

THE GOVERNANCE DIVIDE

The Case Study for Georgia

By

Andrea Venezia
Patrick M. Callan
Michael W. Kirst
Michael D. Usdan

April 2006



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

National Center Report #05-5

© 2006 by The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Material may be duplicated with full attribution.

Contents

Foreword.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. History of P–16 Reform and Governance in Georgia.....	3
III. Other Major P–16 Projects and Policies	12
IV. P–16 Accomplishments	16
V. Challenges to P–16 Reform	19
VI. Conclusion	23
Appendix: Georgia Interview Protocol.....	25
Endnotes.....	31
About the Authors.....	32
The Institute for Educational Leadership.....	33
The Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.....	33
The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.....	34

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

Over the past decade, Georgia has developed innovative ways to implement and institutionalize P–16 reform. These efforts made the state a national leader in reforms associated with coordinating and connecting the entire educational experience for students, from preschool to and including four years of college. Because Georgia is at the forefront of these kinds of reforms, the state has experienced both successes and failures that no other state has yet seen. As a regent for the University System of Georgia said,

Things are light years better than they used to be ... because this is the structure that ought to be in place... We've got the model. I mean, ours is neat. It should work, it does work, it can work better, and hopefully we'll make it work because, politics notwithstanding, when people come together with the notion of trying to improve education, and you've got the governance structure, that's key. You can talk about things, and you can persuade people, but when there's the power of legislation, [that's important].

Unlike most states engaged in this work, Georgia created state and regional P–16 reforms at the same time. At the state level, it has a statewide P–16 Council, the Education Coordinating Council (ECC), and particularly strong gubernatorial support across the administrations of Governors Zell Miller and Roy Barnes. At the regional level, it has regional and local P–16 Councils. In addition, there are many projects focusing on issues such as teacher preparation, professional development, standards development across the systems, and proficiency-based teaching and learning.

The major initiatives driving this P–16 work include efforts to improve students' academic achievement and college preparation, as well as efforts to keep the “best-prepared” college students in-state. As Chancellor Thomas Meredith said to faculty and staff of the University System of Georgia (USG) on January 28, 2002, “It's time we seized the opportunity to help more Georgians tackle college. We are a long way from where we need to be in that regard. We have to make sure we have the right access, the right programs, and a more-than-adequate amount of resources and facilities. If we don't, Georgians will leave the state for college, and we'll probably lose them for good.”¹ Meanwhile, state policymakers have made the case that the economic future of Georgia is at stake, because of the need to have a highly educated workforce that can succeed in an increasingly competitive global economy.

While Georgia's P–16 efforts have been studied by researchers and policy analysts across the country, little documentation exists about the state's governance and policy structures, their evolution over time, and the effects these changes have had on educational reform efforts. This report, in seeking to fill some of this research gap, explores the past and present of Georgia's

P-16 efforts. The Georgia field research was conducted in September 2003. Two central questions that this report seeks to answer are:

- What types of governance structures and related policies enable, or create difficulties for, P-16 reforms?
- How necessary is a P-16 governance framework in order to create and institutionalize P-16 reform?

To examine these questions and issues, this report describes the history of and context for P-16 reform and governance in Georgia. It then presents a summary of major P-16 projects and policies, and an analysis of the state's major P-16 accomplishments and challenges. The report concludes with thoughts about the present and future of P-16 reform in the state. In addition, an appendix provides the key research questions that comprised the interview protocol for research visits to the state.

II. History of P–16 Reform and Governance in Georgia

Many states have K–16 programs or policies, although the majority of these programs are mostly ad hoc and are supported by soft money. Georgia’s P–16 reforms, which are recognized nationally, were supported by two governors, have the support of state legislation, are driven by staff dedicated to P–16 issues, and have the support of staff through an official office within the University System of Georgia (USG). Gubernatorial support gave the P–16 issue momentum, visibility, and a degree of institutionalization—whether permanent or temporary remains to be seen. Before describing the history and nature of these reforms, it is important to provide an overview of the statewide institutional context.

MAJOR EDUCATIONAL ENTITIES IN GEORGIA

Department of Education (DOE)

The State Department of Education is led by the state superintendent of schools, an elected official, and is governed by the State Board of Education. There are 13 board members—one from each congressional district—appointed by the governor. The main goals of the Department of Education (DOE) are to oversee the following: the recruitment, training, and retention of teachers; the Quality Core Curriculum; testing; school improvement; high school improvement; data development; financial management of state and federal education dollars; and policy development and implementation.²

University System of Georgia (USG)

The University System of Georgia (USG) is governed by the Board of Regents, a constitutional board consisting of members appointed to seven-year terms by the governor. The board was created in 1931 as part of a reorganization of the state government. Public higher education in Georgia was then unified for the first time under a single management and governing authority. Five of the regents are appointed from the state at large, and there is one appointed from each of the 13 congressional districts. The board elects a chancellor, who serves as its chief executive officer and as the chief administrative officer of the USG.³

The board oversees 34 institutions: 4 research universities, 2 regional universities, 13 state universities, 2 state colleges, and 13 two-year colleges. These institutions enroll more than 223,000 students. Georgia’s community colleges fall under the purview of the USG,⁴ but the state’s technical colleges are governed by the Department of Technical and Adult Education, a separate entity.

Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE)

The Area Vocational-Technical Schools were officially started in 1958 as an outgrowth of the vocational school system. The State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education was created in 1984, followed by the creation of the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE) in 1988, with the goal of providing more consistency and higher quality throughout the system. The DTAE oversees the state's system of technical colleges, the adult literacy program, and many economic and workforce development programs. It is led by a commissioner and is governed by the State Board for Technical and Adult Education, whose members are appointed by the governor.⁵ The agency runs collaborative programs between its colleges and neighboring high schools, in which students can earn college credit and technical certificates while still in high school. In 2000, 3,783 students took part in such programs; that number rose to 7,361 in 2002, with 392 high schools, 4,086 private employers, and 851 public employers participating.⁶

GOVERNANCE REFORMS

The Inauguration of Reforms

P-16 efforts in Georgia began approximately 10 years ago, when Governor Miller, the USG regents' office (under Chancellor Stephen Portch), and other education entities began informal discussions about connecting the systems. In the words of a USG administrator:

It was real clear to me that there was no agenda. It was just sort of ad hoc stuff. So I went to then-Chancellor Portch and asked if I could write a white paper about what I see as the core work, he said, "Fine." ... [Then] I sat down and wrote something called Preschool to College, P-16, which basically characterized two strands of work—looking at the educator quality side, the alignment of the school and college systems. Then Chancellor Portch took it to our board and he asked me to present it—I did and the board approved it. With our board's approval, former Chancellor Portch went to the governor [Miller] and said, this is really important work from our perspective. We need a statewide P-16 Council. Governor Miller then appointed the statewide P-16 Council... I asked Chancellor Portch if we could put in a budget request for seed money for local P-16 councils; he said yes, and we got funded. This gave P-16 work a \$300,000 line item in the regents' budget. It was real clear to me that we needed to do some leveraging. So Chancellor Portch and I worked together to build some private money, which would then allow us to go back to the Legislature and ask for increased funding... In this way, we kept building it. So we ended up with a structure of 15 regional P-16 councils and a state council.

