

2005

An exploration of equity : a case study of an Upward Bound Program

Arthurine Walker

School for International Training

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones>

Recommended Citation

Walker, Arthurine, "An exploration of equity : a case study of an Upward Bound Program" (2005). *Capstone Collection*. 322.
<https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones/322>

This Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

**AN EXPLORATION OF EQUITY IN
THE STAR UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM**

**Arthurine Walker
PIM 62**

*A Capstone Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
a Master of Art in Intercultural Service, Leadership and Management
at the School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont, USA.*

May 28, 2005

Janaki Natarajan Tschannerl, Advisor

Copyright Notice

*The author hereby grants to the School for International Training the permission to reproduce either electronically or in print format this document in whole or in part **for library archival purposes only.***

*The author hereby does grant to the School for International Training the permission to **electronically reproduce and transmit this document to the student, alumni, staff, and faculty of the World Learning Community.***

Author's Signature Arthurine Walker

© Arthurine Walker, 2005. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	iv
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Introduction	1
Statement of Research	5
Research Question	6
Literature Review	9
Conceptual Framework	17
Research Methodology	18
Data Summary	20
Data Analysis	28
Conclusion	43
Recommendations	50
Further Research	51
References	53
Bibliography	55
Appendices	

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AP	Advanced Placement (classes)
AY	Academic Year
DOE	Department of Education
FG	First-generation College Bound Students
GPA	Grade Point Average
LI	Low-income Students
LI/FG	Low-income and first-generation college bound students
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test
SES	Socio-economic Status
SUPP.	Supplementary (referring to supplementary funding)
TC	Tutor Counselors, (interns) who work with UB students during the Summer Academy
UB	Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

The Star Upward Bound Program has operated for over 35 years. In that time, it has assisted over a thousand low-income, first-generation students to obtain their dream of going to college. In recent years, the program has boasted a success rate at getting more than 98 percent of its graduates to go on to college.

While the program has had many overall successes, program management had not explored whether it was equally successful with all of the groups the program serves. Program staff have deep concerns around issues of equity and wanted to explore these issue. Among the concerns were whether males and females were equally successful in the program, if services to different racial and ethnic groups were yielding similar results and if students from low-income families were achieving similar success to those from middle-income families.

The research sought to view equity within Star Upward Bound by exploring the educational achievement gap between males and females, students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds and students of different income levels. Additionally, the research viewed the program results through the frameworks of education as a means for breaking the cycle of poverty or maintaining the socio-economic status quo.

Overall, the Star Upward Bound program is having a great deal of success among male and female students; students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds; and students in all three of its income categories. However, there are some specific areas of concern:

1. Males are underrepresented in the program and are not performing as well academically as female participants.
2. Black and Latino students lag behind White and Asian students in academic performance after participating in the program even when they began on parity with White students.
3. Students whose academic performance is being tracked for the Department of Education are more likely to remain with the program, while those not being tracked appear more likely to be dismissed from the program.

Research data may not clearly indicate the reasons for the disparity in performance of students, but observations by the researcher about the varied experiences that participants are having within the program may provide some indications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to gratefully acknowledge my advisor, Janaki Natarajan for her flexibility and support in completing this work.

I want to thank my friends, Maxwell and Zenobia Amo-Hoyte, Michea Caye, and Eunice Wahome, who believed that I could complete the capstone this year even when I did not believe it. I am eternally grateful for their moral support.

Thanks are also due to the director of the Star Upward Bound Program, who willingly provided me unlimited access to the data that was used in completing this work.

Mostly, I wish to acknowledge all of the Black, Latino and low-income youth who, despite the odds, are completing high school, going on to college and becoming productive members of a society that too often treats them as disposable. It will be their challenge to try to create a more equitable educational system and egalitarian society in which all children are valued and supported to rise to their highest potential.

INTRODUCTION

In America, education is often referred to as the great equalizer. “Indeed, most Americans would like to believe that the U.S. public education system is not only fundamentally fair and equitable, but that it was intentionally designed to deconstruct the barriers of race, ethnicity, language, gender and poverty for the benefit of its extremely diverse citizenry.” (Cross, 2002) However, according to the Education Trust, a national non-profit with a mission to make schools and colleges work for all of the young people they serve, Black and Latino students and low-income students lag behind other students in academic achievement and college attendance. This difference in educational achievement has become known as the educational achievement gap.

Upward Bound is a federally funded program administered by the United States Department of Education. It was instituted as part of President Johnson’s war on poverty in 1965. The War on Poverty (1964-1968) was a campaign of legislation and social services aimed at reducing or eliminating poverty in the United States of America. The campaign yielded the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which was signed on August 20, 1964. (Wikipedia, 2001) The mission of Upward Bound is to assist low-income and potentially first-generation college bound students to prepare for college and achieve college success. Since the students Upward Bound serves are those who are typically on the negative end of the achievement gap, it could be said that intrinsic in this mission is closing the gap between the low-income, first-generation students and their wealthier peers. As defined in the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Appendix A), “low-income” means an individual from a family whose taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of an amount equal to the poverty level determined by using criteria of poverty established by the Bureau of the Census (see Appendix B for current guidelines). “First-

generation” means: an individual both of whose parents did not complete a baccalaureate degree; or in the case of any individual who regularly resided with and received support from only one parent, an individual whose only such parent did not complete a baccalaureate degree.

Upward Bound works with high school student participants to provide a variety of services designed to assist them in succeeding in high school and going on to college. These services include academic advising, tutoring, mentoring, SAT preparation, college visits, and assistance with completing college and financial aid applications. The ultimate goal of this program is to break the multi-generational cycle of poverty through access to higher education. Upward Bound (UB) programs are primarily administered by two- and four-year institutions of higher education. However, community organizations and some secondary institutions also administer UB programs.

The Department of Education sets a number of objectives against which Upward Bound program sponsors measure their success. These include:

- Demonstrated improvement in academic skills and competencies as measured by standardized tests.
- Demonstrated improvement in academic skills and competencies as measured by grade point average (GPA).
- Project participants continue to participate in the Upward Bound program until they graduate from high school.
- Project participants who complete the project undertake programs of postsecondary education and do so by the fall after completing the program.
- Project participants who complete the project succeed in education beyond high school including graduation from a postsecondary educational institution.

Each Upward Bound program sets specific objectives in its grant application to the Department of Education on the extent to which it will meet the above objectives.

The Star Upward Bound Program¹ is administered by a secondary school located in a rural area. During the time period covered in the research, the program served students at seven high schools within a 50-mile radius of the administering school's location. The schools being served included four schools in rural communities and three schools located in two small urban communities. For a profile of the seven schools, see Appendix C. Of the four rural schools, two were in the process of being cycled out of the program due to a decrease in the poverty level of students at the schools, which is determined by the number of students receiving free and reduced-cost lunch. One student attended an urban school not being served by the program and it is believed that she changed schools after admission to the program. That school is referred to as School X in the research. Star Upward Bound has been very successful at meeting its objectives of improving Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and Grade Point Averages (GPA), participant retention, college attendance and college success. Data gathered annually for the performance report to the Department of Education indicates that Star Upward Bound is exceeding the objectives that it set in the above stated areas.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the stated objectives are being achieved in an equitable fashion with regard to gender, race/ethnicity and income level. Program participants come from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, while two-thirds of project participants must come from families that are both low-income and where the participant would

¹ To protect the confidentiality of the Upward Bound Program, which is the subject of this report, and its participants, the name of the program has been changed. The program will be referred to as the Star Upward Bound program throughout this research.

be the first in the family to potentially attend a 4-year college, the remaining one-third of participants may come from families that are either low-income or first generation college bound. As a result of this distinction, a portion of the participant population may come from middle-income families. The data that has been gathered on student participation and achievement over the past five years will be analyzed to determine whether the achievement levels based on gender, race/ethnicity and low-income and first-generation status are equivalent to the overall successes of the program.

“Recent reports have confirmed that boys, not girls, are increasingly on the unfavorable side of the gender gap in education and developmental matters. For example, enrollments in institutions of higher education in the 1990s favor females by a ratio of 54 to 46 (Green et al., 1993); (Riordan 1998). As recent as 1980, the ration was 50/50. Of course, in 1970 the ratio favored males by a margin of 59 to 41. Similarly, in 1971 only 43 percent of those people who received a baccalaureate degree and 40 percent of those who received a master’s degree were women, compared to 54 percent for each degree in 1993 (Kopka and Kolb 1996); (Riordan 1998). Because of this large gap favoring males just 25 years ago, it is easy to understand how the reversal has gone unnoticed. Among African- and Hispanic-Americans, the gap actually favored females in 1970 and has expanded substantially during these past two decades (Kopka and Kolb, 1996);” (Riordan, 1998).

Fifty-seven percent of participants in Star UB are female and 43 percent are male, already representing a gender gap in those who are being served by the program. The breakdown by gender and race of students in the Star Program represent approximately their makeup in the

population of the schools being served. However, due to the nature of the Upward Bound program, there is a much larger representation of low-income students in the program than in the population at the schools being served. The urban schools being served had a much larger population of low-income students than the rural schools.

The schools being served in the two small urban communities—Schools C, S and H—are more racially diverse than those schools being served in the rural communities—Schools G, M, P and T—where 90 percent or more of students are White (Appendix C). As a result, when all of the Star UB students come together for the Summer Academy in the predominantly White rural community, it is often the most diverse experience for the rural White students and the least diverse experience for the urban students of color.

STATEMENT OF RESEARCH

The Star Upward Bound Program has operated for over 35 years. In that time, it has assisted hundreds of low-income, first-generation students to obtain their dream of going to college. In recent years, the program has boasted a success rate at getting more than 98 percent of its graduates to go on to college. The program has also been very successful in many other aspects as the data gathered annually on program participants demonstrates:

- UB Scholars increase their overall combined SAT scores by an average of 150 points from the time they enter the program to the time they graduate.
- 100 percent of the students served by the program continued with the program or graduated from high school.
- 93 percent of the 2003 graduates and 100 percent of the 2004 graduates enrolled in a program of post-secondary education.
- 80 percent of graduates complete a program of post-secondary education within 6 years.

- 92 percent of UB scholars achieve a GPA of 2.25 or better.
- 68 percent of UB scholars achieve a GPA of 3.0 or better.
- 75 percent of all students tested improved their score by 20 percent on Writing Tests.
- 92 percent of all students tested improved their score by 20 percent on Mathematics Tests.

While the program has had many overall successes, program management had not explored whether it was equally successful with all of the groups the program serves. Program staff have deep concerns around issues of equity and wanted to explore these issue. Among the concerns were whether males and females were equally successful in the program, if services to different racial and ethnic groups were yielding similar results and if students from low-income families were achieving similar success to those from middle-income families.

RESEARCH QUESTION:

Is the Upward Bound Program meeting its stated objectives in an equitable way among students of different genders, racial backgrounds and different income categories?

Sub-questions:

- At the time of selection, how do students compare to each other in terms of GPA by gender, race/ethnicity and Low-Income/First-Generation (LI/FG) status?
- What, if any, are the differences in GPAs for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income category after participation in the program?
- What, if any, are the differences in SAT scores for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income who participated in the program?

- What is the rate of high school graduation for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income category?
- How do the success rates of this program regarding race and income compare to national averages around SAT scores and college attendance?
- What do students, UB advisors and other UB staff think about the relationship between gender, race/ethnicity, income and student success?

Since this research is looking at success rates for students in the Upward Bound program, it is necessary to define the success factors that are being explored.

- The ultimate success factor for a UB program participant is admission to a competitive college, graduation from which will often ensure the future employability of the student. In exploring this factor, the competitive nature of the college, whether it is public or private and type of college (2-year or 4-year) will be considered. Obviously college graduation becomes a part of this success factor. However, because this research looks at student participants over a five-year period, only students who completed the UB program during year one of the research period could have graduated college at the time of this analysis. Related to this is whether students who participated in UB are still in college and making progress toward completion.
- Since college admission is often largely based on particular variables, those variables must be considered among the success factors. These include grade point average (GPA) and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores.
- The college admission rate of UB students will be compared to the national averages of for low-income students attending post-secondary education.

The above factors, which are explored in the research, are included in the stated objectives of the Star Upward Bound Program.

It is also necessary to define here how racial/ethnic categories and income levels are defined in Upward Bound programs and for the purpose of this research. Students self-define their racial/ethnic category on the Upward Bound application, selecting from Asian American, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, White, or More than one race. In the research, students are referred to as Asian, Black, Latino, White, Multiracial or Unknown. Multiracial are those students whose two parents are of different racial backgrounds. Unknown are those students who chose not to respond to this question. In some cases, the lack of response may have been due to the fact that the students were immigrants and were unfamiliar with the racial categories as typically defined in the United States.

Students are divided into three “income” categories: First-Generation only (FG), Low-income only (LI) and Low-Income/First-Generation (LI/FG). The students defined as ‘first-generation only’ are from families with incomes above 150 percent of the US poverty level in the tax year prior to the participants’ acceptance to the program. These students were all middle- to lower-middle income students; none would have been described as high income and none had parents who had a bachelor’s degree. The students defined as ‘low-income only’ had at least one parent who had a bachelor’s degree at the time of acceptance to the program. However, their families’ income was at or below 150 percent of the US poverty level. Those students defined as LI/FG are participants for whom neither parent had obtained a bachelor’s degree at the time of the student’s acceptance to the program and the families’ income fell at or below 150 percent of the

US poverty level. Although ‘first-generation only’ is not specifically an income designation, the research sought to determine if students from middle income families would fair better academically with the assistance of Upward Bound than those whose families had one or more parents who had completed a bachelor’s degree but were still low-income as well as compared to those students who were both low-income and for whom neither parent had completed a college degree.

LITERATURE REVIEW

During the school year, the student participants of the Star Upward Bound Program attend school in low-income urban and rural school districts. Three of the seven schools served during the research period have been named under-performing schools and are in jeopardy of being closed. These schools are located in three of the poorest communities in the state. It is clear that without additional resources and services, students attending the schools served by Star UB may simply continue to experience the *savage inequalities* of a system designed to maintain a social and economic status quo.

Educational Achievement Gap

There are many schools of thought about what has come to be known as the educational achievement gap. This term encompasses the performance difference between students of color, primarily Black and Latino and their White peers, between low-income kids and their wealthier peers; and between males and females. Because these gaps are most often looked at individually, there are many theories about why each of these differences between peer groups exists.

One school of thought is around the ways in which the “culture of power”—ways of speaking, writing, dressing and interacting—play out in the classroom. In order for low-income students and students of color to be successful in the classroom, they need to acquire the culture of those in power. The classroom simply becomes a reflection of societal imbalances of power. Middle- and upper class students come to school understanding this culture and are able to navigate successfully within it. Low-income students and students of color, who are not a part of this culture often find it difficult to be successful in classrooms where miscommunication occurs as a result of cross-cultural communication. The problem here is exacerbated because those with power often are unaware or unwilling to acknowledge the existence of their power or the power dynamic. Although nearly 40 percent of children in America’s schools are children of color; the vast majority of them are taught by White teachers who may have difficulty communicating across the culture of power divide (Delpit, 1996, p.24-26).

