

The Role of Intergovernmental Relations in K-12 to Higher Education Transitions

Michael W. Kirst
Michael D. Usdan
Brent Evans
Jon Valant

* * * * *

The majority of American students who successfully complete high school today reach graduation without satisfying even the minimal qualifications for admission to a four-year college or university (Green and Forster, 2003). For some students, this is neither surprising nor troubling, as they understand the paths ahead of them and have little interest in pursuing postsecondary education. For others who have done everything asked of them to receive a diploma, high school graduation brings with it a harsh lesson about the chasm between America's K-12 and postsecondary education systems.

In this paper, we explore the transition between American secondary and postsecondary institutions and how it is shaped by intra- and intergovernmental relations. At its core, we believe that the problem is one of failed governmental coordination. Although the history and depth of the divide is discouraging for those hoping for a seamless transition between K-12 and higher education, greater coordination between state agencies and across local, state, and federal governments could hold the key to ensuring that students are prepared to succeed in college and the workforce.

The paper begins with an outline of the obstacles impeding the high school to college transition, which is rife with academic and non-academic hurdles for students and inefficiencies for local and state governments. We then examine five historical explanations for the divide

between K-12 and higher education. Next, we identify the roles of state and local actors and discuss how intra- and intergovernmental collaboration can help or hinder this transition. Finally, we describe some particular types of governmental collaboration, including P-16 and P-20 councils, and consider what the federal “Race to the Top” competition teaches us about a possible federal role in bridging the gap between America’s K-12 and higher education systems.

Barriers to transition from K-12 to higher education and the accompanying costs

The chasm between K-12 and higher education as experienced by students

The path to college attendance and success is littered with academic, informational, financial, and social hurdles. We discuss the academic hurdles in greatest detail, as curricular misalignment leaves many high school graduates poorly equipped for the academic rigors of college. Nevertheless, non-academic hurdles deserve attention as well. Consider the consequences of failing to inform high school students and their families about the benefits of a college degree, its often-overestimated and little-understood financial costs (Grotsky and Jones, 2007), the strategies and skills most important to postsecondary success, and characteristics of life on a college campus. Without local actors, who have unparalleled access to their students and best understand their needs, effectively coordinating with state actors, who understand the demands of higher education and have policymaking authority, the transition between secondary and postsecondary education will continue to be unnecessarily difficult and dysfunctional.

The costs of misalignment between K-12 and higher education

The costs of these barriers are borne by both students and society. Some students will be surprised to find that doing everything asked of them to receive a high school diploma was not enough to ensure eligibility for credit-bearing coursework in even a two-year college. Others will leave high school poorly informed about the benefits and costs of college, making life-defining decisions that they could later regret. Still others might find themselves minimally qualified for entering college but poorly equipped for its rigors, victims of “the assumption that the responsibility of K-12 teachers ends with college admissions rather than college success, while the responsibility of higher education begins with the admissions process rather than any significant involvement in the preparation of students up to that point” (Boswell, 2000, pp. 5-6).

Poor secondary-postsecondary alignment creates costs that reach beyond preventing students from enrolling in college. Many students lacking the academic preparation for college courses must enroll in remedial classes if they are to remain in school at all. Drawing from a national dataset, one study found that 40% of traditional students take at least one remedial course, and remediation rates for non-traditional students are even higher (Attewell et al., 2006). The Alliance for Excellence in Education (2006) estimated the direct costs of providing remedial courses to recent high school graduates at \$1.4 billion per year, with another \$2.3 billion lost because these students are more likely to leave college without a degree and reduce their earning potential. These premature postsecondary departures can bring both extensive losses in human capital and a failure to meet particular local (and national) labor market needs. In other words, the costs of the gap between our K-12 and higher education systems reach well beyond the individuals required to cross it.

We turn now to an exploration of the origins of this divide.

Historical explanations for the divide between secondary and postsecondary institutions

Understanding the gap between K-12 and higher education in America today requires telling the story of two entities that were once closely entwined but have gradually drifted apart. Kirst and Usdan (2009) identified five historical developments that led to this secondary-postsecondary gap. In this section, we summarize their findings before examining the role of intergovernmental relations in student transitions from high school to college. We encourage readers to see their article for a more thorough discussion of these historical developments.

