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ABSTRACT

ACCESS VERSUS SUCCESS: AN EXAMINATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SUMMER DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM IN MISSISSIPPI HIGHER EDUCATION

by Amanda Susanne King

May 2016

Historical racial segregation within Mississippi’s public universities and colleges has led to litigation that spanned 25 years and eventually led to sweeping changes in policies and practices. Among these changes were the standardization of admission criteria and the creation of the Summer Developmental Program (SDP). This study sought to better understand the intentions and motives behind the creation and implementation of the SDP at all of the four-year public institutions in Mississippi stemming from the United States v. Fordice (1992) higher education desegregation case. This study compared retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants from the first year of implementation in 1996 through 2013, the most currently available data at the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. It then aimed to describe the effectiveness of the program, establish if the program is performing as the Supreme Court intended, and policy makers to determine if revisions, updates, and new directives are needed to improve the program.

After analyzing and comparing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants in the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi, the researcher concluded that the treatment of SDP is effective in retaining SDP participants. However, the researcher concluded that the SDP is not effective in graduating SDP
participants. Based on the consistent decline of Black SDP participants (95% of total SDP participants were reported as Black), the researcher concluded that the SDP was not providing additional educational opportunities for Blacks and that there is still a “lingering [racial] *de jure* injury” (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 6).
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Historical racial segregation within Mississippi’s public universities and colleges has led to litigation that spanned 25 years and eventually led to sweeping changes in policies and practices. Among these changes were the standardization of admission criteria and the creation of the Summer Developmental Program (SDP). This study sought to better understand the intentions and motives behind the creation and implementation of the SDP at all of the four-year public institutions in Mississippi stemming from the *United States v. Fordice* (1992) higher education desegregation case. This study also sought to help researchers and educators better understand the context of SDP and consider if participants of the program have been successfully completing college. The results of this study indicate the SDP is effective in retaining SDP participants. However, the researcher concluded that the SDP is not effective in graduating SDP participants.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to describe the SDP at all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi required by the Remedial Decree from the *Fordice* case. This study compared retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants from the first year of implementation in 1996 through 2013, the most currently available data at the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. This comparison revealed retention and graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants. It then aimed to describe the effectiveness of the program, establish if the program is performing as the Supreme Court intended, and policy makers to determine if revisions, updates, and
new directives are needed to improve the program. Effectiveness and performance was measured by retention and graduation rate data of SDP participation. These objectives were important to the study in order to determine if the SDP was effective in graduating and retaining program participants.

Summer bridge programs in higher education generally have the same goal - to assist students with the transition from high school to college (Cabrera, Miner, & Milen, 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011). According to Garcia and Paz (1991), summer pre-enrollment programs or summer bridge programs have been described as one of the oldest strategies used to improve college retention rates among academically underprepared students. However, there is limited research on summer bridge programs. Moreover, the research that does exist is individualized because of the uniqueness of the program studied (Barnett et al., 2012; Kezar, 2000). The studies that have been conducted on the effectiveness of summer bridge programs are reviewed in Chapter III.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

In 1992, the United States Supreme Court identified four vestiges, or remnants, of segregation and remanded the *Fordice* case to the U.S. federal district and appeals courts and to state officials to apply standards to satisfy these vestiges. The federal court’s decision, the Remedial Decree, created the SDP and revised the admission requirements for all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi to satisfy the admission vestige (Biggers, 1995). This study focused on the *admission standards* vestige.

While there was a considerable amount of research regarding the other vestiges (academic program duplication, institutional mission statement, and continued operation
of the eight public institutions), there was scant literature concerning the SDP, which was a component of the admission standards vestige. There has been no published research on the outcomes of the SDP program since the *Fordice* ruling. Also, there was limited literature on summer remedial programs’ or summer bridge programs’ (programs that the SDP was founded upon) retention and graduation rates or successfulness. Finally, no literature existed about the SDP from the *Fordice* case. Chapter III provided more details on the literature about summer bridge programs. Since there was scant literature regarding the SDP, this study presented and synthesized published literature on other summer bridge programs as they are similar to the SDP.

The following research questions served to guide this study:

- When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants retained at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?
- When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants graduating at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?

Evaluating retention and graduation rates of the SDP demonstrated whether or not the program is meeting its primary goal of providing additional educational opportunities for enrollment access to Mississippi higher education. If the SDP was in accord with literature, research, and Critical Race Theory, there should be no difference between retention and graduation rates of SDP participants when compared to non-SDP participants. In contrast, however, the hypotheses of this study were as follows:

- There will be a difference in retention rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower retention rates than non-SDP participants.
There will be a difference in graduation rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower graduation rates than non-SDP participants.

Analyzing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants compared to non-SDP participants provided evidence that non-SDP participants exhibited higher retention and graduation rates than SDP participants. As this is the case, the SDP is not increasing educational opportunities for Blacks at four-year public institutions in Mississippi. As well, this study found that SDP participants are not persisting in or graduating from Mississippi public four-year institutions at a rate comparable to non SDP participants.

Data analyses indicate that the SDP is not meeting the vestige set forth by Fordice to provide Blacks an additional route to Mississippi’s four-year public institutions.

Background on the Admission Standard Vestige

In response to litigation, the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL), the governing board for all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi, revamped the admissions criteria to enter these schools by lessening the impact of the American College Test (ACT) and broadening other criteria required for admission based upon the admission vestige identified in Fordice. Prior to Fordice, in Mississippi, the ACT score was the only factor considered for determining admission to the state’s historically White institutions, known as Predominately White Institutions (PWIs). All five public PWIs in Mississippi—Delta State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University of Women, University of Mississippi, and University of Southern Mississippi—required a minimum ACT score of 15, while Mississippi’s three historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs)—Alcorn State University,
Jackson State University, and Mississippi Valley State University—required at least a score of 13 (Biggers, 1995). At the time of the case, the average ACT score for Blacks was seven, and the average score for Whites was 18 (Biggers, 1995; United States v. Fordice, 1992). Also, sixty percent of students enrolled at the HBCUs from 1988 to 1992 scored below a 15 on the ACT, making them unable to matriculate at any of the state’s PWIs if they chose to (Biggers, 1995). In short, the ACT requirement caused a substantial difference in the number of Blacks compared to the number of Whites eligible for admission to Mississippi’s PWIs. As several researchers have noted (Gilreath, 1998; Stefkovich & Leas, 1994; Williams, 2005), Blacks who challenged this admissions method argued that they would have a harder time enrolling in one of the public four-year institutions. Subsequently, the United States Supreme Court, in Fordice, ruled against this admission method and declared that the admission requirements be revised to consider not only ACT scores in the evaluation of admission applications but also high school grade point averages and curricula. Defendants in the case were concerned Blacks would have a harder time enrolling in one of the public four-year institutions (Gilreath, 1998; Stefkovich & Leas, 1994; Williams, 2005). The foundation of the Fordice case was to provide access and to increase enrollment for Blacks at the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Along with broadening the admission requirements, the SDP was created to provide Blacks with low ACT scores an additional route to admission into Mississippi’s eight public four-year institutions and to compensate for the absence of Blacks in the four-year public PWI institutions due to the revised admission requirements from the Fordice case (Biggers, 1995). Further information regarding the history of Fordice is provided in Chapter II.
The new admission requirements reached by United States District Court Judge Biggers in the Remedial Decree concluded that entering freshmen with (1) a 3.2 grade point average (GPA) with any ACT score, (2) a 2.5 GPA with an ACT score of 16 or 17, or (3) a 2.0 GPA with an ACT score of 18 would be granted admission to any of the eight four-year public institutions in Mississippi (Biggers, 1995). Additionally, students who failed to meet these new standards would have the opportunity to go through a spring screening process and take a different test called the ACCUPLACER test (similar to the ACT and the SAT), which is a product of CollegeBoard, the producers of the SAT (Biggers, 1995). The tests are similar but not the same. The ACT and SAT are both timed and consist of over 200 questions, whereas the ACCUPLACER is untimed and consists of three sections with only 20 questions per section. The ACCUPLACER test sections include English, reading, and math, whereas the ACT includes English, reading, math, and science, and the SAT includes math and verbal. The ACCUPLACER is available for all students regardless of race who are seeking enrollment at one of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi and who do not meet admission requirements. Students who pass the ACCUPLACER are admitted to any of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Students who do not pass the ACCUPLACER have the opportunity to enroll in the SDP, a nine-week summer remedial program or summer bridge program (Biggers, 1995; Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015; United States v. Fordice, 1992).

The goal of the SDP is to provide students with a final chance to enroll at any of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Students who pass the SDP are admitted to any of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Students who do
not pass the SDP seek enrollment elsewhere at a private institution, a two-year institution, or an out-of-state institution.

The revamped admissions requirements and the SDP had one primary goal: to increase access or educational opportunities for Blacks in Mississippi higher education (Biggers, 1995). But the new admissions requirements and the SDP were written without regard to color. All students in Mississippi, regardless of race, who do not meet the broadened admission requirements have the opportunity to take the ACCUPLACER, enroll in the SDP, and enroll conditionally (enrollment is contingent upon academic factors) at a four-year public institution the summer prior to their freshman year if they successfully complete the SDP (Biggers, 1995; Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015; United States v. Fordice, 1992).

As explained above, the Biggers’ decision sought to expand the ways students were admitted to IHLs (Biggers, 1995; United States v. Fordice, 1992), but to date no study has been conducted that assesses whether SDP participants succeeded in college. This study examined retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to determine if SDP participants were successful. This study aimed to determine if the SDP created through the Fordice ruling is maintaining successful retention and graduation of students who gained admission through the SDP. The main point of this study was to examine if the change in admission requirements and the SDP provided Blacks with not only an additional route to enrollment into Mississippi’s public four-year institutions, but also helped them to succeed after they arrived. (Biggers, 1995; United States v. Fordice, 1992).
Access versus Opportunity

Providing additional routes or providing additional educational opportunities to higher education were key phrases to the Remedial Decree of the Fordice case (Biggers, 1995, p. 5). In spite of the presence of these two phrases, emphasis was put on the former. In other words, the court emphasized the path to higher education, or what this study referred to as access or opportunity. Less attention was given to the educational experience, or what this study referred to as success. As such, this study attempted to understand what occurred before the journey to higher education (the path) and the higher education experience (success). It focused on the effectiveness of the SDP by analyzing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants.

The court’s use of the phrases providing additional routes or providing additional educational opportunities has been problematic and blurred the true intention of the admissions changes. Therefore, this study unpacked the differences between opportunity and access. According to the Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education (2013), opportunity, in regard to education, was a student having the ability to experience education that results in equality in the resources. The reference of providing additional educational opportunities implied that Blacks had the chance to experience higher education. Access, in regard to education, was when institutions ensure their policies provide equal opportunities for students to take advantage of education (“The Glossary of Education Reform,” 2014). Increasing access in education, according to “The Glossary of Education Reform” (2014), was when institutions remove barriers to education. While access is the true intention of the courts and plaintiffs, Blacks gaining
entrance to higher education through the different venues provided in the vestiges of the case was the true outcome of the case (Biggers, 1995).

At the time that the case was filed in 1975, the United States, specifically the south, was on a decline from important desegregation litigation and legislation surge, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The new admission requirements and SDP were employed to increase Blacks’ access to higher education. The case was filed, in part, due to unequal academics and facilities at HBCUs compared to PWIs. Critical Race Theory is built on the idea that racism is entrenched in the subconscious of Whites in power (Bell, 1995). This results in fewer educational opportunities for Blacks. Because desegregation was disfavored by most Whites in the south, the word choice selected in the ruling was consciously chosen to keep public education segregated and Blacks inferior to Whites. Opportunity implies that higher education is an option for individuals, whereas access is required. The word choice is advantageous for Whites because it does not allude that higher education is required for Blacks, but it is instead an option. When decisions are advantageous for Whites, this is known as interest convergence, a key theme in Critical Race Theory (Bell, 1995). As mentioned earlier in this chapter, this study described the effectiveness of the SDP, but it did so by critically analyzing and critiquing the SDP using Critical Race Theory (CRT). CRT was explored in more depth within Chapter VI, discussion.

Byrd-Chichester (2000) reported that revising the admission requirements has not solved the higher education desegregation problem but rather added to the complexity of the failure in Southern higher education desegregation. Blacks were guaranteed access, or a path to higher education, but not the experience or success of completing college.
The SDP was primarily intended to provide an additional route for students to be admitted to higher education, but it placed less emphasis on the SDP’s capacity to build skills and academic abilities for students to succeed in college. This study described the SDP, compared retention and graduation rates, and determined its effectiveness.

Primary Source Materials

Primary sources used in this study were historical documents collected from the University of Mississippi archives and the Mississippi Department of Archives to develop Chapter II. These historical documents provided descriptions of past events (Wiersma, 1986). Discussion about why historical research was limited to these two archives was discussed in Chapter IV, methodology, collection of data. Historical data included information about prior research on the SDP and archival information on the Fordice case. Data used to analyze retention and graduation rates for this study were archival and requested from the IHL. These data were archival because they were collected by IHL prior to the beginning of the study and were collected not for research purposes (Bramble & Mason, 1997; IRB for Social & Behavioral Sciences University of Virginia, 2015). Discussion on how this data was requested and what variables were used were discussed in Chapter IV, Methodology.

Methodology

As previously mentioned, this study determined the effectiveness of the SDP, described the program, and compared retention and graduation rates of participants and non-SDP participants. This study used archival data from the IHL to conduct a quantitative analysis. Other historical data was used to describe the SDP. Archival quantitative data was analyzed using Single Case Research Design (SCRD). Determining
the effectiveness of the SDP was measured by comparing retention and graduation rates of participants to non-SDP participants.

SCRD was used to quantitatively analyze data from the IHLs using a type of analysis different than pure statistical analysis. SCRDs are experimental designs that determine if there is “a causal relation between the independent variable and the change in the dependent variable” (Plavnick & Ferreri, 2013, p. 1). This type of design is also referenced as an “adaptation of interrupted time-series” design that provides a thorough evaluation and assessment of how the intervention or independent variable effects the dependent variable (Kratchochwill et al., 2012, p. 2). Outcomes of this type of analysis are defined as demonstrations of improvements, plateaus, or not improving (Plavnick & Ferreri, 2013). Even though SCRD is a quantitative analysis, it is different from pure statistical analysis because it does not test for significant differences. Instead of testing for significant differences, SCRD relies on visual analysis graphs using descriptive and inferential statistics. SCRD examines differences within trends, slopes, and levels of visual analysis (Kratchochwill et al., 2012). While this method does not meet the requirements of traditional single case research design, this approach remains an adequate methodology to approach the study. This design best fits this study due to the small sample size of the number of years analyzed. Chapter IV provides a more detailed description of methodology.

Definition of Terms

- Academically underprepared or disadvantaged: students with academic deficits (Astin, 1990).
- Archival Data: “records of past occurrences…that their data were often collected for purposes other than the research” (Bramble & Mason, 1997, pp. 51-52).

- Ayer’s Settlement Agreement: a settlement agreement that was rendered after the decision of the Fordice case in 1992 that compensated HBCUs monetarily for past discrimination (After the Supreme Court rendered the decision in United States v. Fordice in 1992, Judge Neal Biggers of the Northern District of Mississippi was requested by the Supreme Court to satisfy mandates) (Biggers, 1995; Thompson, 2001).

- Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL): the governing board for all public four-year institutions in Mississippi (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015).

- Graduation rates: “Data are collected on the number of students entering the institution as full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students in a particular year (cohort), by race/ethnicity and gender; the number completing their program within 150 percent of normal time to completion” (NCES, 2014).