When it comes to the educational gap between races, the concerns above are only the beginning. “You will find a range of analyses (and a corresponding variety of suggested solutions): biased standardized tests, tests that do not match the learning styles of black students, less money spent on educating black students, socioeconomic differences, lack of motivation, negative peer pressure, lack of family support for education, teacher biases, and many other possibilities. All of these figure prominently in the menu of causes” (Singham, p. 586-591). The same could be said for the Latino population, adding language barriers and bias based on the same to the list of causes.

However, recent studies point to a different cause—the academic rigor of the learning environment. One study found that, “although the college-access gap between whites and blacks and Latinos has closed over the past two decades, the gap in degree completion remains 20% or higher. The degree completion gap has been credited to “academic resources” (made up of a composite of high school curriculum, test scores, and class rank)” (Singham, p.587). These factors were found to have a greater effect than socio-economic status (SES) in predicting college degree completion. “For example, students in the lowest two SES quintiles, but with the highest academic resources, graduated at higher rates than the majority of students in the highest SES quintile. The study also found that the impact of high school curriculum is far more pronounced positively for black and Latino students than any other measure and that this consistently overwhelms such demographic variables as gender, race, and SES. In other words, improving the high school curriculum has a disproportionately positive effect on students from groups that traditionally underachieve” (Singham, p.587).

The list of goals for Latino youth developed by the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators suggests that they are in agreement. The goals for closing the achievement gap between Latinos and White students include: preschool education; time devoted to learning; maximizing intellectual rigor; better trained teachers; learning resources, programs, and technology; and academic choices and transitions. (Tornatzky, Pachon & Torres, 2003)

Other factors that were found to contribute to the achievement gap between races are the quality of the teaching and the availability of resources. Black students were less likely than White students to have teachers who set high standards for them or to be in classrooms that were fully

equipped. The student-teacher relationship also plays an important role in student achievement. While the ethnicity of the teacher did not appear to be a factor, the students' feeling about the teacher did play a role in achievement. Approximately "81% of black females and 62% of black males want to please the teacher more than they do a parent; the comparable figures for whites are 28% for females and 32% for males. In other words, the impact of the teacher is far greater for minority students. Since effective teachers produce as much as six times the learning gains produced by less-effective teachers, it should not be surprising that good teachers can have such a differentially positive effect on minority students" (Singham, p. 589).

In addition to the gap between different racial and socio-economic groups, there is a growing gender gap in education that favors girls. After many years of seeing girls lag behind boys in almost every aspect of education, the trends seems to have reversed. Girls have almost completely closed the long held gap in math and science achievement by twelfth grade, but boys are still lagging way behind in writing skills. Girls are also achieving better grades, higher class ranks and more girls than boys are going to college and achieving college success. (Riordan, 1998) While girls are faring better in the classroom, boys continue to outscore them on national standardized tests. In 2001, the combined average score of males who took the SAT was 42 points higher than their female counterparts. The disparity between grades and SAT scores has led to the conclusion that there may be a built in gender bias to the exam. (Groves, 2001)

In addition to the discussion of gender bias on the SATs, there is also discussion of a racial bias to the exam. Black students have consistently scored lower than White students on the exams. Between 1988 and 2003, Black students saw only a 10-point gain in their average score from 847

to 857. The scoring gap between Black and White students in 1976 was 240 points, it decreased to 189 points by 1988, when the decline stopped and began to increase again. (Confronting the Widening Racial Scoring Gap on the SAT, 2003)

Education and the Cycle of Poverty

Education is often seen as the key to breaking the cycle of poverty. “The link between lack of education and poverty is clear and education is one of the most powerful weapons against poverty. Education raises productivity, innovation and output, and therefore contributes to economic growth and poverty reduction. It gives people new skills and empowers them to take advantage of new opportunities, providing them with the means to gain a fairer share of the economic cake” (Attack the Global Education Crisis and Break the Cycle of Poverty, 1999).

It is a commonly held belief that a college education is crucial to breaking the cycle of poverty. “On average, a male with a bachelor's degree earns more than twice as much a year as male high school dropout, according to the Alliance for Excellence in Education” (Sanchez-Traynor, 2005). However, students living in poverty are least likely to access the resources needed to be able to obtain a college education (Sanchez-Traynor, 2005). Although public education is accessible to all, the type of education that some students receive and the circumstances in which some students live may not make college a possibility.

For low-income students and students of color a combination of circumstances including the structure of public education, expectations, and power dynamics may determine whether they are able to be successful in high school and college and change their socio-economic status.

Is Education the Great Equalizer?

As some educators try to determine what is happening in the classroom to create and maintain an achievement gap, others are looking to more systemic causes. The American public education system is often referred to as the great equalizer, which is consistent with the belief that education can help to break the cycle of poverty. However, some educators question if the system is designed for this purpose. In 1909, when the public school system was still in its early stages, President Woodrow Wilson commented:

“Let us go back and distinguish between the two things that we want to do; for we want to do two things in modern society. We want one class of persons to have a liberal education, and we want another class of person, a very much larger class, to forego the privileges of a liberal education and fit themselves to perform specific difficult manual labor.” (Cross, 2002)

The view of public education as the great equalizer is a myth which stands in the way of efforts to create change in the system. If this myth goes unchallenged, it prevents the formation of a system of educational efficacy in which all children irregardless of race, ethnicity, gender, education level of parents, household income or native language or dialect, from achieving their highest potential. (Cross, 2002)

The term “great equalizer” suggests that students would receive an equal education in the public school system and as a result would be able to achieve equal economic rewards upon completing that education. However, in a market economy, where people are needed as laborers as well as managers, it is conceivable that education is designed to reproduce the very inequalities that persist within the system.

“In the initiation of youth, a society reveals its highest aspirations, tempered less by the weight of tradition than by the limits to which the social relationships of adult life can be pushed. We believe that in the contemporary United States, the limits are sufficiently narrow to preclude the education system from simultaneously integrating youth into adult society and contributing significantly to economic equality. In promoting what John Dewey once called the “social continuity of life,” by integrating new generations into the social order, the schools are constrained to justify and reproduce inequality rather than correct it” (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 102).

The efforts to close the achievement gaps may be in conflict with maintaining a capitalist structure within society. Instead, the education system legitimizes the inequalities in society by promoting meritocracy. The educational system espouses that those who gain particular skills will be economically successful. However, meritocracy is contradictory to equity in education. (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 102-103)

One way that a system of meritocracy is carried out within schools is the practice of tracking. Students are divided into groups based on their perceived abilities or past performance. Each group is then taught according to their perceived ability level. Even though it is controversial, it is estimated that 85 percent of schools group students in this way for learning.

“We’ve grown up in a system that urges us to believe that some kids are smarter than others and that somehow we can accurately sort this out. We place less emphasis on effort and the value of long-term persistence than on ones perceived native ability. Thus when students have difficulty in school, our tendency has been to place that student in an

‘easier’ class with less challenging work.”—Pam Fisher, Center for Inquiry on Secondary Education, Maine Department of Education. (DiMartino and Miles, 2005)

Making things easier for these students is not the answer. Rather ensuring that they are challenged, able to work at their own pace and understand what is expected of them has resulted in higher achievement. (DiMartino and Miles, 2005)

Even for those students who learn and internalize skills taught to them in America’s public school system, they will not have the same opportunities as their wealthier counterparts, who often attend well-funded suburban public schools or private prep schools. Only certain kinds of education can truly create changes in the status quo for low-income students.

“...To insure the longevity of the ruling class is to insure that its children have such an educational advantage that they are the best qualified to hold positions of power in society. In a society like ours, which only about 25 percent of all people complete a college degree, post high school education is the key to higher paying jobs, connections, and the ability to accumulate wealth” (Kivel, 2004, p. 73-74).

The children of the power elite, ruling and managerial classes² attend elite schools throughout their lives that prepare them for certain elite colleges and professional/graduate schools. Youth from working class and middle class backgrounds must gain the competitive edge necessary to enroll and compete at these competitive private colleges. However, this will be a challenge for youth from working and middle class backgrounds because their schools are often less competitive and they face the hidden challenge of legacy (Kivel, 2004, p. 73-74).

² According to Kivel, ruling class is defined as families in the top 1% in terms of wealth; managerial class are families in the next 19% in terms of wealth and the power elite are those among the ruling and managerial classes who hold positions of national decision-making in government or private industry.

“More ruling class youth are admitted [to colleges and universities] under legacy admission guidelines or because of parental donations (15 to 25 percent in some elite universities) than are admitted under affirmative action programs covering race and gender” (Kivel, 2004, p. 73-74).

The view of education as reproducing the status quo is in conflict with the view of education as breaking the cycle of poverty. However the former may explain why over 100 years after the formation of the public school system and 40 years after the legalized desegregation of public schools, there is still an educational gap between low-income and wealthier students and between White and non-White students.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The mission of Upward Bound is to assist low-income and potentially first-generation college bound students to prepare for college and achieve college success. During the research period, 83 percent of the students who participated in the Star Upward Bound program were low-income students and 51 percent were Black or Latino students. These groups are on the unfavorable end of the educational achievement gap. Additionally, there continues to be an achievement gap among genders with females attaining higher GPAs and class ranks and male students scoring higher on standardized exams. Upward Bound was designed to assist students who are traditionally disenfranchised in the educational system to improve their grades and test scores, and to attend and complete college.

Upward Bound is also working within school systems that seem designed to reproduce the inequities of society. The schools are located in the poorest communities in the state and are all under-resourced. Education has long been viewed as the way to upward social and economic mobility. The conceptual framework of this research is based on the ideal that the Upward Bound program is designed to alleviate some of the inequities that are built into the society at large and the educational system in order to assist students in breaking the cycle of poverty. To do this, UB cannot reproduce the achievement gaps or inequities within the program that are seen in the public education system.

In providing a number of services to its students, can Upward Bound begin to address these inequities or are students in the program bound within a system where low-income students and students of color may be considered disposable?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research is an instrumental case study as it explores a particular issue—success of Upward Bound students—through an in-depth data collection from multiple sources. The study is bounded by time—fall 1999 to spring 2004³—and explores a single Upward Bound program as described above.

The primary data used in this research is data that was collected by the Star Upward Bound program for the purpose of its annual performance report to the Department of Education, which

³ While the research looks at students, who participated in the program during a five-year period spanning September 1999 through May 2004, the data was gathered over a three-year period. In the fall of 2002, data was gathered for the three preceding academic years (AY): 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02. In the two subsequent years, data was collected for the preceding AY. To simplify matters, they are referred to as the first, second and third data collection cycles throughout the research.

funds the program. Additional data was collected from the Star program's internal databases for students who were not part of the annual performance report. A survey instrument was also sent to student participants, academic advisors and teachers who worked with the UB students during the five-year period of the research. The questionnaire (See Appendix D) was sent via e-mail and sought general views about the effects of gender, race and income on the learning of Upward Bound participants. Very few of the surveys were returned, but the anecdotal data collected through the questionnaires has been used to enliven the research (See Appendix E for questionnaire responses). A document review of Postsecondary Education Opportunity newsletter was conducted to inform the study and incorporate national trends around gender, race, income and college attendance. In addition, national reports and evaluation data of UB programs were reviewed for purposes of comparison. An interview was conducted with the program director who was the manager of the Star Program during the five-year research period. Finally, the researcher served as an academic advisor in the Star Upward Bound program during the period immediately after the research period. While the researcher's observations are not included in the data summary, observations about program structure and design are included in the conclusions and recommendations of the research.

The setting in which this case study is situated is important in contextualizing the situation as a significant component of the program involves students from predominantly low-income backgrounds spending six-weeks each summer on the campus of a private secondary school that administers the program. Students receive academic instruction and enrichment from a diverse group of instructors. For some students it is the most racially and ethnically diverse environment they have participated in and for others it is the least racially and ethnically diverse environment

they have been in. Many of the advisors who have worked with students are themselves from low-income families and were the first in their families to attend college. The program has also been very proactive in utilizing former students from the program to advise and teach within the program. This is only partly true of the teaching staff, which includes the academic advisors. Some of the teaching staff work year-round at the private secondary school and are used to interacting with students from a much higher income level.

According to the Program Director of Star UB, approximately 50 percent of the Summer Academy staff are usually people of color and the other half are White educators. Additionally, the summer staff typically consist of an even split between males and females. In addition to the program director, who is a white female, there are usually three to four other academic year advising staff members. During the past five years, the academic year advising staff has been made up of three African American females, two Latina females, two White females and one White male. In addition, there has been a racial mix of interns and staff assistants, all of whom were female. With the exception of one intern, the academic year staff has been made up entirely of people from low-income, first-generation backgrounds.

DATA SUMMARY

A total of 200 students participated in the Star Upward Bound Program during the 1999-2004 research period. Some of those students began in the program as early as 1997 and completed high school and Upward Bound as early as 2000. When some of the data used in this research was initially gathered in the fall of 2002 for the preceding three academic years (AY 1999-2000,

AY 2000-2001, and AY 2001-2002), some of the students were beginning their third year of post-secondary education.

Of the 200 students, who participated in the Star Upward Bound program during the research period, data has been collected on 161 students (See Appendix F for a detailed summary of the data). The success rates used throughout most of this research paper are based on the 161 students on whom extensive data was collected. While there is very little data on the remaining 39 students, they play an important role in the findings of this research.

The Star Program is primarily funded through a grant from the Department of Education (DOE), however, the program also receives grants from private funding sources. These grants help to support a larger contingent of student participants in the program. The 161 students, on which data was gathered, are funded under the DOE grant and the 39 students for which there is very little data were funded under supplemental grants. Since there is no detailed reporting requirement for these supplemental grants, very little data has been gathered on these students. For the purpose of reporting to the Department of Education, UB programs must continue to track student participants for up to 10 years from the time they enter the UB program or until they complete their first bachelor's degree.