Disjointed curricula for grades 10 to 14

With nearly half of the country's colleges having few, if any, requirements for admission in the late 1800s, the National Education Association assembled the "Committee of Ten" to examine the nation's curricula and propose academic standards for secondary schools (Ravitch, 2000). The Committee, comprised of college presidents, school principals, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, proposed that high school students should receive deep, broad training in the academic subjects. Although only a select few would enroll in college, the Committee argued that "it is obviously desirable that the colleges and scientific schools should be accessible to all boys or girls who have completed creditably the secondary school course" (Committee of Ten, 1894). Its report sparked the establishment of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), which, in 1900, provided uniform academic standards and a syllabus to help students prepare for the CEEB's college entrance examinations. Shortly thereafter, the University of California began accrediting high schools whose curricula were deemed adequate for preparing students for college. A trend was developing. Educational reformers were

pushing the nation's high schools to prepare their students for the academic rigors of college even though few of those students would ever enroll themselves.

By 1920, however, the trend toward a common, rigorous, college preparatory curriculum had been replaced by broadened, differentiated programs that tracked students based on their perceived ability – or inability – to master traditional academic work (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). The “Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education” embraced this differentiation (U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Education, 1918) and facilitated the later development of comprehensive “shopping mall” high schools. These schools offered a rigorous academic curriculum as just one of many choices available to the student consumer (Powell, Farrar, and Cohen, 1985).

For many years, Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs constituted the only major efforts to build a coherent curriculum across secondary and postsecondary schools (Conley, 2005). Although popular, these non-governmental programs have targeted a relatively small group of high-achieving students. More recently, there have been some signs of progress. Dual enrollment programs have grown more inclusive, creating opportunities for both academically and vocationally minded students to earn college credit for high school coursework (Karp et al., 2007). Of particular consequence, the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers recently spearheaded the Common Core State Standards Initiative, which proposed a set of K-12 mathematics and English language arts standards. This state-led, federally endorsed effort aimed to “define the knowledge and skills students should have within their K-12 education careers so that they will graduate high school able to succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing academic college courses and in workforce

training programs” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010a). Later in the paper, we examine the federal government’s role in encouraging states to adopt these standards.

The evolution of teacher preparation programs

The chasm between high school and college curriculum that grew during the 20th century is one historical development key to understanding how the K-12 to college transition has become so difficult for many American students. Another important development is the changing nature of teacher education programs and what this evolution has meant for the relationship between K-12 institutions (individual schools and local school districts) and postsecondary institutions (state-operated colleges and universities).

Early 20th-century teacher education programs in the United States took the form of “normal schools,” which offered two-year postsecondary programs that sought to establish common standards for teaching. Many of these normal schools – of which there were 264 in 1910 (Dunham, 1969) – transformed into teachers college later in the century. These colleges, which were often governed by K-12 state boards of education, were closely linked to K-12 schools, enabling frequent, close interaction between elementary, secondary, and postsecondary personnel. In time, though, this connection became tenuous, as teachers colleges grew into multipurpose state colleges and universities that saw linkages between their institutions and K-12 teachers and students as a low priority relative to more prestigious, academic pursuits.

The detachment of community colleges from high schools

Much like teachers colleges, the country's community colleges have gradually distanced themselves from K-12 schools (Brint and Karabel, 1989). Initially funded and operated like public schools offering the 13th and 14th grades, community colleges underwent drastic changes in the latter half of the 20th century. Between 1950 and 1970, community college enrollment increased from 217,000 to 1.63 million (Callan, 1997), and governance in many cases split from K-12 systems as local community college governing boards developed. Community colleges also began accepting increasing numbers of nontraditional students, many of whom were long removed from their elementary and secondary education days. This reduced the need to coordinate with high schools, as these schools became just one of many sources of incoming community college students. Today, high school students planning to attend community college are often unfamiliar with these colleges' policies. The Stanford Bridge Project, for example, found that most of these students were unaware that satisfying their high schools' graduation standards might not be enough to ensure entry into credit-bearing courses if they performed poorly on the community colleges' placement tests (Kirst, Venezia, and Antonio, 2004).

