

COLLABORATION, COLLABORATION, COLLABORATION

Strategies and Principles to Address the Need

for Remedial/Developmental Education and Enhance Its Effectiveness

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Community College

Developmental Education Committee

Acknowledgments

Janice Motta, Executive Officer of the Massachusetts Community College Executive Office

David B. Kelley, Chair of the Community College Developmental Education Committee

Ronald Phipps, Principal Author of this Report , The Institute for Higher Education Policy

Richard Lizotte, Editor and Member of the Community College Developmental Education Committee

Special thanks to:

Massachusetts Board of Higher Education

Massachusetts Community College Presidents' Council

Foreword

In recent years, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has instituted an aggressive plan to strengthen public education through the implementation of state-wide assessment standards. A single, uniform assessment standard was created by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education for all two- and four-year institutions of higher education. For the K-12 system, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) was developed to test knowledge and skills in several content areas.

Massachusetts has made great progress in coordinating these assessment efforts across the state system. However, to ensure implementation of a truly seamless system of assessment and remediation for public school students, continued collaboration will need to occur. It is the hope of the Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee (MCCDEC) that this report will provide the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education with a national framework for this collaboration. This framework includes 1) a number of exemplary models to improve student preparation and transition to higher education, and 2) a set of principles to guide future endeavors.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Remedial and developmental education in colleges and universities have been at the forefront of policy discussions in the last few years, and numerous efforts have been undertaken to study the issues and develop new ideas, approaches, and strategies to address the need for remedial education and enhance its effectiveness. Prominent among these efforts is the Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee's July, 1998 report, *Access and Quality: Improving the Performance of Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Programs*. This document proposed twenty-five recommendations that, when taken in their entirety, encompass a model for effective developmental education.

Subsequent to the *Access and Quality* report, the Institute for Higher Education published a report in December 1998 entitled *College Remediation. What It Is, What It Costs, What's at Stake*. The report, a comprehensive review of remedial education in American higher education, offered recommendations for addressing the need for remediation and making it more effective. A major recommendation emphasized the importance of cooperation among the various stakeholders.

Fortunately, there are some states where K-12 systems and colleges and universities are collaborating to address student preparation and transition. Labeled either K-16 or P-16 initiatives, their successful experiences can serve as models for others. Thus, this paper, which identifies both strategies and principles for effective collaboration, is designed as a working document for those who endeavor at the college and high school levels to implement collaborative efforts.

Strategies for Collaboration

Aligning High School Graduation Requirements with College-Level Expectations is a fundamental collaborative strategy to improve student success in college. Currently, 28 states have statewide requirements and six additional states have some state-or system-level involvement in setting admissions policies.

Developing Early Assessment and Intervention Efforts are strategies used by many states. The most common approaches are bringing high school and college faculty together to work on curriculum and standards, developing early outreach programs; distributing information to middle and high school students, allowing high school students to take college courses for credit; and providing feedback to high schools regarding how their graduates perform in college.

Creating Joint Enrollment Agreements Between Two-and Four-Year Institutions has been particularly successful in Massachusetts. Two initiatives, the "Gateway Program" between Quinsigamond Community College and Worcester State College and "Connections," a collaborative between Middlesex Community College and the University of Massachusetts, Lowell are good examples of this strategy.

Monitoring Student Success Through Feedback to High Schools, in use by about 30 states, improves the collaborative process by improving curriculum development, enhancing communication between high schools and colleges, and providing excellent information for establishing performance criteria.

Improving the Quality of Teaching is a fundamental collaborative strategy which, for several states, has resulted in the development of Professional Development Schools. Analogous to teaching hospitals, these schools encourage college and university faculty to work with practicing teachers to develop new methods of instruction and innovative curricula.

Principles of Effective Collaboration

State Level Leadership Must be United and articulate the Goals of Collaboration. In every state reviewed, the state level leadership from the various educational sectors emphasized that they would do what is necessary to facilitate collaboration. In addition, key staff were appointed to be responsible for collaborative efforts.

Effective Collaboration Requires an Incentive Structure. An incentive structure needs to be in place to foster and sustain the collaborative process. Many states use the Eisenhower Professional Development funds for this purpose.

Goals and Objectives must be clearly articulated. It is crucial that the goals and objectives of any collaborative process be understood by every stakeholder. Whether goals are expansive and broad or directed to a specific area of endeavor, all persons involved in the collaborative process must be consistently reminded of these goals, and progress toward reaching the goals should be continually monitored.