The following are the number of students in the data set separated by funding stream:

TABLE 1

	Federal Funding	Supplemental Funding	Total
Total Number of Students	161	39	200
Number in 2002 includes AY 99-00, 00-01, 01-02	113	14	127
Number in 2003 (AY 02-03)	130 (+17)	28 (+14)	158 (+31)
Number in 2004 (AY 03-04)	157 (+31, -4)	39 (+11)	196 (+42, -4)

The breakdown of student participants by gender, race/ethnicity and income designation and school attended are as follows:

TABLE 2

Categories	DOE	Supp.	Total
Total Number of Students	161 (80%)	39 (20%)	200 (100%)
Gender			
Male	66 (41%)	20 (51%)	86 (43%)
Female	95 (59%)	19 (49%)	114 (57%)
Race/Ethnicity			
Asian	9 (6%)	1 (3%)	10 (5%)
Black/African American	32 (20%)	10 (26%)	42 (21%)
Latino/Hispanic	47 (29%)	12 (31%)	59 (29.5%)
White	64 (40%)	12 (31%)	76 (38%)
Multi-racial	5 (3%)	4 (10%)	9 (4.5%)
Unknown Racial Background	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (2%)
LI/FG Income Designation			
First Generation Only (FG)	27 (17%)	5 (13%)	32 (16%)
Low-income Only (LI)	8 (5%)	3 (8%)	11 (5.5%)
LI/FG	126 (78%)	29 (74%)	155 (77.5%)
Income Designation Unknown	0	2 (5%)	2 (1%)
School Attended			
School C	18 (11%)	7 (18%)	25 (12.5%)
School G	12 (7.5%)	14 (36%)	26 (13%)
School H	46 (29%)	9 (23%)	55 (27.5%)
School M	13 (8%)	1 (3%)	14 (7%)
School P	4 (2.5%)	0	4 (2%)
School S	41 (25%)	1 (3%)	42 (21%)
School T	27 (17%)	6 (15%)	33 (16.5%)
School X	0	1 (3%)	1 (.5%)

Gender Summary:

There was good news for both genders in the research. Female students began the program with higher GPAs; during two of the three data collection cycles, they saw greater gains in their GPAs, and scored somewhat higher on the SAT in both the math and verbal categories. The average combined SAT score for females was 1020 (495 Verbal and 525 Math), while the men's average combined score was 956 (468 Verbal and 488 Math). Exceptions to this were that the LI/FG Asian men who outscored their female counterparts by a combined 72 points, similarly with LI/FG Black men who outscored their female counterparts by 62 combined points. FG only White men also outscored their female counterparts by 107 combined points. While the females saw a greater overall gain in their average GPA, a larger percent of male participants increased their GPAs during the first two data collection cycles. In cycle one, 83 percent of males versus 79 percent of females improved their GPAs and 64 percent of men versus 58 percent of women in cycle two. By the third cycle, the trend had reversed and 54 percent of women vs. 46 percent of men saw improvements in their GPAs.

Women were more likely to go on to competitive private colleges upon high school graduation than their male counterparts. Of the three UB participants who have received a first bachelor's degree during the research period, they are all female. However, of the four people who have received Associates degrees, three are male and one is female. Twenty percent of male students went to school out of state, while only ten percent of females went out of state.

Race/Ethnicity Summary:

Multiracial students had the highest combined average SAT score (1035 out of a possible 1600) exceeding White students by seven points and Asian students by eight points. White students had the highest average verbal SAT score (505 out of a possible 800) of the racial/ethnic groups exceeding the Multiracial students' score by five points and the next closest groups—Asian and Black students—by 29 points. Asian students had the highest math SAT scores (551) outscoring Multi-racial students by 16 points and White students by 28 points.

All racial groups entered the program with relatively high average GPAs—2.9937 for Latino students, 3.0018 for White students, 3.0738 for Black students, 3.1128 for Multiracial students, 3.66 for Asian students and 3.3447 for students whose racial background is unknown—on a 4.0 scale. During the first two data cycles, Asian students made small gains in their GPA and had a large gain during cycle three. Black, Latino and White students all added more than one-tenth of a point to their GPA during cycle one, but had lesser increases in the subsequent two cycles. Latino students actually experienced a decrease in their average GPA in cycle two. While White students had lesser gains in cycles two and three, they were significantly higher than Black or Latino students. During cycle two, one half of Black and Latino students saw increased GPAs and by cycle three, that figure had declined to 38 percent for each group. Overall 89 percent of Asian students increased their GPAs during the three cycles; 75 percent of White students, 60 percent of Black students, 53 percent of Latino students and 50 percent of Multiracial students also saw improvements in their GPAs.

Star Upward Bound Program graduates go on to college at very high rates; 96 percent of participants initially enrolled in a post-secondary institution. Thirty-nine percent of Latino students enrolled in private four-year colleges in addition to 43 percent of Whites, 50 percent of Blacks, and 67 percent of Asian students. Seventeen percent of Asian students, 12 percent of Black students, 11 percent of Latino students, 20 percent of White students, and 25 percent of students whose racial background is unknown enrolled in public two-year colleges after completing Upward Bound. The remaining 16 percent of Asian students, 37 percent of White students, 38 percent of Black students, 50 percent of Latino students and one Multi-racial student enrolled in public four-year colleges.

While public vs. private does not always speak to the competitive level of the post-secondary institution, approximately 20 percent of Upward Bound graduates initially enrolled in competitive private schools such as Brown University, Smith College, Williams College, Swarthmore College, Tufts University, and Georgetown University.

Income Designation Summary

On the SAT exams, first generation (FG) only students outscored their low-income (LI) only and LI/FG counterparts by 46 and 52 points respectively. FGs scored 10 points higher on the verbal than their LI counterparts and 27 points higher than their LI/FG counterparts. FGs scored 36 points higher on the math than their LI counterparts, but only 25 points better than their LI/FG counterparts.

LI students entered Upward Bound with a higher average GPA than the FG or LI/FG students. They maintained this advantage throughout the first data collection cycle by achieving an average increase of .2067, while FGs increased by .1126 and LI/FGs by .1143. During the second data collection cycle, LI students had an increase that was twice that of LI/FG students and twenty times that of the FG only students. During the third data collection cycle, LI students had a decrease in their GPAs, while the other two groups saw increases. Overall 62 percent of FG students, 56 percent of LI students and 64 percent of LI/FG student increased their GPAs during the three-year data collection period.

Fifty-five percent of FG students enrolled in private four-year colleges upon completing Upward Bound in addition to 50 percent of LI students and 42 percent of LI/FG students. Fourteen percent of both FG and LI/FG students and 33 percent of LI enrolled in public two-year colleges upon completing high school. Thirty-two percent of FG, 17 percent of LI and 43 percent of LI/FG enrolled in four-year public colleges.

Current Status

Of the 200 students served by Star UB during the research period, 45 students funded under DOE and 9 students funded under supplemental grants are still in high school. Of the 161 students who were funded under DOE, 111 students completed the Star Upward Bound program and went on to college. Star UB has lost track of 20 of those students. However, of the 20 students whose current status is unknown, 19 received high school diplomas and 1 moved away, making her high school completion status unknown. In 2001, five of the 19 were in college; in 2002, 10 were in college; and in 2003, two were in college.

The majority of students who went on to college have remained in their original schools with a few exceptions. Three students who went to in-state four-year colleges with residential campuses returned home and are attending community colleges in their local communities. One student who started at a four-year state school has gone on to a private school out of state. Of the 17 students who began at local community colleges, two earned AA degrees and went on to four-year schools; one has earned a two-year certificate, seven are still in school, one is out of school at this time and the status of 6 remain unknown.

A total of 15 students went out of state to attend college. In the first data collection cycle, four students went out of state to four-year, private colleges. At the time of the second data collection, one had returned to a two-year, in state school leaving three out of state students. During the second data cycle, four more students went out of state and a year later, all seven were still making progress at their out of state schools. Seven additional students who completed the UB program at the time of the third data collection chose to go out of state to attend college, bringing the current number of out-of state students to 14. It is left to be seen how many will remain out of state to complete college.

At the time of the third data collection cycle, the following was the known status of former Star Upward Bound participants: three students had attained their first Bachelor's degree, four had earned Associates degrees, one earned a two-year certificate, 62 were in college and making progress toward a degree, three had left school without completing a degree, and the status of the remaining students are unknown.

DATA ANALYSIS

The Star Upward Bound Program has had a great deal of success in working with low-income, first-generation students in order to increase their academic performance in high school, high school graduation rates and motivation to pursue postsecondary education programs.

At the time of selection, how do students compare to each other in terms of GPA by gender, race/ethnicity and LI/FG status?

TABLE 3

Male	Female		Asian	Black	Latino	White	Multi	Unknown		FG	LI	LI/FG
2.8471	3.1083		3.6654	3.0738	2.9937	3.0018	3.1128	3.3447		3.0694	3.3483	3.043

Female students had higher average GPAs upon entering the UB program than their male counterparts. Asian students had the highest average entry GPA with just over one-tenth of a point separating the remaining four racial/ethnic groups. For the purpose of this study, people whose racial/ethnic background is unknown will not be compared to the specified groups. LI income students who had one parent who had obtained a bachelor's degree began the program with a three-tenths of a point advantage over their FG and LI/FG counterparts.

If all three data collection cycles are viewed together, the students with the top 10 highest program entry grade point averages, all of which were 4.08 or greater on a weighted 4.0 scale⁴ (See Appendix G), the group is strongly represented by female students, students of color and

⁴ Students who are taking Honors and Advanced Placement (AP) courses, which add .5 and 1.0 respectively to the grade earned in a course, may have a weighted GPA that exceeds 4.0 on a 4.0 scale.

LI/FG students: 4 Latino, 2 Black, 3 Asian, 1 White; 8 Female, 2 Male; 8 LI/FG, 1 FG only, 1 LI only; 6 are from School S, and one each are from Schools C, G, H, and M.

Of the 10 students with the lowest entering GPAs—the only students in the three-year data collection cycle to begin the program with GPAs below 2.0—7 are White, 2 Black, and 1 Latino; all 7 White students are male and the 3 students of color were female; 7 students were LI/FG and 3 FG only; 5 students attended School T, and one each attended Schools C, M, G, H, and S. A quick conclusion to draw would be that White male students were more likely to be accepted to the Upward Bound program with lower starting GPAs or to be selected for long-term tracking. However, there is not enough evidence to support this. The question becomes more complicated when one considers the 39 students who were not tracked as part of the detailed data collection. Four of the White males who began the program with GPAs below 2.0 did so in the same year. However, due to lack of data on the 39 students who are not being tracked, it was impossible to determine if any of those with high entering GPAs began the program in the same year as their lower-scoring counterparts who are being tracked.

Since the Star UB program only tracks those students who are funded under the grant from DOE, decisions must be made after the selection of a new contingent of students, who will be tracked. These decisions are based on a number of factors including student interest in the program and entering grade point average. A student who shows a great interest in the program and who will remain with the program throughout high school may be easier to track over a long period of time.

Of those 39 students who were not being tracked, 16 had entering GPAs below 2.0—9 were male and 7 were female; 4 were Black, 6 Latino, 2 Multi-racial, and 4 White. The top 10 GPAs in this data set ranged between 2.57 and 3.66, none of which were comparable to the 4.08 or higher GPA of those in the group of tracked students.

What, if any, are the differences in GPAs for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income category after participation in the program?

Male and female students on which data was gathered during the three-year data collection cycle⁵ fared about the same in regard to GPA once they began participating in the Upward Bound program. In Cycle 1 of data collection, 83 percent of males and 79 percent of females saw increases in their GPAs. In Cycle 2, 64 percent of males and 58 percent of females saw increases. In Cycle 3, 46 percent of males and 54 percent of females saw increases. Overall 63 percent of males and 64 percent of females increased their GPAs after participating in Upward Bound. The greatest difference between the genders was in how much of a gain was made. Female participants had much larger gains in their GPAs in two of the three data gathering cycles resulting in a much greater overall gain over the three cycles.

There was greater disparity in performance across racial/ethnic groups. In Cycle 1, 89 percent of White students, 81 percent of Black students, 77 percent of Latino students and 67 percent of Asian students showed improved GPAs. However, the numbers began to change dramatically for Black and Latino students in Cycles 2 and 3. While 100 percent of Asian students and 71

⁵ Because some students were already in college during the first data collection cycle, and others continued to graduate throughout the research period, the numbers of students vary each year. During cycle one, there were 24 males and 43 females. Cycle two had 33 males and 50 females and cycle three had 32 males and 35 females. This is also true for racial/ethnic groups and LI/FG designations. See Appendix ? for specific number for each cycle.

percent of White students increased their GPAs during Cycle 2 only 50 percent each of Black, Latino and Multi-racial students saw improvements in their GPAs. In Cycle 3, again 100 percent of Asian students improved and 64 percent of White students improved. However, 50 percent of Multiracial students and only 38 percent each of Black and Latino students improved their GPAs during Cycle 3. The three-year results were that 89 percent of Asian students, 75 percent of White students, 60 percent of Black students, 53 percent of Latinos and 50 percent of Multi-racial students improved their GPAs.

The Star UB Program Director was asked what might be the cause of this dramatic decline in the percentage of students who increased their GPAs during the three data collection cycles. She explained that two years ago, the program changed its recruitment within the schools it served. “We made it clear to the schools that we are not just looking for the top kids.” The program began recruiting “higher risk kids,” which may be the reason that fewer students saw improved GPAs after this period. While several racial/ethnic groups saw fewer students improve their GPAs with each succeeding data collection cycle, Black and Latino participants had the greatest decline. White students had a 25 percent decline; Latino students a 39 percent decline; and Black students had a 43 percent decline. The number of Asian students who improved their GPAs actually rose during each data collection cycle and the number of Multi-racial students remained stagnant.

While 100 percent of LI students improved their GPAs during Cycles one and two, a decline in Cycle three resulted in students from all three income designations ending the three-year data collection cycle within 6 percentage points of each other. Sixty-two percent of FG students, 56

percent of LI students and 64 percent of LI/FG students saw improved GPAs over the three cycles.

What, if any, are the differences in SAT scores for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income who participated in the program?

Unlike the national scoring gap on the SATs that favors males, female UB students outscored their male counterparts on both math and verbal. On average, female students scored 21 points higher than male students on the verbal portion of the test but only 3 points higher on the math portion of the test for a combined 24-point advantage for the female students. In the national view of the SATs, males are outscoring females by approximately 49 combined points, most of which is on the math section.

While only a few points separated the combined scores of Multi-racial (1035), White (1028) and Asian (1027) students, there was a significant gap between this group and their Black (968) and Latino (924) peers on the SATs. SAT scores varied less by income designation. The average combined SAT score of FG students (1013) exceeded their LI peers (977) by 36 points and the LI/FG students (976) by 37 points.

The top 10 combined SAT scores fell between 1220 and 1390 out of a possible 1600. The verbal scores of these top 10 people fell between 570 and 740 and the math scores fell between 600 and 690. Included in this group were 3 males and 7 females, 1 student was Asian, 3 were Black, 1 was Latino and 4 were White, 1 student was FG only, and the remaining 9 were LI/FG; 1 student was from School C, 4 from School H, 2 from School S and 3 from School T.

The bottom 10 combined SAT scores fell between 590-740 out of a possible 1600. The verbal scores of these 10 people fell between 250 and 380 and the math scores fell between 240 and 440. Included in this group were 4 males and 6 females, 4 were Black, 4 were Latino and 2 were White; 1 student was FG only and 9 were LI/FG; 2 students were from School C, 2 were from School H, 4 from School S and 2 from School T.

The top 10 Verbal SAT scores fell between 600 and 740 out of a possible 800; 4 people had scores of 600. The combined scores of these top 13 people fell between 1090 and 1390 and the math scores fell between 480 and 690. Included in this group were 2 males and 11 females, 3 students were Black, 3 were Latino and 7 were White, 3 students were FG only, and the remaining 10 were LI/FG; 1 student was from School C, 4 from School H, 4 from School S and 4 from School T.

The bottom 10 Verbal SAT scores fell between 250 and 360 out of a possible 800; 7 people had scores of 360. The combined scores of these 16 people fell between 590 and 880 and the math scores fell between 260 and 590. Included in this group were 7 males and 9 females; 1 student was Asian, 5 were Black, 6 were Latino, 3 were White, and 1 whose racial background is unknown, 1 student was FG only, and the remaining 15 were LI/FG; 4 students were from School C, 1 from School G, 3 from School H, 6 from School S and 2 from School T.