The interviewee's remarks highlight a theme brought up repeatedly throughout the interviews in Georgia: the convergence of key people and a sense of urgency for change. By all accounts, Portch, Miller, and Jan Kettlewell (the associate vice chancellor for P-16 initiatives at the USG

Board of Regents) were energetic, well-respected thinkers who wanted to create a policy environment that supported improved student preparation for college and that would result in more Georgians staying in-state for college.

In 1994, the Board of Regents began a partnership with the Department of Adult and Technical Education to:

be responsive to the needs of Georgians first and foremost while raising their aspirations, and generate a more highly educated populace throughout the state. It will seek to create for students from various backgrounds every possible avenue to intellectual achievement without compromising academic excellence... To these ends, the University System of Georgia will be characterized by: leadership in establishing higher state standards for postsecondary education and—with the public schools and technical institutes—in improving and valuing education at all levels, helping students move smoothly within the system and from one educational sector to another, and insuring that all students who enter the university system are prepared to succeed.⁷

The partnership was based on three principles: (1) the needs of students come first, (2) each system retains its own distinctive mission, and (3) cooperative agreements between the two systems will be negotiated while keeping the perspective of local situations. The policy directives stipulated that:

- The two systems would help high school students make “the most appropriate postsecondary choices to meet their needs”;
- The universities would provide theoretical general education courses and the technical institutions would provide applied general education courses;
- When there are DTAE and USG institutions in the same community, DTAE institutions would not provide preparation for a baccalaureate degree;
- There would not be an assumption that DTAE courses would transfer to USG institutions;
- The two systems would develop a matrix of transfer agreements and 2 + 2 programs (that is, community college programs that include two years of study leading directly to junior and senior year coursework at a university);
- The two systems would work together to help meet geographic areas of need; and
- The two systems would establish a joint council to focus on implementing and monitoring the partnership.⁸

As the partnership moved forward, the stakeholders found other governance needs and supports. For example, they needed an entity to coordinate and oversee the efforts between the agencies. In 1995, Governor Miller swore in 38 members to the statewide P–16 Council with the

charge of improving student academic achievement at all levels and creating a more seamless and stronger educational system. Governor Miller hoped that the council would spur education reforms at the state and local levels that would connect K–12 education, postsecondary education, the business community, and health and human services. Miller asked the Georgia P–16 Council to examine the following issues:

1. New models of teaching;
2. Professional development programs for teachers;
3. P–16 curriculum, including student assessment;
4. Higher academic standards for high school graduation and college admission while maintaining access; and
5. P–16 accountability.⁹

Georgia is one of the few states that includes “P” for preschool in its efforts to connect its education segments. Governor Miller started the Office of School Readiness, according to an administrator at the USG, “to administer the voluntary [preschool] programs in our state for four-year-olds, and it’s sort of Georgia’s administrative arm into early childhood education... We intentionally, in Georgia, refer to our work as P–16, not K–16.”

Education Coordinating Council (ECC)

What Governor Miller started by executive order, Governor Barnes continued by signing legislation into law. Under Governor Barnes, Georgia passed House Bill 1187, the A-Plus Education Reform Act of 2000. As a DOE staff member stated, “The governor appointed an Education Coordinating Council and their job was to implement House Bill 1187, and 1187 wasn’t just K–12. It was P–16.” P–16 in Georgia had been underway for approximately six years before a formal structure was put in place legislatively.

HB 1187 was wide-ranging in scope, focusing on such issues as the juvenile courts; local school councils; physical education; early intervention; class size; assessment (including the development of end-of-course assessments, participation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the elimination of the High School Graduation Tests); and a statewide student information system. The creation of the Education Coordinating Council (ECC), however, stands out as a major milestone in P–16 reform in Georgia. “What Barnes added to the equation,” said a USG administrator, “is that the participation of the CEO of each of the state education agencies, and the chairs of their state boards, is required, and that he personally would chair it... From the point of view of other states learning [from us], that was a critical thing.”

The development of the ECC was an instance in which: (1) a state legislated the meeting of representatives from each public education sector, (2) the entity was handed a set of priorities, and (3) a governor officially led the charge. In addition to the governor, the members are the state superintendent of schools, the chair of the State Board of Education, the USG chancellor, the chair of the USG Board of Regents, the DTAE commissioner, the chair of the State Board of

Technical and Adult Education, the executive secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, the chair of the Professional Standards Commission, and the director of the Office of School Readiness.¹⁰ According to a state representative, the hope was that everyone would “get together and make sure that everyone understands what the expectations are of the children and, most importantly, to make sure that there are mechanisms in place to provide the kinds of instruction needed to prepare those children for the next level.” There was also the understanding that all major stakeholders would be recognized and would give input, in order to create the desired changes.

The ECC is charged with the following responsibilities:

- To foster coordination and cooperation among the chief officers of the departments, boards, and offices represented on the council;
- To develop a seamless and integrated public education system;
- To require the shared and efficient expenditures for and utilization of facilities, personnel, and other resources;
- To require the seamless coordination of curriculum among the departments, boards, and offices represented on the council;
- To require reasonable ease of transition for students among the educational institutions represented on the council;
- To establish and require high levels of student achievement at all levels of education;
- To oversee accountability systems that are within or among the departments, boards, and offices represented on the council and develop overlay accountability systems through the Office of Education Accountability;
- To supervise and oversee the Office of Education Accountability;
- To coordinate the activities of state, regional, and local cooperative public education agencies, offices, or councils, including, but not limited to, the state’s regional educational service agencies or other such groups that may be created in addition or in their place;
- To ensure the availability and quality of the education workforce through preparation, professional development, and nontraditional routes to employment;
- To oversee the development and implementation of a comprehensive systemwide student information system that will support the implementation of an education accountability system and improve the seamless operation of public education;
- To simplify rules and regulations for all departments, boards, and offices represented on the council;

