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Pre-College Outreach and Early Intervention

Abstract
Both individuals and society at large benefit when an individual earns a college degree.

The benefits to individuals are short term and long term, economic and non-economic. Short-term benefits include enjoyment of the learning experience, participation in athletic, cultural, and social events, and enhancement of social status. Long-term benefits include higher lifetime earnings, more fulfilling work environment, better health, and longer life.\(^1\)

Although societal benefits are more difficult to quantify, benefits that spill over beyond the individual cannot be ignored.\(^2\) One societal benefit is the economic growth associated with the enhanced productivity of labor resulting from higher levels of educational attainment.

Neighborhood effects are another societal benefit. These include reduced crime, reduced dependency on public welfare and Medicaid, increased volunteerism, greater voting rates, and increased levels of civic involvement. The single most important effect of higher education may well be intergenerational—manifested, for example, in the increased educational attainment of one's children.\(^3\)

For the individual and societal benefits of higher education to be realized, individuals must have the opportunity and ability to access postsecondary education and persist to degree completion.
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Both individuals and society at large benefit when an individual earns a college degree. The benefits to individuals are short term and long term, economic and non-economic. Short-term benefits include enjoyment of the learning experience, participation in athletic, cultural, and social events, and enhancement of social status. Long-term benefits include higher lifetime earnings, more fulfilling work environment, better health, and longer life.\(^1\)

Although societal benefits are more difficult to quantify, benefits that spill over beyond the individual cannot be ignored.\(^2\) One societal benefit is the economic growth associated with the enhanced productivity of labor resulting from higher levels of educational attainment.

Neighborhood effects are another societal benefit. These include reduced crime, reduced dependency on public welfare and Medicaid, increased volunteerism, greater voting rates, and increased levels of civic involvement. The single most important effect of higher education may well be intergenerational—manifested, for example, in the increased educational attainment of one's children.\(^3\)

For the individual and societal benefits of higher education to be realized, individuals must have the opportunity and ability to access postsecondary education and persist to degree completion.

More students are going to college, but gaps in access to and success in higher education remain among students of different racial/ethnic groups and socioeconomic status.\(^4\) These gaps have persisted despite more than 30 years of efforts by governmental and other entities to reduce them.

Historically, federal intervention at the postsecondary level has focused on reducing economic barriers to postsecondary education. The centerpiece of the federal govern-
The federal government has played a critical role in pre-college outreach and early intervention programs.

The federal government’s effort is the student financial aid programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Two-thirds of the $68 billion in federal, state, and institutional aid awarded to students in 1999-2000 was subsidized through this Act.

The federal government’s reliance upon financial aid as a means for increasing college access assumes that economic variables are among the primary determinants of college enrollment. Yet, a review of relevant research—plus the fact that gaps in access and completion have not been closed despite the resources the federal government has dedicated to closing them—suggests that merely making financial aid available for students to attend college is not enough to ensure that all students have equal access to the benefits associated with earning a college degree.5

A range of variables, in addition to financial resources, influences college enrollment behavior. These include educational aspirations, academic achievement, academic preparation6, and availability of information about college.7

Clearly, a more comprehensive approach is needed to close the gaps in access and completion. Early intervention programs offer an important example of such an approach.

Early intervention programs are designed to provide disadvantaged students with the opportunity to develop the skills, knowledge, confidence, aspirations, and overall preparedness for college early enough in their schooling so as to influence their ultimate educational attainment levels.

Pre-college outreach and early intervention programs are sponsored by the federal government, state governments, not-for-profit organizations, and individual colleges and universities.8 The federal government has played a critical role in developing these types of programs.

Established as part of the original War on Poverty during the Johnson administration, the federal TRIO programs—Upward Bound, Talent Search, and the Student Support Services—are designed to help disadvantaged students prepare for and enter higher education. Two-thirds of the students served by TRIO programs must come from families with incomes below $24,000.

Upward Bound, authorized by Congress in 1964 as part of the Educational Opportunity Act, provides students with academic instruction on college campuses after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer. Currently, about 563 Upward Bound programs serve 44,000 students nationwide.9
The ‘High Hopes’ program notifies low-income 6th- to 12th-grade students of their expected Pell Grant eligibility.

Talent Search and the Student Support Services programs were established during the authorization of the Higher Education Act in 1965.

