

# **UPWARD BOUND: PORTRAIT OF A POVERTY PROGRAM 1965 – 1985**

**William H. James**

**This study outlines the historical background of Upward Bound and traces its evolution from 18 pilot programs in 1965 to the present. Early philosophical connotations of the program are examined, and vital questions during the early years are presented with resolution. Three reports and analyses of Upward Bound in the late 60's summarize the features requisite for successful programs, with the most comprehensive study focusing on the program's effect on attitude, motivation, and achievement of Afro-American students. Extensive attention is devoted to criticism and defenses of Upward Bound during the 1970's with the effect of clarifying the program's objectives. Two statistical follow-up studies (1977, 1979) compared the educational patterns of Upward Bound participants and non-participants and investigate long-term postsecondary entry skills, but the program's effect on participants' measurable postsecondary success is a critical area for future evaluations.**

## **INTRODUCTION**

**Over twenty years ago, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime became the Office of Economic Opportunity Task Force chaired by Sargent Shriver. This Task Force was established by President Johnson to create legislation that would be known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and was part of the Great Society's "War on Poverty."**

**In August of 1964, the EOA was signed by President Johnson, and shortly thereafter the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was established. The EOA contained a formula dictating that 80 percent of the Community Action Program (CAP) funds were to be allocated to states, while 20 percent could be distributed by Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.**

**The OEO Director eagerly established programs with "national emphasis," first Head Start, then Upward Bound. The Upward Bound Program was considered a part of the Community Action Program but was directed from Washington and received funds from the 20 percent of CAP funds available to Mr. Shriver.**

**At the same time that the Federal government was establishing Upward Bound programs, the civil rights movement was having an impact on college campuses. The college students and faculty from the North who were drawn to the South during this era returned to their institutions with a heightened awareness of the low enrollment of low-income and disadvantaged students on college campuses both in the North and the South. College students and faculty members expressed concern over the need to increase the representation of disadvantaged high school students on college campuses, a concern that became one of the central features of the Upward Bound program.**

**The Upward Bound programs were spawned by Congressional Legislation in 1964. That is, under the authority of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) funded 18 projects as pilot programs in the summer of 1965. Following the success of the pilot programs, Upward Bound was authorized as a national program under Title IV-A of the Economic Opportunity Act. Thus, the programs were expanded from 18 to 220 in 1966. In July 1969, the program was transferred to the US Office of Education (USOE) in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW) and the current Upward Bound programs were authorized under section 408 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.**

**During the period of 1964 to the present, several large foundations, such as the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations experienced an increase in the number of proposals from colleges that requested funds for summer programs or institutes. These proposals had the common goal of developing college-based programs, which would provide an opportunity for disadvantaged high school students to attend college. Many of these proposals were similar to summer institutes**

sponsored by the National Science Foundation for high school scholars; they had names such as Project Able or Project Overcome. However, Upward Bound would enjoy success as an experimental pilot program in the 1964 – 65 academic year.

## THE PILOT PROGRAMS

The Office of Economic Opportunity was initiated to disburse monies for experimental programs and responded to proposals for summer programs by funding 18 Upward Bound pilot programs. The Upward Bound pilot programs funded for the summer of 1965 were (U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1970):

- 1. Dillard University  
New Orleans, Louisiana
- 2. Fisk University  
Nashville, Tennessee
- 3. Howard University  
Washington, D.C.
- 4. Texas Southern University  
Houston, Texas
- 5. Webster College  
St. Louis, Missouri
- 6. Moorehouse College  
Atlanta, Georgia
- 7. College of the Ozarks  
Clarksville, Arkansas
- 8. Florida A & M University  
Tallahassee, Florida
- 9. New Mexico Highlands University  
Las Vegas, New Mexico
- 10. New York University,  
Washington Square  
New York City, New York
- 11. University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon
- 12. Western Washington State College  
Bellingham, Washington
- 13. Tennessee A & I  
Nashville, Tennessee
- 14. Ripon College  
Ripon, Wisconsin
- 15. Columbia University  
New York City, New York
- 16. Le Moyne College  
Syracuse, New York
- 17. Independent Schools  
Talent Search Program  
Boston, Massachusetts
- 18. Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York

The pilot programs that are starred were funded as part of Educational Services Incorporated (ESI) of Watertown, Massachusetts. ESI had developed a specific curriculum for these six programs which were all located at predominantly Black Institutions, except for Webster College.