- To develop a statewide mentoring program that enhances student achievement at all levels of public education;
- To establish and coordinate a school safety collaborative with representation from agencies and organizations designated by the council to improve the school climate and enhance school safety; and
- To mediate disputes among the Department of Education, the University System of Georgia, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Professional Standards Commission, the Office of School Readiness, and the Office of Education Accountability in matters regarding accountability or education system seamlessness.¹¹

As of November 2002, the ECC's accomplishments included: the reconstitution of the existing statewide P-16 Council to avoid duplication; investigations into distance learning possibilities and the use of shared facilities; the release of the Office of Education Accountability's Performance Report and Report Card; and the adoption of initial accountability indicators for each of the ECC's member agencies. Also, representatives from each sector received frequent briefings about major initiatives and needs of the other sectors, such as the development of new assessments and accountability indicators, and changes to the state's professional development program for teachers.¹² Many interviewees viewed former State Superintendent Linda Schrenko, the DOE in general, and the ECC specifically as major barriers to P-16 reform. Governor Barnes and Superintendent Schrenko reportedly had a contentious relationship, and her leadership style appeared to alienate the DOE from some of the P-16 work.

Several interviewees said that many long-time DOE staff members who left under Schrenko's leadership are now returning, and that this would help the P-16 cause and education reform in general. In addition, some responsibilities that Barnes removed from the DOE are now returning. According to a USG regent, Barnes also alienated many teachers by not having "the complete acceptance and involvement of the people in the trenches... The people in the trenches did not get assigned the proper roles, didn't have as much input and involvement, and then they view it as threatening and so [teachers] became angry with the governor." A DOE staff member said that to many educators, Barnes' presentation of end-of-course exams made it seem like "something we're going to lord over your head as educators because you're not doing your job." Those tests have since been eliminated. According to interviewees, Barnes' often negative interactions with the DOE and with teachers hurt the P-16 movement.

Current Superintendent Kathy Cox was well respected by the interviewees. Although Cox was relatively new to the job at the time of the interviews, she was described as collaborating with the regents' P-16 office. She planned to have new secondary curriculum standards completed in 2004 that included alignment between grades 10 and 14. From the interviews with DOE staff, it appears that the DOE has been working across levels within the agency and collaborating with the other education agencies more than in the past. (While P-16 is not central to the DOE's mission, there is an infrastructure in the DOE that supports P-16 collaboration.)

As required, the ECC met quarterly under Governor Barnes, but, when this field research was being conducted, it had not met under Governor Sonny Perdue. It appears to be dormant, as evidenced by this uncertain description by a state education leader: “I can’t remember the wording, but he [Barnes] changed from the P–16 structure to a new structure that, just a minute and I’ll get it—Education Coordinating Council, I think is what he called it... [It became] a cabinet-level board for the governor. Now we’re in that first year of a new governor and I don’t think he’s decided which way he’s going with that yet.”

While the ECC is an important visible structure, the staff of the ECC member organizations also work together in informal ways. There are frequent meetings between staff from the Regents, the DOE, the DTAE, and the governor’s office, and those activities are encouraged by the system heads. They often collaborate on foundation grants and advocate jointly for federal policies, and many believe P–16 has helped to create a collaborative working culture.

Regents’ P–16 Office

The P–16 office, housed with the USG Board of Regents, has implemented the bulk of the state’s P–16 work; most of it has been accomplished with soft-money grants from foundations and the U.S. Department of Education. Its three major P–16 emphases are alignment, teacher quality, and improving student skills.

Former Chancellor Portch and current Chancellor Meredith have been very strong advocates for P–16 reform in general, and specifically for improving student preparation for, and access to, postsecondary education. Almost every interviewee attributed much of the success of the regents’ early efforts and much of the momentum in P–16 to Portch. One interviewee said that Portch “spent about 40% of his time on the P–16 agenda, while in most places, system heads spend 1% or so” on those issues.

Jan Kettlewell was hired by Chancellor Portch and was repeatedly referred to as the “Queen of P–16” by many interviewees; she appears to garner much respect throughout the agencies. Kettlewell described P–16 as “aligning curriculum, assessment, instruction for students (preschool through college), and teaching-quality issues, and all of those issues necessary to enable all the students to be ready as they move from one level to the next.” She said that “the thorny issues don’t reside either in K–12 or in higher education. They sit at the intersection.” While Dean of Education at Miami University, Kettlewell tried to develop school-university teacher preparation partnerships, but she “kept butting into state infrastructure problems that, either from the school or the university side, were impediments.” In the USG, she has worked to create a portfolio of programs. Appendix I summarizes several P–16 programs and policies of the USG, in addition to broad state-level policies.

P–16 Councils

Through the USG, Georgia is divided into 15 regional and local P–16 councils, and the authority to implement the state’s P–16 goals is decentralized. Each council is a member of the Georgia

P–16 Network, which is in charge of communication and relationships among the regional and local P–16 councils.¹³ The major foci of the councils are teacher preparation and professional development; there are considerable amounts of incentive funds in those areas.

The networks are as follows:

- Central Georgia P–16 Council (Georgia College & State University);
- Central Savannah River Area P–16 Council (Augusta State University);
- Co-Reform Columbus P–16 Council (Columbus State University);
- East Central Georgia P–16 Council (Georgia Southern University);
- Flint Wiregrass P–16 Council (Albany State University);
- Metropolitan Atlanta P–16 Council (Georgia State University);
- Middle Georgia P–16 Council (Fort Valley State University);
- Northeast Georgia P–16 Council (University of Georgia, Athens);
- Northwest Georgia P–16 Council (Kennesaw State University);
- Society For School-Based Leadership (North Georgia College & State University);
- South Georgia P–16 Council (Valdosta State University);
- Southeast Georgia P–16 Council (Armstrong Atlantic State University);
- Southern Crescent P–16 Council (Clayton College & State University);
- Southwest Georgia P–16 Council (Georgia Southwestern State University); and
- West Georgia P–16 Council (State University of West Georgia).¹⁴

Each of the councils is spearheaded by a postsecondary institution, perhaps reinforcing some people’s suspicions that P–16 is top-down reform driven by the USG. There is a view that the councils have been of uneven quality and effectiveness and that the larger P–16 framework is diffused through the local and regional activities of the councils.