The top 10 Math SAT scores fell between 620 and 760 out of a possible 800; 3 people had scores of 620. The combined scores of these top 12 people fell between 1110 and 1390 and their verbal scores fell between 420 and 710. Included in this group were 3 males and 9 females; 2 students

were Asian, 3 were Black, 1 was Latino and 6 were White; 1 student was FG only, 1 was LI only and the remaining 10 were LI/FG; 1 student was from School C, 5 from School H, 3 from School S and 3 from School T.

The bottom 10 Math SAT scores fell between 240 and 380 out of a possible 800; 3 people had scores of 380. The combined scores of these 12 people fell between 590 and 840 and their verbal scores fell between 320 and 470. Included in this group were 4 males and 8 females; 4 student were Black, 5 were Latino, and 3 were White; 2 students were FG only, and the remaining 10 were LI/FG; 2 students were from School C, 3 from School H, 1 from School M, 3 from School S and 2 from School T.

What is the rate of high school graduation for students by gender, race/ethnicity and income category?

With the exception of one student who moved away prior to completing high school and whose status is unknown, 100 percent of the students who participated in the Star Upward Bound program and who were tracked during the three-year data collection cycle completed high school and earned a High School diploma. Additionally, of the 39 students on whom data has not been collected, 69 percent are still in high school, 21 percent completed high school and went on to college and the status of the remaining 10 percent are unknown. Regardless of gender, race or income designation, UB students are completing high school at extraordinarily high rates.

How do the success rates of this program regarding race and income compare to national averages around SAT scores and college attendance?

To date, 60 percent of students who completed Upward Bound and were part of this research have either completed a post-secondary education program or are currently enrolled in a post-secondary education program. This is far above the national and state average for students attending college in general and specifically for low-income students attending college.

“In 2002, the college participation rate for all 19 year olds [in the US] was 38 percent. (The rate for all 18 to 24 year olds was 36.7 percent.)...By comparison, the college participation for 18 to 24 year olds from low- income families was 24.7 percent. Across the 50 states, the low-income college participation rate ranged from 7.7 [Alaska] to 43.7 [New Jersey] percent—a difference of nearly 6 to one.” In 2002-03, the state in which Star UB operates ranked tenth in terms of the number of low-income students who went on to college. (College Participation Rates for Low Income Families by State 1992 to 2002, Postsecondary Education Opportunity, 2004). In the state where the Star Upward Bound program operates, between 1997 and 2002, there was a 7.4 percent decrease in college participation rates among students from low-income families. In 2002-03, the college participation rate in the state was 32.6 percent. (College Participation Rates for Low Income Families by State 1992 to 2002, Postsecondary Education Opportunity, 2004)

The students represented in this research, who have completed high school graduated between May 2000 and May 2004. During those years, the rate of students who continued on to college immediately after high school varied from 61.7 percent to 65.2 percent (College Continuation Rates for Recent High School Graduates 1959 to 2003, Postsecondary Education Opportunity,

2004). The Upward Bound college continuation rate for each of the five years and three data collection cycles far exceeded this national average.

On average from 1999 to 2004, male students have made up about 49 percent of the annual high school graduation population across the US. During the same time period, male students made up only 36 percent of the annual high school graduation population among Star Upward Bound students. White students made up 41.4 percent of Upward Bound students who went on to college; Asians (5.4 percent), Blacks (23.4 percent), Latinos (25.2 percent), Multi-racial (.6 percent) and the remaining 4 percent were comprised on students whose racial background is unknown. As the percentage of people of color in the US population increases, particularly the Latino and Asian populations, so do their percentages in the college entrance population.

Traditional data has compared White students to students of color. In the most recent data (2003), White students made up 67 percent of the college population and students of color made up 33 percent. Clearly UB has larger percentages of students of color in their population and a larger percentage of these students go on to college than in the general public.

Both male and female students in Star Upward Bound are scoring lower than the national average of 514 on the verbal and 505 on the math portion of the SAT exam. Although Black and Latino students are scoring lower than the national averages for all students, they are scoring higher than the national averages for students in their racial/ethnic groups. White, Asian and Multi-racial students are scoring slightly higher than the national average.

What do students, UB advisors and other UB staff think about the relationship between gender, race/ethnicity, income and student success?

There were twelve questionnaires completed by former Star UB students, advisors and staff responding to questions about the relationship between students learning and issues of gender, race/ethnicity and income. Seven of the 12 respondents were White, 2 Asian, 1 Black, 1 Latino and 1 Multiracial; 8 respondents were female, 4 were male; 8 were students and 4 were program staff. Overwhelmingly, students described UB as a very positive experience that gave them an opportunity to explore diversity and interact with people of different backgrounds. This comment was repeated several times by White students who attended predominantly white schools. Several people pointed to the open atmosphere for discussing issues of gender, race and class. Two of the three staff people who responded questioned their own bias regarding gender in the classroom.

Due to the limited responses, it is difficult to draw any conclusions beyond that participation in Upward Bound was a positive experience for most respondents. However, there were several comments that bear taking a closer look:

“As in most social situations I often felt that people would hang-out with people of their own race. For example, at lunch most of the African-Americans would eat lunch with other African-Americans and this also applied to other races in the program.”

Commentary about Black children sitting together for meals when they are in predominantly White environments are so common, it spawned the book, *Why are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* Dr. Tatum, the book’s author, explains that this is part of a process of identity development. “As one’s awareness of the daily challenges of living in a racist society increases, it is immensely helpful to be able to share one’s experiences with others who have

lived it” (Tatum, 2003). During the five years that were part of the research period, the largest racial group of the students in the Star UB program was White. White students consistently made up almost 40 percent of the student population and students spent the six-week summer program on a campus where the majority of non-UB students were also White. It is interesting that the respondent did not comment on how much time White students may have spent in each other’s company as part of their own identity development.

“I think that UB does the best job at trying to solve any diversity problems that might arise. The only concern I have is about the direction of the program. It appears that the federal government is trying to shape the program into one that helps students who are academically struggling. This might be a stereotype but most of these students will be predominately inner-city minorities. Thus, if more of these students are entering the program then I fear that it will lead to less Caucasian students entering the program.”

While the respondent’s perception is that an increase in the number of struggling students would increase the population of inner city students of color in the program, the data results show that the majority of students who were struggling academically when they joined the Upward Bound program were White males from rural school districts.

“Since most of the students are low-income and/or first-generation I did not feel that their income-related issues often came up. If these issues did come up, then it was often students questioning the TCs⁶ and how could they, the TC, relate to the student’s situation.”

While all of the student respondents indicated that they shared positive experiences with other UB students, faculty and staff, this comment expresses a need for students to have faculty and staff who understand the experience of being low-income and first-generation. The academic year staff during the research period did share the students’ socio-economic background although

⁶ TC is an acronym for Tutor Counselor. TCs are typically college interns who live and work in the dorms with UB participants during the Summer Academy. They meet with small groups of students in advising groups on a regular basis.

students may not always have been aware of this. Summer staff came from a range of backgrounds and some of the tutor counselors (TCs) may not have reflected the backgrounds of the UB students.

“The Diversity Conference is the first event that pops to mind which enables the community to examine differences, especially race, and one’s self in relation to others, locating privilege, learning what individuals/groups/macro level changes can be made to improve race relations in this country. On a daily basis, UB provides a safe space to talk about real issues that are difficult to talk about in other places, i.e. in school. UB is one of the few places where I have worked where I’ve seen young people (and adults) from different races not only work well together, but enjoy and learn from each other.”

The Star Upward Bound Program annually hosts a diversity conference at the end of its six-week Summer Academy. Program participants, students from neighboring communities and other UB programs, attend the conference. This is often seen as a highlight of the year and students spend months learning about a specific aspect of diversity, which will become the focus of the conference. This provides a forum for students, faculty and staff to explore issues such as race, class, gender, and sexual orientation that may be uncomfortable in other settings.

Is the Star Upward Bound Program meeting its objectives in an equitable way among students of different genders, racial backgrounds and different income categories?

Overall, the Star Upward Bound program is having a great deal of success among male and female students; students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds and students in all three of its income categories. However, there are some specific areas of concern:

1. Gender: While male students participating in the program made academic improvements at approximately the same rate as their female counterparts, the females started stronger, made greater gains in their GPAs, scored slightly higher on the SATs and were more

likely to apply and be accepted to competitive, private colleges and universities.

Additionally, male students are underrepresented in the program overall comprising only 41 percent of the UB student population. Males are increasingly on the wrong side of the divide in the educational achievement gap and that is being reproduced in Star UB.

2. Race/Ethnicity: While White students entering the program are at about the same academic level as students of color, based on GPAs, White students make greater academic gains and in much greater numbers than Black, Latino or Multi-racial students. Only Asian students, who are represented in small numbers and who entered the program with much higher average GPAs are scoring as well or better than White students. The one area in which White students lag behind Asian, Black and Multiracial students is in terms of their admission to competitive, private colleges. Black and Latino students in Star UB are doing better academically than their peer group across the country and are going to college at higher rates. However, Star UB is also reproducing the racial gap that can be seen in achievement across the country.
3. LI/FG Designation: Students from all three income categories seem to excel at about the same rate overall. FG students scored higher on the SATs than the other two groups and in two of the three data cycles a much larger percentage of LI students made academic improvements. However, the number of LI students is so small within the sample population that it would be difficult to draw any conclusions.

4. Tracking: Students who are being tracked are represented in numbers relative to their overall population in the program. However, this cannot be said for those who are not being tracked. Male students are generally over-represented among those who are not being tracked, as are Black and Multiracial students. White students are disproportionately underrepresented among the group of students not being tracked (See Table 2, page 22). Of their overall numbers, those not being tracked include 20 percent of all male participants and 17 percent of female participants; 44 percent of Multiracial Students, 24 percent of Blacks, 20 percent of Latinos, 10 percent of Asians, 16 percent of Whites; 15 percent of FGs, 27 percent of LIs and 19 percent of LI/FG students. The problem of tracking grows exponentially when viewed by the school participants attended. Those not be tracked represent 28 percent of program participants who attended School C, 54 percent of School G, 16 percent of School H, 7 percent of School M, 2 percent of School S and 18 percent of School T. There was only one student at School X during the data collection period and she was not tracked.

The clearest way to explore this issue is by looking at School G, where more than half of the program participants over the past five years were not being tracked. First, it means there is no significant data on how students from School G have faired in the program. Second, of those not being tracked at School G, while half are male and half are female, 57 percent are students of color and 43 percent are White. In the group of those who are tracked, 25 percent are students of color and 75 percent are White.

Is tracking important in terms of student success? Students participating in the program do not know whether they are being tracked. All students are told that they will be tracked as they enter the program. Because students may be tracked for up to ten years from the time of program entry or until they earn their first bachelors degree, there may be a greater commitment to keeping students in the program and to ensuring the academic success of students who are being tracked. What is the commitment to students who are not being tracked? If a student who is being tracked leaves the Star UB program, the staff must make every attempt to continuing tracking that student's academic progress. During the five years of the research period, only one student of the 161 in the data set, who was being tracked, was dismissed from the program. However seven of the 39 students who were not being track were dismissed from the program. Since the makeup of these 39 untracked students includes an overrepresentation by males, Black and Multiracial students and an under representation by White students, the group of untracked students becomes significant in this research of gender, race and income.

When asked if students were more likely to be dismissed from the program if they were not being tracked, the Program Director responded that this was not the case. Rather when students were likely to be dismissed, they were unlikely to be tracked. Students who were placed on probation due to low grades and poor attendance with the program were considered at high risk for being dismissed and also potentially difficult to locate and track over a ten year period. As a result, they were not tracked.

While this is logical, the fact that female students, as well as White and Asian students are under represented in the group of untracked students and are doing better than males, Latino, Black and Multiracial students in most of the areas researched suggests a need to take a closer look at this issue. As Pam Fisher of the Maine Department of Education suggest, “when students have difficulty in school, our tendency has been to place that student in an ‘easier’ class with less challenging work.” (DiMartino and Miles, 2005) At the Star Upward Bound Program, the tendency is not to track these students at all. What are the criteria for deciding that the program won’t be able to locate a student over time? There should be a much closer look at why the gender and racial backgrounds of this group closely resembles that of students who have had the least gains in the program.

CONCLUSION

Based on the factors that were analyzed in the research, the Star Upward Bound Program is achieving equitable results among students of different income categories. However, the program is not achieving equitable results for both genders or across racial/ethnic groupings. The program is assisting the vast majority of its students to improve academically. However, like the figures that can be seen in reports about education throughout the United States, Star Upward Bound participants are experiencing a gap in achievement between male and female students and between Black and Latino students and their White and Asian counterparts. Since these figures resemble national data, it is fair to assume that some of the reasons for the similarities lie in variables that are outside of the Upward Bound program. It is important to look at the context in which these outcomes occurred in order to explain what might be the reasons for

the Star UB successes as well as the reasons it is reproducing these gaps while designed to serve students traditionally on the negative end of the achievement gap.

During the five years, covered by the research, only one of the nine academic year staff members in the Star program was male. He was White and served as the Assistant Director in the Program for two academic years. This provided an opportunity for the boys in the rural school districts to have a male role model. The boys in the urban communities did not have this privilege except on the occasions when the Assistant Director substituted in the urban areas. This factor may be contributing to the achievement gap for males in the program.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the researcher served as Assistant Director in Star UB and Academic Advisor to 21 Black and Latino students, who were participants in the program during some part of the research period. Sixteen of these students—ten males, 2 of whom are Asian, 7 Latino and 1 Multiracial and six females, two of whom are Black, 2 Latina and 2 Multiracial—are being tracked. Five of these students—all of whom are Black, four females and one male—are not being tracked. In as much as the Star Upward Bound program has assisted many students in improving their grades and test scores and getting into college, there are indications, based on conversations with participants and program staff and observations by the researcher, that there may be some damage being done as well.

The following are comments from graduating seniors, who have been in the program for two to three years, about the positive effects of the program.

- I get really angry when people complain about Upward Bound. It has been a great experience for me.
- Upward Bound is great! I learned how to interact with people from different backgrounds and made lots of friends. This has been my best year yet and I will miss it.
- I don't know how I would have gotten through my college applications without Upward Bound. How do students do it without help?
- If you are willing to follow the advise of your Upward Bound advisor, you'll do okay (referring to selecting and applying to colleges). I see other students freaking out about college, but Kelly [the previous advisor] really prepared us for what we would need to do.
- I would probably have dropped out of school if it weren't for Upward Bound.

The graduating seniors reflected a variety of comments about their experience with the program and it is a clear demonstration that the program does have positive effects on its students. The program places all of its students within a learning environment, where others who want to achieve academically and to attend college surround them. Students spend time with caring adults who are interested in their academic success. These factors cannot be overlooked in terms of their contribution to the success that Star UB has achieved. These non-tangible factors are in addition to the academic advising, tutoring and mentoring that students receive on a weekly basis.

