

Working Paper Series: CHEWP.2.2011



**OHIO**  
UNIVERSITY

The Patton College of  
Education and Human Services

### Center for Higher Education

<http://www.coe.ohiou.edu/centers-partnerships/centers/center-higher-ed.htm>

*The purpose of this Working Paper Series is to contribute to the body of research on higher education, and enhance dialogue among educators, policy makers, practitioners, and the public. The Working Paper Series includes papers, original research studies, reflective essays, and major reports generated by Center-related research projects. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in these works are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for Higher Education, its research staff, or other affiliated researchers. Questions regarding the content of individual contributions and Center research reports should be directed to the author(s).*

---

## **OHIO EARLY-COLLEGE STRATEGIES AND THEIR POTENTIAL RELEVANCE TO FAMILIES AND STUDENTS FROM RURAL APPALACHIAN OHIO**

**February 2011**

Tom Duncan, Craig Howley and Aimee Howley  
Ohio University

---

### **Executive Summary**

This working paper examines various provisions that have enabled Ohio high school students to participate in college before they would otherwise be scheduled to graduate from high school. The examination focuses, unusually, on the relevance of such arrangements to families in rural Appalachian Ohio.

Ohio's "Postsecondary Education Option" (PSEO) is among the most long-established (since 1989) and arguably most successful state programs for giving high school students access to postsecondary institutions. Initially reserved for third and fourth year high-school students, the PSEO was expanded subsequently (i.e., in 1997) to apply to all high school students. More recently, the new Seniors to Sophomores program and the Early College High Schools (ECHS) funded in part by the Gates Foundation have expanded the array of what this paper calls "early college" options in Ohio.

Perhaps recent interest in these initiatives suggests that a system of early college offerings is evolving in Ohio. If so, the broad swath of educators, families, and communities could benefit from a better understanding of the varieties of early college options, their history, and their challenges. Further, the applicability, accessibility, and appropriateness of such options in Appalachian southeast Ohio would be of particular concern to families, communities, and rural educators in the part of the state where Ohio University is located.

Responding to these concerns, this paper looks closely at the development and evolution of the PSEO, and then lays out the national context for early college programs: their variety, history, and application both to talented students and to a wider group of students with possible capacity to engage postsecondary work earlier than was typical in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As part of the discussion, the paper evaluates the unique institutional emergence of the ECHS, particularly as it relates to providing responsive service to this wider group of students. The history raises the issue of competing aims of early college programs, and the paper describes and contrasts these quite different aims. The presentation to this point in the paper focuses on issues of national and state significance, not yet considering how early college options might be contextualized to Appalachian Ohio.

But such a focus is necessary and unusual for several reasons. First, Ohio University is perhaps the flagship higher education institution in Appalachian Ohio, and the authors have worked at the University and lived in Appalachia, some of us for decades. Our concern, therefore, is personal. We would like to see our own university serve the region well. Second, programs designed and implemented for the state as a whole have often overlooked Appalachia; some colleagues are fond of remarking that Southeast Ohio (Appalachian Ohio) is the region of the state that Columbus would prefer to cede to West Virginia (the only state entirely within the Appalachian region, which extends from New York to Mississippi). Third, the commitments and devotions of rural families in an exploited and impoverished region tend to be poorly understood by the universities sited in their midst (Denham, 2005). Typically (not always) and institutionally (not individually), universities and colleges regard their localist neighbors as deficient, at least with respect with the sorts of goods that are on offer on their campuses.

Thus, the paper considers alternative ways of viewing rural populations and schooling next. As suggested above, one outlook is to view the region as falling short of the state and national standard, due to such challenges as poverty, low educational attainment, disability, and outmoded ways of living and viewing the world. A less common outlook is to understand the aspirations and commitments of rural Appalachian families as legitimate and therefore worthy of serious consideration by educators and policy makers. The paper engages this difference through the lens of three possible explanations for the historic refusal of Appalachian families to participate in higher education, at least at the same rate as families in the state and nation. The discussion here considers explanations centered on theories about social capital and cultural values, status attainment, human capital. Each explanation, it turns out, offers reason to doubt the usual approach in which Appalachians are considered ill-informed and deficient.

This paper is structured around strategies to understand these families; the intended audience is those in the policy-making and higher-education arenas who do not possess such understanding. The discussion casts doubt on the prevailing self-evident truth and offers alternative explanations (theories) about the engagement and disengagement of these rural Appalachian families from formal schooling. Two key constructs used to open up these differing explanations are “rural-localist commitments” and “cosmopolitan commitments.” Briefly, on the one hand, higher education values and promotes a sort of meaningfulness that aims at universality, expertise, and that form of sophistication associated with “high culture” (fine literature, classical music and jazz, and “good taste” generally). The actual reality of university experience nearly always falls far short, but the ideal is clear. Rural-localists, on the other hand, embrace commitments to home, family, place, and community. Universities and colleges almost never even acknowledge the meaningfulness of “low culture.”

The paper therefore suggests that institutions of higher education might follow the lead of cultural visionaries and recognize the unity of meaningfulness in supposedly low and supposedly high culture so that they can develop programs responsive to rural-localist aspirations. It’s only a hypothesis, but this pathway seems much better calculated to secure participation than pathways that lead rural Appalachian young people to abandon family, place, and community for the promise of success on cosmopolitan terms.

A practical critique of this sort aims ultimately at prescriptions for action, and the paper therefore concludes with a series of recommendations for state policy makers, K-12 school-district leaders in Appalachian Ohio, and leaders in postsecondary institutions in Appalachian Ohio. Despite these recommendations, however, far more important is the main message about the need to recognize, embrace, and sustain rural-localist commitments as part of the educational mission of higher education in Appalachian Ohio.

## Introduction

This paper considers policies and programs for “early college”<sup>1</sup> enrollment in Ohio, particularly from the vantage of appropriateness and possible benefits for families and students from the Appalachian region of the state. Discussion begins with a brief orientation to current Ohio policy and then turns to a broader examination of early college as one of several strategies for providing challenging content to high-school students in the United States. Next, the paper reviews and interprets literature relating to both the relevance and effectiveness of early college for students in rural and Appalachian schools.<sup>2</sup> Ultimately the paper makes recommendations—based on both

---

<sup>1</sup> By “early college” this paper refers to any arrangement under which students younger than the traditional age of 18 undertakes coursework that awards college credit upon successful completion. In Ohio, these options include: (1) actual early college entry, (2) the official dual-enrollment program (known as the “Postsecondary Option” or PSEO), (3) the Early College High Schools pioneered by the Gates Foundation and facilitated in Ohio by Cincinnati’s KnowledgeWorks Foundation, and (4) the Strickland-era Seniors to Sophomores effort.

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting that the Ohio Department of Education classifies 103 of the 127 Appalachian school districts as rural. The other 24 are classified by the state as “urban, high poverty, low income” (see Appendix). These urban

benefits and challenges—for state policy makers as well as for leaders of K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions in Appalachian Ohio. The discussions throughout are grounded in the authors' appreciation for rural-localist commitments, an outlook more compatible with concern for rural Appalachian Ohio than is typical in considerations of early college.

### **Early College Programs in an Ohio Policy Context**

Ohio launched its experiment with early college in 1989, with a dual-enrollment provision to serve the needs of academically talented high school students. In that year the state established a policy for Post Secondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) to allow 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students the opportunity to enroll in college courses and receive both high school and college credit at no cost (Blanco & Prescott, 2007, p. 2). The state expanded the policy in 1997 to permit students in grades 9 and 10 to participate if they qualified. As Blanco and Prescott (2007) reported, the

*PSEO policy has allowed thousands of high school students to earn college and high school credit at the same time, with no cost to them. Between 1998 and 2004, more than 55,000 Ohio high school students earned credit that could be applied to college degrees. (p. 3)*

Despite the state's offer of free college tuition and dual credit for qualifying high school students, as of 2007 fewer than 5% of students per annum had taken advantage of this opportunity (p. 3). This statewide average masks very sharp variability, however. As data in the Appendix show, some school districts in Appalachian Ohio enlist less than one-quarter of one percent in the PSEO; the regional district-level average is 2.2%, and *none* of the Joint Vocational Schools exercise the PSEO pathway. Many policymakers in Ohio—including former Governor Strickland—have expressed concern that the PSEO policy has not been working as well as it might.

Preliminary efforts to increase the use of the “dual enrollment” approach to early college were connected by statute to the development of a Core Curriculum for high schools in Ohio. Notably, House Bill 115 (passed in June, 2006) provided seed money to fund collaborations between school districts and colleges that would encourage dual enrollment of students with solid, but not necessarily outstanding, records of academic performance. These early initiatives preceded, and provided a basis for, the “Seniors to Sophomores” plan, which was announced early in 2008.

Under this plan, qualified high school seniors would enroll fulltime as first-year college students, taking a full load of college courses free of charge at Ohio public colleges and universities (University System of Ohio, 2010)—and no high school courses. The plan built on the existing PSEO legislation: both Acts supported a range of postsecondary options. The PSEO legislation, however, did not explicitly focus on seniors and, in general, it did not promote the practice of offering college courses on high school campuses through the appointment of eligible high

---

districts, however, would nearly all be classified as distant (e.g., Athens City) or fringe (Lancaster City) towns by the U.S. Department of Education. On the whole, Appalachian Ohio is a rural region.

school teachers to adjunct faculty roles (which is a permissible approach in Seniors to Sophomores). Despite their somewhat different specifics, both policies have worked to expand similar types of programs, known in the education literature variously as “dual enrollment programs,” “dual credit programs,” and “concurrent enrollment programs.”

According to a newspaper report about the Seniors to Sophomores plan (Smith, Richards, & Boss, 2008), former Governor Strickland wanted more students to participate in the state’s dual-enrollment programs than PSEO had been enabling. His goal was to expand participation as a way to encourage more students to attend college (Okoben, 2008). The plan’s focus on students who might not otherwise attend college represented a different rationale for a program that, in terms of logistics, was otherwise similar to PSEO. Not surprisingly, the Governor sought support for the shift in focus (from students with high levels of academic talent to those with moderate levels of talent) by highlighting the linkage between increased college attendance and the state’s ability to be competitive economically (Office of the Governor [Ohio], 2008).<sup>3</sup>

The first stage of the Seniors to Sophomores plan was to encourage approximately 40 partnerships between school districts and public colleges in the 2008-2009 fiscal year. To support such “Early Adopters,” the administration proposed an allocation of \$4 million, with a limit of \$100,000 for any single partnership. Ultimately, however, Strickland hoped that the new early college program would be available to every high-school senior in the state (Office of the Governor [Ohio], Press Releases, 2008b). Early college programs, however, have been underfunded from the start, as evidence presented later in this paper indicates.

### **Early College High School Programs: The National Context**

Under early college programs such as the PSEO, Seniors to Sophomores, and the Early College High Schools (ECHS) sponsored by the Gates Foundation (in Ohio and many other states via a network of local non-profit organizations), high-school students accelerate their progress through school by enrolling in college-level courses for which they receive *both* high school and college credit (i.e., the dual-enrollment strategy). These programs differ in terms of how many courses they allow or expect students to take, the grade levels at which students become eligible to participate, and the academic and dispositional qualifications required of participating students. Arrangements for course delivery also differ, sometimes dramatically. Early College High Schools, for instance, exist ideally on college campuses (including community college campuses).

According to several commentators, (Ashburn, 2007; Bailey, Hughes & Karp, 2003; Johnstone & Del Genio, 2001; Robertson, Chapman, & Gaskin, 2001; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 2006), many dual-enrollment programs offer college courses at local high schools, with courses taught by college faculty or even by high-school teachers to whom universities grant status as part-time (i.e., adjunct) instructors. Other programs enable students to

---

<sup>3</sup> Such rationales stem from the assumptions of human-capital theory (e.g., Becker, 1964) —a lineage considered later in the paper in sufficient detail to contextualize the issue for Appalachian Ohio.

take college courses on the campus of a community or technical college, or at a four-year college or university. Early college courses are also sometimes offered via distance education (Andrews, 2000).