Formal Lines of Communication must be Developed and Maintained. As communication is fundamental to all human enterprises, this principle would seem self-evident. However, more than one partnership has faltered because of lack of direct and clear communication. There is no specific way to maintain communication channels and, in fact developing redundant lines of communication are beneficial and often necessary.

Personnel Required to Implement the Objectives must be Committed to the Process. No matter how committed the leadership is to the process, if those who are to implement the collaboration have not "bought in" to the objectives, success is virtually impossible. It is helpful to reflect that the entire K-16 movement, whose goals are laudable and long overdue, was generated in part because of the lack of collaboration between high schools and colleges and between community colleges and four-year institutions.

All Stakeholders Must be Committed for the "Long Haul." Achieving success in addressing the need for remedial education and enhancing its effectiveness will require a

sustained undertaking over several years. In fact, the strategies that are put in place should eventually become institutionalized.

INTRODUCTION

Remedial and developmental education in colleges and universities have been at the forefront of institutional, state, and national policy discussions in the last few years. Numerous efforts have been undertaken to study the issues and develop new ideas, approaches, and strategies to address the need for remedial education and enhance its effectiveness. Prominent among these efforts is the Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee's July, 1998 report, *Access and Quality: Improving the Performance of Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Programs*. This document proposed twenty-five recommendations that, when taken in their entirety, encompass a model for effective developmental education. A major contribution of the report is the development of criteria for the assessment of developmental reading, writing, and mathematics. These criteria can serve as the basis for a network of communication and collaboration among secondary and postsecondary institutions that will make the transition to postsecondary education smoother for many students who might not otherwise be able to continue their education.

Subsequent to the *Access and Quality* report, The Institute for Higher Education published a report in December, 1998 entitled *College Remediation: What It Is, What It Costs, What's at Stake*. The report, a comprehensive review of remedial education in American higher education, offered recommendations for addressing the need for remediation and making remediation more effective. They included, among others, aligning high school requirements with college expectations, organizing follow-up and high school feedback systems, improving teacher preparation, and fostering collaboration among colleges and universities.

A major recommendation emphasized the importance of cooperation among the various stakeholders. The report stated:

The importance of collaboration cannot be understated. Paraphrasing the realtor's mantra—location, location, location—reducing the need for remediation in higher education will require collaboration, collaboration, collaboration between and among: colleges and universities and high

schools; states and their colleges and universities; and business/philanthropy and all levels of educational institutions. We have no illusions that the various players in the educational enterprise will voluntarily welcome cooperation and abandon turf. But a lack of true, bona fide collaboration will thwart efforts to address the issue of remediation.

Margaret Miller, President of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), echoes this view. In a symposium dedicated to improving student transition from secondary to postsecondary education, she noted that the danger of a less than systemic approach to transition may result in the following unintended consequences:

- Student access may be in jeopardy if college requirements are raised without adequate communication and preparation work with secondary schools.
- Requiring reductions in remediation levels without efforts to address the need for remediation may lead to course re-labeling exercises and may raise the number of students being admitted under "exceptions" categories.
- If schools and colleges don't work together on pedagogy, problems related to student learning will increase.
- If academic and vocational education are not coordinated, our current two-track system may become even more divided and pervasive.

Fortunately, there are some states where K-12 systems, colleges and universities are collaborating to address student preparation and transition. Labeled either K-16 or P-16 initiatives, their successful experiences can serve as models for others. Thus, this paper is designed as a working document for those who work at the college and high school levels to implement collaborative efforts. It examines two broad types of collaborative models: those involving two-year colleges with their four-year counterparts, and those involving high schools and colleges at various levels.

Drawing upon a number of written sources—including various articles, papers, and documents—along with selected interviews, the first section of this paper identifies several strategies of effective collaboration. It is important for the reader to understand how these strategies are being, or are intended to be, implemented. Although there is broad agreement across states and institutions about the overall strategies, policies for implementing these strategies vary. It is intended that policymakers at various levels use this document by choosing those policies and practices that are most consistent with their particular circumstances. Section I of this paper is organized around those broad

strategies; when appropriate, the particular state, institution or agency is identified for further reference.

Section II identifies principles—along with examples—of effective collaboration efforts that are found to be common in many of the states reviewed. Irrespective of the strategy being employed to improve student transition from high school to college or to improve remediation, specific principles of collaboration are necessary for its success. This section identifies six key principles of effective collaboration and discusses their implications for the broader goals of reducing the need for remedial education and enhancing its effectiveness.