What was startling about working with the Star UB seniors on college applications was the extent to which they believed the Upward Bound staff would do much of the work for them. They had developed this expectation over time within the program. The same was true of completing their

financial aid applications for college. When one student was asked if he had retrieved and inputted his 4-digit pin number in order to complete his financial aid application, he commented, “The truth is I thought you [advisor] would take care of that.”

The program director consistently told advisors how they could and should take care of things for students or they would not get done. This may be true, but for students who will go off to college in a few months, learned helplessness will not assist them in meeting their goals.

To provide schooling for everyone’s children that reflects the liberal, middle-class values and aspirations is to ensure the maintenance of the status quo, to ensure that power, the culture of power, remains in the hands of those who already have it. Some children come to school with more accoutrements of the culture of power already in place—“cultural capital,” as some critical theorists refer to it—some with less. (Delpit. 1996, p. 28)

Student may not come to the Upward Bound program with the accoutrements of independence, self-initiative and follow-through, but in order to be successful in college, they should leave the programs with these attributes.

The following are a few of the negative comments made to the researcher by student participants during the academic year.

- You [researcher] and Kelly [the previous advisor] are our only advocates in the program. Those White people don’t care about us.
- Just because we’re poor, doesn’t mean we’re dirt. She made me feel really small. She thinks she’s better than we are. (Referring to a misunderstanding about comments made by a member of the program staff about White privilege.)
- Donna [a Summer Academy teacher] was always stereotyping me because of the way that I dress and the way that I talk. She called me stupid and she made me feel really stupid.”

- Why should I come to the Upward Bound after-school program? Even though I am doing poorly in math, who's here to help me? (A reference to a lack of consistent tutors to help students.)
- They sent me away and tried to get rid of me, but I'm not that easy to get rid of.

In addition to these comments, there was the story of the White male summer teacher, who declared himself God during a violent make-believe game, where he got to decide how students would "die." There was one Black student in the room and when it was her turn to "die," he chose hanging.

These are a few of the comments/stories made throughout the year, by the Black and Latino students who worked with the researcher. Some of the negative comments came from the same seniors who had such positive things to say about the program. Both positive and negative comments were discussed with the program director to try to gain an understanding of whether she was aware of how students' were feeling. The director was aware of some of the feelings and others were new to her. Program staff is very concerned about students' experiences. However, there is a tendency to focus on intent over impact. While the intent behind the negative comments/incidents were not meant to be harmful, the impact on students was nonetheless harmful.

Students in the Star UB program are having very different experiences from each other and from the staff they work closely with, even as they live together and work together during the six-week Summer Academy. This can be seen in the limited comments received from the questionnaire respondents; 5 of the 7 White respondents spoke about the importance of diversity

in the program and the value they placed on being in the diverse environment provided by Upward Bound. Only one of the respondents of color mentioned this aspect as important. For rural White students, Upward Bound was their most diverse experience. For the students from Schools C, S and H, located in small urban environments, the tendency is to view them as providing the diversity, rather than the compilation of students creating diversity. The reasons for this may be both societal as well as environmental. Within the society, people of color are seen as diverse, but White people are not typically thought of in terms of their diverse ethnic backgrounds. This issue may be compounded in Star UB because the summer program is located in a predominantly White, rural area.

The questionnaire respondent who indicated that students questioned their Tutor Counselors (TCs) about whether the TCs could understand the experiences of low-income students, indicates an understanding, by program participants, that some staff may come from a different life experience than students. While most of the academic year staff have been from low-income, first-generation backgrounds, students may not be aware of this. It is important that students are aware of the backgrounds of the staff who work with them as it may avoid painful misunderstandings.

The student who commented, “Just because we’re poor, doesn’t mean we’re dirt,” was reflecting on how she felt after a white staff member had a discussion about white privilege. The student did not understand the term, white privilege, nor did she know that the staff member holding the discussion came from a low-income family and was the first in her family to attend college. As a result, a lesson about inequities turned into a damaging moment with a lasting impact on a child.

Another lesson from this incident is the importance of education and training for staff who are doing work around diversity, equity and issues of dominance.

Finally, the significance of tracking within Star UB can be viewed in the story of two students, both of whom were doing poorly academically; both had very poor attendance with the Star Upward Bound program; and both were suspected of having learning or psychological issues that affected their participation in the program. There were three real differences between the two students. Student One had been with the program for a year and indicated that he wanted to quit the program. Student Two had been with the program for two years and indicated that it was important to her to remain in the program. The final difference between the students was that Student One was being tracked and Student Two was not. When the situation with both students was discussed with the director, the advise was to send out probation letters with time frames for when Student Two would be dropped from the program if grades and attendance did not immediately improve. A few weeks later an appointment was made to visit with Student One's mother, in her home, to recommend counselors for him and other resources for the family. Calls were made to the school about other issues that Student One was having. Student Two stopped coming and, due to personal conflicts with her family, left the area to live with other relatives. Student One has improved attendance, and while he still needs lots of hand holding, he is making academic progress. These observations are not part of the research, but may provide some insight into the results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If the Star Upward Bound Program wants to meet its objectives in an equitable way among all of its participants:

1. The program should proactively recruit more male students. Additionally, all male students, but particularly male students of color need to have role models within the program who understand their experience and can work with them from that experience. To this end, the Star UB Program should consider hiring men of color to work in the program, not only during the summer months, but during the academic year as well. Due to the growing number of Latino male students, the program should consider a Latino male advisor as a needed asset.
2. The program should work closely with guidance counselors and other school personnel on recruiting more males for the program.
3. Special attention should be paid to the needs of Latino students who lagged behind other students in all of the areas reviewed during the research. Some of this may be as a result of ESL issues and the program should identify proactive ways to address these issues.
4. All Students should be tracked whether they are funded under the Department of Education grant or supplemental grants. This will provide a more accurate picture of students' progress and achievements and a more accurate picture of how well the program is meeting its stated objectives among all student participants.
5. The program should provide multiple mechanisms for on-going feedback from students and opportunities for students to help to shape the program. There should be methods for providing this feedback anonymously as well as through discussion with program participants.

6. All aspects of the program should be academically rigorous and provide a structured and disciplined environment. Additionally, tutors should be secured, prior to the start of the academic year, to assist students at all UB locations, particularly in math and science.
7. While it may be financially prohibitive, Upward Bound should alternate locations of its Summer Academy between urban and rural settings. This would place students from rural communities in a diverse urban setting in some years and provide the rural experience for urban students in alternate years. It would also provide a learning experience for staff. Star Upward Bound should explore a campus exchange with an urban UB program in its vicinity?

FURTHER RESEARCH

More needs to be understood about the causes and effects of the research results. Results should be explored within the larger framework of the school that students attend and the communities in which they live. Upward Bound students may be experiencing greater rates of success than their peers in their local communities, while experiencing a gap among each other.

The Star Upward Bound Program has many fewer males than females, even at a time when males are going to college in equal numbers to their female counterparts. Some research might be done on the recruitment practices of the program as well as the methods used by schools for recommending students to the program.

Within the Star Upward Bound Program, more qualitative research could be conducted on the feelings and attitudes of program participants and those of the faculty and staff who work with participants. A great deal has been written about the success of students relative to the people

who are asking them to do the work. Some correlation between the students who have been less successful and the staff who work with them might be made. During the five years of the research period, the predominantly White service area was served by both White and African-American advisors. White and Latina staff members served the service area that has been approximately half White and half Latino. And, White and African-American advisors served the service area that is predominantly African American and Latino. All but one of the advisors has been female and there may be some relationship between this and the gender gap in the program. This research may serve to shed greater light on why students who were not being tracked were more than 28 times more likely to be dismissed from the program.

Further research might be conducted on those students who were not tracked to see if they achieved similar success rates to those who were tracked. How many have graduated? How many are still in college and making progress toward degrees?

Even within a program that has achieved the success that the Star program has for low-income students and students of color, there is still much work to be done in order to assist every child in achieving their full potential.

REFERENCES

- Attack the Global Education Crisis and Break the Cycle of Poverty. (1999). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.aldrigeshs.qld.edu.au/sose/modrespg/populate/educate.htm> <http://www.aldrigeshs.qld.edu.au/sose/modrespg/populate/educate.htm> <Accessed 2005, March 1>.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). Education, Inequality and Meritocracy, In Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, pp.102-103
- Confronting the Widening Racial Scoring Gap on the SAT. (2003). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*. (October). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.highbeam.com/library/index.asp> <http://www.highbeam.com/library/index.asp> <Accessed 2004, December 5>.
- Cross, K. (2002). Public Education: The Great Equalizer? Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.e-thepeople.org/a-national/article/11059/view> <http://www.e-thepeople.org/a-national/article/11059/view> <Accessed 2005, February 2>.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. The New Press, pp. 24-26.
- DiMartino, J. and Miles, Sh. (2005). Reaching Real Equity in Schools. *The Education Digest*. (January). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://80-proquest.umi.com.reference.sit.edu:2048/> <http://80-proquest.umi.com.reference.sit.edu:2048/> <Accessed 2005, February 28>.
- Groves, M. (2001). SAT's Gender Gap Widening. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://bernard.pitzer.edu/~hfairchi/courses/Spring2001/LATonSAT082901.html>. <http://bernard.pitzer.edu/~hfairchi/courses/Spring2001/LATonSAT082901.html>. <Accessed 2004, December 26>.
- Kivel, P. (2004). Passing on Their Wealth, In Kivel, P. *You Call This a Democracy?* The Apex Press, pp.95-96, 173-174
- Riordan, C. (1998). Gender Trends in Public Secondary School: 1972 to 1992. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal> <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal> <Accessed 2004, December 26.>
- Sanchez-Traynor, M. (2005). Education Can Break The Cycle, Experts Say. *Greenly Tribune* (February) Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.greeleytrib.com/article/20050220/SPECIALB0406/102200065/-1/SPECIALB04> <http://www.greeleytrib.com/article/20050220/SPECIALB0406/102200065/-1/SPECIALB04> <Accessed 2005, March 1>.

Singham, M. (2003). The Achievement Gap: Myths And Reality. Phi Delta Kappan (April), pp. 586-591. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.noycedn.org/literacy/ecrwfiles/ECRWPrincipals/Achivement%20Gap.pdf>
<http://www.noycedn.org/literacy/ecrwfiles/ECRWPrincipals/Achivement%20Gap.pdf>
<Accessed 2004, December 26>

Tornatzky, L.G., Pachon, H.P. and Torres, C. (2003). Closing Achievement Gaps: Improving Educational Outcomes for Hispanic Children. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.nhcsl.com/closingachievement.pdf> <http://www.nhcsl.com/closingachievement.pdf>
<Accessed 2004, December 26>.

Tatum, Beverly Daniel. [1997, 1999] 2003. Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria. Basic Books, New York, NY.

Wikipedia Available URL: HYPERLINK http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_poverty
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_poverty <Accessed 2004, October 1>.

College Participation Rates for Students from Low Income Families by State 1992 to 2002 (2004). Postsecondary Education Opportunity, 12, pp.1-2

College Continuation Rates for Recent High School Graduates 1959 to 2003 (2004). Postsecondary Education Opportunity, 7, pp.3-4

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Bowles, Samuel & Gintis, Herbert M. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Corwin, Miles. 2001. *And Still We Rise: The Trials and Triumphs of Twelve Gifted Inner-City High School Students*. William Morrow and Company, New York, NY.
- Cosin, B.R. (Editor), *Education: Structure and Society*. 1972. Penguin Books Limited, Middlesex, England.
- Creswell, John W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, London, New Delhi.
- Delpit, Lisa. 1996. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. The New Press, New York, NY.
- Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Editors). 2003. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues (2nd Ed)*. Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, London, New Delhi.
- Ehlers, Henry. 1981. *Crucial Issues in Education (7th Ed)*. CBS College Publishing, New York, NY.
- Elias, Norbert, and John L. Scotson. [1965] 1994. *The Established and the Outsiders*. London: Sage.
- Ely, Margot with Anzul, Margaret, Friedman, Teri, Garner, Diane & Steinmetz, Ann McCormack. 1991. *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles Within Circles*. Routledge Falmer, London and New York.
- Eysenck, H.J. 1971. *The IQ Argument*. The Library Press, New York, NY.
- Feagin, Joe R. & McKinney, Karyn D. 2003. *The Many Costs of Racism*. Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, MD.
- Freire, Paulo. 1992. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. The Continuum Publishing Company, New York, NY.
- Freire, Paulo. 1968. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. The Seabury Press, New York, NY.
- Gardner, Howard. 1993. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. Basic Books, New York, NY.

- Hacker, Andrew. 1995. *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. Ballantine Books, New York, NY.
- Hochschild, Jennifer L. 1995. *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Hooks, Bell. 2000. *Where We Stand: Class Matters*. Routledge, New York and London.
- Hunter, Herbert M. and Sameer Y. Abraham (editors). 1987. *Race, Class and the World System: the Sociology of Oliver C. Cox*. Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Kivel, Paul. 2004. *You call this a Democracy?* The Apex Press. New York, NY.
- Kozol, Jonathan. 1991. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. Crown Publishers Inc., New York, NY
- Landsman, Julie. 2001. *A White Teacher Talks About Race*. Scarecrow Press, Lanham, MD
- Levine, David, Lowe, Robert, Peterson, Bob & Tenorio, Rita (Eds), 1995. *Rethinking Schools: An Agenda for Change*. The New York Press, New York, NY.
- MacLeod, Jay. [1987] 1995. *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations & Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO and Oxford, England.
- Rothstein, Stanley. 1994. *Schooling the Poor: A Social Inquiry into the American Educational Experience*. Bergin & Garvey, Westport, CT and London.
- Spradley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. Thomson Learning, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.
- Tatum, Beverly Daniel. [1997, 1999] 2003. *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria*. Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Gatto, John Taylor. 1992. *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling*. New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, PA and Gabriola Island, BC
- Ward, Janie Victoria. 2000. *The Skin We're In; Teaching Our Children to Be: Emotionally Strong, Socially Smart and Spiritually Connected*. The Free Press, New York, NY

JOURNALS & REPORTS

- "Children in Low Income Families in K-12 Education by State 1992 to 2003." *Postsecondary Education Opportunity*, Number 150, December 2004, pgs. 9-16.

- “College Continuation Rates for Recent High School Graduates 1959 to 2003.” Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 145, July 2004, pgs. 1-13.
- “College Participation Rates for Students from Low Income Families by State 1992 to 2002.” Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 150, December 2004, pgs. 1-8.
- “Earnings by Educational Attainment 1958 to 2001.” Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 129, March 2003, pgs. 11-16.
- “Educational Attainment 1940 to 2002.” Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 129, March 2003, pgs. 1-10.
- “Family Income and Higher Education Opportunity 1970 to 2000.” Postsecondary Education Opportunity, Number 112, October 2001, pgs. 1-11.
- U.S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education, *A Profile of the Upward Bound Program: 2000-2001* by Margaret W. Cahalan and Thomas R. Curtin, Washington, DC 2004.
- U.S. Department of Education Office of the Under Secretary, Policy and Program Studies Service, *The Impacts of Regular Upward Bound: Results from the Third Follow-Up Data Collection*, Washington, DC 2004.