Depending on the program, students may be able to take their college courses during the regular school day, during the evenings, or on weekends—whenever the college, or the collaboration, offers them (Andrews, 2000). Citing data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Wright and Bogotch (2006) reported that, during the 2002-2003 school year, approximately 1.2 million high school students in the United States enrolled in early college courses. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the most common arrangement was for “college courses” to be offered at high schools: 74% (855,000) of the students took these sorts of courses. A minority—23% (276,000)—actually went to classes on postsecondary campuses. Another 4% took distance courses, and these courses were presumably undertaken not on college campuses but also at high schools (Wright & Bogotch, 2006, p. 19). As these data suggest, “early college” most often is not a *college* experience at all!

This surprising finding points to a relevant academic and intellectual challenge for early college programming. On average, the intellectual cultures of higher education and of high school could hardly be more different. Many writers, for example, contrast the traditional compliance mission of K-12 schooling with the liberatory mission of higher education espoused by most colleges and universities (e.g., Adams, 1918; Anderson, 1993; Goodman, 1962; Vail, 2001). The difference is predictably sharpest for students from low-wealth (sometimes rural) school districts.

The disproportionate “delivery” of dual-enrollment college courses in high schools, often by high-school teachers serving as adjunct faculty, is perhaps an indication that this circumstance needs further study. A common aim of early college arrangements, after all, is to give high-school students access to a “more rigorous” experience—one that cultivates greater intellectual independence, one that embeds the view that knowledge is contestable and one, therefore, that fosters grasp of a more complex and nuanced content—in a word, a form of learning that is more intentionally liberatory (as in “the liberal arts”). The capacity of many high schools to supply such an experience is arguable—perhaps even doubtful in low-wealth districts. Further study seems warranted, especially in light of the current interest in broadening the student base for early college efforts from exceptionally talented to ordinarily capable students (e.g., Ohio’s Seniors to Sophomores effort sets a grade of C or higher in gateway courses such as Algebra II).

### **A Century of Early College Efforts**

All early college programs and policies, regardless of their specific aims or goals, are part of a family of long-established educational arrangements whose general purpose is to promote the academic engagement of high school students. Some arrangements are designed to provide challenging academic content to high-ability students. Other programs—those open to a wider range of students—aim to prepare students more effectively for full-time college attendance, give them a more rigorous educational experience while still in high school, keep them

motivated and engaged in the senior year, and introduce students from families in which no one has ever attended college to the idea of college participation. Early College High Schools (10 currently exist in Ohio, but only in or near large cities) and the Seniors to Sophomores program are of this latter type.

Programs designed to allow academically talented students to attend college early have had a fairly long history. By contrast, the option of opening up such programs to students whose talents are less pronounced is a relatively new idea, and a curious one as well, considering that acceleration, though a very effective arrangement for exceptionally talented students (Hattie, 2009), has been roundly ignored by K-12 schools and rarely used in higher education. Perhaps some educators regard this effective arrangement as elitist, but others have argued that the typical “enrichment” programs for talented students actually foster elitism precisely because they fail to require such students to confront challenging intellectual content (Howley, 1986).

### **Early college programs in the 20th century**

Early in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, bright students were often permitted to skip grades during their elementary and secondary schooling, and, as a result, some capable students were admitted early to college. The practice of early entrance to college was not widespread, however. Furthermore, pedagogical practices of the 1930s and 1940s were responsive to emerging theories about child development, and, from that point forward, concern for developmentally appropriate education and a “life-adjustment” curriculum restrained educators from using grade-skipping as a way to provide challenging content to talented students (Howley, Howley, & Pendarvis, 1986).

During the 1950s and early 1960s, some educators began to criticize the life adjustment movement of earlier decades, arguing that its emphasis on the development of the “whole child” had eroded the academic rigor of the secondary school curriculum (e.g., Bestor, 1953). The Advanced Placement (AP) Program became one of the earliest initiatives of that period to address the intellectual needs of talented youth and thereby respond to the concerns of critics (Schneider, 2009). The approach, which was adopted initially only in select high schools, provided advanced instruction to talented students, who then took tests to determine whether or not they could be awarded college credit (Blanco, 2006; Schneider, 2009; Waits, Setzer, & Lewis, 2006).<sup>4</sup>

Developed for a slightly different purpose, the International Baccalaureate (IB) Program also entailed advanced study followed by examinations to document achievement. Although its course of study was rigorous, the original aim was not to accelerate students’ accumulation of college credits but to assure that their high school diplomas would be recognized in any country in the world. Some colleges in the United States did choose to grant credit on the basis of performance on IB examinations, however (Callahan, 2003).

---

<sup>4</sup> Readers should understand that AP tests do not actually require a preceding AP course: Anyone at all may take the tests. See <http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/ap/reg.html>.

In the early years of both programs an ethos of selectivity dominated discussion and practice (Schneider, 2009). Educators saw these options as appropriate for very bright students only, and schools adopting one or both programs tended to serve upper-middle class families and to enjoy a commensurate academic reputation. Arguably, the choice to provide one or both curricular options augmented such repute.

Periodically, however, education in the United States has been responsive to demands for equity as well as to demands for quality (e.g., Howley, Howley, & Pendarvis, 1995; Schneider, 2009). And according to Schneider (2009), one way that policy makers and school leaders could promote equity was to provide AP and IB programs in larger numbers of schools. Another was to recruit into such programs a broader subset of students. The popular movie *Stand and Deliver* valorized one such effort.

Beginning in the mid-1980s, moreover, some states began to support the concurrent enrollment in high school and college of students who met certain eligibility requirements (Broughton, 1987). The requirements were certainly not as stringent as those used to determine eligibility for talented and gifted (TAG) programs in K-12 schools, but many of the students who took advantage of concurrent enrollment in its early years were TAG students seeking more challenging course work than that offered by their high schools (Howley & Howley, 1987). In most states where such provisions existed, programs nonetheless served a very small fraction of the students in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades (e.g., Broughton, 1987).

### **College programs for young academically talented students**

One option for talented high school students has been to enroll in college classes while still in high school or even, in more extreme cases, to abandon high school altogether—before receiving a diploma—and enroll full-time in college, on campus, instead. This type of acceleration has never represented “dual enrollment” in the way that it is currently construed, because high schools rarely allowed students to substitute the credit they received in college classes for credits required for high school graduation (Howley et al., 1986). Indeed acceleration of this type was often actively discouraged by high schools, even as an arrangement to provide suitably challenging curriculum to highly talented students (Howley & Howley, 2002). Sometimes, before they can receive a bachelor’s degree, early college students without a high school diploma must demonstrate passing scores on the GED examination—no matter what their college-entrance or GRE scores may be.

Nevertheless, recognizing that some talented students benefit from early entry to college, a small number of institutions of higher education developed, and have for decades offered, special early-entry programs. These on-campus programs provide structures to assist early entrants in making the transition to college-level work and campus life. Programs such as the Simon’s Rock campus at Bard College provide separate housing to cohorts of early entrants as well as providing them with access to special counseling and academic support services (e.g., Goldberger, 1980).

### **Programs for a wider subset of students**

Making use of some of the same structural approaches as those provided to talented students, more recent efforts have sought to expand access to early college options. For example, Middle College High Schools (MCHSs) and Early College High Schools (ECHSs) are designed for students whose high school performance is satisfactory but who may be at risk of losing interest in schooling, for a variety of reasons but notably due to shortcomings in the intellectual cultures of their “regular” schools. These new schools permit students to use the same course work to obtain credits both toward the high school diploma and the college degree.

Although sources from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Hoffman & Vargas, 2005; McKnight & Vargas, 2006) claim that the Foundation originated the ECHS work in 2002 with a grant of \$40 million to establish 70 small schools, Lieberman (2004) locates the origins in the “middle college” movement that began in 1972. There *are* differences in the two concepts, but both focus resources and effort on working-class and impoverished students whose college-going capacity would typically be overlooked or even suppressed in the high schools they would otherwise attend. The Middle College Consortium states the common mission succinctly: these schools “bridge the high school and college experience for underserved youth, leading to increased access to and success in college” (Middle College National Consortium, 2010b, ¶ 1).

Perhaps because of the infusion of Gates’ funding and the similarity of commitment to working-class and minority youth, the ECHS work seems to be absorbing the earlier-established middle-college work (Middle College National Consortium, 2010a, ¶ 1), and currently far fewer MCHSs (~30) exist than ECHSs (~130). In Ohio, the Consortium facilitates just one of the ECHS sites (Early College High School Initiative, 2010). The others are facilitated by KnowledgeWorks, a private non-profit headquartered in Cincinnati.

At present in Ohio, 10 early college high schools exist in the cities of Akron, Canton, Cleveland, Columbus (n=3), Dayton, Elyria, Toledo, and Youngstown (Early College High School Initiative, 2010). None exists, however, in primarily rural areas. Rural regions in Ohio—perhaps especially in Appalachian Ohio—may strike funders as less auspicious because the target population is more dispersed. Additionally, organizations sponsoring such initiatives enjoy a choice of higher education partners in major cities, a circumstance uncommon in the countryside. Such choice is helpful to these organizations because installing an ECHS on a campus entails inevitable challenges, and prospective partners exhibit varied capacities and varied willingness to engage the challenges.

The ECHS Initiative operates nationwide (ECHS Initiative, 2010), though not all states have ECHSs. Nonetheless, similarly focused efforts are taking place in the various states, sometimes with support from external sponsors, and sometimes not. In states with charter school legislation, for instance, some colleges are hosting secondary schools on their campuses. While these high schools remain distinct from their college hosts, their location on campus permits collaboration between the college and the charter school, and makes it convenient for high school students to enroll in college courses and to experience the college environment first-hand.

With different aims and a somewhat different clientele in view, the federally funded “Tech Prep” program links the curricula at vocational high schools with the curricula at community colleges. Four year Tech-Prep programs combine “at least two years of secondary education and two years of postsecondary education in a nonduplicative, sequential course of study” (Blanco, 2006, p. 3). These programs can lead to a postsecondary certificate in a specific career field, an associate’s degree, or a baccalaureate degree (p. 3). The State of Ohio has an active Tech Prep initiative and, in some cases, students may access Tech Prep courses through the Ohio PSEO policy (Blanco & Prescott, 2007, p. 14).<sup>5</sup>

In addition to these formal arrangements, postsecondary enrollment options in Ohio and other states enable students to begin college studies while they are still working to complete their secondary schooling. Some community colleges explicitly recruit secondary students, particularly those who do not meet eligibility requirements for programs such as AP and IB. Some advocacy groups, moreover, cite data demonstrating the benefits of such programs (Blanco & Prescott, 2007) for “first-generation college students” a term that puts the circumstances of students from working-class and impoverished families into a somewhat different, and interesting, frame. Later on, this paper examines the commitments of such families, especially in Appalachian Ohio, as they bear on the participation of students in early college programs.

### **Competing Aims of Early College Programs**

As the discussion above suggested, educators and policy makers who support early college programs have invoked two rather different rationales for them (see also Bailey, Hughes, & Karp, 2002; 2003). According to one well-established rationale, such programs are needed to accelerate the pace of learning for students who already show pronounced academic talent. According to the other, early college enrollment provides an experience designed to increase more (or even *most*) high-school students’ likelihood of attending and completing postsecondary degree programs.

Elaborating on the second of these rationales, the Spellings Commission (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) called for the removal of barriers to student mobility (p. 17) by opening “clearer pathways” among educational levels and institutions,<sup>6</sup> and it specifically “endorsed the expansion of early college or dual-enrollment programs” (p 16). Numerous studies and policy reports also lend credence to the intent of the Commission’s recommendations (Karp, Bailey, Hughes & Fermin, 2005; Kazis, Vargas, & Hoffman, 2004; Kirst & Venezia, 2001; National Commission on the High School Senior Year, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2005; Venezia, Kirst & Antonio, 2003).

