

Opportunity Adrift

Technical Appendix



The Education Trust

Opportunity Adrift

Technical Appendix

This technical appendix explains how we arrived at the percentages and ratios listed in the Performance and Progress Metrics.

PERFORMANCE METRIC 1. MINORITY STUDENT ACCESS

Figure 18

Column 1. Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State's Spring 2007 High School Graduates

Source

These data come from the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD). This source provides the number of diploma recipients by race/ethnicity for each state. The numbers come from Table 2, "Public school number of graduates and Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate, by race/ethnicity and state or jurisdiction: School year 2006-07" in the 2009 NCES report, "Public School Graduates and Dropouts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2006-07."¹ For 2006-07, the CCD lacks diploma recipient data for Kentucky and New York. For these states, 2007 diploma recipient projection data were obtained from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education's (WICHE) "Knocking at the College Door: 1992 to 2022" (March 2008).²

Calculation

(Sum of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native spring 2007 high school graduates in state)

(Sum of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and white non-Hispanic spring 2007 high school graduates in state)

Column 2. Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State Flagship's Fall 2007 Freshmen

Source

These data come from the NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). This source provides the number of full-time and part-time degree/certificate-seeking first-time students in Fall 2007. Race/ethnicity unknown and nonresident alien students are intentionally left out of the total. This methodology differs slightly from that used in the 2006 edition of "Engines of Inequality." In the original publication, nonresident aliens were included as non-underrepresented minorities. However, because the race of nonresident aliens cannot be determined, we omit them from these updated calculations.

Calculation

(Sum of full-time and part-time black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native freshmen entering flagship in fall 2007)

(Sum of full-time and part-time black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and white non-Hispanic freshmen entering flagship in fall 2007)

Column 3. Minority Student Access Ratio, 2007

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Underrepresented minority percentage among state flagship's fall 2007 freshmen)}}{\text{(Underrepresented minority percentage among state's spring 2007 high school graduates)}}$$

Color Assignment System

Color	Minority Student Access Ratio, 2007
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Hawaii – Hawaii has unique demographics, in which Filipinos and Native Hawaiians are the primary populations that are underrepresented. Because the available data are not disaggregated to separate these groups, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Access quartiles.

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana’s higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Access quartiles.

PROGRESS METRIC 1. PROGRESS IN MINORITY STUDENT ACCESS

Figure 18

Column 4. Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State’s Spring 2004 High School Graduates

Source

These data come from the National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD). This source provides the number of diploma recipients by race/ethnicity for each state. The 2003-04 numbers come from the Common Core of Data’s online Build A Table application.³ For 2003-04,

the CCD lacks diploma recipient data for New Hampshire, New York, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. In the 2006 publication of “Engines of Inequality”, only projected numbers of diploma recipients were available for these four states from WICHE’s “Knocking at the College Door: 1988 to 2018.” In this updated edition of the report, we revise these projections and use the actual 2004 diploma recipient data from WICHE’s “Knocking at the College Door: 1992 to 2022” (March 2008).⁴

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Sum of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native spring 2004 high school graduates in state)}}{\text{(Sum of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and white non-Hispanic spring 2004 high school graduates in state)}}$$

Column 5. Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State Flagship’s Fall 2004 Freshmen

Source

These data come from the NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). This source provides the number of full-time and part-time degree/certificate-seeking first-time students in Fall 2004. Race/ethnicity unknown and nonresident alien students are intentionally left out of the total. The numbers presented here may differ slightly from those published in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality” because in the original publication, nonresident aliens were included as non-underrepresented minorities. However, because the race of nonresident aliens cannot be determined, our revised methodology omits them from these updated calculations.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Sum of full-time and part-time black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native freshmen entering flagship in Fall 2004)}}{\text{(Sum of full-time and part-time black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and white non-Hispanic freshmen entering flagship in fall 2004)}}$$

Column 6. Minority Student Access Ratio, 2004

Calculation

(Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State Flagship's Fall 2004 Freshmen)

(Underrepresented Minority Percentage Among State's Spring 2004 High School Graduates)

Column 7. Minority Student Access Ratio Change, 2004-07

Calculation

(Minority Student Access Ratio 2007 – Minority Student Access Ratio 2004)

Color Assignment System

Color	Minority Student Access Ratio Change, 2004-07
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Hawaii – Hawaii has unique demographics, in which Filipinos and Native Hawaiians are the primary populations that are underrepresented. Because the available data are not disaggregated to separate these groups, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Access quartiles.

