



Early College High Schools: Early Recruitment and Selection Strategies

March 2005

Prepared for:

The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Prepared by:

The American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

SRI International
1100 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

This report is part of an ongoing series of interim reports based on the evaluation of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Early College High School Initiative. The views, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily express the viewpoint of the foundation. Direct inquiries to Andrea Berger at 1000 Thomas Jefferson, N.W., Washington, DC 20007 or aberger@air.org.

Principal Investigators:

Becky Smerdon

The American Institutes for Research

Barbara Means

SRI International

Project Directors:

Andrea R. Berger

The American Institutes for Research

Nancy Adelman

SRI International

Introduction

By June 2004, more than 20 schools opened their doors as, or began their transformation into, Early College High Schools (ECHSs).¹ The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation supported these schools, at least in part, through the Early College High School Initiative (ECHSI). The main goal of this initiative is to give students the opportunity to complete high school and two years of college credit in a compressed timeframe and at public expense.

A unique aspect of the ECHSI is its target population. Many high schools offer college credit to academically advanced students, and many colleges support programs that allow gifted students to pursue a high school and college degree simultaneously. ECHSI intends to extend these kinds of opportunities to students from groups that are traditionally underserved and underrepresented in higher education. According to the ECHSI core principles document:

[The] small school being created through this initiative will focus on low-income students—those for whom a smooth transition into post-secondary education is now problematic. These include students who are highly motivated but have not received the academic preparation necessary to meet high school standards, students who are English language learners, students whose family obligations keep them at home, and students for whom the cost of college is prohibitive.²

In working with these students, the foundation's goal is to provide an accelerated, rather than remedial, learning environment. The foundation hopes that by exposing traditionally underserved and underrepresented students to college, and supporting them during that exposure, the students will gain both the confidence that they can achieve in college and the security of having up to two years of college credit to build on.

Given that an essential goal of the ECHSI is to educate traditionally underserved students, examining the strategies that each school used to enroll its initial class of students provides an early indicator of the initiative's implementation success. This paper summarizes the strategies ECHSs have adopted to overcome the initial hurdle of attracting and enrolling the targeted students. Specifically, this paper addresses three main questions about student enrollment:

- What strategies did intermediaries and ECHSs use to *recruit* students?
- What criteria did intermediaries and ECHSs use to *select* students?
- To what extent have ECHSs enrolled traditionally underserved students?

A summary of our findings is presented below, followed by a supporting table that details each school's approach to finding applicants and selecting students. Also included in the table are data related to the population attending the schools, including the percentage of students from several categories of underserved populations.

Data Sources

Data for this report came from several different sources. Each school completed a school-level survey concerning the number of applicants and acceptances, the demographic composition of the students, and several other types of information.³ Data also came from discussions with school leaders and staff, either over the

¹ The ECHSI has been expanding incrementally since 2002-2003. This report is based on data from schools that are affiliated with the Initiative's original seven intermediary groups *and* became operational, with students enrolled, in 2003-2004 or earlier.

² Jobs for the Future. *Early College High Schools: Core Principles for Planning, Implementation, and Assessment*. Retrieved on July 8, 2004 from www.earlycolleges.org.

³ All 24 ECHSs solicited provided at least some of the information requested on the survey.

telephone or in person during a site visit. Because many ECHSs draw students from multiple districts, each ECHS identified the district that provided the most students to the school. Data on the identified districts, which came from published sources including federal, state, and district Web sites, are presented in the table below as the “Primary Feeder District Demographics.” One caveat is important to note about the district data. Although most ECHSs have a primary district that provides more students than other districts, it does not mean that most of the students at the school come from the primary district. For example, MCNC School 9 drew students from many school districts; although the primary feeder district provided the most students, only about half of the students in the school came from that district.

Findings

Our findings are organized around the three research questions outlined in the introduction above. We begin by describing the various approaches intermediaries and ECHSs employed to student recruitment. We then address recruitment and selection strategies and their impact on the demographics of the ECHSs’ student enrollments.

What strategies did intermediaries and ECHSs use to *recruit* students?

As illustrated in Table 1, a majority of the 24 ECHSs worked with middle and high schools to recruit students. Examples of particular activities include presentations to students at local middle or high schools and the distribution of informational materials to these schools or through mailings. About one-third of ECHSs worked with particular populations or community groups to recruit students. A very small number also advertised their school in the newspaper or on the radio. Most ECHSs (at least two thirds) used multiple strategies to recruit students. At least one school did no recruiting and received ten times more applicants than spaces available. This ECHS existed before the foundation’s initiative began. (Details of recruitment strategies by ECHSs and intermediaries are listed in the table provided at the end of this document.)