WEB SITES

- Attack the Global Education Crisis and Break the Cycle of Poverty. (1999). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.aldridgeshs.qld.edu.au/sose/modrespg/populate/educate.htm> <http://www.aldridgeshs.qld.edu.au/sose/modrespg/populate/educate.htm> <Accessed 2005, March 1>.
- Confronting the Widening Racial Scoring Gap on the SAT. (2003). Journal of Blacks in Higher Education. (October). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.highbeam.com/library/index.asp> <http://www.highbeam.com/library/index.asp> <Accessed 2004, December 5>.
- Cross, Kathleen. (2002). Public Education: The Great Equalizer? Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.e-thepeople.org/a-national/article/11059/view> <http://www.e-thepeople.org/a-national/article/11059/view> <Accessed 2005, February 2>.
- Dezmon, Barbara and Farley, Dan. 2002. The Education Achievement Gap [on-line]. Available from <http://www.e-thepeople.org/a-national/article/11059/view>; Internet; accessed 30 February 2005.
- DiMartino, J. and Miles, Sh. (2005). Reaching Real Equity in Schools. The Education Digest. (January). Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://80->

proquest.umi.com.reference.sit.edu:2048/ <http://80-proquest.umi.com.reference.sit.edu:2048/>
<Accessed 2005, February 28>.

- Groves, M. (2001). SAT's Gender Gap Widening. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://bernard.pitzer.edu/~hfairchi/courses/Spring2001/LATonSAT082901.html>. <http://bernard.pitzer.edu/~hfairchi/courses/Spring2001/LATonSAT082901.html>. <Accessed 2004, December 26>.
- Riordan, C. (1998). Gender Trends in Public Secondary School: 1972 to 1992. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal> <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal> <Accessed 2004, December 26.>
- Sanchez-Traynor, M. (2005). Education Can Break The Cycle, Experts Say. Greenly Tribune (February) Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.greeleytrib.com/article/20050220/SPECIALB0406/102200065/-1/SPECIALB04> <http://www.greeleytrib.com/article/20050220/SPECIALB0406/102200065/-1/SPECIALB04> <Accessed 2005, March 1>.
- Singham, M. (2003). The Achievement Gap: Myths And Reality. Phi Delta Kappan (April), pp. 586-591. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.noycefdn.org/literacy/ecrwfiles/ECRWPrincipals/Achivement%20Gap.pdf> <http://www.noycefdn.org/literacy/ecrwfiles/ECRWPrincipals/Achivement%20Gap.pdf> <Accessed 2004, December 26>
- Tornatzky, L.G., Pachon, H.P. and Torres, C. (2003). Closing Achievement Gaps: Improving Educational Outcomes for Hispanic Children. Available URL: HYPERLINK <http://www.nhcsl.com/closingachievement.pdf> <http://www.nhcsl.com/closingachievement.pdf> <Accessed 2004, December 26>.
- Wikipedia Available URL: HYPERLINK http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_poverty http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_poverty <Accessed 2004, October 1>.

APPENDICIES

- Appendix A – Higher Education Act of 1965 (Excerpts)
- Appendix B – Department of Education Low-Income Guidelines
- Appendix C – State and School Profiles
- Appendix D – Star UB Questionnaire
- Appendix E – Questionnaire Responses
- Appendix F – Summary of Research Data
- Appendix G – Explanation of GPA Scale

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 (Excerpts)

Higher Education Act of 1965, 1998 Higher Education Act Amendments
Subpart 2—Federal Early Outreach and Student Services Programs
CHAPTER 1—FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS SEC. 402A. 20 U.S.C. 1070a–11

PROGRAM AUTHORITY; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, carry out a program of making grants and contracts designed to identify qualified individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, to prepare them for a program of postsecondary education, to provide support services for such students who are pursuing programs of postsecondary education, to motivate and prepare students for doctoral programs, and to train individuals serving or preparing for service in programs and projects so designed.

(b) **RECIPIENTS, DURATION, AND SIZE.**—

(1) **RECIPIENTS.**—For the purposes described in subsection(a), the Secretary is authorized, without regard to section 3709of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations, combinations of such institutions, agencies and organizations, and in exceptional circumstances, secondary schools, for planning, developing, or carrying out one or more of the services assisted under this chapter.

(2) **DURATION.**—Grants or contracts made under this chapter shall be awarded for a period of 4 years, except that—(A) the Secretary shall award such grants or contracts for 5 years to applicants whose peer review scores were in the highest 10 percent of scores of all applicants receiving grants or contracts in each program competition for the same award year;(B) grants made under section 402G shall be awarded for a period of 2 years; and(C) grants under section 402H shall be awarded for a period determined by the Secretary.

(3) **MINIMUM GRANTS.**—Unless the institution or agency requests a smaller amount, individual grants under this chapter shall be no less than—

- (A) \$170,000 for programs authorized by sections 402D and 402G;
- (B) \$180,000 for programs authorized by sections 402B and 402F; and
- (C) \$190,000 for programs authorized by sections 402C and 402E.

(c) **PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—An eligible entity that desires to receive a grant or contract under this chapter shall submit an application to the Secretary in such manner and form, and containing such information and assurances, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) **PRIOR EXPERIENCE.**—In making grants under this chapter, the Secretary shall consider each applicant's prior experience of service delivery under the particular program for which funds are sought. The level of consideration given the factor of prior experience shall not vary from the level of consideration given such factor during fiscal years 1994 through 1997, except that grants made under section 402H shall not be given prior experience consideration.

(3) ORDER OF AWARDS; PROGRAM FRAUD.—

(A) Except with respect to grants made under sections 402G and 402H and as provided in subparagraph the Secretary shall award grants and contracts under this chapter in the order of the scores received by the application for such grant or contract in the peer review process required under paragraph (4) and adjusted for prior experience in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(B) The Secretary is not required to provide assistance to a program otherwise eligible for assistance under this chapter, if the Secretary has determined that such program has involved the fraudulent use of funds under this chapter.

(4) PEER REVIEW PROCESS.—

(A) The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, members of groups underrepresented in higher education, including African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, and Native American Pacific Islanders (including Native Hawaiians), are represented as readers of applications submitted under this chapter. The Secretary shall also ensure that persons from urban and rural backgrounds are represented as readers.

(B) The Secretary shall ensure that each application submitted under this chapter is read by at least three readers who are not employees of the Federal Government (other than as readers of applications).

(5) NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary shall not limit the number of applications submitted by an entity under any program authorized under this chapter if the additional applications describe programs serving different populations or campuses.

(6) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS.—The Secretary shall encourage coordination of programs assisted under this chapter with other programs for disadvantaged students operated by the sponsoring institution or agency, regardless of the funding source of such programs. The Secretary shall not limit an entity's eligibility to receive funds under this chapter because such entity sponsors a program similar to the program to be assisted under this chapter, regardless of the funding source of such program. The Secretary shall permit the Director of a program receiving funds under this chapter to administer one or more additional programs for disadvantaged students operated by the sponsoring institution or agency, regardless of the funding sources of such programs.

(7) APPLICATION STATUS.—The Secretary shall inform each entity operating programs under this chapter regarding the status of their application for continued funding at least 8 months prior to the expiration of the grant or contract. The Secretary, in the case of an entity that is continuing to operate a successful program under this chapter, shall ensure that the startup date for a new grant or contract for such program immediately follows the termination of the preceding grant or contract so that no interruption of funding occurs for such successful re-applicants. The Secretary shall inform each entity requesting assistance under this chapter for a new program regarding the status of their application at least 8 months prior to the proposed startup date of such program.

(d) OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach activities to ensure that entities eligible for assistance under this chapter submit applications proposing

programs that serve geographic areas and eligible populations which have been underserved by the programs assisted under this chapter.

(2) NOTICE.—In carrying out the provisions of paragraph(1), the Secretary shall notify the entities described in subsection(b) of the availability of assistance under this subsection not less than 120 days prior to the deadline for submission of applications under this chapter and shall consult national, State, and regional organizations about candidates for notification.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical training to applicants for projects and programs authorized under this chapter. The Secretary shall give priority to serving programs and projects that serve geographic areas and eligible populations which have been underserved by the programs assisted under this chapter. Technical training activities shall include the provision of information on authorizing legislation, goals and objectives of the program, required activities, eligibility requirements, the application process and application deadlines, and assistance in the development of program proposals and the completion of program applications. Such training shall be furnished at conferences, seminars, and workshops to be conducted at not less than 10 sites throughout the United States to ensure that all areas of the United States with large concentrations of eligible participants are served.

(4) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may contract with eligible entities to conduct the outreach activities described in this subsection.

(e) DOCUMENTATION OF STATUS AS A LOW INCOME INDIVIDUAL.—

(1) Except in the case of an independent student, as defined in section 480(d), documentation of an individual's status pursuant to subsection (g)

(2) Shall be made by providing the Secretary with—

- (A) A signed statement from the individual's parent or legal guardian;
- (B) Verification from another governmental source;
- (C) A signed financial aid application; or
- (D) A signed United States or Puerto Rico income tax return.

(3) In the case of an independent student, as defined in section 480(d), documentation of an individual's status pursuant to subsection (g)(2) shall be made by providing the Secretary with—

- (A) A signed statement from the individual;
- (B) Verification from another governmental source;
- (C) A signed financial aid application; or
- (D) A signed United States or Puerto Rico income tax return.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of making grants and contracts under this chapter, there are authorized to be appropriated \$700,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. Of the amount appropriated under this chapter, the Secretary may use no more than one half of 1 percent of such amount to obtain additional qualified readers and additional staff to review applications, to increase the level of oversight monitoring, to support impact studies, program assessments and reviews, and to provide technical assistance to potential applicants and current grantees. In expending these funds, the Secretary shall give priority to the additional administrative requirements provided in the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, to outreach activities, and to obtaining additional readers. The Secretary shall report to Congress by October 1, 1994, on the use of these funds.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this chapter:

(1) FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENT.—The term “first-generation college student” means—

(A) An individual both of whose parents did not complete a baccalaureate degree; or

(B) In the case of any individual who regularly resided with and received support from only one parent, an individual whose only such parent did not complete a baccalaureate degree.

(2) LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUAL.—The term “low-income individual” means an individual from a family whose taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of an amount equal to the poverty level determined by using criteria of poverty established by the Bureau of the Census.

(3) VETERAN ELIGIBILITY.—No veteran shall be deemed ineligible to participate in any program under this chapter by reason of such individual’s age who—

(A) served on active duty for a period of more than 180 days, any part of which occurred after January 31, 1955, and was discharged or released there from under conditions other than dishonorable; or

(B) served on active duty after January 31, 1955, and was discharged or released there from because of a service connected disability.

(4) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the service requirements in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) if the Secretary determines the application of the service requirements to a veteran will defeat the purpose of a program under this chapter.

Sec. 402C HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 SEC. 402C. 20 U.S.C. 1070a–13 UPWARD BOUND.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—

The Secretary shall carry out a program to be known as upward bound which shall be designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond secondary school.

(b) PERMISSIBLE SERVICES.—Any upward bound project assisted under this chapter may provide services such as—

(1) Instruction in reading, writing, study skills, mathematics, and other subjects necessary for success beyond secondary school;

(2) Counseling and workshops;

(3) Academic advice and assistance in secondary school course selection;

(4) Tutorial services;

(5) Exposure to cultural events, academic programs, and other activities not usually available to disadvantaged youth;

- (6) Activities designed to acquaint youths participating in the project with the range of career options available to them;
- (7) Instruction designed to prepare youths participating in the project for careers in which persons from disadvantaged backgrounds are particularly underrepresented;
- (8) On campus residential programs;
- (9) Mentoring programs involving elementary or secondary school teachers or counselors, faculty members at institutions of higher education, students, or any combination of such persons;
- (10) Work-study positions where youth participating in the project are exposed to careers requiring a postsecondary degree;
- (11) Special services to enable veterans to make the transition to postsecondary education; and
- (12) Programs and activities as described in paragraphs (1) through (11) which are specially designed for students of limited English proficiency.

(c) **REQUIRED SERVICES.**—Any upward bound project assisted under this chapter which has received funding for two or more years shall include, as part of the core curriculum in the next and succeeding years, instruction in mathematics through pre-calculus, laboratory science, foreign language, composition, and literature.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—In approving applications for Upward Bound projects under this chapter for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

- (1) Require an assurance that not less than two-thirds of the youths participating in the project proposed to be carried out under any application be low-income individuals who are first generation college students;
- (2) Require an assurance that the remaining youths participating in the project proposed to be carried out under any application be either low-income individuals or first generation college students;
- (3) Require that there be a determination by the institution, with respect to each participant in such project that the participant has a need for academic support in order to pursue successfully a program of education beyond secondary school; and
- (4) Require that such participants be persons who have completed 8 years of elementary education and are at least 13 years of age but not more than 19 years of age, unless the imposition of any such limitation would defeat the purposes of this section

(e) **MAXIMUM STIPENDS.**—Youths participating in a project proposed to be carried out under any application may be paid stipends not in excess of \$60 per month during June, July, and August, except that youth participating in a work-study position under subsection(b)(10) may be paid a stipend of \$300 per month during June, July, and August. Youths participating in a project proposed to be carried out under any application may be paid stipends not in excess of \$40 per month during the remaining period of the year.

LOW INCOME LEVELS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
 Federal TRIO Programs
 2004 Annual Low Income Levels
 (Effective February 2004 until further notice)

Size of Family Unit	48 Contiguous States D.C., and Outlying Jurisdictions	Alaska	Hawaii
1	\$13,965	\$17,445	\$16,050
2	\$18,735	\$23,415	\$21,540
3	\$23,505	\$29,385	\$27,030
4	\$27,275	\$35,355	\$32,520
5	\$33,045	\$41,325	\$38,010
6	\$37,815	\$47,295	\$43,500
7	\$42,585	\$53,265	\$48,990
8*	\$47,355	\$59,235	\$54,480

The term "low-income individual" means an individual whose family's taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150% of the poverty level amount.

The figures shown under family income represent amounts equal to 150% of the family income levels established by the Census Bureau for determining poverty status. The poverty guidelines were established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in the Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 33, February 16, 2001, pp. 10695-10697.

* For family units with more than 8 members, add the following amount for each additional family member: \$4,530 for the 48 Contiguous States, the District of Columbia and outlying jurisdictions; \$5,670 for Alaska; and \$5,205 for Hawaii.

