THE GOVERNANCE DIVIDE

The Case Study for New York

By
Andrea Venezia
Michael W. Kirst
Michael D. Usdan

May 2006

The Institute for Educational Leadership
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research

Contents

Foreword

This report is based on research conducted by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education and its partners, the Institute for Educational Leadership and Stanford University's Institute for Higher Education Research. The project, called Partnerships for Student Success (PSS), was funded by the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. Its findings are presented in four case studies and a cross-cutting report called *The Governance Divide: A Report on a Four-State Study on Improving College Readiness and Success*.

The primary goal of the research project was to examine state policies and governance structures that span K–12 and postsecondary education in order to assist states in identifying promising reforms and ways to connect their education systems. The project is based on two major premises: (1) the current disconnected systems of K–12 and postsecondary education are not effective in ensuring that sufficient numbers of students complete some form of education or training beyond high school, and (2) it is the states who are in the best position to lead efforts to align the systems, create incentives for joint budgeting, and monitor improvement through cross-system data collection and accountability.

The research was conducted in 2003 and 2004 in four states, Florida, Georgia, New York, and Oregon, each of which has a distinct approach to K–16 reform that may offer other states important options for connecting K–12 and postsecondary education:

- Florida has implemented some of the most sweeping education governance changes of any state; all levels of education are housed in the Department of Education, which is overseen by a commissioner who reports to the governor.

- Georgia was the first state to have state and regional P–16 councils, and its regents' office in the University System of Georgia oversees a variety of projects that focus on connecting K–12 and postsecondary education.

- The New York Board of Regents oversees all education in the state and has been in place for over 200 years; this lends the regents' office a stature and a historical legitimacy and tradition unlike any other state education governance structure in the nation.

- Oregon has been a leader in K–16 reform through its development of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS), which articulated postsecondary expectations and linked them with K–12 reforms.

We hope that this research, by documenting the processes used in each state to develop, implement, and institutionalize the reforms, will assist other states in identifying opportunities for K–16 successes.

I. Introduction

History and tradition are important factors in education governance and politics in New York. The state's historic governance structures that are inherently K–16 have created opportunities for connections between K–12 and postsecondary education. The Board of Regents has the legal responsibility for pre-K, K–12, and postsecondary education; libraries, museums, education technologies, public television, and radio; and other education-related areas. The board's history dates to 1784, when the regents were created by several of the nation's founding fathers. This lends the Board of Regents a stature, tradition, and historical legitimacy unlike any other statewide education governance structure in the nation.

The regents were created, a former education leader said, to "launch the new State of New York out of colonial status and to provide quality control by the state." The overall structure of New York's education governance systems has changed little since its inception. "At the end of the 19th century," the education leader said, "there was a unification act and the state superintendent's office was merged with the Board of Regents, and the Department of Education became the administrative arm for both sectors, so it's all one system." Private postsecondary institutions, which are very influential in the state, are not directly overseen by the regents, but the regents often act as a buffer between them and other powerful public sector educational interests.

Numerous interviewees said that the governance system needs to evolve to meet the educational challenges posed by the new economy and by an increasingly diverse student body. As described in this report, however, politics often seem to derail many opportunities for significant changes in educational governance. One interviewee summed up education governance by stating:

> It's all political. The Board of Regents is all controlled by Assembly Democrats. It follows a Democratic agenda. Not even a Democratic agenda—an Assembly Democrat agenda. It's not respected. It's not forward-thinking. It used to be good, during the Golden Age of Rockefeller. They were smart and respected. Now it's a mess… It got too politicized… The structure is there, theoretically, but, in reality, it's the informal relationship and leadership style—innovation and a focus on students—that make things happen.

School finance issues are also prominent in affecting the context of education policymaking in New York. For example, the Campaign for Fiscal Equity filed a constitutional challenge to the state's K–12 funding system in 1993, and the issue is still before the courts. In June of 2003, the Court of Appeals ruled that the New York State Constitution guarantees a "sound basic education" to every child and that all children must have an opportunity to have a

1

"meaningful" high school education. The court then required the state: (1) to determine the cost of providing a sound basic education for every student and (2) to change the funding system to comply with the ruling and necessary costs. The state originally had until July 30, 2004, to develop remedies, but that was delayed.[1] The Legislature had waited to adopt a final 2004–2005 budget because of the impending settlement agreement. After the delay, in September 2004, the Legislature did adopt a budget. According to a news article, "After a year fraught with tension between the governor, the Senate majority leader, and Speaker Silver, the Legislature finally came to some resolution and adopted a budget for this year. It is noteworthy that the vast majority of the budget was adopted through a series of continuing resolutions, or extenders, which kept the state functioning… The legislative budget compromise was only reached once the deadline for the school funding issue had passed."[2]

As a Senate staff member said about K–12 finance, "It's the 800-pound gorilla. It's what we all care about. It's like the congressperson with a military base in his district, except everyone has one. As a result, it tends to suck the air out of the room." In addition, compliance with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act has required a great deal of time and resources at the state level. As one interviewee stated, "NCLB consumed the last two and a half years of our lives."

Economically, much of the state has been hard hit in recent years. Upstate New York has suffered major manufacturing losses, and access to postsecondary education has become very important in many of those communities. The economic challenges, recent demographic changes, and persistent educational inequalities are creating a need for improved postsecondary access and preparation for all. The regents, governor, Legislature, and business leaders are currently taking a more active role in higher education policymaking than in recent years. As an education association president said, "Part of the drive is to recover the state's past glory with … higher education as the catalyst for economic development."

Amidst a renewed interest in higher education policymaking, the commissioner of education has also been active in changing the state's K–12 assessment program. The regents exams were overhauled and there are now two high school diploma levels based on students' scores on the exams. In order to graduate from high school, students must pass regents exams in five core subject areas (English, mathematics, science, U.S. history, and world history). Thus, as in most states, there is a great deal of change in education policy in New York, particularly at the K–12 level—even though the governance structure has remained stable.

This report explores how connected New York's education policies and reforms are across pre-K, K–12, and postsecondary education (called PK–16), with a focus on state-level initiatives, governance, and related structures. Aside from research conducted in New York City, this project did not explore these issues in relation to local or regional issues. The New York field research was conducted in May 2004. The main research questions included the following:

- To what extent is PK–16 reform perceived as a state policy concern? What are the incentives and disincentives for improved connections?

- What are the main goals and objectives of current state-level PK–16 reforms? Who is responsible for developing and implementing those changes?

- What have been the main successes and failures to date?

Many of these questions were difficult to answer because, unlike states such as Oregon and Georgia, New York does not have clearly articulated statewide PK–16 goals, policies, or programs.

In presenting the findings, this report first describes the context of PK–16 reform and governance in New York. It then presents a summary of major PK–16 reforms, an analysis of PK–16 challenges, and a concluding overview of the opportunities for PK–16 reform in New York. An appendix provides the interview questions for the research visit to the state.

II. Context for PK–16 Reform and Governance in New York

New York's governance structures for education are connected through the broad oversight and responsibilities of the Board of Regents, whose history extends into the 18th century. Even pre-K efforts are included under its purview, since the state has universal preschool programs funded by the Legislature. As a result, New York's efforts to connect K–12 and postsecondary education are called PK–16 (including pre-K, K–12, and postsecondary education). Below are brief descriptions of each of the major entities involved in PK–16 reform in New York.

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK (USNY), BOARD OF REGENTS, AND STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SED)

The University of the State of New York (USNY) is an umbrella entity that oversees every segment of education in the state, and many cultural entities as well. It is governed by the Board of Regents, which sets state education policy. The USNY, which describes itself as "the most complete, interconnected system of educational services in the United States," includes:

- More than 7,000 public and private elementary and secondary schools;
- 248 public and private colleges and universities;
- 251 for-profit schools;
- Approximately 7,000 libraries;
- 750 museums;
- The state archives;
- Services for adults with disabilities;
- Special education services;
- A school for the blind;
- A school for the deaf; and
- 25 public broadcasting facilities.[3]

In New York, the State Legislature appoints the regents. Since each member of the Assembly and Senate has one vote, the much larger Assembly has far more influence in appointing the regents than does the Senate. There is no requirement for an even party split, and the governor has no role in the selection or confirmation of appointments. There are 16 regents (one from each judicial district in the state and four at-large), each of which has a five-year term. The Board of Regents does not have a large staff or budget. Many interviewees said that the regents are not particularly accountable, and that it is very difficult to remove a regent. Although the regents oversee all education, many interviewees indicated that K–12 and postsecondary

education, as one SUNY administrator said, "really operate as separate systems." The regents' primary areas of interest in higher education are in teacher education and course approval.