Table 1. Summary of key recruitment strategies.

Strategy	Number of Schools	Examples
Recruit at middle and high schools	18	Made presentations at middle schools; accepted referrals from middle school guidance counselors; sent letters to middle and high schools and directly to students
Outreach to particular populations/ community groups	9	Worked with local children’s agencies to publicize school; conducted open houses in community-based organizations and local churches; asked parents of students to spread word
Media	3	Radio and newspaper advertisements
Other	2	No recruitment; students from district admission process
Missing	2	Survey and/or interview not completed

What criteria did intermediaries and ECHSs use to *select* students?

Typically, ECHSs recruited students using particular criteria, though these criteria and their level of specificity did vary. Table 2 summarizes some of the key selection criteria used by ECHSs and their intermediaries, along with examples. About one-third of the schools had explicit criteria for targeting specific populations of students. For example, ECHSs working with Antioch gave priority to Native American students. Other schools gave priority to students from other racial and ethnic minority groups, to English language learners, or to students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds (including students who would be the first in their families to attend college). Nearly as many schools outlined various behavioral or motivational criteria including requiring no

excessive disciplinary problems and being drug free. One school actively sought out students who *had* exhibited behavioral (and academic and social) problems. Three schools indicated that they formed committees or groups to determine the “fit” of potential students. However, it was unclear what criteria they used to make this determination, though it is likely that behavioral and motivational issues could be considered. Nearly one-half of the schools cited academic considerations when asked about their selection criteria. However, two of these schools targeted students who had dropped out of school or exhibited academic problems. (Details of selection criteria by ECHSs and intermediaries are listed in the table provided at the end of this document.)

Table 2. Summary of key selection criteria.

Selection Criteria	Number of Schools	Examples
Explicit demographic criteria	8	Targeted Native American students, English Language learners, or low income students
Specific behavioral/motivational criteria	7*	No excessive disciplinary problems; drug free; interest/motivation
Academic criteria	10**	Scored 30 th percentile or above on standardized tests; GPA of at least 2.0; ranked in top half of all 8 th graders on test scores

* One ECHS targeted students who have exhibited behavioral problems.

** Two of these ECHSs targeted students who had dropped out of high school or had experienced academic (and other) issues.

To what extent have ECHSs enrolled traditionally underserved students?

Given the goals and priorities of the Early College High School Initiative, ECHS student populations should meet or exceed the diversity of the broader local school-age population on basic demographic characteristics. Table 3 summarizes the enrollment characteristics of ECHSs compared with enrollment characteristics of schools in the primary feeder district. The first column provides a count of ECHSs that enrolled a higher percentage of traditionally underserved students than the other schools in their districts. The ECHSs in this column enrolled either a higher percentage of minority students *or* students from low-income families than the other schools in their districts. The second column provides a count of the number of ECHSs that enrolled percentages of both minority students *and* students from low-income families that are similar to the primary feeder district profile. The final column provides a count of the ECHSs that enrolled a lower percentage of minority students *or* students from low-income families than other schools in the district.

Table 3. Summary of enrollment characteristics in ECHSs compared with enrollment characteristics in the primary feeder district.

Enrolled <i>higher</i> percentage underserved students ¹	Similar to feeder district ²	Enrolled <i>lower</i> percentage underserved students ³
10	5	4

¹ ECHSs in this column enrolled greater percentages (differences of 11% or more) of minority students OR students participating in the free/reduced-price lunch program than did other schools in their primary feeder district.

² ECHSs in this column enrolled about the same percentages (differences of 10% or less) of minority students AND students participating in the free/reduced-price lunch program compared to other schools in their district.

³ ECHSs in this column enrolled lower proportions (differences of 11% or more) of minority students OR students participating in the free/reduced-price lunch program than did other schools in their district.

NOTE: Five ECHSs are not included: 2 ECHSs had a higher percentage in one population but a lower percentage in the other (e.g., a higher percentage of minority students but a lower percentage of students eligible for the free and reduced-priced lunch program); 3 ECHSs had missing data.