I: STRATEGIES FOR COLLABORATION

Reducing the need for remediation and enhancing its effectiveness requires the achievement of five underlying goals.

- Improving student achievement from pre-school through higher education;
- Helping students move easily from one educational system to another;
- Ensuring that all students who enter higher education are adequately prepared to succeed;
- Increasing access and success for all students in higher education; and
- Enhancing the preparation of teachers.

It is important to note that the implementation of any one of the strategies below in isolation is grossly insufficient to achieve the above goals. Policymakers need to identify and embrace several interdependent strategies appropriate to their particular situation. In short, not only is collaboration among various agencies and institutions necessary, but also alignment in institutional and statewide policies and practices.

STRATEGY 1: ALIGNING HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS WITH COLLEGE-LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

A fundamental collaborative strategy to improve student success is aligning high school graduation requirements with college admissions standards—and communicating those standards. Many states have adopted statewide admissions policies, with much of this activity beginning in the 1980s. Currently, 28 states have statewide requirements and six additional states have some state or system-level involvement in setting admissions policies. The most common approach taken by states is to establish required high school coursework units for college admissions. In addition to coursework requirements, many

states use performance criteria for admissions, e.g., ACT/SAT scores, high school GPA, and high school class rank.

An example is *Ohio*, which is beginning to develop and adopt a common definition of college-level knowledge and skills. This common definition will inform all entering freshmen what they should know and be able to do. Initiated by the Ohio Board of Regents, the first step is to join faculty from the state's colleges and universities with the K-12 community to develop a set of academic expectations for freshman-level mathematics, reading, and writing. Once developed, these expectations would be the reference point for placing students in freshman-level courses and a source of information for developing future high school graduation requirements. To ensure maximum benefits, a Transition Guide for the K-12 schools is contemplated that is based on common academic expectations. In addition, it is recommended that equivalent levels of performance among different tests be defined by a working group of admissions experts, college and university faculty, and high school teachers

To bridge the disconnect between college expectations and high school performance, *Georgia* has encouraged the establishment of local/regional P-16 Councils that involve almost all of the university system institutions, more than half of the state's school districts, two-thirds of the Department of Technical and Adult Education Institutes, several private colleges and universities, and private sector participants. Under a broad rubric of statewide goals, each council establishes specific goals and activities that they believe will address the local needs. The local/regional partnerships appear to be determined largely by the affinity the participating schools and postsecondary institutions feel for each other.

Competency-Based Admissions Systems

Twelve states have developed and begun to implement competency-based admissions systems. A competency-based admissions system is defined as one that requires students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in specified academic areas and at specified performance levels. System designs have been diverse because of the differing policy contexts of the states.

Colorado, Massachusetts, Washington, and Wisconsin have been at the forefront of this somewhat controversial movement. These states expect that the use of competency-based assessments by postsecondary education can influence and build upon standards at the K-12 level. A principal component in the development of competency-based admissions is communicating competencies to key constituencies—students, parents, and K-12 and postsecondary faculties. Establishing a forthright communications strategy is important to gain support, overcome skepticism, and reassure parents that a competency-based admissions process does not put students at an unfair disadvantage.

In each state, K-12 and postsecondary faculties who assess competencies are asked to achieve consensus on what students need to know and be able to do in selected academic disciplines. One of the first areas that three states addressed was specifically identifying

and defining student knowledge that would demonstrate readiness for college and probable success in freshman year courses. K-12 and postsecondary faculty were identified who could define competencies in the core academic courses that are required for college admissions. For instance, in Washington, K-12 and postsecondary faculty defined competencies in mathematics, communications, foreign languages, science, social studies, and humanities.

Some of the challenges the states are experiencing include identifying means for assessing competencies and costs for developing new assessments. In some states, competency assessments encompass a range of methodologies, such as statewide testing, development of benchmarks, exemplars of performance, and teacher judgments and ratings. One of the first hurdles in establishing competency-based admissions is to explain the rationale to K-12 and postsecondary faculty, admissions officers, and high school counselors. In Colorado, higher education faculty developed a brochure called "Ready and Able" which defines college entry-level expectations.

STRATEGY 2: DEVELOPING EARLY ASSESSMENT AND INTERVENTION EFFORTS

An important strategy for addressing the need for remediation is to begin promoting college readiness early in the educational process. When high school students are identified as underprepared during their senior year, it is often too late for them to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills they would have gained through three years of full engagement and steady challenge. Thus, remedial education becomes the only solution.