- Historical document data: documents that contain facts relating to past events that assist the researcher in “producing accurate descriptions and interpretations of those events” (Wiersma, 1986, p. 219).

- Historically Black College and University (HBCU): an institution of higher learning at which the majority of the student population has been and remains African-American (Higher Education Act, 1965).
• Predominantly White Institution (PWI): an institution of higher learning at which the majority of the student population is White (Brown & Dancy, 2010).

• Remedial Decree: Once the Supreme Court rendered United States v. Fordice (1992), the case was sent back to the United States District Court for Judge Biggers to flesh out the four vestiges. Details of how each vestige was satisfied is described in Biggers’ decision. The SDP is discussed in detail in this decree (Biggers, 1995; Williams, 2005).

• Retention rates: “a measure of the rate at which students persist in their educational program at an institution…for four-year institutions, this is the percentage of first-time bachelors (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduates from the previous fall who are again enrolled in the current fall” (NCES, 2014).

• Summer Bridge Programs: programs for high school seniors needing remedial help for smoother transitions to college (Walpole et al., 2008).

• Summer Developmental Program (SDP): a summer program designed for students entering college immediately following high school graduation who do not meet regular admission requirements at one of the eight public institutions in Mississippi. The SDP was implemented to satisfy part of the admission vestige in Fordice (Biggers, 1995).

• Vestige: a legal mandate from a court ruling, “of the de jure segregation era of state higher education is a state policy or practice of omission or commission adopted during that period…,” or “enacted in the wake of the mandate to end legally required segregation, hence very likely enacted to perpetuate racial segregation in the universities…” (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 2).
Assumptions

There were four main assumptions associated with this study. The first assumption was that the Mississippi IHL reported SDP data accurately and in a timely manner. For this study, the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi were required to submit SDP participant reports at the beginning and end of each summer semester to IHL. Second, it is assumed that IHL institutions submitted accurate information regarding SDP participants. For data to be considered reliable, Thorndike and Thorndike-Christ (2010) report that the data must be dependable and consistent. Reliability is a significant component of validity. Data validity is the degree to which evidence and theory support interpretation of the data or whether or not we are measuring what is supposed to be measured (Thorndike & Thorndike-Christ, 2010). The third assumption was that the IHL institutions followed the proper procedures when reporting SDP data to IHL. The researcher must be concerned with the accuracy and truthfulness of the archival data. Original documents were key to archival data analysis because unoriginal documents may be missing information or the data could be compromised (Rudestam & Newton, 2007). The final assumption was, in addition to providing a path or access to IHL institutions, the SDP intended to develop participants’ skills and abilities to succeed in college. Summer bridge programs traditionally assist students with their transition to college by offering them developmental courses and activities to enhance their academic and social skills (Cabrera et al., 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011).
Delimitations

The *Fordice* case stands as one of multiple cases regarding higher education desegregation in the southern United States. This study was limited to the United States Supreme Court case *United States v. Fordice* (1992) and one of the four vestiges from *Fordice*: all eight public four-year institutions must adhere to the same admissions criteria and the implementation of SDP. Once the Supreme Court made its official ruling, the case was sent back to the United States District Court for Judge Biggers to implement the four vestiges. The SDP is a part of the implementation of the four vestiges, specifically the admissions vestige. The *Fordice* case does not include private four or two-year institutions, and public two-year institutions in Mississippi were not directly affected by the outcomes of this case nor were they required to adhere to the same admission requirements. IHL is the governing body for all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi, and all institutions must follow IHL admissions guidelines when evaluating students for admission to college directly after high school graduation (Biggers, 1995).

There is a separate governing board for the community and junior colleges in the state ("Mississippi State Board for Community and Junior Colleges," 2016). The *Fordice* case is the only higher education desegregation case that rendered decisions affecting how institutions can evaluate their students for admission (Samuels, 2004). Other studies about *Fordice* or higher education desegregation in Mississippi describe, explain, or explore the vestiges regarding the minority enrollment requirements at the HBCUs in Mississippi or the elimination or merging of the public institutions in Mississippi (Fienberg, 1993; Gilreath; 1998; Minor, 2008; Sum, Light, & King, 2004; Taylor &
Olswang, 1999; Ware 1994; Wilson, 1994). Due to the specifics of the *Fordice* case, this study was limited to the State of Mississippi. Alabama, Louisiana, and Tennessee each had higher education desegregation cases that occurred after the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, none of the cases resulted in the changing of admissions requirements or adding a summer bridge program to all public institutions in the state (Samuels, 2004). Similar studies have been conducted regarding the successfulness of summer bridge programs, such as the California State University – St. Stanislaus; McNeese State University, Texas; University of Arizona; and Arizona State University. However, none of the summer bridge programs within those studies had separate entrance standards, and they were not based upon racial discrimination (Cabrera et al., 2013; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, 2013; Vinson, 2008). Even so, there was limited research on retention rates and non-existent research on graduation rates of summer bridge programs and the SDP.

**Summary**

Currently, the SDP continues to operate as a final attempt to provide access for those who do not meet admission requirements. The SDP was implemented in 1996 as a final attempt to provide admission or access for Blacks to higher education. This study sought to determine if this program is operating and performing the way the courts deemed during the *Fordice* ruling. Some have argued that the revised requirements and a SDP would “aid in curing the lingering de jure injuries to Blacks…assure uniform and fair administration by all universities would fare at each admission requirement” (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 6). This study tested this argument. By comparing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants in the eight public four-year
institutions in Mississippi, this study described the effectiveness of the program by analyzing the successfulness of program participants and determined if there is still a “lingering de jure injury” to Blacks (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 6).

This study determined whether or not incorporating a summer remedial program would support equal educational opportunities without considering the implications of implementing a program that would not be conducive to the academic needs of Black students. When Fordice was rendered, the Supreme Court stated that the intent of revised admissions requirements was to level the playing field between the admission of Whites and Blacks (Williams, 2005). The intent of the Supreme Court in the Fordice case is for Blacks to have an additional opportunity to higher education in Mississippi. The outcome of this study is important because it will help us better understand if the SDP has been successful in providing both educational access and success for Mississippi’s Blacks.
CHAPTER II


As presented in Chapter I, inequality in higher education has remained a key issue in the United States since the mid-1970s and beyond. As a result of the higher education desegregation case United States v. Fordice (1992), the Mississippi Summer Developmental Program (SDP) was created. To fully comprehend the history of the SDP, one must first understand the history of higher education desegregation in general. Therefore, this chapter was dedicated to illuminating the history of higher education desegregation, and the pivotal Fordice case. This chapter ended with a summary of the history of the SDP. Chapter III was dedicated to reviewing pertinent literature and research on summer bridge programs and the SDP.

History of Black Education in the United States from the Civil War to the Rendering of United States v. Fordice (1992)

To understand how the Fordice case evolved, it is important to understand how Blacks were treated in regard to higher education in the southern United States. Higher education desegregation continues to remain an unresolved and controversial issue in American higher education. The complexity of this issue springs from a century of multiple legislative acts and litigation that have been rendered in favor of desegregation. Stefkovich and Leas (1994) explain that desegregation can be divided into three different
time periods: (1) separate but equal; (2) separate is inherently unequal; and (3) dismantling dual systems.

Separate but Equal

The notion of “separate but equal” can be traced back to the time period between 1865 and 1896 and was based on legislation and litigation that attempted to increase educational access for Blacks, such as the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Morrill Act of 1862, the Second Morrill Act of 1890, and *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). Prior to the Civil War in 1861, slave states had laws that barred Blacks from learning to read and write. For the purposes of this study, slave states were defined as states that fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War, states below the Mason Dixon line, and states that supported slavery. During the Civil War, the emancipation of Blacks was a pivotal moment that allowed for the provision of Black education. The aforementioned legislative acts and litigation were implemented in favor of providing Blacks equal rights. Along with legislative acts, the industrialization of the United States and implementation of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments enhanced efforts to educate former slaves; however, many southerners did not agree with the acts (Brown, 1999). Of the 4.5 million Blacks in the former slave states, less than five percent were literate, and industrialization underscored the need to educate freedmen. After 1865, southern states were mandated to provide a public school education to all citizens, including Blacks, in order to comply with the Fourteenth Amendment (Brown, 1999). To secure the rights of former slaves as citizens, John Bingham, an Ohio congressman, led the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1866, but it did not become part of the Constitution until 1868 due to the ratification of
the states (Gates, 2011). This amendment led to a major debacle as Southern Democrats did not view freed slaves as citizens of the United States (Anderson, 1988). In fact, Democrats rejected the notion or idea of former slaves having any rights, especially citizenship rights. The implementation and enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment intended to set a precedent after the Civil War to establish equality for Blacks, including education in the south. This amendment is the foundation to separate but equal desegregation litigation. The main component of this amendment that is relevant to legal battles of desegregation in higher education is detailed as follows:

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without the due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. (U.S. Constitution. amendment. XIV, § 1)

Even though the amendment states that individuals cannot be denied equal protection of the law, rights afforded to Blacks as a result of the Fourteenth Amendment were continuously violated, especially regarding education; however, the Constitution and legal bases for pursuing an equal education were mandated via the Equal Protection Clause (Butler, 1994). A main component of the Fourteenth Amendment is the Equal Protection Clause, which is relevant to higher education desegregation litigation because states cannot create or enforce laws that racially discriminate (Butler, 1994).

Educational access for Blacks grew significantly after the passing of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. One of the first pieces of legislation that built a pathway to higher education for Blacks, all Americans – include the vast majority who
were enslaved at that time - was the Morrill Act. The Morrill Act of 1862 “established a complex partnership” between the federal government and state (Thelin, 2011, p. 76). The federal government provided an incentive system for states to sell the land, but the proceeds had to be used for educational purposes (Thelin, 2011). Each state was allotted a portion of land based upon its number of congressmen. This act enabled states to sell the public lands and use the funds from the sale for educational purposes, specifically for purposes of educating students in the agricultural and mechanical arts, such as Alcorn State University, a public four-year institution in Mississippi (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). Although White-only public institutions in the South were the major result of the Morrill Act of 1862, one HBCU in Mississippi, today’s Alcorn State University, was founded as a land-grant in 1871 (O’Brien, personal communication, 1/21/16).

The Second Morrill Act of 1890 promoted an idea that a “separate education may be an equal education” (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994, p. 407). The act provided funds for the expansion and racial integration of existing colleges/universities or the establishment of “separate but equal” colleges. Funds were denied to tax-supported colleges that discriminated against or refused to provide separate but equal facilities for Blacks (Brown, 2001). However, the funding for Black institutions compared to White institutions was not equal in regard to budgets, facilities, and grounds (Samuels, 2004).

The Second Morrill Act led to the establishment of dual public land grant institutions in the former slave states. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) provided the only opportunity for Blacks in the South to have access to higher education (Taylor & Olswang, 1999). Even so, unequal division of funds limited equal educational opportunities. Resources provided for elementary and secondary education
were minimal and even scarcer for secondary education because many Whites wanted to “put Blacks in their proper place” (Samuels, 2004, p. 33). Samuels (2004) asserted that southerners believed that withholding education from Blacks would maintain their status as the inferior race. Educating Blacks might overthrow the racial caste system in the South. Limiting resources to HBCUs hampered those institutions’ ability to compete with Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). In addition to unequal funding, curricula at HBCUs were restricted for similar reasons (Samuels, 2004).

After the Civil War, education for Blacks focused on industrial training. In the 1890s, Booker T. Washington, a former slave, persuaded many Blacks to pursue industrial, technical, and vocational training. Washington founded Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute and became well respected in both the Black and White community by assuring Whites that Blacks first needed practical training in health living, work habits, and obedience and later, belonged in technical or vocational careers and not in educational or professional careers. In contrast, W.E.B. Dubois, co-founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and civil rights activist, is known for publicly opposing Washington’s “Atlanta Compromise” (Anderson, 1988). This agreement stated that industrial training was more valuable for Blacks than obtaining higher education degrees. Dubois’s biggest criticism of Washington was that the former slave was not fighting for Black equality in education. In contrast to Washington, Dubois believed too much emphasis on industrial, vocational, and technical training would continue White oppression (Rudwick, 2015).

The “separate but equal” doctrine became final in the Supreme Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). Homer Plessy, a man of mixed races consistently mistaken for
White, was arrested for riding in a “Whites only” train car. As a planned challenge by Black professors at Straight College, Plessy purposefully violated Louisiana’s segregation law (Thomas, 1997). The Supreme Court heard Plessy’s case. During the court hearing, it was argued that Plessy’s Fourteenth Amendment rights had been violated. The Supreme Court ruled that as long as facilities were equal, Blacks and Whites could be separated and that this did not violate the constitution. In reality, these separate facilities were not equal, at the time of the decision and, as time would show, were not made equal in the decades that followed (O’Brien, personal communication, 1/21/16), leading to the second phase of higher education desegregation: separate is inherently unequal. According to Gates (2011), the Supreme Court’s decision of Plessy “once again set the Constitution on the side of racism and injustice” (p. 203).

Separate Is Inherently Unequal

The idea that separate is inherently unequal began in the 1930s and focused on three Supreme Court cases that influenced higher education desegregation: *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950), *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents* (1950), and *Brown v. Board of Education Topeka* (1954). This phase also included the GI Bill, a significant legislative act. According to Stefkovich and Leas (1994), this phase of desegregation is characterized by Blacks seeking enrollment at PWIs and the courts’ beginning to question the separate but equal doctrine.

The federal government introduced the GI Bill in 1944 as a means of offering federal financial aid to veterans of World War II, including Black veterans. When Blacks attempted to benefit from their GI Bill funds, the “empowered” Whites that staffed the agency often denied them (Humes, 2006, p. 106). The bill originally did not racially
discriminate; however, the southern White society created barriers that hindered Blacks’ use of the funds. Namely, Blacks were not allowed to use GI Bill funds to pursue education at PWIs; the aid was only acceptable at HBCUs (JBHE Foundation, Inc., 2003). The Veterans Administration took the Booker T. Washington stance on the education of Blacks, believing that Blacks would not benefit from a liberal arts degree and should enroll at a technical or vocational school (Anderson, 1988).

*Sweatt v. Painter* (1950) ruled against the separate but equal doctrine in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). Sweatt applied to the University of Texas Law School, was denied admission based upon race, and consequently filed suit against the university for violating the Equal Protection Clause under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court, and the University of Texas was forced to admit Sweatt. This case laid the groundwork for *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954).

After the decision of *Sweatt v. Painter*, federal courts mandated the admission of Black students to major state universities; however, a majority of the southern states did not adhere to the mandate. Instead, they continued to use race as a consideration within the admission process, which resulted in more litigation (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994; *Sweatt v. Painter*, 1950; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981).

In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents* (1950), the University of Oklahoma’s graduate school initially denied George McLaurin’s admission because Oklahoma law prohibited the instruction of White and Black students in the same classroom. McLaurin sued the Oklahoma State Board of Regents and based his argument on violation of Fourteenth Amendment rights. University of Oklahoma administrators then admitted McLaurin but provided him a separate desk outside of the classroom, a separate desk in

In 1954, educational desegregation was tested again in the ruling of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954). This desegregation case concerned students who would attend racially segregated schools, regardless of the location of the elementary and secondary schools. A parent of a third grader stated that their child had to walk six blocks to the school bus stop and then another 1.6 miles to their segregated elementary school, while the White school was only seven blocks away. Brown was a class-action suit that combined four cases in the South and Border States into one. Overruling lower federal courts the Supreme Court held that even if segregated Black and White schools were equal in all aspects, the actual separation of the races was detrimental to Black students’ education. This landmark case declared that racially segregated K-12 education was unconstitutional and overturned the Plessy v. Ferguson decision. The Supreme Court ruling on Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka concluded that “separate education facilities are inherently unequal” (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981, p. 2).

