

Review and Discussion

At their September meeting, the P-16 Council members asked the staff to review the priorities it had drawn up at the NASH K-12 Summer Institute and to see how they related to the P-16 Council's draft Vision Statement, Goals, and Objectives. Following the meeting, Chair Gail Henson suggested that the P-16 Council also be provided with a summary of the data and research that has been presented to the Council at previous meetings.

In addition to the research findings presented at the September meeting, the P-16 Council has reviewed and endorsed recommendations made in several other reports addressing ways to raise the level of student achievement, reduce the need for postsecondary remediation, and reduce the achievement gap among various subpopulations of students. These include recommendations made by the Kentucky P-16 Council Literacy and Mathematics Alignment Teams, a recommendation to create a single, rigorous "default" high school curriculum issued in a white paper that the Council directed the staff to develop, and recommendations in the report *Raising Our Sights* issued by the National Commission on the High School Senior Year.

Attachment B-1 is a summary of what we have learned from the extensive research the P-16 Council has reviewed over the past four years. Attachment B-2 contains the NASH priorities presented in September, with corresponding goals and objectives from the draft vision statement noted. A revised version of the vision statement document will be distributed at the meeting.

On the basis of the discussion, Council members will direct the staff regarding its priorities for the coming year.

Statewide P-16 Council

Summary of Research Findings

High School Preparation

- The single greatest predictor of a high school student obtaining a baccalaureate degree is not grades, nor family income level, nor gender, nor ethnicity, but the intensity and rigor of the curriculum that the student undertakes in high school (a finding of Clifford Adelman in his 1999 report *Answers in the Toolbox: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment*, both cited throughout and confirmed by research presented to the Council).
- The skills developed in a college preparatory curriculum include the skills required by vocational trades and other high skilled employment sectors (a finding supported by both the 1998 SREB study of vocational students and the research conducted by the American Diploma Project).
- Non-white and low-income students are more likely to be enrolled in non-college preparatory tracks.
- All students, across all demographic categories, who are enrolled in college-preparatory curricula achieve at higher levels than their counterparts who are not enrolled in college-preparatory curricula.
- More students are aspiring to college than are academically prepared to succeed in college, and students themselves are more likely to report that they expect to attend college than are the adults (parents, teachers, guidance counselors) with whom they interact.

Collegiate Success

- Students placed in remedial courses in college are less likely to persist and graduate than those who are not, and those placed in more than one remedial course are far less likely to succeed than those who do not need this degree of remediation.
- Postsecondary institutions vary in the degree of success with which they retain and graduate various subpopulations of students.
- Minority students and first-generation college goers are less likely to obtain a postsecondary degree in six years than other students.

Teacher Quality

- Schools with high levels of non-white students and those from low-income families are more likely to receive less experienced and less prepared teachers than schools with higher levels of white students and those from middle-to-upper-income families.
- Teachers are more likely to return to teach near their school districts of origin than not.
- Active cooperation between district superintendents and postsecondary officials can lead to improvement in teacher quality.

Impact of Policy and Good Data

- School-level, district-level, and state-level policies make a difference both in raising the level of student achievement and in reducing achievement gaps among sub-populations.
- We cannot monitor the effectiveness of our policies without accurate data. This includes monitoring the performance (including persistence and graduation rates) of individual students from grade school through college and the equity of funding and resource allocations.

**Priorities Emerging from the 2003 NASH K-16 Summer Institute State Team Meeting
(with corresponding Goals and Objectives in the P-16 Council Vision Statement)**

1. Implement American Diploma Project. (*Goal 2, Objectives 5 and 6*)
 - Provide student-level accountability, including end-of-course exams.
 - Provide samples of college work to high schools.
 - Review high school achievement standards based on ADP benchmarks to be released in January 2004.
 - Develop a single rigorous high school curriculum (college- and workplace-preparatory) reflecting these benchmarks.
 - Align adult education curriculum to postsecondary entrance standards based on ADP benchmarks to be released in January 2004.
 - Reduce need for postsecondary remediation.
2. Reduce achievement and opportunity gaps for African-American and Latino students, students from low-income families, and students with disabilities. (*Goals 1, 2, and 3*)
3. Data-mine (*background for all goals*)
 - Improve teaching and learning at the classroom level.
 - Formulate and modify policy.
 - Communicate to various publics.
4. Increase successful transfer from two- to four-year postsecondary institutions. (*Goal 2, Objective 7*)
5. Increase dual credit opportunities for high school students. (*Goal 2, Objective 5; Goal 3, Objective 3*)
 - Address district funding and postsecondary tuition policy issues. (*Goal 3, Objective 2*)
6. Develop school leadership (principals, counselors, teachers) for P-16 responsibilities. (*Goal 1, Objectives 1-3*)
7. Advocate for education, P-16 (*Vision/Mission Statement*)
 - Expand state P-16 Council's role with local councils, legislators, and others to promote funding for education at all levels and in all sectors in the coming session.
 - Target key groups to support seamless system of education (including P-16 forums).
 - Rethink state P-16 Council's membership (e.g., adding business and labor representation) and its status as a voluntary body.
8. Modify the High School Feedback Report to increase use by superintendents, principals, and teachers. (*Goal 2, Objectives 5 and 6*)

9. Develop and use skill and competency verification (vs. reliance on Carnegie course units and “seat-time” calculations to measure student learning). (*Goal 2, Objectives 5 and 6*)

The state NASH team also discussed the following policy issues and possible projects:

- Build employer/high school partnerships. (*Goal 3, Objective 4*)
- Tackle hard-to-staff schools (and the costs of emergency certification) (*Goal 1, Objectives 1-3*)
- Develop alternative routes to certification (and measuring outcomes). (*Goal 1, Objective 2*)
- Devise alternative learning pathways for disengaged students. (*Goal 3, Objective 3*)
- Reform the postsecondary faculty roles and reward structure to support quality P-12 and postsecondary education. (*Goal 1, Objective 4*)