Talent Search, which serves over 300,000 6th- through 12th-grade students at 319 sites across the nation, provides participants and their families with information regarding college admissions requirements, scholarships, and available financial aid. Student Support Services provides counseling and remedial training to students during college. Congress appropriated $730 million for TRIO programs in FY 2001.

In 1992, the federal government expanded its commitment to early intervention programs by authorizing the National Early Intervention Scholarship Program (NEISP). This program offered matching grants to states for programs providing financial incentives, academic support services and counseling, and college-related information to disadvantaged students and their parents.

Nine state programs were funded under the NEISP: California, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. At least six other state governments have sponsored early intervention programs.10

As part of the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Congress established a new program, Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP), to supercede the NEISP.

Unlike the NEISP, GEAR-UP grants are available not only to states, but also to partnerships comprised of local educational agencies representing at least one elementary and one secondary school, one institution of higher education, and at least two community organizations, which may include businesses, philanthropic organizations, or other community-based entities.

The GEAR-UP legislation also includes the “21st Century Scholars Certificate” program. This program, borne out of a bill written by Congressman Chaka Fattah (D-PA) and later endorsed and retitled by President Clinton as the “High Hopes” program, notifies low-income 6th- to 12th-grade students of their expected eligibility for federal financial assistance under the Pell Grant program.

In FY99, $120 million was appropriated for GEAR-UP—a substantial increase over the $3.6 million provided for NEISP in FY98. More than 670 partnerships applied for the first GEAR-UP grants in 1999, suggesting that as many as one of every four-year col-
Early intervention programs can be expensive in terms of both support services costs and scholarship awards.

Colleges and universities nationwide partnered for the effort. In the end, 180 awards were made. Congress appropriated $200 million for the second year of GEAR-UP and $295 million for FY2001, enough funds for a new round of competitive grants.

One of the most important factors in creating successful intervention programs is ensuring adequate financial support. Yet, the Council for Opportunity in Education reports that, although 11 million Americans are eligible for services through TRIO programs, only 5 percent of those eligible are being served due to limited federal funding for these programs.11

Admittedly, early intervention programs can be expensive in terms of both support services costs and scholarship awards. For programs offering scholarship awards and other financial incentives, accurately projecting the costs of future awards is difficult, given possible variations in program participation and eligibility rates as well as escalating college costs.

Nonetheless, ensuring adequate funding for early intervention programs must be a priority. Shortfalls in funding will likely result in cutbacks in program services and/or smaller average financial aid awards to eligible students, thereby reducing at-risk students’ motivation for and predisposition toward college. Insufficient or unstable funding undoubtedly diminishes the effectiveness of these programs.

Some non-governmental entities also sponsor early intervention programs. These include private organizations, foundations, and colleges and universities. One of the most prominent private early intervention programs is Eugene Lang’s I Have a Dream (IHAD) Program, established in 1981.

The program originated when Lang, visiting his former East Harlem elementary school, spontaneously guaranteed the 61 students in his presence the financial support to attend college if they graduated from high school. That story—and that promise—has expanded to 180 projects in over 60 cities across the nation, serving more than 13,000 students. IHAD has not only supported the students fortunate enough to take part in the program, but has also led other philanthropists and agencies to establish similar programs.

A 1999 survey sponsored by the College Board suggests that about one fifth of all early intervention programs targeted at low-income students receive some amount of financial support from private foundations.12

Colleges and universities also play an important role in early
One-third of colleges and universities offer programs to increase access for disadvantaged pre-collegiate students.

...
More research is required to evaluate the effectiveness of early intervention programs.

study, program administrators believe that the following elements are associated with successful early intervention programs: a clear focus; motivated and committed students; starting early in the educational pipeline; links with school curricula and schedules as well as with other community organizations; adaptation to the particular needs of the students, school, and community; and involved parents.

Administrators have also described several challenges, including sustaining funding, hiring and retaining effective staffs, and incorporating current technology.20

Understanding the nexus between funding and programmatic philosophies is important to sustaining funding for such programs. Whereas funders are typically interested in providing enough funding for programs to become stable and self-sufficient, program administrators are generally interested in extending external funding as long as possible. Building a more compatible and cooperative alliance between funders and programs may help ameliorate these inconsistent attitudes.