The Clark Doll test, created by Kenneth and Mamie Phipps Clark, served as an instrumental piece of evidence in the Brown decision as it demonstrated the psychological effects segregation had on children, such as self-hatred and feelings of inferiority. The doll test asked children to select a doll that most resembled them and to describe it. Children from a segregated school identified an Black doll as bad and a White doll as good. As a result of the test, the Supreme Court concluded that racial segregation created harmful thinking in children (Gibbons & Van Nort, 2009).
Nevertheless, racial separation and discrimination remained a controversial issue in higher education, particularly in the former slave states as they continued to operate dual systems of higher education.

Dismantling Dual Systems

The third phase of higher education desegregation referenced in Stefkovich and Leas (1994) is the dismantlement of dual systems. This phase began with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and *Adams v. Richardson* (1973) and continued with *United States v. Fordice* (1992), all of which had the intent of supporting educational access for Blacks. President Truman implemented the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to eliminate discrimination and guarantee desegregation. This act guaranteed that “No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Civil Rights Act, 1964).

According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1981), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964 had the potential to make the greatest impact on higher education, as states not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could lose federal funding; however, this issue did not stop most of the former slave states from continuing to operate segregated higher education systems. To satisfy requirements of the CRA of 1964, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), was tasked to enforce dismantling dual systems by threatening to eliminate federal funding. Dismantling was directed at elementary and secondary education starting in 1964. Not until 1969 was dismantling examined in higher education. Ten states were identified as operating dual systems of higher
education—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Due to HEW’s failure to carry out its Title VI of the CRA responsibilities, a series of suits were filed (Taylor & Olswang, 1999; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981).

*Adams v. Richardson* (1972) tested the issue of how long it would take HEW to terminate federal funds. HEW requested states to submit state-wide plans for desegregation and dismantling. Between 1969 and 1970, HEW found that the former slave states discussed above operated dual systems of higher education, which was a direct violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Butler, 1994; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). HEW and the federal courts finally “took a unified stand behind the law” to oppose southern resistance against desegregation by ordering the deconstruction of dual systems of higher education or federal funding would be terminated (Edelman, 1973, p. 32). Federal funding, however, was never terminated, and dual systems continued to operate. The ten states that were identified as operating dual systems of higher education were sent individual letters providing them with acceptable desegregation plan requirements. Out of the ten states, only eight submitted plans. Louisiana refused to submit a plan, and HEW deemed Mississippi’s plan unacceptable (Sansing, 1990; Taylor & Olswang, 1999; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). The Southern states, specifically Louisiana, Alabama, Tennessee, and Mississippi, experienced federal lawsuits filed for noncompliance and violation of Title VI of the Civil Right Act of 1964. These particular four states each had a higher education desegregation law suit rendered by the Supreme Court, but each Supreme Court ruling was significantly different.
When *Brown* was rendered for K-12 education, advocates believed that this landmark case was a stepping-stone to dismantling segregation in higher education as well. However, *Brown* failed to enforce racial desegregation in Southern higher education. As a result of Mississippi’s noncompliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a lawsuit was filed against the state for operating dual systems of higher education: *United States v. Fordice* (1992).

**History of *United States v. Fordice* (1992)**

In January 1975, Jake Ayers, Sr., father of Jackson State University student Jake Ayers, Jr., filed suit with the United States District Court in Mississippi on behalf of his son and 20 other Black students. This case, known as *Ayers and U.S. v. Waller*, (1975), charged the State of Mississippi for unequal academics and facilities at the HBCUs Alcorn State University, Jackson State University, and Mississippi Valley State University compared to the five PWIs: Delta State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University for Women, University of Mississippi, and The University of Southern Mississippi (Gilreath, 1998; Taylor & Olswang, 1999). The case changed name due to governors: *Ayers and U.S. v. Waller* (1975), *Ayers v. Allain* (Ayers I – 1987; II- 1990; III – 1990), *Ayers v. Mabus* (1991), and then *Ayers v. Fordice* and *United States v. Fordice* (1992) (Cooper, 2004; Gilreath, 1998; Samuels, 2004). The suit however, remained dormant for 12 years from its initial filing in 1975 until Ayers I in 1987. In 1986, one year prior to the court trial, Jake Ayers, Sr. died, and his wife, Lillian, assumed the main plaintiff’s position in the case. Both parties attempted to achieve a consensual resolution outside of court by attempting to voluntarily dismantle the dual systems. However, by 1987, both parties were unable to come to an agreement on how to
or dismantle the dual system and went to trial. Aside from Ayers, Sr.’s death, the remaining plaintiffs had left the state except for Bennie Thompson, U.S. Representative, and Lillian Ayers, Ayers Sr.’s wife (Williams, 2005). With the loss of the original plaintiffs, the intentions of the suit changed over time and influenced how the case was rendered (Biggers, 1995; Taylor & Olswang, 1999; Williams, 2005).

United States District Judge Neal A. Biggers, Jr. of Oxford, Mississippi, dismissed the suit on December 11, 1987. Judge Biggers wrote:

The court finds that current actions on the part of the defendants demonstrate conclusively that the defendants are fulfilling their affirmative duty to invalidate the former de jure segregated system of higher education. The defendants have adopted race-neutral policies and procedures in the areas of student admission and recruitment and in the areas of faculty and staff hiring and resource allocation...The differentiation made by the defendants with respect to each of the individual institutions in the designation of institutional missions are reasonable and were not motivated by discriminatory purpose. (Ayers v. Allain, 1987, p. 1564)

The United States District Court claimed that Mississippi concluded that the defendants were fulfilling their affirmative duty to dismantle dual systems of higher education in Mississippi. Five days later, the Mississippi chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) appealed Biggers’ verdict to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Fifth Circuit Court overturned the district court’s decision on February 6, 1990. On September 28, 1990, the Fifth Circuit Court overturned the three judge panels’ ruling and dismissed the case.
The court stated:

The roots of de jure segregation were spread all over and the branches of this poisonous tree provided shadows over areas where Brown was supposed to usher in rays of sunshine…perception of inferiority regarding Black students and their institutions remains. (Ayers v. Allain II, 1990, p. 752)

The court ordered affirmative action efforts but did not mandate equal funding, admissions standards, or academic program allocation (Kaplin & Lee, 1997). Equal funding and academic program allocation were included in the original defense by the state in the Ayers case. Lillian Ayers’s and Bennie Thompsons’s attorney, Alvin Chambliss of Oxford, filed a writ of certiorari on December 17, 1990 requesting the United States Supreme Court to hear the suit. On April 15, 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court approved the request. This marked the first instance, since McLaurin, that the Supreme Court heard a higher education desegregation case. As the State of Mississippi was the defendant and Kirk Fordice was governor, the Supreme Court case became known as United States v. Fordice (Gilreath, 1998).

On June 26, 1992, the Supreme Court ruled eight to one that Mississippi’s public four-year universities were operating dual systems, and the state continued to violate the constitution by maintaining illegally segregated higher education (Ellis, 1995; Gilreath, 1998). The Supreme Court criticized the lower court’s legal reasoning and mandated that Mississippi end segregation at its eight public four-year institutions by implementing the following four vestiges: (1) admissions standards, (2) program duplication, (3) institutional mission statement, and (4) reorganization and operation of the eight public institutions (United States v Fordice, 1992). Once the Supreme Court formulated its
decision, the ruling was sent back to the U.S. District Court for Judge Neal Bigger, Jr. to implement.

Of the four vestiges, the plaintiffs repeatedly questioned and appealed the revised admissions requirements for all eight public institutions as the new requirements would deny more Blacks than the old requirements due to the ACT/SAT score requirement (Boone, 1999; Gilreath, 1998; Williams, 2005). At the time of the rendering, the average ACT score for Blacks was seven, and Whites’ average ACT score was 18 (Biggers, 1995).

On March 7, 1995, after a ten-week trial and ten-month deliberation, Judge Biggers affirmed the Supreme Court’s decision that Mississippi continued “lingering vestiges of segregation in the state’s higher education system” (Gilreath, 1998, p. 237). Biggers issued a Remedial Decree for the state to eliminate any vestiges from the prior system (Gilreath, 1998). Biggers established new uniform admissions standards, which were no longer based solely on test scores. The Institute of Higher Learning (IHL) Board’s plan for new admission requirements included high school grade point average, high school course curriculum, and ACT or SAT test scores, along with a stronger summer remedial program (Summer Developmental Program) to prepare at-risk students for college work. This program would be built into the revised admissions requirements in order to improve graduation rates (Kanengiser, 1994).

It was believed that integrating other factors into the admissions decision process would level the playing field among applicants (Williams, 2005). Basing the admissions standards assessment on several factors, rather than just test scores, removed many of the cultural bias problems associated with standardized testing that negatively impacted
Black students (Biggers, 1995; Kanengiser, 1996). In addition to the new requirements, the plan provided remedial assistance for students who did not meet the regular admissions criteria. The final admissions requirements approved by Biggers ordered that entering freshmen had to possess one of the following grade point/test score combinations in order to be admitted to any of the four-year public institutions in Mississippi: (1) a 3.2 high school grade point average with any ACT score, (2) a 2.5 grade point average and a score of 16 or 17, or (3) a 2.0 grade point average and a score of 18. Students failing to meet the new standards would have the opportunity to enroll in a summer remedial program, otherwise known as the Mississippi SDP. Students who successfully completed the SDP would gain admission to one of the public four-year institutions in Mississippi. The new standards were consistently challenged by plaintiffs, who claimed that the new standards were too rigorous; therefore, they strongly advocated against them (Gilreath, 1998; Williams, 2005).

On October 22, 1996, Judge Biggers received a College Board proposal to address the Supreme Court ruling. Biggers also established a monitoring committee of three disinterested persons with higher education experience to monitor the implementation of the Remedial Decree’s terms and obligations (Kanengiser, 1998). On April 23, 1997, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals agreed that the new admissions policies and process and the SDP were “educationally sound” (Gilreath, 1998, p. 239). In 1998, Biggers appointed Dr. Jerry Boone to monitor the case and help carry out the rulings (Kanengiser, 1998). After much deliberation, discussion, and disagreement, Biggers signed the 503 million-dollar Ayers Settlement Agreement in 2001, which provided financial support to the Summer Developmental Program, as well as other academic programs and facility
improvements at Mississippi’s HBCUs in order to increase the enrollment of minorities. This concluded the two-decade desegregation case (Kanengiser, 1998). The settlement primarily focused on accomplishing a “full, complete and final settlement of this controversy” (Thompson, 2001, p. 1). This agreement did not provide any further details regarding admissions requirements or the SDP. Mississippi’s IHL is currently charged with the responsibility of assuring that all eight four-year institutions in the State of Mississippi are adhering to the admissions standards (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015).

Creation of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning

As previously mentioned, the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) is the governing board for all of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Initially, separate and autonomous college boards controlled state-funded higher education since the end of Reconstruction and contributed to the continuation of segregation in Mississippi (Sansing, 1990). Prior to 1910, each of Mississippi’s four-year public institutions of higher learning—University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, Alcorn State University, and Mississippi University for Women—was governed by its own separate board of trustees and the governor-appointed board members for each board (Gilreath, 1998; Heindl, 1993; Sansing, 1990). However, this structure board did not include the state teacher colleges. In 1910, the Mississippi legislature consolidated these boards into one single board in order to govern and provide enhanced coordination between colleges and universities and to decrease costly duplication. The state’s teacher college boards were not included in this consolidation at
that time. In 1928, Governor Bilbo was given control over IHL by the board members (Heindl, 1993).

In 1944, all public senior institutions, including all teacher colleges, were governed by one board named the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (Lucas, 1967). The board members were compromised of 13 members appointed by the governor. In 1950, IHL gave the PWI presidents authority to admit or deny applicants to their institution. From 1965-67, IHL developed an admissions policy that required a minimum score on the ACT at all institutions with the minimum score depending on the institution (Heindl, 1993). Soon after the decision was mandated to admit the first Black to the University of Mississippi, James Meredith, Mississippi State University, University of Mississippi, and The University of Southern Mississippi changed their admission policy to require freshmen to achieve a minimum ACT of 15. Even through the mid-70’s IHL policy still required students to take and submit ACT scores to be considered for admission, each institution adopted their own procedures in regard to using the ACT scores (Heindl, 1993). Therefore, the PWIs continued to require an ACT that was higher than the average ACT for Blacks, 15 compared to nine. In 1973, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) requested that all former slave states dismantle their dual systems of higher education (Taylor & Olswang, 1999; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). M. M. Roberts, president of the IHL Board of Trustees at the time of HEW’s request, initially chose not to respond to HEW’s order (Sansing, 1990). When Roberts finally did respond, HEW did not accept his plan to dismantle the dual systems (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981). The disregard of HEW’s request and failure to comply with the CRA led to *Fordice.*
History of the Summer Developmental Program

The Associate Commissioner of Academic Affairs for IHL, Dr. Charles Pickering, established the Summer Remedial Program, now known as the Summer Developmental Program (SDP). The initial program was known as “Project 95” and was a “vehicle designed to bridge the gap between high school and college and to make more accessible to minorities higher education without weakening admissions requirements” (Biggers, 1995, p. 13). The historical document did not describe how the initial program acquired its name of “Project 95.” Dr. Hunter Boylan, director of The National Center for Developmental Education at Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina, was asked to testify as an expert witness in the Fordice trial and provide recommendations concerning the remedial program due to his background and knowledge of developmental education at HBCUs and PWIs (Biggers, 1995).

Screening for admission to one of the eight public four-year institutions begins in the spring of a student’s senior year in high school. The student is administered the ACCUPLACER test, which is a diagnostic test produced by The College Board, a non-profit organization that promotes success of college-bound students (College Board, n.d.). Additional student data are collected via counselor interviews and ACT/SAT subtest scores. Students must complete this “academic screening process” designed by the IHL to determine whether they will benefit from remediation, and if so, what remediation the student will need to better prepare him or her for college (Biggers, 1995, p. 102). According to Dr. Boylan, the ACCUPLACER is a cognitive assessment instrument that measures intellect and records student characteristics (Biggers, 1995). The spring screening process considers additional factors, such as the person’s skills and abilities.
Primarily, four-year institutions in the United States with open-door admission policies use this process. The ACCUPLACER is designed to identify student deficiencies in certain curricular. It is not designed to be a screening instrument or a component of an admission process, but rather as a placement device (Biggers, 1995; College Board, n.d.). However, the ACCUPLACER was adopted regardless of how it was designed. Once data are gathered from the ACCUPLACER, the student is enrolled in either the remedial program or freshman curricula, with or without academic support (Biggers, 1995).

The Summer Developmental Program (SDP) consists of approximately nine to ten weeks and is available to students who indicate a need for remediation after screening. The SDP is an intensive program that concentrates on high school subject areas (writing, reading, mathematics) that are essential to success in first-year college courses (Biggers, 1995). At the end of the program, students are tested again with the ACCUPLACER to determine progress made between entry and exit and the extent to which the student has mastered the required material. Students who successfully complete the program are admitted to one of the four-year public institutions of their choice with mandatory participation in the Year-Long Academic Support Program during their freshman year (Biggers, 1995). Following the SDP, participating students who successfully completed the SDP enter college with a moderate amount of academic support services or with a lighter course load (i.e. developmental courses) coupled with a greater amount of support services. Otherwise, students who do not successfully complete the SDP are counseled to explore other educational alternatives, such as a community/junior college, four-year private institutions in Mississippi, or out-of-state colleges/universities (Biggers, 1995). While developmental courses and the ACCUPLACER have been tested elsewhere in the
United States, until the *Fordice* ruling, the program had not been implemented as a complete and comprehensive system. The ACCUPLACER had only been pilot-tested in a few Mississippi high schools; however, at the time of the trial, an analysis and evaluation of the SDP had not been initiated (Biggers, 1995; Kanengiser, 1995; Williams, 2005).

The Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) inspired Federal TRIO Programs (TRIO), which led to a program known as Upward Bound. TRIO programs were created to address access and retention issues stemming from cultural barriers within higher education. These programs were established as a part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty campaign, which included the Educational Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA), the same year as the Civil Rights Act. The most well-known TRIO program is Upward Bound (UB), which serves historically underrepresented groups (Council for Opportunity in Education, n.d.).

The ultimate purpose of UB is to increase higher education graduation rates of targeted high school students by providing academic counseling, tutoring services, work study programs, and counseling services, along with cultural and social enrichment components, such as activities or events underrepresented participants may not otherwise experience due to their socioeconomic status, during the summer at an institution of higher learning (Council for Opportunity in Education, n.d.; McElroy & Armesto, 1998). In addition, most Upward Bound programs provide participants with a college experience through a summer program at an institution of higher learning (Council for Opportunity in Education, n.d.). During the following semesters, participants have access to weekly tutorial and mentoring services (McElroy & Armesto, 1998).
Summary

Blacks have received a different and inferior education in the South for well over two centuries. This segregation can be studied by distinct phases: (1) separate but equal; (2) separate is inherently unequal; and (3) dismantling dual systems (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). After the Civil War, racial discrimination was a widespread practice in the South. White southerners believed that educating Blacks would overthrow the region’s racial caste system; as such, limiting educational opportunities for Blacks was deemed the solution. When the initial suit that would become the *Fordice* case was filed in 1975, the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964 had been in existence for eleven years. Compared to other regions in the United States, the South was the last to accept desegregation and only accepted it due to government mandates and lawsuits (Taylor, 2009).

In the 1970s and 1980s, the South consistently ignored legislation that provided rights to Blacks (Tate, 1997). The Second Morrill Act of 1890, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, and *Adams v. Richardson* (1973) threatened to cut off federal funds to institutions that did not comply with desegregation, but none of these threats came to fruition. The South’s overarching negative stance on desegregation explains why it has taken the region so long to comply with legislation that supported Black rights. According to Biggers (1995), the defendants tried vigorously to incorporate standards that would provide equal access without compromising the standards of the post-secondary system. The purpose of this research was to determine if the admissions vestige, the Summer Developmental Program, did, in fact, create an alternative route that provided equal access compared to prior admission standards. Just as important, this study attempted to
determine if the new standards, specifically the SDP, were operating according to the Supreme Court’s 1992 mandate.
CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF THE SUMMER DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM | LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provided a description of the Summer Developmental Program (SDP). This review included a discussion of summer bridge programs in other states and compared those programs to the SDP. Research on the outcomes of these programs were provided along with an historical overview of the SDP and a review of the literature and research related to summer bridge programs and the SDP from the *Fordice* case. The literature review addressed pertinent areas, such as summer bridge programs at other institutions that are similar to the SDP, prior research on Upward Bound and summer bridge programs, and prior research on the SDP, to demonstrate the gap in the literature.

Description of the Summer Developmental Program

The SDP in Mississippi is an intensive nine-week program designed to prepare undergraduate students for success during their first year of college coursework (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). The program was implemented as a result of the *United States v. Fordice* (1992) admission vestige. Each of the eight public four-year institutions of higher learning in Mississippi were required to provide a SDP for students who do not meet conditions for regular admission to a state-funded college or university, including those who did not demonstrate college readiness through a spring screening process (ACCUPLACER) during their senior year of high school (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). The District Court’s reasoning for the creation of the SDP was primarily to provide greater access to and opportunity at Mississippi’s public universities.
for Blacks as the state’s response to the Supreme Court’s admission vestige (Biggers, 1995).

The design of the SDP focuses on high school subject areas (writing, reading, mathematics) that are crucial to success in first-year college curricula. Students who participate in the SDP are admitted to a state college or university under the status *Full Admission with Academic Deficiencies* (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). Students who successfully complete the SDP are allowed to continue their enrollment into the fall term with mandatory participation in the Year-Long Academic Support Program during their freshman year. Students who do not successfully complete the SDP are counseled to explore other post-secondary opportunities, including those offered by community colleges (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). The cost to students enrolled in the program is regular full-semester tuition plus the costs of required study materials. A student may apply for financial aid to assist in paying for the program by filling out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA); a grant is also available through the State of Mississippi (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015).

**Description of Select Summer Bridge Programs Similar to the Summer Developmental Program**

Summer bridge programs in higher education generally have the goal to assist students with the transition from high school to college (Cabrera et al., 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011). However, requirements for entrance into summer bridge programs differ based upon each institution’s program and admissions requirements (Cabrera et al., 2013).
Generally, a student may enroll in a summer bridge program if they are provisionally admitted into a college or university; however, their continued admission would be contingent upon meeting additional requirements set forth by their institution. Examples of additional requirements may include, but are not limited to, the number of hours enrolled for a semester, a minimum grade point average for a particular semester, mandatory study hours, and/or completion of certain remedial classes. The following is a review of select summer bridge programs and a discussion of how they compare with the SDP in Mississippi. Each program presented is from a four-year institution and has provisional admission requirements used in conjunction with a summer bridge program. These programs were selected because the SDP has provisional admission requirements and is similar to a summer bridge program. The selected programs were compared and contrasted to the Mississippi SDP characteristics. Other state programs were not be examined or compared because this study is limited to the SDP that was created through a higher education desegregation case. These institutions discussed share the same goal: to provide transition to college for academically underprepared, first-generation, or low income (or any combination) students. Unlike the SDP, these summer bridge programs were not created as a result of a higher education desegregation case; therefore, these institutions do not necessarily focus on equal education access for minorities or ethnicities as the SDP does.

Examples of Summer Bridge Programs

California State University – St. Stanislaus (CSU) extends provisional admission to entering freshman who do not meet traditional admission requirements. Admission to CSU’s summer bridge program requires the student to apply, and selection is based on
the student meeting the following criteria: California resident, first-time freshman at CSU, undergraduate with low family income, educational disadvantage, and income level (The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, 2013).

Similar to CSU – St. Stanislaus, Hampton University in Virginia offers a summer pre-college program to entering freshmen who do not meet admission requirements. Hampton invites students who do not meet these requirements to attend the program, and students are admitted to the university pending “successful” completion of the program. “The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education” (2013) defines success as students completing the two required courses with a grade of ‘C’ or better.

McNeese State University in Louisiana does not offer provisional admission to its entering freshmen, but it does offer a summer bridge program to those who do not meet traditional admission requirements if they meet one of the following requirements instead: ACT test score of 20, 2.0 grade point average, or sub-score of 19 on ACT in English or Math. The institution selects students to participate in the program (Vinson, 2008). Similarly, the University of Texas at San Antonio offers provisional admission to entering freshmen and invites a select group of students to participate in its Academic Developmental Program (The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, 2013). Similarly, Fayetteville State University in North Carolina offers provisional admission through the Creating Higher Expectations for Educational Readiness (CHEERS) summer bridge program. Qualifying students are identified via an application process (The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, 2013).
Florida State University has a Center for Academic Retention and Enhancement (CARE) program. This program monitors year-to-year changes of its bridge participants, studies the impact of different interventions on student outcomes, analyzes data for different student populations, and continuously inquires about program improvements. CARE, unlike the SDP, offers admission standards for low-income, first-generation students compared to them having to meet traditional FSU admission requirements with the condition that they agree to participate in an academic support program that begins the summer before they enter college and extends throughout their freshman and sophomore years (McGlynn, 2008).

Similar to the Florida State University CARE Program, the summer bridge programs discussed were primarily implemented to assist low-income, academically underprepared, minority students. Most summer bridge programs are intentional rather than a vestige from a desegregation higher education case. All of the previously referenced programs differ from the SDP in Mississippi in that participation is limited to students who are either selected or identified to participate and participation is optional. In contrast, the SDP is open to all entering freshmen who do not meet admission requirements and have not successfully passed the ACCUPLACER. In general, summer bridge programs were implemented to assist academically underprepared, first generation, and low-income students transitioning to college from high school (Cabrera et al., 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011). The SDP, in contrast, stems from a vestige in the Fordice case to provide another route to higher education for Blacks (Biggers, 1995).
Existing Research on Summer Bridge Programs

A review of literature revealed that there was limited research on summer bridge programs, and the research that does exist was individualized to specific institutions because of the uniqueness of the program studied (Barnett et al., 2012; Kezar, 2000). This chapter reviewed the scant literature on summer bridge programs at higher education institutions and Upward Bound (UB) programs, which were incorporated into this study as the SDP was founded using its principles (Biggers, 1995). UB provides support to low-income, first generation students to help them succeed in high school, prepares them for the transition to college, and attempts to increase college enrollment and graduation rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). The following SDP criteria was used to identify commonalities and differences between summer bridge programs and the SDP:

- First, were summer bridge program participants invited or selected, or was the program open to its participants? SDP is open to all students who do not meet freshman admission requirements at one of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi (Biggers, 1995).

- Second, did the study report retention rates of its bridge participants, and, if so, were the findings significant? Did the study report graduation rates of SDP participants, and if so, were the findings significant?

- Third, is race incorporated into the literature, and if so, how?

- Fourth, what are the intentions or goals of the summer bridge programs?

These four items were selected because they are key determinants of what set the SDP apart from other summer bridge programs, and this study focused on retention and graduation rates of the SDP. The literature reviewed primarily focuses on summer bridge
programs at institutions of higher learning to identify any commonalities and differences between summer bridge programs and the Mississippi SDP using the criteria described above.

As mentioned earlier, UB programs were reviewed as the SDP was founded using its principles (Biggers, 1995). McLure and Child (1998) compared participants in UB who completed the ACT to non-UB students from 1997 to 1998. Participants were selected who were a part of UB and had taken the ACT in 1997 and 1998. This study examined underprepared students to determine if they were admissible to college if they attended UB; however, the study did not examine students’ retention and graduation rates. Similar to other studies reviewed, this study did not primarily focus on ethnicity but instead compared the demographics, majors, family income, and ACT scores of participants. Results of the study demonstrated that the UB group had nearly four times as many African-American students compared to the non-UB group (38.6% to 10.1%) and that the average ACT composite score was higher for non-UB than UB students (21.04 vs. 18.37) (McLure & Child, 1998).

Garcia and Paz’s (1991) study illustrated the process and impact of one summer bridge program that targeted academically underprepared students at California State University (CSU). This study identified participants who might be at high risk of dropping out early. Students were considered at risk if they had scored low on nationally standardized tests, were first-generation college students, or were from low-income backgrounds (Garcia & Paz, 1991). The summer bridge program that Garcia and Paz studied was intended to assist summer bridge participants with their transition to college. This program selected students with certain characteristics, such as a high risk for
dropping out, and provided them provisional acceptance to the institution with the requirement they participate in the summer bridge program. Garcia and Paz (1991) found no significant difference in retention rates for the summer bridge program participants (.769) when compared to the CSU student population (.773); however, program participants were retained at a rate similar to the rest of the study. Garcia and Paz (1991) concluded that summer bridge programs succeed if they are able to retain underprepared students. This study did not examine graduation rates of its participants.

Santa Rita and Bacota (1997) published a study that determined the effects of a summer bridge program on the academic, personal, and social development of minority and low-income students during their first-year at Bronx Community College (BCC). The College Discovery Pre-Freshman Summer Program at BCC is a six-week intensive program designed to acclimate students already accepted for admission to BCC prior to their first semester. Santa Rita and Bacota (1997) collected attitudinal and academic data on the program participants. Based on grade point average after the first semester and persistence rates, students’ academic performance at BCC following the summer program was an excellent indicator of how successfully this program prepared students to face the academic challenges and rigors of college life. There was a significant difference in retention rates of summer bridge program participants (93%) when compared to the entire BCC campus population (87%). Participant demographics were reported, but race was not included as a variable in the study. This study did not disclose how the participants were selected, nor did it examine graduation rates. It did, however, examine retention rates (Santa Rita & Bacota, 1997).
Carroll, Tyson, and Lumas (2000) also conducted a study relevant to the Mississippi SDP. The researchers did not focus on summer bridge programs, but they did report information pertaining to Blacks who were denied college admission after admission requirements were changed due to a federal affirmative action case, *University of California v. Bakke* (1978). Although individuals of minority status generally filed affirmative action cases of this era, it is important to note that *Bakke* originated with a White plaintiff who had applied to the UC-Davis medical school. The purpose of Carroll and colleagues’ (2000) study was to determine the influence of race and racism on affirmative action at UCB after *Bakke*. The sample size of the study was 18 and included UCB alumni who were low-income California residents. The study used demographics, SAT, and grade point average, along with face-to-face interviews, to make inferences about the hypotheses (Carroll et al., 2000). In 1987, a committee revised UCB’s admission policies to require the use of a formula for admission decisions. These new policies reemphasized SAT and grade point average; in 1998, admission requirements were changed again in response to a race-blind admission policy (Carroll et al., 2000). The new admission policies were more stringent with regard to consideration of quantitative scores. As a result, the number of new admits from underrepresented minority groups decreased by 50% (Carroll et al., 2000). This study illustrated how the revised admission requirements from a court case denied Blacks access to higher education. Even though this study did not examine a summer bridge program, it shares similarities with this present study of the SDP because the changes were prompted by a court order in an effort to address equal access and opportunity in higher education by
revising admission standards that denied more Blacks entrance into higher education (Biggers, 1995).

All summer bridge programs attempt to provide academic assistance to students entering college in the fall of their freshman year; however, the focus of each bridge program varies in regard to specific missions and goals (Kezar, 2000). Kezar’s (2000) study concluded that summer bridge programs are helpful in assisting students’ transition to college. According to Kezar (2000), the main point of summer bridge programs is to retain developmental students and “provide them an equal footing” with non-SDP participants (p.1). Kezar (2000) also reported that few studies on summer bridge programs utilize control groups; therefore, findings from these studies are not comparative. Kezar referenced a summer bridge study completed by York and Tross (1994). This study evaluated a summer bridge program that assisted minority students’ adjustment to college. York and Tross (1994) determined that these programs ultimately assist with students’ transition to college, but they do not increase retention in summer bridge participants.

Vinson (2008) completed a study on two summer bridge programs in Louisiana, Northwestern State University and McNeese State University. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between participation in the summer bridge programs, grade point averages, and retention of first-year students using archival data (Vinson, 2008). Data were collected from Northwestern State University and McNeese State University. Students participating in both summer bridge programs were invited to participate in the study. Research focused on determining if there were significant differences between summer bridge program participants and non-SDP participants in
terms of enrollment status, demographic variables, high school academic performance (high school grade point average and ACT) and grade point average (GPA) after the first semester of their first year of college. The study found no significant relationships between summer bridge participation, gender, race, high school GPA, ACT score, first semester GPA, first-year GPA, and retention. The study reported participant demographics, but it was not a variable in data analysis. The study did not investigate graduation rates, and there was no significant difference in the program participant retention rates nor did the study examine participation graduation rates (Vinson, 2008).