---

<sup>5</sup> The circumstances behind the apparent lack of participation in the PSEO from Joint Vocational Schools (see previous discussion) may be an artifact of arrangements with the sending high schools, or some other condition. Either way, the relationship between the Tech Prep path and the PSEO likely deserves further scrutiny, since the JVSs, not the sending high schools, would seemingly be the most logical link to PSEO arrangements responsive to the Tech Prep design.

<sup>6</sup> See also, *Pathways to College Access and Success* (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, 2005).

Hoffman (2005) outlined the primary advantages of dual-enrollment policies:

- time to a college degree may be shortened by as much as two years,
- families can save money,
- students try out the college environment,
- college learning is measured in multiple ways, and
- young people begin college work as full-time students. (p. 5)

In a review prepared for the Education Commission of the States (ECS), Hale (2001, p.1) reported that state policymakers support such policies in order to:

- promote rigorous academics and to provide more educational options,
- save students time and money on a college degree,
- encourage competition from colleges and universities, which then might pressure secondary schools to be more responsive to student and parent needs,
- accelerate student progress towards a degree in order to free up additional space on campus to meet the increased demands for college access by the children of the “baby boomer” generation,
- provide greater academic opportunities for students at small rural schools,
- enable greater collaboration between high school and college faculty,
- increase student aspirations to go to college, and
- build closer ties between colleges and their communities. (p. 1)

### **Benefits and Drawbacks of Early College Programs**

Although education policy analysts discuss benefits and drawbacks of the full variety of early college programs, and substantial funds have sometimes been deployed to propagate them, comparatively little empirical work has examined their efficacy, particularly as a method for working with high-school students who are not exceptionally accomplished. In fact, to argue the merits, advocates of such programs typically cite studies that are only remotely related to early college arrangements. For example, based on such remotely related studies, Bailey and colleagues (2001) argued that early college might logically be expected to increase rates of bachelor’s degree completion. The claim is logically, and not empirically, based. Others recount findings about adolescents’ disengagement from school and the consequences of the “senior slump” (Education Commission of the States, 2001; Kirst, 2001) to justify the arrangement. Again, the logic is evident, but the actual consequences of the arrangement are not. The recent ECHS evaluation (Berger, Adelman, Cole, Evan, Hall, Hersh, et al., 2007) conducted for the Gates Foundation demonstrated that these schools were functioning overall, but the researchers

were unable to address the comparative effectiveness using tested student achievement. Notably, however, the goal of requiring every student to accumulate two years of college credit had proved to be unworkable across the board. Instead, in general, the goal became, perhaps more reasonably in view of the clientele, to help students earn *up to* two years of college credit.<sup>7</sup> Most curiously, perhaps, Berger and colleagues suggested that the conceptual foundation of the ECHS effort (i.e., the mantra was “rigor, relevance, and relationships”) was better honored in the high school classes than in the college classes!<sup>8</sup>

At the same time—and also with little empirical backing—policy analysts identify logical drawbacks of such arrangements. For example, policy documents from the Education Commission of the States (e.g., 2001) discuss the following as potential problems with early college programs:

1. They remove the brightest students from high schools.
2. They divert funding from local districts.
3. They do not always offer high-quality college-level instruction.
4. They may not provide enough support for students who are not sufficiently mature to handle the college experience without assistance.

Perhaps early college options for students other than the most talented have not been in place long enough to enable researchers to evaluate them robustly. Clearly, though, the issues that such programs *seek* to address are difficult and persistent—disengagement from high school, for one, as well as the range of circumstances (economic, cultural, and political) that make higher education most “accessible” to students from comparatively more affluent families (e.g., National Center for Education Statistics, 2001).

---

<sup>7</sup> Julian Stanley, a famed advocate for the acceleration of *mathematically brilliant students*, defined radical acceleration as permitting students to complete 13 years of K-12 schooling in 10 or fewer years (e.g., Stanley, 1976). The expectation of at least two years’ college credit accrued by academically ordinary students would probably have seemed misguided to Stanley.

<sup>8</sup> The ECHS stress on rigor, relevance, and relationships (the 3Rs) indicates a conceptual space rather different from the tradition of libortory learning in higher education, and thus the finding by Berger and colleagues (2007) that the ECHSs did a better job of honoring their own conceptual space is not surprising. Indeed, one might argue that the three vectors of educational purpose (usual compliance purposes of high school practice for impoverished populations, the ECHS “3Rs,” and the tradition of libortory learning so notably advertised by elite colleges and universities) are orthogonal (largely unrelated) to each other. It’s also true the vaunted tradition of liberal learning has struggled to sustain its place in elite schools and to find a foothold elsewhere in American higher education (see, e.g., Anderson, 1993; Aronowitz, 2000; Barrow, 1990; Etzioni, 1970; Karabell, 1998). On the basis of the extant literature, the liberal arts tradition, in fact, seems to be losing ground fast. In sum, the ECHS effort is probably not trying to replicate a contested tradition in American higher education, nor perhaps even to prepare students to embrace a vision of libortory learning. One might speculate that the main point is to give impoverished students access to a credential with better status value than a high school diploma (see Collins, 2002, on credential inflation and the future of universities).

## Rural Locale as a Context for Early College Arrangements

The national debate is relevant to what happens with early college arrangements in rural, Appalachian Ohio because of so-called institutional isomorphism, the tendency of institutions, including states, to mimic each other's policies—tendencies that roll upward to influence the national debate (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). For reasons that will shortly become evident, however, national debates nearly always overlook the antecedents and consequences of policy in particular places (Scott, 1998), including rural places, and most specifically, rural Appalachia.

As will also become apparent, even the state of Ohio and Ohio University experience challenges in seeing and understanding the related needs (Denham, 2005). For local people, the devils plague the details—and *rural* people are consummately *local* (see, e.g., Corbett, 2007; Herzog & Pittman, 1995; Theobald, 1997). In fact, as some authors argue, *rural localism* is a circumstance that applies with unique force to Appalachians (see, e.g., DeYoung, 1995; Duncan, 1999; Eller, 2008; Porter, 1997; Reck, Reck, & Keefe, 1993).

In the contemporary United States proportionally fewer rural students attend college than their urban and suburban counterparts (Jensen, 2006; Provasnik, KewalRamani, Coleman, Gilbertson, Herring, & Xie, 2007), and this generality certainly applies in Appalachian Ohio (Blanco & Prescott, 2007; Crowther, Lykins, & Spohn, 1992; Ohio Board of Regents, 2005; Voinovich School, 2007; Voinovich School, 2008). Various theories are useful in accounting for this apparent influence of locale on college-going rates. Of particular relevance to an analysis of the potential of early college programs for rural and Appalachian youth are theories relating to (1) social capital, (2) status-attainment, and (3) human capital and rational choice. Some familiarity with these theories is required for policy makers and educators who do want to see and understand the related needs. Contrasts among the theories help make sense of college participation and early college arrangements, and the discussion that follows is organized to draw out the relevant connections and contrasts.

### Social Capital, Status Attainment, and College Attendance

“Social capital” can be understood in contrast to traditional capital (tangible fiscal and physical capital) and human capital (knowledge and skills possessed by workers) as *social relationships* that, like traditional capital, have productive value. Two theories of social capital are prominent.

First, in the United States, James Coleman (1987) is one of the originators (see also, Putnam, 2000), and in his version of social capital, the relevant relationships inhere in families, neighborhoods, and communities—where they provide individuals and families a sort of resiliency. Coleman's is a sunny view of social capital. In contrast to fiscal, physical, and human capital, social capital is rather freely accessible to anyone—anyone, that is, who is a member of a functional extended family, neighborhood, or community (e.g., via church membership, participation in civic clubs, and recreational organizations). In the United States, however, many people are not. The Appalachian region is something of an exception in this respect: “familism” (devotion to family) is a feature of the culture long identified by scholars.

Second is the European version, first articulated by Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). In this darker French scheme, the relevant relationships are with the members of one's social class. For instance, managers, professionals, and state functionaries exhibit prized cultural adornments that both mark and reinforce their high status (e.g., knowledge of literature, ownership of expensive cars, the habit of sending children to private schools). Bourdieu would observe that part of what one acquires in college, perhaps the main part, is the right to treat such adornments as one's own in the pursuit of property and influence.

Clearly, both forms are relevant to working-class students confronting the dilemma of participation in higher education. The discussion that follows acknowledges both versions of social capital theory, though it pays more attention to the American version. An older tradition of scholarship is far more familiar to most Americans than either version of social capital theory, but it is related to both of them. This theory is the status-attainment model (Blau & Duncan, 1967). Simply put, it offers statistical accounts of how people become successful.

For this reason, perhaps, this older theory retains dominant appeal and influence. In general this theory and its line of evidence treat higher levels of educational attainment as a policy goal because of the association between more years of schooling and other reputedly positive outcomes, such as higher incomes (e.g., Day & Newburger, 2002), better health (Adams, 2002), and higher occupational status (e.g., McClendon, 1976). The related research identifies predictors of attainment milestones such as enrollment in and graduation from college. In general, the studies show that background characteristics, most notably family income and parents' levels of educational attainment, function as strong predictors of participation in postsecondary education (e.g., Belley & Lochner, 2007).<sup>9</sup>

The American version of social capital theory has nonetheless made contributions that are relevant to rural populations. Some of the status-attainment researchers have taken a particular interest in predictors of college attendance among rural populations, where postsecondary enrollment rates are lower than those in urban and suburban locales. Dyk and Wilson (1999), for example, suggested that the lower college-going rates of rural students could not be accounted for adequately by considering background characteristics alone, but could be accounted for more fully by incorporating social capital into prediction models. Similarly, McGrath, Swisher, Elder, and Conger (2001) found that, all else equal, rural students who were involved in school and community activities were somewhat more likely to attend college than those less involved or uninvolved. Moreover, these and other researchers have found that greater involvement in school activities tends to occur among students whose families have solid roots in their communities either because of their membership in local elites or because of their long-standing engagement in valued community enterprises, such as agriculture (e.g., Duncan, 1999; Howley, Howley, & Howley, 2006). Overall, it seems that social capital helps explain some of the additional contingencies of participation in higher education by members of rural families.

---

<sup>9</sup> Perhaps oddly, then, this traditional American sociology provides more direct support for the "darker" European theory of social capital than it does for the "sunnier" American version.

## Status Attainment, Social Capital, Cultural Values, and College Attendance

One difficulty often identified with the American status-attainment model is that it valorizes a class-based notion of high versus low status, in which the aspirations of the upper-middle class are made to seem legitimate as the best aspirations for everyone (Burnell, 2003; Horvat, Weininger, & Lareau, 2003); in other words, upper-middle class status, legitimated in this way, *should be* the aim for everyone.

The difficulty here is that the aspirations of the upper-middle class actually *are not* the only valid (nor necessarily the best) aspirations,<sup>10</sup> let alone the best for everyone, as many astute observers have argued across the decades (Crawford, 2009; DeYoung, 1995; Goodman, 1962). Indeed different, but also valuable, sets of aspirations *do* exist, in particular among rural people (Bickel, 1989; Burnell, 2003; Herzog & Pittman, 1995; Hostetler & Huntington, 1992; Sher, 1977; Williams, 1958/2001; Woodrum 2004).

Because working-class rural families link college attendance with their children's almost inevitable decision to leave the home community, they often do not encourage, and in some cases discourage, their children's choice of this route to adulthood (Corbett, 2007; DeYoung, 1995; Hostetler & Huntington, 1992; Woodrum, 2004). In the status-attainment model, however, in which upper-middle class status is valorized as best, the circumstance of being born rural and working class is a liability, and hence class origins and locale are understood as deficits in the backgrounds of many rural youth.

A social capital perspective (Coleman, 1988), by contrast, is more likely to understand the rural commitment to place, family, and community as a set of affordances (Gibson, 1977) useful to rural people and productively embedded in their relationships with one another. Some researchers, in fact, *have* examined the cultural values of rural residents—in particular the (positive) values associated with place, family, and community—and they interpret the relationship of these values to college attendance (e.g., McGrath et al., 2001; Falk, 2004; Howley, Harmon, & Leopold, 1996).