Within the USNY, the State Education Department (SED) is the administrative arm of the regents, and the commissioner is chosen by the regents to implement its policies. The commissioner is both the president of the USNY and the commissioner of education.[4] Traditionally, the commissioner focuses more time and energy on K–12 than on postsecondary education. According to many interviewees, Commissioner Rick Mills' focus on K–12 standards has led to a more centralized system of K–12 education. Postsecondary education, meanwhile, remains virtually untouched.

SUNY and CUNY submit master plans to the regents every eight years. Master plans were required every four years, but the change was a compromise with Governor George Pataki in reaction to his effort to strip the regents of all authority for higher education. Independent postsecondary institutions submit master plans through the Commission on Independent Colleges, and the regents have review authority.

The current statewide plan for higher education includes PK–16 goals. The plan calls for all higher education institutions in the state to "collaborate with elementary and secondary schools to assist, where possible, in preparing pupils to enter and succeed in higher education, and, if teacher education is their mission, to prepare quality teachers to meet the state's needs for certified teachers."[5] Two of the five priorities set forth by the statewide plan for higher education are designed to maximize success for all postsecondary students and to create smoother student transitions from secondary to postsecondary education.

The commissioner has an Advisory Council on Higher Education comprised of administrators from CUNY, SUNY, and the independent colleges and universities. The major PK–16 issues the council planned to address were the Tuition Assistance Program, accessibility for students with disabilities, opportunity programs, and teacher preparation.[6]

Although the commissioner has traditionally played a rather limited role in postsecondary education, he said that he is hoping to "create a situation in which I'm sent to work on higher education." He is focusing resources on the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) as a lever for PK–16 change because they are regionally dispersed intermediate districts that include local leaders in K–12, postsecondary education, business, and libraries. BOCES are comprised of two or more school districts; they pool resources across districts and other education-related entities to focus on common goals.[7] The commissioner hopes these regional approaches will help include postsecondary more fully in his education reform agenda. He wants people to see "the synergy" and connections between all the different components within USNY.

According to an administrator at the State Education Department, the department is currently trying to promote itself, following the USNY model, as an all-encompassing PK–16 entity rather than just a K–12 agency. A major objective is to pull together fragmented education and cultural pieces and create more explicit linkages between K–12, postsecondary education, SUNY, CUNY, libraries, public television and radio, and museums.

In addition, the State Education Department has an Office of K–16 Initiatives and Access Programs, which is the only organizational unit within the department that spans the PK–16 continuum. It "administers over $115 million in grants, contracts, and scholarships to colleges and universities; schools, school districts, and BOCES; community-based and nonprofit organizations, and students."[8] Its main goals are to: (1) improve postsecondary graduation rates for historically under-represented and economically disadvantaged students and (2) close the achievement gap between students who pass the regents' high school graduation requirements and those who do not. To accomplish these goals, the office has established the following divisions:

- *The Pre-Collegiate Preparation Programs Unit* focuses on the development and implementation of collaborative partnerships between K–12 education, postsecondary education, nonprofit organizations, parents, students, businesses, and governmental entities.

- *The Collegiate and Professional Development Programs Unit* coordinates state and federal funded programs that: (1) increase retention and graduation rates for under-represented and economically disadvantaged postsecondary students, (2) increase access for those student groups, (3) increase student preparation, (4) provide partnerships with high-need schools for teacher recruitment and professional development; (5) increase the participation of students from the aforementioned groups in teaching, and (6) recognize successful recruitment and retention of teachers.

- *The Scholarships and Grants Administration Unit* oversees several student scholarships. The program that is the most relevant for this work is called the Scholarships for Academic Excellence, which the governor and Legislature started in 1997. Scholarship winners are selected by their high schools based on student scores on the regents exams taken prior to the senior year (in English, global studies, U.S. history/government, mathematics B, and science). The scholarship money must be used at an in-state postsecondary institution.[9]

While there appear to be many programs overseen by the Office of K–16 Initiatives and Access Programs, a state agency administrator said, "There is no political advocate for K–16 currently, and the office feels naked and vulnerable." Funding is erratic for the initiatives run through that office, and most of the funds are directed to tutoring and after-school enrichment programs. According to a staff member at the State Education Department, the efforts are not connected to systemic changes being made by the commissioner or other state-level entities. The Education Trust and the National Association of System Heads have been involved in PK–16 reforms in New York and have created a stakeholder group with representatives from the education department, SUNY, and CUNY.

In addition, the State Education Department is reeling from cuts of 30 to 40 percent in its staff size—the result of a challenging fiscal situation and the perennial political battles the Legislature and governor have waged against the department. Almost every governor has tried to

clip the regents' wings, but the only authority the governors have over the regents is to cut the department's budget. This has affected every aspect of the department, including the K–16 office.

Within this environment there is a fair amount of tension between K–12 and higher education with regard to funding. As a staff member in the governor's office said, "K–12 has been receiving a tremendous amount of resources and higher ed feels it's getting crumbs off the table and that tuition increases are what will keep them going… There are those within the ed community who think that regents focus mostly on elementary and secondary and are nominally involved in higher ed. To what extent is the Master Plan just a paper tiger?" The issue of what is on paper (PK–16) versus what actually happens in practice was a theme throughout most of the interviews. The next section discusses the vital role of the governor in more detail.

GOVERNOR'S ROLE IN EDUCATION

Compared with many other states, New York's governor plays a limited role in all levels of education. In New York, the governor appoints the trustees for SUNY institutions as well as their local college councils; appoints 10 of CUNY's 17 trustees; and directs collective bargaining negotiations with faculty and employee unions.[10] Yet the governor is not involved in the selection of the regents or the commissioner. Many interviewees, including state education and business leaders, stated that the governor is not a force in public education in New York, and that the Legislature has more power over public education in New York than does the governor. For example, Governor Pataki's involvement in higher education has been limited primarily to his attempts to limit the regents' authority.

One area in which the governor wields significant power, however, is the budget. New York has an incremental budget process. The Legislature can add to and cut from the governor's budget, but those actions are subject to the governor's veto, which is then subject to the Legislature's veto. A high-level staff member in the governor's office stated that in 2004 the Legislature "cut a lot and the governor vetoed everything and … then the Legislature vetoed all the governor's vetoes." The governor can, one interviewee said, "ride the commissioner out of town with the budget and by making him miserable," which, by most accounts, describes the relationship between the current governor and commissioner. The education budget often holds up the entire state budgetary process because it represents such a large portion of the state budget and because the relationships are so politicized.

HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

State University of New York (SUNY)

The State University of New York, or SUNY, is comprised of 64 universities throughout the state. It is the largest comprehensive university system in the country, enrolling over 400,000 students in 6,688 degree and certificate programs. SUNY's continuing education enrollment is

more than one million.[11] Every student who graduates with a New York diploma can be admitted to a SUNY institution, but not necessarily one of their choice.