PROFILE OF STATE AND SCHOOLS SERVED

	State	County A				County B			
		School C	School H	School S	School X	School G	School M	School P	School T
Enrollment	293,398*	1,988	1,263	1,842	1,666	582	779	527	394
Dropout Rate	9,389	2.8	10.5	3.2	5.4	7.4	3.2	2.8	12.6
Racial Makeup									
Asian	4.8%	2.4	1.2	4.4	2.2	.7	.8	0.6	.8
Black	8.9%	28.2	4.2	28.2	35.3	2.1	1.5	0.2	1.5
Latino	11.8%	33.4	53.5	45.8	49.9	6	1	0	6.1
Native Amer.	.3%	0.3	0.1	0.1	0	0.2	0.6	0	1.5
White	74.2%	35.7	41	21.4	12.6	91.1	96	99.2	90.1
Gender Makeup									
Male	473,915 (48.6%)	992	590	1,045	714	274	403	275	189
Female	501,996 (51.4%)	996	673	797	952	308	376	275	205
Low-Income	270,660 (27.6%)	56.5	56.6	63.4	74.2	31.4	33.8	17.6	35.5
Post-Grad Plans									
4-year priv.	31%	23	17	17	15	15	17	34	26
4-year pub.	25%	19	20	22	16	23	20	18	12
2-year priv.	2%	1	1	2	2	0	1	0	1
2-year pub.	15%	40	40	35	23	33	25	26	36
Other Post-Sec	2%	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	3
Work	12%	4	8	5	1	2	24	15	16
Military	2%	2	7	5	1	2	1	2	5
Other	1%	0	1	3	1	0	8	0	1
Unknown	8%	11	8	11	42	23	2	0	0

The names of the schools are not used and are identified by the first initial of the school. Please note that School X was not served by the Star Program. However, one student participant, who is believed to have changed schools after being admitted to the program, attended School X. There are 7375 students at the remaining schools being served by Star UB. Approximately 2% are Asian, 16% are Black, 31% are Latino, and 51% are White. If Schools M and P, which were being cycled out of the program during the research period, were excluded, the breakdown would be 2% Asian, 19% Black, 37% Latino and 41% White. This more closely reflects the numbers in Star UB, where approximately, 5% of students are Asian, 20% are Black, 30% are Latino, and 40% are White.

* - The figure in the chart above represents the population of grades 9-12. There are 975,911 students enrolled in public schools in the state for grades k12.

Class/Income: UB students may be low-income, the first-generation in their families to go to college or both. This means that some students may be the first in their families to go to college, but come from middle-income families.

During your time with the Upward Bound Program, did you notice any class or income-related issues that positively or negatively affected students' learning? ____ Yes ____ No

If yes, please explain if the issues had a positive or negative affect on low-income or middle-income students. You may also provide specific examples.

Teaching/Advising: During your time with the Upward Bound Program, do you think there were any differences in the teaching (in UB) or advising (in UB) to students based on gender, race/ethnicity or class/income.

Gender: ____ Yes ____ No

Race/Ethnicity: ____ Yes ____ No

Class/Income: ____ Yes ____ No

Please explain any yes answers, the differences you observed and any positive or negative affects of those differences on students' learning.

Additional Information: Please use this space to provide any additional information about Upward Bound or gender, race/ethnicity, or class/income issues within the program.

Can I contact you for further information or clarification? _____ No _____ Yes (Please provide contact information below.

Name:

Phone:

Please **return the questionnaire** via e-mail to: arthurinew@aol.com by **March 30**. Thank **you** for completing the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

G=Gender;
R=Race/Ethnicity
I= Income
O=Other

FEMALE	STUDENT	G	+ positive interactions in boarding environment +/- I found a lot about sexuality with in our 6 weeks at upward bound. This was a very important time in high school, girls trying to find themselves and who they are and how they appear to boys. The self-identifying process was even harder because we were faced with many different backgrounds that had importance on many different things involving women.
		R	+ positive interactions with people of different backgrounds + learning about the history of other people including Native Americans + went to a White HS; benefited from having peers from different races/ethnicities. + It was quite a shock because I was never taught in an area that had so much diversity. I went to a 96% white school. I had no idea of the ethic groups out there until upward bound. + Students that usually might not be able to experience the benefits of a boarding school environment were provided with such an experience. Also, students were able to get assistance on college applications and were positively encouraged to pursue academic achievement. + Upward Bound has been my most accurate representation in life of what a healthy and wonderful experience it can be to be friends with any and all ethnicities. Diversity Day was the best! It was wonderful to hug, love and appreciate all mixes of race, and to be equally blended with city/town/country folk. How awesome.
		I	+ all low-income; not too worried about appearance + lots of support and encouragement around being LI/FG
		O	+ the teachers were equal in their time and effort with everyone. There was never a slur or negative attitude that was undeserved or unequalled to anyone else. That's one of the qualities that made Upward Bound so unique.
	FACULTY/ STAFF	G	+ Some of the traditions which exist at UB encourage healthy relationships between males and females, such as Serenade and within dorm activities. UB is one of the few places where I have seen adolescents interact so respectfully with one another in terms of gender.
		R	+The Diversity Conference is the first event that pops to mind which enables the community to examine differences, especially race, and one's self in relation to others, locating privilege, learning what individuals/groups/macro level changes can be made to improve race relations in this country. On a daily basis, UB provides a safe space to talk about real issues that are difficult to talk about in other places, i.e. In school. UB is one of the few places where I have worked where I've seen young people (and adults) from different races not only work well together, but enjoy and learn from each other.
		I	+ UB is one of the few places where talking about social class is even allowed or encouraged. In my opinion, most of the young people were lower class. Class issues were discussed and included in staff training, which I think is essential-recognition of class-for the program to meet its mission and best serve the students.
		O	+ UB is a model for how I wish young people's experience was in the US. The structure and leadership is such (at least in my experience) that fosters not only tolerance but respect, friendship, and embracement of diversity. Additionally, the program works, which is why Bush should not cut it...If only a UB student were in office...

MALE	STUDENT	G	
		R	<p>- As in most social situations I often felt that people would hang-out with people of their own race. For example, at lunch most of the African-Americans would eat lunch with other African-Americans and this also applied to other races in the program.</p> <p>+/- I think that UB does the best job at trying to solve any diversity problems that might arise. The only concern I have is about the direction of the program. It appears that the federal government is trying to shape the program into one that helps students who are academically struggling. This might be a stereotype but most of these students will be predominately inner-city minorities. Thus, if more of these students are entering the program than I fear that it will lead to less Caucasian students entering the program.</p> <p>+ UB has been one of the most meaningful experiences for me in my life. In the classes and workshops, we were made aware of issues of gender, race, and class that have existed in our society. However, I was not a victim and I did not witness any act of discrimination whatsoever. Instead, UB was sort of a haven for people from different cultures and backgrounds to come together without feeling alienated by their uniqueness.</p>
		I	- Since most of the students are low-income and/or first-generation I did not feel that their income-related issues often were came up. If these issues did come up than it was often students questing the TCs and how could they, the TC, relate to the student's situation.
	FACULTY/ STAFF	G	- I teach math and sometimes I wonder if I'm treating the young men and women in my class equally. I think I do, but perhaps an objective eye might detect some biases? +spent more time with males students because they were harder to reach.
		R	- multicultural students do not ask questions when they are unsure of the material. Spent more time with MC students because they asked fewer questions. Program needs greater focus on individual cultural development in addition to academics.
		I	- working students had to skip electives, which was a chance to get to know them and explore their interests.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH DATA (Explanation of Appendix F)

Appendix F is a series of charts of the data that was used in completing this research.

1. Pages 13-15 include SAT scores, entering GPA, and GPA gains/losses by race, gender and income category (LI, FG, LI/FG). The numbers in parentheses represent the students who were not tracked, so the data does not include these students. The information is there to assist the reader in assessing the potential influence of students who are not being tracked on the data results.
2. Pages 16-18 takes the information from bullet number one and compiles it for all males, all females, by each racial/ethnic group, by each of the three income designations and by the school that students attended. Here also, the information in parentheses represents the students who are not being tracked.
3. Pages 19-21 include numbers and percentages of students who attended two-year, four-year, public or private postsecondary institutions. These numbers are presented by gender, racial/ethnic group, income designation and school attended. Additionally, the current status of students who have completed high school is included. On pages 19 and 20, the information in parentheses represents the number of students who are not being tracked and their percentage within that demographic population. On page 21, all demographic information in parentheses is for those students who are not being tracked.
4. Please note that while the demographic information of those not being tracked has been included, all of the reported data are for students supported by DOE who are being tracked.
5. Additional acronyms/abbreviations:

C	Combined SAT score
De.	Decrease
In.	Increase
M	Math SAT score
N	represents the number of students being counted within a particular grouping
Unch.	Unchanged
V	Verbal SAT score

Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	LI/FG	Average SAT	Average Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 by Race and Gender	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 by Race and Gender	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 by Race and Gender			
n=161	n=161	n=161	n=126	n=160	n=67	n=67	n=83	n=83	n=67	n=67			
Asian n=9 (+1)	Male n=3	LI/FG n=3 (+1)	C = 1075 V = 560 M = 515 n= 2 (SAT)	3.523	0.102	0.102	0.102	0.102	0.358	0.358			
	Female n=6 (+1)	FG only n=1	C = 1030 V = 440 M = 590	4.291	-0.018	0.0096	0.154	0.0956	n=0	0.15			
		LI/FG n=5 (+1)	C = 1003 V = 443 M = 560 n=4 (SAT)	3.6258	0.0371		n=2 1 in., 1 de.		0.0371		n=2 2 in.	0.15	
Black n=32 (+10)	Male n= 12 (+3)	FG only n=4 (+1)	C = 890 V = 453 M = 437	3.1308	0.054	0.0939	-0.0133	-0.0688	n=0	-0.451			
		LI/FG n=8 (+2)	C = 1008 V = 469 M = 539	2.966 n=7	0.1238		n=7 5 in., 1 de. 1 unchanged		-0.1104		n=7 3 in., 4 de.	-0.451	
	Female n= 20 (+7)	FG only n=2	C = 1065 V = 510 M = 555	3.45	0.106	0.1745	-0.271	0.0612	n=1 1 in.	0.64			
		LI only n=2 (+2)	C = 1005 V = 500 M = 505	3.7515	0.12		n=9 8 in., 1 de.		0.12		n=9 5 in., 4 de.	n=0	
		LI/FG n=16 (+5)	C = 946 V = 479 M = 467 n=13 (SAT)	2.9749	0.1921		n=7 6 in., 1 de.		0.1003		n=7 4 in., 3 de.	0.1853	1 unchanged
			n=6 2 in., 3 de. 1 unchanged										

Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	LI/FG	Average SAT	Average Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 by Race and Gender	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 by Race and Gender	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 by Race and Gender	
n=161	n=161	n=161	n=126	n=160	n=67	n=67	n=83	n=83	n=67	n=67	
Latino/Hispanic n=47 (+12)	Male n=27 (+8)	FG only n=2	C = 860 V = 420 M = 440 n=1 (SAT)	2.742	n=0		-0.2	n=1 1 de.	0.01615		
		LI only n=3	C = 970 V = 505 M = 465 n=2 (SAT)	3.3787	n=0	0.1423	-0.045	n=11 5 in., 5 de. 1 unchanged	-0.173	-0.0106	
		LI/FG n=22 (+7)	C = 899 V = 435 M = 464 n=14 (SAT)	2.8207	0.1423	n=7 6 in., 1 de.	0.058	n=9 5 in., 3 de., 1 unchanged	-0.0121	n=17 5 in., 2 de, 2 unchanged	
	Female n=20 (+4)	FG only n=2	C = 1230 V = 620 M = 610 n=1 (SAT)	2.4093	0.171	n=1 1 in.	0.0746	0.1219	n=1 1 in.	-0.0854	0.0568
		LI/FG n=18 (+3)	C = 925 V = 460 M = 465 n=16 (SAT)	3.2339	0.0649	n=10 7 in., 3 de.	n=11 8 in., 3 de.	-0.0665	n=13 7 in, 6 de.	0.0974	n=9 5 in., 4 de,
Multi-racial n=5 (+4)	Male n=1 (+2)	FG only n=1 (+1) (+1 LI/FG)	C = N/A V = N/A M = N/A n=0 (SAT)	3.333	n=0	n=0	n=0	n=0	-0.333	-0.333	
	Female n=4 (+2)	LI/FG n=4 (+2)	C = 1035 V = 500 M = 535 n=2 (SAT)	3.0578	n=0	n=0	0.041	0.041	0.0727	0.0727	

Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	LI/FG	Average SAT	Average Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 by Race and Gender	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 by Race and Gender	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 by Race and Gender
n=161	n=161	n=161	n=126	n=160	n=67	n=67	n=83	n=83	n=67	n=67
Unknown n=4	Male n=1	LI/FG n=1	C = 800 V = 360 M = 440	3.7269	0.03 n=1 1 in.	0.03 n=1 1 in.	0.03 n=1 1 in.	0.03 n=1 1 in.	n=0	n=0
	Female n=3	LI/FG n=3	C = 966 V = 493 M = 473	3.2172	-0.015 n=2 2 de.	-0.015 n=2 2 de.	-0.125 n=2 2 de.	-0.125 n=2 2 de.	-0.02 n=1 1 de.	-0.02 n=1 1 de.
White n=64 (+12)	Male n=22 (+7)	FG only n=7 (+2)	C = 1102 V = 534 M = 568 n=5 (SAT)	2.8371	0.1353 n=4 4 in.	0.1109 n=8 7 in., 1 de.	0.0458 n=4 3 in., 1 de.	0.1498 n=13 11 in., 2 de.	0.1443 n=4 3 in., 1 unch.	0.0743 n=11 8 in, 1 de. 2 unchanged
		LI/FG n=15 (+4)	C = 998 V = 480 M = 518 n=12 (SAT)	2.6306	0.0865 n=4 3 in., 1 de.		0.1961 n=9 8 in, 1. de.		0.0343 n=7 5 in., 1 de., 1 unchanged	
	Female n=42 (+5)	FG only n=8 (+1)	C = 995 V = 510 M = 485	3.2079	0.1673 n=3 2in., 1 de.	0.1506 n=19 17 in., 2 de.	0.0231 n=5 2 in., 3 de.	0.071 n=22 14 in., 7 de.	n=0	0.0851 n=14 8 in, 4 de., 2 unchanged
		LI only n=3 (+1)	C = 963 V = 463 M = 500	3.049	0.25 n=2 2 in.		0.125 n=2 1 in., 1 de.		n=0	
		LI/FG n=31 (+3)	C = 1049 V = 516 M = 533 n=21 (SAT)	3.1608	0.1329 n=14 13 in., 1 de.		0.0798 n=15 11 in., 3 de. 1 unchanged		0.0851 n=14 8 in, 4 de., 2 unchanged	