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana's higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Access quartiles.

PERFORMANCE METRIC 2. LOW-INCOME STUDENT ACCESS

Figure 19

Column 1. Percentage of Flagship Undergraduates Receiving Pell Grants, 2007

Source

The number of undergraduates receiving Pell Grants at each flagship in the 2007-08 academic year comes from the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) at the U.S. Department of Education. These data are available at: www.ed.gov/finaid/prof/resources/data/pell-institution.html.

The number of Pell recipients is divided by the total undergraduate fall enrollment at the school to determine the percentage of undergraduates receiving Pell Grants. This total enrollment number comes from IPEDS 2007. There are several technical issues associated with calculating the percentage of students who receive Pell Grants:

- Nonresident aliens are not eligible to receive Pell Grants and non-degree-seekers generally do not receive the grants. To account for these realities, this analysis omits nonresident aliens and non-degree-seekers from the total enrollment number.⁵ This methodology represents a change from the calculations done for the 2006 edition of "Engines of Inequality."
- Pell Grant recipient data represents the total number of Pell recipients for the entire academic year. However, we use fall undergraduate enrollment as the denominator in this calculation⁶ because this fall variable includes more detail, allowing us to omit nonresident aliens and non-degree-seekers. Because flagships generally enroll traditional students, most of whom begin their studies in the fall semester, the impact of using fall enrollment for this measure should be minor.
- Seven of the flagship schools are part of university systems that reported a consolidated systemwide number of 2007-08 Pell Grant recipients to the OPE. These parent/child relationships complicate calculations of the percent of undergraduates receiving Pell Grants at the flagship campus. We obtained campus-level Pell recipient data directly from Ohio State University and the University of New Hampshire. We were unable to obtain campus-level recipient numbers for five institutions that report a consolidated Pell recipient number. For these schools—University of

Connecticut, Rutgers University, University of New Mexico, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Washington—we generated a systemwide Pell percentage by dividing the systemwide Pell recipient number by the systemwide fall undergraduate enrollment.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Total number of Pell Grant recipients at flagship, 2007-08)}}{\text{(Total number of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at flagship who are not nonresident aliens, Fall 2007)}}$$

Column 2. Percentage of State Undergraduates Receiving Pell Grants, 2007

Source

As in column 1, Pell recipient data come from OPE and fall enrollment data come from IPEDS. However, these statewide calculations require additional explanation:

- Both the figure for the number of Pell Grant recipients statewide and the figure for the number of undergraduates statewide include students at all types of degree/certificate-granting, Title IV postsecondary institutions, including two-year and four-year, and public, private, and proprietary institutions. This methodology differs slightly from that used in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality,” which did not limit the institutions to degree-granting, Title IV schools, but rather included all postsecondary institutions.
- Unlike with the flagship universities, using fall enrollment in the denominator of the percent Pell calculation does have an impact at some other degree/certificate-granting, Title IV schools, particularly proprietary schools, many of which allow students to begin their studies at various points during the year. At some of these institutions, the number of Pell Grant recipients actually is greater than the fall enrollment. Unfortunately, this data issue does introduce some unavoidable error into the statewide percent Pell calculations. However, since the number of Pell recipients and the undergraduate enrollments are summed across

all institutions in a state, the error should not be large, and it should be fairly evenly distributed across all states. Furthermore, the data alternatives (e.g. using full-year enrollment) introduce additional error.⁷