These 18 pilots programs enrolled approximately 2,000 students during the summer of 1965 and 1,200 students were provided some level of follow-up services during the 1965-1966 academic school year. An estimated 1,500 recent high school graduates enrolled in the first summer class who were not able to receive a full year of service during the 1965-1966 academic year, a summer component that would become a very important component of Upward Bound programs.

The success of the pilot Upward Bounds programs was due to a concerted effort on behalf of the Office of Economic Opportunity and public and private institutions. This success is best exemplified by a statement from Dr. Robert T. Frost, the first national director of the Upward Bound and Community Action Programs in OEO.

We in the Office of Economic Opportunity join other institutions in the nation, both public and private, in trying to find remedies for what Sargent Shriver has called the “great waste of talent.” But the Office of Economic Opportunity cannot provide an education for everybody. Only the academic institutions can do that. Our responsibility is to encourage these institutions

to propose effective methods to induce college-capable young people, not headed toward higher education, to shift gears and get on the college track. (U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1965, p. 3)

The conclusions drawn from the 1965 summer programs were used to strengthen the programs and to further the development of this national effort. Among the conclusions was that 12<sup>th</sup> graders who enter an Upward Bound program during their last year of high school simply do not have enough time to be exposed to an effective program. Moreover, 9<sup>th</sup> graders were believed to have too much time and an unnecessarily long span in an Upward Bound program. It was felt by OEO at the time that 10<sup>th</sup> graders would be the most favorable target group. This feeling has been modified over the years, and current Upward Bound programs are allowed to recruit 9<sup>th</sup> graders.

During this developmental period several high schools and preparatory schools were interested in operating Upward Bound programs. But these schools were rarely selected to operate such programs since the focus of Upward Bound was essentially to get youngsters out of high school and into college, not out of high school and into a preparatory school or another type of high school.

Among the 18 pilot programs that began in the summer of 1965, one was proposed and operated by Dr. Thomas A. Billings at Western Washington University. Dr. Billings became the second National Director of Upward Bound and Community Action Programs in the Office of Economic Opportunity. His Philosophy was succinctly stated as follows:

While Upward Bound's central assignment is practical and down-to-earth, and while we must talk about our achievements in relation to that assignment in terms of program and college attention, admission and retention. Upward Bound is not and should not become a national conveyor belt mindlessly processing youngsters for the nation's work force as if they were so many carrots to be canned, so many units to be programmed. Hopefully, our program will assist all of our youngsters to become competent and effective participants in the American social and economic order. But beyond that, our programs should assist Upward Bound youngsters to become sensitive human beings, free, informed and committed to the human struggle for excellence. (U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968 p. 13)

### The Success of the Pilot Programs

Before Upward Bound began, a number of concerns needed to be addressed. The first concern was whether the youngster (a) could be recruited and (b) would be interested enough to spend several summers on a college or university campus. Another concern was whether the campuses would open their doors to the to the youngster, and would be willing to provide needed resources. Other long-range concerns were; would college and university admissions officers admit the youngster recommended by Upward Bound programs, and would adequate financial aid be available. Finally, would the youngsters be able to survive the academic pressure of college, once removed from the protection of a support program.

