



---

# Statewide Remedial Education Policies

**EDWARD CROWE**

**SEPTEMBER 1998**

---

State Strategies that Support  
Successful Student Transitions from  
Secondary to Postsecondary Education

A JOINT INITIATIVE OF SHEEO AND ACT, INC.



STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

---

Copies of this document are available from the SHEEO Office,  
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427,  
303-299-3686; [www.sheeo.org](http://www.sheeo.org).

This strategy brief is supported through a grant from the Office for  
Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education.  
Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations  
expressed in this material are those of the author and do not  
necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education.

---

## FOREWORD

---

This strategy brief is the first in a series of analytical reports that are part of the SHEEO/ACT study, *State Strategies that Support Successful Student Transitions from Secondary to Postsecondary Education*. *Statewide Remedial Education Policies* examines current state postsecondary remedial and developmental education and creative approaches being implemented in some states to reduce the need for remedial programs in colleges and universities. Forthcoming strategy briefs in the series will focus on the following issues:

- ✓ Statewide School-College (K-16) Partnerships to Improve Student Performance
- ✓ Statewide Strategies for Implementing Competency-based Admissions Systems
- ✓ Statewide Strategies to Create Quality Teacher Education and Professional Development Programs
- ✓ Statewide Strategies to Support Applied and Contextual Learning in K-16 Programs.

The SHEEO/ACT study, conducted from October 1996 through February 1998, collected information on and examined state-level strategies that support student success through the linkage of K-12 and postsecondary education systems. The study produced a 50-state survey report called *Statewide College Admissions, Student Preparation, and Remediation Policies and Programs* (SHEEO, 1998), which provides a national overview of state higher education initiatives aimed at student preparation for college, college admissions, and postsecondary education remediation. In February 1998, state and national K-12 and higher education leaders convened at a national symposium and briefing in Washington, D. C. Information gathered and analyzed through site visits to Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, Ohio, Washington, and Wisconsin provides the data for this series of strategy briefs.

The author of this report, Edward Crowe, Senior Associate Director at the Arkansas Department of Higher Education, was a member of the team of state educators

who participated in site visits to Georgia, Ohio, and Maryland. These visits were directed by several individuals whose leadership was critical to the success of this study: Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University System of Georgia; Michael Rosenthal, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Higher Education Commission; Jonathan Tafel, Director, Academic Initiatives and Education Linkages, Ohio Board of Regents; and Nancy Eberhart, Interim Chief Program Officer, Ohio Department of Education.

Financial support for the preparation and publication of the strategy brief series has been provided through a grant from the Office for Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. In particular, we recognize Patricia W. McNeil, Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, and Henry Smith, Senior Policy Consultant, for their interest and encouragement of this work.

*Esther M. Rodriguez*  
*Associate Executive Director*  
*SHEEO*

*Donald Carstensen*  
*Vice President, Educational Services*  
*ACT, Inc.*



# Statewide Remedial Education Policies

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

Few issues in American higher education have attracted as much attention or controversy in recent years as college-level remediation. In state after state, an influx of underprepared entering freshmen has been the subject of media attention and criticism from public officials, along with the expenditure of public funds by colleges and universities to cope with these students. The problem of remediation has spawned a wide array of state policy initiatives. Their goals include helping students to succeed in college, limiting the cost of remediation, and creating effective partnerships between K-12 and higher education systems.

In many ways, remediation stands at the apex of a series of challenges and opportunities that confront state policy makers, campus faculty, and administrators. These include cost issues, access to college, strengths and weaknesses of K-12 education, the quality of teacher preparation programs, and ensuring educational opportunities for disadvantaged students. This SHEEO strategy brief offers an overview of issues, policy approaches, and emerging new practices as states grapple with remedial education. Remediation policies and practices in the states have been studied through a 50-state SHEEO survey, by site visits to six states, and

with information drawn from numerous other studies and reports. The strategy brief looks at state policy environments and discusses new approaches in the states that capitalize on timing, leadership, and other factors to focus different strategies on remedial education.

A critical question in every state is how to bridge the disconnect between what students are expected to learn in high school and what they must know to succeed in college. State K-16 partnerships have emerged as a vehicle for dealing with this and related issues in a *systemic* way. The brief will explore the goals and impact of K-16 partnerships in three of the six SHEEO site visit states. Because the root causes of remediation reach deep into the fabric of our education and social systems in the United States, resolving them effectively poses continuing challenges. These are touched on in the concluding section of the strategy brief.

