899</td>
<td>21,085</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Central Florida</td>
<td>FL Public 1,140 Doctoral/Research Intensive</td>
<td>$6,103</td>
<td>28,034</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bottom Line:

• So yes, we have to keep working to improve our high schools;
• But we’ve got to focus on improving our colleges, too.
Mississippi:
What do the numbers tell us?
8th grade

Highest grade for which National Assessment data are available by state.
2007 NAEP Grade 8 Reading
Average Overall Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 281

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Reading
Average African American Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 281

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Reading Average White Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 281

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Reading
Average Poor Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 281

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Math
Average Overall Scale Scores by State


Proficient Scale Score: 299
2007 NAEP Grade 8 Math
Average African American Scale Scores by State

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Math
Average White Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 299

2007 NAEP Grade 8 Math
Average Poor Scale Scores by State

Proficient Scale Score: 299

Some recent progress, especially in math at lower grades
NAEP Grade 4 Math
Movement Out of Below Basic, Overall, 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top States</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Hawaii</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>26% to 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rankings are for the 40 states with Overall data in both 2000 and 2007. Data refer to the *percentage point difference* between the percent of students at Below Basic in 2007 and 2000.

### NAEP Grade 4 Math
Movement Out of Below Basic, African American, 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top States</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas, Kentucky</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS, OH, SC, VA, WV</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>33% to 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rankings are for the 32 states with African American data in both 2000 and 2007. Data refer to the *percentage point difference* between the percent of students at Below Basic in 2007 and 2000.

**Source:** National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP Data Explorer, [http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/)
High School, College
College Going Rate for Recent High School Graduates: Mississippi Top Third (2004)

Source: Postsecondary.org
But When High School Dropout Rate is Factored In, State Performance Drops to Bottom Quarter

( HS Grad. Rate x College Continuation Rate, 2004)

Source: Postsecondary.org
Six-Year College Graduation Rates: Mississippi Middle Third (2005)

Source: Ed Trust Analysis of IPEDS data. First-time, full-time freshmen completing a BA within 6 years.
Overall Six-Year Graduation Rates for Largest Public University: Mississippi Bottom Quarter, 2005

Source: Ed Trust Analysis of IPEDS data
Six-Year Graduation Rates for African Americans at Largest Public University: Mississippi Below Average, 2005

Source: Ed Trust Analysis of IPEDS data
Adults Ages 25-64 with at least Associate’s Degrees:
Mississippi Bottom Quarter

Source: NCHEMS - calculated using data from U.S. Census Bureau
Adults 25+ with at least Bachelor’s Degrees
Mississippi Bottom Quarter

Looking ahead?
The College Educated Population In Mississippi: Today and Tomorrow

Percent of Adults Ages 25-64 with College Degrees

|          | MISSISSIPPI | USA          | USA Projected | Best-Performing Nations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCHEMS; estimates calculated using data from US Census Bureau; [http://www.makingopportunityaffordable.org/adding-it-up/p04/](http://www.makingopportunityaffordable.org/adding-it-up/p04/)
What can we do?
Several high-leverage places to focus
First, let’s be clear: improving high schools is hugely important.
Far too many of our high schools—especially those serving concentrations of poor and minority students—don’t prepare their students for much of anything.
But let us also be clear that it doesn’t have to be that way.

Some schools serving exactly the same students manage to produce much, much higher achievement.
Elmont Memorial Junior-Senior High School
Elmont Memorial Junior-Senior High School
Elmont, New York

- 1,966 Students in Grades 7-12
- 75% African American
- 12% Latino

Elmont Memorial
Higher Percentage of Students Meeting Graduation Requirements than the State, Class of 2004 Regents English

Elmont Memorial
Higher Percentage of Students Meeting Graduation Requirements than the State,
Class of 2004 Regents Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Elmont</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Poor</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Park Campus School
University Park Campus School
Worcester, Massachusetts

- 220 Students in Grades 7-12
- 9% African American
- 18% Asian
- 35% Latino
- 39% White
- 73% Low-Income

Source: Massachusetts Department of Education School Profile, http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/
University Park Results: 2004

- 100% of 10th graders passed MA high school exit exam on first attempt.
- 87% passed at advanced or proficient level.
- Fifth most successful school in the state, surpassing many schools serving wealthy students.
These schools, however, exceptions.