Generally speaking, most schools enrolled either students similar to the feeder district population or a greater proportion of students from racial/ethnic minority groups or low-income families. One Antioch ECHS in Washington enrolled 98 percent minority students, whereas only 22 percent of the students in the feeder district were racial/ethnic minorities. This school also enrolled almost 50 percent more students eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program than the local district as a whole. On the other hand, four schools enrolled a lower percentage of underserved students than the schools in their feeder districts. For example, the most selective ECHS, with the most rigorous enrollment criteria, enrolled fewer traditionally underserved students than would be expected given the local student population. (Details of demographic characteristics by ECHS and intermediary, as well as for the primary feeder district, are listed in the table provided at the end of this document.)

All but four ECHSs enrolled a majority of students from racial/ethnic minority groups. Three of these exceptions are have feeder districts where less than half of the enrolled students are from racial/ethnic minority groups. Of the 22 ECHSs with data, all but six schools enrolled a majority of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. Of these six, four schools are in districts where students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch make up less than half of the high school population.

Summary

All ECHSs and their intermediaries developed a number of recruiting strategies and selection criteria to shape their enrollments. That is, they were schools of choice first and foremost, so they began with a group of students and families that chose the school or had the opportunity to choose. It appears, however, that the vast majority of the schools we examined worked hard to widely disseminate information about their schools to increase the number of students and families with knowledge of this option.

Within their pool of applicants, nearly all ECHSs exercised a screening process. Criteria included some combination of dimensions of students' demographic, academic, and behavioral/motivational characteristics. Only one school accepted all applicants. One-third of the schools accepted 90 to 100 percent of applicants, another third accepted between 60 to 89 percent of applicants, and the final third accepted fewer than 59 percent of applicants. With respect to demographic characteristics, a majority of the ECHSs enrolled a majority of students from racial/ethnic minority groups and students from low income families. In addition, a majority of ECHSs enrolled percentages of such students that were similar to or higher than high schools in the primary feeder district. Generally speaking, the ECHSs with the most rigorous enrollment criteria also enrolled fewer traditionally underserved students than would be expected given the local student population.

A key question as the ECHSI moves forward is to determine the appropriate degree of selectivity. That is, is this an initiative that should target and serve *all* historically underserved high school students? Or, should it target minority or low-income students who are best positioned to succeed in an accelerated secondary school environment? Are there some students who reach high school unable to succeed in this accelerated environment? Are there performance criteria (e.g., prior achievement, high motivation, some notion of “undiscovered talent”) that should be taken into account and sought after? As the initiative moves forward, we plan to monitor the academic competence or “potential” that students enrolled in ECHSs bring to their classrooms and how this impacts the implementation and success of the initiative.

Details on recruitment, selection, and enrollment data for each school are presented in the table below.

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Antioch University of Seattle</p> <p>School 1: Existing HS adapting to ECHS⁴</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made presentations to the middle schools and to tribal school • Worked closely with local Native American leaders • Held student and parent focus groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primarily targeted Native American students • Accepted other ethnic minority students, first generation college students, and economically disadvantaged students 	<p>Applied- 104</p> <p>Accepted- 104</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 100%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 88</p> <p>Grade 10- 9</p> <p>Grade 11- 4</p> <p>Grade 12- 3</p> <p>Total- 104</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 49% • Latino- 11% • African American- 3% • Native American- 35% • Asian- 0% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 56% • IEP- 0% • LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY-31% • Latino- 7% • African American- 1% • Native American- 21% • Asian- 2% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 43% • IEP- 14% • LEP- 5%
<p>Antioch University of Seattle</p> <p>School 2: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hired local university staff part-time to target kids from all the high schools in the district; these staff talked to the counselors and the students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted students identified as “Native American students” on form 506 filed through the federal government as a part of Title VII • Opened the program to other students, but gave priority to these Native American students 	<p>Applied- 50</p> <p>Accepted- 28</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 56%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 9</p> <p>Grade 10- 10</p> <p>Grade 11- 8</p> <p>Grade 12- 8</p> <p>Total- 35</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 100% • Latino- 0% • African American- 0% • Native American- 100% • Asian- 0% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 100% • IEP- 7% • LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 15% • Latino- 3% • African American- 5% • Native American- 4% • Asian- 3% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 46% • IEP- 13% • LEP- Unavailable

⁴ All schools designated as “adapting” in this table are previously existing high schools. They are either adding ECHS as a program or changing the entire school into an ECHS.