Through a variety of collaborative efforts, several states are taking proactive steps to prepare students for college work. The most common approaches are: bringing high school and college faculty together to work on curriculum and standards; developing early outreach programs; distributing information to middle and high school students; allowing high school students to take college courses for credit; and providing feedback to high schools regarding how their graduates perform in college.

Through the advice and input of several constituencies, *Oklahoma* has established several programs which include: (1) the Higher Learning Access Program, which targets low-income 8th and 9th grade students for a challenging college preparation program; (2) Summer Academies, which offer summer science and math learning experiences; and (3) FOCUS, which provides free academic and financial planning information to parents of 7th, 9th, and 11th grade students. *New Mexico* has established the Early Intervention and Scholarship Program that targets elementary and middle school students in schools with historically low postsecondary participation rates. Also, the MESA Program (Math, Engineering, Science Achievement) identifies ethnic minority students in 6th grade or later who are interested in college. During middle and high school, the program provides them with advice, tutoring, challenge events, and other activities designed to strengthen their preparation for college programs and careers in math, engineering, science, and related fields.

In its comprehensive plan to address the levels of remedial education in its colleges and universities, *Ohio* recommends the establishment of the "Learning Extension" Program. The program is designed to connect Ohio colleges and universities, Regional Professional Development Centers, and the high schools. The collaborative—which combines the expertise of high school teachers, college and university faculty, college faculty who teach entry-level courses in arts and sciences, and professional development practitioners—provides support for best practices and technical assistance. A major responsibility of the program is to provide leadership and assistance in creating and applying a continuum of assessment and intervention strategies. The first phase of these strategies would focus on the transition between 8th and 9th grade. A student who does not pass every section of the Ninth Grade Proficiency Test by the end of the 8th grade will begin remediation through additional learning experiences over grades 10 and 11. If the student fails the 12th grade proficiency test by the beginning of the 12th grade, the student receives intensive remediation during the last year in high school.

STRATEGY 3: CREATING JOINT ENROLLMENT AGREEMENTS BETWEEN TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Massachusetts has established at least two joint enrollment agreements at two- and four-year institutions. The Gateway program, a collaborative effort between Quinsigamond Community College and Worcester State College, identifies students at Worcester State who are in need of remedial education. Some of these students may be assigned to take a developmental course at Worcester State College taught by Quinsigamond Community College instructors, while simultaneously taking college-level courses. Others may be jointly admitted to both institutions while taking some developmental courses at Quinsigamond, with the promise of later admission to Worcester if they are successful in their coursework. Students in the program get special advising. This collaborative program has improved relationships between the community college and the four-year institution. For example, there is a regular Worcester State College recruiter now at the community college.

Another program, called Connections, a collaborative between Middlesex Community College and the University of Massachusetts, Lowell, is designed to give students who are initially rejected because they do not have the necessary academic skills another chance for entry into a four-year institution. The program is designed to build both basic skills and self-confidence for those students who participate. The institutions are less than a mile apart; while at Middlesex Community College, students in the program also can take one course at the university. These students are placed in the same sections of other developmental education courses to create a learning community. The students have individualized advising for academic planning and have the option of living in the university residence hall. In addition, Connections students can participate in activities at the university and use library and technology resources at both campuses. When students have fulfilled all requirements, they are guaranteed admission and can enroll in the program of their choice.

Ohio has recommended some scenarios to address remedial educational enrollments and improve college preparation. In one scenario, mathematics faculty at a residential university, its regional campuses, a technical college, and several high schools form a distributive learning collaborative to improve mathematics skills. Each participant develops and teaches an innovative lesson that is based on a fundamental topic students often find difficult. The lessons are broadcast at different times and days during a term. Another scenario includes a community college, a university main campus, and several high schools which would create a collaborative approach to improving writing skills.

STRATEGY 4: MONITORING STUDENT SUCCESS THROUGH FEEDBACK TO HIGH SCHOOLS

Robust databases are a pivotal collaborative strategy for monitoring student progress and assessing early intervention policies. About 30 states have implemented some type of feedback mechanism designed to provide information to high schools. One of the more robust systems has been developed in *Maryland*.