SUNY institutions are involved in a great deal of local-level PK–16 work. SUNY campuses are involved in teacher preparation, teacher professional development, and student outreach. In addition, many SUNY institutions receive state or federal funds for PK–16 programs, including:

- *The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.* The SUNY partners are SUNY Cobleskill, SUNY College of Technology at Alfred, SUNY College of Technology at Canton, SUNY College of Technology at Delhi, SUNY Farmingdale, and Morrisville State College.[12]

- *The New York Consortium for Professional Development (NYCPD)*, a network of postsecondary institutions and Eisenhower's K–16 Alliance, is focused on creating PK–16 partnerships in New York City. SUNY Oswego is the SUNY institution involved in the consortium.[13]

- *The Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP)*, a State Education Department program, seeks to increase "the number of historically underrepresented students who enroll in and complete undergraduate or graduate programs leading to professional licensure or to careers in mathematics, science, technology (MST), and health-related fields." The participating SUNY institutions include: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, the College of Optometry, Stony Brook, Utica/Rome, the College at Farmingdale, Brockport, Buffalo, Fredonia, New Paltz, Old Westbury, Oswego, Potsdam, Purchase, Dutchess Community College, Monroe Community College, and Onondaga Community College.[14]

Because SUNY does not appear to be working extensively on PK–16 reform at the state level or in a systemic way, this report does not focus on SUNY. When this research was conducted, however, there were several discussions underway within SUNY regarding systemwide PK–16 reform. Staff members in the system office were discussing the development a systemwide placement test, but according to a SUNY administrator, "There is a wide range of paranoia when you've got such a wide range of institutions. It's an uphill battle to get community colleges to look at the same placement tests as the other institutions."

Another SUNY project, the Academic Preparation Initiative, analyzes entering students' transcripts across all SUNY institutions to understand how well prepared students are when they matriculate. According to a SUNY administrator, the system office is considering reinforcing the regents' standards by requiring a regular regents exam for some of the institutions and an advanced diploma for the more selective institutions (SUNY administrator).

One systemwide policy that does affect admission throughout SUNY is the development of a selectivity framework based on SAT scores and grades. There are five selectivity levels, with open enrollment on one end and highly selective on the other. According to an interviewee,

the system office works with each institution to decide where it fits on the spectrum, and then the campus must admit students accordingly.

City University of New York (CUNY)

The City University of New York, or CUNY, is the nation's largest urban university. It is comprised of 11 senior colleges, 6 community colleges, a graduate school, a law school and a School of Biomedical Education. CUNY currently enrolls more than 450,000 students.[15] The campuses can continue to grow; according to a high-level CUNY administrator, at least half of the colleges could easily increase their enrollment. CUNY balances its accountability to the state with its responsibilities to the mayor and the city council.[16]

In June 1999, the mayor's task force on CUNY released a study that criticized CUNY for its high levels of remediation and poor college completion rates. The report found the public schools and CUNY responsible for low student performance and recommended that they work together to address the shortcomings.[17] The report stated that CUNY is "in a spiral of decline" and that "doubts fester about the value of a CUNY degree." When the report was written, more than 50% of CUNY's first-year students failed more than one remedial class.[18] As an outgrowth of the report, remediation at CUNY senior college campuses was eliminated. That initiative was pushed by trustees appointed by Governor Pataki and by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. Many members of the Assembly lobbied the regents to reject the proposed change.[19]

In the wake of these developments, CUNY, according to an administrator, "tried to figure out a way that would not simply rely on a single measure to say that you [students] cannot come to a senior college." CUNY created the following two exemptions from its placement tests: students must score 500 or more on each section of the SAT or 75 or higher on the regents English and mathematics tests.[20] According to an interviewee, "It was a way of saying that there are multiple measures to demonstrate that you … are ready for college-level work." This change also connected K–12 and postsecondary standards for students and sent a message about CUNY's academic expectations of entering students.

CUNY's nationally lauded PK–16 reform, College Now, is discussed in Section III of this report.[21]

SUNY and CUNY

Traditionally, the Democratic Assembly is more interested in CUNY while the Republican Senate is more focused on SUNY. Tuition for both systems is controlled by the governor and the Legislature. The regents have much greater authority over K–12 than over postsecondary education. For example, they can prescribe that all high school students have to pass certain exams, but no entity has that authority over higher education. The regents' authority over higher education is limited primarily to program approval. SUNY and CUNY determine their own admission, placement, and related policies. According to the director of the Senate Higher Education Committee, the systems rarely need to interact with the regents.

SUNY's policymaking is more decentralized than is CUNY's; CUNY is more of an integrated system in terms of governance and operations. In SUNY, however, campuses can opt out of system projects, so system initiatives must be well coordinated and managed in order to gather participation from the campuses. The fact that most projects are campus-based can create challenges for systemwide PK–16 reform. From a state governance perspective, there are few incentives, according to a SUNY administrator, for SUNY and the education department to work together, given the governor's connection with SUNY via the appointment of trustees and the governor's animosity toward SUNY.

BUSINESS COUNCIL OF NEW YORK STATE, INC.

The business community in New York, which is represented statewide by the Business Council of New York State, Inc., is more active in K–12 than in postsecondary education. A business community representative stated that this is partially because businesses have had more success in their dealings with higher education and attribute their employees' shortcomings to K–12 rather than postsecondary education. According to interviewees, the business community believes that K–12 schools have more problems than does postsecondary education. The legislative agenda of the Business Council supports the regents exams; advocates for high standards for all students; and seeks to improve educational accountability, educational leadership, and professional development.[22]

EDUCATION FINANCE RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

The consortium began in 1992 as a series of policy discussions between the education department, the regents, and postsecondary representatives interested in K–12 school finance issues. The consortium hosts forums and publishes documents on issues such as equity in outcomes, cost-effectiveness measures in school districts, how to generate additional revenues, and how to use spending as a means to elevate student performance. The board of directors includes representatives from K–12 and postsecondary education, although its focus is primarily on K–12 education.

HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES CORPORATION (HESC)

While there are no evaluations of the PK–16 work of the Higher Education Services Corporation (HESC), it appears to be one of the main PK–16 grant-receiving entities outside of New York City. It runs the state's GEAR UP program (which seeks to improve access to postsecondary education for low-income students), the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP), and 18 other state-level financial aid programs. It is part of the executive branch and reports to the governor. According to its staff, it is a more trusted entity than other state-level agencies (such as the education department) because it tends to be less bureaucratic and as a result it is in charge of

projects such as GEAR UP. Another interviewee outside the agency said that the "tension" between the governor and the regents makes HESC the logical home for such projects.

III. Summary of PK–16 Reforms

This section discusses statewide PK–16 reforms and CUNY's College Now.[23]

FOUR STATE POLICY AREAS

This project sought to understand if New York had developed or was considering PK–16 reforms in the following four state policy areas: alignment of curriculum and assessment; finance systems; data systems; and accountability systems. The sections below outline New York's activities in these areas.

Curricular and Assessment Alignment

New York is ahead of most states in aligning its curriculum and assessments for K–12 and postsecondary education. New York might not receive the credit other states have in the area of test alignment because its K–12 exit tests and postsecondary entrance tests have a long history—their connections are not part of recent K–16 reforms. As a former state education leader said, "We didn't walk around talking about K–16 integration. We didn't make it explicit, but we were thinking about it all the time… There has been a relatively high degree of explicit expectations for kids regarding completing a high school program and successfully entering the postsecondary system."

Much of the student-centered alignment reforms relate to the efforts of Commissioner Mills to initiate the first changes in the regents exams for decades. Under his watch, content changes were made in each of the five required subject areas (English, mathematics, science, U.S. history, and world history) to align them with curriculum standards for high school. Students must pass each of those tests in order to earn a high school diploma. The cut score for a high school diploma was originally set at 65, but that was determined to be too high—too many students were not passing the tests, so the cut score was lowered to 55. To earn an "advanced diploma" and place directly into college-level work, students have to pass with a 75. A score of 65 is called "preferred." The test is not scored on a linear scale; earning a 75 is, relatively speaking, much harder than earning a 55. Critics charge that what used to be a regular regents diploma is now an advanced diploma. A business community representative said that her organization is concerned that "the public thinks that the regular diploma is college prep, but we just think it's a high school diploma." Many interviewees said that a cut score of 55 is too low, and many indicated that higher education should have been involved in changing the tests.

The revisions in the regents exams were very controversial, particularly among local school districts. Newspapers (including the *New York Times*) ran headlines such as, "New York to Lower the Bar for High School Graduation."[24] One interviewee said that although the tests

originally were not "dumbed down," too many students did not pass, so politically the commissioner had to lower the standards. The tests were challenged after 60% of students failed a high school math exam and almost half failed a physics test.[25] A union representative summed up the controversy from the union's perspective:

> When Mills came in, we suggested that the regents exam system be continued. We said, "Why throw out a good test and start over?" We haven't said much because we don't want to derail the standards movement. The regents made the following changes: math 1, 2, and 3 into math A and B; watered down American and global history; watered down living environment—it used to be biology. The union opposed watering down the assessments… Now the assessments are weak. You have a weak assessment system, you're in trouble… The commissioner had to control the passing rate or else he'd have mass failure. They threw the baby out with the bath water… Screwed physics up twice. Screwed math up twice. Lost teachers' faith.

