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ABSTRACT

This study articulates and maps the changes found in the historical discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy and state-level policy formation. The relationship between the momentum to create education reform through policy and the actual creation of the policy through state level regulatory entities is also explored in this research study. The theoretical model developed for this study frames three rationales for policy development- sociological, economic, and organizational rationales. Policy discourse analysis, an examination of policy language, is used as the methodology to develop the narrative of changing discourses. Understanding discourse is a way to understand the meanings, practices, and agendas of policy processes. Through policy discourse analysis, a deeper understanding of P-16 as a large scale education reform is attained. The historical mapping of P-16 discourse development in the United States provides a vital component in understanding the role of discourse in the creation of education policy. Analysis of the both national P-16 policy advocacy documents and state level P-16 policy formation documents demonstrates a shifting of discourses over time. Early P-16 advocates and policy makers were likely to use both sociological and economic rationales in sampled documents. However, later P-16 advocates and policy makers were more likely to use economic rationales. A stable foundation of organizational discourse was uncovered historically throughout both advocacy documents and policy formation documents and provides P-16 with a potential mode of sustainability. In addition, this research found evidence that P-16 policy advocacy discourses were influential on P-16 policy formation discourses.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

For clarification purposes, the following terminology will be used in this proposal as described below.

P-16 Initiatives- P-16 is an educational reform initiative defined by the advocates as an aligned state level system for all students, from Preschool through Higher Education. As an ideological premise, P-16 initiatives call for the coordination of all parts of the educational system, including governance, curricula, and funding, to provide students with a more complete and seamless pipeline of education.

Discourse Analysis- Discourse analysis is generally considered the study of language. Discourse analysis examines communicative events of all types, including speech, conversation, non-verbal communications, and documents. While there are several types of discourse analysis, this proposal will use a particular form, policy discourse analysis as its chosen methodology to study documents.

Policy Discourse Analysis- Policy discourse analysis examines the structure and content of the language of policy and policy making. This research proposal will use Ball’s (2006) definition which finds that policy discourse analysis aims to understand policy formation, practice, and the contexts surrounding them.
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The purpose of this dissertation research study is to articulate and map the changes found in historical discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy and state-level policy formation. Understanding how and when the discourses of P-16 initiatives evolve highlights how the changes in motivations and rationales behind policy development can potentially influence sustainability of education policy. This research also explores the relationship between the momentum to create education reform through policy and the actual creation of policy through state level regulatory entities. By exploring this latter relationship, this research also adds to the policy analysis research base and provides information about the mechanisms of educational policy creation. This historical analysis combines both mapping of discourses and an examination of the influence of discourse in policy processes in order to understand a national large scale education reform initiative.

Policy discourse analysis is used as the methodology to develop the narrative of changing discourses. Policy discourse analysis is an examination of policy language. Discourse can be understood as a type of communication, written, verbal, or non-verbal. In this dissertation, discourse refers to the language found in the texts of national P-16
policy advocacy documents and state level P-16 policy formation documents.

Understanding discourse is a way to understand the meanings, practices, and agendas of policy processes. Through policy discourse analysis, a deeper understanding of P-16 as an education reform is attained. In particular, the incorporation of time provides a method for mapping historical discourse development of P-16 initiatives in the United States, providing a vital component in understanding the role of discourse in the creation of education policy.

Previous research on P-16 education, while extremely informative, has generally examined the outcomes of programs or it has taken on a tone of advocacy. This dissertation is a departure from both previous research and advocacy based reports because it positions the research study as a policy analysis. This chapter establishes the groundwork for this dissertation research. First, an overview of P-16 initiatives is developed, including what they are and a short history of the reform effort to date. This introduction to “P-16” and the subsequent review of the P-16 educational reform advocacy literature provides a basis for this dissertation research. This is followed by a brief exploration of the theoretical foundation used in this study. The research questions are next. This chapter concludes with the assumptions and limitations of the study and the organization of the dissertation.
What is P-16? – Defining P-16 Initiatives

“P-16” is an educational reform initiative encompassing statewide systemic policy changes that refocus the way the current educational system is configured, governed, authorized, and funded. P-16 advocates highlight the creation of one aligned educational system, a pipeline of education, where all the subsystems, preschool through higher education, work together to provide a better education for students (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001). P-16 is often described by the advocates (Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001) as a systemic reform initiative which creates a seamless educational system, in which students enter ready to learn through a quality preschool program (P) and exit with a degree (16) and/or a career.

P-16, as a state level reform initiative, encompasses several elements of educational reform, including teacher training, curricula, student outcome measures, alignment of high school graduation requirements with postsecondary requisites, state level data gathering and use of data to form scientific justification for reforms, and governance alignment of efforts (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001). P-16 is generally implemented in one of two ways, either legislatively or through policy formation from state governance agencies (Cohen and Spillane 1992; Imber and vanGeel 2004).

P-16 initiatives, known alternatively as P-20, K-20, K-16, B-20, PK-20, PK-20+, and PreK-16, are state level policy reform initiatives. The moniker “P-16” came into the educational reform lexicon in the mid-1980s. As was typical of this time period, calls for changes in the current educational system were prominent. National reports, such as A
Nation at Risk (1983), highlighted problems and concerns with the educational systems throughout the Unites States. In 1985, the concept of P-16 was introduced by Harold Hodgkinson in his seminal policy report All One System. Hodgkinson developed the idea that education systems should connect K-12 with postsecondary education. P-16 proponents advocated for continued change, calling for concrete systemic change for the purpose of meeting America’s educational ideals of democracy, equity, access, as well as to serve the purpose of developing a more educated workforce and economically strong nation.

In the early 1990s, several states developed P-16 councils and began the process of working toward a P-16 system. Georgia, Texas and Oregon pioneered the P-16 systems in the United States, creating statewide systems which connected K-12 and public higher education programs. Throughout the 2000s, states increasingly became involved in the P-16 movement. In 2000, six states had formed a P-16 council. By 2010, 38 states had formed a P-16 council. In addition, by 2010, 46 states had either developed or were in the process of developing a state level P-16 program (Durand 2010). The increased presence of this reform throughout the United States, as well as the continued national advocacy for the development and implementation of further P-16 efforts forms the foundational relevance of this dissertation research.

P-16 Advocacy Literature Review

In this section, a concise review of the relevant literature follows. The literature on P-16 is predominantly policy advocacy based. In this dissertation, advocacy literature is defined as that literature which seeks to promote or advocate for a particular education
reform. This type of literature is not empirical research, but rather advocates for change for a variety of reasons. In this case, it refers to reports, articles, or papers which seek change through written arguments for an educational reform initiative through the policy process. In contrast to research studies, advocacy literature clearly has a bias or predisposition toward a certain outcome. The “P-16 system” as described in the advocacy literature can be considered an *ideal type* of system (Weber 1947). In viewing the P-16 system as a general phenomenon of educational reform and subjectively grouping the characteristics and ideas associated with P-16, it is possible to construct a common *ideal type*. In this way, the ideas, thoughts, and actions of what P-16 advocates promoted nationally (based on their research and educational ideals) are used to both understand P-16 as an education reform initiative, as well as to map the consequent actions of states’ policy formation. Key P-16 advocacy literature is covered in brief here, with a more detailed examination in Chapter Two.

In their seminal research study, Michael Usdan *et al.*’s 1969 book, *Education and State Politics: The Developing Relationship between Elementary-Secondary and Higher Education*, set the stage for education reformists to make connections between K-12 education and postsecondary education. This study, although not an advocacy based piece, was the first effort to make the connection between K-12 and postsecondary education. It is widely cited as the first “P-16” study and used in future advocacy reports as evidence of the need for one continuous educational system.

Following on this concept of aligning educational sectors, Harold Hodgkinson’s policy report *All One System (1985)* promoted the idea that education systems should connect K-12 with postsecondary education. He observed that most states view
postsecondary systems as separate and distinct from K-12 schooling and recommended that state education organizations overcome decades of separation of funding, governance, accountability, and standards to establish one seamless system. In his follow-up, *All One System: A Second Look*, (1999), Hodgkinson continued to promote the ideal system where education systems are aligned and worked together. In addition, he advocated for including preschool in this systemic reform effort. These works attest to the consistency of the P-16 concept throughout the 1980s and 1990s. In addition, these reports set the stage for future P-16 advocacy reports by developing the concept of P-16 and helping to define the elements that it encompasses.

Continuing the focus on connecting successive levels of education at the state level, in 2000, The Consortium for Policy Research in Education published the policy brief, *Bridging the K-12/Postsecondary Divide with a Coherent K-12 System*. This brief noted a division between K-12 and higher education and called for an alignment of assessments and standards, improvement of teacher training and quality, and improved data reporting systems.

Van de Water and Rainwater’s 2001 policy report, *What is P-16 Education? A Primer for Legislators*, defines P-16 as a system-wide comprehensive education reform effort which describes the educational experience as a pipeline, where each level, preschool to higher education, flows into the next level. Through a clear exposition on the elements of a P-16 system, as well as outlining the strengths and challenges of P-16, the authors define what P-16 should be for policy-makers.
Shortly after, the 2002 policy report, *Gathering Momentum: Building the Learning Connection between Schools and Colleges*, focused on critical elements of developing a K-16 system (The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002). They assert that the key elements of the P-16 issue are improving equity in education, increasing relationships, communication, and levels of cooperation between various levels of governance within state education settings, aligning assessments and standards across the state, improving teacher training, and including community involvement in education efforts.

These advocacy reports are the basis for the P-16 education initiatives because they provide the reform movement with definitions and guidelines for development. These were chosen to be highlighted in this study because they are the most quoted and utilized in both future policy advocacy and policy development.

Research and Evaluation of P-16 Initiatives

Although several P-16 programs have been in progress for more than a decade, there is very little research evaluating these programs. Generally, this research focuses on certain aspects of P-16 reforms, such as program evaluations, reports on developments of parts of a P-16 system (i.e. data warehouses or preschool programs), or on alignment efforts at the state level, and not on the systems as a whole. Highlights of this research are provided here with full exploration in Chapter Two.
The first research study on educational alignment efforts was Michael Usdan et al.’s book, *Education and State Politics: The Developing Relationship between Elementary-Secondary and Higher Education* (1969). They completed a twelve state study using interviews with key officials and archival state documents to consider three elements of relationships between K-12 and higher education; the form of the relationship, any processes affecting relationships and an analysis of the relationship for patterns and uncovered meanings (Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969). They reported that these relationships could be categorized as either conflictual or cooperative, although conflict and fractured relationships were most common in the studied states.

This empirical research include explorations of alignment efforts between K-12 and postsecondary schooling (Brown and Conley 2007; Dounay 2006; Oregon Roundtable and Oregon Business Council 2005, 2005) and governance collaborations (Anderson-Butcher et al. 2005; McGrath 2006; McGrath et al. 2005). States have conducted their own single state evaluations designed to report on outcomes including student achievement and program evaluations. For example, Indiana is in the process of exploring several alignment programs between Indiana Universities and high schools (Center for P-16 Research and Collaboration- Indiana 2010). Texas and Georgia have also completed evaluations on the effectiveness of their programs (Texas Education Agency 2008; Kettlewell, Kaste, and Jones 2000).

Additionally, a literature search revealed only two dissertations with P-16 as the topic. Both were examinations of elements of state-level P-16 initiatives. The first is an in-depth qualitative case study policy analysis of dual enrollment courses over a 30 year period in Florida (Rasch 2004). The second is a broad study of the relationship between
two separate sectors of the state budget, K-12 and postsecondary education (Streams 2007). Streams’ study provides a quantitative national study of fiscal elements of education. Both are studies of P-16 systems with a focus on outcomes. However, one is a singular case study, albeit over three decades, that looks in depth at one state. The other is a broader national study which focuses solely on a particular element of P-16 systems. In contrast, this dissertation embarks on a policy analysis which includes both an historical look at P-16 as a reform movement over several decades, as well as provides the breadth of sampling across all fifty states in the P-16 movement. By looking historically at the inception of this reform and encompassing all fifty states in this analysis, this study contributes to the research base by exploring how a large national educational reform initiative is conceived and sustained.

With this knowledge of the limitations in the research base on P-16 programs and related policies, this study endeavored to further investigate P-16 initiatives throughout the United States using policy analysis. The study documents the historical development and changes of specific types of discourse of the P-16 movement. Utilizing P-16 policy documents (both national advocacy and state level policy and legislation documents), this study adds in the dimension of time for two outcomes. First, this study maps and documents the history of P-16 policy making in the United States. Second, this study uncovers the historical changes of discourse of P-16 policymaking – from advocacy to formation - through the use of the theoretical framework described in the next section.
Theoretical Foundation

This research project examined whether the discourses of P-16 shifted over time. Such an analysis is important because the discourses of the policy process have the potential to affect both the implementation and the sustainability of education reform initiatives. This analysis provides policy makers with a clearer understanding of the underlying rationales and motivations behind the development of P-16 as a policy. The following theoretical framework was applied to the analysis of the data. This framework stems from three discourses - sociological, economic, and organizational discourses - prevalent in the policy advocacy literature previously discussed.

In order to examine P-16 initiatives, various theories from social sciences are applied to explore discourses in the policy process from advocacy to formation. As previously noted, policy discourse analysis is an examination of policy language- or discourse- expressed in policy documents and materials (Clarke 2007). Analysis is done through coding of documents to develop categorizations of data, sorting and analyzing patterns within the data, identifying points of conflict that reflect different interpretations by different documents or policy communities, and explaining the implications of the different ways of interpreting or developing meaning from the texts (Clarke 2007).

In this study, the researcher turned to theoretical concepts to guide the coding and categorization of the documents. The theoretical framework developed for this study utilizes three social science lenses - sociological, economic, and organizational rationales - prevalent in the policy advocacy literature, in order to focus the analysis and interpretation of discourses. The theoretical concepts used in this study’s model have a
long history of use in education reform initiatives, ideals of schooling, and education policy processes (See for example Bowe, Ball, and Gold 1992; Callan 2001; Coleman 1986; Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore 1991; Katzenelson and Weir 1985; Lagemann 2000; McGuinn 2006; Rose 2010; Rothstein, Jacobsen, and Wilder 2006; Ruppert 1994; Sanoff 2006; Spring 2001; Zigler and Styfco 2000; Zumeta 2001; Tyack, James, and Benavot 1987). This study aims to examine the use of these theoretical concepts as they apply to P-16. The three social science rationales utilized for this study are discussed in the following sections.

**Sociological Rationales**

Some of the P-16 advocacy literature (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001) utilizes social justice language as a rationale for the development of a P-16 statewide initiative. While not explicitly mentioning any sociological theories or theorists, the discourse within some P-16 policy advocacy literature contains language (or discourse) which helped to formulate and focus the P-16 reform movement on creating a more socially stable, seamless, interdependent education system. Examples of this type of language within P-16 advocacy literature includes support for increased student accessibility, opportunities for preschool programs, development of systems which address current societal inequities, and utilizing legislative or regulatory entities to legitimize this movement. In other examples, the widely used pipeline metaphor which describes an ideal type system where education is seamlessly and continuously provided to all students from preschool through postsecondary education is used by advocates. Thus, three sociological lenses,
functionalism, conflict theory, and rational-legal authority, are employed in the analysis of the documents of this study.

The first sociological theory utilized in the theoretical framework focuses on the functional nature of education. Functionalist frameworks (Durkheim 1956, 1961, 1964; Parsons 1959) approach education as a support for the creation of a socially unitized society, the development of culture, values, and social unity, and determining which students have the necessary characteristics for particular functions in society. The second theory explored for this study is that of the conflict theorists (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Coleman 1966; Jencks et al. 1972; Willis 1977). Conflict theorists critically review the functionalist paradigm and believe that competition, inequality, conflict, and revolution are inevitable parts of systems, including education systems. The third sociological construct brought to bear on this research is the rational-legal authority of Weber (1958). The concept of rational-legal authority refers to the idea that institutions follow the rules set up by official legal routes and policy decrees because they hold power and strength of authority. These sociological concepts are applied to the analysis of discourses within P-16 advocacy and policy formation documents.

Economic Rationales

In addition, the P-16 policy advocacy literature (Krueger 2006; Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Venezia et al. 2005), relies on economic rationales for developing a P-16 system. Examples of this type of language within the P-16 advocacy literature include developing a P-16 system in order to create a more efficient and productive education system. This system would develop a more skilled workforce with increased
education attainment. Therefore, three key concepts are employed in this economic portion of this theoretical framework.

The first concept in the economic portion of the framework is the development of human capital; defined as the investment of humans in education and learning experiences (Becker 1993; Hartog, 2000). The second key concept is demonstrated by Hanushek (1986) who stated that education can lead to a more efficient and productive society. The third key economic concept in the P-16 advocacy literature is increased economic growth. Thurow (1977) explains that education systems can lead to a better trained workforce, with knowledge and skills to participate in a technical and ever-changing competitive economy. This concept stems from the notion that the world economic boundaries are becoming more blurred and that education can help people be more prepared to participate in a global economic society. These three economic theoretical principles were brought to bear upon the discourse analysis of the language of both national P-16 advocacy literature and the statewide P-16 policy formation documents.

Organizational Rationales

The third segment of the theoretical framework used in this study is focused on organizational reform. System change discourses are present in the language of P-16 advocacy, connecting the sociological and economic rationales and providing a stable and constant underpinning to this reform effort. Examples of this type of language in the P-16 advocacy literature include developing a pipeline through alignment programs, pragmatic matters such as development of a P-16 council or establishing evaluative
structures, and organizational restructuring through increased communication and goal setting. Thus, the theory of systems change is applied to this study.

This research examined system reform through an organizational lens, to investigate P-16 systems through a systems organizational framework. Open system theorists (Hall 2002; Katz and Kahn 1978; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Scott 1992, 2001) believe that as systems are more open, their connections with external elements are critical, subsystems have increased communication. In contrast, a closed system is characterized by inflexible and impenetrable boundaries. Katz and Kahn (1978) describe the closed system perspective as that which views an organization by examining internal structures, but little consideration of external environments.

The multi-theoretical model outlined here takes into account three significant rationales, sociological, economic, and organizational, for the development of P-16 initiatives. These rationales and the model guide the methodology of this study. Further details on this model are expanded in Chapter Two (see Figure 2.1 for a graphic depiction). Utilization of this framework provided a conceptual lens for the coding and categorization of the discourses within P-16 national policy advocacy and state policy formation documents. Additionally, this theoretical framework comprises the analytical lens applied to policy discourse analysis of these documents.

**Methodology**

As previously discussed, the theoretical model developed to frame this study focused on the analysis of language found in P-16 reform initiative. The multi-theoretical focus, sociological, economic, and organizational, forms the basis for utilizing policy
discourse analysis as the chosen methodology. This methodology is briefly discussed in this section with a full description in Chapter Three.¹

Discourse analysis, as a methodology, can be interpreted in many ways. Many agree that discourse analysis is the study of language (Fairclough 1992; Gee 1999; Woods 2006). However, approaches to discourse analysis can take many formats and refers to various definitions of “language,” including texts of all kinds - documents, newspapers, books, articles, textbooks, etc; verbal communications - speech, conversation, exchanges, dialogues; and non-verbal communications - gestures, facial expressions, movement (see for example, Myers 2000; Fairclough 1992; Luke 1995; Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Woods 2006; Foucault 1972; Jørgensen and Phillips 2002; Van Dijk 1997). This study uses policy discourse analysis to examine the shifting discourses in the text-based language found in national P-16 policy advocacy literature and state level P-16 policy and legislative documents. Using policy discourse analysis provides a departure from other policy analyses which use critical discourse analysis as their methodology².

Policy discourse analysis may explore the content and structure of the language of policy (Ball 2006). This can include policy formation, practice, and contexts of policy. Ball (2006) discusses two forms of policy discourse, policy as text and policy as discourse. Policy as text is represented by both documents and outcome while policy as discourse makes sense of language, understanding contexts and meaning through analysis

¹ Chapter Three also contains a question by question layout of an analysis plan, coding charts, and samples of the proposed matrix and other charts for clarification.
² Critical discourse analysis offers a differing (although commonly used) view of discourse analysis - focusing on the “problem” from the viewpoint that power and language are connected and integral.
of words, word order, and phrases (Ball 2006; Glynos et al. 2009; Lewis and Simon 1986). Interpreting the words within policy documents and seeking understanding, implications, and assumptions are critical in policy discourse analysis (Ball 2006). Many reform initiatives attempt to address complex problems and policy discourse analysis offers the researcher a new way of examining these complexities. Researchers utilize pre-established theoretical frameworks to guide the policy discourse analysis of policy formation, establishment, or practice (deLeon 1998; Fischer 1995; Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007).

For this study, three types of documents were studied. The first is a sample of P-16 national policy advocacy documents which represent the history of P-16 policy advocacy. P-16 policy formation documents, including all state level official policy and legislative documents pertaining to P-16 comprise the other two types. Using the computer aided software program, NVivo 8 (QSR International 2009), this researcher coded all documents by sentence in order to uncover and capture the emerging discourses. Categorical coding was predetermined based on the literature review and the theoretical framework and focuses on sociological, economic, and organizational elements.

Data analysis utilized a meta-matrix system to explore the depth and breadth of discourse levels in the documents (Miles and Huberman 1994). Presence (or absence) of discourse was documented and a depth of discourse was determined by using a LOW/MOD/HIGH coding system as described by Miles and Huberman (1994). This was followed by a mapping of the chronology of discourses throughout the cases. Analysis included the notation of shifting of P-16 discourses, relationships between cases, and
ultimately a narrative policy discourse analysis. These analyses ultimately led to the validation (or disproof) of the hypotheses.

**Research Questions**

In summary, the general intent of this dissertation research study is to articulate the shifting of P-16 policy discourses. Analyzing the rationales behind the momentum for P-16 to gain a foothold in education reform and the formation of P-16 initiatives constitutes a new focus for the study of P-16. Additionally, the purpose is to determine if relationships exist between the intersections of discourses found in P-16 national policy advocacy documents and P-16 state level policy formation documents. This analysis furthers the knowledge of policy mechanisms and processes by focusing specifically on processes that initiate and formulate policy. By focusing on the historical changes of a large scale national reform initiative, this study adds information as to how discourse plays a role in the development and formation of P-16 initiatives. Thus, the following questions comprise the basis for this dissertation research.

*Question One:* Do the dominant discourses within the P-16 national policy advocacy literature and the P-16 state level policy and legislative documents vary by era of time?

*Question Two:* What are the relationships between time eras of P-16 and the influence of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation (represented by state level policy and legislation)?

A. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy advocacy documents over time?
B. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy formation documents over time?
C. Do the discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation have influence on each other?
Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

This researcher acknowledges the following assumptions about the research study. It is assumed that official policy and legislative documents are accurate documentary representations of state level policy formation. Based upon literature searches of policy and policy formation mechanisms (Bell and Stevenson 2006; Essex 2005; Hawkesworth 1988; Taylor et al. 1997; Yudof et al. 2002; Ball 2006; Clarke 2007; Fischer 1995; Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007; Sabatier 2007; Stone 1997), this assumption appears to be appropriate.

In this study, it is assumed that how states choose to label their P-16 programs does not affect the outcomes of this study. In fact, states label their P-16 programs in many different ways and this could potentially affect how the program is seen (a B-20 program clearly has a different set of parameters and needs than a K-16 program). It could also potentially affect the types of legislation or policy developed. However, this study is designed to identify commonalities among programs and thus it is beyond the focus of this study to determine how differences in program labels might affect the programs.

Finally, several assumptions about the research questions were made prior to analysis, particularly in regard to time sequences. These assumptions were based upon the literature review and lead the researcher toward a natural sequence of early policy advocacy and formation versus later policy advocacy and formation. These assumptions
were found to be valid in most, but not all circumstances. However, this researcher has compensated for these errors in the findings section with further time delineations.

Limitations

This researcher also acknowledges the following limitations within this research study. The first limitation is that the boundaries of time established in this study (January 1, 1985 - June 30, 2010) leave the possibility of missing some potential data sources. There is the possibility that some P-16 policy was officially installed prior to January 1, 1985. However, based upon the literature search of P-16 and prior research (Durand 2007; Mokher 2010), 1992 is the earliest date states claim to have established any official P-16 programs. Additionally, as P-16 is currently a widespread movement in the United States, the status of P-16 changes rapidly. Therefore, setting an end date for data collection of June 30, 2010 leaves the possibility that changes to P-16 in some states may occur after this date.

Second, as the focus of this effort is on the language of policy formation, it may not be possible to infer conclusions for policy practice. This study aims to explore the relationships between the discourses of policy advocacy and formation. In addition, it maps the shifting of discourses of P-16 initiatives over time. It leaves exploration of the implementation and practice of P-16 for further study.

Place and context matter, particularly in discourse analysis. It is acknowledged that states contexts, and in particular, state characteristics such as governance, population, political conditions, economic environment, and geography could potentially affect discourse about education policy. Due to the structure established for this study, not
every context can be accounted for in this study. In this study, context is limited to time, place (state), and text. Contextual issues could be important to future studies.

Finally, the nature of discourse analysis requires the researcher to include some of their own biases, knowledge, and previous experience with the subject. These biases and previous knowledge can be both helpful in providing necessary background and foundation to this study, as well as potentially detrimental if the researcher allows biases to cloud analytic study. This researcher has developed and followed several steps to alleviate bias and error in this study. These steps are described in Chapter Three. However, it is acknowledged that despite great care, the potential for bias still exists and this researcher accepts all errors as her own.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized as follows. Chapter One consists of an introduction, summary of the research literature, synopsis of the theoretical foundation, overview of the methodology, statement of purpose, research questions, assumptions, limitations, and the organization of the study. Chapter Two provides an overview of the relevant literature of P-16, including P-16 definitions, current research on P-16 programs, proponents for P-16, and challenges of P-16. Chapter Two also contains the current status of P-16 programs in the United States, both at the state level and federal level. Finally, the theoretical foundation is established and the theoretical model is introduced in Chapter Two. Chapter Three explains the methodology in detail. An examination of policy analysis in general and policy discourse analysis specifically is undertaken. Then, Chapter Three contains a description of the sampling methods, coding procedures, the
software analytical tool, and the data analysis plan. Chapters Four and Five present the research findings. Chapter Six presents a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings in relation to the theoretical model, and implications for policy and practice.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to develop a historical mapping of the shifts in dominant discourses of P-16 policy processes. National P-16 advocacy literature and official state level P-16 policy and legislative documents were explored using a theoretical model, which takes into account the element of time. This study narrates the shifting of discourses, relationships between discourses within parts of the policy process, and articulates the rationales behind P-16 - an educational policy reform.

Chapter Two is divided into three sections. The first is a literature review of the relevant P-16 literature. This includes both P-16 policy advocacy literature and P-16 empirical research studies. The second section comprises a look at policy analysis and its connection to the study of P-16 initiatives. The third section builds upon the previous two sections providing the theoretical foundation for this study, with three critical components to P-16 policy analysis and how they link to the theoretical model developed for this dissertation.
P-16 Defined

Within the last two decades, a new model of education reform has emerged. Known generally as P-16\(^3\), these initiatives are state level policy efforts aimed at developing an educational system where each stage, from early childhood education to higher education, builds into the next (Portch 2006). P-16 advocates describe these initiatives as systemic state level comprehensive reform efforts (Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001). In a P-16 system, all educational stakeholders, from preschool to higher education, work to improve the system as a whole (VandeWater and Rainwater 2001). These efforts are described in the policy advocacy literature as “policy umbrellas” which gather several reform efforts (preschool, data reform, teacher quality reform, alignment efforts, and economic development) and call for all educational stakeholders to communicate, coordinate, and make one consistent system.

In this study, the term “P-16” is defined by the advocacy literature. The fundamental P-16 literature is primarily based upon these policy reports or literature issued by education consortiums and P-16 advocates. As previously stated, in this dissertation, advocacy literature is defined as that literature which advocates for a particular education reform. This promotion of education reform is not in a salesmanship or marketing type of way, but rather coherent and consistent arguments for reform. These arguments are founded in the creation of change because current conditions or

\(^3\) States have alternative titles for this reform effort, including P-16, P-20, K-16, K-20, B-20, Pre-K-16, and PreK-20, however, for the purposes of this study, all of these efforts will be referred to as P-16 initiatives. As was previously acknowledged in the limitations of this research study, it is clear that different names will require different courses of action for states. However, as this does not affect this particular dissertation study because the study focuses on the discourses within existing policy and law, the “P-16” name will be used here.
circumstances have been deemed in need of either improvement or advancement. In contrast to empirical research studies, advocacy literature clearly has a bias or predisposition toward a certain outcome.

The “P-16 system” as described in the advocacy literature is an ideal type of system (Weber 1947). When viewing P-16 as a general phenomenon of education reform, it is possible to construct an ideal type by grouping the characteristics and ideas associated with P-16. Weber (1947) refers to understanding an ideal type as a way of focusing on what motivates social action and behavior through the construction of an abstract typology that incorporates all of the characteristics of the studied phenomenon, with the understanding that the general typology may not correspond to the contextualization of specific cases. Weber’s conception of ideal types is a used as a tool to frame the general synthesis of ideas, thoughts and actions of what P-16 advocates promote historically and nationally. Then it is applied at the state level as a means of documenting how P-16 as a phenomenon manifests as policy formation.

In the case of this dissertation, the advocacy literature is founded on the premise that the current structure and mechanisms of the education system are deficient in meeting the needs of students, parents, schools, and the general economy of the state and nation. This basic foundation, enhanced by current statistics and facts which emphasize their argument, form the advocacy literature and the primary phase of policy development of P-16. Therefore, the definition of P-16 is gleaned from this policy advocacy literature.
P-16 Advocacy Literature Review

P-16 literature consists primarily of a significant and influential collection of reports that are designed to advocate for the creation of a redesigned, reconfigured and newly governed system of education at the state level. There is currently a lack of empirical research studies on P-16 as a policy or as a program. In this section, four seminal P-16 policy literatures are reviewed. While other P-16 advocates and challengers exist and are noted in the following sections, the four policy advocacy reports reviewed here were chosen based upon their widespread use in subsequent P-16 policy and literature and their complete coverage of the P-16 issues.

In their seminal research study, Michael Usdan et al.’s 1969 book, *Education and State Politics: The Developing Relationship between Elementary-Secondary and Higher Education*, set the stage for education reformists to make connections between K-12 education and postsecondary education. This study, although not an advocacy based piece, was the first effort to make the connection between K-12 and postsecondary education. It is widely cited as the first “P-16” research study and used in future advocacy reports as evidence of the need for one continuous educational system.