---

## OVERVIEW OF THE STATE POLICY ENVIRONMENT

---

Remediation is not a new issue in American higher education. Harvard implemented special courses in 1874 for freshmen with deficiencies in writing skills. By the 1930s, most colleges had remedial reading courses and study skill centers. A 1998 report by the National Center

for Education Statistics (NCES) noted that 78 percent of all American colleges and universities offer remedial courses. Surveys conducted by the American Council on Education and by ACT, in cooperation with the American Association of Community Colleges, reported even higher figures. What seems more recent is intense concern about the implications of remediation for the education system, student success, and the production of skilled workers for a rapidly changing economy.

### ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT POLICIES

The 1997 SHEEO survey<sup>1</sup> provides comprehensive information on state activities in remedial education. At least seven states have statewide policies dealing with assessment and placement of *all* entering freshmen in public higher education. These comprehensive policies cover mathematics, reading, and English preparation in some states, or math and English in others. In **Georgia**, students entering the state university system without completing all high school core courses must take an exam to determine freshman placement into developmental or college-level courses. At the **City University of New York**, all entering freshmen are required to take placement tests in mathematics, reading, and writing. **Nevada** uses the ACT or SAT to determine English placement for university and community college students.

---

<sup>1</sup> Russell, Alene Bycer, *Statewide College Admissions, Student Preparation, and Remediation Policies and Programs* (Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers, January 1998).

**Arkansas** assesses and places all degree-seeking entering freshmen at public two- and four-year institutions, using common placement standards to assign students to freshman math, English, or reading courses. **Oklahoma** also assesses every freshman, and traditional-age students who do not meet cut-off scores are placed into developmental courses. **South Dakota** has statewide assessment policies in math and English, and **West Virginia** has a similar policy for its state college system.

Common statewide standards provide a uniform benchmark for assessing the college readiness of *all* high school graduates entering college. This approach is also an effective way to bring issues related to precollegiate preparation and successful student transitions to the forefront of the policy process.

Other states, such as **Illinois** and **Virginia**, have state policies that do not set common statewide standards, but they do call for appropriate assessment or placement decisions made at the institutional level. Yet a third approach is taken in **Kansas**, **Montana**, **Nebraska**, and **North Dakota**, where campus-based assessment is the norm; there are no statewide common policies, and placement criteria vary by institution.

Many states have found it necessary to adopt rules on whether remedial credit hours count toward graduation. The predominant approach, in 17 states, is for remedial courses to count toward enrollment and financial aid eligibility, but to *prohibit* credit for graduation. No state in the SHEEO survey indicated that remedial

credit hours would count toward graduation requirements.

### LIMITS ON REMEDIAL EDUCATION

This first wave of state-level remedial policies focused on identifying students with academic deficiencies and placing them in appropriate developmental or remedial course experiences. As states examined the impact of these policies, it became clear that large numbers of college freshmen, especially recent high school graduates, simply were not prepared academically to succeed in freshman college-level courses. In some states, as many as 50 percent of high school graduates going directly to college required remedial help as new freshmen. Without the knowledge that many students are simply not ready for college, policy makers may not understand that a state's college-going rate is a superficial indicator of how well students progress through the system. These first wave policies have raised the visibility of precollege preparation as an education policy issue, setting a foundation for more comprehensive initiatives. The findings cited here also have pushed some states into adopting other approaches.

The second round of policies seeks to constrain which institutions can offer remedial instruction and how much public money is spent on this activity. As policy makers fret about the financial burden of remediation, states have imposed limits on which institutions or system sectors can offer remedial courses. This is a rapidly changing environment as states grapple with strategies for dealing with underprepared students. The main effect of these policies so

far has been to move underprepared students around in the system, treating a highly visible *symptom* of system failure but not yet grappling with its root causes. The SHEEO survey reports, for instance, that **Colorado, Florida, and South Carolina** restrict remediation and its public funding to the two-year college sector. Other states strongly recommend that their public universities get out of the remedial business. **Massachusetts** recently adopted a ceiling on the percent of university freshmen who can be enrolled in remedial classes. Concerning funding, **Arkansas** has a statutory cap on the use of state funds for remediation at public universities, while **New Mexico** and **South Carolina** prohibit state funding for remediation at doctoral institutions. **Utah** allows the use of state funding for developmental education only at its community colleges. **Wisconsin's** funding policy at the university level is to offer remedial courses on a fee recovery basis.