This line of inquiry contrasts “cosmopolitan” perspectives on educational and occupational success (class-based notions of the attainment of high status) with “localist” perspectives, suggesting, moreover, that both perspectives operate not only simultaneously in most rural communities, but that the two perspectives are to a certain extent in dialog with one another—that they change and modify one another in rural places. Sorge (2008) described this feature of the rural cultural landscape as follows:

*The terms “localist” and “cosmopolitan” are used ... as categories of analysis for the purpose of discerning social distinctions as they are expressed in social life. The dramatis personae, then, are the localists, whose identity is emphatically*

---

<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, the European version of social capital theory acknowledges this possibility, and by contrast with both the American status-attainment model and the American version of social capital it embeds a strong suspicion with the view that higher education is an unqualified benefit for everyone.

*rural and tied to the locality, and the urban-orientated cosmopolitans, drawn from among the ranks of shopkeepers, tertiary-sector employees, town administrators, professionals, and the university-educated. The former self-consciously embody a rural highland ethos, and the latter an individualist and universalist ethos, each respectively viewing the other with ambiguity. (Sorge, 2008, pp. 808-809)*

Sorge was writing about Sardinia, but in Woodrum's (2004) study of rural Appalachia, professionals and other college-educated residents saw the local community as a place to which their children might or might not choose—as they wished—to return after completing college, as an individual option. Working-class residents, however, worried that children's school success would encourage their permanent separation from the local community and local ways of life.

Nevertheless, rural localists might also see that such efforts as Tech Prep and Ohio's PSEO could give their children access to *local* community colleges and *nearby* four-year colleges and universities and thereby provide a way to reconcile postsecondary study with children's and families' aspirations to sustain homeplace and community. Furthermore, rural localist families might find local community colleges, and even some local four-year colleges (where they exist), to be more welcoming than consolidated public high schools, especially if the consolidated schools treat them as deficient and ungrateful (e.g., Howley et al., 2006) and if local postsecondary institutions value them, and their localist aspirations, as constituting the principal "higher-education market" in which the institution operates. In general, then, the cultural responsiveness of local postsecondary institutions would have predictable rural appeal (whether to localist or cosmopolitan families) based on the general attachment of rural families to place (Corbett, 2007; DeYoung, 1995; Theobald, 1997).

### **Human Capital, Rational Choice, and College Attendance**

As many human capital theorists suggest, individuals' choices in the education marketplace often relate to the earnings associated with particular schooling options. The choices take place, of course, in a dynamic and changeable economy, and so individuals' decision making may also respond to the particular characteristics of the economic opportunity structures that they confront (e.g., Becker, 1967; Kienzl, Alfonso, & Melguizo, 2007; Mincer, 1974). On this basis, another perspective with potential for explaining rural students' choices regarding college attendance (including participation in PSEO or other early college arrangements) focuses on the rational choices that students and families make when they determine whether or not to invest time or money in schooling of various types (e.g., Bickel, 1989; Bickel & Lange, 1995). According to Bickel (1989), for example,

*Students try to make rational judgments about the larger social environment in which they live and in which schooling occurs. Such judgments, undoubtedly, are based on imperfect information, and may often be erroneous. Nevertheless, it is*

*important not to lose sight of the fact that students...do try to respond rationally to their environments. (p. 253)*

Recently, some theorists have also identified potential *risks* to investments in education that students might also be taking into account (or ought logically to take into account) when making choices about investments of their time and money in schooling that is not compelled by the State. Howell, Tung, and Wade-Harper (1996) found that assessment of local employment opportunities exerted measurable influence on the decision making of rural families and youth. More recent research has identified other risks to which prospective college students might also be attentive, including (1) the potential for failure in college classes, (2) the accumulation of insupportable levels of debt, and (3) the flattening of the income structure in certain fields nationally (Hartog, Van Ophem, & Bajdechi, 2007).

Such risks are compounded for rural young people. Rural-localist families, because of their ties to traditional rural occupations (Bickel, 1989; Corbett, 2007; DeYoung, 1995; Sorge, 2008), are more often members of the working class and are less likely than rural-cosmopolitan families to include family members with postsecondary degrees. (Under the ECHS arrangements accessible in urban areas, however, these are exactly the families targeted for recruitment—working-class youth who will be the first in their families to attend college.) The attachment to home and family, however, means that when such *rural* parents and students think about the future value of investment in postsecondary education, their employment market is local. A rational assessment of costs, benefits, and risks can easily lead students and families to rule out postsecondary participation (Bickel, 1989). Again, a postsecondary connection that cultivated localist commitments and post-graduation local employment options would likely appeal to working-class, localist rural families. This outlook may come much more naturally to community colleges than to either four-year colleges or large and mid-size universities that offer four-year undergraduate programs (see, e.g., Hlavna, 1992; Kienzl et al., 2007).

### **Two Alternatives for Thinking about the Rural and the Local**

Two alternatives seem relevant to this circumstance. First, and most common, are attempts to change the cultures of rural-localist families. Despite the fact that engineered cultural change is enormously difficult and usually unsuccessful (Scott, 1998), social and economic progress is argued already to have made rural ways of living obsolete (Corbett, 2007; DeYoung, 1995; Whisnant, 1980) and rural-localist families are thus, on the terms of the national debate, seen as misguidedly clinging to outmoded, and irrelevant, ways of being. Attempts to lead children from rural-localist families toward “higher aspirations” (i.e., attempts to supplant devotion to family and place with devotion to career and status) are, in this alternative, seen as charitable and even liberating (Beaulieu & Mulkey, 1995). In short, some children from rural-localist families can be “saved” from their own culture; perhaps many. This approach bases its outlook in the status-attainment model’s valorization of upper-middle class status as best, and in a cosmopolitan version of human capital theory: Rational choice, in this cosmopolitan version of human capital theory, *necessitates metropolitan residence*.

A second response (see, e.g., Burnell, 2003; Hektner, 1995; Howley et al., 1996) requires institutional thinking to doubt the shibboleths of the status-attainment model (higher educational attainment is always better for individuals) and to valorize rural aspirations for family and place. For universities, whose intellectual mission is universalist and cosmopolitan (Altbach, Gumport, & Johnstone, 2001; Aronowitz, 2000; Karabell, 1998) and even corporate (Barrow, 1990; Gilde, 2007), such a change in thinking must be difficult. Community colleges already go some distance to this end, however. But they also occupy an ambiguous position between the cosmopolitan intentions and values of the university systems to which they belong and their localist connections (e.g., offering programs that provide the initial courses in baccalaureate programs located at “the main campus”). In any case, instead of working to promote unpromising and difficult cultural change, the full range of postsecondary institutions—and not only community colleges—might develop programs responsive to rural aspirations for family and place.

This more localist response also entails finding meaningful ways to engage local community development (Galston & Baehler, 1995; Kienzl et al., 2007; Stauber, 2001), an entailment made all the more challenging for the fact that rural communities in many locales exist under extreme economic and social threat. Indeed, some rural sites (e.g., coal mines and their residential annexes) were established in the first place by remote cosmopolitan concerns specifically as sites of economic exploitation to serve national and international economic development, not local development, much less community development per se (DeYoung, 1995; Duncan, 1999; Eller, 2008; Gaventa, 1980). Further, although agrarian communities have been a traditional source of rural strength, mechanization and the proliferation of chemical fertilizers and pest-control products have created an efficient system of food production in which local farmers and farm-related businesses play an increasingly marginal role (Berry, 1977; Glass, 2007; Lyson, Torres, & Welsh, 2001; Strange, 2008; Theobald, 2009). Towns with more entrepreneurial leadership, with legacies of a formerly or still active petty-bourgeois middle class, and with more egalitarian income distributions are often said to fare better than other towns (Carr & Kefalas, 2009; DeYoung, 1995; Howley & Harmon, 2001; Rosenfeld, 1984; Sher, 1977).

Apparently, much remains to be done, and rurally located institutions of higher education might establish and evolve degree programs that address local, rather than cosmopolitan or national or global desiderata. Until this phenomenon develops on a much wider basis, however, rural youth will remain less likely to participate in higher education, including “early college” options. Of course, another possibility is that rural populations, cultures, and communities actually will disappear from the face of the earth. Disparate observers (Kunstler, 2006; Orr, 1995; Theobald, 2008) regard that possibility as a cosmopolitan illusion. Theobald (2009) points out that humans cannot exist hungry, and for this reason he claims that rural places are the fundamental anchor of human existence.

The biggest impediment to the emergence of relevant local programs in rural places, however, is arguably not material, but ideological: the frequent misconstruction of rural ways of living as simultaneously nostalgic and ignorant (Herzog & Pittman, 1995). Rural places remain widely

viewed not only as passé, but *as* the past itself—a region of quaint cultural existence to be sure, but in fact one that lacks any proper future without direction from the metropolis and the cosmopolis—“globalization” directed from world-class cities and transnational firms (see Bauman, 1998, and Sassen, 1996, for analyses of local existence under the processes of globalization; and Bageant, 2007; Biggers, 2006; and Goad, 1997 for specifically Appalachian critiques of cosmopolitan blindness).

### **Early College: What Makes Sense in Appalachian Ohio?<sup>11</sup>**

Addressing this question requires three assessments. First, with what baggage do universities and colleges (including community colleges) come to this effort? Second, with what legitimate concerns do rural people—Appalachian Ohio families—approach participation in postsecondary schooling? Third, what does an understanding of the recent ECHS phenomenon disclose about early college efforts for ordinary students in Appalachian Ohio? Discussion turns first, then, to making sense of the university.

#### **Making Sense of the University**

Circumstances present colleges and universities in Appalachian Ohio with a sharp dilemma with respect to early college for ordinary students. On the one hand, Appalachian families are quite likely to be rural and to embody rural-localist aspirations of home, family, place, and community (Denham, 2005; DeYoung, 1995; Eller, 1994, 2008; Reck, Reck, & Keefe, 1993). On the other hand, universities and liberal arts colleges promote cultural agendas that are cosmopolitan, universalist, and corporate (Altbach, Gumport, & Johnstone, 2001; Aronowitz, 2000; Barrow, 1990; Gilde, 2007; Karabell, 1998). Even community colleges, more locally attentive by design, are heir to this dilemma because the assumptions of human-capital theory predominate in those institutions as well as in the rest of higher education (e.g., Goho & Blackman, 2004; Hlavna, 1992), and also because community colleges, despite a characteristically vocational mission, articulate many of their offerings with conventional university baccalaureate and master’s programs conducted on the cosmopolitan and universalist platform. Universities, after all, are institutions with a global and even universal mission, pursuing knowledge and truth, but also striving thereby to exercise national and international power and influence (e.g., Barrow, 1990; Birnbaum, 1993; Gaffkin & Perry, 2009).

Because of universities’ poor history of dealing with rural localist-families, the term “first-generation” may to some extent embed the view that such students come from families that are deficient (e.g., Crowther et al., 1992). Deficit views of the poor—both urban and rural—pervade

---

<sup>11</sup> This section considers early college provision for ordinary students and not for exceptionally talented students. Clearly the authors believe that a much larger proportion of exceptionally talented students should begin full-time, on-campus college work early—after about 10 years of K-12 schooling (see Stanley, 1976). Given the coincidence of comparative affluence and academic talent, this provision is organizational *easy* to engineer—despite the fact that it has not yet been engineered widely or well. This persistent failing baffles the authors, who have struggled with it for a long time. The provision of early college to ordinary rural students, therefore, is a far greater challenge.

the discourse about K-12 schooling (Osei-Kofi, 2005), so their evidence in discourse about higher education is hardly surprising. It makes sense that universities would find little benefit in cultivating the poor either as a promising pool of talent, a likely source of power and influence, or a source of revenue. The poor are thought to be deficient precisely because they harbor so little promise of this sort.