Part of the long-standing tradition of the regents test is the related awarding of Regents Scholarships. Even though the content of the regents tests has changed, the Regents Scholarships are still in place, but they are dwarfed by the aid awarded by the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP). TAP is a more equitable financial aid program, according to a state education leader, in terms of the diversity of students receiving awards.

Finance Systems

Researchers found no evidence that New York has or is developing a PK–16 finance system.

Data Systems

The data systems for public education are not connected in New York. SUNY and CUNY have unit record systems that allow each of the postsecondary systems to track students that transfer from one institution to another within the same system, but not from a CUNY to a SUNY institution, or vice versa. The State Education Department does not have a unit record system for K–12 education, which means that the state cannot effectively track students from one school district to another—although discussions were underway to consider the implementation of such a system. According to a report from the Alliance for International Higher Education Policy Studies, "Representatives from SUNY and CUNY resist a student record system for the education department for a variety of reasons, including concerns about cost, redundancy, and the possibility of endless discussions about whose data is correct."[26]

The SUNY system office is working with the State Education Department to build a comprehensive teacher database of SUNY graduates. If the effort succeeds, SUNY will be able to track its graduates for three years.

Accountability Systems

Researchers found no evidence that New York has or is developing a PK–16 accountability system.

UNIVERSAL PRE–K

Although this project's focus is on transitions from high school to college, it is important to note that New York includes pre–K in its school continuum. While many states are working to create K–16 reform, few have tried a pre–K approach. New York passed legislation authorizing providing four-year-old children with universal opportunity to access pre–Kindergarten programs. The program is funded by lottery funds, and an established percentage of openings must go to economically disadvantaged youth.[27]

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In the most recent Master Plan, the regents identified the need for special education students to have greater access to postsecondary education. They were concerned that only two to three percent of students eligible for special education were participating in postsecondary education. Through the education department, the regents created a funding program designed to improve disability services and increase access at postsecondary institutions.

CUNY AND COLLEGE NOW

New York City has focused a great deal of attention on PK–16 reform in recent years. A report by the Center for an Urban Future, "Building a Highway to Higher Ed," documents some major accomplishments:

- Expanding the College Now program, which links City University of New York (CUNY) faculty and administrators to hundreds of high schools in the city;

- Hiring the first teacher education "czar" who reports to the CUNY Chancellor and is responsible for coordinating and restructuring teacher training at CUNY; and

- Aligning New York City's English and math high school exit exams (the regents tests) with CUNY's college placement exams.[28]

CUNY runs many pre-college outreach programs, including College Now; Campus High Schools/Early College High Schools; the Honors College; the Teaching Opportunity Program; the Summer Language Immersion Program; the College Discovery Program; and the Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge (SEEK) program.[29] This report focuses on College Now because it is the largest, most comprehensive pre-college outreach program in the state, and because it is a systemic effort; CUNY's other K–16 projects are more programmatic.

College Now, a collaborative between CUNY and the New York City Department of Education (DOE), is part of CUNY's larger strategy to reduce remediation needs and improve student preparation for college. It has been a program for over 20 years on some CUNY campuses. In fall 2003, 40,500 students were enrolled, all 17 undergraduate CUNY colleges took part, and more than 200 New York City high schools participated in the program. Another 8,000 students are enrolled in CUNY-affiliated high schools.[30] According to a CUNY administrator, the program costs CUNY about $10 to $11 million.

College Now's primary goals are "to improve academic achievement of high school students and to ensure that they graduate ready to do college-level work." The program, which is free for all participating students, accepts middle and high school students.[31] There are three main components: dual enrollment, curriculum development, and workshops and related activities with postsecondary staff. Participating students can enroll in introductory-level college credit courses, non-credit preparatory courses, or specially developed high school credit classes at the college (in partnership with the high school). College Now also offers courses to help students prepare for tests such as the regents exams and the SAT.[32] In addition, there are scholarships that are only available to College Now students.[33]

The range of programmatic offerings differs, depending on the school a student attends, so it is difficult to determine the level of intervention a "typical" College Now student receives. Some students might spend three hours a day at Brooklyn College's environmental lab, while others might take a field trip with a professor or take part in an intensive academic summer program.

From a governance perspective, College Now was housed within Academic Affairs rather than Student Services to give it more respect. It is viewed by many as a top-down initiative because it is funded and staffed entirely by the CUNY System, but the university dean for academic affairs at CUNY believes that the program would have encountered far more opposition from public schools if they had to use their own funds or other resources for the program. College Now has not had an extensive evaluation yet, but several are underway. One of the major priorities for CUNY is to collect data on each participant and track them into CUNY.

The mayor's office recently took over the New York Public Schools (NYPS) and runs the district through a chancellor's office. Project researchers were able to talk with two political officials who focus on education, but everyone else in the NYPS turned down the offer for an interview (during the research the NYPS were under a gag order not related to this project). However, the director of an education nonprofit said that participation in College Now is based more on local partnerships with principals than with the systemwide office of the NYPS: "The New York public schools are not on board with CUNY's College Now. It's not on the radar screen. It's the luck of the draw in terms of which principals you get [as partners with CUNY]. There is no staff person responsible for this initiative in the New York Public Schools."

Many interviewees said that the NYPS have too much on their plate to focus on PK–16 issues. The NYPS, in the midst of a major restructuring, are focusing on safety, standards, and accountability. The school system is also investing in its academy for principals and in aligning

teacher education with K–12 standards. A New York City political official said, "The New York Public Schools are not really involved in College Now."

IV. Challenges to PK–16 Reform

The picture of governance and PK–16 reform is mixed in New York. The history provides for a grand structure that connects the education segments through major policies and programs. But the reality is one in which competing interests, politics, and the rigidity of the structure often inhibits innovative change.

For example, even though there is one over-arching education governance entity in New York, the state's education systems are divided along traditional K–12 and postsecondary lines. As a high-level governor's office staff member stated, "What's on paper and what's reality are two different things." Most interviewees attributed this to a long history that does not include, and perhaps inhibits, innovation and to a great deal of negative politics. A recent report described New York's political process as "byzantine."[34]

Almost every interviewee mentioned the political nature of education policy, with statements such as, "Things have become even more politicized"; "The divisiveness of Albany exceeds that of other states… Politics are the most important thing"; "The structure of education in New York … worked pretty harmoniously when the governor, Senate, and Assembly were all the same party, but it hasn't been that way for decades"; "This is a very political place"; and, "I try to keep public officials in the dark about this stuff [because] they are very patronage-oriented."

Partisan issues appear to be related to the governor's role, or lack thereof, in PK–16 reform and in education policymaking more broadly. The governor sets budget and policy priorities, directs collective bargaining, and appoints trustees to SUNY's and CUNY's boards. Governor Pataki would like to abolish or at least weaken the regents, but all he can do is put a financial stranglehold on the education department. The regents, for their part, are not an executive branch structure. In terms of higher education, the executive budget is a powerful force and "attempts by other actors to influence the decision process make little headway."[35]

Because of its battles with the governor and Legislature, the State Education Department has lost a great deal of state funds and, consequently, personnel. As a Senate staff member said, "You won't see a decrease, but there are chokeholds put in throughout the system. An appropriation can be made and no money flows unless the executive branch okays the budget." But Senate Republicans and the governor are estranged from the regents because the Democratic Assembly appoints the regents. Pataki—and governors before him—would like the power to appoint the regents and have them focus on his education priorities; the Assembly has blocked this move every time a governor has initiated the proposed change.