- Institutions that were missing either Pell recipient data in OPE’s database or fall enrollment data in IPEDS were omitted from the statewide calculations. However, we attempted to include children institutions that did not report Pell recipient data directly, but whose Pell recipients were consolidated with a parent institution’s reporting. Forty-four such “families” were identified and included in the 2007 analysis.
- Some schools, such as the ITT Technical Institute, consolidate Pell recipient data for parent/child campuses in multiple states. Since students attending these schools cannot be assigned to a specific state, the institutions are omitted from our analysis. We identified and omitted 19 of the largest such institutions. While there probably are more multi-state parent/child institutions that we were not able to identify, they likely are smaller and distributed fairly evenly across states, so identifying and omitting them would have only minimal effects on the statewide percent Pell calculations.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Total number of Pell Grant recipients statewide, 2007-08)}}{\text{(Total number of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates who are not nonresident aliens, statewide, Fall 2007)}}$$

Column 3. Low-Income Student Access Ratio, 2007

Color Assignment System

Color	Low-Income Student Access Ratio, 2007
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Percent of flagship undergraduates with Pell Grants, 2007)}}{\text{(Percent of undergraduates in state with Pell Grants, 2007)}}$$

States Omitted from Quartiles

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana’s higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Low-Income Student Access quartiles.

Connecticut, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Washington – Because the 2007 low-income student access ratio is based on system level Pell Grant data for University of Connecticut, Rutgers University, University of New Mexico, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Washington, these states are omitted from the Low-Income Access quartiles.

PROGRESS METRIC 2. PROGRESS IN LOW-INCOME STUDENT ACCESS

Figure 19

Column 4. Percentage of Flagship Undergraduates Receiving Pell Grants, 2004

Source

Data sources are the same as Column 1. However, a few points about the 2004 analysis are important to note:

- The percentage of flagship undergraduates receiving Pell Grants in 2004 published in this report may differ slightly from the numbers reported in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality” because in this update we omit nonresident aliens and non-degree-seekers from the total enrollment number since they are not eligible to receive Pell Grants.
- 2004 Pell data for SUNY Buffalo was not available from OPE, but SUNY provided these data to us directly for inclusion in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality.”
- Eight of the flagship schools are part of university systems that reported a consolidated systemwide number of 2004-05 Pell Grant recipients to the OPE. These parent/child relationships complicate calculations of the

percent of undergraduates receiving Pell Grants at the flagship campus. We obtained campus-level Pell recipient data directly from University of Connecticut, University of Mississippi, University of New Hampshire, University of New Mexico, Ohio State University, and Pennsylvania State University. We were unable to obtain campus-level recipient numbers for two institutions that report consolidated Pell recipients number. For these schools—Rutgers University and University of Washington—we generated a systemwide Pell percentage by dividing the systemwide Pell recipient number by the systemwide fall undergraduate enrollment.

- In the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality,” 2003-04 data replaced 2004-05 data for University of Kentucky because of data irregularities. Because using the 2003-04 data does not fully address the data complication, we use 2004-05 data for University of Kentucky and note the limitations in this update.

Prior to 2005-06, Pell recipient data reported for University of Kentucky included Pell Grant recipients at Lexington Community College as well, so the published 2004 percent Pell for University of Kentucky actually represents the percent Pell at University of Kentucky and Lexington Community College, combined. In 2007-08, the University of Kentucky reported its Pell data separately from Lexington Community College, so the 2007 percent Pell reported in the tables accurately represents the percent Pell at University of Kentucky. For this reason, the flagship’s progress between 2004 and 2007 cannot be determined.

- The Pell Grant data reported in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality” for SUNY Buffalo represented the number of Pell Grants awarded. In this update, we adjust this number to represent only the number of Pell Grants disbursed, in order to be consistent with the other flagships’ data.