Walpole et al. (2008) conducted a study to examine how summer bridge participants transitioned to college using a mixed methods design. The researchers collected data from participants regarding their aspirations, as well as academic and social activities, and analyzed data regarding their academic progress. The study focused on summer bridge students who were conditionally admitted to an unnamed, public, four-year, predominantly White institution. Students were required to successfully complete the bridge program in order to enroll at the university in the fall. One of the study’s research questions related to the summer bridge program’s influence on students’ grade point average, attempted credits, earned credits, and retention rates compared to a control group of non-bridge program students admitted at the same time. The researchers employed a longitudinal design using surveys administered to participants attending a five-week summer bridge program in 2003. Along with survey data, institutional research about summer bridge cohort data was utilized. Walpole et al. (2008) reported that Blacks, Latinos, and students of low socioeconomic status continued to be underrepresented in higher education and continued to have lower retention rates than
their peers. These underrepresented students often found it difficult to gain access to higher education because they did not receive adequate information and support regarding college preparation, requirements, admission standards, and procedures (Walpole et al., 2008).

The findings of the study were supported by similar research that also found positive effects associated with bridge program participation, including higher grades, increased retention, and higher college completion rates than comparable nonparticipants (Walpole et al., 2008). According to Walpole et al. (2008), higher-than-expected retention rates may be the most important outcome of bridge programs. Results of the study indicated that between the fall and spring semesters of the 2003-2004 academic years, 90% of program participants were retained while 96% of the control group participants were retained. However, retention rates for participants’ (72%) were higher than the control group (69%) between the sophomore and junior years. Based on the reported retention rates, the researchers concluded that summer bridge programs were important to the retention of underrepresented students. Neither race nor ethnicity was reported in the study, nor did this study examine graduation rates (Walpole et al., 2008).

In the summer of 2008, Suziki (2009) conducted a study on the Pathways Summer Bridge Program at Arizona State University, which was piloted in 2006 but has not been located to date. The purpose of this study was to improve re-enrollment and retention rates of first generation and/or academically underprepared freshmen. The secondary purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the program’s design using a mixed method study (Suziki, 2009). The method incorporated pre- and post-program surveys based on program goals, as well as interviews. The study defined academically
underprepared students as students with a score of 18 or lower on the ACT. The study compared program participants to non-program participants for one calendar year, focusing primarily on factors of transition to college with little discussion of race or its role in summer bridge programs. Data regarding race were collected and reported but were not used a variable in the study. Retention and graduation rates were not evaluated for the participants (Suziki, 2009).

Similar to the Arizona State University summer bridge program, Barnett et al. (2012), Pretlow and Mitchell (2010), and Wathington, Pretlow, and Mitchell (2011) each conducted studies that focused on high school graduates in need of remediation at eight open access institutions in Texas. The purpose of the Texas program was to increase college readiness by providing an alternative to the traditional developmental coursework (Barnett et al., 2012). The program provided graduating high school seniors instruction in two academic areas to assist with the transition from high school to college. However, participation in the Texas summer bridge program was not a part of their conditional fall admission. Although each study was conducted at different times, each had a similar purpose: effectiveness of summer bridge programs in regard to retaining program participants. The eight institutions included in the above mentioned studies were two four-year institutions and six two-year institutions. Each higher education institution had approximately 52 to 165 participants. Participants were recruited to participate in the program based on eligible college placement scores (Wathington et al., 2011).

Even though this study did not examine graduation rates, it concluded that there was no difference or effect in persistence or college success as measured by fall semester grade point averages between participants of the randomized control group and
participants in the summer bridge program at each institution. Barnett et al. (2012) did not provide evidence on whether or not the Texas program influenced persistence, but suggested that the Texas program did not lead to increased persistence or overall academic course credit completion for the term. Barnett et al. (2012) suggested “that we should not expect to find long-term impacts… on persistence from a short, intensive summer program” (p. 3). This statement relates to the current study as the SDP is a nine-week intensive summer program. Pretlow and Mitchell (2010) suggested that current developmental education programs do not work well because developmental students are less likely to complete college. Pretlow and Mitchell’s (2010) study included race as a factor in their study. Among their sample, the largest group reported was Hispanic/Latino (84%). Ethnicity data were collected and described in the participant sample but not included as a variable in the study.

Strayhorn’s (2011) study included race as a variable in a study that measured the effect of required participation in a summer bridge program on students’ preparedness for college. The sample consisted of historically underrepresented students, specifically Blacks at a highly selective, predominantly White research university located in the southeastern United States. The study drew participants from a population of at-risk or academically underprepared students of which 63% were Black. This summer bridge program involved developmental courses designed to prepare students, both academically and socially, who were entering their first year of college. The purpose of this study was to measure the effect of participation in the summer bridge program on preparation for college in four areas: 1) academic self-efficacy, 2) sense of belonging, 3) academic skills, and 4) social skills. Strayhorn (2011) found that academic achievement prior to college
(i.e., high school grade point average) is a powerful predictor of success during the first fall term, even for low-income minority students who participated in the summer bridge program. However, retention and graduation rates were not examined in this study (Strayhorn, 2011).

Cabrera et al. (2013) conducted a longitudinal study on the New Start Summer Program (NSSP) at the University of Arizona. NSSP began in 1969 and remains open to all entering first-time, full-time freshmen; however, the majority of participants originate from traditionally underserved populations. This six-week program was created to help racial minorities, low-income, and first-generation college students’ transition into their first year of college. The program’s primary objective was to assist students in acclimating themselves to college while helping them develop academic skills to successfully navigate through higher education. The researchers analyzed first-year retention rates and first-year grade point averages of NSSP participants compared to students who were eligible for the program but did not participate for the years 1993-2009. Cabrera and colleagues (2013) attempted to measure the influence NSSP participation has on minority, low-income, and first-generation college students. The researchers determined that NSSP participation was a significant predictor of both first-year retention and GPA. However, this study did not examine graduation rates, and data related to race were not collected in this study (Cabrera et al., 2013).

As this review of developmental programs at various institutions of higher education revealed, research pertaining to summer bridge programs does exist. Nine of the 14 studies reviewed analyzed retention rates of program participants; however, none of these studies examined graduation rates of program participants. Out of the nine
studies that analyzed retention rates, only three found that participation in a summer bridge program made a significant difference regarding retention rates. Based on the literature reviewed, the reader can conclude that there is a gap in the literature in regard to examining graduation rates of summer bridge programs, as there is no published research regarding graduation rates of summer bridge program participants.

Comparing and Contrasting the Selected Summer Bridge Programs to the Summer Developmental Program

A comparison of summer bridge programs and the SDP, using the criteria mentioned earlier in this chapter, revealed several commonalities and differences. In light of the limited published literature about the SDP, information about similar summer bridge programs helps inform and frame the present study. The following provided a discussion of these programs’ goals, program participation, and examined retention and graduation rates. Identifying commonalities and differences was important to this study because it provided support of the lack of literature on the SDP.

**Program Goals**

A review of summer programs (reported earlier in this chapter) revealed that the primary goal of summer bridge programs is to assist academically underprepared students with their transition into college (Cabrera et al., 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011). It is important to understand how summer bridge programs influenced participant retention. These goals are not consistent with the goal of the SDP, which is to increase access for Blacks to higher education (Biggers, 1995).
Summer Bridge Participants

The SDP is open to all students who do not meet admission requirements to the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. The reviewed summer bridge programs invited, recruited, or otherwise selected students to participate except for one program, the University of Arizona – New Start Summer Program, which was open to all students. One study did not disclose how participants entered the program. Studies reviewed also included race but not as a variable. Only one study used race as a primary factor. Race played a role in this study because a majority of the SDP participants’ ethnicity is Black. This population was recorded as having an average ACT score of seven, which does not meet the required score of 16 for Mississippi four-year public institutions of higher education (Biggers, 1995). The SDP was created as a result of a Mississippi desegregation case; therefore, race was an important factor in this study and discussed further in later chapters. As race was an important factor, this study made use of Critical Race Theory to interpret the results of this study was presented in Chapter V.

Did Study Examine Retention or Graduation Data

This study examined graduation rates due to the lack of research on it, and it focused on whether or not SDP participants are successful in college. None of the studies reviewed included graduation rates of summer bridge program participants. This study also examined retention rates because there was a lack of research on it, and this study focused on whether or not SDP participants are successful in college. College success is often measured using retention and graduation rates. Sixty-four percent of the studies reviewed analyzed and reported retention rates (freshman to sophomore year) of summer bridge program participants (NCES, 2014).
Prior research on the Summer Developmental Program

Scholars are challenged to conduct empirical analyses of summer bridge programs to justify their existence, to inform stakeholders, and to make improvements to the programs for the benefit of its participants. The possibility that the outcome may suggest that programs are not effective also adds to such difficulties (Cabrera et al., 2013). Several studies report that there is limited research on summer bridge programs due to the uniqueness of each program (Garcia & Paz, 1991; Kezar, 2000; Strayhorn, 2011; Walpole et al., 2008). Similar to the limited research on summer bridge programs, there is scarce research on the Mississippi Summer Developmental Program. An investigation of the historical documents at the Mississippi Department of Archives and the University of Mississippi Archives (Dr. Jerry Boone collection) revealed that, out of the eight public four-year institutions of higher education in Mississippi, the University of Mississippi is the only institution that housed historical data on the SDP. More information on historical documentation was discussed in Chapter IV. In 1999, Dr. Boone requested a study to examine the effectiveness of the SDP as well as the Academic Support Program compared to former remediation practices. Boone’s investigation used a matched-pairs methodology, a process in which an equal number of students from one set of data is compared to an equal number of students from the other set of data and matched by common variables (Boone, 1999).

For this study, students were matched based on institution, age, sex, race, and ACT score; however, the University of Mississippi was not included in the study because there were no matches between the 1993 database (fall remediation group) and the 1996 database (Summer Developmental Program) (Boone, 1999). This study used three
measures: retention after two and half years, semester credit hours, and college grade point average (GPA). A t-test compared each measure between the 1993 remediation group and the 1996 SDP. The study does not indicate why there is a gap in the dates. Results indicated that the SDP outperformed the fall 1993 remedial group in all three measures. Boone’s study did not review graduation rates of SDP participants, and this study could be considered unreliable as it failed to include data from all institutions. The University of Mississippi was not included in the study because there were no matches in the databases. Also, the study compared groups of students from different time frames within the aforementioned. The two different groups were a 1993 remediation group and a 1996 Summer Developmental Program. The documents did not provide the academic status of the 1993 group, but we do know the how the 1996 was selected due to the standards of the case. Thorndike and Thorndike-Christ (2010) consider a study to be unreliable if any aspect of the data is inconsistent.

Another study attempted to determine the effectiveness of the Summer Developmental Program in early 1999 via a telephone survey. Subjects were randomly selected from a list of high school graduates who applied to Mississippi universities but were not admitted. Boone reported in his memo to Judge Neal Biggers, Jr., U.S. District court judge in Northern Mississippi, that he “wouldn’t put too much stock into it” because there were far too many inconsistent findings for the survey to be considered valid (Boone, 1999, p. 1). For example, 16 participants stated that they took the ACCUPLACER, but 28 stated they attended the SDP. In order for participants to participate in the SDP, they must have taken the ACCUPLACER first (Boone, 1999). Further, another example of an inconsistency is that 86% of participants interviewed
reported that they applied to a public four-year Mississippi institution while others reported that they had actually attended a public four-year Mississippi institution. The latter is fallible as the interviewees were inadmissible (Boone, 1999).

Contradictory to the 1999 report, on February 21, 2000, the court-appointed monitor Dr. Jerry Boone reported on the effectiveness of the SDP. He affirmed that the program was effective and should continue to operate in its current format (Boone, 2000). However, this report contradicts what was reported to Biggers in 1999 (Boone, 1999). Boone reported to Biggers that there were too many inconsistencies with the survey in 1999, but in 2000 he reported that the program was effective using the same data in the 1999 report. Despite this discrepancy, no documentation has been uncovered to explain the differing analyses between the 1999 and 2000 report. Ultimately, the plaintiff, Bennie Thompson, disagreed with the monitor’s conclusions and suggested additional information be provided for analysis. They considered the information unreliable because the program had not been implemented long enough for a researcher to make an informed decision about the effectiveness based on survey data. Boone (1998) indicated that the statistical evidence from the 1997 summer program report showed that the Mississippi SDP programs failed to achieve the intended goal of the case, an alternative route to admission, as fewer Black students qualified for admission under the revised standards.

This report was issued as an order by the fifth circuit court “directing the defendants to file a report on the results of the 1997 spring screening and summer remedial program” with the court’s comments on the report (Boone, 1998, p. 2). Moreover, in one section of the “United States’ Statement on Areas Remanded,” it was
declared that a subsection declared that the “spring placement and summer
developmental program is not remedying the reduction of Black students admitted to the
state system” (Boone, 1998, p. 5). The number of students identified and referred to
spring screening, as well as the number of students enrolling in the program, support this
critique. Out of the 27,852 freshmen applicants, only 424 students actually enrolled in
the SDP during the first two years (Boone, 1998).

Conceptual Dimensions of the Summer Developmental Program

In addition to race, student socioeconomic status can influence academic
performance prior to and during college (Fowler & Boylan, 2010). Studies have
concluded that gender, race, financial resources, prior academic achievement, and
parental education level affect student persistence rates (Fowler & Boylan, 2010;
Kitsantas, Winsler, & Huie, 2008; Lotkowski, Robbins, & Noeth, 2004; Reason, 2009;
Sparkman, Maulding, & Roberts, 2012). As this study addressed race and
developmental education, it should be noted that Blacks have traditionally scored lower
on the ACT than Whites. Prior research indicates that high school grade point average
and test scores, such as the ACT and the SAT, are significant predictors of retention and
generally used to direct students into remediation (Astin, Korn, & Green, 1987; Reason,
2009; Lotkowski et al., 2004; Tross, Harper, Osher, & Kneidinger, 2000). Prior to
United States v. Fordice (1992), ACT and SAT test scores were the sole basis for
admission to a predominantly White institution in Mississippi. Following Fordice,
admission requirements changed and become standardized amongst the Mississippi four-
year institutions. The new admission requirements included evaluation of a student’s
high school grade point average, course curriculum, and ACT or SAT test scores (Biggers, 1995).

Summary

A considerable amount of research existed on summer bridge programs; however, little research has been performed that examines the Mississippi SDP. Since there was scant literature regarding the SDP, this study presented and synthesized published literature about other summer bridge programs and compared them to the SDP. There was limited research studying the effectiveness of the SDP in terms of college success, and there was limited research studying the effectiveness of summer bridge programs in terms of success. Providing an evaluation of success rates effectively demonstrated whether the SDP was meeting its primary goal, providing learning opportunities versus failing opportunities, or “educational opportunities” in higher education, at the rendering of the case (providing learning opportunities versus failing opportunities) or “educational opportunities” in higher education. The literature explained that summer bridge programs exist to aid students with their transition to college based upon academic status. To assess the effectiveness of summer bridge programs regarding whether students were successfully transitioning to college, most studies measure retention rates of program participants, but the studies defined retention rates as progression or persistence from year to year. In contrast, this study determined if SDP participants were retained and graduating. An evaluation of retention and graduation rates effectively demonstrated whether the SDP was meeting its goal to provide an additional route to admission and enrollment in educational opportunities in higher education (Biggers, 1995; Williams, 2005).
CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

This chapter focused on the methodological procedures used to collect and analyze data and included a discussion of the study’s research design, research questions and hypotheses, participant description, data collection, and data analysis. This study examined archival quantitative and historical document data. An analysis of these data allowed the researcher to describe the effectiveness of the Summer Developmental Program (SDP) and determine if the SDP is performing as the Supreme Court intended. Effectiveness and performance were measured by analyzing and examining retention and graduation rates of SDP participation.