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Antioch University of Seattle</p> <p>School 3: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located the school on a reservation and serves local Native American students • Also recruited at other high schools in the district • Used parents of students to help spread news about the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrote grant specifically for Native American students 	<p>Applied- 66</p> <p>Accepted- 66</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 100%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 24</p> <p>Grade 10- 18</p> <p>Grade 11- 12</p> <p>Grade 12- 12</p> <p>Total- 66</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 98% • Latino- 2% • African American- 0% • Native American- 96% • Asian- 0% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 71% • IEP- 6% • LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 22% • Latino- 6% • African American- 2% • Native American- 8% • Asian- 6% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 27% • IEP- 13% • LEP- Unavailable
<p>Knowledge Works Foundation</p> <p>School 1: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed recruitment information to all public and private elementary and middle schools in the district • Had ECHS staff participate in a school fair and follow-up information sessions • Accepted referrals from middle school guidance counselors, community leaders, and parents • Solicited referrals from the local courts and children’s services center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used three main criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Student must have passed the reading portion of the 6th grade proficiency test or equivalent o Student must be no older than 15 o Student must be drug free • Also considered: student is first generation to go to college, student is an English language learner, student is an undiscovered talent, or student has never considered higher education owing to circumstances of poverty or family disinterest. 	<p>Applied- 125</p> <p>Accepted- 96</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 77%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 96</p> <p>Total- 96</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 88% • Latino- 0% • African American- 82% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 0% • Other- 6% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 73% • IEP- 12% • LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 71% • Latino- 1% • African American- 70% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 0% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 65% • IEP- 19% • LEP- 0%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
Middle College National Consortium School 1: New ECHS Started 02-03	<i>Data not yet available</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chose students by lottery Did not consider desire for college course work or academic ability as a factor in admissions 	Applied- 45 Accepted- 35 Acceptance Rate- 78%	Grade 11- 35 Grade 12- 30 Total- 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 36% Latino- 8% African American- 26% Native American- 0% Asian- 2% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 12% IEP- 5% LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 37% Latino- 14% African American- 18% Native American- 0% Asian- 5% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 33% IEP- 13% LEP- 1%
Middle College National Consortium School 2: New ECHS Started 02-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contacted and visited middle schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considered students who scored in the 30th percentile and above on standardized tests; also considered GPA Received assistance from the college in reviewing applications Sometimes accepted low scores if a student appeared extremely motivated 	Applied- 90 Accepted- 85 Acceptance Rate- 94%	Grade 9- 68 Grade 10- 66 Total- 134	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 87% Latino- 42% African American- 32% Native American- 0% Asian- 13% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- Unavailable IEP- Unavailable LEP- Unavailable Note: Data obtained from a state Web site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 90% Latino- 72% African American- 12% Native American- 0% Asian- 4% Other- 2% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 75% IEP- 25% LEP- 43%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 3: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 02-03</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Received applications from 85% of students through the city’s admissions process ● Received applications from another recently arrived 15% who were not part of the city’s board of education system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Used the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All students were English language learners. Most students scored below the 21st percentile on a test of English language skills ○ Students were in the U.S. for less than 4 years. ○ Students applied through city’s admission process. Students ranked their choices. Schools made selections. District made the matches. 	<p>Applied- 440</p> <p>Accepted- 120</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 27%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 112</p> <p>Grade 10- 115</p> <p>Grade 11- 113</p> <p>Grade 12- 110</p> <p>Total- 450</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 80% ● Latino- 52% ● African American- 3% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 26% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 80% ● IEP- 1% ● LEP- 100% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 85% ● Latino- 38% ● African American- 34% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 13% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 69% ● IEP- 10% ● LEP- 19%
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 4: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sponsored an Open House for prospective students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Used the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students must fall in the 65th to 80th percentile for overall academic achievement ○ Students could not have excessive disciplinary problems ○ During interviews, students had to demonstrate a sincere interest in attending the school 	<p>Applied- 83</p> <p>Accepted- 83</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 100%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 80</p> <p>Total- 80</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 82% ● Latino- 8% ● African American- 74% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 0% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 74% ● IEP- 14% ● LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 73% ● Latino- 12% ● African American- 58% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 0% ● Other- 3% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 74% ● IEP- 22% ● LEP- 6%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 5: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 02-03</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not recruit and received 10 times more applicants than seats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted students who have academic, behavioral, focusing, attendance, and social issues • Sought information from schools to see whether students would be a good fit • Used the following process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Students applied through the city’s admission process o Students ranked their choices o Schools made selections o District made the matches 	<p>Applied- 998</p> <p>Accepted- 123</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 12%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 108</p> <p>Grade 10- 145*</p> <p>Grade 11- 144*</p> <p>Grade 12- 108</p> <p>Total- 497</p> <p>*Estimate- No grades 10 or 11, promotion based on credits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 78% • Latino- 57% • African American- 14% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 7% • Other- 0% • Universal School Food Program- 84% • IEP- 9% • LEP- 5% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 86% • Latino- 58% • African American- 11% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 17% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 72% • IEP- 9% • LEP- 20%