In 1985, Harold Hodgkinson’s policy report, *All One System*, re-proposed the initiative that would connect K-12 with postsecondary education. He argued that our nation’s postsecondary schools were reliant upon the quality of the K-12 school system and yet, as he observed, states view these as two separate and distinct systems (Hodgkinson 1985). In 1999, Hodgkinson returned with a re-examination of P-16 and its

---

4 This research study will be reviewed more thoroughly in the empirical research section next in this chapter. It is highlighted here as well because it is a foundational study in the history of P-16 and many advocacy reports cite it as a seminal work.
relevant issues in *All One System: A Second Look*. In this follow-up, he focuses on the description of a P-16 system and its parts. He first discusses the merits of a quality statewide preschool program, particularly the strength of the national program Head Start. He notes that a linkage mechanism that joins early childhood education with later schooling involves licensing, training, and credentialing staff, creating clear and attainable goals for kindergarten so that preschool curricula can help meet these goals, and developing communication linkages between elementary school and preschool personnel (Hodgkinson 1999, p 4). He also observes that preschool is particularly important for the poorest children and recommends that children have access to safe, quality, developmentally appropriate programs with nutrition, physical activity, and health care as additional goals of such programs (p 5).

Hodgkinson (1999) continues the P-16 discussion by moving up the educational pipeline and examining elementary schooling and in particular, the transition points from elementary school to middle school and beyond. He focuses on standardized testing as a gateway to linking early and middle education (p 8). Then he explores the connections between high school education and workforce or college. This exploration looks at the connection in the form of people, guidance counselors, teachers, advisors, and testing, SATs, College Boards, and ACT tests (p 10). He concludes this report with the following:

“K-16, so far, is an idea: education should be a seamless web from kindergarten to college graduation. It almost always leaves out the crucial first five years of life, but has been very useful in some states in which the governors have supported educational standards that are calibrated across the grades and levels (p15).”
Hodgkinson’s policy reports set the stage for further P-16 advocacy reports and kept the P-16 idea and name in the education spotlight in the 1980s and 1990s.

Following on the concept of connecting K-12 and postsecondary education systems, in 2000, The Consortium for Policy Research in Education\(^5\) published a policy brief called *Bridging the K-12/Postsecondary Divide with a Coherent K-16 System*. They observed that cross-system collaborations are starting to be evident in many states, nearly a dozen by 1999. These collaborative efforts are generated by changing educational environments including increasing percentages of students attending postsecondary education, democratic values, and economic motivations (p 1-2). Remarking on the disjuncture between K-12 and higher education, they called for the “institutionalization of a K-16 perspective and improving teaching to meet more demanding K-16 standards (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000, p 2). They found that this schism between educational levels is evident in conflicting student standards, inequality of opportunities for some students, high school drop-out rates and college remediation. They sum up the rifts by stating:

> “Because there is not an integrated accountability system for the two systems, postsecondary faculties blame high schools for sending them poorly prepared students; high school administrators blame colleges for not doing a better job preparing teachers; high school teachers blame middle and elementary schools for not better preparing students for secondary school; students and their parents often cite a lack of information about what is required for postsecondary admissions and course placement. Everyone is to blame; no one is responsible (p 4).”

---

\(^5\) The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) is a federally funded research agency which studies local, state, and federal education issues (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2007).
The Consortium for Policy Research in Education report (2000) called for the institutionalization of K-16 ideals—particularly the alignment of assessments and standards between K-12 and postsecondary (p 5). These alignments could be made easier through student counseling, parent and student college information sessions, and postsecondary outreach programs. They also explained the need for a K-16 statewide data reporting system “that would allow policy makers, educators, and the mass media to trace the progress of students from high schools through postsecondary institutions (p 5).” Additionally, they promoted the improvement of teacher quality and training as a way of improving the education system as a whole. Noting that there are many obstacles to a K-16 system, such as historical separations of K-12 and postsecondary educators and political divisions at governance levels, they found that more than a dozen states have begun to cooperate on P-16 efforts at a state level (p 10).

Shortly after that, Van de Water and Rainwater’s P-16 policy report, What is P-16 Education? A Primer for Legislators, is written for the Education Commission of the States in 2001. In this treatise on P-16, Van de Water and Rainwater define P-16, clearly outline the strengths and challenges of P-16 systems, explore P-16 systems in four states and finally propose a step by step guide for establishing P-16 education system. Their oft quoted and idealized explanation of P16 is:

“Imagine a system of education where every child enters school ready to learn, where all third graders read at or above grade level, where all students have taken algebra by the end of the 8th grade, where high school exit exams test students at the 12th-grade level and are aligned with college admissions requirements, where all young people graduate from high school prepared for
college or work, and where every student who enters college finishes college.(p 1)"

In an examination of the education system, they found that the system lacks a coherent and connected plan for meeting the educational needs of its students (p 5). Noting that previous efforts to reform the education system had been rather piecemeal, they found that by 2000, twenty-four states reported “multi-faceted P-16 initiatives” (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001). P-16 is thus defined as:

“...the shorthand term for an integrated system of education stretching from early childhood (the “P” stands for pre-kindergarten or preschool) through a four year college degree (“grade 16”). The ultimate goal of P-16 system is to improve student achievement by getting kids off to a good start, raising academic standards, conducting appropriate assessments, improving teacher quality and generally smoothing student transitions from one level of learning to the next (p 3).”

In addition, this policy brief outlines eight potential strengths of a P-16 system (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001, p 7-8). The first describes a system that is inclusive for all learners from all races, social classes, ages, and ability levels. Other possible assets of a P-16 system include the alignment of educational efforts at all levels, system-wide support of standards and assessments, creation of a coherent progression of learning, curricula, and standards, and removes boundaries at transition points. Additionally, they describe how a P-16 system would potentially reduce the need for remediation at all levels, is more effective and efficient, and shows the ability of the education system to adapt to changing needs and wants of the economy.
Conversely, they portray seven potential challenges to a P-16 system (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001p 8-9). These possible obstacles include the length of time necessary to develop such a complex system, current structural issues such as fragmented state educational organizations, leadership issues, and historical boundaries, as well as acknowledgement that including a preschool element to the educational system creates a new set of issues including financial, jurisdictional, and assessments. The final challenge that is covered is lack of evidence that this new system is effective. In conclusion, Van de Water and Rainwater (2001) examine P-16 efforts in four states, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri, and Oregon, using them as illustrations of how to create a policy leadership for P-16. Through a clear exposition on the elements of a P-16 system, as well as outlining the strengths and challenges of P-16, the authors define what P-16 should be for policymakers as well as advocate for future P-16 policy development.

These types of policy reports are continuing their focus on alignment of educational elements within the state system. In 2002, the Institute for Educational Leadership and the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education published the proceedings from The Learning Connection Conference. This K-16 policy report, *Gathering Momentum: Building the Learning Connection between Schools and Colleges*, examines five key issues in developing and framing a K-16 system. Proclaiming that “decades of disconnection have lead to the expectation that two systems should stand apart,” this report looks at improving the connections between K-12 and postsecondary education (The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
This report asserts that nearly half of all U.S. states are developing policy talks about K-16 systems and a dozen have already created one (p 3).

The report, *Gathering Momentum* (2002), explores five critical issues behind K-16 efforts. The first fundamental element of K-16 discussions from this advocacy group is the issue of equity. Stating “when thinking about strengthening connections and collaboration between K-12 and higher education, states can start by considering the equity implications (p 5);” the committee promotes the notion that years of race, class, gender, age and other educational gaps could be rectified through K-16 efforts. The next critical factor from this advocacy group is governance issues including developing leaders and policy makers from all levels of education in order to make sustainable change.

The third essential element promoted by these advocates for reform calls for discussion between K-16 leaders surrounding the alignment of standards and assessments. Teacher quality and training, particularly teacher professional development, comprises the next advocated for critical element of K-16 reform. Finally, this report includes community resources and the roles of universities as neighborhood builders as the fifth significant component of K-16 system reform efforts.

In summary, according to the current advocates and leaders of this P-16 movement, the P-16 educational system has many goals. These goals include creation of an educational system focused on providing equitable and high quality educational access for students and preparation of all students to participate in the competitive global economy (Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Van
In order to accomplish these goals, P-16 initiatives focus on preparing students in preschool, building content knowledge, social skills, critical and creative thinking skills, and civic and moral values (Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; National Governors Association 2005). When students emerge from the pipeline they are ready to contribute to society by holding a job, paying taxes, voting, owning a home, and raising the next generation of citizens (The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002).

This strong and developing advocacy literature base forms the movement behind P-16 initiatives. These reports advocate for change. They call for concrete systemic changes to state-wide education systems. In order to do this, they call upon the American education ideals of equity, student access, democracy as well as calling on the concepts of economic growth, a more educated workforce, and increased accountability and standards.

This advocacy literature and the ideas, both concrete and abstract, that they promote are the primary literature on P-16. They are the source of definition for the movement and the resulting policy development. However, they do not provide empirical, tested, or scientific research on the P-16 initiatives (or parts of the initiatives themselves). This type of research empirically-based research is sparse. Perhaps for many states, it is still the beginning of their P-16 programs and evaluations have yet to be undertaken. In the next section, key empirical studies of P-16 are reviewed.
Empirical Research on P-16 Initiatives

As shown previously, early P-16 policy literature concentrated on defining what P-16 is, what it could be, developing the central aspects of this reform effort (Preschool, Teacher Quality and Training, Statewide Data Systems, Alignment Efforts, and Economic Efforts), and advocating for P-16 efforts to get underway. However, this literature also noted that there was a considerable lack of research on P-16 efforts currently ongoing and called for future research studies to provide evidence of success or failure of these efforts (Hodgkinson 1999; The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Venezia et al. 2005). To date, this empirical research is limited.

Much of the empirical research focuses on the alignment element of P-16. In other words, the research focuses on the connections between K-12 and postsecondary education and its implementation or outcomes. For example, in the first P-16 study in 1969, Michael Usdan, David Minar and Emanuel Hurwitz Jr. developed the idea of a relationship between elementary-secondary schools and schools of higher education. In their book, *Education and State Politics: The Developing Relationship between Elementary-Secondary and Higher Education*, they examined a “sharp division in our society between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other.” (Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969, p v.)

This qualitative study examined interviews from twelve states with key officials in prominent educational and political positions as well as collecting supplementary state documents (official reports, statistical documents, staff studies, newspapers, and other
relevant materials) through comparative state to state analysis (Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969, p 5). In this study, relationships between state educational institutions and the political institutions and processes are considered, primarily those involved in state decision making such as legislatures, governors, budget, and finance agencies. Usdan et al. reported that relationships that they found could be categorized in one of two ways—either conflict or cooperation. Conflict and outright friction between levels of education were found in most states. Only three study states had mechanisms for broad coordination and they found that they were relatively new and unable to be judged on their merits (p 165). Additionally, they noted that the structure of state government and long standing divisions between elementary-secondary education and higher education greatly affect coordination and conflict (p 170).

This study, while outdated, provides an early glimpse into the problems that states encounter when establishing alignment efforts. It is interesting that the authors noted many of the same difficulties that states currently face in developing and implementing P-16 efforts. In addition, this study is often utilized by advocates (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999), as evidence of long-standing divisions between sectors of educational governance.

Other P-16 studies focus on the alignment efforts specifically between high school and post-secondary education. Brown and Conley (2007) frame their study as of import to P-16 policy makers. They examine the alignment between high school assessment tests and standards set at institutions of higher education using a two-pronged theoretical approach. This study applied both theories of systems coherence and alignment, as well as signaling theory, to the analysis (Brown and Conley 2007).
national study explored data from twenty states using alignment analysis as the methodology. The method involves researchers analyzing and rating entry level postsecondary course documents along a preset “knowledge development” scale and comparing them to analysis and rating of standards and objectives of high school assessment standards. This study found moderate to poor levels of alignment between levels of college knowledge expectation and high school assessments in Math and English.

Another study (Dounay 2006) focused on mapping the current status of alignment efforts throughout the United States. Although an excellent resource for policy makers who are looking to compare their state’s program with others, this report provides no analysis or recommendations for future policy.

Other studies examine the connection and alignment efforts between high school and postsecondary education, but refine their studies to a single state level analysis. Rasch’s 2004 dissertation research explored Florida’s dual enrollment policy as it works within their P-16 system. The historical case study explores the thirty-year history of dual-enrollment in Florida using inter-organizational and micro-political theory. This analysis uses interviews and archival data to provide an in depth look at one element of a P-16 system and offers insight into the challenges of such a model (Rasch 2004). This single state study provides a limited view of P-16.

Oregon’s Higher Education Roundtable provides two reports (Oregon Roundtable and Oregon Business Council 2005, 2005) related to access in higher education which provides an overview of the current connections and linkages between high schools and
public postsecondary institutions in Oregon. In addition, it offers recommendations for policy makers. These studies provide an interesting case history of alignment policies and outcomes in Oregon, which is particularly of interest because Oregon has one of the longest standing P-16 programs in the United States. It is, however, limited in that it provides only a single state study and a look at alignment policies only.

National studies of specific aspects of P-16 have been conducted. In 2007, L’Orange and Ewell conducted a study on the status of statewide data systems for the Data Quality Campaign (DQC). This fifty state survey examined states progress in meeting ten goals established by the DQC. They reported that only one state, Florida, had established all ten essential elements, while ten more states had established eight elements. However, all fifty states have committed to establishing all ten essential elements (L'Orange and Ewell 2007). The Education Commission of the States (ECS) has issued several reports on the status of certain elements of P-16 in the states. In 2006, the conducted a study of all fifty states and compared high school graduation requirements with state college admission requirements (Dounay 2006). In 2008, a report on the establishment of P-16 councils in the states listed the names of councils, stakeholders involved in developing the councils, any legislation or statutes establishing the councils and their responsibilities in each state (Dounay 2008). In 2008, ECS established a database and a resulting report on the status of data systems in the fifty states, providing states with data on post secondary students (Colasanti 2008). These reports provide a national portrait of the status of P-16 in the United States. They are not peer-reviewed studies and some (Dounay 2006, 2008; Colasanti 2008) offer an account of these programs, but no analysis or recommendations for policy or practice.
Other national studies add to the research base. Streams’ 2007 dissertation research explored issues of policy interaction and public finance of both K-12 and public higher education. This study develops a theoretical model of public subsidies for public education where multiple jurisdictions interact with one another. This qualitative study includes longitudinal data (1984-2001) from forty-seven states and explores changes in funding support in K-12 versus public higher education. The study concluded that aging populations correlated with lower state financial support for education, particularly K-12 education. In addition, it found a positive relationship exists between states that states centralization measures and non-court-mandated support for higher education. While bringing in P-16 policy development and connections between levels of education as an impetus for this research, it is primarily a study of finance and public subsidies, rather than a study of P-16 programs. In fact, although discussed rather extensively in the literature review section, the connection is not made of findings to P-16 policies in this study.

A national study of P-16 councils (Mokher 2010) used network theory to frame the potential relationships between the formation of P-16 councils in the fifty United States and three state level characteristics; leadership, organizational, and environmental. For leadership she utilized governor’s state of the state addresses to determine if they were an “education governor” (amount of the speech which was geared toward education, as determined through content analysis), margin of victory for the governor in office, roles of the governor in certain areas of education boards, and number of terms in office. In the organizational element, she focused on share of revenue given to K-12 education and consolidation of governance of boards of education. In the environmental element,
she chose percentage of adults with a bachelor’s degree, unemployment rates in the state, and size of population of the state. Mokher’s quantitative study found that most of the explored factors did not affect the formation of a P-16 council. The exceptions were that being an “education governor” seemed to influence the likelihood of there being a P-16 council in the state. In addition, she found that as the population goes up in a state, states were more likely to have a P-16 council (Mohker 2010). This national study offers a look at the potential connections between state level characteristics and the implementation of policy.

Another national investigation of P-16 initiatives across the fifty United States was undertaken, focusing on documenting P-16 definitions, goals, and challenges, as well as providing an overview of four policy goals relevant to P-16 at that time; preschool, teacher quality improvement, data system development, and alignment policies (Durand 2007). Following this initial exploratory study, subsequent research (Durand 2010) investigated the subject of boundary spanning in P-16 state level legislation and policy records in a sample of six randomly chosen states. Using open systems theory and content analysis as the methodology to explore how organizational boundaries are opened through policy and legislation, this study revealed a lack of consensus between literature-derived definitions of P-16 initiatives and state level programs. The language of the studied legislative and policy documents emphasized motivation for aligning and opening state systems of curricula, funding, governance, and communication. Both studies provided insight into this future dissertation research by illuminating the lack of empirical research on P-16 initiatives, providing an overview of P-16 initiatives in the United States, and refining the methodological and theoretical models used in this study.
For this research study a review and update of Durand’s (2007) was completed. This includes a review of the states’ P-16 initiatives. The practice of P-16 policy is varied throughout the United States. The vast majority of states have some form of a P-16 policy initiative. This researcher found that as of 2010, forty-six states have begun a P-16 education reform initiative [See table 2.1 for synopsis, Appendix A for details]. Additionally, according to a 2008 report from the Education Commission of the States, twenty-nine states have also established some form of P-16 legislation (Dounay 2008). However, these states were at different stages in implementing policies. Of the forty-six (46) states that had a P-16 program, twenty-one (21) states were in Phase One, the policy discussion phase. This is defined as states that may have designated a P-16 council and/or have initiated discussions around the development of a P-16 system, but have not yet begun implementing P-16 policies. These states may have clearly defined what goals they hope to meet and what policies they plan to implement, but they have not yet put them into practice.

Fifteen states are in Phase Two. These states have moved beyond the initial policy discussion phase and implemented at least one of the major P-16 policy goals, preschool, data warehousing, alignment, or teacher training/quality\(^6\), within the P-16 framework [Appendix A]. These states have also instituted P-16 policy discussions at the state level and many have a P-16 Council established to create policy and maintain reform.

However, establishment of a P-16 council is not a mandatory requirement to reach Phase One.

---

\(^6\) Four primary goals of P-16 initiatives were culled from the national advocacy literature. These P-16 goals are teacher quality/training, universal preschool, data warehouse development, and alignment policies. State websites were explored for evidence of policies developed in these areas and a ranking system was developed by this author.
Ten states are in the final phase, or *Phase Three*, which means that they have a statewide, implemented P-16 program [Appendix A]. These states have implemented the five main P-16 policy objectives to some extent. This does not mean that the policies are completely meeting statewide goals, but merely that the states are attempting to make reforms in these areas within their P-16 framework.

Four states have no formal P-16 initiative in place at this time. Many of these states have participated in P-16 discussions at national P-16 conferences. However, these states have not designated a P-16 council, nor have they established any P-16 goals within a P-16 framework. Some of these states have established a statewide early childhood education program or a data warehouse system; however, these were not considered in this analysis because they were not explicitly part of a statewide P-16 initiative.
## TABLE 2.1
SYNOPSIS OF STATE P-16 PROGRAM STATUS AS OF JANUARY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Phase</th>
<th># of States</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None- State does not have a P-16 initiative at this time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alabama, Alaska, Michigan, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1- State is in policy discussions regarding P-16. State may have established a P-16 Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2- State has implemented one to three policy initiatives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Arizona, Arkansas, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3– State has implemented four major policy initiatives and engages in P-16 policy discussions at state level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no federal P-16 policy at this time. However, P-16 does get support at the federal level. The US Department of Education 2006 report, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of Higher Education*, found that reforms were urgently needed. The report called for more data, better alignment of standards between higher education and K-12, clearer expectations from institutions of higher education, and stronger students emerging from the education system (U.S. Department of Education 2006, pp vii-viii). National level government groups, such as the National Governors Association (NGA), recommend P-16 reforms, particularly the alignment of federal laws and programs to
support P-16 efforts (National Governors Association 2005, 2007). In the 2005 NGA report (p 1), they stated:

“Federal law should reinforce sound state education practices, including statewide efforts to strengthen P-16 alignment. This does not mean that Congress should mandate a one-size-fits-all solution to federal P-16 alignment. State systems vary significantly and different approaches are needed at different levels along the education pipeline. Yet one constant is true, federal education law should roll back restrictions on states’ ability to align and integrate delivery systems for students at all levels of education.”

The recent federal grant program, Race to the Top 7 (2009), also provides financial support to states that apply for and win grants for the development of education initiatives for:

“creating conditions for education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers; and implementing ambitious plans for success in four core education reform areas: Standards and Assessments, Building Data Systems, Improving Teacher Quality, and Improving Student Achievement in lowest performing schools (Department of Education 2009).”

In addition, federal sources provide financial support for P-16 programs through other current federal programs, notably Head Start, NCLB, Workforce Investment Act, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, GEAR UP, and the Higher Education Act, receive federal funds to operate. These programs have been incorporated within state

---

7 Race to the Top is funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009.
level P-16 frameworks (Rochford and Conner 2005; National Governors Association 2005).

Summary of Literature Review

In summary, the previously reviewed studies identify a clear need in the research base for continued empirical studies of P-16 programs in the United States. The empirical studies reviewed here offer limited glimpses of P-16 programs, either by focusing on particular elements of a P-16 program or by focusing on a single state’s program. Although, important studies to be sure, they are in direct contrast to this dissertation research which frames P-16 from a policy analysis viewpoint. This longitudinal and comparative study of P-16 policy discourse explores the shifting of discourse from policy advocacy to policy formation.

P-16 as a Policy Analysis

This research study offers an exploration from a policy analysis viewpoint, exploring P-16 as a policy from advocacy to formation. It examines the relationships and linkages between impetus for policy and policy structure and formation through a national historical exploration of policy discourse. An appreciation and comprehension of how policy discourse analysis is achieved and understood is critical to the process of policy study (Bell and Stevenson 2006; Heck 2004; Taylor et al. 1997). To that end, an examination of the policy analysis process is the next section of this chapter. First, this section begins with a look at law and its relationship to state level policy making and its relevance for exploration in this study. A description of the policy process follows.
Discourse analysis as a methodology is next. Then, an explanation as to why policy discourse analysis is the best method to investigate the chosen research questions.

Law and Policy

This research looks at state systems because the power for education, through law and policy, resides predominantly within states. The federal constitution’s 10th Amendment, which limits federal power over the states, gives state legislatures absolute power to make laws that govern education (Cambron-McCabe, McCarthy, and Thomas 2004). Legislatures can dictate who can and may attend schools, allow governance arrangements, and designate standards for curricula, teacher quality, and assessments (Imber and vanGeel 2004). Legislatures can designate authority to subordinate agencies, such as state departments of education or state boards of education and their leaders. These centralized powers have control over state education policy as well (Essex 2005). State level polices are not mandates, but rather are a strong recommendation that is backed by high level executive offices (Essex 2005). P-16 laws and official policies that are established by these authorities are of interest because they are the first line in attempting to create education practice.

Policy Analysis

Policies, at any level, are developed to create a change in the current situation; that is to address particular social, economic, or political problems (Heck 2004, 2). Public policy is defined as “what the government, acting on our behalf, chooses to do or not to do, such as law, regulation, ruling, decision, or order, or a combination of these (Birkland
Ball (2006) adds that “policies embody claims to speak with authority, they legitimate and initiate practices in the world, and they privilege certain visions and interests.”

Understanding the process by which policies are conceived, developed, established and implemented is critical to the study of why some policies are effective, why some policies are partially effective, and why some do not have the desired outcomes (Heck 2004). Policy research is both complex and dynamic, leading to a variety of tools for study and analysis. This section first examines what the policy analysis process is and then explores the ways and means of undertaking policy research.

The analysis of policy can be viewed through a number of lenses. A review of the literature finds that policy analysis is multifaceted with different definitions depending upon the focus of the researcher. Policy appears to be both a product and a process. Taylor et al. (1997) defines policy as a process which “involves the recognition of a ‘problem’ which requires a policy response (p 24). Others describe policy as a product, “the bringing of resources of government –money, rules, and authority- into the service of political objective; and by using those resources to influence the actions of individuals and institutions (McDonnell and Elmore 1991, 157).”

Policy analysis can be classified in two ways, analysis for policy or analysis of policy (Bell and Stevenson 2006; Heck 2004). When a researcher is working on an analysis for policy, there are three possible motivations. First is policy advocacy which strives to promote or advance a particular policy (or set of policies). The second is to provide policy makers with information and advice so that they can make more informed
decisions and take more promising actions. The third involves monitoring and evaluating existing policies to determine performance and evaluate the need for change. On the other hand, when a researcher undertakes an analysis of policy she can examine either the development and history of the policy or the content of the policy (Bell and Stevenson 2006, 10-11). Birkland (2005) adds that laws and decisions of the policy process can be thought of as outputs of the policy system (158).

Taylor, et al. (1997) caution that analyzing policy is about more than the words in a document. They state “to analyze policies simply in terms of the words written in formal documents is to overlook the nuances and subtleties of the context which give the text meaning and significance. Policies are thus dynamic and interactive and not merely a set of instructions or intentions (Taylor et al. 1997, 15).” They also view policy as complex and ever-changing. However, they include the analysis of underlying values to policy analysis, asking what the justifications for the policy are, whose interest are they in and how are they prioritized (Taylor et al. 1997).

Broadly defined, qualitative research of the policy process examines context, cases, and social processes to interpret or find meaning in situations (Neuman 2006). Traditional, positivistic policy analysis is guided by the scientific method which finds that there is a logic to inquiry (Yanow 2000). This logic can be reapplied, tested, and is deductive (Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007). In a scientific inquiry, the policy process can be examined as a series of linear steps (Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007). Policy analysis, in this tradition, can examine any of the following steps or the entire process of policy making and implementation. The rational process of policy development and
implementation utilizes the following systematic and comprehensive process (Lindblom 1959).

1. Identify the problem – structure the problem with facts and knowledge – a problem is the difference between the current situation and the preferred solution.
2. Specify goals and other values.
3. Evaluate alternatives and the consequences of alternatives.
4. Identify the optimal solution.
5. Collect feedback, data and evaluate.

However, the rational policy process is limited by resources and human capacity leading to bounded rationality (Simon 1982), where decisions are made based upon the best available knowledge at the time. Others argue that this model does not take into account political considerations and social contexts, and assumes that there is only one solution to any given problem (Hawkesworth 1988; Lindblom 1993). Postpositivist theorists (Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007; Sabatier 2007; Stone 1997; Yanow 2000) also take issue with the linear framework of policy formation and take a myriad of complicating factors, such as debates, politics, economics, stakeholders, party interests, power, beliefs, and goals, into account in their analyses. The post-positivistic researcher acknowledges that no one individual can perfectly see the world and that bias and objectivity are part of research. Theoretical frameworks help guide the post-positivistic researcher toward a concept of reality.

In this project, the context of policy meaning is represented in the language within P-16 advocacy documents and state level policy and legislative documents. These documents represent the policy discussion/identification of the problem phase as well as the policy formation phase. The discourse found within these documents was examined
with the aforementioned overarching theoretical focus, searching for sociological, economic, and organizational theoretical rationales for P-16 systems and initiatives.

Discourse Analysis

The use of discourse analysis in qualitative research takes many forms. In general, many researchers (Fairclough 1992; Gee 1999; Gill 2000; Woods 2006) agree that discourse analysis is the study of language. Discourse analytic approaches share an interest in determining meaning through the structure and construction of language (Glynos et al. 2009). However, the study of discursive language takes on many formats. A brief survey of the literature on discourse analysis finds that there are multiple types of discourse analysis, each with their own formats, methodologies for analysis, and theoretical backgrounds; including conversation analysis (Myers 2000), critical discourse analysis (Gee 1999; Wodak 2001; Fairclough 1992; Luke 1995; Vavrus and Seghers 2009), political discourse analysis (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) discourse analysis of the law or medicine (Woods 2006), discourse analysis in psychology (Parker 2004) (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002), semiotics or critical language studies (Fairclough 1992), poststructural discourse analysis (Foucault 1972, 1980), organizational discourse analysis (Grant et al. 2004), and policy discourse analysis (Ball 2006; deLeon 1998; Fischer 1995).

Additionally, discourse analysis can study different types of language including texts of all kinds- documents, newspapers, books, articles, textbooks, etc, verbal communications- speech, conversation, exchanges, dialogues, and non-verbal communications- gestures, facial expressions, movement (vanDijk 1997; Jørgensen and
Phillips 2002). VanDijk (1997) characterizes discourse as a “communicative event,” either simple or complex, and describes three dimensions of discourse (p 2). Discourse can involve (a) language use, (b) cognition or communication of beliefs, and (c) interaction in social situations (VanDijk 1997, 2). He continues, beyond “systematic descriptions, we may expect discourse studies to formulate theories that explain such relationships between language use, beliefs and interaction (VanDijk 1997, 2).” His analysis of the types of discourse and their uses make clear the need for explicit definitions of the modes of discourse as well as the methods of analysis in research projects. The current research study, rooted in the previously discussed policy frameworks, uses a policy discourse analysis framework to study the shifting of discourse, over time, in the language of state level P-16 policy and legislative documents.

Policy Discourse Analysis

Policy discourse analysis examines the structure and content of the language of policy and policy making. Policy discourse analysis aims to understand policy formation, practice, and the contexts surrounding them (Ball 2006). Ball (2006, 6) describes policy as statements about what could or should be and the way things are. He then claims, “Discourse provides a particular and pertinent way of understanding policy formation, for policies are, pre-eminently, statements about practice- the way things could or should be-which rest upon, derive from, statements about the world- about the way things are.” He further defines the difference between policy as text and policy as discourse. Policy as text is a symbolic representation of a complex and ever-changing process of policy, a product of compromise, negotiation, serendipity, and agenda (p 44-45). Policies as text are “interventions into practice” and “both a product and a tool of production (p 46).”
Policy as discourse is a way of making meaning, appreciating policy formation, understanding contexts through the order and organization of words, phrases, chunks of language (p 48). Ball finds that, in analysis, policy as discourse forms a complement to policy as text. Lewis and Simon (1986) provide a similar explanation. Policy as text refers to concrete products that exist within a particular policy discourse. Policy discourse refers to the organization of meaning-making practices (Lewis and Simon 1986, 457-8).