We need them to be the rule.
Work on aligning standards, assessments and high school course requirements matters a lot.

American Diploma Project
But everybody in this room knows that policy alignment is only the first—and perhaps the easiest—step.
To get students to these standards, teachers will need:

• Robust curriculum materials;
• Help designing powerful units, assignments;
• Help mastering the array of teaching strategies necessary to get all learners to much higher standards;
• Better data on how their students are doing along the way.
This is particularly fertile ground for high school/college collaboration.
What to do on the higher education side?

Six suggestions.
1. Get folks engaged in looking at their data.

Yes, the numbers will often suggest the need for better preparation. But they will also typically show that we’re not doing so well even by the students who meet our definition of “prepared.”
NASH/EdTrust Math Success Initiative

9 Systems Analyzing Data on Student Success in Math Courses
Participating Systems

- State Univ System of Florida
- University System of Georgia
- University of Hawaii System
- Purdue University
- State University of New York
- Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Ed
- University of Louisiana System
- Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning
- Nevada System of Higher Education
Some Initial Findings

- Large numbers of remedial students not successful—either withdraw or fail.
- Large D, F, W rates in first several credit-bearing courses.
- Preparation matters. Students who have higher ACT math subscores, for example, more likely to be successful. BUT prep levels only explain a small part of success (ACT around one-third; SAT even less).
- Math coursework taken during senior year important. Many students taking courses below Algebra 1.
- In many cases, students who test as non-ready have success rates in non-remedial courses equal to those in the remedial courses designed for them. (California Community Colleges, too.)
- Wide differences in these rates even among comparable institutions.
Much more to learn—including how big the differences are among faculty members—but clear indicators for action.
2. Do a close analysis of student progression through your institutions and ACT on what you learn.
Two states in our network—KY and NV—have done such analyses, focused specifically on students with developmental needs.

Conclusion: Student who take those courses immediately on entry are much more likely to succeed.
Both now have new policies.
University of Northern Iowa “Path Analysis”:
Not enough sections of key courses.

By adding just a few sections, unblocked clogged arteries…and student success went up.
#3. Learn from your own high performers.
Almost every system has found some campuses that get better results. Important to understand what they are doing.

Should be looking at the data by faculty member, as well, and working to understand teaching practices that work.
4. Take on introductory courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State U</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State U</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio CC</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Alabama</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Missouri-SL</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Greensboro</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State U</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Academic Transformation
Drop-Failure-Withdrawal Rates
Other Disciplines

- Calhoun CC  Statistics  35%
- Chattanooga State  Psychology  37%
- Drexel  U  Computing  51%
- IUPUI  Sociology  39%
- SW MN State U  Biology  37%
- Tallahassee CC  English Comp  46%
- U of Iowa  Chemistry  25%
- U of New Mexico  Psychology  39%
- U of S Maine  Psychology  28%
- UNC-Greensboro  Statistics  70%

Source: National Center for Academic Transformation
Of course, some of this may be about preparation. But clearly not all...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, totally eliminated black/white gap in course outcomes.

Same students.
Same preparation.
Different results.
#5. Set some stretch goals.
A lot of systems, campuses don’t set goals. At best, report increases or decreases. Those numbers can be seriously misleading. But they also don’t inspire or engage.
New NASH Access to Success Initiative: One example of an effort to set serious stretch goals, measure and report progress over time.

Goal?
By 2015 to reduce by at least half the gaps in college going and college success that separate low-income students and students of color from others.
#6. How about teacher preparation?
This area, too, is a place where folks in higher ed can just throw up their hands.

“Until those K-12 people raise salaries to a decent level and don’t hire anybody who can fog a mirror, there’s no way that we can raise our standards.”
But, some higher ed leaders aren’t throwing up their hands.
• Louisiana: Blue Ribbon Commission;
• North Carolina: System Leadership on Teacher Pay Issues.
#7. Finally, what about mounting a big effort to increase need-based state aid, as well as rethinking how we use our institutional aid dollars?
Over the past few decades, role of higher education has been transformed from agent of opportunity and mobility, to another agent of stratification.
Perhaps not surprising, given the relentless march of privilege in our society and the tendency of privileged people to demand ever more.
But…that’s not why most of us in higher education got into this business.

Somehow, we’ve got to find a way to refocus our energies and our resources.
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