The first two concerns were alleviated during the first several years of Upward Bound programs. The success of the 18 pilot programs in the recruitment of students and the receptiveness of the campuses resulted in the expansion of the programs from 18 in 1965 to 220 in 1966 and the number of students from approximately 2,000 to 20,000. In addition, during the first several years of Upward Bound programs, high percentages of students admitted to college were provided financial aid. The last concern, the retention of students, was also alleviated during the first several years of Upward Bound. The official report, compiled by Billings (1968), for the Office of Economic Opportunity showed that:

1. The college admission rates were:

1965 (pilot programs)	80% admitted to college
1966 (expanded programs)	78% admitted to college
1967	83.1% admitted to college

2. The drop-out rates were:

1965	12% during the first year of college
1966	21% during the second year of college
	13% during third year of college
1967	___ during second year of college
	___ just entered first year

These data suggest that Upward Bound students have about the same retention rate as all other students admitted to college. Thus, the five initial concerns were successfully achieved during the several years of Upward Bound programs.

### Reports and Analyses

The institute for Services to Education (1968), summarized the features of successful 1965 pilot Upward Bound programs. The institute's report stressed that Upward Bound programs should have two essential goals: (a) to prepare normally intelligent disadvantaged high school students for admissions to, and success in, college and (b) to stimulate interest and motivation through the help of qualified staff and offer programs adapted to the student's individual learning needs. Guidelines and details of two hypothetical programs – one to service a rural population; the other an urban population – are presented in the institute's document.

One of the most comprehensive analysis of the Upward Bound programs of 1966 was conducted by Hunt and Hunt (1969), who studied the effects of Upward Bound and control groups indicated slight increases, but the White Upward Bound group increase was not significant. The Program effect upon the academic achievement of either group was not significant. However, the researchers concluded the positive effect of Upward Bound program upon student attitude and motivation was virtually identical for Afro-Americans and White students. Thus, this report concluded that the task of producing academic gain for students is indeed a formidable challenge requiring continued effort and creativity.

Because high school students from disadvantaged environments are increasing their awareness and interest in attending college, and colleges are developing programs designed to assist low-income students, the results of Upward Bound programs heretofore reviewed have both theoretical and applied implications. Theoretically, these results may be interpreted as assessments of the construct validity for certain measures designed to discriminate between college-bound and non-college-bound groups. Hunt, Hardt, and Victor (1968) conducted a characterization study utilizing the same nine measures as the study that was completed by Hunt and Hardt (1969) but included a larger sample of Upward Bound students (N=1800). Results from the characterization study indicated that the Upward Bound rate of enrollment in college was 68 percent, compared to an enrollment rate of 48 percent in a matched non-Upward Bound control sample. These results indicated that, up to the point of college enrollment, the 21 projects that were sampled appeared to be successful in achieving their goals. More, specifically, the same research analyzed the relationship between Upward Bound students' scores on an academic attitude or motivation measure and the likelihood of the students gaining college admission. Significant differences were found between the mean scores of college-bound and non-college-bound groups on the following measures; (a) interpersonal flexibility, (b) self-evaluated intelligence, (c) importance of college graduation, and (d) possibility of college graduation. These differences were in favor of the college-bound group. However, the construct validity of the remaining five non-significant measures would require empirical verification from further research. These measures were; (a) self-esteem, (b) internal control, (c) future orientation, (d) alienation, and (e) motivation for college. A basic methodological problem of this research was that the accuracy of the conclusions rests upon the validity of self-report data, and additional methods of measuring and reporting should be used with longitudinal research.

### CRITIQUE OF UPWARD BOUND

On October 19, 1967, Dr. Gloria Joseph, Director of Special Education at Cornell University, delivered a speech to a gathering of Upward Bound directors and college administrators. In that speech, her criticism of Upward Bound programs resulted in a lively exchange of ideas between Dr. Joseph and Dr. Thomas Billing, the National Director of Upward Bound programs. The critique presented below will highlight the major points of her speech, which was published at a later date (Joseph, 1968)

The first major criticism by Dr. Joseph was that poverty programs do not really help the poor, a problem described by Harrington (1962). That is, those students in ghetto slums, reservation, rural poverty pockets, and Appalachia that are in the \$2,000 to \$4,000 annual income bracket are not being reached by Upward Bound. The point that was stressed was that these students are not found in school and therefore would not have an opportunity to be recommended by teachers, guidance counselors, or case workers to an Upward Bound program. In addition, if these students are in school, they fall further and further behind and eventually most of them drop out of school because they have to find work to help the family.