But does any evidence suggest that universities actually do distance themselves from a surrounding impoverished population? Denham (2005) reports the dilemma evident to members of one large university in Appalachian Ohio:

*Many respondents made comments that suggest a paradox associated with a large, privileged university in a poor county. [The university] appears to be perceived by many respondents as a unified and insensitive whole that exists in the midst of local residents, but neither sees nor understands the needs of those living in the region. (p. 9)*

Such non-responsiveness, however, is certainly not peculiar to the university in Denham's study. Indeed, this non-responsiveness is linked to a rhetoric of power and influence with which all universities are bombarded (e.g., Blanco & Prescott, 2007)—rhetoric based on nationally and internationally oriented economic models of education production (i.e., human-capital and status-attainment theories), which increasingly hector reform in both higher education and K-12 schooling (see, e.g., Aronowitz, 2000; Gaffkin & Perry, 2009; Orr, 1995; Theobald, 2009).

A serious contributing difficulty is that the governing theories—as *economic* theories—are famously and perhaps tragically blind to *cultural* and *social* issues (e.g., Bruner, 1996; DeYoung, 1989; Theobald, 2009). Why tragic? As explained by astute writers for a very long time and from a wide variety of disciplinary outlooks, cultural issues are those that constitute the root substance of all education, localist and universalist, formal and informal (e.g., Barzun, 1989; Berry, 1977; Bruner, 1996; Counts, 1930; DeYoung, 1989; Gramsci, 1971; Hofstede, 2001; Peshkin, 1978; Spring, 1994; Theobald, 2009; Williams, 1958/2001).

Additionally, and for a thousand years, universities have dealt primarily with “high” (i.e., universal, cosmopolitan, or elite) culture—as embodied in the disciplinary aspirations of the arts, humanities, and natural sciences housed most notably within their own walls. The distance from everyday life is both intentional and, to some extent, necessary (i.e., theory is itself an act of distance-taking, see Arendt, 1958). Thus, rural-localist aspirations are understandably difficult for universities and colleges to engage in general, the trenchant observations of rural visionaries aside (e.g., Theobald, 2009; Williams, 1958/2001).

Rural-localist aspirations, by marked contrast, are embodied in the “low” culture of everyday concerns studied, for instance, by anthropologists. Occasionally, scholars do appear who can demonstrate the unity of high and low culture (e.g., Berry, 1977; Thompson, 2002; Theobald, 1997; Williams, 1958/2001), but, as the Denham report perhaps suggests (Denham, 2005), the

two versions of culture are often regarded, within universities themselves, as unconnected or even hostile to one another.

The Welsh literary critic Raymond Williams famously observed, for instance, that “[all] culture is ordinary” (Williams, 1958/2001, p. 11). He wrote in the essay of that title:

*When I now read a book such as Clive Bell’s Civilization, I experience not so much disagreement as stupor. What kind of life can it be, I wonder, to produce this extraordinary fussiness, this extraordinary decision to call certain things culture and then separate them, as with a park wall, from ordinary people and ordinary work? (p. 12)*

Wendell Berry, Raymond Williams, Pat Thompson, and Paul Theobald (among many others) have understood that what is meaningful, useful, and beautiful is hardly restricted to the artifacts of high-culture, or to the intellectual disciplines of the university. These thinkers argue that academics (at all levels of the educational system) need to recognize far more widely such features in everyday life. Academics who already share the insights of these thinkers—and they perhaps constitute an identifiable minority on many rural campuses—are arguably in a much better position than many of their colleagues to engage rural-localists in university participation.

### **Making Sense of College Attendance in Rural Appalachia**

Appalachian students should, can, and do attend college—and they have since colleges and universities were established here. At the same time, the postsecondary institutions located in Appalachia (like the K-12 schools in Appalachia) can do much more to understand, engage, honor, and *sustain* the rural-localist aspirations evident in the region.

What might a responsive university do?

Two alternatives come to mind. One would be to adopt the approach that universities enrolling substantial minority populations use: institute culturally responsive support mechanisms in order to make enrollment more attractive and student retention after enrollment more likely (e.g., Braxton & Mundy, 2002; Tucker, 1999). In general, such tactics respond to, and challenge, universities’ typical inability to include working-class, black, or Chicano students in university life. Such tactics, however, would not by themselves accommodate rural-localist aspirations for home, family, place, and community evident in Appalachian Ohio.

Over recent decades, however, one might observe that some institutions have also sustained Black or Latino Studies programs at the same time they have tried more actively to welcome “diverse” students. This familiar development entails changes in the content of instruction and not only in the processes of instruction to help students adapt to the university “environment.”

In the case of Appalachian students, this more promising alternative would construct pathways to degrees that visibly honor and sustain localist aspirations. Intellectually challenging programs

that do so are a genuine possibility because substantial and relevant literatures exist in many established fields (e.g., literature, sociology, political science, history, fine arts, music), serving easily as a basis for an Appalachian studies program (see Denham, 2005, for consideration of such a proposal).

Conceptually, though, the challenge in pursuing this alternative (that is, the alternative of honoring and sustaining rural-localist commitments) will consist of embracing the position that rural Appalachian people have the *right*, and even in some sense the *obligation*, to remain local and to work for the benefit of their *local* communities—rather than for the benefit of the state or national economy, or for transnational interests struggling for global economic dominion. Such rights and obligations are nearly impossible for educators to see (DeYoung, 1995; Theobald, 1997, 2009) because the assertion of such rights and obligations so completely violates the human-capital and status-attainment assumptions that now dominate conventional thinking about schooling at all levels.

Universities, of course, would not undertake such development in a radically oppositional mode, but simply with eyes open sufficiently wide “to see and understand the needs of those living in the region” (Denham, 2005, p. 9). It would be exciting work, and with the supports of the first alternative in place (making campus more friendly to rural-localists), would be predictably successful. These are indeed interesting issues to confront for a university or community college located anywhere *rural*.

### **Making Sense of “Early College”**

From the perspective of research about acceleration, the advent of early college high schools was a remarkable, even transgressive phenomenon. How so? First, it violated the precepts from a long and strong research base: Acceleration had been scientifically determined to be very effective for *gifted* students, but its use had hardly been imagined for anyone else.<sup>12</sup> The terrible irony in this literature, however, has been that this famously effective arrangement was and remains seldom used with those for whom it exhibits proven, strong benefits. Essentially, a wealthy foundation engineered and propagated a new institutional form (“early college high schools”) centered on use of a repudiated strategy with a population for whom no one would have otherwise deemed it suitable.

Second, ECHSs combine in a single site the compliance culture of K-12 schooling and the libertory culture of higher education. The combination is sharp and perhaps intentional since the goal is to help average but somehow promising youth in big-city systems retrieve their birthrights as curious and independently learning minds. The stretch is, under the circumstances, huge. The advantage for ECHSs, however, is that the most successful of them appear to benefit from being located on postsecondary campuses. The contrast between college and high school is

---

<sup>12</sup> Except perhaps by Henry Levin in this “accelerated schools” project, which has since been shown not actually to accelerate student learning.

real for ECHS students in a way that it cannot be for most American students. This second transgression is even more astonishing than the first.

Working from the human-capital assumption, the Gates Foundation propagated “early college high schools” to accelerate the learning of urban poor or minority youth ill-served by gigantic and too often dysfunctional public school systems. Leveraging a variety of funding sources from a variety of partners, and a few willing higher-education institutions, the Foundation created over 100 such schools (each enrolling several hundred students). It seems like very good work to many observers (e.g., Lewin, 2010).

The ECHS experiment shows some evident success in urban locales—where the schools at least produce graduates and continue to exist—but nationwide, rurally located ECHSs are apparently very rare, if they exist at all. It seems that organizers believe that ECHSs require a coincidence of resources much more probable in cities and suburbs. Or perhaps organizers believe that educational circumstances in the countryside are less desperate than in cities.

The authors (one of whom has been involved in ECHS evaluations) tend to view the founding of ECHSs as acts of desperate courage undertaken in face of the failure of some huge urban public school districts to provide decent schooling to poor and minority youngsters and their families. It seems a worthy effort, but not one that has been ultimately attentive to, deemed appropriate for, or even considered possible in rural places. One cannot, however, see why not, when in some rural places, including rural Appalachian Ohio, viable higher-education partners certainly exist. An early college formulated on rural-localist commitments, however, would be a conceptual stretch for cosmopolitan institutions located rurally but not imagining themselves of the locality (see, e.g., Denham, 2005).

“Early college,” by contrast, in the sense of the PSEO policy, *is* far more consistent with the understandings of the research base so valiantly ignored by Gates and their collaborators. And the data in the Appendix also demonstrate that the option is exercised unevenly in rural Appalachian school districts (from a low of 0% to a high of 25% annual participation rate). The present authors, moreover, have little doubt that early college should be much more frequently experienced by students in these schools; an average 5 or 10 percent participation rate should be possible for every district.

The substantial difficulty, though, is political and not educational: The State removes student funding from low-wealth Appalachian districts and redirects it to postsecondary institutions when students exercise the option. Students are reportedly discouraged from exercising the option in many low-wealth districts, and no wonder. Under such circumstances, low-wealth districts in particular would be logically expected to deploy various strategies to stem the loss. Of the districts within commuting distance of Ohio University, for instance, the poorest, Trimble Local, reported no PSEO students in 2006-2007, and low-wealth Nelsonville-York and Federal Hocking Locals each reported less than one-quarter of one percent of students as participating in the PSEO. Only Athens City Schools sent an almost average proportion (3.7%). Cumulatively across Appalachian Ohio, however, the difference in PSEO experience is not dramatically

different. Approximately 6% of 2006 high school *graduates* in Ohio's Appalachian districts had taken at least one dual-enrollment (PSEO) course while in high school, as compared to slightly more than 8% of high school graduates in Ohio's non-Appalachian districts (Voinovich School, 2007). Interestingly, for the Tech Prep program, approximately 14% of Appalachian Ohio graduates had participated, as compared to 13% of non-Appalachian Ohio graduates. Perhaps families find the Tech Prep option more appealing, or perhaps Tech Prep does not face the policy difficulties that confront the PSEO (again, further study of Tech Prep and participation in PSEO seems needed).

With respect to *early college participation of ordinary Appalachian students*, however, considerably more would be logically anticipated than has yet been realized. Universities might, for instance, adopt some of the programming more characteristic of community colleges—for instance offering early coursework that would transfer to community colleges that offer complete vocational and technical programs (and thus inaugurating an uncharacteristic flow of students from the main to outlying campuses). An Appalachian university might establish a residential ECHS to enable participation of willing students and families from a wide geographic region. The difficulties of such possibilities, of course, are legion, and particularly daunting in a time of fiscal emergency. A virtual ECHS might be established for rural Appalachian Ohio, building on data from evaluations and research about extant urban ECHSs and extant virtual schools. Such options are expensive—and ordinary Appalachian families are sources of neither revenue nor political power.

## Recommendations

Because this paper delivers a practical critique of ideas about “early college,” it has the responsibility to suggest courses of action relevant to families in largely rural Appalachian Ohio. The authors therefore provide recommendations, and readers are invited to consider them as they continue to think about the purposes of education and the needs of Appalachian families and communities.

In general, the statewide recommendations in Blanco and Prescott's (2007) report on dual enrollment seem prudent and appropriate. PSEO, as those authors note, is only a *policy* and its provisions do not rise to the level of a *program* because so little support has been provided to families and students, and little or no guidance and engagement undertaken with colleges and school districts. The policy sanctions possibilities, but does comparatively little to help realize them well or equitably. It appeared to Blanco and Prescott, indeed, that the program short-changes both K-12 districts and the “receiving” postsecondary institutions. Much of what Blanco and Prescott suggest would probably benefit the Appalachian region.

Specific recommendations for improvement of the “early college” approach in Appalachian Ohio, however, are unique to this paper, and they are offered with an uncommon, but nonetheless, partial understanding of rural-localist commitments in view. The recommendations

are directed to professional stakeholders only: state policymakers, school-district leaders, and leaders in postsecondary institutions.