Divided governance and finance

Although local actors – including school administrators, teachers, school board members, superintendents, and mayors – exert considerable influence over K-12 schooling, many decisions about K-12 policy happen at the state level, often through state boards of education. Still, state-level K-12 and postsecondary governing bodies tend to be largely detached from one another.

The post-World War II growth of public colleges and universities led to a reorganization of higher education governance. Fewer than half of the states had a governing, coordinating, or planning agency responsible for all public higher education in 1940, but almost all did by 1979 (Richardson et al., 1999). Today, there is wide variation in states' higher education governing structures, with some states, like Georgia, governing all two-year and four-year colleges and universities through a single Board of Regents and others, like California, using multiple statewide systems of higher education. However, at least one feature seems common to state higher education governance systems: they are largely isolated from K-12 governance systems. Similar isolation exists in the finance and oversight of education by state legislatures. Whereas elementary and secondary schools have historically drawn most of their funding from property taxes, higher education funding comes from an eclectic mix of sources, including tuition, federal grants, and appropriations from state general funds. Moreover, many state legislatures use different substantive and appropriation subcommittees to handle K-12 and postsecondary issues.

A lack of organizational relationships

Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz (1969) examined organizational relationships between K-12 and higher education in the late 1960s, hoping to better understand how cooperation or conflict across these sectors resolve or create challenges to building a coherent education system. In fact, they found little evidence of cooperation or conflict. There were few relationships spanning across the sectors and fewer still with enough depth to be meaningful. Most of the respondents in the 12 states examined simply felt that K-12 and higher education issues were distinct from one another and best managed independently.

Today's state and local actors recognize that K-12 and higher education issues are inextricably linked, though this recognition still has not led to productive systemic collaboration in most jurisdictions.

Summary of historical analysis

Having surveyed the historical developments behind the gap between American secondary and postsecondary institutions, one sees a pattern of increasing separation of actors whose collaboration is critical to ensuring a smooth transition across the gap. Despite such substantial historical and political deterrents, there have been numerous efforts – a few successful, most not – to improve coordination and ease the transition from high school to college. We explore some of those efforts now, considering both “intra-governmental” coordination at the state level and intergovernmental coordination across local and state governments.

State-level “intra-governmental” coordination and the secondary-postsecondary divide

Although the distribution of education governance authority between state and local governments varies across the country, one clear trend is that considerable authority resides with state-level boards, departments, and agencies. In the 1970s, several states attempted to better align their K-12 and postsecondary programs by creating governor-appointed secretaries of education responsible for both sectors. The rationale was that centralized, state-level, K-16 leadership would help bring about more coherent, gap-bridging education policies. These reforms, though not entirely unsuccessful, failed to fulfill their promise, as none delivered K-16 programs as deeply integrated as its reformers intended.

Kirst and Usdan (2009) provided examples of these disappointments in Idaho, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. For the purposes of this article on intergovernmental relations, we turn to examples of coordination between local and state entities.

Local-state intergovernmental coordination and the secondary-postsecondary divide

The precise reason for the struggles of state-level K-16 governing bodies is unclear. What is clear, however, is that the nature of the secondary-postsecondary divide is such that no state organization – or coalition of state organizations – can smooth the transition between secondary schools and postsecondary schools without at least the support of local entities such as school districts. What the state has in policymaking authority and broad vision it lacks in direct access to students and local knowledge. School districts, through the teachers and school staff members that they employ, can reach students directly, choosing which reforms to enthusiastically pursue and which to disregard or halfheartedly execute. The history of educational reform is one in which seemingly good ideas failed to penetrate classroom doors and create meaningful change. Said Michael Fullan, “Educational change is technically simple and socially complex” (Fullan, 2007, p. 84).

In addition to more direct access to students, local actors benefit from grassroots perspective unavailable to institutions of higher education and more distant state-level policymakers. School administrators and teachers directly witness the struggles and decisions of many students who cannot make the leap from high school to college. For colleges and universities, however, these students generally become visible only upon arriving in their admissions offices via written applications. Thus, the most promising efforts to bridge the gap

between secondary and postsecondary education will be those that make use of the policymaking authority and vision of state actors and the access and knowledge of local actors. We now discuss some particular opportunities for local-state intergovernmental collaboration.