The second criticism was related to the fact that most Upward Bound programs are based on college or university campuses. Although there were some education benefits derived from being on a campus, the expenses involved and the limitations placed on the number of students that could attend a summer session were greater than the benefits obtained.

Another criticism was directed toward the academic curriculum, and the courses developed and offered during the summer. The criticism was that the courses should be directed toward minority group students enrolled in the program. For the Black students, self-esteem and pride could be developed by teaching more about Afro-American history, racism awareness, and Black power. Also, similar approaches could be used for other minority groups to enable them to better understand their history and culture.

The fourth major criticism was that there should be more emphasis placed upon remedial work in basic academic subjects such as English, math and science. That is, the “cultural frills” of most Upward Bound programs are not needed and result in little payoff for the students.

A final criticism was that Upward Bound programs have not attacked the roots of the problem, which Dr. Joseph viewed as inferior education and discriminatory educational practices regarding the hard-core poverty youth in our nation. She felt that Upward Bound was like putting a band-aid on a cancerous growth. The accusation was also made that Upward Bound was trying to perform the tasks that the high schools should be doing, and have failed to do effectively.

In summary, Dr. Joseph made the recommendation that the efforts should be directed towards hard-core poverty youth, with the focus on keeping these students in school rather than preparing them for post-secondary education. She recommended that Upward Bound be scrapped and that the money should be spent elsewhere. Dr. Joseph predicted that, in future years, Upward Bound would simply be remembered as another poverty program that failed.

#### **A Reply to the Criticism**

Dr. Thomas Billings, National Director of Upward Bound, replied to Dr. Joseph’s criticism (Doremus, 1968). Dr. Billings countered the remarks by indicating that Upward Bound was not an all-encompassing poverty program, which would cure all the problems of low-income youth. Upward Bound was based on the notion that students must have the potential for college, but are not achieving this potential and are not utilizing their talents. Billings indicated that the academic summer phase was designed to tease these talents out of Upward Bound students, and the follow-up phase designed to continue stimulating these students toward academic achievement. Dr. Billings also retorted that the mandate of Upward Bound programs was not to change the public schools, but rather to change the students with some spill-over effect of the program upon the schools.

The National Director felt that the importance of Upward Bound programs being located on college or university campuses should not be minimized or overlooked. He cited several reasons for that location in addition to students gaining familiarity with a campus. These reasons included ; (a) relieving the students from the often oppressive environments of home or community; (b) the opportunity for students to participate in many cultural, social, and recreational activities on campus; and (c) the 24-hour contact with counselors and the atmosphere of group living. He felt that all of these reasons were very important for students in order for the full effects of Upward Bound to be realized.

The criticism by Dr. Joseph of the academic curriculum was countered by the National Director by pointing out that many curriculums contained courses pertaining to Afro-American history, ethics studies, Native-American history, racism in our society, and many other courses dealing with contemporary topics.

The criticism of the “cultural frills” of Upward Bound programs was answered by the assertion that plays, concerts, art exhibits, and guest lecturers provide an integrated curriculum. In addition, remedial coursework was provided where necessary, and nearly all programs offered courses in English, mathematics, science and history, along with several other disciplines. Dr. Billings emphasized the innovation and creativity that characterizes these courses, making the students interested in learning.