Although many states address student *placement*, far fewer have policies to guide the transition of students from developmental to regular status. The SHEEO survey indicates that **Arizona** gives students one year to correct deficiencies. **Georgia** requires passing an exit exam within four quarters of enrollment, and **Texas** mandates passage of remedial courses and related subject area exams required by the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP). Several states, including **Oklahoma**, have studied the academic success of entering students to gauge whether placement cut-off scores are set at the right levels.

## STATE STUDIES AND OTHER INITIATIVES

One indicator that remediation is a major policy topic across the country is the number of recent state-level studies on the issue. Major studies of remedial education policies and practices have been completed recently in **Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin**. Other states like **Georgia** are engaged in comprehensive review of existing data on remediation to explore policy implications and make appropriate changes.

Beyond these reports and analyses, many states have implemented significant new initiatives aimed at reducing the need for remediation. **Arkansas, Georgia**, and some other states are tying innovative scholarship programs to completion of precollegiate preparation courses. One force driving creation of these scholarship programs is state-level analyses that show a rigorous set of high school courses lessens the chance a student will need remediation. The Academic Challenge Scholarship program in Arkansas offers incentives to take a full set of core courses. One result is that the proportion of high school graduates completing these courses before entering college has grown from 41 percent in 1991 to 73 percent in 1997. By 2002, Georgia will tie its HOPE Scholarship to completion of core courses. The HOPE Scholarship is a lottery-funded program providing financial aid to any Georgia high school graduate who completes a defined set of high school courses with a B average.

Another tack is being taken by the **City University of New York (CUNY)** and states such as **Massachusetts** and **Utah**. In this group, policies have placed caps on the percent of university students who can be admitted with remedial needs. At CUNY, underprepared students are being directed to the system's community colleges, and the Board of Trustees has ordered that remedial instruction be phased out of all baccalaureate programs at senior colleges. In other places, "contracting out" remediation to community colleges is being tried on a pilot basis. Two **Maryland** institutions are experimenting with using a private vendor for remedial delivery, comparing costs and student learning outcomes with more traditional delivery modes.

K-16 partnerships also have emerged as a major new approach to remedial education concerns. States have begun to realize that an effective response to remediation requires "system solutions," going well beyond the first and second wave responses. They recognize that it is not possible to deal with the underlying causes of remediation without K-12 involvement. Key features of these partnerships include comprehensive studies of remediation and its causes, formal partnership structures that run across education and higher education systems within these states, and new policies to deal with remediation issues at all levels of the K-16 system.

There are some innovative examples of this strategic approach. The **University System of Georgia** has developed a massive early identification and intervention program for seventh

graders designed to get them ready for new university-wide admissions standards. **Arkansas** and **Oklahoma** higher education systems have joined forces with their K-12 systems and with ACT to assess and help all eighth and tenth grade students. **Maryland**, one of the six SHEEO site visit states, has set up a K-16 partnership with leadership from the top levels of K-12 and higher education. **Ohio**, another site visit state, has built a K-12 partnership initially motivated by concerns about remedial education. These state partnership efforts cut the widest swath across institutions, state agencies, and education system sectors of all the state attempts to cope with remediation. They also raise compelling issues about whether state education systems can mobilize and cooperate effectively to serve the needs of students.

---

## STATE PARTNERSHIPS

---

Three of the SHEEO site visit states have established comprehensive K-16 partnerships to focus system-wide attention on education reform issues. In all three places, concern about remedial education has either been the key driver behind the partnership or emerged very quickly as a central policy concern. In **Ohio**, for example, the state is taking a systemic approach to the remedial issue. Ohio's K-16 partnership has five core policy areas, all aimed at achieving significant reduction in the percent of college freshmen needing developmental education: communicate college expectations to define what entering freshmen should know and be able to do; develop a continuum of early

assessment and intervention services; create the Ohio Learning Extension Network to link the K-16 community; target or reallocate existing fiscal resources; and build a common agenda through a partnership council of state education and higher education board members.

**Maryland's** K-16 Partnership plunged into the remedial issue with a study that reviewed statewide data to make policy recommendations. As with Ohio and Georgia, there is a systemic focus to this work. The Maryland partnership set out "to identify the underlying factors" that cause a need for remediation, find "best practices" examples in schools and colleges that successfully reduce this need, and look at developmental education in Maryland higher education from the standpoint of institutional mission. The Maryland Partnership is an alliance of the State Board of Education, the Higher Education Commission, and the University of Maryland System. Its chief goal is to develop strategies to strengthen K-16 standards, competencies, assessment systems and the professional development of teachers, and to promote community involvement in the state's K-16 initiative.