Policy discourse analysis can utilize the language of policy documents to find out “what a policy means” (Glynos et al. 2009, 21). Interpreting context within text “enables the researcher to test her assumptions about the limits of the policy community, the significance of the gathered artifacts, and the meaning of the narratives gathered (Glynos et al. 2009, 23). This approach to research sees policy as an evolving social process which is founded on a network of assumptions and meanings (Ball 2006). This tactic of understanding policy through discourse follows the postpositivist traditions which find that complex or “wicked” problems cannot be predictable (deLeon 1998; Fischer 1995). The researcher made judgments and emphasize certain selected contexts, based upon chosen frameworks or theoretical lenses (Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007).

Policy discourse analysis has been used in several recent policy studies. Three (Allan 2008; Fimyar 2008; Iverson 2008) are highlighted here. In the first example, Fimyar (2008) utilized policy discourse analysis to examine recent policy documents for examples of emerging governance in post-communist Ukraine. She analyzed three state issued policy documents, dated 1999-2003, as cultural and ideological artifacts and determined the dominant discourses, renewal, subordination, competency, choice and autonomy, in them (Fimyar 2008). Her study “unraveled the dominant and competing
discourses embedded in policy documents and connected them to broad socio-political contexts and the theoretical framework (Fimyar 2008, 579). Employing Foucault’s governmentality framework, Fimyar analyzes the documents to show how emerging governmentality was evident.

In the second example, Iverson (2008) examined twenty-one diversity action plans in United States Land-Grant Universities for discourses in diversity. Iverson frames discourses as “frameworks or ways of viewing issues” and through discourse, social identity is determined (Iverson 2008, 184). Utilizing a poststructuralist view and a multiple theoretical framework including a commitment to social justice, a belief that many competing truth claims exist, and recognition of power as a productive force, Iverson examined twenty-one diversity action plan documents. Using NVivo to help her qualitative discourse inquiry, four discourses emerged, marketplace, excellence, managerialism, and democracy, and through these emergent discourses, action plans for future policy were recommended.

Finally, Allan (2008) examines the discourses within twenty-one university women’s commission reports at four research universities in the United States. Allan (2008) uses policy discourse analysis to examine the “silences” within policy reports, explaining that understanding silences can help determine how to solve social problems through policy (p 49). Allan describes policy discourse analysis as “an explicit focus on policy discourses and the discursive shaping of positions through policy. The approach highlights the discursive power of policy by investigating the written text of policy documents as primary data sources situated within a larger sociopolitical context (Allan 2008, 49).” She applies lenses of feminism, critical analysis, and poststructural
perspectives in order to frame her study and explore how dominant discourses of femininity, access, and professionalism play a role in women’s status within university settings. Her study concludes with recommendations for future policy, including increasing awareness of silences, constructing images of women, and promoting discourse analysis of policy. These three studies provide example of using policy discourse analysis as a method for deeper understanding of the processes of policy. This current study utilizes the above examples as templates for policy discourse analysis, while going beyond previous studies to incorporate the study of discourses of a national large-scale education reform policy.

Summary of Policy Analysis

In summary, policy discourse analysis is used as the methodology to develop the narrative of changing discourses. Policy discourse analysis is an examination of discourse found in the texts of national P-16 policy advocacy documents and state level P-16 policy formation documents. Understanding discourse is a way to understand the meanings, practices, and agendas of policy processes. Through policy discourse analysis, a deeper understanding of P-16 as an education reform is attained. In addition, it provides a vital component in understanding the role of discourse in the creation of education policy.
Theoretical Foundation

Introduction to Theoretical Foundation

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine if there are changes in the discourse of P-16 over time and if so, how the discursive changes of advocacy may affect the discourse of policy formation. This study focuses on articulating the changes in discourse of both national P-16 policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation documents of all fifty United States.

The theoretical concepts used in this study’s model have a long history of use in education reform initiatives, ideals of schooling, and education policy processes (see for example Bowe, Ball, and Gold 1992; Callan 2001; Coleman 1986; Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore 1991; Katzenelson and Weir 1985; Lagemann 2000; McGuinn 2006; Rose 2010; Rothstein, Jacobsen, and Wilder 2006; Ruppert 1994; Sanoff 2006; Spring 2001; Zigler and Styfco 2000; Zumeta 2001; Tyack, James, and Benavot 1987). Reforms such as the preschool and the school choice are examples of using ideals such as access, equity, accountability, and student achievement to advocate for and develop their initiatives. This study examines the use of these theoretical concepts (and others) as they apply to P-16.

This analysis is based upon a theoretical model developed for this project. There are three elements to this theoretical model, sociologic, economic, and organizational. The first, sociological framework, is based upon reviews of the language formulated by policy advocates for an ideal P-16 system. Some discourses communicate and emphasize sociological or social justice rationales, including providing schooling for all and the good of society. The policy advocacy language in some documents also focuses
on economic rationales for a statewide P-16 system, particularly creating a skilled and ready workforce and improving the economy, thus providing the second element of the theoretical framework. The final element is based on organizational system reform language. Throughout the history of P-16 advocacy, there are discourses calling for restructuring and aligning the education system. This alignment language encourages the transformation of the organization from a disjointed, fractured system to one that has new characteristics, namely a system with more open communication between subsystems, as well as cooperation and coordination of goals and efforts. This organizational reform language seems to represent a foundational basis for the P-16 reform movement. It remains consistent throughout the history of P-16 initiatives while the frameworks of priorities and goals of the P-16 movement have shifted through different theoretical lenses, sociological and economic.

In this section, these three theoretical constructs are discussed and developed. Following these discussions, a theoretical model is introduced as the conceptual framework from which this research project commences.

Sociological Rationales in P-16

The first element of the mult-theoretical model for this research stems from the language within P-16 advocacy literature. The advocacy literature (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000) utilizes language that claims that a P-16 initiative would create an education system that has the characteristics and purpose of a socially integrated, stable, and interdependent organization with a particular focus on
providing access and equity for all students. While not explicitly mentioning sociological frames or theorists, the advocates appeared to use language from sociology that helped formulate, focus, and frame the larger P-16 reform movement in order to substantiate their policy reform movement.

For example, one of the constructs of P-16 focused on the functional or structuralist nature of education. While not specifically citing these theories or theorists, advocates nevertheless seem to have employed the language of this point of view. Functionalist theory of education finds that the education system can be utilized to create a socially cohesive and congruous society (Durkheim 1964, 1956). Durkheim (1964) emphasizes that society is held together by this mutual interdependence and that leads to stability. From this lens, education is valuable as a support for culture, values, and social unity. He also believed that society is the source of morality and that education is utilized to perpetuate societal morality and create individuals who can function in society (Durkheim 1961).

The advocacy literature further describes how a P-16 system fulfills a societal purpose of education as selection; where education takes into account differing abilities and backgrounds of students, measuring accomplishments of students based on more than grades (for example, being able to meet cultural and moral standards of the time). In using these constructs, advocates are in essence utilizing the theoretical concepts put forth by Parsons (1959) who finds that education becomes a way of determining which students have the necessary characteristics, or the ability to learn and develop them, for certain roles and responsibilities in society. Through this lens, he describes the
interdependence between education and society, thus theorizing a direct link between the institution of education and the perpetuation of society (Parsons 1959).

P-16 advocates also stressed the importance of including state level officials, particularly legal and governmental administrators, in order to lend legitimacy and authority to these reform initiatives. In utilizing these ideas, supporters of P-16 seem to have adopted some of the sociological frameworks of Weber (1958) who conceived of rational-legal authority and its influence on institutions. Rational-legal authority is described by Weber (1958) in his analysis of three different types of authority (traditional, charismatic, rational-legal). In a system which utilizes rational-legal authority, power is formed through the law (legal) or through natural law (rationality). Weber believed that systems that abide by law or rules did so because of their beliefs that the legitimacy of the rules was strengthened by the power and status of the government. P-16 advocates highlight the need for empowering P-16 councils and reform initiatives through governmental support, legal mandates, and policy directives.

Therefore, P-16 advocacy literature appears to be influenced by these frameworks (Durkheim 1956, 1961, 1964; Parsons 1959; Weber 1958) when using discourses that emphasized how education, in a P-16 system, creates a better society with individuals who are qualified for their responsibilities when they emerge from the system. The primary functions of education, as seen in a P-16 system, would be to create good citizens, socialize and adapt generations of students to society, and increase access for all students to education. In addition, P-16 reforms result from official state level policy reform through legislative and policy decrees. Examples of this language in the P-16 literature (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969; Van
de Water and Rainwater 2001; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000) include legislative authority, providing more education for all students, the value of education as a goal for building a better society, and the promotion of societal culture and values.

P-16 advocacy literature also acknowledges that the current status of the education system is not addressing many societal inequities. P-16 advocates aim to provide a mechanism, through organizational change, for the education of all students and make use of language emphasizing access, fairness, and equal educational opportunities to stress these intentions. This line of reasoning seems to be fundamentally influenced by the sociological conflict theorists who explore constructs of equity and access.

Conflict theorists (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Jencks et al. 1972; Jencks and Brown 1975) are critical of some of the concepts put forth by sociological functionalists. Conflict theorists believe that the functional constructs in education systems inevitably lead to stratification and thus conflict. As individuals and organizations seek to maximize their benefits they find that current systems maintain certain opportunities and access for elite (higher socioeconomic status) members of society. In education, conflict theory is often used to examine reform movements, inequalities, and issues of equity and access (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Coleman 1966; Jencks et al. 1972; Jencks and Brown 1975).

Bowles and Gintis, in their 1976 book, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, describe an education system in the United States that perpetuates opportunities for higher
socioeconomic status (SES) families while maintaining inequality of attainment, access, and achievement for lower SES children. They state

“The educational system serves through the correspondence of its social relations with those of economic life to reproduce economic inequality and to distort personal development. Thus under corporate capitalism, the objectives of liberal education reform are contradictory: It is precisely because of its role as producer of an alienated and stratified labor force that the educational system has developed its repressive and unequal structure. In the history of U.S. education, it is the integrative function which has dominated the purpose of schooling, to the detriment of the other liberal objectives (Bowles and Gintis 1976, 48).”

This educational system, ripe for conflict, generates many forms of reform movements focused on repairing inequities and providing access. In the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, many years prior to P-16 reform conversations on a national level, there were many studies examining the educational system and its flaws in providing educational opportunities for all children. In particular, some examples of research (Bowles and Gintis 1976; Coleman 1966; Jencks et al. 1972; Willis 1977) focusing on inequalities in schools and school systems demonstrate that the institution of education was not meeting the needs of all of its students.

Coleman, et al’s 1966 landmark study of the Equality of Educational Opportunity national data (often referred to as The Coleman Report) explored the disparities in educational opportunities for children based on race, religion, national origin and color. This study concluded that academic achievement was related to school environment, particularly student peers. In other words, if a student was surrounded by other students with higher educational goals and higher family educational backgrounds, then they were
more likely to have higher student achievement. This study led to many national policy
decisions, in particular busing in order to achieve racial balance within schools.

Bowles and Gintis (1976) exploration of educational attainment in the 1970s. In
this study, they reported that socioeconomic background of families was tied to
attainment levels of education of children, holding IQ constant; higher SES levels were
associated with increased attainment of schooling (Bowles and Gintis 1976). In another
study, Jencks et al (1972) explored the relationships between school inputs and resources
and student achievement at the K-12 level. This research, consistent with Coleman’s
1966 study, detailed statistical analyses and reported that student achievement was related
to socioeconomic status of schoolmates (Jencks et al. 1972). Willis’ ethnographic study
of social class, Learning to Labor (1977), conveyed that alienation of working class boys
by the educational system leads to their resistance to school and the continuation of their
lives in working class.

While the previously mentioned studies predate P-16 initiatives, they represent
influences leading to the larger P-16 conversation in the 1980s and subsequent reform
movement in the 1990s. These frameworks seemingly influenced the advocates of P-16
whose some discourses referred to changing the current education system to provide
access to all students, creating educational opportunities through systemwide changes
such as transitional programs, teacher quality reform, and offering universal preschool
opportunities to all young students.
Economic Rationales in P-16

The second element of the multitheoretical model is based on economic theories. The discourses of advocates for P-16 also use economic rationales to promote the development of a P-16 education system. Prominent in some advocacy literature are the utilization of economic frameworks for the creation of a statewide P-16 system. Again, while advocates do not explicitly mention theory or theorists in their rationales, the language employed by the literature seems to have changed its focus to economic rationales discourses.

For example, the development of human capital has been touted as a goal of a P-16 system. The construct of human capital refers to the idea that humans have the ability to accumulate capital through their investment in educational experiences (Becker 1993). Becker (1993) also states,

"... expenditures on education, training, medical care, etc., are investments in capital. However, these produce human, not physical or financial, capital because you cannot separate a person from his or her knowledge, skills, health, or values the way it is possible to move financial and physical assets while the owner stays put (p 16)."

Human capital is a method of valuing human skill and knowledge (Hartog 2000). Hartog (2000) further explains, “Capital is the value of productive services that can be generated, it is the potential performance of the engine.” (p 7) Human capital and education research has shown that increasing investment in human capital provides many returns, including increased lifetime earnings and higher salaries (Hartog 2000; Becker 1993; Langlett 2002), better health (Becker 1993; Schultz 1961), societal economic
growth (Becker 1993), and intergenerational effects such as increased human capital of offspring, improved prenatal and infant care, and decreased fertility (less offspring) (Currie and Moretti 2003).

Additionally, some P-16 advocacy literature appears to focus on articulating the goal of increasing production and efficiency, through language such as increasing workforce production, more efficient system, global and national economic development, creation of a knowledge society, and generating a skilled and productive workforce. These economic concepts are influenced by the frameworks of production and efficiency presented by Hanushek (1986). Extensively reviewing his studies of how and if education can lead to increased production, as well as how schools can increase their efficiency as organization, he shows that studies of expenditures in education have reflected a connection to student retention, enrollment, and completion rates, teacher skills, salary, and performance, and student achievement (Hanushek 1986).

Finally, the reviewed policy literature discusses economic growth. This is found in language such as global and national economic development, creation of a knowledge society, and generating a skilled and productive workforce. P-16 advocates seem to have been influenced by economic growth frameworks such as those from Thurow (1977), who states that education has many benefits to society. He discusses how education leads to a more productive, better trained workforce which leads to a more technical and skill-based society. These types of jobs lead to a more industrious economy with higher economic standards of living (Thurow 1977, 332). Again, these key concepts are prevalent in the P-16 policy advocacy literature as motivations for the establishment of a new, aligned education system.
Organizational Rationales in P-16

The third element of the theoretical model is based on organizational system change theories. The P-16 advocacy literature uses discourses of organizational systems change to frame the conversation of how P-16 initiatives can shift state education systems from fragmented and disorganized to more coherent, coordinated, and cooperative systems. P-16 initiatives, as defined in the advocacy literature (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Usdan, Minar, and Hurwitz 1969; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000), call for P-16 reforms to occur through the restructuring and realignment of the current education system. Systems change, in P-16 advocacy, utilizes ideas of systems-building and creation of “all one system” as scaffolds for change. Systems change and the discourses that surround it, including realigning elements within the educational system, increasing communication between stakeholders, evaluation of systems in order to improve, and coordinating elements, form the discourses of P-16 advocacy. Thus they are the basis for imposing organizational discourses on the discourse policy analysis framework of this study.

A state level P-16 program works within the education system. A system is characterized by inputs which go through processes to produce outputs, all of which work together to accomplish the system’s overall goals (Scott 1992, 589; Katz and Kahn 1978). Systems can be comprised of subsystems (Scott 1992), as states are comprised of many subparts; including legislatures, governors, judicial offices, departments, and school districts. Each subsystem has its own set of boundaries, inputs, outputs and processes (Scott 1992). In this study, the subsystems considered are state level education
departments (including higher education, K-12, Early Childhood Education), legislatures, and P-16 councils.

This study investigates whether the discourses are predominantly focused on creating a more open or a more closed organizational system. In an open system organizational model interdependence and connections between subsystems is critical (Weick 1976). In an open system organization, all of the subparts of the system work together through interdependent and coherent connections (Scott 1992; Katz and Kahn 1978). In an open systems perspective, “environments shape, support, and infiltrate organizations. Connections with ‘external’ elements may be more critical than those with ‘internal’ components…” (Scott 1992, p 25) According to Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), open system organizations can use increased communication to maximize their flexibility. Additionally, members within an open system have behaviors that are interrelated and are oriented toward particular goals (Lawrence and Lorsch 1967).

In the open system perspective, analysts would consider external components such as finance, outside governance, and politics (Katz and Kahn 1978). Katz and Kahn (1978) further explain that open systems have subsystems with communication, feedback, and governance links between them. Scott (1992) defines organizations in open systems as not a formal structure but as a system of interdependent activities. Scott adds:

*Organizations are systems of interdependent activities linking shifting coalitions of participants; the systems are embedded in -- dependent on continuing exchanges with and constituted by-- the environments in which they operate (Scott 1992, 25).*
In contrast, a closed system is characterized by inflexible and impenetrable boundaries. Katz and Kahn (1978) describe the closed system perspective as that which views an organization by examining internal structures, but little consideration of external environments. Traditionally, closed systems are seen as isolated or independent from their environment. Scott (2001) adds that closed system ideas are based upon rational system models and bureaucratic notions of organizations (see for example, Taylor 1911; Barnard 1936; Weber 1947), and that some of these original ideas are still prevalent in the closed system model of today. These constructs include promotion of efficiency of the organization, fixed division of labor, and hierarchy of governance.

P-16 systems, as described in the advocacy literature, have some of the features of an open system. In a P-16 education system, advocates call for the traditional boundaries to be set aside for a new way of thinking about education (VandeWater and Rainwater 2001; Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Venezia et al. 2005). P-16 requires a change in viewpoint; thinking about education as a long-term process with aligned standards and assessments, blended funding, and increased communication between stakeholders (Portch 2006; VandeWater and Rainwater 2001; McGrath et al. 2005). In contrast, the P-16 advocacy literature portrays an ideal P-16 system as having some of the features of a closed system such as being stable, efficient, and self-sustaining (Portch 2006; Rochford et al. 2005; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Venezia et al. 2005).

The organizational discourse of change in this advocacy literature seems to lay the groundwork for the P-16 education reform movement and appears to remain constant throughout the lifetime of P-16. The P-16 dialogue is reliant upon this continuity of the
organizational theoretical focus to hold the movement together and weather the changes through the previously mentioned sociological and economic theoretical lens shifts.

Theoretical Model

In order to build upon the advocacy literature foundation, this researcher utilized the following theoretical framework [see Figure 2.1] as a lens to investigate the research questions. This model takes on three perspectives, outlined previously. The first is based upon the sociological frameworks of Durkheim (1956, 1964), Parsons (1959), Weber (cite), Coleman et. al. (1966), and Bowles and Gintis (1976). Through this sociological perspective, language was explored that focuses on sociological concepts such as providing access, creating a more integrated seamless education system, developing an equitable system, and creating a better society through more civic-minded, better prepared citizens.

The second perspective is based upon the economic concepts of human capital (Becker 1993; Currie and Moretti 2003; Hartog 2000; Langlett 2002; Schultz 1961), production and efficiency (Hanushek 1986), and economic growth (Thurow 1977). Through this economic framework, language was explored that focuses on these concepts. Finally, the framework that remains constant throughout all documents, the organizational systems reform framework. Through this organizational construct, ideas such as creating a new system were analyzed with the characteristics of an open system and a closed system compared and contrasted (Weick 1976; Hall 2002; Katz and Kahn 1978; Scott 1992; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967). This theoretical framework served as an
overarching conceptual tool in the analysis of P-16 advocacy and policy formation documents.

**Figure 2.1**

Theoretical Framework

Using the theoretical model developed for this research, both national P-16 advocacy documents and state level P-16 legislative and policy documents of fifty states were examined to identify discourses within the language of these documents. The overarching conceptual tool provided a multi-perspective focus, examining two theoretical motivations, sociological and economic, and one widespread theory of utility,
organizational systems theory. Based upon the transformation of focus in the language of P-16 policy advocacy literature, this research aims to examine the language within P-16 policy documents to see if they also represent a shifting of motivation behind P-16 policy initiatives through the shifting of discourses.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that through the span of P-16 as an educational reform movement, proponents have transformed the underlying discourses from sociological constructs to economic constructs, while utilizing a strong foundational overarching concept, organizational open system theories continually throughout. Through this literature analysis, it is seen that reform through policy is constantly evolving and that the formation of P-16 is also undergoing continual and progressive transformations. This study is framed in a policy analysis lens in order to explore the shifting of discourse throughout the policy process of P-16 initiatives. The theoretical framework provided forms the conceptual lens through which this research project is approached. The purpose of this study is to explore and enhance the understanding of P-16 initiatives through the examination of discourse within official state level P-16 policy and legislative documents. In the next chapter, Chapter Three, the methodology and research design is discussed.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This dissertation research study examines the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy and formation, explores historic shifts of these discourses, and investigates whether the discourses of advocacy influenced the discourses of policy formation. To do this, P-16 is viewed through a theoretical framework using policy discourse analysis as the methodology to explore changes in the discourses of official P-16 policy and legislative documents. In this chapter, the methodology of this dissertation research is described and explained. First, the research questions are restated. Then, an explanation of how the documents utilized for this dissertation research were chosen and collected. Then a description of the chosen qualitative software, NVivo8, as well as an accounting of the coding process follows. Finally, the research questions are explored and anticipated findings (hypotheses) of those questions with an explanation of how each of these hypotheses were responded to using policy discourse analysis as the methodology.

Research Questions, Assumptions, and Hypotheses

Question One: Do the dominant discourses within the P-16 national policy advocacy literature and the P-16 state level policy and legislative documents vary by era of time?

Assumption I: This question begins a multilayered analysis that maps a relationship between time, policy advocacy, and policy formation.
Assumption II: There are two time frames for each type of document being collected. The advocacy literature started several years before policy formation began in any state, thus accounting for the expected differences in the early time frames. The Hodgkinson advocacy literature (1985) is the beginning of the advocacy literature Time Era 1. Policy formation began about three years later. Texas started P-16 legislation in 1993, Maine in 1995, and Maryland had P-16 policy in 1996 thus setting the 1987 beginning time frame for policy formation as a starting point.

The second time frame is established to explore the potential shifts in discourses. This time frame is about 2002, but is flexible in that there are some changes in levels of discourse prior to 2002. 2002 was chosen as a starting point for the second time eras (for both advocacy and policy formation) based on reading and previous research.

Assumption III: There is a time lag between policy advocacy and policy formation. This lag is described in the literature and is prevalent in policy formation studies.

Contexts:

- Advocacy Literature Time Era 1: 1985-2002
- Advocacy Literature Time Era 2: 2002-2010
- Policy Formation Time Era 4: 2002-2010

Categories:

- Sociological Discourses
- Economic Discourses
- Organizational Discourses

Hypotheses:

1a. If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 1, then the dominant discourses are more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

1b. If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 2, then the dominant discourses are more likely to be focused on economic discourses than on sociological discourses.

1c. The organizational discourses within national P-16 policy advocacy literature have remained constant throughout Time Eras 1 and 2.
1d: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 3, these documents will have dominant discourses that will be more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

1e: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 4, these documents will have dominant discourses that will be more likely to be focused on economic discourses than sociological discourses.

1f: The discourses of organizational change within state level P-16 policy and legislation documents have remained constant throughout Time Eras 3 and 4.

**Question Two:** What are the relationships between time eras of P-16 and the influence of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation (represented by state level policy and legislation)?

A. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy advocacy documents over time?

B. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy formation documents over time?

C. Do the discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation have influence on each other?

Assumption IV: This question and the more specific follow-up questions examined the entry points where states became a part of the P-16 world by creating policy or legislation. It is designed to observe how states depict P-16 through their policy/legislative language depending on their time entering into P-16. For example, a state that started a program in the 1990s is likely have many iterations of what P-16 “is”- how it’s legislated or made into policy over the past twenty years. It is also likely that a state that has only recently formed a P-16 program may have skipped discourses and gone straight to economic rationales.

Assumption V: The time frame assumptions from Question One continue here in Question Two.

Assumption VI: Discourse analysis, by its nature, allows the researcher to make judgments based on theory and frameworks outlined in advance by the researcher. In this case, the theoretical framework is set up to examine any shifting of discourses across time. The final steps of policy discourse analysis call for the researcher to look beyond the “counts” of words/phrases and to determine the meaning of policy. Influence is used in this research to
demonstrate how the language and meaning behind the advocacy literature may be observed in the language and meaning of policy formation.

Contexts:

- Advocacy Literature Time Era 1: 1985-2002
- Advocacy Literature Time Era 2: 2002-2010
- Policy Formation Time Era 4: 2002-2010

Categories:

- P-16 National Policy Advocacy Literature
- P-16 State Policy and Legislation

Hypotheses:

2a: The volume (number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 national policy advocacy literature will be greater in Time Era 1 and less in Time Era 2.

2b: The volume (number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 state policy and legislation will be greater in Time Era 4 and less in Time Era 3.

2c: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 3, then the language is influenced by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 1.

2d: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4, then the language is influenced by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 2.

2e: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4, then the language is also influenced by the language of state level policy/legislation in time Era 3.

Data Collection

For this dissertation research study, three types of documents were gathered, (1) national P-16 policy advocacy literature; (2) P-16 state level policy documents; and (3) P-16 state level legislative documents. Comparison between national P-16 advocacy
documents and state level P-16 formation documents is warranted because national level policy advocacy may influence state level policy formation. States utilize national policy advocacy documents in their rationales behind the development and formation of policy, as evidenced by their use of these advocacy documents on their P-16 websites. These advocacy documents are referenced and cited on the websites in suggested reference lists, mission statements, and state level analyses of P-16 programs (or parts of programs).

The first type of document collected for this study is a representative sampling of the national P-16 policy advocacy literature. The chosen documents met the following criteria. They were from national policy advocacy organizations or authors associated with these organizations. The chosen documents represent an overall P-16 agenda, not specific parts of a P-16 agenda. For example, national organizations such as the Pew Foundation and Education Commission of the States were consulted. However, while they have a stake in P-16 initiatives, advocacy agendas from organizations such as the National Federation of Teachers or NIEER were not included as they promote particular parts of P-16 rather than the whole of P-16. While some of these policy advocacy documents have been cited as representative of the overall policy advocacy literature in previous chapters of this proposal, there are additional advocacy documents included in the analysis portion of this project. State P-16 council websites were also searched for potential documents for this project.

Documents were collected that were published during the time period 1985 (Hodgkinson 1985 as a starting point) to June 30, 2010 in order to match the exclusion point established for the archival policy and legislative documents. Seventeen national policy advocacy documents were selected; see table 3.1 “Number of Advocacy
Documents by Year for the breakdown. See Appendix C for a list of the national policy advocacy documents chosen and used in this study.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Advocacy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An historical archival document search was conducted for the second type of documents in this study. All state-level P-16 legislative documents were collected from state level government sources. For the purposes of this study, P-16 legislation is defined as those laws enacted by a state legislature that pertain to P-16 (or as named by the state) initiatives. Pending bills or legislation were not included in this study as they are not final.

---

8 This category of documents is not intended to cover every single P-16 policy advocacy document, it is a representative sample chosen by the researcher to represent the advocacy for P-16 during this twenty-five year time frame. As such, some years were not represented and some documents that may have been influential were excluded. This researcher acknowledges that this represents a potential source of bias.
and have no power to create practice. The search gathered documents from state-level governments.

Legislation is publically accessible through several sources. These sources include each state’s legislature website, state government portals, and each state’s law libraries. Laws that do not explicitly mention P-16 (or the state’s alternative name) were not included in this study. This may have inadvertently left out some P-16 legislation. In order to mitigate this possibility, the researcher cross-checked lists of P-16 legislation collected on the Education Commission of the States website. In addition, each state’s own P-16 websites were checked for potential P-16 legislation. A total of 157 legislative documents were discovered in twenty-four states (see Table 3.2 Number of Policy Formation Documents by Year and Map 3.1 for a map of states with legislative documents).
The third type of documents that were collected includes all official state level P-16 policy documents. State P-16 policy documents are defined as those that are from an official state government education agency. Policy documents are also publically available. An archival historical search of state government sites was used to gain access to obtain official PDFs (or other formats) of state level P-16 policy. Searches were limited to those policy documents that explicitly refer to P-16. This excluded policy documents that may have included some part of the P-16 policy objectives, but are not part of an official state agency P-16 policy. For example, if there is a state preschool policy but the policy is not a part of a P-16 initiative, it is not included in the documents for the proposed study. Unless these policies are explicitly included within P-16
legislation or state policy, they were considered beyond the scope of this research study.

A total of 89 policy documents were discovered in twenty-four states. In addition, 24 other types of policy documents (including by laws and Governor’s Executive Orders) were collected from fourteen states (see Table 3.2 Number of Policy Formation Documents by Year and Map 3.2 for a map of states with policy and other documents).

Map 3.2

P-16 Policy Formation Documents – States with Policy Documents

Previous studies have shown that the first states to implement their programs did so in 1992 (Durand 2007; Mohker 2010), so by searching for any legislative or policy
documents from 1985 and later, this research covered the relevant legislative and official policy documents from all fifty United States. The cutoff date for inclusion of documents was June 30, 2010.\(^9\) This allowed recent policies to be included but established a point of exclusion. A total of 270 state level P-16 policy formation documents were accumulated (Table 3.2 Number of Policy Formation Documents by Year); 157 (58%) were legislative documents, 89 (33%) were state level policy documents, and 24 (9%) were other (Governor’s Executive Orders and P-16 Council By-Laws). There are documents from 39 states and they range from one page to sixty-eight pages long. The vast majority (70%) of state level documents were dated from 2003-2010. A complete categorization and summarization of all documents collected can be seen in Appendix B. In addition, Appendix C contains a citation list of all collected documents.

---

\(^9\) Some states create laws only in the first half of the year and this cutoff point made it possible to include the most recent laws established in 2010.
Table 3.2

Number of Policy Formation Documents by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Number of Formation Documents</th>
<th>Number of Policy Docs</th>
<th>Number of Law Docs</th>
<th>Number of Other Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computer Aided Software- NVivo 8

Policy discourse analysis as the methodology and the qualitative software program NVivo 8 (QSR International 2009) as the means were used to qualitatively analyze the 270 policy formation and 17 policy advocacy documents. NVivo 8 is a comprehensive qualitative software package that assists the researcher in organizing and sorting data, as well as supporting the coding and categorization process. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) found that using a computer program for qualitative analysis is particularly effective when coping with data overload and retrieval, coding, comparison, linkages, and ultimately analysis (p 488). However, they caution that the programs do not actually perform any analysis, but rather “facilitate and assist it” (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2007, 489). Others (Krippendorff 2004; Miles and Huberman 1994) affirm that the benefits of using software programs include processing large amounts of data quickly and reliably, assistance with coding, search and retrieval within documents, offering data display methods, and strengthening theory-building.