Many of the regional and local councils have math and science initiatives; all conduct teacher education and professional development activities; many collaborate with other regional P–16 councils; and some are involved in policies and programs that provide a “seamless education for students.”¹⁵ There is significant variation across the P–16 councils in their activities and their involvement in governance issues. Some P–16 council representatives reported that in more rural areas the councils have become de facto governance boards that address policy issues. Other more metropolitan councils reported that their roles are more advisory and they are not involved in policymaking. As a metropolitan council representative stated, “It was always an advisory group. It had discussions and did networking, but was never a true governing group. It was discussed at the very beginning, but we decided that didn’t hold much relevance for us because local boards of education run their own governance and the

university's school of education has its own governance, so there was no need to have a group to oversee their activities. We coordinate and work together, though." All P-16 council representatives were in agreement that the regents' office plays a crucial role in spearheading the content and funding for their efforts.

III. Other Major P-16 Projects and Policies

The following policies and practices also have a significant impact on student transitions from high school to college in Georgia. Presidents of the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE) institutions, regional service agency representatives, local superintendents, and university representatives meet regularly to discuss ways to coordinate their activities and programs. According to the DTAE commissioner, “That’s probably done more to stimulate collaboration than anything that has happened in the last 10 years.”

THE HOPE SCHOLARSHIP

One initiative that has garnered much national media attention is the HOPE Scholarship, legislated in 1992. Funded by the lottery, it costs over \$350 million per year (2002–2003). Students must earn a grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher to qualify for a HOPE Scholarship for USG institutions (and those students must maintain a 3.0 while in college). There is no GPA requirement for HOPE grants for students who go to DTAE institutions and do not enroll in a degree program. The scholarships pay for full tuition and mandatory fees, plus \$150 per semester for books per year at public colleges and universities, and \$3,000 annually for students attending private colleges in Georgia. It pays for full tuition, mandatory fees, and \$100 per quarter for books at public technical colleges. In 2001–2002, 56% of Georgia’s high school graduates qualified for HOPE, and 196,000 received scholarships.¹⁶

Some assert that the money from HOPE is being distributed to students who do not need it, but that it is also keeping more students in-state for college, changing attitudes toward Georgia’s public postsecondary institutions, and improving the state’s high school dropout rate. Others are concerned that HOPE is sending confusing messages to students. As an education finance expert in the state said:

You have to get an 80 to get the HOPE Scholarship, but to get into college, they’re looking at what your grade point average is on a 4.0 scale. So there’re two different standards... Currently, the HOPE looks at the core curriculum, what it takes to graduate from high school, but not if you’ve taken a more robust curriculum what your grade point average would be on that. So we’re sending, I think, mixed signals to kids on, you know, what you should do to be eligible for HOPE and to get into college.

DUAL ENROLLMENT

Dual enrollment between high schools and DTAE institutions is “sky-rocketing,” and the system views those programs as recruitment tools. The DTAE commissioner stated that in 2002–03, 8,544 DTAE students received credit for one or more dual enrollment courses. The commissioner believes that the revamping of the colleges’ physical plants and the redesignation of the institutions as colleges have done more to increase dual enrollment than anything else. In addition, DTAE institutions are enrolling increasing numbers of students directly after high school graduation.

SYSTEMWIDE ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT TESTING

Many policymakers in Georgia are upset by data showing that Georgia’s SAT takers, on average, score among the lowest in the nation. The DOE has an education program specialist who focuses primarily on policies that can boost students’ scores on the SAT and Advanced Placement (AP) exams. This position also works with high schools on their improvement plans and with high school teachers to connect with their local middle and elementary schools, focusing on student preparation for college. For the last several years, the state has paid for all AP tests taken by students who are enrolled in official AP classes. In 2003–04, however, Georgia reduced its funding and now will pay for only one test per student.

USG institutions use SAT scores for first-year course placement, and they do not require high scores. If students have a verbal score of 510, they are exempted from taking the reading test. Students must also pass the state’s Regents Test (formerly the Rising Junior Test) before they have 45 semester credit hours in postsecondary education, or they must take remedial coursework. Students entering any public postsecondary institution in Georgia must take at least four years of mathematics, or they need to take a math placement exam. In terms of standardized testing and DTAE institutions, every program standard is geared toward the ASSET (a placement test developed by ACT).

In addition, the USG runs many P–16 programs and projects. The bulk of the work of the regents’ P–16 office has been focusing on teacher education and professional development. The major teacher-focused initiatives include:¹⁷

- Guidelines regarding the preparation of non-teaching educators (such as administrators);
- Guidelines regarding the preparation of school counselors;
- Guidelines regarding the preparation of teachers for the schools;
- Guidelines regarding the preparation of educational leaders for the schools;
- The Teacher Quality Action Plan;
- The Georgia Guide to Collaborative University Induction Programs;

- The Standards-based Teacher Education Program;
- Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology; and
- Raising the Standard: Georgia’s Leadership in Teacher Preparation Reform.

POSTSECONDARY READINESS ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (PREP)

Started in 1996, the Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (PREP) is an institutionally based, supplemental program focused on increasing college readiness for 7th to 12th grade students in at-risk situations. It has a presence in approximately 29 postsecondary institutions in Georgia. Its goals are to:

- Close the college-readiness gap between “middle and high school students from majority and minority groups and between high and low income groups”;
- Teach parents of students in at-risk situations how to help their children become ready for college; and
- Increase college success for students from historically underrepresented groups.¹⁸

PARTNERSHIP FOR REFORM IN SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (PRISM)

The Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics (PRISM) is funded by the National Science Foundation, with a primary focus on improving math and science achievement for K–12 students.¹⁹ The USG, DOE, and K–12 systems in four regions of the state collaboratively developed Georgia’s proposal. PRISM objectives include the development of state and local policies that support the following across the P–12 continuum:

- The hiring and training of highly qualified and ethnically diverse science and mathematics teachers;
- Successful student completion of challenging science and mathematics courses; and
- The development in students of a deep understanding of major concepts in science and mathematics.²⁰

As regents’ staff members indicated, the project’s original aim has been to develop math standards in grade 14 and use those standards to drive improvement and change throughout the K–12 system.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR COLLEGES AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS (PACTS)

The Performance Assessment for Colleges and Technical Schools (PACTS) was started in 1998 by the USG and the DTAE. It is modeled after Oregon’s Proficiency-based Admission Standards

System (PASS)—an effort to move student preparation for college from seat-time and courses taken to a proficiency model.²¹ Unlike PASS, PACTS includes workforce preparation, and has a large focus on preparing students for two-year community and technical colleges. The objectives for PACTS are to:

- Align high school exit standards and postsecondary entrance standards;
- Establish performance-based admission criteria tied to the standards;
- Train teachers to provide evidence of students’ performance toward meeting the standards, and
- Train raters to score students’ performance on the standards.²²

High school and postsecondary education faculty work together on various aspects of PACTS. The exit-level standards were developed by subject-area teams composed of high school teachers; faculty from technical colleges, two-year colleges, and universities; and business representatives. Students who wish to submit their schoolwork as evidence for postsecondary admission must have their work verified by a committee of high school teachers and college faculty.