### **State policymakers should...**

1. work to make local schooling more responsive to commitments to home, family, place, and community
2. create a comprehensive early college *program* that responds to the full range of circumstances prevailing in urban, suburban, and rural locales throughout the state (see Blanco & Prescott, 2007);
3. work harder to sustain and further develop early college efforts, since evident lack of concern (Blanco & Prescott, 2007) is short-sighted even according to the assumptions of human-capital theory;
4. insist that students in low-wealth districts have the same access to “early college” options that students in high-wealth districts do—in recognition of how reductions in funding associated with PSEO participation disproportionately penalize low-wealth districts; and
5. honor the contributions of schooling to local community development as at least as important as contributions to the national economy.

### **Appalachian school-district leaders should...**

1. influence policymakers, perhaps through their professional organizations, to address the forgoing recommendations;
2. emphasize more strongly the contributions of schooling, both K-12 and postsecondary, to sustaining local families and communities;
3. talk with working-class Appalachians to understand in greater detail the significance of what this paper calls “rural-localist commitments,” an educational domain often ignored by policy makers and even by many educators; and
4. work with postsecondary institutions to create college programming for students that explicitly aims to benefit local communities and working-class families instead of exporting local students to distant cities and states.

### **Leaders in postsecondary institutions located in Appalachia should...**

1. collaborate with K-12 educators to lobby for the recommendations given above to policy makers;
2. study “rural-localist commitments” in a twin effort to understand them and respond to them;

3. conceptualize schooling in Appalachian Ohio as a grow-your-own mission and not as a pathway for migration of skilled youth out of Appalachia;
4. anticipate the likely value of vocational, technical, and two-year programming as a postsecondary option of local importance and initiate—even in universities—a wider range of dual-enrollment options related to trades (comparatively few such options exist within universities across the region);
5. initiate planning to establish several brick-and-mortar early college high schools on several campuses (regional, community-college, or main university) across the region;
6. initiate planning to establish an Appalachian consortium to offer online dual-enrollment college classes to rural students who demonstrate dispositions and academic readiness to complete such offerings successfully; and, finally,
7. understand and act on the fact that about 25% of high school students in each of the 127 Appalachian districts already exhibits the capacity to earn at least some dual credit at local postsecondary institutions.

### **A Highlighted Recommendation**

Ways need to be found for rural students to experience the actual, on-campus, higher-education environment. This recommendation—simply enough stated—deserves to be highlighted on its own because of the NCES finding (Wright & Bogotch, 2006) that nearly 80% of early college courses are seemingly taking place in high schools. This is a disturbing finding, in light of the most legitimate purpose of an early college experience: to bridge the gap in intellectual cultures between K-12 and higher education. Americans seem to find it particularly difficult to acknowledge the existence of “intellectual culture” or “intellectual purpose,” and, on such a view, it is no wonder that so much *early college experience* involves so little experience of college.

### **A Recommendation Not Made**

Other than the preceding endorsement of the ECHS concept (a high school on a college campus with the aim of acceleration for average but somehow promising students), the extension of PSEO to all students without qualification seems to the authors of this report unwise. Far more students in rural Appalachian Ohio have the capacity to exercise the PSEO pathway than is now the case, but not every, or even most, high school students. In any district, 25% is probably a high upper limit, based simply on James Conant’s classic, and generous, concern for students ranked in the upper quartile in academic aptitude (Conant, 1959). The under-use of acceleration as a strategy for the top 3% in academic aptitude (academically talented youth) shows, however, the persistent historical challenge the PSEO confronts almost everywhere in reaching this level of use (and warrants the goal in the forgoing recommendations).

## Caveats and Regrets

Recommendations like these are always tentative, precisely because they cannot anticipate the myriad devils in the many details. More important than the specifically suggested actions, then, is the big picture behind them.

The big picture should be clear and simple by now: The discussion of postsecondary participation turns on a utilitarian discourse that nearly always puts global competition and national welfare ahead of local welfare, and nearly always is willing to sacrifice rural commitments to that mission. In order to serve families in Appalachian Ohio well, different understandings—and different priorities—must be articulated and work on them begun, however unprepared some colleges and universities may seem to be.

One important issue remains: Is “early college” the best answer to the question, “How should postsecondary enrollment be increased in rural Appalachian Ohio?” Early College High Schools (ECHSs) are a seemingly good and workable answer in some urban systems. But does such an answer even pertain in rural Appalachian Ohio, where districts, though equally impoverished as their urban cousins, are so much smaller and so much less encumbered with bureaucratic layers separating real families from actual teachers and administrators?

Our best judgment is that the question here in rural Appalachian Ohio is different: “What can be done to foster all sorts of locally useful talent and support the subsequent local use of that developed talent?” With respect to Appalachia in general and Appalachian Ohio in particular, the default position in higher education, especially in four-year programs, is that students learn to view the world as their oyster in order to abandon such supposedly blighted places as Appalachia. For that reason, and because of that question, this paper argues that postsecondary institutions in Appalachia need to do a much, much better job of listening carefully to the rural-localist position—so they can understand it and embrace it. The authors’ long experience in rural education and in rural Appalachian communities suggests that Appalachian families are extremely reluctant to see their children leave the region and would welcome the efforts of postsecondary institutions to help develop alternatives to outmigration that prepare their children to thrive locally.

---

## REFERENCES

Adams, H. (1918). *The education of Henry Adams* (Vol. 1931). New York: Random House (Retrieved May 31, 2006, from <http://www.bartleby.com/159/5.html>).

Adams, S.J. (2002). Educational attainment and health: Evidence from a sample of older adults. *Education Economics*, 10(1), 97-109.

- Altbach, P., Gumport, P., & Johnstone, D. (2001). *In defense of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Anderson, C. (1993). *Prescribing the life of the mind*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Andrews, H. (2000). Lessons learned from current state and national dual-credit programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 111, 31-38.
- Arendt, H. (1959). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Ashburn, E. (2007, October 17). High-school students are helped by taking college courses, study finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Bageant, J. (2007). *Deer hunting with Jesus: Dispatches from America's class war*. New York: Crown.
- Bailey, T., Hughes, K., & Karp, M. (2002). What role can dual-enrollment programs play in easing the transition between high school and postsecondary education? *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 24, 18-29.
- Bailey, T., Hughes, K., & Karp, M. (2003). Dual enrollment programs: Erasing transitions from high school to college. *Community College Research Center Brief*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Bailey, T. & Karp, M. (2005). Expanding the reach of dual-enrollment programs. *Community College Journal*, 75, 8-11.
- Bailey, T. & Karp, M. (2004). *State dual-enrollment policies: Addressing access and quality*. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, Community College Research Center.
- Barrow, C.W. (1990). *Universities and the capitalist state: Corporate liberalism and the reconstruction of American higher education, 1894-1928*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barzun, J. (1989). *The culture we deserve* (Vol. 1). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beaulieu, L., & Mulkey, W. (1995). *Investing in people: The human capital needs of rural America*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Berger, A., Adelman, N., Cole, S., Evan, A., Hall, C., Hersh, L., Keating, K., et al. (2007). *Evaluation of the early college high school initiative: Select topics on implementation*. Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.earlycolleges.org/publications.html#evaluations>
- Becker, G. (1967). *Human capital and the personal distribution of income: An analytical approach*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Belley, P., & Lochner, L. (2007). The changing role of family income and ability in determining educational achievement. *Journal of Human Capital*, 1(1), 37-89.
- Berry, W. (1977). *The unsettling of America: Culture & agriculture*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Bestor, A.E. (1953). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bickel, R. (1989). Opportunity and high school completion. *Urban Review*, 21(4), 251-261.
- Bickel, R., & Lange, L. (1995). Opportunities, costs, and high school completion in West Virginia: A replication of Florida research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88(6), 363-370.
- Biggers, J. (2006). *The United States of Appalachia: How southern mountaineers brought independence, culture, and enlightenment to America*. San Francisco and New York: Avalon Publishing Group.
- Birnbaum, N. (1993). *Searching for the light: Essays on thought and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blanco, C. (2006). *Accelerated learning options: Moving the needle on access and success: A study of state and institutional policies and practices*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Policy Analysis and Research Unit.
- Blanco, C., & Prescott, B. (2007). *The promise of dual enrollment: Assessing Ohio's early college access policy*. Cincinnati, OH: KnowledgeWorks Foundation.
- Blau, P., & Duncan, O. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Boughton, R.W. (1987). *The Minnesota 11th and 12th grade post-secondary enrollment options program: Is it changing the traditional structure of secondary and post-secondary schools?* Jefferson City, MO: Council of North Central Community and Junior Colleges. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED282600)
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Braxton, J. M., & Mundy, M. E. (2002). Powerful institutional levers to reduce college student departure. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 3(1), 91-118.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burnell, B. (2003). The real-world aspirations of work-bound rural students. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 18(2), 104-113.
- Callahan, C.M. (2003). *Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs for talented students in American high schools: A focus on science and mathematics*. Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED505457)
- Carr, P., & Kefalas, M. (2009). *Hollowing out the middle: The rural brain drain and what it means for America*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Coleman, J. S. (1987). Social capital and the development of youth. *Momentum*, 18(4), 6-8.
- Collins, R. (2002). Credential inflation and the future of universities. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 23-46). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Conant, J. (1959). *The American high school today*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crowther, T., Lykins, C., & Spohn, K. (1992). *Appalachian access and success: A research Project of the Ohio Board of Regents and a consortium of two-and four-year colleges and universities in Appalachian Ohio*. Athens and Portsmouth, OH: Institute for Local Government Administration and Rural Development, Ohio University; and Appalachian Access and Success Project, Shawnee State University.
- Counts, G. (1930). *The American road to culture: A social interpretation of education in the United States*. New York: The John Day Company.
- Corbett, M. (2007). *Learning to leave: The irony of schooling in a coastal community*. Black Point, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Crawford, M. (2009). *Shop class as soulcraft: An inquiry into the value of work*. New York: Penguin.
- Day, J.C., & Newburger, E.C. (2002). *The big payoff: Educational attainment and synthetic estimates of work-life earnings* (Special Population Reports). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf>
- Denham, S. (2005). *Voices at Ohio University speak about Appalachia: Executive report*. Athens, OH: Appalachian Faculty Learning Community. Retrieved from <http://www.ohio.edu/appalachia/pdfs/ExecutiveReport.pdf>

- DeYoung, A. (1995). *The life and death of a rural American high school: Farewell, Little Kanawha*. New York: Garland.
- DeYoung, A. (1989). *Economics and American education: A historical and critical overview of the impact of the economic theories on schooling in the United States*. New York: Longman.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Duncan, C. (1999). *Worlds apart: Why poverty persists in rural America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dyk, P. H., & Wilson, S. M. (1999). Family based social capital consideration as predictors of attainment among Appalachian youth. *Sociological Inquiry*, 69, 477-503.
- Early College High School Initiative. (2010). *Schools* [Webpage]. Boston: Jobs for the Future. Retrieved from <http://www.earlycolleges.org/schools.html#Ohio>
- Education Commission of the States. (2001). *Postsecondary options: Dual/concurrent enrollment* (State Notes). Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.ecs.org>.
- Eller, R. (2008). *Uneven ground: Appalachia since 1945*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Eller, R. (1994). *Place and the recovery of community in Appalachia*. Charlottesville, VA: Virginia Foundation for the Humanities and Public Policy. Retrieved from <http://freepages.family.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~adelr/feb95/feb95p19.htm>
- Etzioni, A. (1970). Towards higher education in an active society: Three policy guidelines. New York: Center for Policy Research, Columbia University. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED047618)
- Falk, W.W. (2004). *Rooted in place: Family and belonging in a Southern black community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gaffkin, F., & Perry, D. C. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The US research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), 115-144.
- Galston, W., & Baehler, K. (1995). *Rural development in the United States: Connecting theory, practice, and possibilities*. Washington D.C.: Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Gaventa, J. (1980). *Power and powerlessness: Quiescence and rebellion in an Appalachian valley*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Gibson, J. (1977). The theory of affordances. In *Perceiving, acting, and knowing: Toward an ecological psychology* (pp. 67-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gilde, C. (2007). *Higher education: Open for business*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Glass, G. (2007). *Fertilizers, pills, and magnetic strips: The fate of public education in America*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Goad, J. (1997). *The redneck manifesto: How hillbillies, hicks, and white trash became America's scapegoats*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Goho, J., & Blackman, A. (2004). Employment outcomes of Community College Equity Group graduates. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 12(1), 17-32.
- Goldberger, N. (1980). Simon's Rock: Meeting the developmental needs of the early college student. *New Directions for Higher Education*, [No Volume/Issue], 37-46.
- Goodman, P. (1962). *Compulsory miseducation*. New York: Horizon Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. (Q. Hoare & G.N. Smith, trans.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hartog, J., Van Ophem, H., & Bajdechi, S. M. (2007). Simulating the risk of investment in human capital. *Education Economics*, 15(3), 259-275.
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Hektner, J. (1995). When moving up implies moving out: Rural adolescent conflict in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 11(1), 3-14.
- Herzog, M., & Pittman, R. (1995). Home, family, and community: Ingredients in the rural education equation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(2), 13-18.
- Hlavna, D. P. (1992). Economic development, human capital theory and the community college. *Community College Review*, 19(4), 47-51.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hostetler, J.A., & Huntington, G.E. (1992). *Amish children: Education in the family, school, and community*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hoffman, N. (2005). *Add and subtract: Dual enrollment as a state strategy to increase postsecondary success for underrepresented students*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future. Retrieved from <http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/Addsubtract.pdf>
- Hoffman, N., & Vargas, J. (2005). *Integrating grades 9 through 14: State policies to support and sustain early college high schools*. Boston: Jobs for the Future.