Many interviewees believe that because the governor has such a small to nonexistent role with the regents (the main PK–16 entity in the state), PK–16 cannot rise to a high policy level in the state. As a business community representative stated, "The fact that the governor is not a big

player in education is a problem. The CEOs will talk to the governor, but if the governor does not think he can do anything—what can you do? This structure kind of limits the business community because it usually works with the governor, and the governor is not that involved in education compared to other states." However, for CUNY administrators the lack of intrusive governance structures and oversight has given them the flexibility to create College Now and other K–16-related programs. As a high-level CUNY administrator stated, nonexistent governance in this area has "allowed us to do some of the best things we've done because, in order to try something, we made mistakes," which would be more risky if the Legislature, governor, or other state-level entities were watching over their work.

Fiscal constraints were cited as another major problem affecting public education and limiting the sectors' abilities to connect successfully for PK–16 reform. A high-level staff member in the governor's office said, "The allocations for each district are put in a computer run that shows how much additional state aid is given and that affects local taxes that people pay… Politically, legislators are held responsible for bringing home the bacon for schools because it's so connected. But it's not as connected for higher education so it isn't held accountable for that in the same way."

However, fiscal constraints do create problems for higher education because the crisis facing K–12 funding shifts attention and resources away from postsecondary education. In addition, the majority of postsecondary degrees are awarded by private colleges and universities. This is problematic for the regents because they have little direct authority over the private institutions. In addition, other salient issues in K–12 education, such as testing and safety, continually absorb resources and distract attention from other policy areas, such as higher education.

V. Conclusion

Connecting K–12 and postsecondary education in New York has been an integral part of the responsibility and role of the regents and related staff members for hundreds of years. The regents exam and related curricula have been embedded in state policy and classrooms for more than a century. In most states, statewide standards and assessments are relatively new, and discussions are currently underway in many states about how to connect those policies and programs across the sectors. In New York, that has been the policy for decades.

Yet even though the structure is in place for New York to create a vibrant PK–16 policy environment, the state has not done so. Few state-level policies or programs seek to connect the segments, aside from curricula and assessments. Many interviewees stated that, on paper and in theory, the regents provide the structure for a single PK–16 system. One state education leader summed up those perspectives by stating, "Other states' K–16 efforts are very intentional. We have a structural advantage… We're able to sound impressive with those groups, but then, behind closed doors, we'll say we need to do what they—other active K–16 states—do." While state agency staff members are seeking to reach various PK–16 objectives, there is not an over-arching goal or defined purpose for PK–16 work at the statewide level. Additionally, there does not appear to be an entrepreneurial style within the state agencies that could create a PK–16 portfolio behind the scenes. In New York, state-level PK–16 planning and interaction appears to flow from specific issues that require inter-level coordination, such as the activities that have taken place around students with disabilities and postsecondary education access and teacher education.

New York's "single" system is still bifurcated between the levels, and the political nature of education in New York continually reinforces the divisions. The lack of new or innovative PK–16 reforms at the state level could partially be due to the governor's limited role in education in general and fairly nonexistent role with regard to PK–16 issues. In New York it is the regents—and the Assembly—who are responsible for developing a state-level PK–16 agenda. Yet the regents are viewed as a distant and historical entity removed from education policymaking; they are not woven into the executive or legislative branches. Given the decentralized nature of the Assembly and the overall lack of political unity, compounded by disagreements between the governor and the regents, the chances of coherent state-level PK–16 policymaking in New York seem slim. The relative isolation of the regents from the budget processes also inhibits statewide education planning. In addition, the annual state appropriations process tends to focus on short-term issues. The structures appear relatively rigid and have been in place for so long that they support the status quo rather than providing a conduit for innovation. Given these challenges, what is the capacity of the state to change? Who can initiate policies and how do they get on the state's agenda?

Perhaps the economic troubles and demographic changes in New York will create the impetus for change. It is dubious, however, whether innovative, large-scale PK–16 reforms will be developed, given the rigidity of the traditions and structures in the state and the lack of participation of the governor. The structure alone does not appear to stimulate or support the types of K–16 changes being discussed currently across the nation.

New York Interview Protocol

CONTEXT QUESTIONS

These data to be gathered from websites and other sources:

- High school dropout rate (and accuracy of data).
- College-going rate (in-state public institutions of higher education, in-state privates, out-of-state, disaggregated).
- College persistence/completion rates (same as above).
- Projected growth in K–12 population (next 20 years, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, geography).
- Projected growth in postsecondary population (next 20 years, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, geography).

QUESTIONS FOR K–12 INTERVIEWEES

[For state agencies:] Please describe the following functions in your agency: information management, education budgeting, program planning, and articulation and collaboration.

Please describe New York's K–12 assessment system. Please describe New York's K–12 accountability system.

Please describe any changes in the regents exams or diploma requirements over the past 10 years.

What percentage of students takes regents exams? Earns a regents diploma? Are there equity concerns with regard to who takes the exams? Who passes them? Who earns a regents diploma?

Have the regents' policies and programs (exams and diploma) had an impact on K–12 reform in New York (for example, creating alignment between K–12 and postsecondary expectations)? If so, please describe.

Please describe any changes in K–12 and postsecondary education test alignment over the past 10 years.

What is the relationship, in terms of content and expectations, between the regents tests and the high school exit test?

Please describe any impact the regents' policies have had on student readiness for college.

What role(s) has K–12 education played in the development and implementation of the regents exams and diploma program?

Please describe any additional collaborative projects/endeavors with postsecondary institutions/systems. How did they start? How are they governed? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

Please describe College Now (goals and objectives). How widespread is it, and how effective has it been in terms of meeting its goals and objectives?

Is your [agency, district] brought to the table for state-level PK–16 policy discussions? Please describe those discussions (content, goals, objectives, who attends, outcomes).

What kinds of K–12 data are collected? How are they used?

Is New York able to connect its K–12 and postsecondary education data? If so, how are they used?

We understand that college access is a major priority for New York. Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of New York's postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What is the state doing to improve access?

Do you think New York has been a leader in developing and implementing innovative PK–16 reforms? If so, please give examples. If not, why not, especially given the formal power and structure given to the regents?

QUESTIONS FOR POSTSECONDARY INTERVIEWEES

In New York, who is responsible for regulating postsecondary education in terms of:

- Budgeting and resource allocation.
- Review of existing programs and approval of new ones.
- Strategic planning and enrollment management.
- Information management and accountability reporting.

How well are these responsibilities currently being performed?

[For state agencies/system offices:] Please describe the following functions in New York: information management, program planning, and articulation and collaboration with K–12.

What is the role of, and relationship between, state government and postsecondary education?

What percentage of students takes regents exams? Earns a regents diploma? Are there equity concerns with regard to who takes the exams? Who passes them? Who earns a regents diploma?

Please describe the process—what does is take to earn a regents diploma? Has that changed over the past 10 years? Has that changed since the inception of the program? If so, why?

How are regents tests developed (for example, are they curriculum-based)? How are they updated or changed? Who is involved in that process? How are they scored? Who scores them?

Please describe CUNY's and SUNY's remediation and placement policies, including community colleges' policies.

Please describe changes to CUNY's remediation policies over the past 10 years. Have those reforms benefited students? If so, in what way? Have they changed K–12 standards? Postsecondary persistence/completion? Has SUNY made similar changes?

Please describe any changes in the regents exams or diploma requirements over the past 10 years.

Please describe any impact the regents' policies have had on student readiness for college.

Have the regents' policies and programs (exams and diploma) had an impact on K–12 reform in New York (for example, creating alignment between K–12 and postsecondary expectations)? If so, please describe.

What is the relationship, in terms of content and expectations, between the regents tests, the high school exit test, and CUNY/SUNY/community college placement tests?

How important is the regents diploma in terms of gaining admission to public universities in New York? Privates? Community colleges?

How are the regents' data used? Do any of the community colleges use the regents' information or data?

Please describe any additional collaborative projects/endeavors with K–12 districts or schools (dual enrollment, middle college, early college high schools). How did they start? How are they governed? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

Please describe College Now (goals and objectives). How widespread is it, and how effective has it been in terms of meeting its goals and objectives?

Are your institutions/is your system brought to the table for state-level PK–16 policy discussions? Please describe those discussions (for instance, content, goals, objectives, who attends, outcomes).

What kinds of postsecondary education data are collected? How are they used?

Is New York able to connect its K–12 and postsecondary education data? If so, how was that done? How are the data being used (across systems)?