Coding

Once the documents for each of the fifty states were collected, categorical coding of each document, including words in titles, table of contents, captions, sidebars, committee membership lists, and glossaries (but not bibliographies, author names, or appendices) occurred, utilizing the software program NVivo8. In particular, a priori categories developed from the literature review and the theoretical model were utilized to help guide the coding process (Neuman 2006).
Table 3.3 demonstrates the codes that were determined by this researcher through a systematic, sentence-by-sentence, examination of P-16 policy formation documents from two states. The first document is a state level P-16 policy document from New Jersey (The New Jersey High School Redesign Steering Committee 2008). The second is the legislation pertaining to P-16 from Texas (Texas Constitution and Statutes: Education Code Sec. 7. 005- 006., Sec. 7. 010, Sec 61.001.-002., Sec 61. 076.- 0761.- 0762. 2009). Each sentence within each of the documents was examined for any and all phrases that could fit within the three predetermined frameworks: organizational, sociological, and economic.

All of the words and phrases were collected and then sorted into similar coding categories. Each of these categories was given a name. In each of these categories, multiple words represent each theme; therefore, these are truly categorical representations, rather than a count of a particular word. Table 3.3 represents the categories and examples of the phrases collected within those categories. There are nine category codes within each framework. Nine codes were chosen in order to use a meta-matrix framework (Miles and Huberman 1994). Using nine codes allows for a comparative analysis in which “levels of code depth” can be measured through even numbers of categorical codes within each level of code depth. In this case, one to three codes represents LO, four to six codes represents MOD, and seven to nine codes represents HIGH. The meta-matrix gives the qualitative researcher a way to structure the counting process beyond simple counts (Miles and Huberman 1994).

Nine codes were chosen (as opposed to 12 or 16) because when going through the pre-coding process with the aforementioned documents, eight or nine categories appeared
in each framework. In the organizational framework, where only eight appeared after the pre-coding process, this researcher added an organizational code, P-16 Councils, which seemed likely to appear based on the literature review.

The coding categories were designed to help the researcher find commonalities among the documents. In other words, find the areas where categories match up and are common between the types of documents. The categories are based upon the previously established theoretical model and fall under three main discourses, sociological, organizational, or economic. These codes were applied to all three types of documents.

The coding process involved a two-step process. First, each document was read in its entirety by this researcher. This process helps the researcher gain insight into the overall themes and discourses that might emerge from the more detailed coding. Documents were then downloaded into NVivo8 and a sentence-by-sentence coding was begun. Previous studies (Durand 2010) have shown that paragraphs of differing sizes are not a representative analysis. This is because the varying styles of policy advocacy, state legislation, and state policy language mean that paragraph by paragraph analysis misses the depth to which certain categories are represented. Weber (1990) explains that sentences are often the recording units of analysis when the investigator is interested in words or phrases that occur closely together and a sense of words with multiple meanings might occur (p 22). He also finds that investigators might code an entire paragraph to reduce the effort required however, this reduces the reliability of the study (Weber 1990, 23).

Upon the reading of each sentence, a determination of which (if any) codes were apparent in the sentence. A sentence could have no codes or all of the codes could apply
to the sentence. Sentences were expected to have overlapping between codes; i.e. sentences may fit into more than one category on the coding chart. This was handled by coding a sentence with multiple codes. The following examples demonstrate the coding process and how each sentence would fit within the coding categories designated.

The first example is from New Jersey (The New Jersey High School Redesign Steering Committee 2008). The direct quote from the document is in italics. Following this, the codes for that were assigned to the sentence are outlined and the part of the sentence that corresponds to the coded category is listed.

_The Steering Committee’s mission was to recommend those education policy revisions required to ensure that all students graduate from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship._

Coded:

- Achievement – _graduate from high school_
- Workforce Preparation- _prepared for work_
- College Readiness- _prepared for ... further education_
- Organization- _The steering committee_
- Equity- _all students_
- Citizen- _prepared for...citizenship_
- Goals- _mission_

The second example is from Minnesota (Minnesota Law 127A.70, subdivision 1-3, 2009). The direct quote from the document is in italics. Then the codes and the part of the sentence or a reason why it was coded follows.
A P-20 education partnership is established to create a seamless system of education that maximizes achievements of all students, from early childhood through elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, while promoting the efficient use of financial and human resources.

Coded:

- Pipeline - to create a seamless system of education
- Equity - all students
- Achievement - maximizes achievements
- Efficiency - while promoting the efficient use of financial and human resources
- Allocation - while promoting the efficient use of financial and human resources
- P-16 Council - A P-20 education partnership is established
- Collaboration - education partnership
- Alignment - from early childhood through elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education

Appendix E provides another example of the coding process by showing a screen shot of a coded document as it appears in NVivo8. For this study, each sentence in its entirety was coded within NVivo 8 under a narrow context. This allowed for easier analysis after the coding stage was completed because NVivo 8 has the ability display the sentence for context and allows linkage back to entire paragraphs if more background or context is needed. NVivo8 allows for multiple coding options in the same sentence, while keeping track of individual code counts.
Miles and Huberman (1994) describe coding as a form of analysis because selections are made by the researcher as to what to code for and what to exclude, based upon chosen theoretical models, frameworks, or lenses. The coding process has some limitations embedded within; particularly the notion that the researcher is doing little more than counting, researcher bias, and the idea that *a priori* codes are the only codes possible (Miles and Huberman 1994). However, Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest ways to combat these hazards, such as to revisit coded material, understand that emerging codes may occur, acknowledge potential researcher bias, and require a rigorous examination of the data from multiple perspectives. Validity and reliability of this study are addressed below.
### Table 3.3

**CODING SEARCH TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY NAME</th>
<th>Examples of language category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociological</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Education continuum, pipeline(ideal), pathways, seamless system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Access, recruit minority students, financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Equity, equal educational opportunity, bridge programs, disadvantaged students, closing the gap, education for all,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>Learning community, 21st century skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Lifelong learning, comprehensive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Quality of Life, Sociological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Culture, organizational culture, culturally sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Citizenship, civic literacy, civic engagement, voting, democracy, Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Education</td>
<td>High quality education, quality programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achievement, performance indicators, degree attainment, student assessment, graduation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Efficiency, efficient system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Preparation</td>
<td>Workforce demands, highly educated workforce, jobs, entrepreneurial experience, preparation for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness</td>
<td>College readiness, high school to college, college preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge, skill attainment, skilled and educated workforce, knowledge economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Global competitiveness, dissolving geographic boundaries, competition, comparisons between states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Accountability, testing, standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>Brave new world, industrialized society, economic growth, technical society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Align, continuity, ease of transition, articulation between systems, coordination, pipeline (concrete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Shared action agenda, strategic action plan, agreement on expectations, mission, vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Unified efforts, links, partnership, cooperate, consensus building, collaborate, coordinate people/groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Redesign, coordinate, develop infrastructure, framework for change, governance, change of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16 Council</td>
<td>P-16 council (or the name that the state uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate</td>
<td>Reallocate, shared budgets, funding, resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Exchange information, communicate, report, share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Organizational boundaries, borders, challenges, difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Programs</td>
<td>Evaluation of programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability, Validity and Potential Biases of Project

In order to assess the validity and reliability of the coding framework a collection of passages from a sample of all three types of documents was accumulated. In order to address potential vulnerabilities in this study (Miles and Huberman 1994), several steps were taken. First, the data was examined from multiple perspectives. Several chosen paragraphs from the policy formation documents were coded by two other doctoral students in the department after they were trained in coding techniques and expectations. An 85-90% inter-rater reliability was achieved.

Second, the researcher was open to the potential for emerging codes and coded all documents with codes that emerged. However, there were no codes that emerged that were critical to this research study, so they have been saved for future studies. Third, this researcher acknowledges that the a priori coding scheme can be a source of researcher bias. This potential bias was combated by collecting emerging codes and examining those codes for potential importance to this study. Finally, coded material was revisited. Ten percent of the documents were randomly sampled for recoding and that recoding was measured for reliability. The inter-rater reliability for the recoding process was 93-100%.

In addition, in order to meet the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of University at Albany, SUNY, the researcher has completed the CITI training and submitted this project to IRB for review. Because this research does not include any human subjects and involves only documents that are accessible in the public domain, an
expedited approval from IRB has been given. This letter has been copied and attached in Appendix D.

While this project was designed to eliminate as many potential biases as possible, the nature of the project introduces a few biases that are discussed here. The sampling process, although designed to include all P-16 policy formation documents, potentially excludes some documents due to the restrictions set by the researcher. In particular, not including policy or legislation that is potentially used by P-16 committees or councils but has not been labeled P-16 could introduce some bias. This is likely to occur in states that have firmly established programs, such as a statewide preschool program, but the program is not explicitly and unambiguously linked to P-16 in policy or legislation. This research has been set up to match the policy advocacy literature which talks about explicitly linking all parts of a P-16 system.

**Research Questions- Analyses and Hypotheses**

This section contains a description of how each research question was examined. Then, anticipated findings of that question are described. The first step, following coding, was to include qualitative descriptions of the found discourses. This first step detailed the existence (or not) of any discourses. In order to do this, a meta-matrix was used for analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994) define a case ordered meta-matrix as an analysis problem that sorts and demonstrates the cases to show the data for each variable across all cases. The effects can be clustered in order to more easily exhibit the potential results. This type of matrix is appropriate for making comparisons and contrasts, noting relations between variables including patterns and themes (p 190).
In the case ordered meta-matrix developed for this study (see Meta-Matrix One: Existence of Codes within Documents), each document was considered one case. The cases were ordered by date (earliest to latest). A classification of each coding category was entered in the cells of the meta-matrix, a 1 if the key term is present in the document and a 0 if it is not. This first step provides a record of discourse representation within each case/document.

In the next step, this researcher performed an assessment to determine the depth of the three types of discourses (sociological, economic, and organizational) in each document. Miles and Huberman (1994) describe researcher assessment within qualitative analysis to include notation of relationships between variables, counting, and evaluating strengths based on prior knowledge and literature searches. In this study, a scaled rating to represent the presence of key terms within documents was *a priori* created by this researcher based upon study of discourse policy analysis (deLeon 1998; vanDijk 1997) and literature and theoretical reviews in Chapters Two. For each document, a scaled rating was assigned for the three types of discourses (Miles and Huberman 1994) based on the following scale:

- **High**  
  *Presence of 7-9 key terms- high level of discourse in document*
- **Moderate**  
  *Presence of 4-6 key terms- medium level of discourse in document*
- **Low**  
  *Presence of 1-3 key terms- low level of discourse in document*
- **None**  
  *Presence of 0 key terms- none- discourse not present in document*

Thus, each document receives three scores, a discourse level for sociological discourses, a discourse level for economic discourses, and a discourse level for
organizational discourses. (An example of the meta-matrix and the scoring process is available in Appendix F).

Discursive depths were found by using the meta-matrix and determining whether a code exists in the document. If it did, regardless of how much it exists, it was labeled 1. There are nine potential discourses found in each discourse category. Thus, nine sociological discourses, nine economic discourses, and nine organizational discourses were examined. It follows then that each document has a potential score of 0-9 in each of three measured discourses.

Once all the documents were analyzed individually and the entire meta-matrix was filled in, the next step involved creating a timeline of discourse levels. This was easily captured in the policy advocacy documents. However, because of the sheer numbers of policy formation documents in each year, it is difficult to see the trend of discourses over the course of twenty-five years. To alleviate this problem, a measure to capture average annual discourses for the state level policy formation documents was created. Average annual discourses levels give a portrait of the trend by year. This process involved separating the documents by year and then taking the levels of discourse for each document within a year and creating an average. As an example, in the year 2001 the discourse levels of all of the documents \((n=11)\) from that year were determined first. Each document received a score of 0-9 for sociological discourses, 0-9 for economic discourses, and 0-9 for organizational discourses. Then an average sociological score for 2001 was created by summing the sociological scores across the 11 documents and dividing the total by 11. The same process was repeated to get an average economic discourse score and an average organizational score for 2001. This process continued for
every year over the twenty-five year time frame- generating average annual discourse levels for the policy formation documents. This process is demonstrated in Appendix F.
### Table 3.4

**Meta-Matrix One - Existence of Codes within Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P-16 Discourses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Case 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Case 2</strong></td>
<td>→</td>
<td><strong>Case N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIIOLOGICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Education</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse Level/Research Assessment</strong></td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Programs</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16 Council</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse Level/Research Assessment</strong></td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Preparation</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
<td>y/n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse Level/Research Assessment</strong></td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
<td>H/M/L/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

Question One

Do the dominant discourses within the P-16 national policy advocacy literature and the P-16 state level policy and legislative documents vary by era of time?

This question started the multilayered analysis to examine a mapping of a relationship between time, policy advocacy, and policy formation. In order to answer this question the analysis took several steps. First, a timeline mapping of each document, advocacy and policy formation, occurred. This timeline laid out each document by year, from 1985 to 2010, giving a picture of the frequency of occurrence of each type of document over time. A second timeline mapped three levels of discourse, sociological, economic, and organizational. The scaled researcher analysis was then layered into this analysis to determine depth of discourse within documents over time.

Anticipated Findings for Question One

- Advocacy Literature Time Era 1: 1985-2002
- Advocacy Literature Time Era 2: 2002-2010
- Policy Formation Time Era 4: 2002-2010

Hypotheses:

1a. If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 1, then the dominant discourses is more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

1b. If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 2, then the dominant discourses is more likely to be focused on economic discourses than on sociological discourses.

1c. The organizational discourses within national P-16 policy advocacy literature have remained constant throughout Time Eras 1 and 2.
1d: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 3, these documents will have dominant discourses that are more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

1e: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 4, these documents will have dominant discourses that are more likely to be focused on economic discourses than sociological discourses.

1f: The discourses of organizational change within state level P-16 policy and legislation documents have remained constant throughout Time Eras 3 and 4.

Question Two

What are the relationships between time eras of P-16 and the influence of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation (represented by state level policy and legislation)?

A. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy advocacy documents over time?
B. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy formation documents over time?
C. Do the discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation have influence on each other?

This question and the more specific follow-up questions examined the entry points where states become part of the P-16 world by creating policy or legislation. It was designed to observe how states depict P-16 through their policy/legislative language depending on their time entering into P-16. For example, a state that started a program in the 1990s is likely have many iterations of what P-16 “is”- how it’s legislated or made into policy over the past twenty years. It is also likely that a state that has only recently formed a P-16 program may have skipped discourses and gone straight to economic rationales. In order to answer Research Question Two (and its sub questions), this research took the following steps. For Part A- a count of page numbers and timeline occurrences created a volume and frequency of all types of documents studied in this
project. This provides the researcher and reader with some background of what is happening in P-16 policy advocacy and formation in the United States. This counting (and charting of) the documents volume and frequency formulates the response to hypotheses 2a and 2b. Below are the predicted outcomes of this question.

In order to respond to part B, this researcher conducted an in-depth policy discourse analysis based upon the findings from the data of P-16 discourses within the P-16 policy advocacy, legislative, and policy documents (Miles and Huberman 1994). This historical analysis examined the chronology of discourses in state level P-16 legislation and policy. The narrative of this historical process involved noting patterns of discourse shifts and relationships between cases in order to extrapolate the ways that the dominant discourses of P-16 shape the realities of P-16 for the states. In order to determine any shifting of discourses or any potential influence of discourses from one type of policy to another (advocacy influencing formation perhaps), the researcher used policy discourse analysis. Discourse analysis, by its nature, allows the researcher to make judgments based on theory and frameworks outlined in advance by the researcher. In this case, the theoretical framework was set up to examine any shifting of discourses across time. The final steps of policy discourse analysis call for the researcher to look beyond the “counts” of words/phrases and to determine the meaning of policy. Influence is used in this research to demonstrate how the language and meaning behind the advocacy literature may be observed in the language and meaning of policy formation. It also allows this researcher to determine if the expected findings in hypotheses 2C-2E are valid. Further discussion of this question continues in Chapter Five.
Anticipated Findings for Question Two

- Advocacy Literature Time Era 1: 1985-2002
- Advocacy Literature Time Era 2: 2002-2010
- Policy Formation Time Era 4: 2002-2010

Hypotheses:

2a: The volume (number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 national policy advocacy literature is greater in Time Era 1 and less in Time Era 2.

2b: The volume (size and number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 state policy and legislation is greater in Time Era 4 and less in Time Era 3.

2c: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 3, then the language is influenced by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 1.

2d: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4, then the language is influenced by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 2.

2e: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4, then the language is also influenced by the language of state level policy/legislation in Time Era 3.

Summary

In summary, this study employed policy discourse analysis as a methodology and utilized the qualitative software program NVivo8 as the means to explore and examine constructs and context of the language of P-16 policy. This study focused on investigating the historical transformation of discourse over the lifetime of P-16 policy advocacy and formation. A priori coding schemes were based upon previous literature
reviews and theoretical foundations found in Chapter Two. Two hundred and eighty-seven documents were found and coded on a sentence-by-sentence basis. In the next chapter, findings from analysis are presented.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS PART ONE

Introduction

This study examined the shift of discourses of P-16 through the examination of language of both policy advocacy literature and policy formation documents. A multi-theoretical framework was developed in order to set the context for the analysis. This theoretical framework involves three primary perspectives: (1) sociological framework; (2) organizational framework; and (3) economic framework. In this chapter, the results and findings from this analysis are explored and answers to the previously laid out research questions are expounded upon. These questions are:

Question One: Do the dominant discourses within the P-16 national policy advocacy literature and the P-16 state level policy and legislative documents vary by era of time?

Question Two: What are the relationships between time eras of P-16 and the influence of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation (represented by state level policy and legislation)?

A. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 literature and policy over time?

B. Do the discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation have influence on each other?
This chapter responds to each question and its corresponding hypotheses in sequence. A synopsis of findings is presented at the end of the chapter. A discussion of analysis and implications follows in Chapter Six.

**Question One Findings**

**Question One: Do the dominant discourses within the P-16 national policy advocacy literature and the P-16 state level policy and legislative documents vary by era of time?**

In order to examine the relationships between time, policy advocacy, and policy formation, several steps were taken. In the first step, a meta-matrix which lays out both time and type of policy document (advocacy vs. formation) was developed\(^{10}\). This process made possible the development of a timeline of frequencies of pre-established discourses within the policy documents. In addition, a mapping of the existence of documents was undertaken.

The P-16 advocacy documents sampled to represent this category were predominantly found to be published during the five year span from 1999-2003. 65% of the sampled advocacy documents were published during this five year span (see Graph 4.1). In contrast, the five year span that encompasses the greatest number of policy formation documents is 2005-2009. Fifty-one percent of the policy formation documents were dated during this time period (see Graph 4.2). This finding is expected because the literature review indicated that policy advocacy leads to policy formation, with a lag time between them. Thus, it is found that the period of greatest P-16 policy formation is about 2 years behind the period of greatest P-16 policy advocacy.

\(^{10}\) The entire meta matrix can be made available by contacting the author. See Appendix F for example.
Graph 4.1
P-16 Sampled Policy Advocacy Documents

Graph 4.2
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The next step in the analyses involved the mapping of coded discourses over the twenty-five year time span. Two maps were developed— one for policy advocacy documents and one for policy formation documents. These maps show the comparison of the three discourses, sociological, organizational, and economic, that occur in the P-16 policy formation and advocacy documents. As described in Chapter Three, discursive depths were found by using a meta-matrix (see Appendix F for example) and determining whether a code exists in the document. If it did, regardless of how much it exists, it was labeled 1. There are nine potential discourses found in each discourse category. Thus, nine sociological discourses, nine economic discourses, and nine organizational discourses were examined. It follows then that each document has a potential score of 0-9 in each of three measured discourses. Average annual discourses were taken for the policy formation documents to portray the annual trends. Graph 4.3 (P-16 Policy Advocacy Documents Average Annual Discourses) demonstrates the average discourses found in the P-16 advocacy formation documents in each year, from 1985-2010. Graph 4.411 (P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Discourses) demonstrates the average annual discourses found in the P-16 policy formation documents, from 1987-2010. A more detailed examination of data points follows below in response to the predetermined hypotheses.

11 Graph 4.4a, 4.4b, and 4.4c are separated out versions of Graph 4.4. In other words, 4.4a is the sociological discourses over time, 4.4b is the economic discourses over time, and 4.4c is the organizational discourses over time, while Graph 4.4 shows them all together. Many data points overlapped and in order to provide clarity these graphs were presented as separate and then merged.
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Graph 4.4a
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P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Economic Discourses
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P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Organizational Discourses
Analysis of coding of the P-16 documents found that an important distinction between the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy and that of P-16 policy formation emerged. In each of the advocacy documents sampled, all three expected discourses (sociological, economic, and organizational discourses) were present at some level. However, the policy formation documents differed greatly in terms of their discursive levels. It was found that most in the policy formation documents (98%) had organizational discourses. This is not surprising because policy and legislative formation documents are geared to the development and establishment of policy. Organizational
discourses often speak to a practical set of discourses which explore the set of actions or
plans for the establishment of a program or policy.

Economic discourses were found in 80% of the policy formation documents. Although this represents a vast majority of documents, it was still surprising that economic discourses did not appear in more of the formation documents. Although strong levels of economic discourses were not expected in all documents over the twenty-five year time frame, based on the presence of economic discourses throughout the historic span of advocacy literature, it was expected that some level economic discourse would be present in all documents.

In another surprising finding, only 39% of the policy formation documents had any sociological discourses. This was unexpected, as sociological discourses remained prevalent throughout the advocacy documents and it was expected that more sociological discourses would be found.

**Question One Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1a**

Hypothesis 1a: If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 1 [1985-2002], then the dominant discourses are more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

Seventeen P-16 policy advocacy documents were purposively sampled for this analysis. As previously stated, these documents were chosen based upon their impact on P-16 based on citations in (1) other advocacy documents; (2) state level P-16 documents (i.e. mission statements, information about state level P-16 programs); and (3) reports or
articles about P-16 program analyses. As expected, and as demonstrated in Graph 4.5 (P-16 Advocacy Documents Sociological and Economic Average Annual Discourses), 55% of the documents within the 1985-2002 (Era 1) time period were rated slightly higher on sociological discourses than they were on economic discourses. A score of nine was the highest rating given for any document’s discourse level. In the given time frame, 55% of the documents (n=11) rated HIGH (received a score of 7-9) on the sociological discourse scale, while only 45% of the same documents rated HIGH on the economic discourse scale. The linear trend lines in Graph 4.5 show the relative stability of the economic discourses of the advocacy documents, with the trend line decreasing slightly over the time period 1985 to 2002. However, the linear sociological trend line shows a definitive decrease in sociological discourses over this time, starting in the HIGH range and ending in the MOD discourse scale.

The unexpected finding of this time frame is that the economic discourses of the earliest P-16 policy advocacy documents were more evident than they were expected to be. Early policy advocacy documents utilized economic rationales within the discourses nearly on parity with the amount of sociological discourses. In fact, economic discourses remained a relatively steady presence throughout the P-16 policy advocacy documents included in this study.
Hypothesis 1b

_Hypothesis 1b: If the national policy advocacy documents have a published date during Time Era 2 [2003-2010], then the dominant discourses are more likely to be focused on economic discourses than on sociological discourses._

As expected, 83% of the documents within the 2003-2010 time period (Time Era 2) were rated higher on economic discourses than they were on sociological discourses.

As before, a score of nine was the highest given rating in any one document’s discourse level. In the given time frame, 50% of the documents rated HIGH (7-9) on the economic discourse scale, while the other 50% rated MOD (4-6) on the economic discourse scale.

In contrast, 67% of the documents rated MOD on the sociological discourse scale, the
highest score achieved during Time Era 2. The linear trend lines in Graph 4.5 show the relative stability of the economic discourses of the advocacy documents, with the trend line decreasing slightly over the time period 2003 to 2010. However, the linear sociological trend line shows a definitive decrease in sociological discourses over this time, starting in the MOD range and ending in the LOW discourse scale.

Hypothesis 1c

Hypothesis 1c: The organizational discourses within national P-16 policy advocacy literature have remained consistent throughout Time Eras 1 and 2 [1985-2010].

As expected based on the literature search of P-16 policy, the analysis demonstrates a generally stable level of organizational discourse throughout 1985-2010 (Time Eras 1 and 2). As demonstrated in Graph 4.6 (P-16 Advocacy Documents Average Annual Organizational Discourses), the sampled P-16 advocacy documents are most likely to be rated HIGH on the organizational discourse scale. In the 1985-2010 time-frame, 76% rated HIGH on the organizational scale, with 100% of the average annual organizational discourses scored at MOD or HIGH. The linear organizational trend line shows an increasing trend of organizational discourse over time, with the trend line showing an increase from the MOD scale of 6 over time to the HIGH scale of 9.
Hypothesis 1d

Hypothesis 1d: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 3 [1987-2002], these documents will have dominant discourses that are more likely to be focused on sociological discourses than economic discourses.

The expected outcome was not found for this hypothesis. In examining Time Era 3 [1987-2002], very few policy formation documents were found prior to 2000. From 1987-1999, there were fifteen P-16 policy formation documents from 7 states. In contrast, from 2000-2002, sixty-one P-16 policy formation documents from 12 states were found. Average annual discourse levels for sociological and economic discourses

---

12 Colorado, Indiana, Maine, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Wyoming
13 California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Jersey, Texas
can be seen in Graph 4.7\(^\text{14}\) (P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Sociological and Economic Discourses 1987-2002).

Prior to 2000, the average levels of sociological discourse and economic discourse in the P-16 policy formation documents are generally the same; i.e. NONE (no evidence of any sociological discourses in the document) or LOW (scored 1-3). The average annual levels of sociological and economic discourses are LOW throughout Time Era 3 [1987-2002], with no average discourse level score rising above a scaled score of 2.5 (out of 9) in any year. A close look at individual documents reveals that all fifteen documents dated prior to 2000 scored either LOW or NONE in economic and sociological discourses. A slight increase of average annual economic discourses over sociological discourses can be found in 1987. A detailed examination of the data points reveals three documents found in 1987 with no sociological discourses in any of them and only one had any economic discourses with a low level score of 3.

However, in 1999, a trend emerges and the level of economic discourses begins to outpace the level of sociological discourses in the P-16 policy formation documents. In the years 2000-2002, the average annual levels of economic and sociological discourses remain low, but steadily increasing. Examining the documents in these years in depth, it is found that the documents are dominantly scored NONE or LOW in sociological discourses (90% of the scores were either NONE or LOW). In contrast, while the documents are also primarily scored LOW or NONE in economic discourses (77% of

\(^\text{14}\) Graph 4.7a and 4.7b are separated out versions of Graph 4.7. In other words, 4.7a is the sociological discourses in Time Era 3, 4.7b is the economic discourses in Time Era 3, while Graph 4.3 shows them all together. Many data points overlapped and in order to provide clarity these graphs were presented as separate and then merged.
documents scored LOW or NONE), more economic discourses are starting to emerge—
10% scored HIGH on the economic discourse scale and 13% had MOD scores. As seen in Graph 4.7, from 1999-2002 economic discourses are generally scaled twice as much as sociological discourses.

Graph 4.7a

P-16 Policy Formation Documents

Average Annual Sociological Discourses 1987-2002
Graph 4.7b

P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Economic Discourses 1987-2002

Graph 4.7

P-16 Policy Formation Documents
Average Annual Sociological and Economic Discourses 1987-2002
Hypothesis 1e

Hypothesis 1e: If the state level P-16 policy and legislation documents are created in Time Era 4 [2003-2010], these documents will have dominant discourses that are more likely to be focused on economic discourses than sociological discourses.

In Time Era 4, Hypothesis 1e is upheld. As Graph 4.8 (P-16 Policy Formation Documents Annual Average Sociological and Economic Discourses 2003-2010) shows, the P-16 policy formation documents are more likely to be focused on economic discourses than they are on sociological discourses. There are 209 P-16 policy formation documents dated 2003-2010 from thirty-nine of the fifty United States. During this time period, the average annual coded score of the formation documents is generally two scaled points higher in economic discourses than it is in sociological discourses throughout this time period. The average annual levels of discourse remain relatively steady over this seven year period. The average annual economic discourse level is MOD throughout this time, fluctuating between a score of 3 and 4.5, with a very slight trend up over time. The average annual sociological discourse continues its steady LOW course, with scores between 1.5 and 2.8, again with a slight trend up over time.

With closer examination of the data during this time period, another trend is revealed. Over time, the documents become more likely to receive HIGH or MOD scores in economic discourses. As previously noted, from 2000-2002, 23% of the documents had HIGH or MOD scores. Over the next seven years, the P-16 policy formation documents that scored HIGH or MOD ranged from 37% to 60%, with an overall 47% of
the documents with these scores. The linear economic discourse trend line shows a slight increase in economic discourses over this time period, from 3.5 to nearly 4.5.

The documents of this time era are most likely to be scored LOW or NONE in sociological discourses - 76% of the documents in this time era are scored thusly. However, it is significant to note that the level of sociological discourse, while still low overall, rose slightly over time. The linear sociological trend line shows this slight increase over time, increasing about a half a point on the scale over this time period.

**Graph 4.8**

**P-16 Policy Formation Documents**

*Annual Average Sociological and Economic Discourses 2003-2010*
Hypothesis 1f

Hypothesis 1f: The discourses of organizational change within state level P-16 policy and legislation documents have remained consistent throughout Time Eras 3 and 4 [1987-2010].

The state level P-16 policy formation documents demonstrate a steady moderate average annual level of organizational discourses from 1999-2010 (see Graph 4.9 P-16 Policy Formation Documents Average Annual Organizational Discourses 1987-2010). Prior to 1999, there is fluctuation in the average annual levels of organizational discourses, from LOW to MOD. This fluctuation may be due to the fact that only 15 documents are in this time span, thus each data point represents one or two document scores, rather than the average of 9-35 document scores that are represented in later years. From 2000-2010, the documents average annual organizational discourse scores remain in the MOD range with a slight increase over time from a score of 3.23 in 2000 to 4.65 in 2010. The linear economic discourse trend line shows this slight increase in scaled score discourse levels over this time period.
Summary

In this chapter, the findings from Research Question One and its hypotheses are presented. Chapter Five presents findings from Research Question Two and resulting hypotheses. This study has found that the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy and formation documents have shifted over time. The evidence collected shows that the discourse shifts are more clearly seen after the late 1990s when more documents are available for study. Although P-16 clearly got its start in the late 1980s, there were not enough documents for study until approximately 1998/1999. However, from 1998-2010, the hypotheses generally find empirical support and the shift from more sociological discourse to more economic rationales discourse is evident over time. It also appears that the organizational discourses generally remain steady and stable during this time frame.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS PART TWO

Question Two Findings

Question Two: What are the relationships between time eras of P-16 and the influence of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation (represented by state level policy and legislation)?

A. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy advocacy documents over time?
B. What are the volume and frequency of P-16 policy formation documents over time?
C. Do the discourses of P-16 national policy advocacy literature and P-16 policy formation have influence on each other?

The examination of relationships between time, policy advocacy, and policy formation aims to explore how and when states become a part of the P-16 world. This research uses official policy language to determine what is happening in policy formation and when it is happening in relationship to policy advocacy. The first part of this question gathers some background information on P-16 in the fifty United States through some basic frequencies and mapping of information. The second part (part B) provides an in depth historical policy discourse analysis of P-16 policy advocacy and formation documents.
Question Two Hypotheses

Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a: The volume (number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 national policy advocacy literature is greater in Time Era 1 and less in Time Era 2.

There are seventeen total P-16 policy advocacy documents sampled for this study. The frequency and volume of the sampled national policy advocacy literature, as shown in Table 5.1, are greater in Time Era 1 [1985-2002] than they are in Time Era 2 [2003-2010]. There are eleven total sampled advocacy documents published between 1985 and 2002. These eleven documents have a total of 195 pages, with documents ranging from 2 to 68 pages long. There are six total sampled advocacy documents published between 2003 and 2010. These six documents have a total of 144 pages, with documents ranging from 5 pages to 68 pages long. However, the average page number per document is greater in Time Era 2 than it is in Time Era 1. The average number of pages per document in Time Era 2 is 24 pages/document, while the average in Time Era 1 is 18 pages/document. Thus, as expected, the volume and frequency of P-16 policy advocacy are greater in earlier years of the history of P-16 (Time Era 1) than they are in the later years (Time Era 2).

It should be noted that although there appears to be a great gap in the advocacy literature between 1985 and 1999, this is not the case. It appears that there was no advocacy for P-16 in the years 1986-1998. However, this is due to the sampling procedure for the advocacy documents. Not all P-16 advocacy documents were selected to be included in this study. The criteria for sampling advocacy documents required that the most prevalently cited or quoted advocacy documents are included in the sample.
Thus, the seventeen chosen documents were sampled. These documents were cited in both subsequent P-16 advocacy and on the P-16 state level websites as sources of P-16 information. There was P-16 advocacy during this “gap”, but it did not fit within the sampling criteria of this particular study.

Table 5.1
Sampled Advocacy Documents - By Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th># ADVOCACY DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>PAGES of ADVOCACY DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2b

Hypothesis 2b: The volume (number of pages) and frequency (how often) of P-16 state policy and legislation is greater in Time Era 4 and less in Time Era 3.

There are 270 total P-16 policy formation documents collected for this study. The frequency and volume of the sampled national policy advocacy literature, as shown in Table 5.2, is greater in Time Era 4 [2003-2010] than it is in Time Era 3 [1987-2002]. There are 209 total P-16 policy formation documents published between 2003 and 2010. These documents have a total of 1426 pages, with documents ranging from 1 to 90 pages long. The average page length per document in Time Era 4 is 7 pages/document. There are 61 total P-16 policy formation documents published between 1985 and 2002. These 61 documents have a total of 172 pages, ranging from 1 to 23 pages long. The average page number per document in Time Era 3 is 3 pages/document. Based upon the literature, it was expected that the volume and frequency of policy formation documents would be greater in the later years of P-16 policy history.
Table 5.2

Policy Formation Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Forma_tion Docs</th>
<th>No. of Policy Docs</th>
<th>No. of Law Docs</th>
<th>No. of Other Docs</th>
<th>Pages Policy</th>
<th>Pages Law</th>
<th>Pages Other</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 exec order</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 exec order</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 exec order</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 exec order</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 exec order</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 exec order</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 bylaws</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2c

Hypothesis 2c: *If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 3 [1987-2002], then the language is changed by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 1 [1985-2002].*

The analysis of this hypothesis is divided into two time sections, 1987-1999 and 2000-2002. This is because during the 1987-1999, there were only fifteen laws passed in seven states (Oregon, Texas, Maine, Colorado, North Carolina, Wyoming, and Indiana) regarding P-16. In 2000-2002, there were a sixty-one policy formation documents, 27 were official state level policy documents from six states (Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, California, Florida, and Maryland), 33 were state laws from five states (Florida, Georgia, Texas, Kentucky, and North Dakota), and 1 Governor’s Executive Order (Iowa). The two time periods are different in respect to development of P-16 because of the amount of policy formation documents that were found during these time periods and thus warrant two findings discussions.

1987-1998

In the first time section, 1987-1999, six states passed P-16 laws. These laws were generally short in text- ranging from less than a page to seven pages in length. The laws generated were focused on two subjects. The first is the coordination of state agencies under one state authority. This authority may not have been named P-16 at the time, but later became the P-16 agency (Wyoming) or the law developed into the P-16 laws of that state (Texas). The second is the development of a P-16 council in order to study or evaluate the process of developing a P-16 education system within the state. In this very
early time of P-16, rather than being heavily influenced by P-16 policy advocacy language, states policy formation relied on general ideas put forth by Hodgkinson (1985), but not actual discourses. In other words, the language within the Hodgkinson policy report is not replicated or similar to the language within early policy formation. However, the “idea of P-16” which included connecting the levels of education and developing councils to create further policy is found. National Governors Association (www.nga.org) meetings in the 1990s where discussions were held on P-16 concepts, as well as state and local level voluntary and Governor led efforts in states such as Georgia, Texas, and Oregon also likely influenced the early development of P-16 initiatives during this time period.

These early P-16 laws were beginning efforts for creating a coordinated education system. Language examples are included here in order to provide the reader with clarity as to discourses represented within the P-16 policy formation documents. The language examples provided here demonstrate the types of “development of programs or systems” that is found in this early time frame. Discourses refer to connecting of systems, coordinating activities and elements within the system, and developing plans for further alignment. Examples include:

“(1) The State Board of Higher Education [,] and the State Board of Education [and the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission] shall hold at least one meeting annually for the purpose of coordinating their activities and facilitating the solution of problems of mutual concern.”15

“The State Board of Education and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, in conjunction with other appropriate agencies, shall ensure

15 Coordination of State Agencies, Sec 16, ORS 348.890, Oregon Legislature, 1987
that long-range plans and educational programs established by each board provide a comprehensive education for the students of this state under the jurisdiction of that board, extending from early childhood education through postgraduate study.”

The creation of P-16 councils (under various names) was also prominent in the P-16 laws of 1987-1999. Language of P-16 council creation examples include:

“The Education Cabinet is created. The Education Cabinet shall be located administratively within, and shall exercise its powers within existing resources of, the Office of the Governor. However, the Education Cabinet shall exercise its statutory powers independently of the Office of the Governor.”

“The Education Roundtable is established.”

Other language clarifies the intent of the P-16 councils, their membership and leadership, and meetings information (how often, where, who attends), as well as allocation of funds information for P-16 council operations. Thus, the findings are that during the time period 1985-1999, P-16 policy advocacy documents sampled for this study do not influence the state’s policy formation in a measurable or observable way.

1999-2002

In the second time period, 2000-2002, eleven states had policy formation documents. Of the sixty-one documents, 54% were laws and 46% were policy (including

---

16 Cooperation Between State Agencies of Higher Education, Sec. 7.005, Texas Legislature, 1995
17 Continuum of Education Programs, §116C-1, General Assembly of North Carolina, 1993
18 Education Roundtable, §20-1-20.5, Sec.3, Indiana Legislature, 1999
one executive order). Overall, these documents varied in length, from one to sixty-eight pages long, however the policies average 4 pages/documents while laws average 1.7 pages/document. During this time frame, the emergence of some influence of advocacy language on policy formation begins.

**P-16 Policy Advocacy Dominant Discourses 1999-2002**

In the P-16 policy advocacy literature published between 1999 and 2002, strong discourses are apparent (see Table 5.3 Dominant Discourses Advocacy vs. Formation 1999-2002). In these ten documents, the three dominant economic discourses are accountability, achievement, and college preparation/readiness. These three discourses appear in 100% of the advocacy documents of this time period.
As previously mentioned, language examples are included here in order to provide the reader with clarity as to discourses represented within the P-16 policy advocacy documents. These examples are given to demonstrate how the sentences were coded as types of discourses. Discourse examples (sample sentences) from the advocacy documents from 1999-2002 are provided. Each sentence is quoted in full. Then, in order to demonstrate how the sentence was coded either a portion of the sentence is bolded or an explanation from the researcher follows in bold.
Accountability in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002

“Today, national standards, in national tests, as well as state testing programs are on the front burner and equity issues get less attention than in the past.”

“Currently, K-12 and postsecondary institutions move in different orbits, upholding different sets of standards regarding what students should know and be able to do.”

“Regardless of the type of system a state or local community chooses, it is important to note that the goal is the same: to create a system of education that begins in early childhood and ends after college, and promotes access, standards, accountability and lifelong learning.”

“This roundtable focused on the need for stringent accountability systems linked to standards, and on system reform in place of remediating students after-the-fact on postsecondary campuses.”

Achievement in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002

“It is important to keep both quality and equality in mind, as we need a set of equity/ linkages that will help reduce the effects of economic and social differences, and a set of content-based linkages that will smooth students' passage through the system and allow them to achieve at the highest levels they are capable of.”

“A system of incentives could be used to encourage and reward student achievement and parent involvement along the P-16 path.”

19 Hogkinson, 1999
21 Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000
22 The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002
23 Hodgkinson 1999
24 Pipho 2001
“Math achievement in the 8th grade clears the way for students to take advanced classes in high school.”

“K–12, for example, might be held accountable not only for improving student achievement and closing gaps between groups, but also for assuring that all of its secondary teachers have deep and substantial knowledge in the subject areas they are teaching.”

*College Preparation/Readiness in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002

“Uninformed students are likely to miss taking important academic courses, almost ensuring that they will be inadequately prepared for postsecondary work.”

“This idea has major implications for community colleges and other postsecondary institutions and raises a basic question: What does it mean to be at an academic level appropriate to begin college?”

“The goal is to increase the chances that high school graduates will be well-prepared for college-level work and can move smoothly to the next level without requiring remediation.”

“Finally, the lack of early and high-quality college counseling for all, combined with widespread “senioritis” in the final year, mean that many students are poorly prepared for college.”

25 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
26 The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002
27 Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000
28 Pipho 2001
29 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
30 The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002
The three strongest sociological discourses are pipeline, access, and high quality education, appearing in 90%, 80% and 80% of the advocacy documents, respectively. As previously noted, discourse examples (sample sentences) from the advocacy documents from 1999-2002 are provided. Each sentence is quoted in full. Then, in order to demonstrate how the sentence was coded either a portion of the sentence is bolded or an explanation from the researcher follows in bold. Examples of these sociological discourses in the 1999-2002 policy advocacy documents follow.

*Pipeline in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002*

“*K-16, so far, is an idea: education should be a seamless web from kindergarten to college graduation.*”

“The shorthand term for such initiatives, P-16, reflects the central vision of a coherent, flexible continuum of public education that stretches from preschool to grade 16, culminating in a baccalaureate degree.”

*Access in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002*

“All children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school.”

“New technologies may mean the end of distance as a barrier, and allow states to reformulate the goal of providing access.”

“In response to this dramatic change and other developments, communities and states across the country are looking for ways to improve student achievement,

---

31 Hodgkinson, 1999
32 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001)
33 Hodgkinson 1999
34 Levine 2001
access to and success in higher education.  

“Expanding access to early learning for children ages 3 to 5, and improving their readiness for kindergarten.”

*High Quality Education in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002

“Children who attend a quality preschool program experience higher rates of graduation and enrollment in postsecondary institutions, as well as lower rates of grade retention, fewer special education placements, fewer dropouts and teenage pregnancies, and higher employment rates as teens and young adults.”

“Provides access to high-quality education opportunities for all students regardless of race, ethnicity, income or gender...thereby preparing all learners to be successful as citizens and workers.”

“High-quality, easily accessible programs: Services for young children that are available inequitably and that further segregate children by income do not characterize any public service in this nation, and they should not characterize those services for our youngest and most vulnerable citizens.”

The three dominant organizational discourses found in the 1999-2002 policy advocacy literature are alignment, boundary, and collaboration, appearing in 100%, 100%, and 90% of the documents, respectively. Language examples of these organizational discourses in the 1999-2002 policy advocacy documents are included here in order to demonstrate the types of discourses represented within the P-16 policy

---

35 Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000
36 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
37 Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000
38 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
39 Education Commission of the States 2002
advocacy documents. Discourse examples (sample sentences) from the advocacy documents from 1999-2002 are provided. Each sentence is quoted in full and either a portion of the sentence is bolded to demonstrate why this sentence was coded the way it was.

**Alignment in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002**

“No faculty member in higher education ever got tenure because of a concern for the linkage of higher education with ‘lower education’.”

“Aligning these different standards and then providing all students hoping to attend postsecondary institutions with the information and academic skills they need to succeed would represent enormous leaps forward, especially during this time of declining affirmative action admissions.”

“Putting together a comprehensive bill requires recognition of the crucial interconnectedness of the various components of a P-16 system.”

“Here are a few of the reasons that it is crucial to work toward a fully aligned system.”

**Boundary in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002**

“There are some new jurisdictional issues as well.”

“Guarantee permeable boundaries between schools and colleges that ensure all advanced high school students have the opportunity to pursue college-level

---

40 Hodgkinson 1999
41 Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000
42 Pipho 2001
43 Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
44 Hodgkinson 1999
instruction at their school or local college.\textsuperscript{45}

“American education has long been \textit{characterized by a profound disjuncture between K-12 and postsecondary education}—two systems that often act independently and at cross-purposes from one another.\textsuperscript{46}”

“Other options include sponsoring a policy audit to \textit{identify various opportunities and barriers}, or establishing an advisory body to help build the P-16 vision and sell the idea.\textsuperscript{47}”

*Collaboration in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002*

“\textit{Attempts at collaboration} usually fail against segmentation unless there is some kind of broad-based institutional effort.\textsuperscript{48}”

“In many states the voluntary and \textit{cooperative relationship} between state boards of education and higher education systems is seen as the success behind their effort.\textsuperscript{49}”

“The earliest efforts at \textit{cross-system collaboration} tended to be piecemeal; that is, they focused on a portion of the P-16 continuum, such as teacher education or high school exit standards and college admission requirements, and did not attempt to create a full-fledged seamless education system.\textsuperscript{50}”

“A P-16 system seeks to improve student flow and raise student achievement \textit{through collaboration} and coordination across all education levels.\textsuperscript{51}”

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Levine 1999
\item \textsuperscript{46} Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000
\item \textsuperscript{47} Pihpo 2001
\item \textsuperscript{48} Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000
\item \textsuperscript{49} Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000
\item \textsuperscript{50} Van de Water and Rainwater 2001
\item \textsuperscript{51} Education Commission of the States 2002
\end{itemize}
If the advocacy discourses are influential, it would be expected, based on the literature, that policy formation documents would have the same dominant discourses in their text. In exploring the dominant discourses of P-16 policy formation literature published in 2000-2002, it is apparent that in the comparison of all three discourse categories, it is found that the discourses found within advocacy documents are also primarily the same discourses found in the formation documents.

The top three dominant economic discourses of the policy formation literature are accountability (79%), student achievement (39%), and efficient (27%). In contrast, college readiness, in only 18% of the policy formation documents, is not considered a primary economic discourse during the 2000-2002 timeframe. Discourse examples (sample sentences) from the P-16 policy formation documents from 1999-2002 are provided. Each sentence is quoted in full and in order to demonstrate how the sentence was coded, either a portion of the sentence is bolded or an explanation from the researcher follows in bold.

*Accountability in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“Contribute to the development of an assessment system that links student learning in schools to higher education admissions and placement processes in a manner that provides students and parents with a consistent message as to the importance of mastering State Board of Education standards,”

“7) ’Sunshine State Standards’ are standards that identify what public school

52 Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. 2002. California Education Roundtable, Sacramento, CA
students should know and be able to do53‚’’

“Enabling students to meet high standards54‚’’

“The Alignment Commission shall develop and agree upon common standards for all core curriculum courses taught by P-16 educators in the state.55‚’’

*Achievement in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002

‘Publish and make presentations on Achievement in California that contains a comprehensive picture of the current situation in terms of the performance of students across multiple educational levels in order to inform the development of policy and programs;56‚’’

“During the second meeting, the staff team reached a similar conclusion about progress in Illinois, but also determined that the current P-16 initiative is neither comprehensive nor bold enough to adequately address issues of student achievement and teacher quality.57‚’’

“WHEREAS, meaningful improvement in student achievement at all educational levels requires leadership that promotes and facilitates improvements from kindergarten through college graduation;58‚’’

“Given New Jersey’s growing number of immigrants and minorities and the increasing importance of a college degree in our high-tech economy, EOF must build on this success to help more students overcome disadvantaged backgrounds

---

53 Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2002
54 Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. 2002. Memorandum of understanding, Maryland K-16 Partnership, Annapolis, MD
55 North Dakota State Law, 15.1-01-02, North Dakota Legislative Assembly, 2002
56 Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. 2002. California Education Roundtable, Sacramento, CA
58 Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. 2002. Memorandum of understanding, Maryland K-16 Partnership, Annapolis, MD
to succeed in college and **achieve their educational goals**.\(^{59}\)

*Efficient in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“Develop a plan for a comprehensive and coherent system that **efficiently** uses State, institutional, and private resources in a collaborative manner to facilitate access by students, families, and educators on preparing and applying for higher education;\(^{60}\)”

“**WHEREAS**, our traditional educational system can sometimes lead to **inefficiencies** including; inconsistent admission criteria; service duplication; **inefficient funding** strategies; and delayed responses to critical state needs;\(^{61}\)”

“**New Jersey’s community colleges strive to provide a convenient and efficient transfer route for baccalaureate seekers, reducing overall tuition outlays.**\(^{62}\)”

When comparing the P-16 advocacy documents to the policy formation documents of the 1999-2002 time-period, it was found that the dominant sociological discourses of the policy formation documents are the same as those for advocacy documents. The primary sociological discourses of the policy formation documents are equity (28%), pipeline (18%), and access and high quality education (13% each). While pipeline, access, and high quality education appear in both lists of dominant discourses, equity is not among the top three discourses for advocacy documents. Nevertheless, it is


\(^{60}\) Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. 2002. California Education Roundtable, Sacramento, CA.

\(^{61}\) *Iowa Executive Order,* Governor’s Executive Order 20, Executive Office of the State of Iowa, 2001

a critical discourse within the advocacy documents of this time period, appearing in 80% of them. Examples of the discourses found within the policy formation documents of this time period are found below. As previously noted, the sentences below are direct quotes from policy formation documents (1999-2002) and then are bolded to demonstrate how they would be coded as such.

*Equity in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“The outcome of this collaboration is to develop a coherent, high quality educational experience for each and every learner - kindergarten through postgraduate programs.”

“(3) PURPOSE.--The purpose of the Florida K-20 Education Code is to provide by law for a state system of schools, courses, classes, and educational institutions and services adequate to allow, for all Florida's students, the opportunity to obtain a high quality education.”

“The institutions are expanding their capacity to meet increasing enrollment and needs, enhancing flexibility to serve students effectively through nontraditional means, and strengthening parity among all minority groups in respect to enrollment, academic performance, faculty retention, and graduation rates.”

*Pipeline in Advocacy Documents 1999-2002*

“Despite the need for increased educational attainment by all students, the pipeline is leaking badly.”

---

64 Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2002
“12) To establish a Citizen Information Center responsible for the preparation, publication, and distribution of materials relating to the state system of seamless K-20 public education.67"

“To achieve within existing resources true systemic change in education governance by establishing a seamless academic educational system that fosters an integrated continuum of kindergarten through graduate school education for Florida's citizens.68"


“The report must specify, for each limited-access program within each institution, the following categories, by race and gender.69"

“Providing all children and youth in Georgia with access to a quality program which supports their development of essential competencies in order that they may realize their potential.70"

“Every student must have access to and take course content that is rigorous and relevant.71"

“As colleges and universities strive to provide both access and success for all potential students, government support for institutions is crucial.72"

---

67 Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2002
69 Florida Statute, §1000.02, Florida State Legislature, 2002
70 Georgia Education Code, HB1187, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
*High Quality Education in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“3) PURPOSE.--The purpose of the Florida K-20 Education Code is to provide by law for a state system of schools, courses, classes, and educational institutions and services adequate to allow, for all Florida’s students, the opportunity to obtain a high quality education.”

“WHEREAS, the Partnership focuses on providing to Maryland students a seamless path of high quality academic opportunity from pre-kindergarten through college and beyond.”

“New Jersey’s system of higher education aspires to be among the best in the world, embracing excellence, access, and affordability.”

Finally, in comparing the organizational discourses, there is only one that is dominant in both policy advocacy and formation documents. Alignment is in 100% of the advocacy documents, but in 49% of the policy formation documents of this time frame. The other two primary discourses that appear in the policy formation documents appear to be related to creation of programs. The first, evaluation of programs (in 61% of the documents), is coded language which refers to P-16 councils evaluating the work of education organizations in the state or evaluating their own work. The second, organization (44%), is language which refers to governance, reorganization, and restructuring. As previously mentioned, examples of each of the dominant organizational discourses of the policy formation documents of the 1999-2000 time-period are provided

---

73 Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2002
74 Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. 2002. Memorandum of understanding, Maryland K-16 Partnership, Annapolis, MD
in order to demonstrate the types of language within each primary discourse. These examples are quoted directly from policy formation documents (in italics) and then are bolded to emphasize why this sentence was coded as such.

*Alignment in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“c) Alignment of standards and resources.--Academic standards for every level of the K-20 education system are aligned, and education financial resources are aligned with student performance expectations at each level of the K-20 education system. 76”

“Strategic Imperative 5: Setting and Aligning Academic Standards at Every Level of the K-20 Education System 77”

“Matches high school graduation and college admission requirements (seek changes in legislation, if necessary, as early as next spring), 78”

“A local P-16 council shall promote the preparation and development of teachers, the alignment of competency standards, and the elimination of barriers that impede student transition from preschool through baccalaureate programs.79”

*Evaluation of Programs in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002*

“The Governor, as chairperson of the council, may appoint such study commissions as he or she shall deem appropriate to the purposes of this chapter

76 Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2002
77 Florida Board of Education. 2002. Florida’s K-20 Education System strategic plan, Tallahassee, FL
78 Illinois State Board of Education. 2000. Illinois State Board of Education P-16 planning, Illinois State Board of Education, Chicago, IL
79 Local P-16 Councils, 164.033, Kentucky Legislature, 2002
to study education questions, issue findings, and make recommendations to the council." 80\(^{\text{a}}\)

“(a) Before June 30, 2000, the Indiana state board of education (as defined in IC 20-10.1-1-17) shall obtain an independent evaluation of all state education programs and policies for the purpose of." 81\(^{\text{a}}\)

*Organization in Policy Formation Documents 1999-2002

“The State Board of Community Colleges is abolished.” 82\(^{\text{a}}\)

“(b) The member agencies of the council and other departments, boards, and offices of this state shall cooperate fully with the office and shall provide the office with all information that the council deems necessary for the office to discharge its accountability duties under this article regarding the education programs and units governed by such member agencies or other departments, boards, or offices.” 83\(^{\text{a}}\)

“This Memorandum of Understanding defines the individual and joint obligations of the Maryland State department of Education (MSDE), the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and the University System of Maryland (USM), the primary partners, for the full implementation of the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16 as reflected in the vision statement, mission statement, and the commitments set forth below.” 84\(^{\text{a}}\)

\(^{80}\) Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-11, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

\(^{81}\) Indiana Education Roundtable, HB 1750, General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 1999

\(^{82}\) Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2002

\(^{83}\) Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-26, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

\(^{84}\) Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. 2002. Memorandum of understanding, Maryland K-16 Partnership, Annapolis, MD
From 1999-2002, it is clear that the dominant sociological and economic discourses are generally the same from P-16 advocacy documents to P-16 policy formation documents. However, it is not as clear when looking at the dominant organizational discourses that there is a policy advocacy to policy formation connection. This study’s analysis goes to a second level to explore the discourses within the documents through policy discourse analysis to see if the same themes or discourses emerge. This analysis found evidence that themes that emerged in P-16 policy advocacy documents were also present in P-16 policy formation documents during the 1999-2002 time period. This analysis goes beyond the “counting of codes” to determine what underlying themes emerged during the coding process. For this section, several examples of analysis are provided to demonstrate the policy discourse analysis process and the outcomes from the process.

For example, in the economic discourses, achievement is a dominant discourse in both advocacy and formation documents (1999-2002). In a closer examination of the discourses that were coded achievement, a key theme emerged. This theme refers to increasing achievement of students in the state education system through several means, including increasing high school graduation rates, increasing college completion rates, and increasing the access to higher level courses throughout their educational career. As This quote from the 2001 policy report, What is P-16 Education?: A Primer for Legislators (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001), is an example of this type of discourse within the P-16 policy advocacy literature of this time.
“Imagine a system of education where every child enters school ready to learn, where all third graders read at or above grade level, where all students have taken algebra by the end of the 8th grade, where high school exit exams test students at the 12th-grade level and are aligned with college admissions requirements, where all young people graduate from high school prepared for college or work, and where every student who enters college finishes college.”

Through policy discourse analysis, it was found that during 1999-2002, states were using similar language to describe student achievement and to develop policy. Two examples are provided here. These are not the only examples of this type of discourse, but are provided here as examples of what the economic discourse of achievement is during this time frame. The first example is from a 2002 Florida Law (1000.03).

“(a) Learning and completion at all levels, including increased high school graduation rate and readiness for postsecondary education without remediation. - -All students demonstrate increased learning and completion at all levels, graduate from high school, and are prepared to enter postsecondary education without remediation.”

The second example of state policy formation discourse which refers to achievement is from the Illinois State Board of Education 2000 P-16 Plan.

“Build a safety and support net around every student to ensure they stay in school and are successful in their educational and career endeavors.”

Sociological discourses found in the 1999-2002 documents also had emerging themes. As previously stated, the dominant sociological discourses were initially able to be traced from advocacy to policy formation through the notation of what discourses
appeared most often. A closer examination of the sociological discourses found that there is evidence of a connection between the discourses of P-16 advocacy and the discourses of P-16 policy formation.

For example, access emerged as a key discourse of the P-16 advocacy documents in 1999-2002. In an exploration of the discourses of these documents, it became clear that within the access coded portions of the document, a theme emerged. This theme is that education should do a better job of providing access to students, particularly in the areas of access to postsecondary education and access to preschool education. Two representative quotes are provided here. The first is from the 1985 policy report, *All One System* (Hodgkinson 1985). The second is from the 2001 policy report, *What is P-16 Education?: A Primer for Legislators* (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001).

“On the second criterion, we undoubtedly have a long way to go, although access to the best institution can be improved by better institutional publicity at the college level so that the student knows what the institution expects, plus, better guidance from secondary schools and employers, so that the student's aspirations are realistic and clear.”

“Expanding access to early learning for children ages 3 to 5, and improving their readiness for kindergarten”

Then in P-16 policy formation documents of the 1999-2002 time period, the same discourses are found which promote the increase of access to both college and preschool for students in the state. Two examples are provided here. The first is from the Governor of Iowa’s 2001 Executive Order:
“Potential topical issues that the Roundtable may consider can include, but shall not be limited to: **Expanding access to early learning opportunities**; smoothing student transitions between learning levels and across learning sectors; closing the achievement gap between students of different backgrounds; upgrading teacher education and professional development; strengthening relationships between families/communities and schools; creating a wider range of learning opportunities and experiences for students in the final two years of their secondary education; improving and streamlining remedial services; coordinating programming and curricula; and assessing employer needs within the state and implementing those needs into a comprehensive educational policy.”

And from Florida’s 2002 K-20 policy, *K-20 Strategic Plan*:

“*Increase Access to and Production of Baccalaureate, Master and Doctoral Degrees*”

As previously discussed, using the dominant discourses as the sole basis of analysis for determining the connection between discourses of policy advocacy and policy formation revealed there were few obvious connections in the organizational discourses. However, a closer examination of the discourses, through policy discourse analysis, found that the same types of discourses are occurring in the 1999-2002 P-16 policy advocacy and policy formation. In an organizational discourse example, it was found that boundary was a key coding category. The boundary discourses stress the potential barriers between different agencies and ways to maneuver around them through policy.

As an example of this type of discourse, this quote from the 2001 policy report, *What is P-16? A Primer for Legislators*, is provided: “One of the most challenging parts
of a P-16 system is getting legislators and education leaders from different systems to think about early learning, elementary, secondary and postsecondary education as one system instead of several.” (Van de Water and Rainwater 2001)

States utilized this organizational boundary discourse in their 1999-2002 P-16 policy formation documents. Two examples of the organizational boundary discourse follow. The first is from Georgia Law (20-14-8 2000)

“(15) To mediate disputes among the Department of Education, the University System of Georgia, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Professional Standards Commission, the Office of School Readiness, and the Office of Education Accountability in matters regarding accountability or education system seamlessness.”

A second example from Iowa 2001 Governor’s Executive Order also uses this boundary discourse to point out the difficulties that the current educational system boundaries and barriers can create when developing a P-16 system.

“WHEREAS, the state’s current educational system reflects a traditional approach, wherein the structure of education delivery is divided into three distinct, and somewhat disjointed levels: (1) early childhood; (2) kindergarten through 12th grade; and (3) post secondary, with each level being further divided into public and private educational systems;”

Thus, there is evidence that the discourses of P-16 advocacy documents have influence on the discourses of P-16 policy formation documents in the time era 1999-2002.
Hypothesis 2d

Hypothesis 2d: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4 [2003-2010], then the language will be changed by the language of the advocacy literature of Time Era 2 [2003-2010].