The work to develop standards was guided by the previous progress made by some of the regional P–16 councils. Four of those councils worked together to develop standards at grades K, 3, 5, 8, 12, and 16. As part of PACTS, staff members at the regents’ P–16 office adapted those standards and aligned them with the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum, and then developed a related alternative assessment system using collections of student work.

Like Oregon’s PASS, PACTS has not become common practice in Georgia’s schools or postsecondary institutions. So far, PACTS standards, professional development materials, and student work evaluation procedures have been developed; raters have been trained; and a database is up and running to track student and rater performance. Performance-based admissions criteria were also developed for participating postsecondary institutions; they are based on the standards and reflect the different levels of selectivity of the participating institutions.

IV. P-16 Accomplishments

Most of the interviewees believe that the existence of the regents' P-16 office, the sustained work of those in that office over the last 10 years, and the national acclaim it has received represent major successes. The role of Governors Miller and Barnes cannot be understated. Their support provided the effort legitimacy and public awareness that it needed to move forward, in addition to the political influence (power and structure) necessary to develop projects and work toward institutionalization. The governors framed P-16 as a core issue. Governor Barnes believed that because of the lack of incentives and P-16 structure, only governors have the clout needed to move this issue forward. In Georgia, the governor has enormous political and fiscal influence, including line-item veto power over the state budget.

As stated earlier, many other people played crucial leadership roles at the state level in Georgia. A former state education leader recognized the role that Kettlewell played as well, emphasizing "the importance of having a live person associated with this sort of movement... And so people within the university system and outside the university system with whom [she's] worked, they sort of see [her] as ... the outreach arm, if you will, to schools and colleges and businesses for P-16 work." That office now has 35 full-time staff members, millions of dollars worth of grants, and scores of P-16 projects. Kettlewell has tried to maintain the momentum—and improve the institutionalization of P-16—by teaching people on her staff to write grant proposals, promoting them into leadership roles, and targeting systemic change rather than simply the development of partnerships. P-16 has become a civic issue that many foundations have responded to, and the office has helped to leverage private and public support, which has then generated influential public support for P-16 reform generally.

Portch worked to embed P-16 components into people's daily work lives to ensure that some of the reforms will outlast political and leadership changes. One mechanism he used was his evaluation of USG presidents on the basis of their commitment to P-16 initiatives. Presidents responded, because Portch appointed them and controlled the higher education budgets. In addition, college presidents were added to the Regional Educational Service Center boards to encourage collaborative purchasing and the sharing of facilities. The leadership of Kettlewell, Portch, and their staff members has helped both establish P-16 as a concept in Georgia and make Georgia a state to watch in this arena. A benefit of housing these efforts in the regents' office is that it has been relatively insulated from changes in gubernatorial administrations or legislative terms.

Given the lack of apparent, tangible incentives, many interviewees complimented Barnes, Portch, and Kettlewell for working so hard to help raise student achievement. Along those lines, the president of a Georgia education nonprofit said, "You have to give a lot of credit to [USG Chancellor] Tom Meredith and [DTAE Commissioner] Ken Breeden because ... they've got

more students than they know what to do with. Why the hell should Tom be concerned about these high school dropouts?” A state education leader, when discussing this issue, stated:

I’m an idealist. I think the incentives should be doing what’s best for the students... If there’s a disincentive, then the best thing to do is get that out of the way, but the biggest incentive, I mean, why do we do what we do? To provide services and to help our students be successful people. And the best way to do that is, first, give them really, really good skills where they can go to work and be very successful. Another is to do everything we can to increase their upward mobility when they leave us. And another is to reach down into the high schools and bring those students into the system where they can be successful. So the incentive is the biggest of all possible incentives.

The work of the regents’ P–16 office is primarily project-based, with the hope that it will be integrated into the larger agenda of the system office—especially with a new, large science and mathematics grant awarded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). As a USG administrator stated, “Under that rubric of P–16, people want to go off in 27 different directions and have these little collaboratives and they’re not really being systemic about driving that home unless they have someone who keeps drilling that and keeps tying that together.” Kettlewell and her staff try to tie all the P–16 initiatives together. Already, their P–16 work has succeeded in raising K–12 standards, and the NSF project will reinforce that progress. Although a major focus has been on teacher education, staff members are hoping to use the NSF funds, in part, to create change throughout K–12. In addition, much of the past and current work links together well, as evidenced by the connections between the state-level work on Performance Assessment for Colleges and Technical Schools and by the standards development of the P–16 regional councils.

Getting the Education Coordinating Council into statute was a major accomplishment. As a USG staff member said, “That was probably the best opportunity to have that [P–16 reform] happen because he [Barnes] had created the structures and had the will to do something ... and he got all that stuff passed into statute, which was probably phenomenal in and of itself.” In addition, having two governors support the effort in a state with a strong governor’s office meant that they used the bully pulpit and set budgetary priorities that reflected their direct interest in P–16 reform.

Dual enrollment was cited by several as a major accomplishment, though it cannot properly fall under the state’s P–16 initiative umbrella. The state had to figure out how not to penalize K–12 schools financially if one of their students took a dual enrollment course. The DTAE resolved this by hiring a high school teacher to teach dual enrollment courses, and then each system collected its revenue according to a formula.

An issue that includes both accomplishments and hurdles is the development of a P–16 data system. Barnes’ legislation called for an independent Office of Educational Accountability. The office has been renamed and placed into the DOE; it is supposed to oversee the P–16 database. Many believe that the development of a good, integrated data system is key to the

successful progression of P-16 in Georgia. The development of such a data system is another one of those issues—a political landmine—that cannot happen if someone addresses the need head-on. As one interviewee stated, “Just to stand out there and say, ‘I’m sorry, we need this P-16 database that’s got to have all of this stuff [in it],’ I mean, I wouldn’t live long enough to see it through.” Consequently, state education staff members are taking their time, letting people get used to the idea by showing useful results, and slowly building the database. It is important to ensure that the staff members developing the database have credibility with each of the sectors and uses a nonthreatening model.