Demographics	Average SAT	Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	% Of Increased GPA /Total GPA improvement
			n=69	n=69	n=65	n=65	n=66	n=66	n=66
Male - 66 (+20 or 23%)	C= 968 V= 469 M= 499 n=47 (SAT)	2.8471 n=65	0.1113 n=24 20 in., 3 de. 1 unchanged	83% increased 13% decreased 4% unchanged	0.0568 n=33 21 in., 11 de. 1 unchanged	64% increased 33% decreased 3% unchanged	0.0178 n=32 15 in., 13 de 4 unchanged	46% increased 41% decreased 13% unchanged	63% 0.1859
Female - 95 (+19 or 17%)	C= 991 V= 490 M= 502 n=76 (SAT)	3.1803	0.1219 n=43 34 in., 9 de.	79% increased 21% decreased	0.0292 n=50 29 in., 20 de., 1 unchanged	58% increased 40% decreased 2% unchanged	0.1086 n=35 19 in., 12 de 3 unchanged	54% increased 34% decreased 12% unchanged	64% 0.2597
Asian - 9 (+1 or 9%)	C= 1027 V= 476 M= 551 n=7 (SAT)	3.6654	0.0404 n=3 2 in., 1 de.	67% increased 33% decreased	0.0977 n=3 3 in.	100% increased	0.2887 n=3 3 in.	100% increased	89% 0.4268
Black/- 32 (+10 or 24%)	C= 968 V= 476 M=491 n=29 (SAT)	3.0738	0.1392 n=18 13 in., 4 de. 1 unchanged	72% increased 22% decreased 6% unchanged	0.0043 n=16 8 in., 8 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	0.01626 n=8 3 in., 4 de. 1 unchanged	38% increased 50% decreased 12% unchanged	60% 0.15976
Latino/Hispanic - 47 (+12 or 20%)	C= 924 V= 456 M=468 n=34 (SAT)	2.9937	0.1109 n=18 14 in., 4 de.	77% increased 23% decreased	-0.0166 n=24 12 in., 11 de. 1 unchanged	50% increased 46% decreased 4% unchanged	0.0003 n=26 10 in., 14 de. 2 unchanged	38% increased 54% decreased 8% unchanged	53% 0.0946
White - 64 (+11 or 15%)	C= 1028 V= 505 M=523 n=49 (SAT)	3.0018	0.1389 n=27 24 in., 3 de.	89% increased 11% decreased	0.1003 n=35 25 in., 9 de 1 unchanged	71% increased 26% decreased 3% unchanged	0.0803 n=25 16 in., 5 de. 4 unchanged	64% increased 20% decreased 16% unchanged	75% 0.3195
Multi-racial - 5 (+4 or 44%)	C= 1035 V= 500 M=535 n=2 (SAT)	3.1128	n=0		0.041 n=2 1 in., 1 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	-0.0288 n=4 2 in., 2 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	50% 0.0122
Unknown Race - 4	C= 925 V= 460 M=465 n=4 (SAT)	3.3447	0 n=3 1 in., 2 de.	33% increased 66% decreased	-0.0733 n=3 1 in., 2 de.	33% increased 66% decreased	-0.02 n=1 1 de.	100% decreased	33% -0.0933

Demographics	Average SAT	Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	% of Increased GPA /Total GPA improvement
			n=69	n=69	n=65	n=65	n=66	n=66	n=66
FG Only - 27 (+5 or 16%)	C= 1013 V= 503 M=510 n=22 (SAT)	3.0694	0.1126 n=13 10 in., 3 de.	77% increased 33% decreased	0.004 n=16 9 in., 7 de.	56% increased 44% decreased	0.1036 n=10 5 in, 3 de, 2 unchanged	50% increased 30% decreased 20% unchanged	62% 0.2202
LI Only - 8 (+3 or 27%)	C= 977 V= 486 M= 491 n=7 (SAT)	3.3483	0.2067 n=3 3 in.	100% increased	0.0814 n=4 2 in., 2 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	-0.173 n=2 2 de.	100% decreased	56% 0.1151
LI/FG - 126 (+29 or 19%)	C= 976 V= 477 M=499 n= 96 (SAT)	3.043	0.1143 n=51 41 in., 9 de. 1 unchanged	80% increased 18% decreased 2% unchanged	0.0468 n=63 39 in., 22 de., 2 unchanged	62% increased 35% decreased 3% unchanged	0.0654 n=54 28 in., 21 de. 5 unchanged	52% increased 39% decreased 7% unchanged	64% 0.2265

Demographics	Average SAT	Entry GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2001 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2002 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA	2003 Average Gain/Loss GPA in %	% of Increased GPA
			n=69	n=69	n=65	n=65	n=66	n=66	n=66
School C- 18 Students (+7 or 28%) 4 Male, 14 Female (3 males, 4 females) 2 Asian, 9 Black, 5 Latino, 1 Multi, 1 White (5 Black, 1 Latino, 1 Multi.) 3 FG only, 15 LI/FG (2 LI, 5 LI/FG)	C=962 V=451 M=511 N=15	3.122	0.2439 n=10 10 in	100% increased	0.1183 n=11 9 in., 2 de.	82% increased 18% decreased	0.0912 n=7 1 in., 6 de.	14% increased 86% decreased	71%
School G - 12 Students (+14 or 54%) 5 Male, 7 Female 1 Asian, 2 Latino, 9 White (3 Black, 5 Latino, 6 White) 12 LI/FG (2 FG, 1 LI, 10 LI/FG, 1 unknown)	C=1014 V=467 M=547 N=7	2.9622	0.2015 n=5 4 in, 1 de	80% increased 20% decreased	0.1574 n=7 7 in.	100% increased	0.0607 n=6 4 in., 1 de. 1 unchanged	67% increased 17% decreased 17% unchanged	83%
School H - 46 Students (+9 or 16%) 24 Male, 22 Female (7 Male, 2 Female) 1 Asian, 4 Black, 22 Latino, 15 White, 4 Unkn (1 Black, 6 Latino, 1 Multi., 1 White) 6 FG only, 3 LI only, 37 LI/FG (1 FG, 7 LI/FG)	C=989 V=489 M=500 N=36	3.084	0.08316 n=19 14 in, 4 de, 1 unchanged	74% increased 21% decreased 5% unchanged	-0.037 n=23 11 in., 11 de, 1 unchanged	48% increased 48% decreased 4% unchanged	0.0724 n=21 10 in., 6 de. 5 unchanged	48% increased 29% decreased 23% unchanged	55%
School M - 13 Students (+1 or 7%) 3 Male, 10 Female (1 Male) 1 Multi, 12 White (1 White) 1 FG only, 1 LI only, 10 LI/FG (1 LI/FG)	C=966 V=477 M=489 N=11	3.0296	0.0949 n=7 6 in. 1 de.	86% increased 14% decreased	0.0338 n=8 3 in., 5 de.	38% increased 62% decreased	0.021 n=2 1 in., 1 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	59%
School P - 4 Students 1 Male, 3 Female 1 Latino, 3 White 2 FG only, 2 LI/FG	C=1010 V=510 M=500 N=4	3.5	0.1233 n=3 2 in. 1 de.	67% increased 33% decreased	0.1033 n=3 1 in., 1 de. 1 unchanged	33% increased 33% decreased 33% unchanged	-0.01 n=2 1 in., 1 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	50%
School S - 41 Students (+1 or 2%) 21 Male, 20 Female (1 Male) 5 Asian, 18 Black, 16 Latino, 2 Multi (1 Black) 8 FG only, 1 LI only, 32 LI/FG (1 LI/FG)	C=952 V=469 M=482 N=33	3.1511	0.0716 n=40 n=16 13 in., 3 de.	81% increased 19% decreased	-0.02 n=18 9 in., 9 de.	50% increased 50% decreased	0.1088 n=16 9 in., 7 de.	56% increased 44% decreased	62%
School T - 27 Students (+6 or 18%) 8 Male, 14 Female (1 Male, 5 Female) 1 Black, 1 Latino, 1 Multi, 24 White (2 Multi, 4 White) 7 FG only, 20 LI/FG (1 FG, 1 LI, 4 LI/FG)	C=1030 V=515 M=515 N=19	2.8519	0.0784 n=7 5 in., 2 de.	71% increased 29% decreased	0.1201 n=13 10 in., 3 de.	77% increased 23% decreased	1048 n=13 9 in., 4 de.	69% increased 31% decreased	73%

Demographics	Starting Post-Sec. School	% of Students Attending Public/Private & 2-year/4-year Post-Sec. Schools	2003 College Status	Attending College or Completed Degree
Male - 66 (+20 or 23%)	27 public, 5 2-year, 22 4-year 13 private 4-year 8 out of state, 32 in state	67% public, 35% private 12.5% 2-year 87.5% 4-year	3 received AA degrees 20 were in college 3 left college before graduating 9 were of unknown status	58%
Female - 95 (+19 or 17%)	34 public, 12 2-year, 22 4-year public 37 private 4-year 7 out of state, 64 in state	48% public, 52% private 17% 2-year 83% 4-year	3 received their first bachelors degree 1 received an AA degree 1 received a two-year certificate 42 were in college 14 were of unknown status	66%
Asian - 9 (+1 or 9%)	2 public, 1 2-year, 1 4-year 4 private 4-year 6 in state	33% public, 67% private 17% 2-year 83% 4-year	1 received her first bachelors degree 4 were in college 1 was of unknown status	83%
Black/African-American - 32 (+10 or 24%)	13 public, 3 2-year, 10 4-year 13 private 4-year 6 out of state, 20 in state	50% public, 50% private 12% 2-year 88% 4-year	16 were in college 8 were of unknown status	62%
Latino/Hispanic - 47 (+12 or 20%)	17 public, 3 2-year, 14 4-year 11 private 4-year 4 out of state, 24 in state	61% public, 39% private 11% 2-year 89% 4-year	1 received her first bachelors degree 14 were in college 6 were of unknown status	54%
White - 64 (+11 or 15%)	26 public, 9 2-year, 17 4-year 20 private 4-year 4 out of state, 24 in state	57% public, 43% private 20% 2-year 80% 4-year	1 received her first bachelors degree 3 received AA degrees 1 received a two-year certificate 25 were in college 3 left college before graduating 7 were of unknown status	65%
Multi-racial - 5 (+4 or 44%)	1 public 4-year 1 in state	100% public 100% 4-year	1 was in college	100%
Unknown Race/Ethnicity - 4	2 public, 1 2-year, 1 4-year 2 private 4-year 4 in state	50% public, 50% private 25% 2-year 75% 4-year	2 were in college 1 was of unknown status	50%

Demographics	Starting Post-Sec. School	% of Students Attending Public/Private & 2-year/4-year Post-Sec. Schools	2003 College Status	Attending College or Completed Degree
FG Only - 27 (+5 or 16%)	10 public, 3 2-year, 7 4-year 12 private 4-year 5 out of state, 17 in state	45% public, 55% private 14% 2-year 86% 4-year	1 received an AA degree 13 were in college 1 left college before graduating 2 are of unknown status	67%
LI Only - 8 (+3 or 27%)	3 public, 2 2-year, 1 4-year 3 private 4-year 2 out of state, 4 in state	50% public, 50% private 33% 2-year 67% 4-year	1 received a two-year certificate 5 were in college	100%
LI/FG - 126 (+29 or 19%)	48 public, 12 2-year, 36 4-year 35 private 4-year 8 out of state, 75 in state	58% public, 42% private 14% 2-year 86% 4-year	3 received their first bachelors degree 2 received AA degrees 44 were in college 2 left college before graduating 21 are of unknown status	60%

Demographics	Starting Post-Sec. School	% of Students Attending Public/Private & 2-year/4-year Post-Sec. Schools	2003 College Status	Attending College or Completed Degree
School C- 18 Students (+7 or 28%) 4 Male, 14 Female (3 males, 4 females) 2 Asian, 9 Black, 5 Latino, 1 Multi, 1 White (5 Black, 1 Latino, 1 Multi.) 3 FG only, 15 LI/FG (2 LI, 5 LI/FG)	8 public, 2 2-year, 6 4-year 6 private 4-year 1 out of state, 13 in state	57% public, 43% private 14% 2-year 86% 4-year	8 were in college 3 were of unknown status	57%
School G - 12 Students (+14 or 54%) 5 Male, 7 Female (7 Male, 7 Female) 1 Asian, 2 Latino, 9 White (3 Black, 5 Latino, 6 White) 12 LI/FG (2 FG, 1 LI, 10 LI/FG, 1 unknown)	5 public, 2 2-year, 3 4-year 2 private 4-year 1 out of state, 6 in state	71% public, 29% private 29% 2-year 71% 4-year	1 received an AA degree 2 were in college 1 left college before graduating 2 were of unknown status	43%
School H - 46 Students (+9 or 16%) 24 Male, 22 Female (7 Male, 2 Female) 1 Asian, 4 Black, 4 Unknown, 22 Latino, 15 White (1 Black, 6 Latino, 1 Multi, 1 White) 6 FG only, 3 LI only, 37 LI/FG (1 FG, 7 LI/FG)	16 public, 3 2-year, 13 4-year 12 private 4-year 4 out of state, 24 in state	57% public, 43% private 11% 2-year 89% 4-year	2 received their first bachelors degree 16 were in college 2 left college without graduating 5 are of unknown status	64%
School M - 13 Students (+1 or 7%) 3 Male, 10 Female (1 Male) 1 Multi, 12 White (1 White) 1 FG only, 1 LI only, 10 LI/FG (1 LI/FG)	8 public, 4 2-year, 4 4-year 3 private 4-year 1 out of state, 10 in state	78% public, 22% private 36% 2-year 64% 4-year	1 received an AA degree 1 received a two-year certificate 8 were in college 2 are of unknown status	83%
School P - 4 Students 1 Male, 3 Female; 1 Latino, 3 White 2 FG only, 2 LI/FG	2 public, 1 2-year, 1 4-year 2 private 4-year 1 out of state, 3 in state	50% public, 50% private 25% 2-year 75% 4-year	1 received an AA degree 1 is still in college 2 are of unknown status	50%
School S - 41 Students (+1 or 2%) 21 Male, 20 Female (1 Male) 5 Asian, 18 Black, 16 Latino, 2 Multi (1 Black) 8 FG only, 1 LI only, 32 LI/FG (1 LI/FG)	13 public, 2 2-year, 11 4-year 16 private 4-year 6 out of state, 23 in state	45% public, 55% private 7% 2-year 93% 4-year	1 received her first bachelors degree 18 were in college 6 are of unknown status	61%
School T - 27 Students (+6 or 18%) 8 Male, 14 Female (1 Male, 5 Female) 1 Black, 1 Latino, 1 Multi, 24 White (2 Multi, 4 White) 7 FG only, 20 LI/FG (1 FG, 1 LI, 4 LI/FG)	9 public, 3 2-year, 6 4-year 9 private 4-year 1 out of state, 17 in state	50% public, 50% private 17% 2-year 83% 4-year	9 were in college 5 were of unknown status.	50%

CALCULATING STUDENT GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade Passing = 60	(CP) College Preparatory	(H) Honors	(AP) Advanced Placement
A+	99-100	4.33	4.83	5.33
A	93-98	4.00	4.50	5.00
A-	90-92	3.67	4.17	4.67
B+	86-89	3.33	3.83	4.33
B	83-85	3.00	3.50	4.00
B-	80-82	2.67	3.17	3.67
C+	75-79	2.33	2.83	3.33
C	73-75	2.00	2.50	3.00
C-	70-72	1.67	2.17	2.67
D+	66-69	1.33	1.83	2.33
D	63-65	1.00	1.50	2.00
D-	60-62	0.67	1.17	1.67
F	59 or below	0.00	0.00	0.00

To calculate the student's GPA:

- Find the grade in column 1 or 2 above and the class level (e.g. B+ in a CP class is 3.33).
- Add the grade points for each major class
- Divide the total grade points by the number of credits. Full year classes are one credit and half-year classes are .5 credit.