Are there any discussions about developing a postsecondary education accountability system? If so, please characterize those discussions.

Please describe the role politics plays in making education policy decisions—particularly decisions that relate to student transitions from high school to college.

We understand that college access is a major priority for New York. Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of New York's postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What is the state doing to improve access?

Do you think New York has been a leader in developing and implementing innovative PK–16 reforms? If so, please give examples. If not, why not, especially given the formal power and structure given to the regents.

QUESTIONS FOR ALL INTERVIEWEES

In what ways, and under what circumstances, do cooperation and conflict between the levels manifest themselves? Who is responsible for developing and implementing those changes? How do governors, key legislators, and agencies influence inter-level programs?

- Please describe education governance in New York over the past 10 years (for example, governor, Legislature, K–12 education, and postsecondary education). Changes prior to that? Why does New York have its current coordinating/governance structures and processes? How do all the different entities interact (legislatively, behind closed doors, territorially.)

- Who are the major players for K–12 education? Two-year institutions? Four-year institutions? K–16? What are their roles? How do they create change? How would you characterize their working relationships? How do they fit into the new governance structure?

- What is the role of the Legislature in developing, implementing, and institutionalizing PK–16 reform? The governor's office? The regents? The state education department? CUNY? SUNY? The community colleges?

- What is the role of each of those entities [repeat them] in terms of educational innovation?

- How would you characterize the relationships between those entities [repeat them] historically? Currently?

- Please describe the major executive, legislative, and judicial roles that the regents play, particularly with PK–16 reform.

- Please characterize New York's history of collaboration across K–12 and postsecondary education. Please give some examples.

- Is there a history of territoriality between education sectors? If so, please give some examples.

- How did PK–16 reforms get on the state agenda—what sparked the changes?

- [Same as above. Who has led the charge in developing these changes? In implementation?]

- What has been the role of [interviewee's organization] in developing and implementing PK–16 reforms?

- What role do non-governmental groups play in the PK–16 governance arena in New York? How do they interact with public governing entities? How effective have their PK–16 initiatives been?

- What has been the role of the business community in PK–16 reform and governance?

- Would you change your state's governance system(s) in any way? If so, how?

- If you wanted to improve PK–16 policymaking would you change your state's governance system(s) in any way? If so, how?

To what extent is PK–16 reform perceived as a state policy concern?

- What are the major K–12 and postsecondary (two-year and four-year) issues facing New York?

- What are the major issues facing New York that bridge the different education sectors? What are the major student needs (for example, problems regarding school readiness, high school completion, college-going rates, remediation, college completion)? How does New York assess those needs (especially across the PK–16 continuum)?

- Where do they fit on the state's education agenda in terms of the priority level? Who views those as major issues? Who is taking action?

- Other than the regents exams and diploma, what are New York's PK–16 student transition policies?

- What are the major issues facing the high school exit-level test?

- What are the major issues facing the regents exams?

- What are the major issues facing CUNY placement tests? SUNY placement tests (including the community colleges)?

What are the main goals and objectives of current state-level PK–16 reforms?

- These questions try to get at specific state policies related to the connections between high schools and colleges. Please characterize any discussions about (or actions regarding) developing and implementing the following changes:

  - Restructuring state governance to reflect a PK–16 frame.

  - Creating a PK–16 accountability system [holding postsecondary education accountable for persistence and completion].

  - Restructuring state education finance within a PK–16 frame (joint budgeting).

  - Connecting data systems across K–12 and postsecondary education.

  - Funding K–12 and postsecondary collaborations.

  - Broadening the scope/number of dual enrollment and related programs.

  - Alignment of K–12 and postsecondary assessments (or use of relevant cut scores).

- Administering postsecondary placement exams to high school students (diagnostic testing across the continuum) in community colleges and four-year institutions.
- Connecting K–12 and postsecondary standards.
- Public articulation of postsecondary standards (for example, entrance, placement, graduation/general ed, major-specific standards).
- Public articulation of transfer requirements.

- In each area in which there have been reforms, what have been the main goals and objectives? Have those been measured and, if so, how?
- What was the evolution of each of New York's PK–16 reforms? What changes in these structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place in the past 10 years?

What are the incentives and disincentives for improved coordination?

- Given New York's longstanding tradition of collaboration across sectors, do you have advice for other states (without a similar governance structure) regarding how to develop, implement, and institutionalize PK–16 reforms?
- What are the main barriers to developing and implementing PK–16 reforms in New York? What are the main barriers to institutionalizing these changes? Historically, how were those issues dealt with?
- How institutionalized are these reforms (specifically, the regents tests and diploma)? What is the best way to give traction to these issues (specifically, the regents tests and diploma)? What are some incentives New York used to create and institutionalize some of these changes?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to work with K–12 to improve student preparation?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to improve their student persistence and completion rates?
- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to improve their placement and advising practices?

What have been the main successes and failures to date? What changes in education structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place since the PK–16 reforms were initiated?

- What have been the main PK–16 successes and failures to date [and why does the interviewee consider them successes/failures—based on what evidence]?
- Do you consider the regents exams/diploma to be a success or failure? If you consider it to be a failure, is there something that could have been done to make it a success? Other PK–16 reforms?

To what extent do state budgetary practices impede or encourage the establishment and viability of inter-level programs?

- Please describe how all the various education entities in the state are funded (please describe your state's education finance system).
- What is the current education budget? What financial challenges are you currently facing? How have the different education sectors been impacted by budgetary problems?
- Will the current financial problems impact the regents exams/diploma in any way? If so, how? Other PK–16 programs and policies?
- Will the current financial problems reduce the capacity of postsecondary education institutions in New York to serve current and potential students? Equity?
- How does the state's finance structure impact the development, implementation, and institutionalization of PK–16 reforms? (Does money matter? Does how its flow is structured matter? What kind of behavior does your funding stream create? What kinds of incentives and disincentives does it create?)
- Would you change your state's finance system in any way? If so, how?

What are the short- and long-term outlooks for inter-level relationships? Is legislative or gubernatorial action to promote collaboration likely? Are specific connective mechanisms operational or being proposed?

- Can you predict what will happen in 5 years, 10 years, with the regents exams/diploma? Other PK–16 reforms?
- [If relevant for non-regents reforms:] How institutionalized will the reforms be?
- What will be the major changes for students? K–12 educators? Postsecondary education?

Endnotes

1. See http://www.winningbeginningny.org/documents/cfe_lawsuit.pdf.
2. See http://www.nyfb.org/.
3. See http://usny.nysed.gov/aboutusny.html.
4. See http://usny.nysed.gov/aboutusny.html.
5. New York State Board of Regents, "Statewide Plan for Higher Education, 2004-2012: Next Steps," memo from the Board of Regents, December 23, 2003.
6. See Richard C. Richardson, Jr., with Christine Shakespeare and Tara Parker, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York* (New York, NY: Alliance for International Higher Education Policy Studies, 2004).
7. See http://www.monroe2boces.org/about.
8. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.
9. See www.highered.hysed.gov/kiap/PCPPU/home and www.highered.hysed.gov/kiap/scholarships/home.
10. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.
11. See http://www.suny.edu/About_suny/about_suny.cfm.
12. See http://www.potsdam.edu/CSTEP/whatis.htm.
13. See http://www.oswego.edu/~beyerbac/newyorkconsortiumforprofessi.htm.
14. See http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/collegiate/introduction_to_cstep.htm.
15. See http://portal.cuny.edu/portal/site/cuny/.
16. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.
17. See http://www.educationupdate.com/archives/2001/july01/htmls/college-cuny.html.
18. See http://newyorkmetrol.com/nymetro/urban/education/features/1550/index3.html.
19. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.
20. Michele G. Knight, "Through Urban Youth's Eyes: Negotiating K–16 Policies, Practices, and Their Futures," *Educational Policy* 17, no. 5 (November 2003), p.536.
21. New York City's educational needs and programs are not representative of the state's or of other cities in New York. However, College Now was examined for this study because it appears to be an exemplary program that might be useful for other states or metropolitan areas.
22. See http://www.bcnys.org/inside/educcom.htm#legislative.
23. The Gates Foundation has awarded funds to CUNY and the New York Public Schools to create Early College High Schools. Because that effort is not generated or supported financially by governmental entities, it is not discussed in this case study. In addition, the reform efforts in New York City are not meant to be representative of other cities in New York State.
24. See http://teachers.altschools.org/tnellen/nyt/lowerbar.html.
25. See http://www.theithacajournal.com/news/stories/20031219/localnews/63982.html.
26. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.
27. See http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/UPK/UPK%20regs.doc.
28. See http://www.nycfuture.org/content/reports/report_view.cfm?repkey=10.