V. Challenges to P-16 Reform

STRUCTURES AND PEOPLE

The voluntary nature of Georgia's P-16 efforts became problematic early in the evolution of Georgia's P-16 work; thus, the Education Coordinating Council was created, requiring all of the heads of the agencies and boards to meet quarterly. A USG administrator recommended that states "not start with the voluntary state council. I would start with [one like] ours that is created in legislation, the ECC. Either through legislation or through something that sort of gives it some staying power. I would encourage that whatever the state structure is ... you need to walk into DOE and see the same kind of sign. You need to see [a position like] a deputy school superintendent for P-16 partnerships," and that person needs to keep momentum going.

Another problem arose with the realization that P-16 leadership was coming from the regents' office, and not from other education sectors. Several interviewees indicated that the over-identification of P-16 reform with the regents' office was a drawback. The work has often been seen as originating only within the higher education community, and some in K-12 fear that this is a veiled attempt for higher education to control K-12. Even a former USG representative remarked that the regents are admittedly over-involved and over-identified with P-16 efforts, and that higher education is a poor place from which to lead because of the innate suspicions of the other education sectors. Some interviewees believe this could be helped by having a counterpart to Kettlewell housed in the DOE.

Although the regents' office was behind many of the reforms, the ECC could not find a politically viable staff. According to a USG administrator, "Somebody in the governor's office made a decision to ask the newly created education accountability office to staff the ECC. The ECC was not part of the mission of the Office of Educational Accountability. I think it was a big mistake going in... There wasn't really staff to do it, so, in my opinion, the Education Coordinating Council has yet to optimize... We had meetings—people came—but they didn't really sit around and gnaw on the real policy questions... That has yet to happen." In addition, the P-16 staff members believe that it takes the accountability office longer to make changes than it would if the ECC were a more active body and made more of the decisions. The staff members believe that ensuring that the leaders of each system agree with a reform idea adds to the external legitimacy and public buy-in.

A USG administrator believes that the leadership needs to come from the governor's office; Governor Perdue has not included P-16 as a major component of his education platform. According to this administrator, it needs to be someone who is as neutral as possible—that is, someone who is not associated with just one educational level—to lead the effort; staff within all the agencies can provide the programmatic arms. It will be "dead in the water" if the regents or

another education agency lead the staffing of the ECC. Currently, without other leadership, staff members from the regents and DOE meet informally to move the P–16 agenda forward.

Many interviewees stated that the structure of the state’s education funding system and the Legislature’s budgetary processes are major roadblocks in the development of the kind of P–16 reforms envisioned by Governors Miller and Barnes. A former elected official said that the only way for P–16 to be completely successful is if the budget procedures change, because competition for money deters cooperation across the sectors. He suggested double-funding to help bridge the conflicts. Similarly, a state education leader stated, “Our feeling as much as a decade ago is until we solve this funding problem, you’re not going to do much collaboration. You’re going to take some credits [for example, dual enrollment] ... and you’re going to have some little local initiatives, but until you have a way that you can structure it where it’s [fiscally] nonthreatening, you’re not going to get a whole lot of collaboration between the systems.”

Funding concerns create splits between the education sectors that cannot be connected by the P–16 work. According to a Senate staff member, “Education is very bifurcated in this state and so, consequently, there are definite little fiefdoms. And the Board of Regents have their own little world, and K–12 has its own little world and Pre–K has its own little world, and for funding reasons there’s not a lot of incentive individually for those individual agencies to work together. And so far, Barnes didn’t really add a lot of incentives and the current governor so far has not done that either.”

Many of these types of barriers have led some policymakers in other states, such as Florida, to wonder if placing all state-level education agencies under one governance structure is the necessary key to creating successful P–16 reforms. The interviewees who discussed this issue did not believe that such an action would be positive in Georgia. As a state education leader said, “You might be thinking in terms of governance structure because you might be thinking, well, if you got the right governance structure, that will take care of it. Let me tell you something—it won’t. It’s the opposite. If you put it all under one governing structure, you’re liable to institutionalize the barriers... You don’t solve collaboration problems by putting everything in a common governance structure.”

Another interviewee concurred by stating:

I would not recommend to any other state what Florida did with their sort of structural change... I think you have to honor the cultures of the different entities and figure out ways that make sense within each state for them to work together to solve real problems... My biggest fear [for postsecondary] if we had a one superboard, would be all the nonsense that [K–12] schools have had to put up with—that all that nonsense would be brought onto the university system and, you know, that’s the last thing it would want. That would just take everyone backwards in time. It would not facilitate anything.

Many of the major education policy leaders in Georgia concurred with the statements above and believe that simply changing the structures will not create the changes desired. They agree that it

is crucial, though, to have bipartisan support for P-16 and a core of P-16 advocates in both K-12 and postsecondary education.

Many of those interviewed said that, over the years, different segments of the general public have resisted P-16, including many conservative Christian groups that are concerned about such issues as the state's centralized role in developing K-12 standards and assessments.²³ For a USG administrator, the most surprising problem she has faced is that although Georgia is at the bottom in most national education rankings (for example, high school graduation rates and SAT scores), people often question why P-16 reform is necessary. She believes that many Georgians are "still of the mindset that college is for about a third of the population," and consequently do not think it is necessary to connect curricula, assessments, or teacher professional development across the sectors. In addition, it is very difficult to engage people around the concept of improving educational programs in postsecondary institutions, one of the endeavors of the P-16 office. A state representative concurred, stating that in Georgia this work bucks the "bigotry of low expectations." Governor Barnes found that a major deterrent was middle- and upper-income people who do not believe that they need P-16 because they think they know how to maneuver their children through college admission and placement processes.

Interviewees said that another group that has resisted P-16 reform is higher education faculty in general and those in colleges of education specifically. Structurally, there are not many incentives for postsecondary education faculty to adopt collaborative models. The position of the regents' P-16 office is that postsecondary institutions share responsibility for student preparation, yet the institutions continue to frame their missions as the creation of new knowledge. Higher education, one Senate staff member stated, "has got a different system, they've got different legislation, they've got different committees. They're just separate, and so they have their own little fiefdom and [it's] the same thing with K-12." As a result, it has been difficult to convince postsecondary stakeholders to take part fully in P-16 reform initiatives.

A USG administrator believes that an effective strategy is not to approach postsecondary faculty directly with difficult issues. She illustrated this strategy with an example:

I would never go to a group of higher education faculty and say, you guys are lousy teachers. I can't even say, "Teaching is important." What I can say is, "You're preparing future teachers. Now, do you care? Do you care about the quality of K-12 students who come to you as college freshmen?" "Well, yes, I care very much." "Well, have you ever thought about the way you're teaching and how that influences what that future teacher is learning? And depending upon the depth of understanding that a future teacher has of math and science, there's going to be a direct relationship between what that teacher is able to do with the kids." "Well, no, I've never thought about that." ... [You need to] have enough understanding of what the biases and problems are that you can weave your way in one way or another.