In the time period 2003-2010, there are six national P-16 policy advocacy documents sampled. During this same time period, 209 state level policy formation documents were found. There are 62 state level official policy documents from twenty-four states, 20 Governor’s Executive Orders from twelve states, and 3 P-16 council By Laws from Minnesota. Additionally, there are 109 state laws from twenty-four states. Total number of pages per document ranges from one to sixty-eight. However, there is a wide range in average number of pages by type of document- 2.5 pages/document for executive orders, 4.4 pages/document for laws, and 14.3 pages/document for policy. During this time frame, as in the previous time frame, some influence of P-16 policy advocacy discourses on policy formation discourses is evident.

85 Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Wyoming, Utah
86 Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Virginia, Washington
87 Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Missouri, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington
Table 5.4

Dominant Discourses Advocacy vs. Formation 2003-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMINANT DISCOURSES</th>
<th>#1 Dominant Discourse</th>
<th>#2 Dominant Discourse</th>
<th># 3 Dominant Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Advocacy 2003-2010</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>College Preparation and Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>College Preparation and Workforce Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Advocacy 2003-2010</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Culture and Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Advocacy 2003-2010</td>
<td>Alignment and Boundary</td>
<td>Communication and Evaluation of Programs</td>
<td>Goals and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the P-16 policy advocacy literature published between 2003 and 2010, strong discourses are apparent (see Table 5.4). In these six documents, four dominant economic discourses emerge. They are accountability, achievement, college preparation/readiness, and economic growth. Each of these discourses occurs in 100% of the advocacy documents of this time period. Examples of the discourses present (by coded category) are presented below. In order to demonstrate how the coding of language was done each
sentence is quoted directly (in italics) and then a portion of the sentence is bolded in order to emphasize why this sentence was coded as such.

*P-16 Policy Advocacy Dominant Discourses 2003-2010*

**Accountability in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010**

“*States need to connect their accountability systems to span K–12 and postsecondary education.*”

“There are few accountability systems that track college readiness from secondary to postsecondary education.”

“For successful transitions, *standards must be rigorous* at all levels and must prepare students to move through transitions smoothly.”

**Achievement in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010**

“*Every state needs to increase the percentage of students who complete high school and finish some form of postsecondary education; existing governance structures and policies cannot meet this overwhelming need.*”

“There is widespread agreement among policymakers, the business community, and educational leaders that the United States needs to *raise the educational achievement of its young population.*”

“*P-16 – an integrated system of education designed to raise student achievement at all levels, preschool through a baccalaureate degree – has gained interest in many states because of its focus on collaboration, alignment and educational...*”

---

88 Venezia et al. 2005
89 Callan et al. 2006
90 Chamberlin and Plucker 2008
91 Venezia et al. 2005
92 (Callan et al. 2006)
“Noble goals set forth for P-16 councils in enabling legislation or executive orders — improving student achievement, improving postsecondary completion, etc. — need to be distilled into actionable specifics. 

*College Preparation/Readiness in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

Despite their high aspirations, many students are not well prepared for college, and too few complete their college programs.

Today, however, when the vast majority of high school students aspire to attend college, states need policies that require K–12 and postsecondary education to collaborate to improve the college readiness of all high school students.

“In place of a goal such as, “Students will enter college ready to learn,” a goal might state, ‘The postsecondary remediation rate in mathematics at four-year public institutions will be reduced to 25% by 2016.’

“It is necessary to consider innovation, real-world skills, and depth beyond subject-specific skills in determining what students need to succeed in college and the workforce.

*Economic Growth in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“This challenge places the United States at a crossroads: we can improve college readiness and completion rates and thereby prepare the workforce for the economic and civic challenges of the next generation, or we can allow gaps in educational achievement to undermine our competitive edge and our
communities’ economic prosperity. 99"

“States that are successful in integrating precollegiate and higher education share the presence of an external civic culture that stresses a belief that the two levels must come together to improve the labor force and the economy. 100”.

The four dominant sociological discourses are pipeline, citizenship, culture and equity, appearing in 100%, 83%, 67% and 67% of the advocacy documents, respectively. Examples of the discourses of the policy advocacy documents from the 2003-2010 time-period follow and as previously noted, these examples are direct quotes from Policy advocacy documents in italics and then bolded portions of the text to demonstrate how a sentence would have been coded within the given category.

*Pipeline in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“States must create high-quality data systems that span the K–16 continuum. 101”

“Leaks in the Pipeline 102”

“It focuses on the interrelated nature of the education pipeline, an idea that goes as far back as the 1980s. 103”

“Many states have correctly perceived that they cannot improve the P-12 to postsecondary pipeline if no early learning student data are collected. 104”

---

99 Callan et al. 2006
100 Dounay 2008
101 Venezia et al. 2005
102 Callan et al. 2006
103 Krueger 2006
104 Dounay 2008
*Citizenship in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“It must also produce students who are prepared to take their place in society as active citizens.”

“Or can the system be deemed successful if high school students who choose not to enter postsecondary education are nevertheless productive members of society and skilled laborers?”

*Culture in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“The history of public education in the United States has several defining moments in which economic, political, and cultural forces demanded a more diverse and better informed student body.”

“In addition, this report identifies the role of other factors—such as leadership and state culture and history—in implementing and sustaining K–16 reforms within states.”

“Each state’s responses to these challenges will be unique, tempered by historical context, political culture, and the educational and other resources that are available.”

“States that are successful in integrating precollegiate and higher education share the presence of an external civic culture that stresses a belief that the two levels must come together to improve the labor force and the economy.”

---

105 Krueger and Rainwater 2003
106 Chamberlin and Plucker 2008
107 Krueger and Rainwater 2003
108 Venezia et al. 2005
109 Callan et al. 2006
110 Dounay 2008
“inequities in college preparation opportunities”

“Today, however, when the vast majority of high school students aspire to attend college, states need policies that require K–12 and postsecondary education to collaborate to improve the college readiness of all high school students.”

“Policymakers know the results of the current system – achievement gaps, low participation rates and remediation.”

Five organizational discourses emerge as dominant in the advocacy documents of the 2003-2010 time-period. They are alignment, boundary, communication, evaluation of programs, organization-each appearing in 100% of the documents. The discourses of collaboration and P-16 council are also significant discourses in the policy advocacy documents, with occurrences in 83% of the documents each. The following examples of organizational discourse within policy advocacy documents are presented as direct quotes (in italics) with bolded portions to demonstrate why the sentence was coded within the given category.

*Alignment in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“For instance, in almost every state, high school students must meet coursework requirements that are not connected to the requirements for college admission. In those states that require course alignment, the secondary and postsecondary sectors may find agreement in the number of math courses but not in the course

---

111 Venezia et al. 2005
112 Callan et al. 2006
113 Krueger 2006
title or content of these courses.\textsuperscript{114}

“To reverse this course, we must connect high school and postsecondary education standards, policies, and practices\textsuperscript{115}.”

“This report identifies four state policy dimensions for improving college readiness and success: the alignment of coursework and assessments; state finance; statewide data systems; and accountability.\textsuperscript{116}”

“P-16 – an integrated system of education designed to raise student achievement at all levels, preschool through a baccalaureate degree – has gained interest in many states because of its focus on collaboration, alignment and educational attainment.\textsuperscript{117}”

*Boundary in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“As research has documented, reforms that focus either on K–12 schools or on colleges and universities are likely to perpetuate some of the key barriers to improving educational achievement for students.\textsuperscript{118}”

“Historically, the three levels of the modern American education system – early learning, K-12 and postsecondary – have developed and operated independently of each other, leading to a fractured and disjointed educational path for students to follow.\textsuperscript{119}”

“And conversely, K-12 and postsecondary leaders can learn from political leaders the roadblocks their solutions may encounter, and ways to overcome these roadblocks.\textsuperscript{120}”

\textsuperscript{114} Krueger and Rainwater 2003
\textsuperscript{115} Venezia et al. 2005
\textsuperscript{116} Callan et al. 2006
\textsuperscript{117} Krueger 2006
\textsuperscript{118} Callan et al. 2006
\textsuperscript{119} Krueger 2006
\textsuperscript{120} Dounay 2008
*Communication in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“We caution state education leaders that convening a commission and **holding cross-system discussions may be helpful**, but are not sufficient for creating meaningful and lasting K–16 reform."^{121}\n
“As P-16 has progressed in the states, a **common language and understanding of what it means** has developed."^{122}\n
“**Community and business voices**, by contrast, are present to inform state leaders of needs identified on-the-ground, assist in defining policy solutions to address those needs, inform their constituencies of the council’s activities while seeking their buy-in or feedback, and to bring this feedback back to the council."^{123}\n
*Evaluation of Programs in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“**Without such systems, it is impossible to assess needs effectively, understand where the problems are, gain traction for changes needed, and evaluate reforms.**"^{124}\n
“A robust statewide data system is **needed to determine the effectiveness of programs and reforms in improving student achievement.**"^{125}\n
“But assessing the impact of P-16 in most states is a difficult matter..."^{126}\n
“To **evaluate the effectiveness of a P-16 system**, states need to develop **evaluation mechanisms** that examine the system’s goals, activities undertaken to achieve those goals, performance indicators to determine whether or not the

---

^{121} Venezia et al. 2005
^{122} Krueger 2006
^{123} Dounay 2008
^{124} Venezia et al. 2005
^{125} Callan et al. 2006
^{126} Krueger 2006
goals have been achieved, and how the goals and activities should be revised.\textsuperscript{127}

*Organization in Advocacy Documents 2003-2010*

“This report is based on findings from Partnerships for Student Success (PSS), a four-state study that analyzed K–16 educational governance and policies at the state level, such as organizational structures, leadership, finance, curricula and assessment, accountability, and data systems.\textsuperscript{128}"

“Currently, most states maintain separate legislative committee structures governing K–12 and postsecondary education.\textsuperscript{129}”

“Does a successful P-16 education system require a governance change?\textsuperscript{130}”

**P-16 Policy Formation Dominant Discourses 2003-2010**

As noted above, if the advocacy discourses are influential, it would be expected, based on the literature, that policy formation documents would have mostly the same dominant discourses in their text. In the analyses of the dominant discourses of the P-16 policy formation literature published in 2003-2010, there is evidence of policy advocacy documents influencing policy formation documents in all three discourse categories (see Table 5.4 Dominant Discourses Advocacy vs. Formation 2003-2010). The dominant economic discourses of the policy formation literature are accountability (65%), student achievement (55%), and college readiness (44%). Economic growth, a significant discourse in the advocacy literature is in 1/3 of the policy formation documents of this

\textsuperscript{127} Chamberlin and Plucker 2008
\textsuperscript{128} Venezia et al. 2005
\textsuperscript{129} Callan et al. 2006
\textsuperscript{130} Krueger 2006
time frame. Workforce preparation (42%) emerges as an important discourse in the policy formation documents and is often used in tandem with college preparation in the literature. This is reflected by the similar percentages of occurrence in the documents. Examples from policy formation documents (2003-2010) are presented here with direct quoted sentences in italics and a bolded portion which demonstrates why a sentence would be coded within that category.

*Accountability in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“WHEREAS, the strengths of a P-20 system are inclusion, alignment of effort, support for standards and assessment, logical progressions for learners, reduced need for remediation, removal of artificial barriers and opening the door to building on previously successful partnerships and furthering such partnerships on behalf of the State,”

“With the exception of matters relating to the State University System, the State Board of Education shall oversee the enforcement of all laws and rules, and the timely provision of direction, resources, assistance, intervention when needed, and strong incentives and disincentives to force accountability for results.”

“GOAL 3: TRANSPARENT ACCOUNTABILITY - Increase transparency and accountability in Idaho’s public education system.”

“The roundtable shall make recommendations to the state board for improving the academic standards under IC 20-31-3.”

“Public accountability for learning outcomes and stewardship of public funds

---

131 Establishing Delaware’s P-20 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 47, Executive Office of the State of Delaware, 2003
132 Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2007
134 Indiana Education Roundtable, IC 20-19-4/1-13, General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 2005
are priorities for Missouri’s higher education institutions.\textsuperscript{135}"

\textbf{*Achievement in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*}

“Connecticut’s future young workers are expected to be less prepared for the 21st century careers than those they are replacing in large part because nearly half our future workforce will be coming out of the state’s urban centers where a significant and stubborn achievement gap persists.\textsuperscript{136}”

“Provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting \textit{increased academic success}, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.\textsuperscript{137}”

“Mission: Ensure \textbf{Higher Academic Achievement for All Students} \textsuperscript{138}”

“\textit{WHEREAS}, a seamless, coherent state system of education is carried out best by a formal structure that ensures \textit{improved student achievement} at all levels through more formalized and systemic communication and alignment between Rhode Island’s elementary, secondary and post secondary (“PK-16”) education systems and workforce development programs;\textsuperscript{139}”

\textbf{*College Preparation/Readiness in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*}

“The commissioner shall have unlimited access to such data solely for the

\textsuperscript{135} Coordinating Board for Higher Education. 2008. Imperatives for change: Building a higher education system for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. Jefferson City, MO

\textsuperscript{136} Connecticut Office for Workforce Competitiveness. 2007. A talent based strategy to keep Connecticut competitive in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century, Hartford, CT.

\textsuperscript{137} Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. 2003. Regents’ principles and actions for the preparation of school counselors, Board of Regents, Atlanta, GA

\textsuperscript{138} State of Louisiana Department of Education. 2009. Louisiana’s education reform plan vision, mission, and critical goals

\textsuperscript{139} Statewide PK-16 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 05-08, Executive Office of the State of Rhode Island, 2005
purposes of conducting studies, reporting annual and longitudinal student outcomes, and improving college readiness and articulation.\textsuperscript{140}

“Furthers the goal of raising Maine’s high school-to-college rate from 55\% to 70\%;\textsuperscript{141}

“The department shall ensure that the readiness assessment system is aligned with state academic content and performance standards, college placement tests and entry-level career skill requirements.\textsuperscript{142}

“Finally, high school students must be provided guidance and curricula that will enable them to complete successfully their individual graduation plans, preparing them for a seamless transition to relevant employment, further training, or postsecondary study.\textsuperscript{143}

*Workforce Preparation in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“To articulate a framework for systemic educational improvement and innovation that will enable every student to meet or exceed Illinois learning standards and be well-prepared to succeed in the workforce and community.\textsuperscript{144}

“An integrated high quality educational system that prepares Kansans for life and work.\textsuperscript{145}

“Maryland’s business and education communities recognize the importance of aligning education policies to the State’s economic needs in order to better prepare students for the job market and to allow the State to grow

\begin{footnotes}
\item[140] Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2008
\item[141] An order establishing the Pre-K through adult advisory council to plan for and coordinate a seamless public education system in Maine, Governor’s Executive Order, Executive Office of the State of Maine, 2008
\item[142] New Mexico State Law, SB 561, Legislature of the State of New Mexico, 2007
\item[143] Education and Economic Development Act, A88, R102, H3155, South Carolina Legislature, 2005
\item[144] Illinois Public Act, 105 ILCS 5/22-45, General Assembly of the State of Illinois, 2009
\end{footnotes}
One of the report’s specific recommendations is to create a P-20 Council to evaluate early learning, K-12, higher education and workforce preparation with the goal of increasing accountability in our education system.

The primary sociological discourses of the policy formation documents during this time frame are equity (36%), pipeline (33%), and access (29%). While pipeline and equity appear in both lists of dominant discourses, access is not among the top three discourses for advocacy documents. Nevertheless, it is a critical discourse within the advocacy documents of this time period, appearing in 50% of them. Citizenship and culture are critical discourses from the advocacy literature of this time period, but they do not appear to be dominant in the policy formation documents, appearing in only 19% and 15% respectively. Examples of this language are provided below as a demonstration of the types of primary discourses found in the policy formation documents of this time frame. As before, the sentences are direct quotes from the policy formation documents and with bolded portions to demonstrate why a sentence was coded within the given category.

*Equity in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“Eliminating the achievement gap between groups of students, especially those..."
gaps associated with socio-economic status and racial-ethnic background\textsuperscript{148}.

“Vision: Create a World-Class Education System for All Students in Louisiana
Mission: Ensure Higher Academic Achievement for All Students\textsuperscript{149}.”

“WHEREAS, all Nebraska students deserve a high quality of education\textsuperscript{150}.”

“They foresee a New York in which gaps in achievement have closed, and the
overall level of knowledge and skill among the people matches or exceeds the best
in the world.\textsuperscript{151}”

*Pipeline in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“The P-20 Council shall explore ways Arizona can achieve a more effective,
efficient and equitable education pipeline through some or all of the following
strategies\textsuperscript{152}.”

“To remain competitive in the 21st century, Connecticut must renew its efforts to
ensure a talent pipeline that must be all-inclusive, diverse, and operate as a
seamless continuum, encompassing the state’s early childhood education efforts
at one end and world-class\textsuperscript{153}.”

“(a) The General Assembly finds that preparing Illinoisans for success in school
and the workplace requires a continuum of quality education from preschool

\textsuperscript{148} Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. 2007. 2005-2007 Workplan California Education Roundtable, Sacramento, CA.
\textsuperscript{149} State of Louisiana Department of Education. 2009. Louisiana’s education reform plan vision, mission, and critical goals
\textsuperscript{150} Nebraska P-16 Committee. 2009. Nebraska P-16 goal committee- LR75, Nebraska Board of Education, Omaha, NE.
\textsuperscript{151} University of State of New York Board of Regents. 2006. P-16 Education: A plan for action. University of State of New York Board of Regents and State Education Department, Albany, NY
\textsuperscript{152} Governor’s P-20 Council of Arizona, Governor’s Executive Order 2008-14, Executive Office of the
State of Arizona, 2008
\textsuperscript{153} Connecticut Office for Workforce Competitiveness. 2007. A talent based strategy to keep Connecticut
competitive in the 21st Century, Hartford, CT
through graduate school.\textsuperscript{154}"

"Increasingly, however, more and more people are calling for what is often called a K-16, or P-16, perspective on education—a recognition that this is ideally ‘all one system.’\textsuperscript{155}

\*Access in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010

"VISION: The State Board of Education \textit{envisions an accessible, seamless public education system} that results in a highly educated citizenry.\textsuperscript{156}

"What other post-secondary programs/offers are available in Kansas (e.g., concurrent credit, developmental education)?\textsuperscript{157}

"That the goals of the P-16 Working Group shall be \textit{to increase access} and success at all education levels by regularly assessing educational accomplishments, bridging curricula, increasing articulation, and sharing data, including the development of a shared data system.\textsuperscript{158}

"\textit{Provide better pathways to higher education} for low-income residents;\textsuperscript{159}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{155} Kimball, Richard, E. 2007. K16 Alliances, Part1: Building the pipeline through rigorous high school curricula and college-school district partnerships, A report for the State Board of Regents, Salt Lake City, UT
\textsuperscript{158} An order regarding establishing a Governor’s P-16 working group, Governor’s Executive Order 2006-10, Executive Office of the State of New Hampshire, 2006
\textsuperscript{159} Statewide PK-16 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 05-08, Executive Office of the State of Rhode Island, 2005
\end{flushleft}
Finally, in the analyses of organizational discourses, it is clear that organizational discourses are dominant throughout the advocacy documents, with six out of nine discourses (alignment, boundary, communication, evaluation of programs, organization) appearing in all advocacy documents, two more (collaboration and P-16 council) appearing in 83% of the advocacy documents, and the last (allocation) in 67% of this time-period. Thus, all nine organizational discourses are significant in the advocacy documents in 2003-2010. Five organizational discourses in the policy formation documents are significant—collaboration (64%), alignment (63%), allocation (62%), communication (56%) and P-16 Council (50%). Examples of discourses found in the policy formation documents are provided below. These sentences are direct quotes from P-16 policy formation documents with bolded portions to explain why a sentence would be in that coded category.

*Collaboration in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“*Whereas, the ARRA funds are also subject to increased accountability and reporting responsibilities that will require all of the critical stakeholders in education to collaborate in new ways*;\textsuperscript{160}.”

“*WHEREAS, growing 21st century talent is no longer the province of any single agency, but necessarily involves multiple entities functioning in collaborative ways with a unified purpose*;\textsuperscript{161}.”

“*WHEREAS, the Community College System and the University of Maine System established a Coordinating Advisory Council in 2003 to increase*

\textsuperscript{160} Governor’s P-20 Coordinating Council of Arizona, Governor’s Executive Order 2009-10, Executive Office of the State of Arizona, 2009

\textsuperscript{161} Connecticut Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 2A, Executive Office of the State of Connecticut, 2009
collaboration,”

“Accomplishing these two related goals requires unprecedented collaboration among parents, employers, elected leaders and educators.”

*Alignment in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“Recognize that the alignment of high-quality kindergarten with high-quality preschool is critical to a successful P-20 system in the state of Colorado.”

“(c) Alignment of standards and resources.--Academic standards for every level of the K-20 education system are aligned, and education financial resources are aligned with student performance expectations at each level of the K-20 education system.”

“Whereas the P-16 Plan calls for ensuring that Indiana’s requirements for high school graduation be aligned with the expectations of college and a knowledge-based economy.”

*Allocation in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*

“This diversity contributes to the Council’s success by increasing understanding of issues and barriers for all stakeholders, by maintaining communication across agencies and organizations, by reducing the potential for duplication of efforts, and by gaining the support of elected leaders who influence policy and authorize

---

162 An order establishing the Pre-K through adult advisory council to plan for and coordinate a seamless public education system in Maine, Governor’s Executive Order, Executive Office of the State of Maine, 2008

163 University of State of New York Board of Regents. 2006. P-16 Education: A plan for action. University of State of New York Board of Regents and State Education Department, Albany, NY

164 Colorado Law, Senate Joint Resolution 10-047, Colorado General Assembly, 2010

165 Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2006

166 Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to adopt changes to Indiana’s course and credit requirements for a high school diploma. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN
funding."\textsuperscript{167}"

"Align resources to strategic goals."\textsuperscript{168}"

"The Council shall coordinate the implementation and evaluation of the plan, including resource alignment in the use of federal, state, district and private funds to support policy."\textsuperscript{169}"

"Institution funding from competitive Federally funded grants."\textsuperscript{170}"

\textit{*Communication in Policy Formation Documents 2003-2010*}

"WHEREAS, the Kansas State Board of Education and the Kansas Board of Regents have jointly endorsed a collaborative effort to improve communication, cooperation and coordination at all levels of education governance in the state."\textsuperscript{171}"

"Assist agencies in public relations aspects of LDS in communication with school districts and charter schools, higher education institutions and the public."\textsuperscript{172}"

"The Subcommittee refined its specific charge, created definitions and developed a plan for communicating with other subcommittee members and developmental education stakeholders."\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{167} Delaware P-20 Council. 2009. Summary and scope of the work of Delaware’s P-20 council, Delaware P-20 Council, Dover, DE
\textsuperscript{168} Florida Board of Education. 2009. Florida’s next generation PreK-20 Education strategic plan, Tallahassee, FL
\textsuperscript{169} Kansas Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 08-05, Executive Office of the State of Kansas, 2005
\textsuperscript{171} Kansas Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 08-05, Executive Office of the State of Kansas, 2005
\textsuperscript{172} Resolution of the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership, ByLaw of P-20 Education Partnership, Minnesota, 2010
\textsuperscript{173} Texas P-16 Council. 2007. Texas P-16 Council development education report. Report to the Texas State Legislature, Dallas, TX
“(a) There shall be formed a P-20 Council to coordinate educational efforts of publicly-funded programs from early care through higher education and to foster partnerships among groups concerned with public education.”

“To audit and inspect or cause to be audited or inspected for the purpose of verification, research, analysis, reporting, or for other purposes related to the performance of its powers and duties as provided in this article and for the purposes of auditing pre-kindergarten, elementary, middle grades, and secondary education, postsecondary education, and education work force programs and schools, local school systems, institutes, colleges, universities, regional educational service agencies, and other public education programs and entities as defined by the council.”

“Whereas the Education Roundtable was created by the Indiana General Assembly in 1999 and signed into law by Governor Frank O’Bannon;”

“The Education Coordinating Committee, referred to in this section as the "committee,“ is established to promote efficiency, cooperative effort and strategic planning between the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, the University of Maine System, the Maine Community College System and the Maine Maritime Academy.”

---

174 P-20 Council, Delaware Code Sec 107, Delaware State Legislature, 2005
175 Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-26, General Assembly of Georgia, 2005
176 Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to require core 40 (or documented equivalent) as a minimum admissions requirement for Indianan four year public universities. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN
177 Education Coordinating Committee, 20-1-1-§9, Maine State Legislature, 2003
From 2003-2010, it is clear that the dominant sociological and economic discourses are generally the same from P-16 advocacy documents to P-16 policy formation documents. However, it is not as clear when looking at the dominant organizational discourses that there is a policy advocacy to policy formation connection. The second level of the analysis in this study is to explore the discourses within the documents through policy discourse analysis to see if the same themes or discourses emerge. This analysis has shown that the same themes emerged from P-16 policy advocacy and P-16 policy formation during the 2003-2010 time period. This analysis goes beyond the “counting of codes” to determine what underlying themes emerged during the coding process. For this section, several examples of analysis are provided to demonstrate the policy discourse analysis process and the outcomes from the process. The examples do not represent the entire analysis which will be summarized at the end of this section.

For example, in the economic discourses, accountability is a dominant discourse in both advocacy and formation documents of this time period. In a closer examination of the discourses that were coded *accountability*, two themes emerge. The first is the connection of standards between K-12 and postsecondary education. These generally refer to aligning or coordinating the requirements for high school graduation and the expectations for college level work. This quote from the 2005 policy advocacy report, *The Governance Divide* (Venezia et al. 2005) is representative of this type of discourse.

“States need to connect their accountability systems to span K-12 and postsecondary education. Currently accountability systems are usually designed
for either K-12 or postsecondary education without much attention to the interface between the two. Accountability systems need to reflect, better, the reality of students’ educational paths.”

States use this theme of connecting accountability systems in the discourse of policy formation as shown in the two examples provided here. This legislation from Colorado (SB 08-212 2009) is the first example of the use of this theme within accountability discourses.

“Since 1993, implementation of standards-based education has resulted in significant increases in the ability of school districts and the state to measure what each student knows and is able to demonstrate at various levels in the student’s academic career and in significant increases in learning and academic achievement among some students enrolled in the public schools of the state;”

This second example is from Minnesota’s 2008 P-16 policy, Minnesota’s Promise: World Class Schools, World Class State.

Align Expectations: Integrate college and workforce readiness standards into Minnesota’s K-12 academic standards to ensure that all students are prepared for higher education and high-skill employment after high school.

The second accountability theme that emerges from a policy discourse analysis examination of the policy advocacy and formation documents (2003-2010) is that states need to develop ways to track accountability measures across the state. This quote from the 2006 policy advocacy report, Claiming Common Ground, is representative of this type of discourse. “There are few accountability systems that track college readiness from secondary to postsecondary education. And no one is held responsible for the students who drop between the cracks of the two systems.”(Callan et al. 2006)
States use this theme of developing accountability measures across the state in their policy formation documents, as shown here in two examples. Although only two examples are provided, there are many more from other states which are similar and continue along this theme. From the Texas 2007 P-16 Council Developmental Education report:

“Having standards, competencies, and objectives, that are consistent throughout the state, ensures that all students are achieving and performing at least at the same basic minimum level; that all schools are measuring the same basic knowledge and skill areas and expecting similar performance; and ensures that common state-wide data is available for research, comparing student performance, preparing reports and requests for the legislature and more importantly, ensuring more accountability of higher education.”

And from the 2008 California policy, Closing the Achievement Gap:

Strategies to reform education, as they relate to closing the achievement gap in particular, have centered on such things as incorporating a quality prekindergarten program, implementing a robust data collection system, developing rigorous curriculum, implementing quality professional development, investing in an effective accountability system, and strengthening articulation throughout the P-16 system.

Themes also emerged in the sociological discourses found in the documents in this study. As previously stated, the dominant sociological discourses were initially able to be traced from advocacy to policy formation through the notation of what discourses appeared most often. However, some discourses appeared to be critical in the P-16 advocacy documents, but the counts were not as high in the policy formation documents. In this situation, policy discourse analysis provides a closer examination of the themes.
For example, citizenship emerged as a key discourse of the P-16 advocacy documents in 2003-2010. However, it did not appear in the top discourses of P-16 policy formation documents of this time. In an exploration of the discourses of these documents, it becomes clear that within the citizenship coded sections, a theme emerged. This is that one of the reasons for schooling is to create and produce students who will become active citizens. Schools will produce citizens will participate in society, particularly through being “good citizens”. This representative quote is from the 2003 policy report, P-16: Building a cohesive education system from preschool through postsecondary (Krueger and Rainwater 2003).

“It (the education system) must also produce students who are prepared to take their place in society as active citizens. While volunteerism among young people currently is increasing, voting rates are down. Here too, the role of postsecondary education is vital.”

Then in subsequent P-16 policy formation documents, the same discourses are found which promote the use of education to create good citizens or prepare students for citizenship. Two examples are provided here. The first is from North Dakota’s 2006 P-16 Education Task Force policy report:

“Proficiency standards for high school graduation in North Dakota are as applicable to students who go on to post-secondary education as they are to students who choose to enter the workforce after high school graduation, and they are essential to developing good citizens.”

And from Ohio’s 2010 policy Developing a P-16 System:

“Public education is the cornerstone that binds the forces of good government,
In the organizational discourses, as previously noted, there were few obvious connections between the discourses if it is solely based on the dominant discourses. However, a closer examination of the discourses through policy discourse analysis finds that the same types of discourses are occurring in the 2003-2010 P-16 policy advocacy and policy formation. In an organizational discourse example, it was found that communication was a critical coding category. The discourses stress interagency communication between educational levels as well as between subsystems of state government.

As an example of this type of discourse, this quote from the 2006 policy report, *Claiming Common Ground*, is provided: “As a result, there are few widespread practices or traditions for these two systems of education to communicate with each other, much less to collaborate to improve student achievement across institutions.” (Callan et al. 2006)

States utilize this discourse in their 2003-2010 P-16 policy formation. Two examples of the organizational communication discourse follow. The first is from Kansas P-20 Education Council policy report (2008)

> “Policymakers in at least 30 states have looked for ways to enhance an integrated system of education in which all levels of education as well as business partners and legislators, coordinate, communicate, and educate as one system.”