- Horvat, E., Weininger, E., & Lareau, A. (2003). From social ties to social capital: Class differences in the relations between schools and parent networks. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), 319-351.
- Howell, F., Tung, Y., & Wade-Harper, C. (1996). *The social cost of growing up in rural America: Rural development and social change during the twentieth century* (Social Research Report Series 96-5). Mississippi State, MS: Mississippi State University. Retrieved from the ERIC database. (ED415057)
- Howley, A. (1986). Gifted education and the specter of elitism. (1986). *Journal of Education*, 168(1) 117-125.
- Howley, A., Howley, C., & Pendarvis, E. (1986). *Teaching gifted children: Principles and strategies*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Howley, C., & Harmon, H. (2001). *Small high schools that flourish: Rural context, case studies, and resources*. Charleston, WV: AEL, Inc. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED447997)
- Howley, C., Harmon, H., & Leopold, G. (1996). Rural scholars or bright rednecks? Aspirations for a sense of place among rural youth in Appalachia. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 12(3), 150–160.
- Howley, C., & Howley, A. (1987, November). *Skipping high school: Means and ends*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for Gifted Children, New Orleans, LA.
- Howley, C., Howley, A., Howley, M., & Howley, C.W. (2006, April). *Saving the children of the poor in rural schools.*” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED495031)
- Howley, C., Howley, A., & Pendarvis, E. (1995). *Out of our minds: Anti-intellectualism and talent development in American schooling*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Howley, C., & Howley, A. (2002). A personal record: Is acceleration worth the effort? *Roeper Review*, 24, 158-160.
- Jensen, L. (2006). At the razor's edge: Building hope for America's rural poor. *Rural Realities*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Johnstone, D. & Del Genio, B. (2001). *College-level learning in high school: Purposes, policies, and practical implications*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lieberman, J. (2004). *The early college concept: Requisites for success*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

- Karabell, Z. (1998). *What's college for? The struggle to define American higher education*. Scranton, PA: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Karp, M., Bailey, T., Hughes, K., & Fermin, B. (2005, April 26). State dual enrollment policies: Addressing access and quality. *Community College Research Center Brief*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- Kazis, R., Vargas, J., & Hoffman, N. (2004). *Double the numbers: Increasing postsecondary credentials for underrepresented youth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Kienzl, G.S., Alfonso, M., & Melguizo, T. (2007). *The effect of local labor market conditions in the 1990s on the likelihood of community college students' persistence and attainment*. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(7), 751-774.
- Kirst, M. (2001). *Overcoming the high school senior slump: New education policies*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.ecs.org>.
- Kirst, M. & Venezia, A. (2001). *Overcoming the high school senior slump*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Higher Education and Public Policy.
- Lewin, T. (2010, February 7). For students at risk, early college proves a draw. *New York Times*, p. A14. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/08/education/08school.html>
- Lyson, T., Torres, R., & Welsh, R. (2001). Scale of agricultural production, civic engagement, and community welfare. *Social Forces*, 80(1), 311-327.
- McClendon, M.J (1976). The occupational status attainment processes of males and females. *American Sociological Review*, 41(1), 52-64.
- Middle College National Consortium, (2010a). *About MCNC* [Webpage]. New York: Middle School National Consortiums. Retrieved from <http://www.mcnc.us/aboutus.htm>
- Middle College National Consortium, (2010b). *Middle School National Consortium* [Website homepage]. New York: Middle School National Consortiums. Retrieved from <http://www.mcnc.us/>
- McKnight, E., & Vargas, J. (2006). *Smoothing the path: Changing state policies to support early college high school: Case studies from Georgia, Ohio, Texas, and Utah*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, experience and earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- National Commission on the High School Senior Year. (2001). *Raising Our Sights: No High school senior left behind*. Princeton, N.J: The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

- Office of the Governor of Ohio (2008, February 6). *Governor Strickland proposes major jobs plan in 2008 state of the state address* [Press Release]. Retrieved from: <http://governor.ohio.gov>
- Ohio Board of Regents (2005). *Making the Transition from High School to College in Ohio 2005: A Statewide Perspective*. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Okoben, J. (2008, February 29). Seniors to sophomores offers free college credit. *The Plain Dealer*. Retrieved February 29, 2008, from <http://www.cleveland.com/>
- Orr, D. (1995). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Osei-Kofi, N. (2005). Pathologizing the poor: A framework for understanding Ruby Payne's work. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 38(4), 367-375.
- Peshkin, A. (1978). *Growing Up American; Schooling and the Survival of Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Porter, M. (1997). *Moving mountains: Reform, resistance, and resiliency in an Appalachian Kentucky high school* (Unpublished dissertation, DAI-A 57/12, p. 5008). Stanford University.
- Provasnik, S., KewalRamani, A., Coleman, M.M., Gilbertson, L., Herring, W., & Xie, Q. (2007). *Status of education in rural America*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved April 25, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov/PUBSEARCH/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007040>
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reck, U., Reck, G., & Keefe, S. (1993). Implications of teachers' perceptions of students in an Appalachian school system. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26(2), 117-121.
- Robertson, P., Chapman, B., & Gaskin, F., (2001). *Systems for offering concurrent enrollment at high schools and community colleges*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosenfeld, S. (1984). *Something old, something new: The wedding of rural education and rural development*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Growth Policies Board. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED261815)
- Sassen, S. (1996). *Losing control? Sovereignty in an age of globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schneider, J. (2009). Privilege, equity, and the Advanced Placement Program: Tug of war. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(6), 813-831. DOI: 10.1080/00220270802713613

- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Spring, J. (1994). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sher, J. (1977). *Education in rural America: A reassessment of the conventional wisdom*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Smith-Richards, J. & Boss, C. (2008, February 8). Few use Option of college credit: High schoolers' low interest spurred governor's new plan. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved on February 11, 2008 from [http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/local\\_news/stories/2008/02/08/college.ART\\_ART\\_0](http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/local_news/stories/2008/02/08/college.ART_ART_0)
- Sorge, A. (2008). Divergent visions: Localist and cosmopolitan identities in highland Sardinia. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 14, 808-824.
- Stauber, K. (2001). *Why invest in rural America and how? A critical public policy question for the 21st century*. Kansas City, MO: Center for the Study of Rural America, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. Retrieved from <http://www.kc.frb.org>
- Stanley, J. (1976). *Brilliant youth: Improving the quality and speed of their education*. Presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED136536)
- Strange, M. (2008). *Family farming: A new economic vision*. Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, University of Nebraska Press.
- Theobald, P. (2009). *Education now: How rethinking America's past can change its future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Theobald, P. (1997). *Teaching the commons: Place, pride, and the renewal of community*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Thompson, P. (2002). *The accidental theorist: The double helix of everyday life*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tucker, J. E. (1999). Tinto's Model and Successful College Transitions. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 1(2), 163-75.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on the Future of Higher Education.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Pathways to College Access and Success*. Washington, DC: Author.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Betraying the college dream: How disconnected k-12 and postsecondary education systems undermine student aspiration*. Washington, DC: Author.
- University System of Ohio. (2010). [Seniors to sophomores] (Web Page). Retrieved from <http://www.uso.edu/opportunities/seniors2soph/faqs.php>
- Vail, K. (2001). Nurturing the life of the mind: If schools don't value intellect, who will? *American School Board Journal*, 188(1), 19-23.
- Venezia, A., Kirst, M., & Antonio, A. (2003). *Betraying the college dream: How disconnected k-12 and postsecondary education systems undermine student aspirations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.
- Voinovich School. (2008). *Access and success: Appalachian Ohio* (Report 2: Preliminary analysis of high school students survey). Athens, OH: Author.
- Voinovich School. (2007). *Access and success: Appalachian Ohio* (Report 1: Analysis of selected state and national data). Athens, OH: Author.
- Waits, T., Setzer, J., & Lewis, L. (2006). Dual credit and exam-based courses in U.S. public high schools: 2002-03. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 7(1/2), 1.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (2006). *Accelerated learning options: moving the needle on access and success: A study of state and institutional policies and practices*. Boulder, CO: Author.
- Whisnant, D. (1980). *Modernizing the mountaineer*. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.
- Williams, R. (2001). Culture is ordinary. In J. Higgins (Ed.), *The Raymond Williams reader* (pp. 10-24). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers. (Original work published 1958)
- Woodrum, A. (2004). State-mandated testing and cultural resistance in Appalachian schools: Competing values and expectations. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 19(1). Retrieved May 16, 2010 from <http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/19-1.pdf>.
- Wright, D. & Bogotch, I. (2006). High school: Erasing borders. *Journal of College Admission*, 193, 19-24.