The Maryland Student Outcomes and Achievement Report (SOAR) includes the following information on new high school graduates: high school attended; demographics, including race/ethnicity and gender; first-year college attendance; remedial work needed in mathematics, English, and reading; admissions exemptions; performance indicators, including cumulative GPA and first English and/or mathematics grades; and ACT and SAT test scores. All public two- and four-year campuses in Maryland and 13 independent institutions participate in SOAR. In addition to providing information that can be used for tracking student outcomes at the state level, SOAR is also intended to be a tool to help local educators with the evaluation of high school preparatory programs, curriculum development, counseling, and the establishment of educational policy.

Because of an arrangement with the American College Testing Program and the College Board, data regarding high school performance of individual students, as well as demographic information from the ACT and the SAT, are correlated with college performance. The high school information includes courses taken with corresponding grades, the years studied in various academic disciplines, honors classes, grade point average, and rank in class. This very powerful research tool has enabled policymakers to better understand the relationship between high school preparation and college success. A major inquiry of the SOAR is to determine the college academic success of students—with specific attention to remediation—who have participated in college preparatory courses and of students who *have not* participated in college preparatory courses.

The SOAR data have resulted directly in the exploration of more effective policies for remediation. When reviewing the SOAR data, school administrators identified inconsistent definitions of remediation across postsecondary institutions, a variety of assessment instruments used to place students in remediation programs, and differences in cut-off scores and norms used for placing students in remediation. These revelations

supported the argument that such incompatible data made program improvements and student counseling difficult.

This SOAR monitoring process has enhanced the collaborative process in the following ways.

- School principals review the results with their staffs and many have developed strategies for addressing remediation.
- District curriculum offices analyze the data to determine implications for curriculum development.
- SOAR data has been used to bring high school and community college faculty together to discuss high school exit and college entry expectations.
- SOAR is used by the Maryland State Department of Education to establish performance criteria for students participating in career and technology education programs.

STRATEGY 5: *IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING*

The influential 1996 report by the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, discusses many options for collaboration. The report, which calls for a major overhaul of how teachers are trained, has been a catalyst for teacher education reform in many states.

One of the report's recommendations addresses the establishment of "Professional Development Schools," (PDS's) which are designed to provide extensive internships for teachers. Universities, colleges, and schools work closely to design enriched school environments and extensive internships, usually one-year in length, that integrate teacher education and P-12 curricula. PDS's take many forms to reflect specific partnership activities and approaches. Some provide initial experiences for early deciders who have participated in undergraduate practica. Others may be tailored to the needs and experiences of career changers. Higher education institutions and school systems can design PDS's that target particular areas of emphasis, such as special education inclusion, urban education, or teaching students with limited English proficiency.

The overriding theme of these college/university-school collaborations is to design projects and activities that support the simultaneous renewal and improvement of teacher education and K-12 schools for the common purpose of enhancing the learning of all students. Some of the defining characteristics of the PDS include:

- PDS's model the best in teaching and learning. Analogous to a teaching hospital, the sites reflect the most current research and best practices in education. College

and university faculty work with practicing teachers to develop new methods of instruction and innovative curricula—for both the school and college classroom.

- PDS's provide opportunities for continuing growth and development of experienced teachers, other school personnel, and university and college faculty.
- University and K-12 educators participate in shared governance of PDS's and engage in collaborative planning and decision making.
- University faculty actively participate in PDS's through on-site courses and seminars for teacher candidates and experienced teachers, involvement in school improvement projects, participation in site-based research projects, and service on mentoring and assessment teams.

II: PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION

Building on the previous section's discussion of state-level collaborative endeavors that attempt to address specific objectives for addressing the need for remediation or enhancing its effectiveness, several questions emerge: What can be learned from these models? What are the common themes that are necessary for effective collaboration? In short, what are those principles that underlay collaboration? The following principles can help to shape discussions in this area.

PRINCIPLE 1: STATE LEVEL LEADERSHIP MUST BE UNITED AND ARTICULATE THE GOALS OF COLLABORATION.

In every state reviewed for this working paper, the state-level leadership from the various educational sectors made it very clear that they would do what is necessary to facilitate collaboration. The Georgia initiative included the Board of Regents, the Department of Education, the Office of School Readiness, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, and the Governor's Office. Ohio included the Board of Regents and the Board of Education. In Maryland, the leadership included the University of Maryland System, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the State Department of Education. In Missouri, in an effort to address mathematics education, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the State Board of Education, and the University of Missouri Board of Curators also invited business, educational, and legislative leaders to join the coalition.

To support a plan in New Mexico to improve the quality of teachers, the State Board of Education and the Commission on Higher Education issued a joint statement called "This We Believe: Quality Learning Requires Quality Teaching."