Through this work, the Maryland group arrived at policy choices similar to those adopted in Ohio. An important point in comparing the policies and goals of these state partnerships is that cross-system issues emerge repeatedly as part of the solution. For Maryland, the answer includes higher expectations for high school students and changed course-taking behavior; partnerships focused on curricula and course content in high school and college; parent

education; consistent statewide higher education placement standards; improved data collection strategies; and appropriate exit standards from developmental courses.

In **Georgia**, the P-16 Initiative has five goals. They are: to improve student achievement at all levels of the system; facilitate student transitions within the system; ensure that all entering college students are prepared to succeed; improve postsecondary access and success, especially for minority and low income students; and focus teacher preparation, as well as teacher professional development programs, on meeting high academic standards for every student.

A belief that the entire education system is responsible for preparing every student to meet these standards drove creation of the Georgia P-16 Initiative. This partnership quickly focused on remediation as one indicator of how well the system addresses the needs of underprepared students. But the long-term goal, here as elsewhere, is to ensure that Georgia students arrive at college fully prepared to succeed academically.

### STRATEGIES USING DATA ANALYSIS

A common theme in partnership states is the use of data to analyze, inform, and involve potential stakeholders. **Ohio** started with a thorough study of remedial education using a diverse group from education, higher education, and from the business and political sectors. The Ohio partnership used study results to set a goal of reducing developmental enrollment in public

higher education by 15 percent by the year 2001. **Georgia** uses extensive analyses on such topics as the remediation rates for students entering public colleges or universities and student progression rates to paint a clear picture of the issues facing that state. **Maryland's** analysis of state and national data on remediation is leading the K-16 Partnership to deal with important policy questions: how much remedial education is appropriate; which system sector should provide it; how much public money should be used; and how effective are the current remedial programs?

In different ways, states are facing the question of whether high school graduation requirements are sufficient for student success in higher education. Ohio, Georgia, and Maryland are looking to a common in-state data collection strategy across the K-16 system, with at least one state committed to a shared database with student achievement information. This is an ambitious undertaking for any state. It points up an important feature of statewide reform efforts: quality data and policy-oriented analyses are useful tools to create change. Understanding the problem in quantitative terms and disseminating the results widely help to raise the visibility of an education issue. This strategy captures the attention of stakeholders who might otherwise not understand the problem or be involved in policy deliberations.

### STATE COALITION PARTNERS

Who are the partners? State partnerships are guided by boards or councils that bring important stakeholders together. One observation

from the site visits is that education system leaders in a state often are barely acquainted with one another until a formal structure is created. A successful effort requires many partners. This is a process issue at the beginning — to make sure that all the players who *should* be involved are at the table whether they want to be there or not. One thread that runs across the states is that interest or pressure from outside the education system is an important motivator for change. This can be a high level of legislative interest in remedial education issues, coupled with concern in the business community about the state’s capacity to produce workers with needed skills. Activist governors willing to expend political capital on fundamental education changes are playing a seminal role in several states. A crucial ingredient for early success is that state leadership and key staff in K-12 and higher education agencies have stepped forward with a commitment to a systemic approach. These forces help to open the door to high-level cooperation across education sectors. This pressure for change from the external environment should be viewed as an important precondition for systemic action. In some cases, it helps strong leaders to overcome turf issues and organizational inertia to get a program of reform underway and sustain its momentum.

A state-level partnership council functions as a communications mechanism for system officials who should be working in concert. Members include state education and higher education CEOs, business leaders, the Governor’s office, legislators, education and higher education

board members, school and college leaders, parent groups, students, and faculty. While partnership council composition varies from place to place, these are the most common elements.

It is clear from the evolution and development of state K-16 efforts that partnerships must also be created at the local level for reform to move from state leaders to schools and higher education institutions across the state. For this to happen productively, funding from the top can be used to ensure that local partnership activities further system goals. At the same time, the local partnership groups can translate state system vision and goals into activities adapted to needs and conditions that vary greatly within a state.