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 6: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruited in local schools • Used existing AVID connections • Asked middle school guidance counselors to find students who would fit • Just recruited 8th grade students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received AVID profile • Looked for GPA between 2.0 and 2.5 • Looked for student motivation during interview process • Targeted minority, economically disadvantaged, or first-generation college students • Screened out students who apply primarily because of parental pressure 	<p>Applied- 75</p> <p>Accepted- 70</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 93%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 68*</p> <p>Grade 10- 28</p> <p>Grade 11- 35</p> <p>Grade 12- 43</p> <p>Total- 174</p> <p>* Only grade 9 students in ECHS</p>	<p>These numbers for 9th grade students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 69% • Latino- 19% • African American- 13% • Native American- 3% • Asian- 34% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 53% • IEP- 0% • LEP- 29% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 61% • Latino- 30% • African American- 7% • Native American- 1% • Asian- 23% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 60% • IEP- 12% • LEP- 28%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 7: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<p><i>Data not yet available</i></p>	<p><i>Data not yet available</i></p>	<p>Applied-70</p> <p>Accepted-50</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 71%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 49*</p> <p>Grade 10- 80</p> <p>Grade 11- 76</p> <p>Grade 12- 82</p> <p>Total- 287</p> <p>* Only grade 9 students in ECHS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 91% ● Latino- 86% ● African American- 3% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 2% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 41% ● IEP- 0% ● LEP- 4% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 96% ● Latino- 92% ● African American- 1% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 3% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 75% ● IEP- 9% ● LEP- 64%
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 8: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sent letters to all counselors at local middle and high schools ● Worked with local children’s agencies to publicize the school ● Hosted informational sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Had a selection committee (high school and college staff, including counselors) meet with students and parents to choose students who would be a good fit within the school 	<p>Applied- 325</p> <p>Accepted- 98</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 30%</p>	<p>Grade 10- 60</p> <p>Grade 11- 88</p> <p>Grade 12- 70</p> <p>Total- 218</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 99% ● Latino- 0% ● African American- 99% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 0% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 71% ● IEP- 1% ● LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 90% ● Latino- 2% ● African American- 87% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 1% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 73% ● IEP- 12% ● LEP- 2%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 9: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received referrals from counselors from the 21 school districts from which the school accepts students Accepted recommendations from community and religious leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tried to select students by determining the students’ needs and whether the school can meet them. Targeted students performing under their potential who need such a program to meet their potential 	<p>Applied- 360</p> <p>Accepted- 163</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 45%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 51</p> <p>Grade 10- 92</p> <p>Grade 11- 77</p> <p>Grade 12- 59</p> <p>Total- 279</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 40% Latino- 5% African American- 33% Native American- 1% Asian- 1% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- Unavailable IEP- 0% LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 79%* Latino- 3% African American- 75% Native American- 0% Asian- 1% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 93% IEP- 6% LEP- Unavailable <p>* 50% of students from primary district; remaining from 20 other districts.</p>
<p>Middle College National Consortium</p> <p>School 10: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drew 9th grade students primarily from a charter middle school started by the principal Also drew students from the pool of retrieval students identified by school staff to have the ability to handle college-level courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used a retrieval program to test students who dropped out of regular public school Used the following criteria: students must have an 8.0 reading and math score, have accumulated fewer than 10 credits, and be between 16 and 19 Interviewed all prospective students Established a waiting list for both the retrieval program and the middle school 	<p>Applied- 600</p> <p>Accepted- 245</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 41%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 99</p> <p>Grade 10- 66</p> <p>Grade 11- 44</p> <p>Grade 12- 26</p> <p>Total- 235*</p> <p>*Includes all students, not just ECHS students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 100% Latino- 1% African American- 99% Native American- 0% Asian- 0% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 93% IEP- Unavailable LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 90% Latino- 36% African American- 51% Native American- 0% Asian- 3% Other- 0% Low-income families- 85% IEP- 13% LEP- 14%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>National Council of La Raza</p> <p>School 1: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created as a partner to an existing middle school • Recruited at a few other local charter middle schools • Also targeted Latinos living in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instituted a school charter that guaranteed placement for all students completing CALS middle school • Selected additional applicants by lottery and kept a waiting list 	<p>Applied- 107</p> <p>Accepted- 84</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 79%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 84</p> <p>Total- 84</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 100% • Latino- 98% • African American- 1% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 1% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 82% • IEP- 6% • LEP- 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 90% • Latino- 72% • African American- 12% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 4% • Other- 2% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 75% • IEP- 25% • LEP- 43%