P-16/P-20 Councils

One of the most popular strategies for encouraging state and local levels to interact on educational policy is the development of P-16/P-20 councils. The Education Commission of the States reported that as of May 2008, 41 states (see Table 1) had created councils with the purpose of smoothing transitions across the entire lifecycle of education from early childhood through graduate education (Education Commission of the States, 2008). Ideally, councils address these issues by fostering collaboration among disparate policymakers across sectors of the state's educational system. For example, councils may bring together representatives from colleges, school boards, teachers unions, state educational agencies, and the business community to discuss curricular alignment of high school graduation standards and college enrollment requirements. Although widespread, the success of these councils has been mixed because their limited policymaking authority and difficulty outlasting changes in state leadership have compromised their effectiveness.

In order to gain a more thorough understanding of the current state of P-16/P-20 councils nationwide, we turn to data collected by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). Through the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), NCHEMS conducted an open-ended survey of all 50 states' P-16 councils in 2007. Walsh (2009) consolidated the findings into six important themes: governance, data systems,

alignment of coursework and assessments, finance, accountability, and public relations. We focus here on governance and curricular alignment.

Walsh reported that less than twenty percent of states align their secondary achievement exams with college entrance expectations. This gives students a skewed perspective of their level of preparedness for enrolling in an institution of higher education. The study advocated for relying on P-16 councils to push for this alignment and coordinate the curricular requirements that could link high school with college.

The study also outlined key governance barriers that hinder P-16 councils' effectiveness. Limited financial resources, as well as limited staffing, have prevented the councils from fully pursuing their charge. Perhaps more importantly, "a lack of policymaking authority at the state, district, and institutional levels also poses a barrier to P-16 governance" (Walsh, 2009, p.25). This concern speaks directly to the intergovernmental challenges of a state sponsored organization attempting to sway local authorities. Without political clout, the councils can merely convene meetings in an effort to encourage discussion and collaboration across governmental levels and between K-12 and postsecondary policymakers. Patrick Callan has discussed the potential for these councils to become "empty shells" when they mistake activity for progress and fail to significantly reshape policy (Olson, 2006).

Even if the councils are successful at facilitating discussion, few of them excel at fully integrating local governments into the policy discussions at the state level. Many involve only one or two representatives of a large and heterogeneous population of local constituents. For example, Illinois' P-20 Council consists of 29 members but only one representative of a local government and two representatives from local school administrations and school boards

(State of Illinois Appointments, 2009). Delaware's 14-member P-20 Council does not contain any local K-12 representation (Delaware Department of Education, 2011).

To the extent that school districts provide invaluable information about students to the states and states rely on schools to implement state policy, this failure to bridge governmental boundaries seriously hinders reform efforts. In the late 1990s, SHEEO, an association of leaders from state higher education coordinating and governing boards, conducted a study on easing students' transitions from secondary to postsecondary education. One of the resulting policy briefs lauded the advantages of statewide partnership councils and their ability to facilitate communication across sectors, but it also highlighted the necessity of greater local level partnerships (Crowe, 1998). The policy brief emphasized the responsibility of local actors to actually implement state policy and translate the state's goals into actions that best serve their local populations. Because many states' councils do not fully incorporate local actors in their P-16/P-20 efforts, their role and influence has been limited, and they have missed an important opportunity to improve intergovernmental cooperation and communication.

Rather than include a large sample of local representatives on a state P-16/P-20 council, an alternate strategy is for the state to support local P-16/P-20 councils. This tack has many advantages such as enabling local school districts to coordinate with their regional postsecondary institutions. According to ECS's database, twelve states have at least some version of local or regional P-16/P-20 councils. Several, however, are not supported by the state's P-16/P-20 council. Kentucky provides one notable example of state-level coordination. Its state P-16 council coordinates the 22 regional P-16 councils that provide coverage over most

of the state's counties and more fully integrate local actors into state policy decisions (Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, 2011).

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education conducted a case study of three states' P-16/P-20 councils and elaborated on Kentucky's regional system of councils (Shulock, 2009). The state's General Assembly encouraged the development of the regional councils by providing seed money and directed the statewide council to coordinate the network. Citing interviews with policymakers involved with the P-16 initiative, the author identified several leaders who stressed the importance of integrating local perspectives into state policymaking and developing local initiatives and cooperation between regional and state actors. They credited these regional councils with improving college readiness through collaborations on curricula, professional development, and college admissions. The respondents made clear that, "without a local council structure there would not be any emphasis on people interacting effectively across organizational boundaries" (Shulock, 2009, p. 100).