29. New York State Office of the Governor, "New York State K–16 Policy," internal memo from the governor's office, 2004.

30. See http://portal.cuny.edu/portal/site/cuny/.

31. New York State Office of the Governor, "New York State K–16 Policy," 2004.

32. Ibid.

33. New York City Department of Education, "College Now: A Free Program for New York City Public High School Students" brochure, not dated.

34. Richardson et al, *Public Policy and Higher Education Performance in the State of New York*, 2004.

35. Ibid.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ANDREA VENEZIA is senior policy analyst and project director at the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Her work examines education policy, particularly as related to equity and the transition from K–12 to postsecondary education. Prior to joining the National Center, she directed Stanford University's Bridge Project and co-authored *Betraying the College Dream* and *From High School to College*. She has worked for a variety of state, federal, and not-for-profit entities, including the Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the National Education Goals Panel.

MICHAEL W. KIRST is professor of education at Stanford University and former president of the California State Board of Education. He is a faculty affiliate with the Department of Political Science, and has a courtesy appointment with the Graduate School of Business. Before joining the Stanford University faculty, Kirst held several positions with the federal government, including staff director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, and director of program planning and evaluation for the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education in the former U.S. Office of Education. He was the principal investigator for Stanford University's Bridge Project and is co-author of *Betraying the College Dream* and *From High School to College*.

MICHAEL D. USDAN is senior fellow at the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), where he was president for 20 years. Before joining IEL, he was Connecticut's commissioner of higher education, he served as president of the Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit, and he taught at Columbia University, the City University of New York, Northwestern University, and Fordham University, as well as in schools in New York City and White Plains, New York.

THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization based in Washington, D.C. For more than 40 years, IEL's mission has been to build the capacity of individuals and organizations in education and related fields to work together—across policies, programs, and sectors. The Institute provides services in the following three program areas: Developing and Supporting Leaders, Strengthening School-Family-Community Connections, and Connecting and Improving Policies and Systems that Serve Children and Youth. IEL brings together diverse constituencies, such as federal, state, and local government agencies and nonprofit organizations, and focuses on empowering leaders with knowledge and applicable ideas. The Institute facilitates dialogue across boundaries of all sorts, building alliances and partnerships for change. Its publications translate research and experience into practical recommendations about what works to improve American education.

THE STANFORD INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH

The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research (SIHER) is home to sponsored research projects that examine contemporary higher education planning and policy issues from a wide range of analytical perspectives, including those of social scientists and policy audiences in the United States and abroad. Since its establishment in 1989, SIHER has sought to understand the dynamics of systemic change, productivity, management, and effectiveness of higher education organizations, as well as to offer suggestions for their improvement.

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education promotes public policies that enhance Americans' opportunities to pursue and achieve high-quality education and training beyond high school. As an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization, the National Center prepares action-oriented analyses of pressing policy issues facing the states and the nation regarding opportunity and achievement in higher education—including two- and four-year, public and private, for-profit and nonprofit institutions. The National Center communicates performance results and key findings to the public, to civic, business, and higher education leaders, and to state and federal leaders who are in positions to improve higher education policy.

Established in 1998, the National Center is not affiliated with any institution of higher education, with any political party, or with any government agency; it receives continuing, core financial support from a consortium of national foundations that includes The Pew Charitable Trusts, The Atlantic Philanthropies, and The Ford Foundation.

152 North Third Street, Suite 705, San Jose, California 95112
Telephone: 408-271-2699 • FAX: 408-271-2697
www.highereducation.org

National Center Publications

The National Center publishes:
- ★ Reports and analyses commissioned by the National Center,
- ★ Reports and analyses written by National Center staff,
- ★ National Center Policy Reports that are approved by the National Center's Board of Directors, and
- ★ *National CrossTalk*, a quarterly publication.

The following National Center publications—as well as a host of other information and links—are available at www.highereducation.org. Single copies of most of these reports are also available from the National Center. Please FAX requests to 408-271-2697 and ask for the report by publication number.

American Higher Education: How Does It Measure Up for the 21st Century, by James B. Hunt Jr. and Thomas J. Tierney with a Foreword by Garrey Carruthers (May 2006, #06-2). These essays by former Governor James B. Hunt Jr. and business leader Thomas J. Tierney lay out in succinct fashion the requirements of both our nation and our states for new and higher levels of performance from America's colleges and universities.

Claiming Common Ground: State Policymaking for Improving College Readiness and Success, by Patrick M. Callan, Joni E. Finney, Michael W. Kirst, Michael D. Usdan, and Andrea Venezia (March 2006, #06-1). To improve college readiness and success, states can develop policies that better connect their K–12 and postsecondary

education systems. However, state action in each of the following policy areas is needed to create college-readiness reform: alignment of coursework and assessments; state finance; statewide data systems; and accountability.

Measuring Up on College-Level Learning, by Margaret A. Miller and Peter T. Ewell (October 2005, #05-8). In this report, the National Forum on College-Level Learning proposes a model for evaluating and comparing college-level learning on a state-by-state basis, including assessing educational capital. As well as releasing the results for five participating states, the authors also explore the implications of their findings in terms of performance gaps by race/ethnicity and educating future teachers.

The Governance Divide: A Report on a Four-State Study on Improving College Readiness and Success, by Andrea Venezia, Patrick M. Callan, Joni E. Finney, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (September 2005, #05-3). This report, supported by case studies in Florida, Georgia, New York, and Oregon, identifies and examines policy options available to states that are interested in creating sustained K–16 reform.

> ***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Florida***, by Andrea Venezia and Joni E. Finney (May 2006, #05-4).

> ***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Georgia***, by Andrea Venezia, Patrick M. Callan, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (April 2006, #05-5).

> ***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for New York***, by Andrea Venezia, Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan (May 2006, #05-6).

> ***The Governance Divide: The Case Study for Oregon***, by Andrea Venezia and Michael W. Kirst (April 2006, #05-7).

Borrowers Who Drop Out: A Neglected Aspect of the College Student Loan Trend, by Lawrence Gladieux and Laura Perna (May 2005, #05-2). This report examines the experiences of students who borrow to finance their educations, but do not complete their postsecondary programs. Using the latest comprehensive data, this report compares borrowers who drop out with other groups of students, and provides recommendations on policies and programs that would better prepare, support, and guide students—especially low-income students—in completing their degrees.

Case Study of Utah Higher Education, by Kathy Reeves Bracco and Mario Martinez (April 2005, #05-1). This report examines state policies and performance in the areas of enrollment and affordability. Compared with other states, Utah has been able to maintain a system of higher education that is more affordable for students, while enrollments have almost doubled over the past 20 years.

Measuring Up 2004: The National Report Card on Higher Education (September 2004). *Measuring Up 2004* consists of a national report card for higher education (report #04-5) and 50 state report cards (#04-4). The purpose of *Measuring Up 2004* is to provide the public and policymakers with information to assess and improve postsecondary education in each state. For the first time, this edition of *Measuring Up* provides information about each state's improvement over the past decade. Visit www.highereducation.org to download *Measuring Up 2004* or to make your own comparisons of state performance in higher education.

> ***Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators, and Data Sources for* Measuring Up 2004** (November 2004, #04-6).

Ensuring Access with Quality to California's Community Colleges, by Gerald C. Hayward, Dennis P. Jones, Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., and Allene Timar, with a postscript by Nancy Shulock (May 2004, #04-3). This report finds that enrollment growth pressures, fee increases, and recent budget cuts in the California Community Colleges are having

significant detrimental effects on student access and program quality. The report also provides recommendations for creating improvements that build from the state policy context and from existing promising practices within the community colleges.