Research Design

A non-experimental research design was employed to quantitatively analyze and examine the archival data collected. According to Haskins and Jeffrey (1990), non-experimental designs are used when the researcher does not control the variables studied. Unlike experimental studies, participants voluntarily choose to involve themselves. In this study, the SDP participants elected to participate in the SDP as an opportunity to enroll in a four-year public Mississippi institution of higher education. Since this study analyzed archived quantitative data, it can only be non-experimental because the researcher could not randomly assign participants to the control and experimental group (Haskins & Jeffrey, 1990).

This study employed a Single Case Research Design (SCRD) approach to compare SDP participants’ (entering freshman who did not meet admission requirements) retention and graduation rates to non-SDP participants’ (entering freshman who met
admission requirements) retention and graduation rates, all of whom enrolled in one of the eight public four-year Mississippi institutions in the fall semesters from 1996 to 2012. SCRD is a quantitative analysis that tests for significant differences using visual analysis graphs. The SCRD design best fits this study based upon the small population. According to O’Neill, McDonnell, Billingsley, and Jenson (2011), there is no minimum numbers of sample or population size for SCRD. Design and timeframes selected, along with details of the data, were discussed later in this chapter.

Participants

Generally, a sample is used in quantitative research, as data on the entire population are often unavailable or too cumbersome to analyze (Fowler, 2009). Such sampling should yield a representation of the population under review. The target population for this study was SDP participants, or data from SDP participants and non-SDP participants, at all eight public four-year Mississippi institutions—Alcorn State University, Delta State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University for Women, Mississippi Valley State University, University of Mississippi, and The University of Southern Mississippi. For the purposes of this study, these institutions were referenced as the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning system. Individual SDP participants and non-SDP participants were not studied. However, overall retention and graduation rates of participants and non-SDP participants of the Mississippi IHL system were studied.

Data used in this study were selected on the basis that they were collected by the Mississippi Institutions Higher Education system as a requirement of United States v. Fordice (1992). An underlying assumption of this study was that all data were accurately
collected, reported, and had not been altered. This assumption was deemed as an important measurement of reliability for SCRD in order for the researcher to draw appropriate conclusions regarding the relationships between the variables (O’Neill et al., 2011). All eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi were included in this case because Mississippi had not dismantled its dual system of higher education when the original Ayers suit was filed in 1975. Other institutions of higher learning in Mississippi, such as private or two-year institutions, were excluded because they were not involved in the Ayers Settlement and later Fordice case.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

While there was a considerable amount of published research regarding the other vestiges (academic program duplication, institutional mission statement, and continued operation of the eight public institutions), there was scant literature concerning the SDP, which was a component of the admission standards vestige. There has been no published research on the outcomes of the SDP program since the Fordice ruling. Also, there was limited literature about the foundation of the SDP or about summer remedial program participants’ or summer bridge program participants’ retention and graduation rates or successfulness. Research questions were derived from finding a “void in the literature” about summer bridge programs and, specifically, the SDP (Creswell, 2014, p. 20).

The following research questions served to guide this study:

- When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants retained at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?
- When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants graduating at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?
Evaluating retention and graduation rates of the SDP demonstrated whether the program is meeting its primary goal of providing additional educational opportunities for enrollment access to Mississippi higher education. Based upon the literature, research, and Critical Race Theory, there should be no difference between retention and graduation rates of SDP participants when compared to non-SDP participants. In contrast, however, the hypotheses of this study were as follows:

- There will be a difference in retention rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower retention rates than non-SDP participants.

- There will be a difference in graduation rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower graduation rates than non-SDP participants.

Analyzing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants compared to non-SDP participants may provide evidence that non-SDP participants exhibit higher retention and graduation rates than SDP participants. If this is found, it could be concluded that the SDP is not increasing educational opportunities for Blacks at four-year public institutions in Mississippi. In essence, the SDP would not be meeting the admission vestige set forth by Fordice to provide an additional route to Mississippi’s four-year public institutions, as evidenced by the fact that SDP participants are not persisting in or graduating from Mississippi public four-year institutions at a rate comparable to non-SDP participants.

Results of this study were analyzed through Critical Race Theory, which was further discussed in Chapter VI, discussion.
Data, Variables, and Materials

No instruments were incorporated in this study because the data obtained was archival. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, this study examined archival quantitative and historical document data to address the proposed research questions. These data were deemed archival because the data existed prior to the beginning of the study and were collected for purposes beside research (Bramble & Mason, 1997; IRB for Social & Behavioral Sciences University of Virginia, 2015).

Archival Quantitative Data

Archival quantitative data sets were requested from Mississippi IHL Office of Strategic Data Management. The data sets contained retention and graduation rates of SDP participation at all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Graduation rates were collected from 1998 through 2007, and retention rates were collected from 1996 through 2012. Retention and graduation rates were calculated using different date ranges. This is necessary because graduation rates, traditionally reported for census data, are reported and calculated every six years (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005). In contrast, retention rates are calculated when students matriculate from their freshman fall semester to their sophomore fall semester (NCES, 2014). The SDP commenced in 1995; therefore, the first available evidence of retention rates could not be calculated until the first cohort completed their first year of college in 1996, and graduation rates could not be calculated until the first cohort graduated in 1998. Fall 2007 is the last year graduation rates were analyzed in this study. Graduation rates after fall 2007 had not been compiled or calculated by Mississippi IHL at the time data were requested. As such, these data represent the most current graduation rates available. Fall 2012 will be
the last year retention rates were analyzed for this study. Retention rates after fall 2012 had not been compiled or calculated by the Mississippi IHL at the time data were requested, so this data represents the current retention rates available. Retention and graduation rates were compared year to year for the overall IHL system. It is important to note that archival data received are not true traditional data from the archives. However, the data received can be used to reference points in time past, which is key to this study.

**Historical Document Data**

Historical document data, presented in previous chapters, provided the reader with the foundation and history of the *Fordice* case as well as pre-existing literature and research on the SDP. The nature of historical data was to identify, acquire, and maintain records that serve as a representation of the past (Robyns, 2001). Generally, researchers draw analysis on historical data collected to formulate “judgments and to attempt to establish causal relationship between facts…” by placing them in “some significant pattern in order…” (Goodman & Kruger, 1988, p. 319). Along with drawing inferences from historical data, historical research focuses on determining the validity of acquired evidence. According to Goodman and Kruger (1988), authenticity and credibility of data supports data validity. This study incorporated historical document data to establish a foundation of the purpose of the study within Chapter II, which was to explore the intentions of the admission vestige set forth by the Supreme Court. To identify and describe the intended goals of the SDP, primary data were requested from all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi and the Mississippi Department of Archives via email or a request link via their website. Out of the eight institutions contacted, only one
institutions, the University of Mississippi, reported housing the data requested. The Mississippi Department of Archives indicated that they also retained information about the Fordice case and the SDP.

Variables

The independent variable in this study was SDP participation: whether or not students participated in the SDP at one of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. The dependent variables were retention rates and graduation rates of all entering freshman at each Mississippi public four-year institution for fall 1996 through 2013 (retention rates) and 1998 through fall 2007 (graduation rates). Individual SDP participants and non-SDP participants were not studied. However, overall retention and graduation rates of participants and non-SDP participants of the Mississippi IHL system were studied. Race was also included as a variable in this study due to the Fordice case’s concerns with providing additional educational opportunities for Blacks in higher education in Mississippi. Therefore, this study attempted to determine if the SDP is meeting or not meeting the admission vestige to provide SDP Blacks and non-SDP Blacks additional educational opportunities or an additional route to Mississippi’s four-year public institutions compared to SDP non-Blacks and non-SDP non-Blacks.

Data Analysis

The descriptive statistical test that examined the hypotheses in this study is a Single Case Research Design (SCRD). SCRD was used to quantitatively analyze data from the IHL institutions to compare SDP participants’ (entering freshman who do not meet admission requirements) retention and graduation rates to non-SDP participants’ (entering freshman who met admission requirements) retention and graduation rates from
1996 through 2012. For the purpose of this study, the researcher observed treatment implemented, i.e., the SDP, over time. One group received an “intervention” (i.e., the SDP) and the other did not (i.e., non-SDP participants did not participate in the SDP). This type of design was also referenced as an “adaption of interrupted time-series” design that provided a thorough evaluation and assessment of how the intervention or independent variable effects the dependent variable (Kratchochwill et al., 2012, p. 2).

There are numerous types of evaluation designs of SCRD, such as Baseline and Treatment Design, Repeated Pretest-Posttest Design, Reversal Design, Multiple Baseline Design, Alternating Treatment Design, and Treatment Only Design (Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011; Wong, 2010). This study applied the Treatment Only Design (B Design). B Design allows the researcher to administer the treatment repeatedly over time (Wong, 2010). This type of SCRD best fit this study due to the absence of a baseline to compare to the treatment. There was no existing data prior to the creation of the SDP to compare to the retention and graduation rates.

Even though SCRD is a quantitative form of analysis, it is different from pure statistical analysis as it does not test for significant differences. Instead of testing for significant differences, SCRD relies on visual analysis graphs to determine if there are any patterns in the data (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000). The justification behind using visual analysis is to identify “powerful interventions” that can provide changes in the studied behavior, and once the visual analysis has been published, other researchers will have the opportunity to examine and draw their own conclusions about the findings (O’Neill et al., 2011, p. 49). The visual displays generally include a graph with horizontal and vertical axes, where the dependent variable will be on the vertical axis and
the time frame will be on the horizontal axis (O’Neill et al., 2011). For this study, retention rates were plotted on the vertical axis, and the time frame of SDP participation of 1996 through 2012 were plotted on the horizontal axis. The same applied for graduation rates. Data points for retention rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were plotted on one graph, and data points for graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were plotted on another graph. The data points are generally represented by a geometrical shape (i.e. circle, triangle, square, etc.) connected by a solid or dotted line. Since this study plotted SDP participants’ and non-participant’s retention rates within the same graph, SDP participants were represented by a solid line with filled in circles, and non-SDP participants were represented by a dotted line with filled in circles. SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates were plotted on the same graph. SDP participants were represented by a solid line with filled in circles, and non-SDP participants were represented by a dotted line with filled in circles.

SCRDs are intended for experimental designs that determine if there is a relationship between the independent variable(s) and the change in the dependent variable(s) (Plavnick & Ferreri, 2013). Even though this study was non-experimental, the SCRD experimental design best fits this study based upon the small population size and the number of years for comparing retention and graduation rates. While this method did not meet the requirements of traditional SCRD, this approach remains an adequate methodology to approach this study.

There are five concepts of this type of visual analysis: 1) trend; 2) regression; 3) stability; 4) level; and; 5) variability (Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011).
SCRD examines differences within these five concepts to ultimately determine if there are demonstrations of improvements, plateaus, or no improvements. This study looked at an event, the SDP, and how it influenced the five concepts of SCRD visual analysis of retention and graduation rates of SDP participation.

This design informed the researcher if conditions have improved, no change has occurred, or if the condition has worsened by examining the patterns of the visual analysis (Wong, 2010). The graphical representation demonstrated if a) improvements, b) plateaus, or c) no improvements occurred. Retention rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were graphed by year in one graph for the researcher to compare each groups’ rate and to determine if there were any patterns over the years. Graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were graphed by year in one graph for the researcher to compare each groups’ rate and to determine if there were any patterns over the years. Each graph analyzed any trend, regression, stability, level, and variability of the rates for each group. Trends demonstrate patterns where the dependent variable is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; O’Neill et al., 2011). In this study, trends concluded if retention and/or graduation rates of SDP participants were improving, not improving, or remaining the same over the years. Because it is sometimes difficult to conclude if there are any clear trends, O’Neill et al. (2011) discussed fitting a regression line to the data in question, which allowed for a clearer determination of the trend direction. Level computed the average or mean within the phase (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011). This study calculated the mean retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants and the graduation rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants to
determine if there was variability (O’Neill et al., 2011). Variability allowed the researcher to determine the variation in the data points to the overall mean or level. Variability was associated with the statistical term, standard deviation (O’Neill et al., 2011). Stability indicated whether the level, or mean, trend, and variability, were staying consistent throughout each graph (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; O’Neill et al., 2011). This determined if retention and graduation rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants were remaining consistent throughout the analyzed years.

One of the common basic principles of SCRD is the measurement of the dependent variable is repeated over time or is similar to an interrupted times series. This means that the researcher was looking at an event, the SDP, and how it influences the five concepts mentioned earlier (Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011). As mentioned earlier in this chapter, retention rates were compared for SDP participants and non-SDP participants from 1996 through 2012, and graduation rates were compared for SDP participants and non-SDP participants from 1998 through 2007. As related to this study, the aforementioned was applied to determine if the SDP has increased educational opportunities for Blacks at four-year public institutions in Mississippi. Analyses were conducted with the statistical software SPSS and Microsoft Excel.

Ethical Treatment of Data

An IRB exemption was requested and approved for this study because it involved only archival quantitative data and did not use human subjects. Even though human subjects were not studied, training on the responsible conduct of research to ensure appropriate measures has been completed (Appendix A). Anonymity of SDP participants were protected as data collected by the Mississippi IHL includes only retention and
graduation rates, total number of students who participated in the SDP, racial demographics, and enrollment numbers of first-time, college students. No unique identifiable information was requested or used in the analysis.

Summary

Capitalizing on the data previously collected by IHL, this study represented an opportunity to expand the literature on summer bridge programs and, specifically, the SDP. Since the filing of the *Fordice* case in 1975, to the rendering in 1992, access to education has changed significantly in higher education. Racial discrimination continued to plague the South and was a widespread practice in the South as White southerners believed in limiting educational opportunities for Blacks. This can be seen in the South consistently ignoring legislation that would provide rights to Blacks, such as the Fourteenth Amendment, the GI Bill, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Tate, 1997). Compared to other regions in the United States, the South was the last to accept desegregation and only accepted it due to government mandates and lawsuits (Taylor, 2009). As mentioned in Chapter II, it took over 25 years for the defendants and plaintiffs to reach an agreement in *Fordice*. Therefore, this study has potential to influence research and policy.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This chapter provides a discussion of the results from the archival quantitative data analyzed using visual analysis through Single Case Research Design. Results of the research are divided by the research question, hypothesis, and participant’s race. As mentioned earlier, this study sought to describe the Summer Developmental Program (SDP) at all eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi required by the Remedial Decree from the *Fordice* case (1995). This study compared retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants from the first year of implementation in 1996 through 2012.

Participation

The target population for this study was SDP participation or data from SDP participants and non-SDP participants at all eight public four-year Mississippi institutions—Alcorn State University, Delta State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University for Women, Mississippi Valley State University, University of Mississippi, and The University of Southern Mississippi. From 1996 through 2007, there were 3,114 students who participated in the SDP and 93,555 freshman students who were traditionally admitted to a four-year public institution in Mississippi. The data used to calculate the total number of participants was obtained from the Office of Strategic Management at the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL). These data were also used to analyze graduation rates. Therefore, the total number of participants includes only those who attended a four-year public institution in Mississippi through 2007 as further relevant data has yet to be compiled or
calculated by Mississippi IHL. Out of the 3,114 SDP participants from 1998 through 2007, 95% of the participants were identified as Black while 3.11% were identified as White. The 93,555 freshman traditionally admitted students, 32% were identified as Black and 54.4% were identified as White. SDP participants were students who do not meet conditions for regular admission to a state-funded college or university, including those who did not demonstrate college readiness through a spring screening process (ACCUPLACER) during their senior year of high school (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). Non-SDP participants were students who met freshman admission requirements and enrolled at one of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. Individual SDP participants and non-SDP participants were not studied. However, overall retention and graduation rates of participants and non-SDP participants of the Mississippi IHL system were studied.