Providing information through counseling

As discussed above, one of the major barriers to effective transitions between secondary and postsecondary education is a lack of information about college admissions and financing. Avery and Kane (2004) found that information plays an essential role in the decision to pursue college and in taking the necessary steps to complete an application and enroll. Dynarski and Scott-Clayton (2006) argued that the complexity of the financial aid system hurts the students most in need of financial assistance to attend. Strong evidence suggests that even

many academically prepared students are choosing not to pursue postsecondary education because they are insufficiently informed.

Delivering accurate and timely information to students can mitigate these obstacles. High school guidance counselors are intended to serve this purpose, but they often are overwhelmed by the magnitude of work expected of them and poor student-counselor ratios. Nationwide, there are 238 students to each guidance counselor in secondary schools, with California, for example, expecting an average guidance counselor to serve 395 students.¹

Collaboration across local and state agencies has the potential to supplement the information services of traditional guidance counselors. The National College Advising Corps (NCAC) provides a model for this type of cross organizational cooperation. NCAC, which is currently active in 14 states, hires recent college graduates and places them as full-time college advisers in high schools. The advisers provide information and college preparation assistance directly to high school students in an effort to improve college enrollment and success rates of those high schools and their districts. The program is administered out of one or more colleges or universities in each state that recruit, train, and supervise the advisers. Local school districts and individual schools work closely with the colleges to identify the best match between adviser and school. This model relies heavily upon the cooperation of local-level school districts with the postsecondary sector and state agents to alleviate the knowledge barriers commonly associated with poor K-12 to higher education transitions.

A federal role? Lessons learned from the Race to the Top applications

¹ Authors calculations based on 2008-2009 data from the Common Core of Data collected and administered by the Institute of Education Sciences.

There are myriad ways in which improved governmental coordination – and strategically placed incentives – might close the gap between secondary and postsecondary education. Above, we discussed the Common Core Standards Initiative’s role in increasing the rigor of the high school curriculum in order to more closely align it with college expectations. Additionally, many policymakers have called for the alignment of high school graduation exams with college placement tests. Scholars also have lamented that accountability systems for the secondary and postsecondary systems remain separate.

Although most of these ideas require partnerships between state and local agents, there may be a role for movements at the national level to bolster K-12 to postsecondary alignment (Walsh, 2009). Examples such as Achieve’s American Diploma Project, a predecessor to the Common Core Standards movement, provide a roadmap for states to follow in coordinating curricular alignment both across and within states. The federal government may also have a role to play in encouraging and creating incentives for these collaborations and assisting states in addressing transitional issues. With America’s educational system still heavily predicated on local and state control and financing, the federal government’s primary role is likely to continue to be one of providing incentives to nudge states and local education agencies to cooperate. By selectively awarding money to states for educational purposes, the federal government can play an important catalytic role in encouraging states to adopt promising policies to improve educational practices and outcomes.

The Race to the Top (RTTT) competition offers an intriguing example of this catalytic role. The U.S. Department of Education proposed several policies to improve educational outcomes and invited states to submit an RTTT application in which they could promise to

adapt those policy standards to their own state contexts. Over two rounds of the competition, the government awarded twelve sizable grants ranging from \$75 million to \$700 million in order to implement their proposed reforms.

Through the pre-advertised point allocation for evaluating which states would receive the awards, the Department created incentives for states to accept certain reforms. At the same time, the Department advocated for other reforms that it deemed worthwhile but for which it did not award points. For example, the competition awarded 40 out of 500 possible points for the ambitious task of developing and adopting common curricular standards. On the other hand, it awarded no points but encouraged states to work toward P-20 coordination and vertical and horizontal alignment (inviting them to describe these plans in a section titled “Invitational Priority 5”). Whereas most states incorporated support for the Common Core Standards in their RTTT applications, only 21 of 47 applicants (including Washington, D.C.) even responded to Invitational Priority 5 (though a few states with strong councils were among those not responding).