Public Attitudes on Higher Education: A Trend Analysis, 1993 to 2003, by John Immerwahr (February 2004, #04-2). This public opinion survey, prepared by Public Agenda for the National Center, reveals that public attitudes about the importance of higher education have remained stable during the recent economic downturn. The survey also finds that there are some growing public concerns about the costs of higher education, especially for those groups most affected, including parents of high school students, African-Americans, and Hispanics.

Responding to the Crisis in College Opportunity (January 2004, #04-1). This policy statement, developed by education policy experts at Lansdowne, Virginia, proposes short-term emergency measures and long-term priorities for governors and legislators to consider for funding higher education during the current lean budget years. *Responding to the Crisis* suggests that in 2004 the highest priority for state higher education budgets should be to protect college access and affordability for students and families.

With Diploma in Hand: Hispanic High School Seniors Talk About Their Future, by John Immerwahr (June 2003, #03-2). This report by Public Agenda explores some of the primary obstacles that many Hispanic students face in seeking higher education—barriers that suggest opportunities for creative public policy to improve college attendance and completion rates among Hispanics.

Purposes, Policies, Performance: Higher Education and the Fulfillment of a State's Public Agenda (February 2003, #03-1). This essay is drawn from discussions of higher education leaders and policy officials at a roundtable convened in June 2002 at New Jersey City University on the relationship between public purposes, policies, and performance of American higher education.

Measuring Up 2002: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education (October 2002, #02-7). This report card, which updates the inaugural edition released in 2000, grades each state on its performance in five key areas of higher education. *Measuring Up 2002* also evaluates each state's progress in relation to its own results from 2000.

> ***Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators, and Data Sources for*** **Measuring Up 2002** (October 2002, #02-8).

State Policy and Community College–Baccalaureate Transfer, by Jane V. Wellman (July 2002, #02-6). This report recommends state policies to energize and improve higher education performance regarding transfers from community colleges to four-year institutions.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education: The Early Years (June 2002, #02-5). The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) attained remarkable success in funding innovative and enduring projects during its early years. This report, prepared by FIPSE's early program officers, describes how those results were achieved.

Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of American Higher Education (May 2002, #02-3). This national status report documents the declining affordability of higher education for American families, and highlights public policies that support affordable higher education. It provides state-by-state summaries as well as national findings.

> ***The Affordability of Higher Education: A Review of Recent Survey Research***, by John Immerwahr (May 2002, #02-4). This review of recent surveys by Public Agenda confirms that Americans feel that rising college costs threaten to make higher education inaccessible for many people.

Coping with Recession: Public Policy, Economic Downturns, and Higher Education, by Patrick M. Callan (February 2002, #02-2). This report outlines the major policy considerations that states and institutions of higher education face during economic downturns.

Competition and Collaboration in California Higher Education, by Kathy Reeves Bracco and Patrick M. Callan (January 2002, #02-1). This report argues that the structure of California's state higher education system limits the system's capacity for collaboration.

Measuring Up 2000: The State-by-State Report Card for Higher Education (November 2000, #00-3). This first-of-its-kind report card grades each state on its performance in higher education. The report card also provides comprehensive profiles of each state and brief states-at-a-glance comparisons.

> *Beneath the Surface: A Statistical Analysis of the Major Variables Associated with State Grades in* **Measuring Up 2000**, by Alisa F. Cunningham and Jane V. Wellman (November 2001, #01-4). Using statistical analysis, this report explores the "drivers" that predict overall performance in *Measuring Up 2000*.

> *Supplementary Analysis for* **Measuring Up 2000***: An Exploratory Report*, by Mario Martinez (November 2001, #01-3). This supplement explores the relationships within and among the performance categories in *Measuring Up 2000*.

> *Some Next Steps for States: A Follow-up to* **Measuring Up 2000**, by Dennis Jones and Karen Paulson (June 2001, #01-2). This report suggests a range of actions that states can take to bridge the gap between state performance identified in *Measuring Up 2000* and the formulation of effective policy to improve performance in higher education.

> *A Review of Tests Performed on the Data in* **Measuring Up 2000**, by Peter Ewell (June 2001, #01-1). This review describes the statistical testing performed on the data in *Measuring Up 2000* by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

> *Recent State Policy Initiatives in Education: A Supplement to* **Measuring Up 2000**, by Aims McGuinness, Jr. (December 2000, #00-6). This supplement highlights education initiatives that states have adopted since 1997–98.

> *Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: A Supplement to* **Measuring Up 2000**, by Peter Ewell and Paula Ries (December 2000, #00-5). This report is a national survey of state efforts to assess student learning outcomes in higher education.

> *Technical Guide Documenting Methodology, Indicators and Data Sources for* **Measuring Up 2000** (November 2000, #00-4).

> *A State-by-State Report Card on Higher Education: Prospectus* (March 2000, #00-1). This document summarizes the goals of the National Center's report-card project.

Great Expectations: How the Public and Parents—White, African-American, and Hispanic—View Higher Education, by John Immerwahr with Tony Foleno (May 2000, #00-2). This report by Public Agenda finds that Americans overwhelmingly see higher education as essential for success. Survey results are also available for the following states:

> *Great Expectations: How Pennsylvanians View Higher Education* (May 2000, #00-2b).
> *Great Expectations: How Floridians View Higher Education* (August 2000, #00-2c).
> *Great Expectations: How Coloradans View Higher Education* (August 2000, #00-2d).

Great Expectations: How Californians View Higher Education (August 2000, #00-2e).
Great Expectations: How New Yorkers View Higher Education (October 2000, #00-2f).
Great Expectations: How Illinois Residents View Higher Education (October 2000, #00-2h).

State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade: The Battle to Sustain Current Support, by Harold A. Hovey (July 1999, #99-3). This fiscal forecast of state and local spending patterns finds that the vast majority of states will face significant fiscal deficits over the next eight years, which will in turn lead to increased scrutiny of higher education in almost all states, and to curtailed spending for public higher education in many states.

South Dakota: Developing Policy-Driven Change in Higher Education, by Mario Martinez (June 1999, #99-2). This report describes the processes for change in higher education that government, business, and higher education leaders are creating and implementing in South Dakota.

Taking Responsibility: Leaders' Expectations of Higher Education, by John Immerwahr (January 1999, #99-1). This paper reports the views of those most involved with decision-making about higher education, based on focus groups and a survey conducted by Public Agenda.

The Challenges and Opportunities Facing Higher Education: An Agenda for Policy Research, by Dennis Jones, Peter Ewell, and Aims McGuinness (December 1998, #98-8). This report argues that due to substantial changes in the landscape of postsecondary education, new state-level policy frameworks must be developed and implemented.

Higher Education Governance: Balancing Institutional and Market Influences, by Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Kathy Reeves Bracco, Patrick M. Callan, and Joni E. Finney (November 1998, #98-7). This publication describes the structural relationships that affect institutional effectiveness in higher education, and argues that state policy should strive for a balance between institutional and market forces.

Federal Tuition Tax Credits and State Higher Education Policy: A Guide for State Policy Makers, by Kristin D. Conklin (December 1998, #98-6). This report examines the implications of the federal income tax provisions for students and their families, and makes recommendations for state higher education policy.

The Challenges Facing California Higher Education: A Memorandum to the Next Governor of California, by David W. Breneman (September 1998, #98-5). This memorandum argues that California should develop a new Master Plan for Higher Education.

Tidal Wave II Revisited: A Review of Earlier Enrollment Projections for California Higher Education, by Gerald C. Hayward, David W. Breneman, and Leobardo F. Estrada (September 1998, #98-4). This review finds that earlier forecasts of a surge in higher education enrollments were accurate.

Organizing for Learning: The View from the Governor's Office, by James B. Hunt Jr., chair of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and former governor of North Carolina (June 1998, #98-3). This publication is an address to the American Association for Higher Education concerning opportunity in higher education.

The Price of Admission: The Growing Importance of Higher Education, by John Immerwahr (Spring 1998, #98-2). This report is a national survey of Americans' views on higher education, conducted and reported by Public Agenda.

Concept Paper: A National Center to Address Higher Education Policy, by Patrick M. Callan (March 1998, #98-1). This concept paper describes the purposes of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

www.highereducation.org