Calculation

$$\frac{\text{(Total number of Pell Grant recipients at flagship, 2004-05)}}{\text{(Total number of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates at flagship who are not nonresident aliens, fall 2004)}}$$

Column 5. Percentage of State Undergraduates Receiving Pell Grants, 2004

Source

Data sources are the same as Column 2. However, a few points about the 2004 analysis are important to note:

- The percentage of state undergraduates receiving Pell Grants in 2004 published in this report may differ slightly from the numbers reported in the 2006 edition of “Engines of Inequality” because the current analysis includes only degree/certificate-granting, Title IV institutions, whereas the numbers in “Engines of Inequality” included all institutions.
- Forty-five “families” of parent/child schools were able to be identified in the 2004 OPE Pell data to be included in our analysis.
- We identified and omitted 16 of the largest multistate parent/child institutions from the 2004 dataset.

Calculation

(Total number of Pell Grant recipients statewide, 2004-05)

(Total number of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates who are not nonresident aliens, statewide, fall 2004)

Column 6. Low-Income Student Access Ratio, 2004

Calculation

(Percent of flagship undergraduates with Pell Grants 2004)

(Percent of undergraduates in state with Pell Grants 2004)

Column 7. Low-Income Student Access Ratio Change, 2004-07

Calculation

(Low-income access ratio 2007 – Low-income access ratio 2004)

Color Assignment System

Color	Low-Income Student Access Ratio Change, 2004-07
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana’s higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Low-Income Student Access quartiles.

Connecticut, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Washington – Because the 2007 low-income student access ratio is based on system level Pell Grant data for University of Connecticut, Rutgers University, University of New Mexico, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Washington, these states are omitted from the quartile analysis for Low-Income Access.

Kentucky – Kentucky is omitted from the quartile analysis for Progress on Low-Income Access because the 2004 low-income student access ratio is based on Pell recipient data that combines University of Kentucky and Lexington Community College.

PERFORMANCE METRIC 3. MINORITY STUDENT SUCCESS

Figure 20

Column 1. Overall Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2008

Source

IPEDS 2008 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of first-time, full-time, bachelor’s degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 2002 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2008 with a bachelor’s or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of first-time, full-time, bachelor’s degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 2002)

Column 2. White Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2008

Source

IPEDS 2008 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of white first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 2002 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2008 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of white first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 2002)

Column 3. Underrepresented Minority (URM) Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2008

Source

IPEDS 2008 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 2002 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2008 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in Fall 2002)

Column 4. White-URM Gap, 2008

Calculation

(White six-year graduation rate) – (URM six-year graduation rate)

Column 5. Minority Student Success Ratio, 2008 Calculation

Calculation

(URM six-year graduation rate, 2008)

(White six-year graduation rate, 2008)

Color Assignment System

Color	Minority Student Success Ratio, 2008
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Hawaii – Hawaii has unique demographics, in which Filipinos and Native Hawaiians are the primary populations that are underrepresented. Because the available data are not disaggregated to separate these groups, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Success quartiles.

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana's higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Success quartiles.

PROGRESS METRIC 3. MINORITY STUDENT SUCCESS CHANGE

Figure 20

Column 6. Overall Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2005

Source

IPEDS 2005 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 1999 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2005 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 1999)

Column 7. White Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2005

Source

IPEDS 2005 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of white first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 1999 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2005 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of white first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 2005)

Column 8. URM Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2005

Source

IPEDS 2005 Graduation Rate data

Calculation

(Number of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering in fall 1999 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2005 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 1999)

Column 9. White – URM Gap, 2005

Calculation

(White six-year graduation rate) – (URM six-year graduation rate)

Column 10. Minority Student Success Ratio, 2005

Calculation

(URM six-year graduation rate, 2005)

(White six-year graduation rate, 2005)

Column 11. Minority Student Success Ratio Change, 2005-08

Calculation

(Minority student success ratio, 2008) – (Minority student success ratio, 2005)

Color Minority Student Success Ratio Change, 2005-08

Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Hawaii – Hawaii has unique demographics, in which Filipinos and Native Hawaiians are the primary populations that are underrepresented. Because the available data are not disaggregated to separate these groups, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Success quartiles.