Although this relationship might not be causal in nature, it seems likely that states were influenced by federal fiscal incentives to adopt common standards. The timing of states’ adoption coincides well with the June 1, 2010 application deadline for RTTT (Table 1). Only one state, Kentucky, adopted the standards before June 2010, while 35 states adopted the Common Core Standards in June, July, or August of that summer (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010b). A July 2010 article in the *New York Times* expressed surprise over the sudden overwhelming support for a common set of academic standards especially because of “states’ long tradition of insisting on retaining local control over curriculum” (Lewin, 2010).

If, as we have suggested, the federal government can effectively use incentives to direct state and local activities – and if P-16/P-20 councils and analogous inter-level mechanisms have some promise – then the Department of Education might have missed a valuable opportunity by opting not to allocate points to the P-20 alignment priority. Even though the postsecondary-secondary divide may, on the surface, appear to be a local or state problem, the federal government has a clear role to play in creating incentives and momentum for key reforms. Unfortunately, it failed to fully embrace this role in the first rounds of Race to the Top.

Conclusion

The creation of a more seamless move from American secondary to postsecondary schools would require elaborate and unprecedented coordination between the many individuals and institutions that shape that transition. Unfortunately, a long history of inadequate coordination leaves too many students facing daunting academic, social, financial, and informational hurdles to college enrollment and success. In this paper, we have discussed some of the intergovernmental dynamics of the secondary-postsecondary divide and explored the potential of greater local-state collaboration and federal intervention to create deeper connections between these sectors. The coordination required might be improbable, but it is certainly attainable, and without it, the costs to students and society associated with this divide will remain unacceptably high.

References

- Alliance for Excellence in Education. (2006). Paying double: Inadequate high schools and community college remediation. Retrieved from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive/publications/remediation.pdf>.
- Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college remediation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 886-924.
- Avery, C., & Kane, T. J. (2004). Student perceptions of college opportunities: The Boston COACH Program. In C.M. Hoxby (ed.), *College choices: The economics of where to go, when to go, and how to pay for it* (pp. 355–394). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boswell, K. (2000). Building bridges or barriers? Public policies that facilitate or impede linkages between community colleges and local school districts. *New Directions for Community Colleges*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cc.11101/pdf>.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The Diverted Dream*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Callan, P. M. (1997). Stewards of opportunity: America's public community colleges. *Daedalus*, 126(4), 95–112.
- Committee of Ten. (1894). *Report of the committee of ten on secondary school studies with the reports of the conferences arranged by the committee*. New York: The American Book Company on behalf of the National Educational Association.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010a). *About the standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards>.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010b). *In the states*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/in-the-states>.
- Conley, D. (2005). *College knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crowe, E. (1998). *Statewide remedial education policies: State strategies that support successful student transitions from secondary to postsecondary education*. Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers.
- Delaware Department of Education. (2011). *Members*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/ddoe/p20council/members.shtml>.
- Dunham, E. A. (1969). *Colleges of the forgotten American*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dynarski, S. M., & Scott-Clayton, J. E. (2006). *The cost of complexity in federal student aid: Lessons from optimal tax theory and behavioral economics*. NBER Working Paper No. 12227. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Education Commission of the States. (2008). P-16/P-20 councils. Retrieved from

<http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=910>.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, J. P., & Forster, G. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States* (Education Working Paper No. 3). New York: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.

Grodsky, E., & Jones, M. T. (2007). Real and imagined barriers to college entry. *Social Science Research, 36*(2), 745-766.

Karp, M. M., Calcagno, J. C., Hughes, K. L., Jeong, D. W., & Bailey, T. (2007). *The postsecondary achievement of participants in dual enrollment: An analysis of student outcomes in two states* (CCRC Brief No. 37). New York: Community College Research Center.

Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education. (2011). *Local/regional P-16 councils*. Retrieved from <http://cpe.ky.gov/policies/academicinit/P16/localP16.htm>.

Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (2009). The historical context of the divide between K-12 and higher education. In *States, schools and colleges: Policies to improve student readiness for college and strengthen coordination between schools and colleges* (pp. 5-22). San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Kirst, M. W., Venezia, A., & Antonio, A. L. (2004). What have we learned, and where do we go next? In M. W. Kirst and A. Venezia (Eds.), *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in postsecondary education* (pp. 285-319). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, T. (2010, July 21). Many states adopt national standards for their schools. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/21/education/21standards.html>.