Data Time Frame

As previously discussed in chapter four, it is important to remember that retention rates were collected from 1996 through 2012, and graduation rates were collected from 1998 through 2007. Retention and graduation rates were calculated using different date ranges. This is necessary because graduation rates, traditionally reported for census data, are reported and calculated every six years (Kuh et al., 2005). In contrast, retention rates are calculated when students matriculate from their freshman fall semester to their sophomore fall semester (NCES, 2014). The SDP commenced in 1995; therefore, the first available evidence of retention rates could not be calculated until the first cohort completed their first year of college in 1996, and graduation rates could not be calculated until the first cohort graduated in 1998. Fall 2007 is the last year graduation rates were
analyzed in this study. Graduation rates after fall 2007 had not been compiled or calculated by Mississippi IHL at the time data were requested. As such, these data represent the most current graduation rates available. Fall 2012 was the last year retention rates were analyzed for this study. The retention rates obtained from Mississippi IHL did not include rates for SDP participants. Retention rates after fall 2012 had not been compiled or calculated by the Mississippi IHL at the time data were requested. Therefore, data presented in this study represents current, available retention rates.

Descriptive Statistics

While all data regarding SDP participants were obtained from the Office of Strategic Management at the Mississippi IHL, data regarding non-SDP participants were obtained from IHL and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The only demographic information requested and provided by IHL was ethnicity. Ethnicity data were broken down into three different groups: Black, White, and other. No other demographic information was requested or provided.

SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ data were entered into SPSS to analyze descriptive statistics. Table 1 presents the number of years analyzed, mean retention rate for SDP participants and non-SDP participants, and standard deviation of retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants.
Table 1

Descriptive statistics of SDP and non-SDP participants’ retention rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-SDP</td>
<td>75.306</td>
<td>.9814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>74.128</td>
<td>3.8568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean retention rate for SDP participants was 74.128%, and the mean retention rate for non-SDP participants was 75.306% (see Table 1). The standard deviation of retention rates for SDP participants was 3.8568, and for non-SDP participants it was .9814 (see Table 1).

Table 2 presents the number of years analyzed, the mean graduation rate for SDP participants and non-SDP participants, and standard deviation of retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of SDP and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-SDP</td>
<td>50.050</td>
<td>.8947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>25.410</td>
<td>4.4376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean graduation rate for SDP participants was 25.41. The mean graduation rate for non-SDP participants was 50.050 (see Table 2). The standard deviation of graduation
rates for SDP participants was 4.4376, and for non-SDP participants it was 4.4376 (see Table 2).

Visual Analysis Results

Single Case Research Design (SCRD) relies on visual data analysis. SCRD was used to quantitatively analyze data from the IHL institutions to compare SDP participants’ retention and graduation rates to non-SDP participants’ retention and graduation rates from 1996 through 2012. The independent variable for this study was SDP participation—whether or not students participated in the SDP at one of the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi. The dependent variables were retention rates and graduation rates for all entering freshman at each Mississippi public four-year institution for fall 1996 through fall 2012 (retention rates) and fall 1998 through fall 2007 (graduation rates). For the purpose of this study, the researcher observed treatment implemented—i.e., the SDP—over time studied, fall 1996 through fall 2012. One group had an “intervention” (i.e., the SDP) and the other did not (i.e., non-SDP participants did not participate in the SDP).

Research Question One

Research Question One: When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants retained at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?

SDP participant retention rates were compared to non-SDP participants’ retention rates from 1996 through 2012 via graph (see Figure 1). Graphs were created using Microsoft Excel. The visual displays generally include a graph with horizontal and vertical axes. The dependent variable which was retention and graduation rates was charted on the vertical axis and timeframe was charted on the horizontal axis (O’Neill et
al., 2011). Data points for retention rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were plotted on one graph. Data points for each dependent variable are represented by a geometrical shape (a circle) and connected by a solid or dotted line. SDP participants are represented by a solid line, and non-SDP participants are represented by a dotted line. As mentioned in chapter four there are five concepts of SCRD: 1) trend; 2) regression; 3) level; 4) variability; and 5) stability. SCRD examines differences within these five concepts to determine if there are demonstrations of improvements, plateaus, or lack of improvements (Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011).

Figure 1. Visual analysis of SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ retention rates from 1996 through 2012. Solid lines represent SDP retention rates and dotted lines represent non-SDP participants’ retention rates.

Trends and Regression

According to Lundervold and Belwood (2000) and O’Neill et al. (2011), trends demonstrate patterns where the dependent variable is increasing, decreasing, or remaining constant. Based on figure one, retention rates of SDP participants decreased, and non-SDP participants’ retention rates improved. Since it is difficult to analyze the trend of
non-SDP participants, O’Neill et al. (2011) state that fitting a regression line to the data in question will allow for a clearer determination of the trend. Regression lines were fitted for SDP participants and non-SDP participants to better establish a trend line. (See figure two for SDP participants and figure three for non-SDP participants.)

*Figure 2.* SDP participants’ retention rates from 1996 through 2012.

Based on the decrease in the regression line, Figure 2 demonstrates that SDP participants’ retention rates were decreasing.
Based on the escalation in the regression line, Figure 3 demonstrates that non-SDP participants’ retention rates were increasing.

*Level*

Level will compute the average or mean of the dependent variable (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; Kratchochwill et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011). For this study, mean retention rates were calculated for SDP participants and non-SDP participants. The mean retention rate for SDP participants was 74.12% while the mean retention rate for non-SDP participants was 75.306% (see Table 1).

*Variability*

Variability refers to the variation in data points as related to the overall mean or level associated with standard deviation (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; Kratchochwil et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2011). The standard deviation of retention rates for SDP participants was 3.8568 (see Table 1). There is substantial variation between the SDP participant retention rates data points. Therefore, the data points are not considered...
consistent (O’Neill et al., 2011). The standard deviation of retention rates for non-SDP participants was .9814 (see Table 1). There was a small amount of variance between non-participant retention rate data points. Therefore, the data points were considered consistent (O’Neill et al., 2011).

**Stability**

Stability indicates whether the level or mean, trend, and variability remain constant throughout each graph (Lundervold & Belwood, 2000; O’Neill et al., 2011). Stability determined if retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants remained consistent throughout the analyzed years. After reviewing the level, trend, and variability for SDP participants through each graph and associated descriptives, the researcher found that there was no consistency and that the data pattern was unstable. After reviewing the level, trend, and variability for non-SDP participants through each graph and associated descriptives, the researcher found that there was consistency and that the data pattern was stable.

**Effect size**

The effect size for retention rates was .83 using Cohen’s d. Calculating and analyzing effect size is a quantitative analysis used in conjunction with SCRD. Effect size explains the degree of the impact the independent variable has on the dependent variable (O’Neill et al., 2011). It also enables researchers to examine the difference between two means (Thalheimer & Cook, 2011). In this study, the researcher is comparing means of retention rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. According to O’Neill et al., (2011), .80 or higher is considered a large effect size. The
SDP had a large effect on retention rates of SDP participants. Therefore, the “treatment,” (SDP), was considered effective at retaining SDP participants.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two: When compared to non-SDP participants, are SDP participants graduating at a higher rate than non-SDP participants?

Visual analysis for graduation rates was constructed in the same way as retention rates. For this study, graduation rates were placed on the vertical axis, and time frame of SDP participation—1998 through 2007—was placed on the horizontal axis. Data points for graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were plotted on one graph. SDP participants’ graduation rates were represented by a solid line with solid circles Non-SDP participants’ graduation rates were represented by a dotted line with solid circles.

Figure 4. SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates from 1998 through 2007.
Trends and Regression Lines

Based on Figure 4, graduation rates of SDP participants decreased and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates remained the same. Since it is difficult to conclude the trend of non-SDP participants, a regression line was fitted for a clearer trend determination. See Figure 5 for SDP participants and Figure 6 for non-SDP participants.

Figure 5. SDP participants’ graduation rates regression line.

Based on the decrease in the regression line, Figure 5 demonstrates that SDP participants’ graduation rates decreased.

Figure 6. Non-SDP participants’ graduation rates regression line.
Figure 6 demonstrates that non-SDP participants’ graduation rates remained the same.

**Level**

For this study, the mean graduation rate was calculated for SDP participants and non-SDP participants. The mean graduation rate for SDP participants was 25.41%, and the mean graduation rate for non-SDP participants was 50.05% (see Table 2).

**Variability**

Variability refers to the variation in data points to the overall mean or level associated with the standard deviation. The standard deviation of graduation rates for SDP participants was 4.4376 (see Table 2). SDP participants’ graduation rates were not close to the mean as there was a large amount of variation between graduation rates. Therefore, the data points were not considered consistent. The standard deviation of graduation rates for non-SDP participants was .8947 (see Table 2). Non-SDP participants’ graduation rates were close to the mean and were considered consistent.

**Stability**

Stability determined if graduation rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants remained consistent throughout the analyzed years. After reviewing the level, trend, and variability for SDP participants through each graph and descriptives, there was no consistency and the data pattern was unstable. After reviewing the level, trend, and variability for non-SDP participants through each graph and descriptives, there was consistency and the data pattern was stable.

**Effect size**

The effect size for graduation rates was .07 using Cohen’s d. According to O’Neil et al., (2011), .0.0 – 0.20 was considered a small effect size. The SDP did not
impact or affect the graduation rates of SDP participants. Therefore, the “treatment” (SDP) was considered ineffective at graduating participants.

Hypothesis One

H₁: There will be a difference in retention rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower retention rates than non-SDP participants.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 were analyzed to allow conclusions regarding hypotheses one. After reviewing the graphs, descriptive statistics, and effect size for SDP participants and non-SDP participants, the researcher concluded that SDP participants have slightly lower retention rates than non-SDP participants in regard to the mean. However, based on the regression lines of both groups, SDP participants’ retention rates consistently decreased while non-SDP participants’ retention rates consistently increased. The large effect size was contradictory to the graph analyses in that the SDP was effective in retaining SDP participants when compared to non-SDP participants. Based on the mean, effect size and visual analysis, hypothesis one was not supported.

Hypothesis Two

H₂: There will be a difference in graduation rates between SDP participants and non-SDP participants. Specifically, SDP participants will have lower graduation rates than non-SDP participants.

Figures 4, 5, and 6 were analyzed to make conclusions regarding hypotheses two. After reviewing the graphs, descriptive statistics, and effect size for SDP participants and non-SDP participants, the researcher concluded that SDP participants have lower graduation rates than non-SDP participants in regard to the mean. Based on the
regression lines of both groups, SDP participants’ graduation rates consistently decreased while non-SDP participants’ retention rates remained the same. The small effect size also corresponds with the graph analysis, which indicated that the SDP was not effective in graduating SDP participants when compared to non-SDP participants. Based on the means, visual analysis, and effect size, hypotheses two was supported.

Race

Race was examined and included as a variable in this study due to the *Fordice* case’s concerns with providing additional educational opportunities for Blacks in Mississippi higher education. Racial demographics were obtained only as they related to SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates. This information was compiled and calculated by the Office of Strategic Management at IHL and IPEDS. Racial demographic information was not available for SDP participants’ and non-SDP participants’ retention rates. IHL divided race into three categories: Black, White, and other. IPEDS reported more than three categories for race, such as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, two or more races, unknown, and resident alien. Therefore, any race other than Black or White were grouped into the category of other to maintain consistency. SDP participants and non-SDP participants data were entered into SPSS to analyze descriptive statistics. Graphs were created using Microsoft Excel. Table three illustrates the number of years analyzed, mean retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants, and standard deviation of retention rates for SDP participants and non-SDP participants. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, out of the 3,114 SDP participants from 1998 through 2007, 95% were identified as Black and 3.11% were
identified as White. Out of the 93,555 admitted students, 32% were identified as Black and 54.4% were identified as White.

The mean graduation rate for Black SDP participants was 25.27%; White SDP participants’ graduation rate was 30.64%; Black non-SDP participants’ graduation rate was 32.43%; and White non-SDP participants’ graduation rate was 54.37% (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Descriptive statistics of SDP and non-SDP participants’ graduation rates by race.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDP White</td>
<td>30.640</td>
<td>16.3494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SDP White</td>
<td>54.370</td>
<td>1.8774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP Black</td>
<td>25.270</td>
<td>4.8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SDP Black</td>
<td>32.430</td>
<td>2.1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation of graduation rates for Black SDP participants was 4.8523; White SDP participants’ standard deviation of graduation rates was 16.3491; Black non-SDP participants’ standard deviation of graduation rates was 2.1995; and White non-SDP participants’ standard deviation of graduation rates was 1.8774 (see Table 3).

Visual analysis for race was constructed in the same manner as retention and graduation rates. For this study, graduation rate was placed on the vertical axis and time frame of SDP participation (1998 through 2007) was placed on the horizontal axis. Data points for graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants were plotted on one graph. Black SDP participants’ graduation rates are represented by a small dotted line with solid circles; Black non-SDP participants’ graduation rates are represented by a larger dashed line with solid circles; White SDP participants’ graduation rates are
represented by a medium dash line with solid circles; and White non-participant’s graduation rates are represented by a solid line with solid circles.

Figure 7. Graduation rates of SDP participants and non-SDP participants by race. Circle dotted line represent Black SDP participants, medium dash line represent White SDP participants, longer dash line represent Black non-SDP participants, and solid line represent White non-SDP participants.

Trends and Regression Lines

Black and White SDP participants and Black and White non-SDP participants were graphed separately to determine trend and regression. Based on Figure 7, establishing trend lines was difficult. Therefore, regression lines were fitted for Black and White SDP participants and Black and White non-SDP participants to better determine the trend line. See Figure 8 for Black SDP participants, Figure 9 for White SDP participants, Figure 10 for Black non-SDP participants, and Figure 11 for White non-SDP participants.
Figure 8. Black SDP participants’ graduation rates.

Figure 8 demonstrates a downward trend related to Black SDP participants’ graduation rates.

---

Figure 9. White SDP participants’ graduation rates.

Figure 9 demonstrates a downward trend related to White SDP participants’ graduation rates. In 2007, there were no White SDP participants who participated in SDP or graduated.
**Figure 10.** Black non-SDP participants’ graduation rates.

Figure 10 demonstrates a downward trend related to Black non-SDP participants’ graduation rates.

**Figure 11.** White non-SDP participants’ graduation rates.

Figure 11 demonstrates an escalating trend related to White non-SDP participants’ graduation rates.
**Level**

For this study, mean graduation rates were calculated for Black and White SDP participants and Black and White non-SDP participants. The mean graduation rate for Black SDP participants was 25.27%; the mean graduation rate for White SDP participants was 30.64%; the mean graduation rate for Black non-SDP participants was 32.43%; and the mean graduation rate for White non-SDP participants was 54.37% (see Table 3). The standard deviation of graduation rates for Black SDP participants was 4.8523; the standard deviation of graduation rates for White SDP participants was 16.3491; the standard deviation of graduation rates for Black non-SDP participants was 2.1995; and the standard deviation of graduation rates for White non-SDP participants was 1.8774 (see Table 3).