<p>National Council of La Raza</p> <p>School 2: Existing HS adapting to ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used word of mouth to communicate information to most students • Had most students come from the neighboring middle school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the 2003–2004 academic year, accepted all students who applied 	<p>Applied- 226</p> <p>Accepted- 226</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 100%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 70</p> <p>Grade 10- 64</p> <p>Grade 11- 44</p> <p>Grade 12- 35</p> <p>Total- 213</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY-81% • Latino-77% • African American- 1% • Native American- 2% • Asian- 1% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 79% • IEP- 2% • LEP- 9% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 98% • Latino- 92% • African American- 1% • Native American- 5% • Asian- 0% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 58% • IEP- 12% • LEP- 17%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>SECME</p> <p>School 1: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ran radio advertisements • Talked to admissions people at magnet schools to identify students who had applied but were rejected • Disseminated the program materials to local schools, including magnet schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used a student recruitment committee to oversee the application process; committee interviewed parents and students, administered a test to the applicants, and made acceptance decisions after reviewing all the information 	<p>Applied- 122</p> <p>Accepted- 118</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 97%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 113</p> <p>Total- 113</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 85% • Latino- 2% • African American- 81% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 2% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 39% • IEP- 0% • LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 54% • Latino- 5% • African American- 43% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 3% • Other- 3% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 49% • IEP- 18% • LEP- 2%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>SECME</p> <p>School 2: New ECHS</p> <p>Started 04-05</p> <p>Note: Details are for the affiliated Pre College Academies (PCAs) and the future ECHS</p>	<p>PCAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected PCAs at four middle schools on the basis of the economic situation of the area served • Recruited students from these middle schools • Had teachers recommend students <p>ECHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received 85% of applicants from PCAs • Allowed PCA students to do ECHS application as part of AVID elective • Used other ways, primarily word of mouth, to inform others about program 	<p>PCAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used application that included an essay, short questions, transcript, interviews, and recommendations • Looked for desire to attend 4-year university, attitudes, no attendance or discipline problems, first generation to attend college, economically disadvantaged, “not working to potential,” traditionally underserved, and GPA > 2.0 <p>ECHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based selection on application with short answer questions, recommendations, a transcript, and essay • Targeted students with limited English skills, low-income, and first-generation college 	<p>PCAs</p> <p>Applied- 500</p> <p>Accepted- 353</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 71%</p> <p>ECHS</p> <p>2004-2005</p> <p>Applied- 140</p> <p>Places- 100</p> <p>Estimated Acceptance Rate- 71%</p>	<p>PCAs</p> <p>Grade 7- 168</p> <p>Grade 8- 185</p> <p>ECHS</p> <p>Not open in 2003-2004</p>	<p>PCAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 90% • Latino- 9% • African American- 78% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 2% • Other- 0% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 35% • IEP- Unavailable • LEP- Unavailable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINORITY- 70% • Latino- 9% • African American- 56% • Native American- 0% • Asian- 2% • Other- 3% • Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 45% • IEP- 13% • LEP- 9%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Utah Partnership for Education</p> <p>School 1: New School</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spoke with Mathematics, Engineering, Science (MESA) club students, which targets students from groups underrepresented in these fields Presented to more than 40 community organizations (particularly African American churches), counselors, and schools Ran bilingual radio ads Sent letter to every 8th and 9th grade student in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected students randomly Used a weighted selection probability to ensure that students mirror the total student population distribution throughout the area 	<p>Applied- 399</p> <p>Accepted- 250</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 64%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 150</p> <p>Grade 10- 101</p> <p>Total- 251</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 37% Latino- 17% African American- 4% Native American- 2% Asian- 8% Other- 6% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 26% IEP- 7% LEP- 3% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY-24% Latino- 18% African American- 2% Native American- 1% Asian- 3% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 37% IEP- 16% LEP- 19%
<p>Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation</p> <p>School 1: New School</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Built on the reputation for excellence of the partner middle school already in existence Did no formal recruiting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected students by lottery, although students with siblings in the school are given priority Required parents to agree to a number of conditions, including 30 hours of mandatory volunteer work, for students to be eligible 	<p>Applied- 144</p> <p>Accepted- 31</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 22%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 31</p> <p>Total- 31</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 100% Latino- 65% African American- 32% Native American- 3% Asian- 0% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 77% IEP- 13% LEP- 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 90% Latino- 72% African American- 12% Native American- 0% Asian- 4% Other- 2% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 75% IEP- 25% LEP- 42%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation School 2: New School Started 03-04	<i>Data not yet available</i>	<i>Data not yet available</i>	Applied- 100 Accepted- 90 Acceptance Rate- 90%	Grade 9- 87 Total- 87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 90% ● Latino- 41% ● African American- 21% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 28% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 100% ● IEP- 1% ● LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 85% ● Latino- 38% ● African American- 34% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 13% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 69% ● IEP- 10% ● LEP- 19%
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation School 3: New School Started 03-04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attended high school nights at local middle schools ● Had several open houses for parents at Brooklyn College and at the high school ● Recruited in local area only; recruited students in terms of academic readiness, not SES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sought students who ranked in the top half of all 8th graders on test scores ● Included in application: interest in math/science; essay; interview, to include parents; review of 7th and 8th grade record; no evidence of disciplinary trouble ● Used the following process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students applied through the city’s admission process ○ Students ranked their choices ○ Schools made selections ○ District made the matches 	Applied- 85 Accepted- 69 Acceptance Rate- 78%	Grade 9- 69 Total- 69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 99% ● Latino- 10% ● African American- 87% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 1% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 84% ● IEP- 4% ● LEP- 1% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MINORITY- 87% ● Latino- 10% ● African American- 71% ● Native American- 0% ● Asian- 6% ● Other- 0% ● Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 67% ● IEP- 10% ● LEP- 7%