Program staffing is also critical to successful programs. Among the related issues are hiring staff who support the mission and goals of the organization and providing ongoing professional development. While the College Board survey indicates that about 80 percent of the programs serving low-income students have five or fewer full-time paid staff,22 focus group participants indicated that many programs have high staff turnover rates, in part because of low salaries and limited opportunities for professional advancement.

The use of computers and other information technologies is an emerging issue for many programs. Programs need to build strategic plans for purchasing, upgrading, and using technology. Although most outreach programs focus on developing academic skills, program administrators believe that more attention should be given to developing the technological capacity that complements knowledge acquisition.23

More research is required to evaluate the effectiveness of early intervention programs, particularly those that, unlike Upward Bound, begin prior to the ninth grade. One area for future research involves identifying the “package” or combination of incentives, support services, and program components that is most effective in accomplishing the goal of increasing access to and success in college for underrepresented groups.

Existing programs offer a wide variety of services, including: col-
We need to know the appropriate grade level in which students should become involved in early intervention.

lege awareness; social skills development; career counseling and exploration; preparatory, supplemental, accelerated, and/or college level courses; life skills and goal setting; information about college and financial aid; campus visits and tours; cultural activities; information for parents; tutoring and remediation; critical thinking skills; and admissions test training. Some programs also include some type or amount of financial benefit, such as full or partial tuition scholarships, book grants, and other types of financial aid.

We also need to know the most appropriate grade level in which students should become involved in early intervention programs. Though Levine and Nidiffer have suggested that intervention programs must start early, more research is required to determine the most appropriate level at which students should initially become involved in an early intervention program. According to the College Board’s survey, the most common entering grade for programs that target low-income students, historically underrepresented minorities, and potential first-generation college students is the ninth grade. But Cabrera and La Nasa concluded that the college choice process begins as early as the seventh grade and that the process of becoming academically qualified for college begins as early as the eighth grade. Because available resources are limited, research should examine the incremental benefits and costs associated with beginning programs at various grade levels.

Research is also needed to identify the characteristics of students to be targeted for participation, particularly whether student eligibility criteria should be limited to financial need and other related risk factors or whether students should also exhibit some level of academic ability.

Based on their evaluation of Maryland’s pilot College Preparation Intervention Program, the Institute of Higher Education Policy recommended that student eligibility be defined in terms of both economic and academic criteria, such as standardized test scores, grade point average, and recommendations from teachers and counselors.

The policy institute concluded that by selecting only students with college potential, this program would differentiate itself from other programs that target all disadvantaged students, such as Upward Bound. Thirty-eight percent of programs targeting low-income students also specifically target students with medium or
Early intervention programs may offer a glimmer of hope for those interested in success in college for all Americans.

Another area for research pertains to the involvement of parents. Program administrators generally believe that parents play a critical role in the success of their programs. Among programs that target low-income students, historically underrepresented minorities, and potential first-generation college students, three-fourths offer a parental component and one-fourth require parental participation, likely reflecting research showing that parental support and encouragement for higher education are important predictors of college enrollment, particularly among students at risk of dropping out of high school.

Based on their examination of one university-sponsored program, Tierney and Jun concluded that by actively involving parents as well as by incorporating other aspects of their neighborhoods, college preparation programs can be successful in part because they are affirming students' identities.

Nonetheless, more research is required to understand not only the particular ways in which parents influence program outcomes, but also the ways in which administrators can effectively encourage parents to become involved.

Finally, more must be learned about the most effective ways that early intervention programs can leverage existing resources and services to maximize program benefits. Collaboration is limited by the wide range of program sponsors and the small size of most programs. One survey revealed a median number of 82 students in programs administered by individual colleges and universities.

Some may argue that early intervention programs are too expensive, serve too few students, and are too inefficient, given the high program dropout rates found in the Upward Bound evaluation. But because these programs appear to have the components that research suggests promote college access and degree attainment, early intervention programs may offer a much-needed glimmer of hope for those interested in college success for all Americans.

Approaches that focus merely on addressing the financial needs of students are clearly not sufficient to level the educational playing field and provide access to the individual-level economic and non-economic benefits associated with earning a college degree or generate the societal-level benefits.

Although much more research is required to identify the particular attributes and characteristics of the most effective early intervention programs, support for and commitment to these programs
must be sustained.

By continuing to support these programs while engaging in rigorous systematic research on a range of different programs, we will be working to ensure that the costs of these programs will be more than offset by the resulting short- and long-term benefits realized not only by individual participants, but also by society at large.
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