It should be emphasized that it is not enough for the heads of these agencies to make a commitment. They must appoint key staff whose responsibility is to adhere to the objectives of the partnerships. These staff members must develop relationships based on trust and mutual understanding of each other's contribution and problems.

PRINCIPLE 2: EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION REQUIRES AN INCENTIVE STRUCTURE.

In addition to strong leadership and enthusiastic commitment by high school and college faculty, an incentive structure needs to be in place to sustain the collaborative process. Many states are using Eisenhower Professional Development funds for this purpose. In particular, the higher education component of the program supports collaboration between colleges and universities and school districts to develop and implement professional development activities for teachers and other school personnel.

Ohio provides a model of a well thought out incentive structure. To help higher education shift the emphasis away from remedial courses and toward activities to improve college readiness, and encourage high schools to be partners, Ohio recommends these funding strategies:

- Enable each institution to reallocate a percentage of its portion of the instructional subsidy attributable to enrollments in remedial courses to be targeted for collaborative programs that enhance teaching and learning for students in secondary and higher education. As a result, institutions that address remedial education enrollments will not be penalized by a reduction in their instructional subsidy.
- Provide each institution with a state match that equals the amount reallocated to college readiness activities.
- Provide funding from the Ohio Department of Education to schools that participate with colleges and universities in collaborative projects to improve the college readiness of high school graduates. The funding should equal the reallocation of developmental subsidy and the state match.

In Georgia, where 15 local P-16 councils were formed, six received \$200,000 multi-year challenge grants to begin implementation of plans in 1997. A competitive process was used to select those councils that showed the greatest amount of readiness. In 1998, through a similar process, 11 grants were awarded—five first-time awards and six for an additional strand of work for those who received the original grants.

PRINCIPLE 3: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES MUST BE CLEARLY ARTICULATED.

It is crucial that the goals and objectives of any collaborative process be articulated and understood by every stakeholder. Whether goals are expansive and broad or directed to a specific area of endeavor, all people involved in the collaborative process must be consistently reminded of these goals, and progress toward reaching the goals should be continually monitored.

Maryland has developed goals that are far-reaching. They include:

- setting standards and clear expectations for student learning;
- increasing college participation and graduation rates;
- reducing the need for remediation;
- creating a seamless web of postsecondary education in Maryland;
- reducing time-to-degree;
- increasing the competitiveness of Maryland's businesses; and
- improving productivity and accountability.

In contrast, the K-16 initiative in Colorado has identified two fundamental state issues: identifying content standards and competencies, and improving preparation of teachers and other educators. This straightforward agenda has allowed the state to achieve several objectives, including the definition and endorsement of college entry level competencies, a revision of statewide admission standards policy, the establishment of higher education/K-12 linkage grants, and the revision of teacher education policy.

PRINCIPLE 4: FORMAL LINES OF COMMUNICATION MUST BE DEVELOPED AND MAINTAINED.

As communication is fundamental to all human enterprises, this principle would seem self-evident. However, more than one partnership has faltered because of the lack of direct and clear communication. Herbert Simon, noted author of organizational behavior, notes that no step in the administrative process is more generally ignored or more poorly performed than the task of communicating decisions. As in all social organizations, informal communication channels develop in a variety of ways and some social scientists would say that they are just as important as formal communication lines. The point, however, is that any collaborative enterprise must be conscious of the need for an organizational structure that incorporates communication relationships between *everybody* who is involved in the process. Thus, not only must communication lines go from leadership to implementers but, just as important, implementers to leaders, and between and among implementers.

There is no one specific way to maintain communication channels and, in fact, developing lines of communication that are at times redundant are beneficial and often

necessary. Some of the more common vehicles for communication include face-to-face meetings, newsletters, memoranda, and periodic announcements. As teachers and learners become more accustomed to cyberspace, Web pages can be an important source for providing information. Regardless of the form of communication, Simon spells out in academic and precise language the essential components of communication.

Communication, then, is essential to the more complex forms of cooperative behavior. The process of coordination in these more complicated situations consists of at least three steps: (1) the development of a plan of behavior for *all* members of the group (not a set of individual plans for each member); (2) the communication of the relevant portions of this plan to each member; and (3) a willingness on the part of the individual members to permit their behavior to be guided by the plan.

It is this last step of the process of coordination which provides an excellent segue for the next two principles.