Finally, Dr. Billings concluded that Upward Bound programs have had a powerful effect upon retaining students in high school and inspiring them on to post-secondary institutions of higher learning. He cited the fact that more than 800 institutions in all states and territories have accepted Upward Bound students, and that other disadvantaged students have been helped financially by Talent Search, a national program conducted by the United States Office of Education. In summary, the National Director referred to the statistics regarding the effectiveness of Upward Bound programs in retaining student, in enabling many of them to go to college, and in serving some 600,000 poverty-stricken students.

#### **BENEFITS AND COST OF UPWARD BOUND**

The **INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE BENEFITS AND COSTS OF Upward Bound programs** should be analyzed from an individual perspective, since individual needs ultimately dictates collective needs. Society cannot generate programs unless net benefits accrue to the participants, otherwise such efforts will eventually prove fruitless. These benefits for Upward Bound participants are:

1. Monthly stipends received by students while in Upward Bound (Limited to \$30.00 per month)
2. Financial aid received by students after entering college (Specified by the Federal Government)
3. Increased lifetime income after taxes
4. The receipt of a high school diploma
5. The receipt of a technical school, 2 year, or 4 year degree
6. Intangible benefits such as self-esteem, personal growth and development, which cannot be assigned a monetary value.

The cost for Upward Bound students are:

1. Loss of welfare and other kinds of public assistance as a result of becoming more employable
2. Loss of unemployment payments as a result of gaining valuable skills
3. Tuition cost not covered by financial aid
4. Living expenses and other expenses not covered by financial aid
5. Loss of earning as a result of attending college
6. Intangible costs such as dropping out of school, which cannot be assigned a monetary value.

Garms (1971) completed an analysis of the benefits and costs of Upward Bound programs for 7,236 students who entered the program between June 1966 and August 1968. The control group for this study consisted of the older siblings of the same sex as the students, and the results indicated that the student does gain economic benefits. These benefits ranged from \$371 to \$1,992 at a discount rate of 10 percent. The range at a discount rate of 5 percent was \$3,608 to \$5,920. However, the conclusion of this particular study suggests that certain social benefits are dependent upon the particular college or university attended, and the resources available on the respective campuses.

#### **The 1973 General Accounting Office (GAO) Report on Upward Bound Programs**

The GAO report (1973) analyzed 15 of a total of 478 Upward Bound programs and was highly critical of the programs in several areas. The first criticism was that there were no measurable objectives and no diagnosis of the educational needs of the students. The report also criticized the lack of appropriate curriculum design to address educational needs. The last major criticism of Upward Bound was that the programs failed to limit participation to the target poverty group, and had recruited students who were not considered academic risks.

With respect to the criticism that students came from families above the poverty level, one needs to be familiar with the details. Namely, the U.S. Labor Department Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Autumn of 1973 report indicated that the lower level determined by the Census Bureau for a family of four was \$4,550. The latter income represented the standard poverty level used by the federal government for Upward Bound programs. Therefore, the Upward Bound income criteria for the poor family of four was \$2,030 less than the Bureau's level which was based upon consumer price index reports regarding housing, food, transportation and clothing. This is important as there are many educators who support the idea that there is a direct relationship between lower socioeconomic status (SES) and lower levels of motivation on the part of the student. However, the recently approved education amendments for 1980 allow the Upward Bound programs to use 150% of the poverty levels defined by the Census Bureau.

In addition, the 1973 GAO Upward Bound report indicated that:

1. 29.6 percent of the participants dropped out of Upward Bound without completing the program.
2. 20.9 percent completed Upward Bound but did not enroll in college.
3. 19.8 percent completed Upward Bound, enrolled in college, then dropped out.
4. 28.3 percent who completed Upward Bound are still enrolled in college.
5. 14 percent completed Upward Bound and graduated from a two- or four year college

Dr. Leonard H. Spearman, Director of the Division of Student Support and Special Programs (DHEW) replied to these criticisms before the US House of Representative on July 13, 1974 with the following rebuttals

1. 35 percent of the public school graduates drop out before graduation, as compared to 29.6 for Upward Bound.
2. 30 percent of high school graduates enroll in two or four year colleges, as compared to 49.5 for Upward Bound.
3. GAO projected that on the basis of these scores and high school grades, 22 percent of the students included in the study could have been successful in college without Upward Bound. Spearman then questioned how the percentages could be 1.4 for Upward Bound college graduates. He suggested that many students are not identified while still others may transfer from one institution to another and are lost as college graduates (Spearman, 1974).