A second example from New Mexico (Executive Order 2009) also uses this communication discourse to stress the importance of communication across agencies.
“WHEREAS, such an effective PreK-20 education data system requires the close coordination and cross-departmental communication among state agencies, public schools, higher education institutions and entities that address New Mexico’s children from birth through their education to their entrance into the workforce;”

Summary

Thus, while not all discourses are translated from P-16 policy advocacy into policy formation, based on the findings from this research the conclusion can be drawn that P-16 policy advocacy discourses are influencing the discourses of P-16 policy formation during the time period 2003-2010. As previously stated, the discourses that are dominant in the advocacy documents are often in more of the documents than the policy formation documents, but this is to be expected based upon the literature. The states are employing discourses from advocacy in order to formulate policy in the 2003-2010 time period. In addition, due to policy discourse analysis, the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy are similar in dominant themes to the discourses of P-16 policy formation. Themes emerged, through policy discourse analysis, which demonstrate the connections between P-16 advocacy and policy formation during this time period.

Hypothesis 2e

_Hypothesis 2e: If a state formulated P-16 policy (through legislation or state level policy) in Time Era 4 [2003-2010], then the language will also be changed by the language of state level policy/legislation in time Era 3 [1987-2002]._
This hypothesis is based on the idea that states might be subject to peer influence in their development of policy. In other words, if other states or they themselves have already developed state level P-16 policies or legislation, the earlier discourses may potentially influence future formation of state level policies or legislation. In order to explore this hypothesis, two steps were performed. First, an overall historical analysis of the discourses from early formation to later formation was performed. This is a national exploration of the discourses of P-16 – early (prior to 2002) vs. later (after 2002). Then a closer examination of two states, Texas and Florida, was completed. This more detailed examination looks at the history of discourses within each state.

**Overall Analysis of Discourse**

In order to determine if there is evidence of influence from early policy on later policy, an analysis of the earlier P-16 policy documents (2000-2002) compared to the later P-16 policy formation documents (2003-2010) was conducted. In other words, the discourses of early policy formation were compared to the discourses of later policy formation. Similarities and differences were noted in this analysis. The earlier time frame was narrowed down to 2000-2002 due to the sparse number of documents (n=15) found in the previous era (1985-1999). As was found previously, there is evidence of P-16 policy formation discourses influence on later policy formation discourses (see Table 5.5 Dominant Discourses Early P-16 Formation vs. Later P-16 Formation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMINANT DISCOURSES</th>
<th>#1 Dominant Discourse</th>
<th>#2 Dominant Discourse</th>
<th>#3 Dominant Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Formation 2000-2002</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>College Preparation and Workforce Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Formation 2000-2002</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Access and High Quality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Formation 2000-2002</td>
<td>Evaluation of Programs</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Formation 2003-2010</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analyses of the dominant economic discourses of the P-16 policy formation literature published in 2000-2010, there is evidence of early policy formation documents influence on later policy formation documents (see Table 5.5). The dominant economic discourses of the policy formation literature of 2000-2002 are accountability (79%), student achievement (39%), and efficiency (23%). In 2003-2010, accountability (65%) and student achievement (55%) are dominant economic discourses. Two thirds of
dominant discourses from earlier time frames are the same as they are in the later time frame.

In 2000-2002, the three dominant sociological discourses are equity (28%), pipeline (33%), and access (13%). These discourses remain dominant in 2003-2010 and in fact seem to be more dominant, appearing in more documents over the time frame: equity (36%), pipeline (33%), and access (29%). This provides evidence of a connection between the sociological discourses of early policy development and later policy formation.

Finally, in the analyses of organizational discourses, there appears to be a limited influence of early discourses on later discourses. In the years 2000-2002, the three dominant organizational discourses are evaluation of programs, alignment, and organization. In 2003-2010, only alignment is a dominant discourse, with collaboration and allocation rising to be more significant. Thus, the dominant organizational discourses appear to have shifted over time, with only one discourse remaining the same from the early time frame to the later time frame.

Texas and Florida

Texas and Florida were chosen for a closer examination because they both have significant histories of P-16 policy making. Texas has had a P-16 plan for close to twenty-five years. Florida has had a K-20 system for about ten years. Analysis of their formation documents finds that within these states there is evidence of prior discourses informing and influencing later discourses. As these states updated their P-16 laws or policies from previous iterations, they often use the same language throughout. In fact, as
policies or laws were changed, the discourses would remain the same or were often added to, rather than subtracted from. Changes in wording often consists of changes in names of organizational structures (for example, changing the name of the P-16 council) or in changing the people or organizations that are included in a P-16 system.

**Texas**

Texas began developing their P-16 system in 1987 by passing a law that called for coordination within the higher education system. This coordination was gradually extended over time throughout the entire P-16 system, with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board overseeing this aligned system. Over the past twenty-five years, Texas has created a P-16 Council, first through an informal network and then through legislation. They also have developed a series of local P-16 councils which perform on-the-ground P-16 work. Texas has also worked with other state education agencies to develop and pass legislation relating to the alignment of college expectations and high school outcomes, financing of such programs, and further strengthen the authority of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Twenty-five policy formation documents were found for this study (see Graph 5.1).

As demonstrated in Graph 5.1, the annual average organizational discourses of P-16 in Texas generally increased slightly over time from the LOW scaled range early to MOD scaled range later. Both annual average sociological and annual average economic discourses remained generally stable over time staying consistently in the LOW scaled range. Early discourses (1987-2002) that emerge as dominant in Texas are achievement (economic), collaboration (organizational), and pipeline (sociological). Later discourses
(2003-2010) that are significant are accountability and achievement (economic), collaboration (organizational), and pipeline (sociological). Thus the dominant discourses are continuing to be dominantly the same from the early time frame to the later time frame.

In addition, a close examination of two particular education statutes pertaining to P-16 in Texas demonstrate that over time only minor changes are made in these laws. In the Texas Education Statutes Sec. 7.005 (Cooperation between State Agencies of Higher Education), the law was first passed in 1995 and then altered in 2003. The single change in the entire law in 2003 was to change the title of the P-16 advisory committee from “Joint Advisory Committee” (1995 title) to “P-16 Council” (2003 title). A look at an additional part of the education statutes in Texas (Sec 61.076) finds that changes to this statute over time include changes to the name of the P-16 advisory board, changes in description of power and organizational components of the board, and information about grants or other funding sources for enacting these laws.
Florida began developing a K-20 system in the early 2000’s with the consolidation of the entire education system under the Florida Board of Education. In the past ten years, Florida’s K-20 system has developed an accountability system, a K-20 budget, and a K-20 data warehouse system in order to support the alignment of educational efforts across the statewide education system. Forty-seven policy formation documents were found from Florida for this study (See Graph 5.2).

Florida

---

178 Florida has a statewide preschool initiative called the Voluntary Prekindergarten Program (est. 2005). It is designed to provide preschool to four year olds in Florida. However, this preschool effort is not attached or aligned with the K-20 system. Standards for Kindergarten readiness are currently being drafted.
As demonstrated in Graph 5.2, the annual average organizational discourses of P-16 in Florida flucutated over the ten years. The early high annual average is based on one document in each of the first two years. However, post 2001, the scaled organizational discourse level remains in the MOD to LOW range. The annual average sociological and annual average economic discourses mirror the national discourse trends. Although both tend to be in the LOW range, the sociological scale started stronger in early documents and then decreased over time. The economic discourses started lower than the sociological discourses, but around 2003 the average annual economic discourses began outpacing the average annual sociological discourses.

The top two early discourses (2000-2004) that emerge as dominant in Florida are accountability and efficiency (economic), alignment and allocation (organizational), and pipeline and equity (sociological). Later discourses (2005-2010) that are significant are accountability and efficiency (economic), alignment and allocation (organizational), and equity and access (sociological). The dominant discourses are continuing to be dominantly the same from the early time frame to the later time frame.

In a closer examination of the formation documents from Florida, from Florida’s Education Statutes, the discourses from the early phases of law 1008.31\textsuperscript{179} (2002) reflect a HIGH level of economic discourses, with a MOD level of organizational discourses and a LOW level of sociological discourses. This law underwent legislative changes five times in 2003, 2005, 2006, 2008, and 2010. Over this time, the economic discourses remained HIGH, increasing slightly within the HIGH scale from a 7 to an 8. The

organizational discourses remained at a MOD level throughout, increasing slightly within the MOD scale from a 4 to a 5. The sociological discourses started in the LOW scaled range and during the first years of the legislative change remained at either LOW or NONE on the sociological scale. In 2006, 2008, and 2010 the sociological discourses increased slightly and moved to the low end of the MOD range, scoring a 4 in each of those years.

Graph 5.2

Florida P-16 Policy Formation Documents

Average Annual Discourses 2000-2010

Thus, while not all discourses are translated from one time period to another in P-16 policy formation documents, the conclusion can be drawn that there is both (1) evidence of a intra-state connection of discourses from early policy formation to later
policy formation; and (2) national evidence that the discourses of the P-16 policy formation documents from 2000-2002 have influence on the discourses of the P-16 policy formation documents of 2003-2010.

Summary

The findings of this study reveal that the national discourses of the education reform policy have shifted over time. While a sociological focus was dominant in the earlier phases of P-16 development, economic rationales took precedence as time went on. During the lifetime of P-16 policy advocacy and formation, this study revealed that discourses generally remain consistent. In addition, as expected, advocacy was most prevalent at the beginning phases of policy development, and formation most prevalent at the later phases of P-16 policy development. This study also demonstrated that the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy appear to influence the discourses of P-16 policy formation throughout the studied time-period of P-16. Results also suggest that early P-16 policy formation influences the discourses of later P-16 policy formation.
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY

The purpose of this study was to explore the shifting of discourses in P-16 policy advocacy and formation. P-16 national advocacy literature and official state level P-16 policy and legislative documents were analyzed for evidence of dominant discourses. The discourses were mapped using policy discourse analysis as the methodology and a multi-theoretical framework as the analytical lens. This historical model included a longitudinal exploration of educational reform policy discourses of policy processes. A comparative policy discourse analysis was also undertaken between policy advocacy documents and state level policy formation documents, as well as between early policy formation discourses compared to later policy formation discourses. These analyses provided information about the mechanisms of policy creation and the role of discourse in policy making.

This final chapter provides an overall summary and discussion of the major findings of this research, articulates the significance of this study, and offers some implications for policy and practice, as well as some preliminary recommendations for the sustainability of P-16 as an educational reform movement.
Significance of Research

The significance of this research lies in the connection between policy advocacy and policy formation. This study found evidence that the discourses in the advocacy documents for P-16, a nationally promoted educational reform movement, were influencing the discourses of P-16 state level policy formation. Additionally, it found evidence that this influence continued over time. This impact of this finding overall, as well as the import over time, is significant because the discourses of advocacy appear critical enough to be manifested in the formulation of policy, which then is likely used in policy implementation. Thus, the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy are vital to the P-16 policy process; in essence creating both the meaning of the policy and the materialization in policy formation. Put in terms of everyday impact, reform “talk” becomes educational mandates which, in turn, impact the everyday lives of all those involved in schooling.

This research study also addresses a void in the research on P-16. Previously, this research primarily focused on proposing and advocating for P-16 initiatives and their formation at the state level (Chamberlin and Plucker 2008; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Education Commission of the States 2002; Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Venezia et al. 2005). However, there have been limited empirical studies on P-16 programs or their subsequent implementation. Those that were studied generally focused on specific aspects of P-16 initiatives (Georgia P-16 Department 2006; Integrated Data Transfer Project 2006; L’Orange and Ewell 2007; Mohker 2010; Oregon Roundtable and
Oregon Business Council 2005; Rasch 2004; Texas Education Agency 2008) or they took broader historical perspective on one aspect of a P-16 program (Streams 2007). This current study goes beyond these previous advocacy reports and empirical research studies to explore a historical perspective on a nationally advocated educational reform initiative that subsequently formulated at various state levels. This policy analysis utilizes policy discourse analysis as the methodology for exploring the policy process, through its evidentiary policy documents or discourse.

Additionally, this study is significant in its historical mapping of the progression of P-16 discourses from their original inception in national advocacy through their manifestation in state level policy formation. In doing so, it uses the theoretical lenses of sociological, economic, and organizational rationales to understand how and when the discourses of P-16 change along these specific theoretical perspectives. The study emphasizes how changing rationales for policy development- economic, sociological, and organizational- can potentially influence the implementation and subsequently the sustainability of an education policy. This knowledge can potentially lead to more effective policy levers in future educational reform policy making.

Finally, this study provides an example of how policy discourse analysis is a relevant methodology for gaining a deeper understanding of how general education reform movements, such as P-16, can be studied both as a current phenomenon and as a mechanism of state/national systems of change. Through policy discourse analysis, this research was able to find evidence of an historical connection between policy advocacy and policy formation for a large scale national reform initiative. The use of policy discourse analysis as a method for analyzing education policy adds a deeper level of
analysis than content analysis alone, providing the researcher with the ability to utilize contexts and concepts to determine meaning and substance behind policy processes.

**Major Findings**

Driven by two primary research questions, this study examined both P-16 policy advocacy and policy formation documents at the state level in order to explore the shifting of discourses over time. It also explored the relationship between the discourses of policy advocacy at the national level and policy formation at the state level. These discourses were mapped to concepts from sociology, economics, and organizational theory. Four major findings are highlighted:

1. Over time, the sociological discourses of both P-16 policy advocacy and policy formation decreased in the examined documents.
2. The economic discourses of both P-16 advocacy documents and P-16 policy formation documents became more prevalent over time.
3. The organizational discourses of both P-16 advocacy documents and P-16 policy documents remained stable over time.
4. The discourses of P-16 advocacy appear to influence the discourses of P-16 policy formation.

**Interpretation of Findings**

**Changes in Discourses**

Statewide P-16 initiatives have persisted over more than two decades in the United States (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Mohker 2010; Van de Water and
Rainwater 2001; VandeWater and Krueger 2002). Over that time, this study found that the discourses of P-16 policy processes, both conceptual and developmental, have shifted and transformed; focusing on different P-16 policy formation rationales for sustaining P-16 as an educational reform movement. States have adopted these shifting discourses over time, from sociological to economic rationales, while continuing to maintain organizational and systems change as a fundamental basis for sustaining this reform. These results suggest that educational reform can withstand changes in some discourses as long as there is a foundational discourse that remains constant.

Based on the P-16 advocacy literature (Chamberlin and Plucker 2008; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Education Commission of the States 2002; Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; The Hechinger Institute on Education and Media, The Institute for Educational Leadership, and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2002; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Venezia et al. 2005), sociological rationales for the development of P-16 initiatives were expected to decline over time. As expected, the study found sociological discourses did decrease over time in the advocacy literature (1985-2010). These rationales formed the basis of early arguments for the creation of P-16 in the advocacy literature. This is likely because these sociological rationales had formed the basis for many prior policy reform movements including the access and equity movements in the 1960s and 1970s (Brubacher and Rudy 2008; Coleman 1966; Rose 2010; Spring 2001). Prior advocacy from large educational think tanks, such as the Rand Corporation, Education Commission of the States, and the Stanford Research Institute, also utilized these educational equity and access ideals in their reports (Education Commission of the
States 2011; RAND Corporation 2011; Stanford Research Institute 2011). Prior to 2002, P-16 advocates promoted a system which would provide additional access to educational opportunities for more students, specifically calling for increasing the democratic ideals of education, equitable opportunities, and providing access to both preschool and higher education through alternative means (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Levine 1999; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001). This then was, as hypothesized, consistent with prior discourses which this study assumed were influential in the initial phases of the P-16 advocacy movement.

It was further hypothesized that a similar trend of declining sociological rationales over time would be evident in the discourses of P-16 policy formation documents. This conjecture was based on the idea that competing discourses (economic) would provide competing rationales for a large scale education reform movement. This hypothesis was accurate for the policy documents from 1999-2010. Sociological rationales of access and equity are present in many documents of this time frame. However, they occupy only small portions of the discourse, which suggests that they are both competing with other discourses and may be present merely to make concession to long-standing American educational ideals. For example, policy formation documents have discourses which make references to providing access to “all students.” However, the resulting laws generally focus on access for a specific group or do not address access issues at all. Future analysis of the connection between sociological and economic rationales could provide information on the ways that these rationales are utilized. If sociological rationales have become merely a concession and are generally mentioned in tandem with
economic rationales, these sociological rationales could be lost in the discourse. Analysis could explain if sociological discourses are primarily rationales for development or they are destined to become mechanized through policy implementation at state or local levels.

Based on the P-16 advocacy literature, the economic rationales of P-16 advocacy literature were expected to increase over time (1985-2010). As projected, this study found evidence that this was accurate. National economic policies and events may have influenced national P-16 policy advocacy; turning discourses toward a greater focus on economic rationales to justify formation of this education reform. For example, in the 1990s, the economy boomed during the dot-com era and declined after the dot-com bust (Rhode and Toniolo 2006). In 2003, the U.S. economy was beginning to recover briefly from the recession following the September 11th terrorist attacks. The housing market was strong, the stock market was rising, and the unemployment rate was low. In 2008, the housing market collapsed based on sub-prime mortgage failures, stock market prices fell precipitously, and the unemployment rate increased (Lewis 2010). With all the volatility in the economic picture over this time, it is no surprise that the economic discourses continued to rise in P-16 policy formation. It seems during a growing economy, further growth and competitiveness would naturally continue to be a national goal and the increased economic discourses speak to this. In times of economic downturns, the need for improvements in education and ways to grow the economy and employment ranks would be even more critical to the economic discourses.

Economic policies in the United States, generally designed to assist with national economic situations at the time, also likely influenced the rationales behind P-16
education reform efforts. The discourses of P-16 policy advocacy and formation make general references to the need for economic growth or competition between states or competition between the United States and other nations (Carnevale and Desrochers 2003; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; Venezia et al. 2005; Callan et al. 2006). These economic references within the documents are general in nature, likely because the policy makers are attempting a “timeless” argument for economic growth or competition. Thus, they may reference economic downturns or economic difficulties without mentioning specific problems that could make the rationale for the development of the P-16 program outdated.

The economic discourses were expected to trend upwards over the lifetime of P-16 policy formation as well. During the 1998-2010 timeframe, this research showed that average annual economic discourses were generally trending slightly upward and that the economic discourse was generally twice that of the sociological discourse. As previously mentioned, these economic elements likely influenced policy advocacy for P-16 initiatives. It is speculated that because this research shows a link between P-16 advocacy discourses and the P-16 policy formation discourses, the same economic forces which influenced advocacy likely influenced policy formation. The creation of a strong economy is often cited as a reason for the development of a P-16 policy at the state level. Economic growth was a persistent dialogue and creating skilled labor through college and workforce readiness programs were critical elements of many P-16 programs at the state level. The potential of the national focus on economic rationales is certainly substantiated in the preponderance of evidence of such discourse in the P-16 policy formation documents in various states.
Based on the P-16 advocacy literature in this study (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Levine 1999; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Portch 2002; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; Venezia et al. 2005; Callan et al. 2006; Chamberlin and Plucker 2008), organizational discourses were expected to remain steady throughout the history of P-16 advocacy. The sampled P-16 advocacy literature had either HIGH levels (or the highest level of MOD) organizational discourses in all documents examined. It was expected that P-16 policy makers utilized organizational discourses as an undergirding rationalization for this education policy and thus provided a stabilizing influence for this educational reform policy. In other words, over time, many factors can affect the sustainability of a policy including politics, governance changes, finances and economic changes; thus refocusing the priorities for educational initiatives. It was the assertion of this study that organizational discourses form a foundation or support for the policy, allowing it to remain viable and relevant for more than twenty-five years. In essence, the enactment of systems-level levers, such as developing P-16 councils and creating programs which specifically align K-12 and postsecondary education, provides the visible manifestation of educational reform. It is the conjecture of this researcher that constant levels of organizational discourses found in the documents helped shape P-16 education policy, creating a concrete and steady mechanism for keeping P-16 viable and visible as a reform initiative. This study speculates that the constant element of organizational discourse is the reason this policy is able to withstand the shifts in other discourses and remains sustainable.
It was also expected that the organizational discourses of P-16 policy formation would remain consistent over time. From 1999-2010, the scaled measurement of average annual discourses in the P-16 policy formation documents was consistently in the MOD range. This finding adds to the notion that organizational discourses provided a foundation to the P-16 policy which increased its stability and sustainability as a reform over time. Organizational discourses, which arise from ideological discourses within the advocacy documents, shape the practical, concrete organizational discourses of the policy formation documents. This provides a way of operationalizing this national educational reform movement at a state and local level. Thus, it is conjectured that even though sociological and economic discourses evolved over time, P-16 remained a viable and relevant education reform policy due to its use of organizational discourses that provided a foundational basis for sustaining this policy.

In summary, policy has to adapt in order to adjust to current political changes, economic realities, and social mores (Ball 2006; Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007). It is likely that P-16 policy-makers had to adapt the discourses of P-16 policy advocacy and P-16 policy formation over time in order to adjust to current political changes, economic realities, and social mores. These adjustments have been demonstrated through the shifting of rationales behind the advocacy for and formation of P-16 policy. Even as the economy of the United States grew and declined, the economic rationales behind the development of P-16 initiatives increased.
Influence of Discourses

Based on the policy analysis literature (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Levine 1999; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Portch 2002; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; Venezia et al. 2005; Callan et al. 2006; Chamberlin and Plucker 2008), it was expected that the discourses of P-16 advocacy documents would influence the discourses of P-16 policy formation documents. This study provides evidence that P-16 policy advocacy discourses influenced the discourse of P-16 education reform policy formation. The general advocacy literature focused on the ideal system and it is clear that the same “ideals”- whether sociological or economic- are utilized in the policy formation at the state level. Both sociological and economic discourses show the same dominant discourses over time from P-16 advocacy to policy formation. In addition, the policy discourse analysis revealed evidence of similar discourses in both types of documents.

As was seen in the analysis of advocacy documents, concrete organizational discourses remain steady throughout both P-16 advocacy and formation documents, but there is less evidence of direct influence based on dominant discourse connections. While both advocacy and formation documents use organizational discourses to bolster their reform efforts, the specific organizational discourses are varied. For instance, while alignment discourses are prevalent throughout all types of documents over time, other discourses are not discernable through “counting” instances. Instead, through policy discourse analysis interpretation, this research revealed that P-16 advocacy did influence organizational discourses within P-16 policy formation. Language used was very similar in both types of documents.
This influence between advocacy and policy is likely because the P-16 “world” of advocacy is rather small. A few very influential advocates for a major reform effort promote P-16 as a tactic for states to meet both national and state-level educational goals, standards, and assessments. Indeed, many states clearly articulate on their P-16 websites that they have utilized advocacy documents in influencing their policy formation – whether law or policy. This may be both a positive and a negative finding. On the plus side, having a few focused voices allows for the internal monitoring for consistency of the message delivered. Alternatively, only a few voices limit the potential influences on the conversation. Looking more closely at the articulations of those voices in the conversation and those left out might reveal the potential nature of conflict and contest over the life of a sustained reform movement.

Looking beyond the advocacy voices alone, potentially, states may be influenced by policy formation in other states. In other words, states may feel “peer pressure” to form P-16 policy or may choose to borrow successful policy formation efforts (i.e. discourse) from states with long standing programs. The language of policy formation is very similar across states and as state level legislation and policy is publicly accessible; this researcher conjectures that the states are potentially influenced by the policy formation of other states. This state-to-state influence could form the basis for future research providing a much more specific examination of what cross-state “pollination” of educational reform movements may look like. More specifically, such a study could explore how influential access to or awareness of specific state P-16 models are to the momentum of a national educational reform movement.
Interpretation of Unexpected Findings

Although empirical support for the majority of the hypotheses in this study is evident, three unexpected results were discovered. First, the time frames that were assumed for policy formation were not applicable to the entire study. In general, prior to 1998 the small number of policy formation documents made generalizations about trends complex. There are only seven states that created P-16 policy throughout 1980s and 1990s, all through legislation. These states produced 14 laws relating to P-16 and 86% were created in odd numbered years. This suggests that legislatures in these states might have been affected by elections and that developing education laws might be easier in non-election years. Another future study could take a closer look at the impact of election-cycles or other state level political events on educational policy formation providing more contextual background to P-16 policy production. This could illuminate the potential impact of national or state level election calendars might have on national P-16 advocacy discourse as well as the development of policy formation documents.

Second, prior to 1998, the general levels of sociological and economic discourses within the P-16 policy formation documents were LOW or NONE. This is likely because any discourses were primarily focused on practical matters, such as the development of P-16 councils or committees and/or council elements such as reports, membership, meeting requirements, etc. Early phases of policy development are often focused on the development of programs, “setting up shop,” so to speak (Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007). P-16 appears to be no different. Future research could more accurately account for the development and deployment of structural-type mechanisms, fully documents these as they manifested across states. Such a study could explore how some states successfully
implemented the early stages of reform and if there are identifiable mechanisms that either promote or constrain a reform over time. Understanding how this type of organizational discourse is developed and maintained and then documenting what mechanisms it may have produced to support or impede the momentum of the reform would provide a substantial addition to our knowledge of reform movements in general. In addition, such a study would expand the understanding of how structural-type mechanisms interact with ideal type constructs.

Third, it was not expected that economic discourses would appear as strongly as they did in early policy advocacy documents. During this early time period, economic rationales were part of the P-16 discourses alongside sociological ones and the near parity of the former with the latter was unexpected. This is likely because accountability and standards were emerging critical elements of general education reform in the 1980s and 1990s, particularly at the national level. P-16 advocates pushed for an education system, throughout the studied time period of P-16, which would increase accountability, improve economic growth, and provide a skilled and accomplished workforce to meet job demands (Spring 2001). These economic rationales also formed the basis for later arguments for the creation of P-16 in the advocacy literature (Hodgkinson 1985; Hodgkinson 1999; Levine 1999; Consortium for Policy Research in Education 2000; Ziebarth and Rainwater 2000; Van de Water and Rainwater 2001; Portch 2002; Krueger and Rainwater 2003; Venezia et al. 2005; Callan et al. 2006; Chamberlin and Plucker 2008). This is likely due to the national accountability reform movement which was begun in 1983, with the report, A Nation at Risk, which revolutionized the education reform arena (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983). Other national
reports at this time echoed the dire predictions and statements of *A Nation at Risk* (McGuinn 2006; Education Commission of the States 1983; Fullan 2007). National governance and policy councils, such as the National Governors Association, also contributed to the discussion of educational accountability on a national level (National Governor's Association 2011).

In addition, accountability and standards increased in importance in that national educational reform arena through presidential administrations and presidential political discourse throughout the 1990s. George H.W. Bush embraced education reform in 1988 and promoted student achievement and national report cards in his 1991, *America 2000* education reform plan (McGuinn 2006). Clinton continued to make educational reform a priority and proposed his own education reform bill, *Goals 2000*, in 1993. The *Improving America’s Schools Act* (1994) included accountability measures, including statewide school assessments and adequate yearly progress benchmarks which would later become the central tenets of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. George W. Bush’s national legislation *No Child Left Behind* (2001), required states to meet ever-increasing accountability standards (Goertz 2005; Simpson, LaCava, and Sampson 2004; Rothstein, Jacobsen, and Wilder 2006; McGuinn 2006; Fullan 2007). Future exploration of how these national policies might have influenced the timing or direction of P-16 movements historically would provide a broader analysis of the influence of national level general educational reform discourses on the state level implementation of P-16 reforms.
Discussion as it Relates to Theoretical Model

The theoretical framework developed for this study utilized a multi-perspective framework which includes three elements - sociological, economic and organizational (Becker 1993; Bourdieu 1986; Bowles and Gintis 1976; Coleman 1966; Durkheim 1956, 1964; Hanushek 1986; Hartog 2000; Jencks et al. 1972; Katz and Kahn 1978; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Parsons 1959; Schultz 1961; Scott 1992, 2001; Thurow 1977; Weber 1958). The basic premise of this framework was that the discourses of P-16 have evolved, resulting in a change in the rationale behind the creation of P-16 over time. In general, the model shows that P-16 advocates and policy makers first utilized more sociological rationales in order to advocate for and establish reformed educational systems in the early stages of P-16. Subsequently, P-16 shifted to dominantly economic discourses as the rationales within the advocacy and formation of P-16 systems in the states. The final presupposition was that underlying this shifting of discourses is a stable foundation of organizational discourses which sustain P-16 policy as a movement. While there is no one understanding of how to make policy sustainable or successful (Ball 2006; Fischer 1995; Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007; Sabatier 2007; Stone 1997), this study can add to the knowledge base by providing a potential reason for sustainability; namely, a viable, visible, and longitudinal organizational mechanism.

This study provides evidence that substantiates this theoretical model, with slight modifications, as relevant for P-16 as an educational reform policy. Policy has to adapt in order to adjust to current political changes, economic realities, and social mores (Ball 2006; Fischer, Miller, and Sidney 2007). Over time, adjustments in discourse have been

See original framework in Figure 2.1 - Chapter Two
found in the analysis of the P-16 policy advocacy and formation documents. This study finds that a shift in sociological and economic discourses is evident, with a foundational organizational discourse throughout the history of P-16. This appears to provide evidence that in order for policy to be sustainable a reform movement must be flexible in rationales while maintaining stable foundational discourse, in this case evident in the visible mechanisms that substantiate the presence of P-16.

In addition, as specific policy discourses are conceptualized and become part of the lexicon of policy reform, they can “solidify into an institution, sometimes as organizational practice…” (Hajer 1993). Hajer (1993) further calls this process “discourse institutionalization” and speaks of the idea that social constructs can become “successful” as people use them and they gain meaning from continued use in policy making (p 45). This concept of discourse institutionalization can be seen in the P-16 policy process where discourses of P-16 are first conceptualized through policy advocacy and then become institutionalized through using the same types of discourses in P-16 policy formation. Institutionalization of P-16 discourses in policy formation can be seen through the changes in organizational discourses, which originally started as pragmatic and realistic actualizations of the program (i.e. when councils would meet, where, who would be members, compensations for members, topics of discussion) and progressed to ideological representations of P-16. These representations focused more on alignment, coordination, and cooperative language to develop programs.

Further study would be needed to determine if the institutionalization of P-16 discourses have become organizational practices at either the state level in governance or
in educational institutions in educational practice. This future research could be coupled with research examining sustainability or scalability of P-16 as a national reform policy.

Figure 6.1 below presents a newer version of the original theoretical model proposed in Chapter Two (Figure 2.1) which now takes into account the empirical evidence from this study that depicts the changes in intensity of sociological and economic discourses in the P-16 policy documents. This model, although still identical in the theoretical aspects it originally outlined, now illuminates the effects of the representation of those discourses over time.