As noted earlier, the former state superintendent of schools also put up major resistance to the reform efforts. One interviewee suggested that, because the superintendent is elected, that person

can act as a deterrent to reforms such as these—particularly if they are underway when the person takes office. A senate staff member believes that the former superintendent felt the need to provide a new direction educationally, but also did not want to be perceived as taking orders from the USG.

PROJECTS

Although the development of an integrated student data system could be one of Georgia’s success stories, it is not without its problems. Logistically, moving the Office of Education Accountability back into the DOE could be seen as a step backward, because it robs it of its ability to be the accountability arm for all of education and diverts attention from the P–16 focus. Technically, there are many difficulties to overcome. For example, the agencies do not have an agreed-upon definition of a high school dropout. A student could transfer districts, but be counted as a dropout if the first district could not find that student. Also, the agency databases do not always have the data elements needed to answer essential questions. When the regents’ P–16 office first started working on a P–16 database, staff members could not find data on students’ high school course-taking patterns. In order to examine college readiness, they could only tell what kind of a diploma a student had: college prep, tech prep, or special ed. The DOE had separate testing and student databases, and the student database used social security numbers while the testing database used names, so the two could not be connected. There is some concern that USG and DTAE course placement data are not particularly reliable or valid.

The regents’ staff members believe that one reform that might have moved along too quickly was the Performance Assessment for College and Technical School (PACTS). PACTS staff developed new standards and a transcript on which to record student achievement data, and trained teachers in scoring and verification processes. As in Oregon, however, they have not been able to get the alternative admission system off the ground. As a state agency interviewee said under condition of anonymity, “They’ve never really been able to implement the admissions part of it because they haven’t been successful getting an entire school to implement it... As an admissions system, it really wasn’t successful, and partly what’s happening with a lot of the P–16 stuff is they came in and tried to do some things before the policy environment, the state structures, were in place to support them. [But] the Georgia leadership is interested in some of the professional development materials [and there is] a very nice set of standards that will be modified when the new Georgia Quality Core Curriculum is completed. So Georgia might be more aligned there, but [PACTS is] going to evolve into something else.” Although the major goals of transforming high school learning, teaching, and admissions processes may not be realized, something positive will likely come from PACTS.

VI. Conclusion

P-16 is a widely accepted concept throughout Georgia's state education agencies, and scores of projects support the P-16 initiatives. Progress had been made in such areas as teacher education, K-12 standards development, math and science instructional policy, and portfolio-based assessment. The creation of a single, dedicated, P-16 staff was an essential component in developing the content side of the reforms. These successes have provided credibility and projected the importance of the P-16 concept and its potential for improving education across the sectors.

Yet it has been difficult to translate the P-16 vision into practice; if this vision is to be fully institutionalized, much work remains. This might be even more challenging at the state level because the P-16 movement has lost its most powerful advocate, Governor Barnes. In addition, throughout the interviews there was little consensus about what actually constitutes P-16 reform, although almost every interviewee was supportive of the concept. It appears to be perceived in a limited way across all education sectors and is widely identified with the regents' P-16 office. As a P-16 staff member stated, "The mission of the P-16 office is tempered by the fact that it is within the regents' office." Given the power and stability of the regents, though—especially in relation to the DOE's political volatility during this time period—housing it in the regents' office was a logical step.

The P-16 charge was carried by Governors Miller and Barnes (the concept successfully transitioned from one administration to another), but Governor Perdue has not yet included this in his agenda. The previous governors played crucial roles in creating momentum, legitimacy, and awareness, in placing it high on the political agenda, and in developing an infrastructure that could institutionalize some changes—especially considering that P-16 reform has no natural constituencies. If Governor Barnes had been re-elected, it is logical to think that P-16 would have continued being one of the state's major education initiatives. Barnes put the Education Coordinating Council in statute, but at the time of this project's field research (September 2003), it had not yet met under Governor Perdue. Thus, it is questionable whether P-16 will evolve past the current work of the regents' office and become institutionalized if the current governor has other education policy priorities. It is possible, though, that the existing statewide initiatives have enough traction to permit P-16 to persist and remain viable as a statewide policy concern. Many interviewees stated that the current success and level of institutionalization of P-16 in Georgia is due to three essential elements: structure, personality, and relationships.

The P-16 work has been carried out during times of political conflict. There is a powerful, influential Board of Regents; a centralized, powerful chancellor; and a state board that is oriented toward local control—and that is a formula for political problems. The main governance structure put into place to support and advocate for P-16 reform, the ECC, has

missed its statutory meeting requirements and, in many interviewees' minds, its potential was never truly realized. The state agencies' administrative staffs have pushed the P-16 reforms forward. Legislative leaders, on the other hand, did not appear to participate as much as other stakeholders did in these P-16 reform efforts. And all of this is overshadowed by budget problems, state testing, No Child Left Behind, concern about the state's low average SAT scores, and the divergent traditional interests of each segment. There were few incentives, other than soft money, for P-16 initiatives. Legislative staff members believe that political volatility is exacerbated by the current fiscal crisis, and it seems improbable that the advocates of greater interlevel coordination can expect active leadership, and particularly the provision of fiscal incentives, for P-16 from either the current Legislature or the governor.

As with most of the P-16 or K-16 work around the country, the issue of institutionalization is unresolved, and thus the final chapter remains to be seen. The potential is still there—particularly if other powerful P-16 leaders and advocates arise—to connect all the work in this area and institutionalize P-16 reform in Georgia. Regardless of the final outcome, the efforts in Georgia provide useful insights for other states that are grappling with P-16 issues.

Georgia Interview Protocol

CONTEXT QUESTIONS

These data to be gathered from web sites 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).

What are the major K–12 and postsecondary (2-year and 4-year) issues facing Georgia?

What is the current education budget? What financial challenges are you currently facing? How have the different education sectors been impacted by budgetary problems?

What are the major student needs (for example, problems regarding school readiness, high school completion, college-going rates, remediation, college completion—what are the biggest problems)? How does your state assess those needs (especially across the P–16 continuum)? Are there plans to work on those problems? If so, please describe.

Is remediation a problem in Georgia’s public postsecondary institutions? What are the statistics?

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 your state’s high school assessment system. What is the last high-school-level assessment? At what grade level is it benchmarked? What are the stakes for students, educators, and schools? How well are students doing on the assessment? How does its content relate to the content of your state’s public postsecondary placement exams?