#### KEY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES

Aside from coalition building and the imaginative use of data systems to improve policy decisions, states are using many other strategies to deal with remediation. **Oklahoma** has a comprehensive set of initiatives to define expectations for college, improve preparation levels, assess incoming students and provide mechanisms for early identification of those with preparation deficiencies. The state higher education system has established outreach partnerships with K-12 and has focused major efforts on improving its teacher preparation programs. Results include more students prepared for college as well as improved retention and graduation rates. Oklahoma uses its state data system effectively to identify the core issues and to profile the system’s status

before and after policy changes have been made.

**Ohio's** partnership has decided that student mastery of knowledge and skills must be at the core of all education system policies and practices. This includes having high expectations that will require students to demonstrate their mastery of learning. To put this philosophical belief into practice, the Ohio partnership is working to build on existing strengths and programs, reshaping the focus of individual partners within a common shared agenda. This involves linking programs such as the Ohio Statewide Systemic Initiative, tech prep, Eisenhower professional development activities, the Urban Schools Initiative, various state technology projects, and substantial changes to teacher preparation programs. The partnership goal, as noted earlier, is to reduce remediation 15 percent by 2001. It is too early to report results from these activities.

**Arkansas** has leveraged resources from the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) program to sustain a K-16 partnership focused on comprehensive school improvement strategies. The state was drawn to the SSI because of analyses done by the state education and higher education agencies on remediation (studies done with the help of ACT). Finding that K-12 curriculum and instruction were major factors behind college-level remediation, Arkansas established a statewide professional development program in mathematics, science, and reading which has served the teachers of more than 85 percent of K-12 students in the state. A related major

push is underway to implement standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices throughout the system. The next wave of change will target radical reform of teacher education programs. The Arkansas goals are better preparation levels for entering college students and lower remedial rates. To date, the percent of entering college freshmen needing remediation has declined from 60 percent in 1991 to 49 percent in 1997.

The hallmark of **Georgia's** K-16 Initiative is its Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (PREP), although the state is pursuing a complex web of policy and practice changes across its whole system. PREP offers supplemental programs for students in grades 7-12 that are designed to improve their access to *and success in* postsecondary education. Through regional partnership sites, "at risk" students benefit from academic enrichment and mentoring; technology instruction; leadership development and career exploration; summer campus experiences; and an extensive college visitation program for seventh graders. Each year, thousands of Georgia seventh graders will participate in free residential programs on college campuses. These student outreach activities are intended to help all students develop the skills and knowledge to meet the Georgia system's 2002 admissions standards. The impact of these changes will not be felt at the system level until 2002 when the first group of freshmen enter public higher education under the new admissions standards.

Other Georgia strategies include teacher preparation reform, stronger teacher pro-

professional development programs, and alignment of HOPE scholarship requirements with the new admissions standards. With other states, Georgia seeks to bridge the K-12/higher education disconnect by linking curricula across all educational levels. These cross-system connections illustrate a strong feature of any systemic reform effort: well thought-out policy linkages at many levels of the system are essential for success. These include ties between college admissions standards and requirements for state-supported scholarships, and recognizing the obvious (but often ignored) relationship between college entrance standards and high school graduation requirements. Other policy linkages include redesign of teacher preparation programs. The goal here is to provide quality instructional support for K-12 students, to help them make successful transitions to postsecondary education and to the workplace.

For state partnerships, the policy linkage with the most important implication for long-term success is the realization that state higher education systems have a large stake in the success of middle and high school students. This connection drives communications strategy, fund-raising, program design issues, local K-16 partnerships and involvement in reform by individual colleges and universities. An important policy focus shared by these initiatives is reform of teacher preparation programs. Policy and practice linkages across the K-12 and higher education systems are viewed in all partnership states as necessary preconditions to improve teacher education. The state coalitions recognize that producing quality teachers from their

universities is central to any meaningful K-12 school improvement program.

---

## LESSONS AND CHALLENGES

---

Two things are clear from any analysis of remediation in American education. While the need for student remediation may diminish over time, this change will happen slowly and remediation will never disappear entirely. Second, concern and criticism about high rates of remediation from educators, parents, and policy makers will be with us for a long time. High school students with preparation deficiencies are still in the system. Weaknesses in K-12 curriculum or in teacher preparation and professional development programs — major factors in producing high school graduates who are not ready for college — will be overcome slowly. Issues of curriculum content or instructional quality *in the elementary years* are hindering students who are years away from entering college. When they arrive on campus, colleges will have to provide remedial help or turn them away.