**APPENDIX**

**Participation in Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO)  
Public School Districts in the 29 Counties of Appalachian Ohio, 2006-2007 School Year**

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
Adams	61903	1	Adams County/Ohio Valley Local	North Adams High School	63	1879	3.4%
	61903	1	Adams County/Ohio Valley Local	Peebles High School			
	61903	1	Adams County/Ohio Valley Local	West Union High School			
	442	1	Manchester Local	Manchester High School			
	61903		Adams County/Ohio Valley Local/Voc	Adams County/Ohio Valley Local/Voc			
Athens	45906	1	Alexander Local	Alexander High School	6	503	1.2%
	43521	6	Athens City	Athens High School	34	913	3.7%
	45914	1	Federal Hocking Local	Federal Hocking High School	1	414	0.2%
	44446	1	Nelsonville-York City	Nelsonville-York High School	1	414	0.2%
	45922	1	Trimble Local	Trimble High School		313	
	51607		Tri-County Career Center Jt Voc S.C.	Tri-County Career Center Jt Voc S.C.		472	
Belmont	45203	1	Barnesville Exempted Village	Barnesville High School	13	412	3.2%
	43570	1	Bellaire City Local	Bellaire High School	1	466	0.2%
	45237	4	Bridgeport Ex Vill S.D.		2		
	44347	4	Martins Ferry City	Martins Ferry High School	8	688	1.2%
	46003	4	Shadyside Local	Shadyside High School	2	367	0.5%
	45997	2	St Clairsville-Richland City	St Clairsville High School	10	573	1.7%
	46011	1	Union Local	Union Local High School	18	498	3.6%

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
	50856		<b>Belmont-Harrison Jt Voc S.C.</b>	<b>Belmont-Harrison Jt Voc S.C.</b>	1		
<b>Brown</b>							
	46037	2	Eastern Local	Eastern High School	11	449	2.4%
	46045	3	Fayetteville-Perry Local	Fayetteville-Perry High School	13	293	4.4%
	45377	1	Georgetown Exempted Village	Georgetown Jr/Sr High School	2	457	0.4%
	46078	1	Ripley-Union-Lewis-Huntington Local	Ripley-Union-Lewis-Huntington High School	18	383	4.7%
	46060	2	Western Brown Local	Western Brown High School	12	1,034	1.2%
	50799		<b>Southern Hills Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Southern Hills Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Carroll</b>							
	46177	2	Brown Local	Malvern High School	4	224	1.8%
	45278	1	Carrollton Exempted Village	Carrollton High School	28	859	3.3%
<b>Clermont</b>							
	46300	6	Batavia Local	Batavia High School	13	603	2.2%
	46318	2	Bethel-Tate Local	Bethel Tate High School	5	618	0.8%
	46326	3	Clermont Northeastern Local	Clermont Northeastern High School	15	624	2.4%
	46334	2	Felicity-Franklin Local	Felicity-Franklin Local High School	6	376	1.6%
	46342	6	Goshen Local	Goshen High School	19	770	2.5%
	45500	6	Milford Exempted Village	Milford Sr High School	12	1,963	0.6%
	45559	3	New Richmond Exempted Village	New Richmond High School	7	772	0.9%
	<b>46359</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>West Clermont Local</b>	<b>Amelia High School</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2,747</b>	1.4%
	<b>46359</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>West Clermont Local</b>	<b>Glen Este High School</b>			
	46367	2	Williamsburg Local	Williamsburg High School	8	555	1.4%
	62802		<b>U.S. Grant Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>U.S. Grant Jt Voc S.D.</b>	1		
<b>Columbiana</b>							
	46425	1	Beaver Local	Beaver Local High School	11	795	1.4%
	417		Buckeye On-Line School	Buckeye On-Line School	15	1154	1.3%
	45328	4	Columbiana Exempted Village	Columbiana High School	2	327	0.6%
	46433	1	Crestview Local	Crestview High School	10	420	2.4%
	43919	4	East Liverpool City	East Liverpool High School	72	788	9.1%

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
	43927	1	East Palestine City	East Palestine High School	3	432	0.7%
	45443	1	Leetonia Exempted Village	Leetonia High School		243	
	45450	1	Lisbon Exempted Village	David Anderson Jr/Sr High School	2	637	0.3%
	44735	4	Salem City	Salem High School	26	672	3.9%
	46441	1	Southern Local	Southern Local Jr/Sr High School	1	427	0.2%
	46458	2	United Local	United High School	2	664	0.3%
	45039	4	Wellsville Local	Wellsville High School		268	
	50906		<b>Columbiana County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Columbiana County Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
	43919		<b>Easter Liverpool City Jt. Voc S.C.</b>	<b>Easter Liverpool City Jt. Voc S.C.</b>			
<b>Coshocton</b>							
	43828	4	Coshocton City	Coshocton High School	5	881	0.6%
	46474	1	Ridgewood Local	Ridgewood High School	7	478	1.5%
	46482	2	River View Local	River View High School	36	851	4.2%
	65227		<b>Coshocton County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Coshocton County Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Gallia</b>							
	<b>65680</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Gallia County Local</b>	<b>River Valley High School</b>			
	<b>65680</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Gallia County Local</b>	<b>South Gallia High School</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
	44032	1	Gallipolis City	Gallia Academy High School	35	1,039	3.4%
	<b>62067</b>		<b>Gallia-Jackson-Vinton JT Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Gallia-Jackson-Vinton JT Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Guernsey</b>							
	43695	1	Cambridge City	Cambridge High School	11	784	1.4%
	69682	1	East Guernsey Local	Buckeye Trail High School	3	402	0.7%
	47308	1	Rolling Hills Local	Meadowbrook High School	10	622	1.6%
<b>Harrison</b>							
	47548	1	Conotton Valley Union Local	Conotton Valley Jr/Sr High School	9	251	3.6%
	45245	1	Harrison Hills City	Harrison Central High School	1	639	0.2%
<b>Highland</b>							
	47613	1	Bright Local	Whiteoak High School	14	249	5.6%
	47621	2	Fairfield Local	Fairfield Local High School	4	254	1.6%

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
	45401	1	Greenfield Exempted Village	McClain High School	6	704	0.9%
	44123	1	Hillsboro City	Hillsboro High School	37	864	4.3%
	47639	2	Lynchburg-Clay Local	Lynchburg-Clay High School	4	406	1.0%
<b>Hocking</b>							
	44248	1	Logan-Hocking Local	Logan-Hocking High School	20	1,323	1.5%
<b>Holmes</b>							
	47688	1	East Holmes Local	Hiland High School		416	
	47696	1	West Holmes Local	West Holmes High School	12	848	1.4%
<b>Jackson</b>							
	7998		Center for Student Achievement		1		
	44156	1	Jackson City	Jackson High School	5	883	0.6%
	47761	1	Oak Hill Union Local	Oak Hill Middle/High School	8	644	1.2%
	45021	1	Wellston City	Wellston High School	2	488	0.4%
<b>Jefferson</b>							
	47787	1	Buckeye Local	Buckeye Local High School	46	799	5.8%
	47795	1	Edison Local	Edison High School	3	773	0.4%
	47803	4	Indian Creek Local	Indian Creek High School	13	666	2.0%
	44826	4	Steubenville City	Steubenville High School	32	671	4.8%
	44917	4	Toronto City	Toronto High School	3	269	1.1%
	51128		<b>Jefferson County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Jefferson County Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Lawrence</b>							
	45294	4	Chesapeake Union Exempted Village	Chesapeake High School	1	417	0.2%
	47928	1	Dawson-Bryant Local	Dawson-Bryant High School	13	399	3.3%
	47936	4	Fairland Local	Fairland High School	16	531	3.0%
	44149	4	Ironton City	Ironton High School	11	483	2.3%
	47944	1	Rock Hill Local	Rock Hill Sr High School	8	557	1.4%
	47951	4	South Point Local	South Point High School	7	506	1.4%
	47969	1	Symmes Valley Local	Symmes Valley High School	1	263	0.4%
	51185		<b>Lawrence County JT Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Lawrence County JT Voc S.D.</b>			

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
<b>Meigs</b>							
	48512	2	Eastern Local	Eastern High School		239	
	48538	1	Southern Local	Southern High School		215	
	48520	1	Meigs Local	Meigs High School	2	656	0.3%
	48520		<b>Meigs Local/Voc</b>	<b>Meigs High School/Voc</b>			
<b>Monroe</b>							
	<b>48652</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Switzerland Of Ohio Local</b>	<b>Beallsville High School</b>			
	<b>48652</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Switzerland Of Ohio Local</b>	<b>Monroe Central High School</b>			
	<b>48652</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Switzerland Of Ohio Local</b>	<b>River High School</b>	19	<b>761</b>	2.5%
	<b>48652</b>		<b>Switzerland Of Ohio Local/Voc</b>	<b>Switzerland Of Ohio Local/Voc</b>			
<b>Morgan</b>							
	48777	1	Morgan Local	Morgan High School	12	708	1.7%
	48777		<b>Morgan Local/Voc</b>	<b>Morgan High School</b>			
<b>Muskingum</b>							
	48835	2	East Muskingum Local	John Glenn High School	15	662	2.3%
	48843	1	Franklin Local	Philo High School	11	722	1.5%
	48850	1	Maysville Local	Maysville High School	16	622	2.6%
	48876	2	Tri-Valley Local	Tri-Valley High School	36	1,002	3.6%
	48884	2	West Muskingum Local	West Muskingum High School	19	634	3.0%
	45179	4	Zanesville City	Zanesville High School	30	1,047	2.9%
	51300		<b>Mid-East Ohio Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Mid-East Ohio Jt Voc S.D.</b>	12		
<b>Noble</b>					5		
	45252	1	Caldwell Exempted Village	Caldwell High School		296	0.0%
	48900	1	Noble Local	Shenandoah High School		384	0.0%
<b>Perry</b>							
	45351	1	Crooksville Exempted Village	Crooksville High School	4	356	1.1%
	44479	1	New Lexington City	New Lexington High School	4	607	0.7%
	49056	2	Northern Local	Sheridan High School	12	776	1.5%
	49064	1	Southern Local	Miller High School	5	308	1.6%

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
<b>Pike</b>							
	49122	1	Eastern Local	Eastern High School	11	270	4.1%
	49130	1	Scioto Valley Local	Piketon Jr/Sr High School	23	624	3.7%
	49148	1	Waverly City	Waverly High School	11	695	1.6%
	49155	1	Western Local	Western High School		370	
	51375		<b>Pike County Area Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Pike County Area Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Ross</b>							
	49494	2	Adena Local	Adena High School	3	327	0.9%
	43745	4	Chillicothe City	Chillicothe High School	6	816	0.7%
	49502	1	Huntington Local	Huntington High School	6	418	1.4%
	49510	1	Paint Valley Local	Paint Valley High School	2	400	0.5%
	49528	2	Southeastern Local	Southeastern High School	1	361	0.3%
	49536	3	Union-Scioto Local	Unioto High School	5	559	0.9%
	49544	3	Zane Trace Local	Zane Trace High School	6	501	1.2%
	51433		<b>Pickaway-Ross County Jt. Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Pickaway-Ross County Jt. Voc S.D.</b>			
<b>Scioto</b>							
	49593	1	Bloom-Vernon Local S.C.		4	439	0.9%
	49601	2	Clay Local	Clay High School	2	275	0.7%
	49619	1	Green Local	Green High School		308	
	49627	1	Minford Local	Minford High School	6	461	1.3%
	44461	4	New Boston Local	Glenwood High School		176	
	49635	1	Northwest Local	Northwest High School	3	520	0.6%
	44669	4	Portsmouth City	Portsmouth High School	19	762	2.5%
	143644		Sciotoville Community School	Sciotoville Community School	2	442	0.5%
	49643	1	Valley Local	Valley High School	3	341	0.9%
	49650	1	Washington-Nile Local	Portsmouth West High School	23	465	4.9%
	49668	4	Wheelersburg Local	Wheelersburg High School	6	413	1.5%
	51490		<b>Scioto County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Scioto County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	1		

County	District #	District Type (ODE)	District Name	School Name	2006-2007		% enrolled In PSEO
					# PSEO students	School Year Enrollment ADM	
<b>Tuscarawas</b>							
	43778	1	Claymont City	Claymont High School	22	702	3.1%
	43893	4	Dover City	Dover High School	23	763	3.0%
	50278	1	Garaway Local	Garaway High School	7	492	1.4%
	50286	1	Indian Valley Local	Indian Valley High School	14	828	1.7%
	44487	4	New Philadelphia City	New Philadelphia High School	22	918	2.4%
	45542	1	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	Newcomerstown High School	2	343	0.6%
	50294	2	Strasburg-Franklin Local	Strasburg-Franklin High School	12	323	3.7%
	50302	2	Tuscarawas Valley Local	Tuscarawas Valley High School	21	407	5.2%
	51656		<b>Buckeye Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Buckeye Jt Voc S.D.</b>	4		
<b>Vinton</b>							
	50393	1	Vinton County Local	Vinton County High School	3	732	0.4%
<b>Washington</b>							
	43604	4	Belpre City	Belpre High School	23	389	5.9%
	50484	1	Fort Frye Local	Fort Frye High School	17	603	2.8%
	50492	1	Frontier Local	Frontier High School	79	314	25.2%
	44321	4	Marietta City	Marietta High School	68	1,008	6.7%
	50500	2	Warren Local	Warren High School	24	850	2.8%
	50518	2	Wolf Creek Local	Waterford High School	8	236	3.4%
	51698		<b>Washington County Jt Voc S.D.</b>	<b>Washington County Jt Voc S.D.</b>			
				<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,605</b>	<b>76,791</b>	<b>2.2%</b>