Please describe your state’s K–12 accountability system.

Please describe any 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?

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

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

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

Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of Georgia’s postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What kind of college preparatory opportunities do students who are traditionally underrepresented in college have in Georgia?

QUESTIONS FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INTERVIEWEES

In Georgia, who is responsible for regulating higher education in terms of:

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

How well are these responsibilities currently being performed?

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

What are the roles of state government and postsecondary education? What is the relationship between them?

What role(s) do two-year institutions play in P–16 reform? Four-year institutions?

Please describe any collaborative projects/endeavors with K–12 districts or schools. How did they start? How are they governed? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

Please describe any “blended institution” efforts (dual enrollment, middle college, early-college high schools). Who started those efforts? Who governs them? Who funds them? What are their goals and objectives? How are they working?

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

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

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

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

Please tell me what you think about the accessibility of Georgia’s postsecondary institutions for students who are traditionally underrepresented in college. What kind of college preparatory opportunities do students who are traditionally underrepresented in college have in Georgia?

GOVERNANCE QUESTIONS

Please describe education governance in your state over the past 10 years (governor, Legislature, K–12, and postsecondary). Why does your state have its current coordinating/governance structures and processes?

Have there been major changes? How has it evolved? Why did it evolve that way?

Is there a history of collaboration across K–12 and postsecondary? If so, please give some examples.

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

How is education governance currently structured in Georgia? How do all the different entities interact (legislatively, behind closed doors, territorially...)?

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

How would you characterize the current relationship between K–12 and postsecondary education leaders in Georgia?

What is the role of the business community in education governance in your state? Community organizations?

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

STATE-LEVEL P–16 REFORM AGENDA

General P–16 Components

Please describe major P–16 reforms in Georgia. [Please discuss the different strands of your P–16 reform agenda: the student-centered work and the teacher education strand.]

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

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

What role do non-governmental groups play in the P–16 governance arena (Georgia: Ed Trust, NASH, SREB, College Board)? How do they interact with public governing entities? How effective have their P–16 initiatives been?

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

Specific P–16 Components

Please characterize any discussions about (or actions regarding) developing and implementing the following changes:

- Development of P–16 councils (state and regional):

- What are the main goals and objectives of the P–16 councils (state and local)? Did those goals and objectives change over time? How effective have the councils been in meeting those goals and objectives?
- When the P–16 councils convene, who is at the table?
- What types of issues are typically on their agenda? Have those changed over time?
- Do you think that the councils were/are an effective way to create a P–16 governance structure?
- Did the councils help institutionalize the reforms?
- Restructuring other areas of state governance (not P–16 councils) to reflect a P–16 frame.
- Creating a P–16 accountability system [Holding postsecondary education accountable for persistence and completion].
- Restructuring state education finance within a P–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).
- Connecting K–12 and postsecondary standards.
- Public articulation of postsecondary standards (entrance, placement, graduation/general ed, major-specific).
- Public articulation of transfer requirements.

What was the evolution of each of Georgia’s P–16 reforms? What changes in these structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place since the reforms were initiated?

How institutionalized are these reforms? What is the best way to give traction to these issues?

What are some incentives Georgia has considered using to create and institutionalize some of these changes?

- What are some incentives for postsecondary institutions and systems to work with K–12 education 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 are the main barriers to creating these changes? What are the main barriers to institutionalizing these changes? Will the current budget crisis impact the P–16 reform agenda?

How has the change of leaders affected the P–16 reform agenda (that is, Governors Miller and Barnes, Superintendents Schrenko and Cox, and Chancellors Portch and Meredith)? How has that affected the institutionalization of the reforms?

What have been the main successes and failures to date?

Can you predict what will happen with the P–16 reform agenda in 5 years and 10 years? [What are the short- and long-term outlooks for the state’s interlevel relationships?]

How institutionalized will the reforms be? What will be the major changes for students? Teachers?

General Finance Questions

Please describe how all the various education entities in the state are funded (please describe your state’s education finance system).

How well do you think it works in terms of supporting and creating the necessary capacity? Equity?

How does the state’s finance structure impact the development, implementation, and institutionalization of P–16 reform? (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?)

How are the state and local P–16 councils funded?

Would you change your state’s finance system in any way? If so, how?

Main Research Questions

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

What are the incentives and disincentives for improved coordination?

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

Who is responsible for developing and implementing those changes? How do governors, key legislators, and agencies influence interlevel programs?

What have been the main successes and failures to date?

What changes in these structures, processes, and relationships, if any, have taken place since the reforms were initiated?

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

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

How do the reforms, incentives, disincentives, successes, and barriers differ among the case study states and why?

In what ways and under what circumstances do cooperation and conflict between the levels manifest themselves?

Endnotes

1. See <http://www.usg.edu/pubs/lu/2002/1.28.02.html>.
2. See <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/doe/superintendent/goals.asp>.
3. See <http://www.usg.edu/admin/regents/index.html>.
4. See <http://www.usg.edu>.
5. K. H. Breeden, "Foundations and Defining Principles of Georgia's Technical College System" (Atlanta, Georgia: DTAE, not dated), p. 3, www.dtae.org.
6. Killian Edwards, "Results: From School to Skill, How High School Students Are Getting a Jump on College and Careers" (Atlanta, Georgia: DTAE, winter 2003), p. 15.
7. See <http://www.usg.edu/admin/oc/dtae/partner.html>.
8. University System of Georgia, Regents Office memo, "A Student-Centered Collaboration for Public Postsecondary Education in Georgia" (not dated).
9. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/about/history.phtml>.
10. See <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/support/plan/hb1187.asp>.
11. See <http://www.state.ga.us/ecc/overview>.
12. See http://www.state.ga.us/ecc/2001_Annual_Report.html.
13. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/network/intro.phtml>.
14. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/network/members.phtml>.
15. Ibid.
16. See <http://www.ajc.com/metro/content/metro/hope/09online.html> and <http://www.ajc.com/metro/content/metro/hope/09timeline.html>.
17. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/tq/>.
18. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/prep/>.
19. PRISM was funded shortly after this project's field research stage and consequently was rarely discussed in the interviews.
20. See <http://www.usg.edu/p16/prism/about.phtml>.
21. See <http://www.ous.edu/pass/>.
22. See http://www.usg.edu/p16/pacts/about/about_pacts.pdf.
23. See <http://www.afaga.org>.

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.

PATRICK M. CALLAN is president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. He has previously served as executive director of the California Higher Education Policy Center, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education, and the Montana Commission on Postsecondary Education, and as vice president of the Education Commission of the States (ECS).

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.

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