Nonetheless, many will view it as a healthy development that remediation has been the force bringing a semblance of unity to state K-16 systems. **Ohio's** early assessment and early identification strategies are built on the recognition that schools and colleges can work together to help students long before they enter the higher education system. The **Georgia** preschool program, part of the state's P-16 partnership, is a carefully designed approach to ensure student success from the beginning.

In a peculiar but useful way, remediation is viewed in many states as a leading indicator of the health and near-term direction of state education systems. It measures the ability of system components to work together and produce students fully prepared for the workplace or for postsecondary education. It also taps the system's capacity to function as a system. Aspects of the system that must be mobilized to solve the remedial problem include high school preparation patterns; teacher education programs; school/college collaboration initiatives; state scholarship programs; higher education admissions standards; the quality of state K-16 education data systems; workforce preparation programs; and the extent to which the state system is energized by policy alignment and systemic thinking.

As states move forward with these efforts, there are some important lessons and challenges. Effective leadership is a vital ingredient for success. A leader with vision, determined to put that vision into practice, is indispensable. In these new K-16 partnership endeavors, concern for the success of students has been forced to the center of education policy making. One observer at a site visit state partnership meeting described this concept—that education should focus on the welfare of children—as so radically different from what goes on in most state K-12 and higher education systems that it can only happen through the intervention of a dynamic leader.

There must also be an organization in the state system willing to step forward and take the lead, committed to policy changes and resource

allocation decisions that others *must* respond to. One site visit observation has been that strong leadership and a clear vision have empowered staff already in place to take action, putting complex programs into place in a short period.

State political leaders must be committed to real and substantial change. Elected officials often have general ideas on how to improve a state and make a mark on history. It is not their role, however, to invent detailed reform programs. Nor is it likely that a fully formed change agenda will be handed down from the General Assembly or the Governor's office. This means that other system actors must step forward to give shape and substance to the policy makers' general desire to make a difference.

Large reform efforts require new funds over and above existing resources. These are needed at the beginning because change agents are doing "double duty," initiating new activities and continuing with business as usual. A key second stage in reform, however, is to redeploy existing resources in support of the program started with new money. Whether they are getting value for their tax dollars or not, state taxpayers already pony up for effective schools and quality higher education. No state can afford to establish parallel universes, one traditional and ineffective, and the other change-oriented. The implication of systemic change is thorough redesign of the structures and operations of the entire education system. This can only happen if base funding resources are redirected massively. In effective reform efforts, therefore, the role of money has three components. New resources begin the change

process. Strings attached to new funds leverage existing money. Resource redeployment institutionalizes the reform agenda.

State efforts to deal with remediation face another challenge, one that may be less welcome in an era of constrained resources. There has been limited policy research on the effectiveness of developmental education programs. Are remedial class sizes too large or about right? Do colleges train and support developmental instructors or just throw them into the breach? And, what do we know about the effectiveness of programs now in place at thousands of colleges and universities?

On the question of cost, there is some evidence that in states with credit hour-based funding formulas, where developmental education is funded using small class size standards, colleges and universities “beat the formula” by doubling or tripling recommended student-faculty ratios. That is, while the state may fund developmental classes on a 15:1 student-faculty ratio, remedial classes often have 30-45 students per instructor. This raises a question that runs counter to state concern about how much money is being spent on remediation: if the goal is to help students to be successful, the real funding story may be that states are spending too little.

In *Educational Benchmarks* (1998), the Southern Regional Education Board raised questions about the effectiveness of remedial programs. Few states have exit standards from remedial courses. It is not clear that many states know whether their programs work. Others have made the same points.

Moreover, state policy debates about remediation do not always take pains to distinguish between the preparation problems of adult entering students and those of recent high school graduates. K-16 partnership programs target only the second group. Preliminary evidence in several states shows that these efforts can make a difference. Older students come to college with learning needs that may be a legacy of state education systems a decade or two ago. In an economy which demands a commitment to lifelong learning on the part of workers, higher education and state policy makers cannot shut this group off from developmental education while moving aggressively to solve the remedial problems of younger students.

---

## SUMMARY

---

As states continue to grapple with remediation in higher education, some clear landmarks stand out in the policy landscape. For a variety of reasons, the need for remediation may diminish slowly but will never go away entirely. Cost, quality, and institutional mission issues are the latest wave of policy concerns in most states. Many policy makers view remediation rates as indicators of the health and performance of the entire state education system. This perspective has led to systemic K-16 partnership efforts in some states, through which the K-12 and higher education systems agree to share responsibility for the success or failure of all students.