**Variability**

Variability refers to the variation in data points to the overall mean or level associated with the standard deviation. The standard deviation of graduation rates for Black SDP participants was 4.8523; the standard deviation of graduation rates for White SDP participants was 16.3491; the standard deviation of graduation rates for Black non-SDP participants was 2.1995; and the standard deviation of graduation rates for White non-SDP participants was 1.8774 (see Table 3). Because there was a small amount of variance between the graduation rates of Black SDP participants, Black non-SDP participants, and White non-SDP participants, these three groups were considered consistent. However, White SDP participants were not consistent at 16.3491 (see Table 3).
Stability

Stability determined if graduation rates for Black and White SDP participants and non-SDP participants were remaining consistent throughout the analyzed years. After reviewing the level, trend, and variability, there was consistency with the data patterns. Data patterns were considered stable for Black and White SDP participants and Black non-SDP participants. However, White non-SDP participants’ data patterns were not stable nor consistent based upon the descriptives and graphs. Specifically, White non-SDP participants’ mean graduation rates were almost fifty percent higher than Black and White SDP participants’ and Black non-SDP participants’ mean graduation rates.

Summary

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, this study’s purpose is to determine if the revised admission requirements and implemented SDP would “aid in curing the lingering de jure injuries to Blacks…assure uniform and fair administration by all universities would fare at each admission requirement” (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 6). After analyzing and comparing retention and graduation rates of SDP participants to non-SDP participants in the eight public four-year institutions in Mississippi, the researcher concluded that the treatment of SDP is effective in retaining SDP participants. However, the researcher concluded that the SDP is not effective in graduating SDP participants. Graduation rates for SDP participants consistently declined from 1998 through 2007. Based on the consistent decline of Black SDP participants (95% of total SDP participants were reported as Black), the researcher concluded that the SDP was not providing additional educational opportunities for Blacks and that there is still a “lingering [racial] de jure injury” (Holley & Weeden, 1997, p. 6).
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

*United States v. Fordice* (1992) led to changes in the admission policies and practices in the four-year public institutions in Mississippi. Among these changes was the creation and implementation of the Summer Developmental Program (SDP). The program’s primary goal was to provide additional educational opportunities for Blacks (Remedial Decree, 1995). This researcher concluded that the SDP was not effective contrary to prior SDP research (Boone, 1998; Boone, 1999; Boone, 2000). Specifically, this study found that the SDP, while providing an opportunity to study at a college or university in Mississippi was not effective in providing additional educational opportunities (retention/graduation) for Blacks. Only three of the studies reviewed in chapter three reported that Summer Bridge Programs (SBP) positively affecting participant retention rates (Cabrera et al., 2013; Santa Rita & Bacota, 1997; Walpole et al., 2008). A general review of higher education summer bridge program literature, revealed that their goal was to assist academically underprepared students transition into college (Cabrera et al., 2013; Kezar, 2000; Pretlow & Mitchell, 2010; Strayhorn, 2011). Conversely, the goal of Mississippi’s SDP was to increase opportunities to higher education for Blacks in particular (Biggers, 1995).

Even though the SDP was founded upon the same principles of SBPs, the foundational goal of the SDP differed from that of SBPs. The court emphasized the *path* to higher education and not the participants’ *experience or success*. The SDP provided an additional path to higher education for Blacks, but it did not provide give them the opportunity to be successful in/graduate from higher education. This study provided an
evaluation of success (retention/graduation) rates, which demonstrated that the SDP has not met its legally mandated goal set by the *Fordice case*.

**Discussion**

The researcher ascertained the following from this study: 1) SDP was effective in retaining participants from 1996 through 2012; 2) SDP was not effective in graduating its participants as compared to non-SDP participants. Even though this study concluded that the SDP was effective in retaining participants, it is important to note that all SDP participants who successfully completed the program were required to participate in a Year Long Academic Program (YLAP) following SDP completion (Institutions of Higher Learning, 2015). Therefore, SDP participant retention may have been positively influenced by YLAP. (SDP participant retention rates were calculated based on yearly (freshman fall semester to sophomore fall semester). Therefore, we must ask the question of whether or not retention SDP retention rates would decline if the participants were not provided YLAP. Further, we must ask whether or not this would change the outcome of research question one.

Since race was an important factor in this study and was the foundation of the *Fordice* case, this study can be critiqued through Critical Race Theory (CRT). According to Harper, Patton, and Wooden (2009), CRT is useful when examining policies affecting Blacks in higher education, specifically when there is a lack of opportunities due to “racial subordination” (p. 392). There are three CRT themes that can be applied to this study: interest convergence, racism is normal, and historical context (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Harper et al., 2009; Muhammed, 2009; Taylor, 2009; Zamudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011). Muhammed (2009) defined “interest convergence” as “gains
in racial equity are advanced only and until there are benefits for Whites” (p. 321). In other words, racial advances for Blacks are only achieved when it is in the interest of Whites. “Racism is normal” is described as White supremacy ideology being so “ingrained in political, legal, and educational structures that they are unrecognizable” (Taylor, 2009, p. 4). Taylor (2009) explained “historical context” as racism being invisible as it has become part of everyday life.

CRT helps to explain why the SDP was not effective in providing Blacks equal access/opportunities to higher education. CRT classifies racism as a normal practice in America, especially in the South (Taylor, 2009). The South’s historic stance on desegregation illustrates why it took the region so long to comply with legislation and litigation that supported Black rights. Until the Fordice case, Mississippi’s operation of higher education demonstrated how Whites received an educational advantage while disadvantaging Blacks. From the literature review, we do know that race can influence academic performance prior to and during college. Race can also affect persistence rates (Fowler & Boylan, 2010; Kitsantas et al., 2008; Lotkowski et al., 2004; Reason, 2009; Sparkman et al., 2012). As the literature has illustrated, Blacks have traditionally scored lower on the ACT when compared to Whites. Mississippi’s Black population was recorded as having an average ACT score of seven in 1995, which does not meet the required admission score of 16 for Mississippi four-year public institutions of higher education (Biggers, 1995).

If Blacks were recorded as having an average ACT of seven and the admission standards were changed to a minimum of 16 as a part of the Fordice case, the researcher can only conclude that this population could not be expected to have the opportunity to
attend a Mississippi public four-year institution without academic support programs. Historically, higher education has been more accessible to Whites because they have societal advantages due to their race and the financial resources to pursue it and lack race-based barriers that hinder enrollment; therefore, existing laws/policies serve the interests of the most powerful class systems. Similarly, limited civil rights legislation only passes when it can be used to benefit Whites and disadvantage Blacks (Muhammed, 2009; Taylor, 2009). The former admission requirements as well as the dual race-based system of higher education (not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) appears to have advantaged Whites over Blacks. According to Muhammed (2009), the Fordice case did remedy discrimination in Mississippi higher education but upheld racial deference to the benefit of White students.

Finally, CRT may help to explain why those in charge of implementing the SDP never thought to pair the program with a longer YLAP (perhaps a four YLAP). As noted in Chapter four, SDP participants’ graduation rates consistently decreased while non-SDP participants’ retention rates remained the same. Also, this study suggested above that that the YLAP may have had a positive added influence on retention from the first to second year in college for SDP participants. This raises an important question: Might the SDP and a longer YLAP increase Black retention and graduation rates for SPD participants?

Logic suggests that the SDP and an extended YLAP program might be tested for a connection or a shorter gap between retention and graduation (pathway and opportunity). In other words, it might be tested empirically to determine if it adds opportunities for Blacks to move toward graduation. However, CRT posits that such an extended program
does not converge with the interest of Whites. CRT suggests convergence provides
Black’s access and allows for some Blacks retention, but does not go so far as a complete
opportunity for college success. To go that far, Whites’ interests would also need to be
met. CRT, then, may explain why something beyond the SDP, akin to the SDP plus a
longer YLAP remains unthought-of, untested, and untried (O’Brien, personal
communication, 1/21/16).

According to the literature, successful decisions in civil rights legislation that
accomplished school desegregation only happened to conserve the United States’ new
democratic image obtained from World War II. For example, the landmark ruling in
Brown vs. Board of Education was only made possible “through the convergence of
foreign policy interests” (Zamudio et al., 2011, p. 35). Zamudio et al. (2011) explained
that Brown only succeeded because “interest of Whites and Black converged”
momentarily (p. 34). When the Department of Justice sided with the National
Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) during Brown, Delgado
and Stefancic (2012) explained that the United States was “responding to a flood of secret
cables and memos outlining the United States’ interest improving its image in the eyes of
the third world” (p. 24). Whites complied with racial integration due to their concerns
regarding the United States’ international perception during an era of external criticism
(Delgado & Stefancic, 2012).

Fordice had a similar contextual situation as Brown. During the Fordice
Supreme Court hearing in 1992, the United States was in engaged in Operation Desert
Storm. Delgado and Stefancic (2012) argue that due to the darker complications of
Middle Easter persons when compared to United States soldiers, there was a feeling of
racial similarity that resonant with conflicts experienced during the American Civil Rights era. This supports the notion that continued racial intolerance has the potential to negatively affect the United States whether at home or abroad. Therefore, in support of Delgado and Stefancic, and considering their thoughts as the researcher reflects on the results of this study, it could be argued that the Fordice rendering redirected some of the racialized “spotlight” away from the United States (Mississippi in particular), by casting the state and nation in a positive racially equatorial light.

Even so, SDP was not fully successfully and does much to illustrate the need for continued assessment of legally implemented programs to aid with student higher education access/opportunity. Effective assessment that provides valid data and analyses helps direct programs like the SDP to successful outcomes and influences the global perception of the United States as higher education administrators, faculty, legislatures, and citizens attempt to support their public colleges and universities.

Limitations

This study was limited to only one of the vestiges stemming from the Supreme Court case United States v. Fordice (1992): all eight public four-year institutions must adhere to the same admissions criteria and implementation of SDP. The Fordice case did not include private four or public two-year institutions. The public two-year colleges in Mississippi were not directly affected by the outcomes of this case nor were they required to adhere to the same admission requirements as there is a separate governing board for the community and junior colleges in Mississippi (“Mississippi State Board for Community and Junior Colleges,” 2016). The Fordice case is the only higher education
desegregation case that rendered decisions affecting how institutions can evaluate their students for admission (Samuels, 2004).

Other studies concerning *Fordice* and higher education desegregation in Mississippi describe, explain, or explore the vestiges regarding minority enrollment requirements at Mississippi HBCUs or the elimination or merging of public institutions in Mississippi (Fienberg, 1993; Gilreath, 1998; Minor, 2008; Sum, Light, & King, 2004; Taylor & Olswang, 1999; Ware 1994; Wilson, 1994). Due to the contextual specifics of the *Fordice* case, this study was limited to both Mississippi and the remaining, unexplored vestige.

**Recommendations for Practice and Policy**

Assessment and evaluation are key for programs to thrive and succeed. Based on the literature, researchers in the field have adopted best practices and policies for SBPs and developmental education (Boylan & Bonham, n.d.; Boylan, Bonham, & White, 1999; Pretlow, 2011). In Chapter II, Dr. Hunter Boylan was introduced as an expert witness in the *Fordice* case. Boylan, an expert in the field of developmental education as he is the founder and director of The National Center for Developmental Education at Appalachian State University, supported and promoted consistent evaluation criteria to effectively evaluate developmental programs due to inconsistencies in the SBP data (Boylan & Bonham, n.d.). The lack of inconsistent data kept campuses from comparing SDP programs and measuring successfulness. For this reason, the National Center for Developmental Education created an “industry standard for evaluating developmental programs” (Boylan & Bonham, n.d., p. 1). The standard was a compilation drawn from the following: the National Center of Education Statistics reports of developmental
education, the National Study of Developmental Education, State Higher Education Agency reports on developmental education, published research studies on developmental education, and institutional research reports (Boylan & Bonham, n.d.). One of the quantitative criteria suggested is “What percentage of those who took one or more developmental courses graduated within 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 years?” (Boylan & Bonham, n.d., p. 2). Such examination would have helped critique SDP performance since its inception.

Boylan et al. (1999) also provided a series of best practices for the creation, maintenance, and provision of developmental education. Best practices that might benefit the SDP include the following: the implementation of mandatory assessment and placement of new students, the promotion of institutional commitments to assess developmental education, providing a comprehensive approach to developmental education courses and services that encompass a variety of learning styles, the establishment of a series of ongoing orientation courses and activities, the abolishment of late registration for developmental students as students cannot afford to miss genesis class meetings, performing regular and systematic program evaluations, requiring an enhanced focus on the development of emotional intelligence skills, giving frequent tests to measure student progress while enrolled in developmental courses, and the use of theory-based approaches to enhance the teaching of developmental courses (Boylan et al., 1999).

Pretlow (2011) suggested institutions partnering up with local high schools to provide high school students information on what they need to make their transition to higher education seamless, to provide developmental courses to high school students to
understand the expectations of college courses, and align high school course curriculum and graduation requirements with college admission requirements. High school students participating in developmental courses after high school may be too late and affect their transition (Pretlow, 2011). Establishing this partnership and introducing developmental courses earlier could increase student’s higher education experience. Pretlow (2011) also recommended continually assessing SBP using meaningful and comprehensive program evaluations. When evaluating programs, Pretlow (2011) recommended employing an outside evaluator to decrease bias and comparing programs with similar variables.

In addition to evaluating program effectiveness, it is also important to be acknowledge of barriers Blacks face in higher. Acknowledging these barriers could foster a more positive higher education experience, which might lead to enhanced retention and graduation rates. According to Harper et al. (2009), policymakers in public institutional sectors can avoid racial disparities as regards access and success by understanding such barriers and implementing policies to overcome them. This is instrumental as Saddler (2005) reported that the general public does not truly understand Black educational barriers. These suggested policies and practices are not inclusive of all needed actions to provide enhanced access/opportunities (including the promotion of successful Mississippi SDPs), but they are a start.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on this study and lack of research on the SDP, there is significant future research that could be conducted. For example, an in-depth historical narrative would be beneficial to describe the history of the monitoring committee assigned by Judge Biggers. This narrative would describe how the committee carried out the rendering of the
remedial decree and determine if the monitoring committee was effective. At the time this study was performed, there was a lack of literature on SBP graduation rates. Of the existing literature on SBP retention rates, graduation rates were not included and could not be analyzed. Boylan et al. (1999) reported that establishing effectiveness of a developmental program by calculating and examining graduation rates is an important criteria. Therefore, additional studies to address graduation rates in SBP may prove useful.

One of the primary goals of this study was to determine if Blacks were provided additional educational opportunities to higher education. Since this study revealed they were not provided additional opportunities that met the Fordice standard, future research could enhance Black access to higher education by determining specific barriers Mississippi’s Black high school graduates experience before and after high school graduation. Examining those barriers could be conducted by engaging in qualitative research to gain critical knowledge about participants’ educational experiences (Higbee, Arendale, & Lundell, 2005). In order for the SDP to become effective and to adhere to the Fordice standard, it is imperative that overall program effectiveness be evaluated.

Summary

The SDP was a progressive step to ensure Blacks’ access to higher education in Mississippi. However, this study revealed that the intentions of the Supreme Court in the Fordice case have not been upheld as regards creating additional retention/graduation opportunities for Blacks. The literature reviewed resonated with the results of this study. As such, the researcher concludes that Blacks still encounter problems with experiencing, attending, and graduating from Mississippi’s public four-year colleges and universities.
The focus of the *Fordice* case was to create an additional pathway for Blacks to access higher education, but it did not focus on ensuring program/student success. New studies not only need to reexamine variables that could increase graduation rates for SDP participants, studies need to further explore educational barriers Blacks continue to face. Such research might determine how to better assist Blacks in overcoming barriers and complete a higher education degree from one of the eight public four-year higher education institutions in Mississippi.
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