Comments on the GAO Report, Upward Bound is generally accepted as a compensatory educational program aimed at assisting the "disadvantaged" and oppressed segments of our society. Educators within Western Culture have convinced the oppressed that education leads to economic and social success, including material goods. Indeed, materials possessions are often placed above human potential, with the result being a tendency to consider lower-class values as more negative and so-called middle-class values as positive. According to the "American Dream" education leads to

excellent position with good income, which leads to material goods and better or middle-class values. These myths are perpetuated by society at large, and suggested that education will “open doors.”

Indeed, education has an important value that should not be overlooked, but the development of individual human potential should be a cornerstone of any education venture. Upward Bound is a means toward fulfilling this potential, but compensatory programs alone are not the definitive solution to the problems of the “disadvantaged. Clearly, the “advantaged” within our society have much at their disposal. The future of many advantaged who aspire to succeed in society is determined by ethnicity, personal ties, family relationship, religion, and other values that one might possess. Therefore, evaluations of Upward Bound programs, such as the one completed by the General Accounting Office in 1973, should consider unquantifiable gains in human potential, and take into account the additional opportunities available to the “advantaged” members of society.

**The U.S. Office of Education Evaluations.** The U.S. Office of Education (USOE) has supported several studies of the Upward Bound programs and they are highlighted in the following sections.

**The Research Triangle Institute Studies.** In July of 1973, the USOD contracted with the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) of North Carolina to evaluate the 333 regular Upward Bound programs operating in 1973-74. Fifty-four of these programs were randomly selected after stratification by type of institutions and student ethnicity. All of the student in the 54 sample projects were in grades 10, 11, 12 and totaling 3, 710 participants.

The comparison group was selected from a average of two feeder high schools providing students to programs and from sample classrooms in each of these schools, a total of 2,340 non-participant students were selected after stratification on ethnicity, low-income status, grade level, and academic risk. The initial (base-year) study produces these major findings.

1. The Upward Bound program appeared to be serving the appropriate kinds of students, 51 percent were Black, 18 percent White and 20 percent either Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, or Asian. About 56 percent were females. Slightly more than half of the program students were classified as “academic risks” and about two-thirds were found to be at or below poverty level in their family incomes.
2. Upward Bound students were generally positive about their program experiences, and their self-reports strongly suggest that they are incorporating program objectives into their own behavior, self-concept, and aspirations.
3. There was no apparent relationship between Upward Bound participation and improvement on measures of academic performance in high school, e.g. grade point average, proportion of academic credits taken or passed.
4. Proportionally more Upward Bound than non-participant students applied for student financial aid. Upward Bound applicants for financial aid did not receive more offers of aid than did non-participant students, but they did receive better offers ... generally in the form of larger grants.
5. Many local Upward Bound projects directors interviewed during site visits expressed the need for more assistance, monitoring, feedback, and direction than they were currently receiving from the central and regional program office of USOE (U.S. Office of Education, 1974)

**A first Follow-up Evaluation.** A follow-up study (U.S. Office of Education, 1979a) was conducted by RTI between October of 1976 and September of 1977 to gather data on the educational progress and persistence of these same students as related to the extent of prior Upward Bound participation. The study also evaluated student expectation, problems, and program effects. Follow-up data were collected during the 1977 academic year through the use of telephone interviews and mail surveys. The overall response rate was 71 percent and the data were representative of 95 percent of the

original sample of 54 programs. The data were generally accepted as reliable and within reasonable tolerance levels. The major findings are presented in Table I