Olson, L. (2006, June 21). States push to align policies from pre-K to postsecondary. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/06/21/41p16.h25.html>.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). *The shopping mall high school*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Ravitch, D. E. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York: Simon and Shuster.

Richardson, R. C., Bracco, K., Callan, P., & Finney, J. (1999). *Designing state higher education systems for a new century*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Shulock, N. B. (2009). Kentucky's P-16 council. In *States, schools and colleges: Policies to improve student readiness for college and strengthen coordination between schools and colleges* (pp. 83-107). San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

- State of Illinois Appointments. (2009). *Boards and commissions detail*. Retrieved from <http://appointments.illinois.gov/appointmentsDetail.cfm?id=211>.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering towards utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Education. (1918). *Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education appointed by the National Education Association*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Usdan, M. D., Minar, D. W., & Hurwitz, E. (1969). *Education and state politics*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Walsh, E. J. (2009). P-16 policy alignment in the states: Findings from a 50-state survey. In, *States, schools and colleges: Policies to improve student readiness for college and strengthen coordination between schools and colleges* (pp. 23-34). San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Table 1

State Support of P-16/P-20 Councils, P-20 Coordination in Race to the Top Applications, and Adoption of Common Core Standards

	Presence of a state P-16 or P-20 council	State support of local/regional P-16 or P-20 council	Presence of Invitational Priority 5 in RTTT Application (2nd round, if available; otherwise, 1st round)	Month of adoption of Common Core Standards (in 2010)
Source	Education Commission of the States (2008)	Education Commission of the States (2008)	RTTT applications	Common Core State Standards Initiative
Link	http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=910	http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=910	http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetotop/index.html	http://www.corestandards.org/in-the-states
Alaska	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	(Did not submit RTTT application)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Alabama	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	No	November
Arizona	P-20	No	Yes	June
Arkansas	P-20	No	Yes	July
California	P-16	No	No	August
Colorado	P-20	No	Yes	August
Connecticut	P-20	No	No	July
District of Columbia	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	Yes	July
Delaware	P-20	No	Yes (round 1)	August
Florida	P-16	Unknown	No	July
Georgia	P-16	No	Yes	July
Hawaii	P-20	No	Yes	June
Idaho	P-16	Unknown	No (round 1)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Illinois	P-20	No	Yes	June
Indiana	P-16	No	No (round 1)	August
Iowa	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	No	July
Kansas	P-20	No	No (round 1)	October
Kentucky	P-16	Yes	No	February
Louisiana	P-16	Yes	No	July
Maine	P-16	No	Yes	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Maryland	P-20	No	Yes	June
Massachusetts	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	Yes	July

Michigan	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	No	June
Minnesota	P-20	No	Yes (round 1)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Mississippi	P-20	No	Yes	June
Missouri	P-20	Yes	Yes	June
Montana	P-20	No	No	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Nebraska	P-16	No	No	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Nevada	P-16	No	No	June
New Hampshire	P-16	No	No	July
New Jersey	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	No	June
New Mexico	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	No	October
New York	P-16	Unknown	Yes	July
North Carolina	P-16	Local P-16 councils exist but not linked to state	No	June
North Dakota	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	(Did not submit RTTT application)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Ohio	P-16	Yes	Yes	June
Oklahoma	P-16	Local P-16 councils exist but not linked to state	No	June
Oregon	P-16	No	Yes (round 1)	October
Pennsylvania	P-20	Yes	No	July
Rhode Island	P-16	No	No	July
South Carolina	P-16	Yes	Yes	July
South Dakota	P-21	No	No (round 1)	November
Tennessee	P-16	Yes	Yes (round 1)	July
Texas	P-16	Yes	(Did not submit RTTT application)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Utah	P-16	Yes	Yes	August
Vermont	No	(No P-16/P-20 council)	(Did not submit RTTT application)	August
Virginia	P-16	No	Yes (round 1)	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
Washington	P-20	No	Yes	(Not as of Jan. 2011)
West Virginia	P-20	No	No (round 1)	June
Wisconsin	P-16	Local P-16 councils exist but not linked to state	No	June
Wyoming	P-16	No	No (round 1)	June