Louisiana – Because Hurricane Katrina created highly unusual circumstances for Louisiana's higher education system in 2005, the state is omitted from the Minority Student Success quartiles.

PERFORMANCE METRIC 4: COMPOSITE PERFORMANCE RATIO

Figure 17

Column 4.

Calculation

(Minority student access ratio change + low-income student access ratio change + minority student success ratio change)

3

Color Composite Performance Ratio

Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Grey	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Connecticut, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Washington – Each of these states had data complications with at least one performance ratio, so their Composite Performance Ratios are omitted from the quartile analysis.

PROGRESS METRIC 4: COMPOSITE PROGRESS RATIO

Figure 17

Column 8

Calculation

(Minority student access ratio + low-income student access ratio + minority student success ratio)

Color	Composite Progress Ratio
Green	Top Quartile
Yellow	Middle Two Quartiles
Red	Bottom Quartile
Gray	Omitted From Quartiles

States Omitted from Quartiles

Connecticut, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Washington – Each of these states had data complications with at least one performance ratio, so their Composite Performance Ratios are omitted from the quartile analysis.

PERFORMANCE METRIC 5. LOW-INCOME STUDENT SUCCESS

Figure 21

Column 1. Non-Pell Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2008

Source

We requested these data directly from all 50 flagships. Thirteen institutions were able and willing to provide the data.

Calculation⁸

(Number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering and not receiving a Pell Grant in fall 2002 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2008 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 2002 and did not receive a Pell Grant)

Column 2. Pell Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2008

Source

We requested these data directly from all 50 flagships. Thirteen institutions were able and willing to provide the data.

Calculation⁹

(Number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen entering and receiving a Pell Grant in fall 2002 who graduated from the institution by August 31, 2008 with a bachelor's or equivalent degree)

(Adjusted number of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen who entered the institution in fall 2002 and received a Pell Grant)

Column 3. Non-Pell – Pell Gap, 2008

Calculation

(Non-Pell six-year graduation rate) – (Pell six-year graduation rate)

Column 4. Low-Income Student Success Ratio, 2008

Calculation

(Pell six-year graduation rate, 2008)

(Non-Pell six-year graduation rate, 2008)

Institutions are not broken into quartiles or assigned colors based on their performance on the Low-Income Student Success metric because so few schools reported data.

NOTES

- ¹ Stillwell, Robert. "Public School Graduates and Dropouts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2006-07" (*NCES 2010-313*). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009.
- ² *Knocking at the College Door: 1992 to 2022*. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 2008.
- ³ "Common Core of Data, Build A Table." 2009. <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/bat/> (accessed January 4, 2009).
- ⁴ "Knocking at the College Door: 1992 to 2022." Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 2008.
- ⁵ This methodology recommended by Tom Mortenson of Postsecondary Education Opportunity.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Because these figures are not reported to a central, standardized database, but rather were provided voluntarily by institutions, it is possible that institutions used slightly different data definitions when calculating the graduation rates for Pell and non-Pell recipients. For example, some institutions may have used the full entering cohort of first-time, full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen in the denominator, while others may have adjusted the cohort for allowable exclusions.
- ⁹ Ibid.

ABOUT THE EDUCATION TRUST

The Education Trust promotes high academic achievement for all students at all levels—pre-kindergarten through college. We work alongside parents, educators, and community and business leaders across the country in transforming schools and colleges into institutions that serve all students well. Lessons learned in these efforts, together with unflinching data analyses, shape our state and national policy agendas. Our goal is to close the gaps in opportunity and achievement that consign far too many young people—especially those who are black, Latino, American Indian, or from low-income families—to lives on the margins of the American mainstream.



The Education Trust is grateful to Lumina Foundation for Education for generously supporting our work. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the foundation, its officers, or employees.



The Education Trust

1250 H STREET, NW, SUITE 700, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

P 202/293-1217 F 202/293-2605 WWW.EDTRUST.ORG