Table I

**COMPOSIT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS OF  
UPWARD BOUND PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS OF  
TENTH GRADE STUDENTS**

	Upward Bound Participants	Non-participants
Completed High School	81%	80%
Entered Postsecondary Institutions	79%	61%
Completed Less Than One Year	14%	18%
Completed One Year	24%	23%
Completed Two or More Years	62%	59%

These findings indicated the educational patterns of Upward Bound participants and non-participants. The percentages reported were composite from tenth grade who have reached certain educational levels. As Table I indicates there is no real difference in the high school graduation rate. However, the Upward Bound participants entered at a much higher rate (79%) than non-participants (61%). The continuation rates were about the same for the two subgroups continuing their education, with the significant result of the larger percent of the Upward Bound participants (29%) still in postsecondary education after two years.

The overall postsecondary entry percentages must be examined in terms of differences on the types of institutions entered and the characteristics of the individuals who entered. A greater percentage (66%) of Upward Bound participants attended four-year institutions or universities, as compared to non-participants (51%). Former Upward Bound participants also reported greater attendance at institutions that hosted Upward Bound projects (47%) as compared to non-participants (23%). This significant difference at which Upward Bound participants attended Upward Bound hosted institutions cannot be explained by institutional proximity because both samples were drawn from the same locations. Some part of this difference may be related to the influence and contacts of Upward Bound staff among the institutions that host Upward Bound programs. There were important differences between the Upward Bound participants and non-participants who entered postsecondary education. There were more poor persons (64% vs 57%), ethnic minorities (86% vs 71%), and academic risks (43% vs 36%) among the Upward Bound participants indicating that the program appears to be targeted on the appropriate groups.

**A second follow-up Evaluation.** The Second Follow-up Evaluation (U.S. Office of Education, 1979a) was conducted between April of 1978 and September of 1979 by the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) in order to investigate long-term educational outcomes related to postsecondary experiences that were not possible to investigate in the First Follow-up Evaluation conducted by RTI. The emphasis of the evaluation was on postsecondary persistence, progress, and performances as related to the Upward Bound participants, as well as receipt of financial aid, use of support services and other contributing factors.

The design of the Second Follow-up (SFE) evaluation was limited by the base year design of 1973-74, where 54 programs were selected from the 333 programs in operation. The data for the SFE were collected during the 1978-79 academic year, using mail surveys and telephone interviews with eligible member from the original sample of 3,710 Upward Bound participants and 2,340 non-participating comparison students. The overall response rate was 73 percent and the data were acceptable in terms of reliability. The techniques used were hypothesis-testing, relational (exploratory and

assumption bound), with the use of modeling methods to examine educational outcomes as they relate to patterns of Upward Bound participation and individual background factors.

The major findings of the SFE indicated that typical participants enter four-year institutions at higher rates (91%) than non-participants (72%). Typical participants also indicated a higher rate of attendance at institutions with predominantly ethnic minority population, more selective institutions, and institutions hosting Upward Bound programs. More than 80 percent of Upward Bound participants aspired to at least a four-year college degree as compared to approximately 66 percent of the comparison group. Over 70 percent of the Upward Bound participants expected to complete a four-year program compared to 60 percent on the comparison group. These differences were attributed to greater expectations for postsecondary study. The Upward Bound participants also reported more difficulty in reaching expected education level, as compared to the comparison group: the difficulties included poor grade, under-developed skills in high school, and financial problems. These results were similar to the First Follow-up conducted by RTI.

With respect to the greater aspirations, the twelfth grade typical Upward Bound participants progressed on the average over half way toward their goals, while the comparison group made significantly less progress. Progress toward goals was lower for eleventh and tenth grade participants, but the difference between participants and non-participants remained stable. No differences were found between Upward Bound and non-participants on measure of persistence, as well as graduation rates within postsecondary education schools. Similarly, there were few differences on measures of educational performances between Upward Bound participants and non-participants. No significant difference were found between the groups in the rates of academic probation or dismissal, and Upward Bound participants had lower overall grade point averages by 4 (approximately one half of a letter grade) than did the non-participants.