**Figure 6.1 Theoretical Framework Revisited**
Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research

The findings of this study naturally lead to additional considerations and questions surrounding the study of policy formation. First, this study did not include policy implementation at the state level or any analysis of such implementation. As such, this study could be advanced through the addition of policy implementation analysis of either state level programs or local programs. Understanding how P-16 programs are “translated” from the policy formation to implementation and action could provide the next level of analysis and provide a specific look into what P-16 becomes after policy dictates definition through formation. Influence of P-16 advocacy and formation on the discourses of policy implementation frames policy analysis in a new way, providing access to how states are furthering or impeding the momentum of this educational reform movement. Policy discourse analysis would likely be useful in such a study.

Second, in a multi-state analysis, a comparison of states’ particular context would likely prove useful to the P-16 and policy literature. In this area, an examination and comparison of when states entered the world of P-16, their general demographic characteristics (size of state, neighboring states comparison, population), political considerations (governor turnover, P-16 council power), and state economic conditions would form the basis for an excellent follow-up study providing a more in-depth view of reform through a comparative case-study analysis.

An examination of the sustainability of P-16 programs through a cross state comparison would provide a third extension of policy analysis in this area. This potential study could examine the length of states P-16 programs (in terms of time) and why some
were sustained and others were not. It is likely that some level of financial or economic state level issues might make a difference, where long-term programs have created a sustainable foundation through the adoption of established and previously successful programs (for example adopting dual credit programs and preschool programs under the P-16 umbrella). Another possibility for the sustainability of some P-16 programs may be related to the political support or backing from state government officials. Analyzing this would incorporate an interesting and insightful view of the aspect of positional power on programmatic content and sustainability.

A further study could be developed which compares the historical nature of this policy to other long-term educational policies. One opportunity would be to examine and compare the sustainability of educational policies which have a long-standing presence and have endured both political and economic changes, such as the charter school reform or preschool reform movements. This cross-policy comparison could be done as a policy analysis or under the theoretical framework of policies and how to promote sustainability or scalability. In other words, what other elements of policy advocacy, formation and implementation make an education policy sustainable over time? This study could provide a theoretical framework for comparison to other reforms, potentially testing the power of discourse analysis to explain reform movement cycles or trends.

As a final note, this researcher would like to point out an interesting finding not initially anticipated for this study. Educational reform movements make efforts to change the status quo and design and develop new ways of doing education. In the P-16 movement, as demonstrated in the policy advocacy documents, the ultimate goal is to improve the education system so that there are clearer pathways throughout, that
elements are aligned, and that students enter ready to learn and exit ready to pursue a career. However, in this analysis, students, as direct subjects, are missing from the discourse, particularly of P-16 policy formation. Students, who are supposedly the primary reason for change, are barely mentioned in the policy formation documents that affect and create change. Instead, students are relegated to a statistic related to graduation rates, participation in educational programs, or achievement. Based on the discourses, goals for P-16 program development assume sociological, economic, and organizational objectives, but do not address students as participants in the process. In the advocacy documents, discourses about students average about 10% of the documents. However, in any given year of policy formation the average percentage of discussion on students is always less than one percent of the document. The highest percentage that students appear in any one policy formation document is 2%. This leads to a final recommendation for policy makers and policy implementers. Do not forget that the ultimate goal of P-16 policy reform is to create a better system for the students who are using it.
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# Appendix A: Status of P-16 Initiatives in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Legislation*</th>
<th>2009 P-16 Status</th>
<th>Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Alabama does not have a P-16 program in place at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Alaska does not have a P-16 program in place at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas Code ANN §6-1-301 thru 304</td>
<td>Arkansas Commission for Coordination of Educational Efforts established in 2003. They have established alignment and teacher recruitment/retention policies</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arkansased.org/index.html">http://www.arkansased.org/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>H.B. 1364 H.B. 1370 H.B. 1388 S.B. 65 S.B. 212 Executive Order 003 007</td>
<td>The Governor’s P-20 Education Coordinating Council was established in 2007 which has been establishing standards and developing legislation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/eo/in/pc/index.htm">http://www.cde.state.co.us/eo/in/pc/index.htm</a> <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/schooltocareer/">http://www.cde.state.co.us/schooltocareer/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Exec. Order #47 Del. Code ANN tit 14 §107</td>
<td>Delaware P-20 Council formed in 2003 and policy discussions are in place to develop data systems, alignment policies, teacher development, and preschool policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/ddoe/P20council/default.shtml">http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/ddoe/P20council/default.shtml</a> <a href="http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/ddoe/P20council/docs/P-20%20for%20web.pdf">http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/ddoe/P20council/docs/P-20%20for%20web.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia P-16 Phase 3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Georgia P-16 council established in 1995. Alliance of Education Agency Established in 2006. Georgia has a complete P-16 system with 16 different policies in place. Preschool, teacher quality, data system, and alignment policies are in place and working.</td>
<td>(Venezia et al. 2005) <a href="http://education.gsu.edu/P-16/P-16overview.html">http://education.gsu.edu/P-16/P-16overview.html</a> <a href="http://www.aug.edu/P-16www/">http://www.aug.edu/P-16www/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii P-20 Phase 2</td>
<td>S.B. 688</td>
<td>United for Learning: The Hawaii P-20 Initiative was est. in 2002. Hawaii has an established early learning program, but it is not part of P20 program. They have developed a data collection effort and alignment policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.p20hawaii.org/">http://www.p20hawaii.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana P-16 Phase 2</td>
<td>IND CODE ANN. §20-19-4 et seq</td>
<td>Indiana’s Education Roundtable was established in 1998. They have enacted alignment policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/P-16plan.shtml">http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/P-16plan.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>P-16 Phase 1</td>
<td>The State Board of Education oversees Early Childhood Education, K12, and HE divisions and performs similar functions to P-16 council.</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.iowa.gov/educate/">http://www.iowa.gov/educate/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>P-20 Phase 1</td>
<td>Governor’s P-20 Education Council established in 2008. Policy plans and goals are being established at this time.</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=2880">http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=2880</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>P-16 Phase 3</td>
<td>Kentucky P-16 Council established in 1999. Programs in place for alignment of 2 and 4 yr higher ed., early education. Plans for teacher preparation, high school to college alignment, and standards alignment</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.kde.state.ky.us/P-16/">http://www.kde.state.ky.us/P-16/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>PK-20+ Phase 2</td>
<td>Two councils established. The Blue Ribbon Commission for Education Excellence was established in 1999. The High School Redesign Commission was established in 1994. These commissions have thus far focused their efforts on alignment policies.</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.doe.louisiana.gov/lde/bese/856.html">http://www.doe.louisiana.gov/lde/bese/856.html</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>P-20 Phase 1</td>
<td>Pre-K through Adult Advisory Council established in 2008 based on 2004 task force recommendation. No actions taken at this point.</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.maine.gov/education/pk16_task_force/homepage.htm">http://www.maine.gov/education/pk16_task_force/homepage.htm</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>P-20 Phase 1</td>
<td>P-20 Leadership Council est. goals and action plans in 2007. Plans include highly qualified teachers and administrators and curricula alignment. Steps toward 1st two goals are being taken at HE level. Cost analysis plan developed in 2004.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts P-16 Phase 3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Massachusetts’ P-16 program has support in student services, career/vo-tech education, technology, ELL, data mapping, health services, special education and funding. They do not have a P-16 Council at this time.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/DSresources/ds_program.html">http://www.doe.mass.edu/DSresources/ds_program.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Phase 0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Michigan has no P-16 Council or program at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota P-16 Phase 1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The Minnesota P-16 Education Partnership is a voluntary organization established in 2002, made up of the statewide education groups in Minnesota, plus others from government, business, and other private sectors.</td>
<td><a href="http://mnP-16.org/">http://mnP-16.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi P-20 Phase 1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The P-20 council formed in 2001. Redesign of council took place in 2008. Primarily still in policy discussion phase.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marshall.edu/ill/P-16/mississippi.htm">http://www.marshall.edu/ill/P-16/mississippi.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri P-20 Phase 1</td>
<td>MO REV STAT §160.730</td>
<td>Missouri P-20 Council was established in 2006. They are in the policy discussion phase.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dhe.mo.gov/p20.shtml">http://www.dhe.mo.gov/p20.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana P-20 Phase 2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The Board of Education Kindergarten to College workgroup was established in 2006. They have developed alignment and data collection policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://governor.mt.gov/boed/kindtocol.asp">http://governor.mt.gov/boed/kindtocol.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska P-16 Phase 2</td>
<td>2006 L.B. 239</td>
<td>Nebraska P-16 Initiative est. 1997. Renewal of interest in program in 2005 with Nebraska P-16 Leadership Council. Regional P-16 councils aid in effort. Established college access and prep program, improvement of data system, rigorous statewide high school grad requirements, Preschool for All, and increased funding.</td>
<td><a href="https://P-16.nebraska.edu/">https://P-16.nebraska.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P-16 Advisory Council est. in 2007. Council is designed to study P-16 issues and make recommendations. No changes in policy to date</td>
<td><a href="http://gov.state.nv.us/P-16%20Council/index.htm">http://gov.state.nv.us/P-16%20Council/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P-20 Coalition of Southern NJ has developed programs that prepare students for postsecondary education, raise achievement, ease transitions, and better prepare teachers. NJ participates in has a statewide Preschool Initiative.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rowan.edu/p20coalition/mission&amp;goals.html">http://www.rowan.edu/p20coalition/mission&amp;goals.html</a> <a href="http://www.state.nj.us/education/ce/">http://www.state.nj.us/education/ce/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>New Mexico has a P-16 task force. There is an alignment task force and data system task force assigned to create these policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://hed.state.nm.us/content.asp?CustComKey=435112&amp;CATEGORYKey=435119&amp;PN=Page&amp;DomainName=hed.state.nm.us">http://hed.state.nm.us/content.asp?CustComKey=435112&amp;CATEGORYKey=435119&amp;PN=Page&amp;DomainName=hed.state.nm.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC Gen STAT §116C-1</td>
<td>North Carolina Education Cabinet established in 1993 and they have a “More at Four” PreK effort, several alignment policies, and a teacher quality policy.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.osr.nc.gov/">http://www.osr.nc.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio P-16</td>
<td>Ohio REV CODE ANN. §3301.41 thru 3301.43 §3301.46; 3302.032; 3313.603; 3313.6013; 3326.01 thru 3326.08; 3326.20; 3345.062</td>
<td>P-16 program is well established with participation at Federal (GEAR UP), State (STEM, STARS, Teacher quality, accountability, and college access/success), and local (P-16 case studies ongoing in several Ohio counties)</td>
<td><a href="http://regents.ohio.gov/prek_16.php">http://regents.ohio.gov/prek_16.php</a> <a href="http://www.kwfdn.org/">http://www.kwfdn.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma P-16</td>
<td>OK STAT ANN. Tit 70 §1210.525</td>
<td>Oklahoma has an established P-16 program since 1995. Program includes Head Start, early childhood educ., PASS program which est. academic achievement standards, and quality teaching programs Achieving Classroom Excellence Steering Committee est. in 2005 to further develop P-16 efforts</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sheeo.org/k16/P-16.pdf">http://www.sheeo.org/k16/P-16.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.nchems.org/c2sp/documents/Oklahoma.pdf">http://www.nchems.org/c2sp/documents/Oklahoma.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon K-16</td>
<td>OR REV STAT §348.890, 340.085</td>
<td>Oregon’s P-16 program was one of first in US, policy discussions started in 1992. Oregon has an established data system, high school-college alignment program, preschool program and a teacher quality initiative.</td>
<td>(Integrated Data Transfer Project nd.) (Oregon State Education Department 2006) (Venezia et al. 2005) <a href="http://www.ous.edu/dept/k16align/">http://www.ous.edu/dept/k16align/</a> <a href="http://www.oregon.gov/OCCF/Mission/BestPrac/bestcc/mibestccCPreschoolDMP.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/OCCF/Mission/BestPrac/bestcc/mibestccCPreschoolDMP.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania P-16</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pennsylvania’s P-16 system is divided into 6 regional councils established in 2000, each with different governance and missions. Teacher quality, student achievement, and grant funding are priorities. Additionally, STEM PK-20 Leadership Team est. in 2007/</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eplc.org/clearinghouse_P-16.html">http://www.eplc.org/clearinghouse_P-16.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LEGISLATION*</td>
<td>2009 P-16 STATUS</td>
<td>INFORMATION SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>TEX EDUC CODE ANN. §61.076</td>
<td>P-16 Council established in 2003 has developed many programs related to educator quality, student preparedness, data collection/dissemination.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/P-16/P-16council.html">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/P-16/P-16council.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/P-16/policy_links.html">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/P-16/policy_links.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>K-16 Utah Alliance was established in 2006. Goals and policies being established at this time</td>
<td><a href="http://science.uvu.edu/k16alliance/index.shtml">http://science.uvu.edu/k16alliance/index.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Vermont does not currently have a P-16 program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Executive Order, 07-03; 07-05</td>
<td>The Governor’s P-20 Council was est. in 2007. Advisory committee makes policy recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hecb.wa.gov/research/issues/P-16.asp">http://www.hecb.wa.gov/research/issues/P-16.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2006 Exec Order 7-06</td>
<td>21st Century Jobs Cabinet established in 2006. Alignment and teacher quality policies are enacted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Wisconsin PK-16 Leadership Council est./ in 2001/ alignment and preschool programs have been implemented</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wisconsin.edu/pk16/">http://www.wisconsin.edu/pk16/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results of this column are partially based on research from (Dounay 2008)*

**Phase Designations are authors own:**

Phase 0 – State does not have a P-16 initiative at this time.
Phase 1 – State is in policy discussions regarding P-16. State may have established a P-16 Council
Phase 2 – State has implemented one to three policy initiatives.
Phase 3 – State has implemented four major policy initiatives and engages in P-16 policy discussions at state level.
## APPENDIX B: Summary of Information on P-16 Documents in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Docs</th>
<th>Adv Docs</th>
<th>Form Docs</th>
<th># Policy</th>
<th># Law</th>
<th># Other</th>
<th>Pages Adv</th>
<th>Pages Policy</th>
<th>Pages Law</th>
<th>Pages Other</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>287</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>270</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>339</strong></td>
<td><strong>976</strong></td>
<td><strong>566</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>1940</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: List of Documents Collected for Study

P-16 POLICY ADVOCACY DOCUMENTS


Chamberlin, Molly, and Jonathan Plucker. 2008. P-16 Education: Where are we going? Where have we been? Phi Delta Kappan.


Dounay, Jennifer. 2008. Landmines P-16/P-20 Councils Encounter - and how they can be addressed (or avoided all together). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.


APPENDIX C: List of Documents Collected for Study

POLICY FORMATION DOCUMENTS IN STUDY

Documents are listed by state

Governor’s P-20 Council of Arizona, Governor’s Executive Order 2005-19, Executive Office of the State of Arizona, 2005
Governor’s P-20 Council of Arizona, Governor’s Executive Order 2008-14, Executive Office of the State of Arizona, 2008
Governor’s P-20 Coordinating Council of Arizona, Governor’s Executive Order 2009-10, Executive Office of the State of Arizona, 2009
Arkansas Law, 6-1-301, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2007
Arkansas Law, 6-1-301, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2005
Arkansas Law, 6-1-301, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2003
Arkansas Law, 6-1-302, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2003
Arkansas Law, 6-1-303, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2003
Arkansas Law, 6-1-304, State of Arkansas General Assembly, 2003
Arkansas Department of Education. 2005. Academic preparation: Transitions from high school to college English/LA expectations for high school graduates, Little Rock, AR
Arkansas Department of Education. 2005. Academic preparation: Transitions from high school to college mathematics expectations for high school students, Little Rock, AR
California Law, SBX5 2, Legislature of California, 2010
California Law, SBX5 1, Legislature of California, 2010
California Law, SB1629, Legislature of California, 2009
California Education Code, 100600-100603, Legislature of California, 2002
California Education Code, 101000-101002, Legislature of California, 2006
California Education Code, 100800-100803, Legislature of California, 2004
California Education Code, 100600, Legislature of California, 2009


Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. 2009. The middle grades initiative of the California Education Roundtable, Sacramento, CA.

Creating the Governor’s P-20 Education Coordinating Council, Governor’s Executive Order B 003 07, Executive Office of the State of Colorado, 2007

Colorado’s Education Alignment Council, Governor’s Executive Order B 009 05, Executive Office of the State of Colorado, 2005

Colorado Law, Senate Joint Resolution 10-047, Colorado General Assembly, 2010

Colorado Law, §22-81-101, Colorado General Assembly, 1990

Colorado Law, §22-81-102, Colorado General Assembly, 1991

Colorado Law, §22-81-103, Colorado General Assembly, 1990

Colorado Law, §22-81-104, Colorado General Assembly, 1991

Colorado Law, §22-81-104, Colorado General Assembly, 2009

Colorado Law, SB 08-212, Colorado General Assembly, 2007

Colorado Governor’s P-20 Council. 2007. P-20 Education Council Recommendations to Governor Ritter, Denver, CO.

Colorado Governor’s P-20 Council. 2008. Summaries of and relevant background for recommendations created by the governor’s P-20 Education Coordinating Council, Denver, CO.

Colorado Governor’s P-20 Council. 2008. Recommendations: Data and Accountability Subcommittee, Denver, CO.


Connecticut State Department of Education. 2007. A superior education for Connecticut’s 21st century learners, Hartford, CT.


Establishing Delaware’s P-20 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 47, Executive Office of the State of Delaware, 2003

P-20 Council, Delaware Code Sec 107, Delaware State Legislature, 2005

Delaware P-20 Council. 2009. Summary and scope of the work of Delaware’s P-20 council, Delaware P-20 Council, Dover, DE

Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2007

Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2003
Florida Statute, §1000.01, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1002.02, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2006
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1000.04, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1000.04, Florida State Legislature, 2004
Florida Statute, §1000.04, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2010
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2009
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2004
Florida Statute, §1000.21, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1000.02, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1000.02, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2006
Florida Statute, §1000.03, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2010
Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2006
Florida Statute, §1001.10, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1001.11, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1001.11, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1001.11, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1001.20, Florida State Legislature, 2010
Florida Statute, §1001.20, Florida State Legislature, 2009
Florida Statute, §1001.20, Florida State Legislature, 2007
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Florida Statute, §1001.20, Florida State Legislature, 2004
Florida Statute, §1001.20, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Statute, §1001.70, Florida State Legislature, 2007
Florida Statute, §1001.70, Florida State Legislature, 2003
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2010
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2008
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2006
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2005
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2003
Florida Statute, §1008.31, Florida State Legislature, 2002
Florida Board of Education. 2002. Florida’s K-20 Education System strategic plan, Tallahassee, FL
Florida Board of Education. 2009. Florida’s next generation PreK-20 Education strategic plan, Tallahassee, FL
Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. 2008. Regents’ principles and actions for the preparation of teachers for the schools, Board of Regents, Atlanta, GA.
Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. 2003. Regents’ principles and actions for the preparation of school counselors, Board of Regents, Atlanta, GA.
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-3, General Assembly of Georgia, 2005
Georgia Education Code, HB1187, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-20, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-25, General Assembly of Georgia, 2005
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-25, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-26, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-26, General Assembly of Georgia, 2004
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-26, General Assembly of Georgia, 2005
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-27, General Assembly of Georgia, 2009
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-27,3,8, General Assembly of Georgia, 2004
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-27, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-28, General Assembly of Georgia, 2002
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-28, General Assembly of Georgia, 2005
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-30, General Assembly of Georgia, 2004
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A. §20-14-30, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000
Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-31, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-31, General Assembly of Georgia, 2004

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-1, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-2, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-3, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-4, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-5, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-6, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-6, General Assembly of Georgia, 2004

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-7, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-8, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-8, General Assembly of Georgia, 2008

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-9, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-10, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Georgia Education Code, O.C.G.A.§20-14-11, General Assembly of Georgia, 2000

Hawai‘i P-20 Partnerships, SCR146, Legislature of the State of Hawai‘i, 2009

Hawai‘i P-20 Initiative, SB688, Legislature of the State of Hawai‘i, 2007

Hawai‘i State Board of Education. 2009. Hawai‘i P-20 fact sheet. Hawai‘i P-20 partnership for education, Honolulu, HI


Indiana Education Roundtable, IC 20-19-4/1-13, General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 2005
Indiana Education Roundtable, HB 1750, General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 1999

Indiana Education Roundtable, SB75, General Assembly of the State of Indiana, 2001

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to adopt standards 2000-science. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to adopt assessment timeline for standards for science. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN


Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to draft standards. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to participate in the national assessment of educational progress (NAEP). Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to participate in the third international mathematics and science study (TIMSS). Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN


Indiana Education Roundtable. 2000. Resolution to eliminate the cognitive skills index (CSI). Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution amending recommendations to Indiana’s school accountability rule. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to adopt standards-science. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to adopt assessment timeline for standards-social studies. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to adopt implementation plan for school accountability in Indiana. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to increase the number of students taking algebra in 8th and 9th grade. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to increase student completion of college preparation coursework. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2001. Resolution to ensure quality and consistency of Core 40 college prep coursework through end-of-course assessments. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN
Indiana Education Roundtable. 2002. Resolution to strengthen middle school and high school mathematics. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2002. Resolution determining the mathematics content for the new graduation qualifying exam (GQE). Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2002. Resolution to serve as the reading leadership team for Indiana’s reading first program. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2002. Resolution to adopt the elementary and secondary education act (ESEA) goals and indicators. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2003. Resolution to adopt Indiana’s P-16 plan for improving student achievement-phase 1. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2003. Resolution clarifying ISTEP + “pass” and “Pass-plus” score definitions. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2003. Resolution recommending ISTEP+ Passing scores for grades 3, 6, 8. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to require core 40 (or documented equivalent) as a minimum admissions requirement for Indiana four year public universities. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to require core 40 (or documented equivalent) as a minimum financial aid requirement for Indiana four year universities. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to adopt changes to Indiana’s course and credit requirements for a high school diploma. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution to make Core 40 Indiana’s required high school curriculum. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Resolution recommending ISTEP+ passing scores for grade 5 science. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2004. Preparing all Indiana students for the 21st century: Indiana’s P-16 plan for improving student achievement. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN


Indiana Education Roundtable. 2005. Resolution recommending ISTEP+ passing scores for grades 9 and 10 (GQE). Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2006. Resolution recommending ISTEP+ passing scores for grade 7 science. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2006. Resolution to adopt English/language arts standards- 2006. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN
Indiana Education Roundtable. 2007. Resolution recommending passing scores for core 40 biology. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2007. Resolution to adopt social studies standards-2007. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2008. Resolution to adopt Indiana’s core standards: Core academic concepts across the K-12 continuum for English/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2009. Resolution recommending ISTEP+ passing scores. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN


Indiana Education Roundtable. 2009. Resolution to continue Indiana’s concurrent enrollment partnership. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Indiana Education Roundtable. 2010. Resolution to adopt science standards. Indiana Education Roundtable, Indianapolis, IN

Iowa Legislative Act, Iowa Act Chapter 169, Iowa Legislature, 2005.

Iowa Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 30, Executive Office of the State of Iowa, 2003

Iowa Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 20, Executive Office of the State of Iowa, 2001

Kansas Executive Order, Governor’s Executive Order 08-05, Executive Office of the State of Kansas, 2005


Local P-16 Councils, 164.033, Kentucky Legislature, 2002


Louisiana Law, Act No. 233; HB 434, Louisiana Legislature, 2005.

State of Louisiana Department of Education. 2009. Louisiana’s education reform plan vision, mission, and critical goals

An order establishing the Task Force to create a seamless Pre-Kindergarten through Sixteenth grade educational systems, Governor’s Executive Order, Executive Office of the State of Maine, 2004

An order establishing the Pre-K through adult advisory council to plan for and coordinate a seamless public education system in Maine, Governor’s Executive Order, Executive Office of the State of Maine, 2008
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Education Coordinating Committee, 20-1-1-§9, Maine State Legislature, 1995

Education Coordinating Committee, 20-1-1-§9, Maine State Legislature, 2003

Governor’s P-20 Leadership Council of Maryland, 01.01.2007.20, Executive Office of the State of Maryland, 2007

Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16. 2002. Memorandum of understanding, Maryland K-16 Partnership, Annapolis, MD

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership, ByLaw of P-20 Education Partnership, Minnesota, 2010

Amendment to Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership, ByLaw of P-20 Education Partnership no. 1, Minnesota, 2010

Resolution of the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership, ByLaw of P-20 Education Partnership, Minnesota, 2010

Minnesota P-16 Education Partnership. 2008. Minnesota’s promise world class schools, world class state. Minneapolis, MN


Minnesota State Law, 127A.70 Subdivision 1-3, Minnesota State Legislature, 2009


Missouri State Law, SB 389, Missouri General Assembly, 2007

Missouri P-20 Council, SB 344, Missouri General Assembly, 2009

Montana Board of Education. 2006. Resolution to establish he kindergarten to college workgroup and dissolve four committees: P-20, Indian Education for All, Unified Budget, and Policy, Board of Education, Helena, MT

Nebraska P-16 Committee. 2009. Nebraska P-16 goal committee- LR75, Nebraska Board of Education, Omaha, NE.

P-16 Advisory Council, Chapter 400, Nevada Legislature, 2007

An order regarding establishing a Governor’s P-16 working group, Governor’s Executive Order 2006-10, Executive Office of the State of New Hampshire, 2006.


Establishing the New Mexico Data Warehouse Council, Governor’s Executive Order 2009-019, Executive Office of the State of New Mexico, 2009

New Mexico State Law, HB 186, Legislature of the State of New Mexico, 2003
New Mexico State Law, SB 561, Legislature of the State of New Mexico, 2007
New Mexico State Law, HEC/HB 70, Legislature of the State of New Mexico, 2010
University of State of New York Board of Regents. 2006. P-16 Education: A plan for action. University of State of New York Board of Regents and State Education Department, Albany, NY
North Carolina State Law, SB656, General Assembly of North Carolina, 2003
North Carolina State Law, 116C-1, General Assembly of North Carolina, 1993
North Carolina State Law, 116C-1, General Assembly of North Carolina, 2005
North Dakota State Law, 15.1-01-02, North Dakota Legislative Assembly, 2002
Ohio State Law, SB6, Ohio General Assembly, 2005
Ohio State Law, 3313.603, Ohio General Assembly, 2010
Ohio Policy, 2004. High quality high schools: Preparing all students for success in postsecondary education, careers, and citizenship, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, OH
Office Of Superintendent of Education of Ohio, 2010. Developing a P-16 statewide system, Special Analysis for Governor Strickland’s Administration, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, OH
The P-20 Data Coordinating Council, 70-3-163, Oklahoma Legislature, 2009
Funding, 70-1210.526, Oklahoma Legislature, 2008
Achieving Classroom Excellence, 70-1210.525, Oklahoma Legislature, 2006
Coordination of State Agencies, 348.890, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 1999
Coordination of State Agencies, 348.890, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 2009
Coordination of State Agencies, 348.890, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 1997
Coordination of State Agencies, 348.890, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 1987
Coordination of State Agencies, SB 300, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 2005
Coordination of State Agencies, SB 23, Oregon Legislative Assembly, 2007
Expansion of statewide PK-16 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 07-04, Executive Office of the State of Rhode Island, 2007
Statewide PK-16 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 05-08, Executive Office of the State of Rhode Island, 2005


Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council, 59-59-170, South Carolina Legislature, 2005

Education and Economic Development Act, A88, R102, H3155, South Carolina Legislature, 2005


Texas P-16 Council. 2007. Study on dual credit programs in Texas. Report to the Texas State Legislature, Dallas, TX.


Texas Statutes, §29.908, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §29.908, Texas Legislature, 2005
Texas Statutes, §7.005, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §7.005, Texas Legislature, 2003
Texas Statutes, §7.005, Texas Legislature, 1995
Texas Statutes, §7.006, Texas Legislature, 2001
Texas Statutes, §7.008, Texas Legislature, 2006
Texas Statutes, §7.009, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §7.009, Texas Legislature, 2006
Texas Statutes, §7.010, Texas Legislature, 2006
Texas Statutes, §29.160, Texas Legislature, 2005
Texas Statutes, §29.160, Texas Legislature, 2003
Texas Statutes, §29.161, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §29.161, Texas Legislature, 2005
Texas Statutes, §32.253, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §32.253, Texas Legislature, 2003
Texas Statutes, §61.002, Texas Legislature, 1987
Texas Statutes, §61.021, Texas Legislature, 1987
Texas Statutes, §61.076, Texas Legislature, 2007
Texas Statutes, §61.076, Texas Legislature, 2005
Texas Statutes, §61.076, Texas Legislature, 2003
Texas Statutes, §61.0761, Texas Legislature, 2006
Texas Statutes, §61.808, Texas Legislature, 1995
Texas Statutes, §61.808, Texas Legislature, 1993

Education Information Technology Systems, HB 82, General Assembly of the State of Utah, 2006


Continuing the P-16 Education Council, Governor’s Executive Order 40, Executive Office of the State of Virginia, 2006

Creating the P-16 Education Council, Governor’s Executive Order 100, Executive Office of the State of Virginia, 2005

Governor’s P-20 Council Early Learning, K-12, and Higher Education, Governor’s Executive Order 07-03, Executive Office of the State of Washington, 2003

Amending Governor’s P-20 Council, Governor’s Executive Order 07-05, Executive Office of the State of Washington, 2005

Washington State Law, HB 2964 Ch 265, Washington Legislature, 2006

Planning and Coordination Council, 21-16-601-602, State of Wyoming Legislature, 1994

Wyoming P-16 Education Council. 2010. Wyoming P-16 education council initiatives and priorities, Wyoming P-16 Education Council, Cheyenne, WA.

Wyoming P-16 Education Council. 2010. Wyoming P-16 education council charter, Wyoming P-16 Education Council, Cheyenne, WA.
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APPENDIX E: CODING EXAMPLE

The following is a screen shot from the qualitative software program NVivo 8 which shows an example of coding from the New Jersey 2008 Policy document.
# APPENDIX F: MetaMatrix 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>TX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME DOC</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoGro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WkPrep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ECO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA ECO</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alloc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvalProg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ORG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA ORG</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LearnC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiLoLe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SOC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA Soc</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **RA ECO**: Resource Allocation (Economics)
- **RA ORG**: Resource Allocation (Organizational)
- **RA Soc**: Resource Allocation (Socioeconomic)