It is appropriate to separate the first four principles from the remaining two because of their degree of difficulty. Adhering to the first four principles is relatively easy compared to the following two principles. Of course, all of the principles require a great deal of energy and thoughtful decision-making by committed people. However, relatively speaking, the last two principles, though essential to the collaborative process, are quite difficult to uphold. Committing the leadership to the collaborative process (the first principle) can be accomplished through the cooperation and dedication of a small number of stakeholders. The other three principles—an incentive structure, clearly articulated goals and objectives, and creating formal lines of communication—are basically administrative in nature. The last two principles, however, are fundamentally different in nature.

PRINCIPLE 5: PERSONNEL REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THE OBJECTIVES MUST BE COMMITTED TO THE PROCESS.

No matter how committed the leadership is to the process, if those who are to implement the collaboration have not "bought in" to the objectives, success is virtually impossible. It is helpful to reflect that the entire K-16 movement, whose goals are laudable and long overdue, was generated in part because of the lack of collaboration between high schools and colleges and between community colleges and four-year institutions. The underlying premise of the K-16 movement is that educators from all levels need to work together to form a seamless web for the common good. The unfortunate fact is that the "cultures" of high schools, community colleges, and universities are often dissimilar and, at times,

conflicting in terms of mission and goals. In order for collaboration to truly work, faculty and administrators must shed old habits, understand the "language" of the other sectors, abandon turf, and establish trusting relationships. In addition, personnel must have a sense of ownership of the task at hand. Directives from the top without acceptance and commitment from the bottom are almost certainly doomed to failure. It is not enough to simply say that personnel must be committed to the process. Personnel may not, indeed, be committed to working together and specific strategies must be employed to overcome those factors that impeded collaboration in the first place.

Approximately 30 states have programs that bring high school and college faculty together to address common goals and work together to solve specific problems. For instance, the Academic Alliances program in West Virginia provides for disciplinary-based communication across educational sectors. Alaska has a Writing Consortium and Math Consortium that bring faculty together. Kentucky's Partnership for Reform Initiatives in Science and Mathematics is designed to improve teaching in science, math, and technology. The Montana Academic Forum provides opportunities for higher education personnel to meet with K-12 leaders. In Georgia the membership of regional and local P-16 councils includes P-12 and postsecondary educators, school board members, youth advocate organizations, community members, legislative and business leaders.

PRINCIPLE 6: ALL STAKEHOLDERS MUST BE COMMITTED FOR THE "LONG HAUL."

Achieving success in reducing the need for remediation and enhancing its effectiveness will require a sustained undertaking over several years. Sporadic attempts will undoubtedly fail. In fact, the strategies that are put in place should eventually become institutionalized. This is far from simple. Like the principle above, fundamentally changing the way things have been done is not easy. Over 60 years ago, the noted economist John Maynard Keynes wrote, "The real difficulty of changing the course of any enterprise lies not in developing new ideas but in escaping from old ones." Although in many respects, specific personalities, because of their commitment and dedication to the process, have made a difference. However, real change will only occur when it is not dependent on personalities, but has become part of the fabric of the enterprise. Thus, it is not surprising that the P-16 initiative adopted by Georgia states that, in addition to identifying root causes for underpreparedness and low levels of student achievement, participants also must adhere to a simple goal—"to stay the course."

Appendix A

**Membership of the Massachusetts Community College
Developmental Education Committee**

Janice C. Motta

Executive Officer

Massachusetts Community Colleges Executive Office

Campus Representatives

David B. Kelley, *Chair*

Associate Dean of Instructional Support

Northern Essex Community College

David Feeney

Dean of Academic Affairs

Bristol Community College

Susan Andrien

Dean of Liberal Studies

Massachusetts Bay Community College

John O'Donnell

Asst. Dean of Student Development

North Shore Community College

David Winsper
English Professor
Springfield Technical Community College

James Rice
English Professor
Quinsigamond Community College

Richard Lizotte
ESL Professor
Northern Essex Community College

Mary Jane McCarthy
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Development
Middlesex Community College