Typical Upward Bound participants received financial aid at a different rate than non-participants. Typical Upward Bound participants received basic Educational Opportunity Grants, National Direct Student Loans, and College Work-study. The results of the Second Follow-up offer consistent support for the notion that the Upward Bound program is meeting its objectives. That is, the program provides participants with the skills and motivation needed for entry and persistence in postsecondary study. The impact is greater on short-term outcomes such as entry into postsecondary institutions, while there is less impact on long-term outcomes such as success in postsecondary education. The results of the study support the notion of an overall positive impact of Upward Bound participation on short-term postsecondary achievement.

#### **Additional Evaluations of Upward Bound**

Young and Exum (1982) conducted an evaluation of an Upward Bound program which focused on measuring whether the program was meeting its intended objectives and whether there were measurable indices of achievement development for the participants. In addition, they also assessed the longitudinal effects and outcomes on the participants and whether the outcomes justify the continuation of the programs.

The Upward Bound program selected for evaluation served students in northern Iowa and southern Minnesota. The participants came from families that had poverty income levels, and the highest level of income for any family was \$7,999. The participants were from grades 9 through 11 and were equally divided among male and female.

The participants were 34 Upward Bound seniors who were pretested with the California Achievement Test (CAT) 1977 series at level 19, grades 9 through 12. This is a norm-reference test as well as criterion-reference format for individualized assessment, and is designed to measure basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic. Minority students are represented in the norms and made up approximately 15% of the standardized sample. The cutoff for the exam at level 19 is a grade equivalent of 12.9 years, and the test battery is considered a well-developed assessment instrument by educational criteria.

The seniors in this Upward Bound program also took the American College Test (ACT), a standardized admissions test with mean composite score of for national samples of high school seniors.

Participants were in residence on campus for an eight-week summer program that included academic classes. They were pretested in order to determine academic proficiency and were post-tested to determine academic development and achievement.

The program results clearly indicated academic development across language arts and the quantitative skill areas and the findings were very positive. The findings certainly support the reports on the Upward Bound program produced by the Research Triangle Institute in 1977 and 1979. That is, the longer the intervention time for the participants the more successful the outcome in terms of measurable changes in academic performance.

This study concludes that Upward Bound programs present information in manners that support differences in learning styles such as the field dependent learner and the culturally diverse student. In addition, it was felt that the emphasis on mastery learning, counseling, and academic situations. It was felt that Upward Bound programs place the student in an environment that is designed for their success, and presents a kind of learning laboratory. Finally, it was felt that these programs provide practice in standardized test-taking and also serve to enhance the self-concept of the individual learner.

## CONCLUSION

Several studies have shown evidence of the benefits of the Upward Bound program. The studies completed by the Research Triangle Institute conclude that the Upward Bound program provides participants with the skills, motivation, and assistance for entry into postsecondary education. However, it is not clear whether the program provides the skills, motivation, and assistance needed for success in postsecondary education. However, evidence does not exist which indicates that Upward Bound participants' postsecondary success is significantly better than comparable non-participants.

Accordingly, the Department of Education, project officials and policymakers have agreed that there is a need to concentrate on three areas in future evaluations.

1. Retention in Upward Bound programs.
2. Enrollment in postsecondary education
3. Measurable progress in postsecondary education.

Congruent achievements with the Department of Education officials would include retention in high school, grade level academic achievement while in high school, grade level achievement in college, and "the ultimate mark of success – graduation from postsecondary institution."

Finally, the success of the Upward Bound program from 1965 to 1986 reflects the efforts of the educational policy makers at federal, state, and local levels as well as the efforts of the administrators, counselors, and instructors who have worked with Upward Bound students at hosts institutions committed to the goals and objectives of the Upward Bound Program.