Intermediary	Recruitment Strategies	Selection Criteria	Students Applied/ Accepted	Total Enrolled 2003–2004	Student Demographics	Primary Feeder District Demographics
<p>Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation</p> <p>School 4: New School</p> <p>Started 03-04</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertised information about the ECHS through flyers and letters to students sent by school system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted all applicants as long as they passed the state assessment required for entrance into 9th grade 	<p>Applied- 30</p> <p>Accepted- 26</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 87%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 26</p> <p>Total- 26</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 100% Latino- 0% African American- 100% Native American- 0% Asian- 0% Other- 0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 100% IEP- 8% LEP- 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 72% Latino- 0% African American- 67% Native American- 0% Asian- 0% Other- 5% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 78% IEP- 11% LEP- 2%
<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>New School</p> <p>Started 01-02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sent postcards to eligible students Ran advertisements in the <i>New York Times</i> Specifically targeted feeder schools with large African American populations to maintain diversity Visited middle schools of previous and current students Conducted open houses in community-based organizations and local churches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required students to have a B+ average GPA, read an essay and write a response, and complete math problems Invited students to interview on the basis of this prescreen (of 4,000 applicants, 570 interviewed) Used the following process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students applied through the city’s admission process Students ranked their choices Schools made selections District made the matches 	<p>Applied- 4000</p> <p>Accepted-140</p> <p>Acceptance Rate- 4%</p>	<p>Grade 9- 146</p> <p>Grade 10- 129</p> <p>Grade 11- 149</p> <p>Grade 12- 76</p> <p>Total- 500</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 61% Latino- 13% African American- 30% Native American- 0% Asian- 13% Other- 5% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 35% IEP- 1% LEP- Unavailable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINORITY- 88% Latino- 48% African American- 25% Native American- 0% Asian- 15% Other-0% Free or Reduced- Price Lunch- 70% IEP- 12% LEP- 12%