Terrence A. Gomes
Dean of Faculty and Instruction
Massasoit Community College

Philip Mahler
Professor of Mathematics
Middlesex Community College

Bill Sakamoto

Dean of Academic Support Services

Bunker Hill Community College

Clare Niven-Blowers

Director of the Assessment Center

Cape Cod Community College

Committee Alternates

Karen Dixon

Assistant Dean for Developmental Education

Bristol Community College

Beverly Verrengia

Educational Planning Specialist

North Shore Community College

Peter Johnston

Director of Academic Resource Center

Massasoit Community College

Appendix B

The Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee

Historical Synopsis

The Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee was created several years ago with the goal of giving clarity and direction to community college developmental education in the state. In its first year, the committee sponsored a major conference with a focus on teaching and learning in developmental education. As its mission grew more specific, the Developmental Education Committee was able to develop strategies for informing state policy with respect to assessment and remediation. The Committee's work in 1997/98 was supported by a Board of Higher Education Campus Performance Improvement Grant. With this funding the committee produced a report entitled *Access and Quality: Improving the Performance of Community College Developmental Education Programs*. This project, for the first time in the history of Massachusetts community colleges, provided criteria for assessment in the areas of developmental reading, writing, and mathematics. It also provided a set of frameworks for the assessment of all students, and for the instruction, advisement, and support of those who need extra academic help.

Additional information about the Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee may be obtained at www.necc.mass.edu/mccdec.

Appendix C

The Institute for Higher Education Policy

The Institute for Higher Education Policy is a non-profit, non-partisan research organization located in Washington, DC. Since it was founded in 1993, The Institute has conducted numerous studies concerning higher education policy and administration at the federal, state, and institutional levels. The Institute has worked with several states, including Massachusetts, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico, in examining various aspects of their higher education programs.

In Massachusetts, The Institute served as staff to a blue-ribbon task force convened by the Chancellor of Higher Education that analyzed student aid programs in the state, identified major goals for the Commonwealth, and offered several policy recommendations to meet those goals. The Institute has also performed a comprehensive

assessment of the state's McNair Reserve access and retention programs, and conducted analyses in support of the recently enacted Community College Cost Initiative.

Project staff include Jamie Merisotis, President, and Ronald Phipps, Senior Associate. As President of The Institute, Mr. Merisotis manages projects concerning higher education financing, student demographics and outcomes, education outreach and support, and federal policy. He previously served as Executive Director of the bipartisan National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education. Dr. Phipps manages projects at The Institute concerning student access and success, academic policy, distance learning, and private career schools. Dr. Phipps previously served as the Assistant Secretary for Academic Affairs and Planning at the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and Executive Director of the Alaska Postsecondary Education Commission.

Additional information about The Institute may be obtained at www.ihep.com.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Colorado Commission on Higher Education. 1998. *K-12/Postsecondary Linkage Initiatives*. Denver: Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts Community College Development Education Committee (MCCDEC). 1998. *Access and Quality: Improving the Performance of Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Programs*. Boston: MCCDEC.

Conley, David. 1999. *Statewide Strategies for Implementing Competency-based Admissions Standards*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Crowe, Edward. 1998. *Statewide Remedial Education Policies*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Hamlett, Bruce D. 1998. *Memorandum: Draft RT Action Plan*. Santa Fe: Commission on Higher Education.

Kelley, David. 1999. *Collaboration Projects in Massachusetts*. Haverhill, MA. Unpublished.

Kirst, Michael W. *Improving and Aligning K-16 Standards, Admissions, and Freshmen Placement Policies*. Stanford: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. 1996. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York.

Maryland Higher Education Commission. 1995. *Teacher Education Task Force Report*. Annapolis.

. 1996. *Relationship Between High School and College Performance by Maryland Students: Student Outcome and Achievement Report*. Annapolis.

Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Committee. 1998. *Access and Quality: Improving the Performance of Massachusetts Community College Developmental Education Programs*. Haverhill, MA: Northern Essex Community College.

Ohio Board of Regents. 1997. *A Total Approach*. Columbus, OH: The Board of Regents.

Phipps, Ronald A. March/April, 1996. *Square One in the Restructuring Process*. AGB Trusteeship.

Russell, Alene Bycer. 1998. *Statewide College Admissions, Student Preparation, and Remediation Policies and Programs*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Simon, Herbert A. 1957. *Administrative Behavior*. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, Ltd.

State Higher Education Executive Officers and American College Testing Program. 1998. *State Strategies that Support Successful Student Transitions from Secondary to Postsecondary Education. Proceedings of the Symposium and Briefing*. Washington, DC.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy. 1998. *College Remediation: What It Is. What It Costs. What's at Stake*. Washington, DC.

Timpane, Michael P. 1998. *Higher Education and the Schools*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Wallhaus, Robert A. 1998. *Statewide K-16 Systems: Helping Underprepared Students Succeed in Postsecondary Education Programs*. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers.