THE POLITICS OF THE PIPELINE: NEOLIBERALISM AND AMERICAN EDUCATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

A Thesis Presented to
The Honors Tutorial College
of Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for Graduation
from the Honors Tutorial College
with the degree of
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science

By
Renée M. I. Hagerty

July 2015
This thesis has been approved by The Honors Tutorial College and the Department of Political Science

______________________________________________
Dr. Debra Thompson,
Professor, Political Science
Thesis Advisor

______________________________________________
Dr. James Mosher
Honors Tutorial College
Director of Studies, Political Science

______________________________________________
Dr. Jeremy Webster
Honors Tutorial College
Dean
Dedication

In any work of this size, there are always many people to thank. I’d like to start by thanking my advisor, Dr. Debra Thompson, who patiently endured this project for more than twice as long as anyone expected. There could not have been a better choice for a mentor or writing critic, which I am even more certain of as this project finally comes to a close.

The rest of this list is in one way or another responsible for my continued mental health and happiness. Blayr Richie, Raul Inesta and Clare Volz provided critical thesis and writing advice during the most difficult periods. My sister, Jeanette Hagerty, provided unending positive reinforcement and opportunities to blow off steam. My parents kept my basic needs met for months so that I could devote all of my attention to the composing of this work. Guennar Ryer and Adam Bogdanoff-Brite provided a steady supply of late night, long distance laughs and motivation. Then the last bit of encouragement, support and editing came from Barbara Kreuzer, who provided the fresh eyes necessary to see this project through to the end.

To this wonderful handful of individuals, as well as the incredible staff of the Ohio University Cutler Scholars and Honors Tutorial College, I owe the completion of this thesis. My gratitude cannot be underestimated. This work touches on the very heart of what drives my passionate dedication to education policy. Thanks to you all, I’ve been able to stay connected to that fire throughout this process. Thank you all for your tough love, guidance and unyielding faith. I hope that some part of this makes sense to each of you.
Table of Contents

Dedication ........................................................................................................................................... 3
Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 5
Chapter Two: Connections .................................................................................................................. 17
Chapter Three: Emergence of the Pipeline ....................................................................................... 36
Chapter Four: Mapping Policy Change ............................................................................................. 50
Chapter 5: Structures ......................................................................................................................... 71
Chapter Six: Conclusion ..................................................................................................................... 94
Bibliography ........................................................................................................................................ 101
Appendix ............................................................................................................................................. 109
Introduction

“Education, then, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance-wheel of the social machinery.” – Horace Mann 1848

Education as the ‘great equalizer’ remains an ideal in America, not the reality. From early childhood through adulthood, students from lower family incomes have significantly lower rates of success. Of those students from low income backgrounds who do qualify to pursue higher education, only 43% are likely to attain a college degree compared to 80% of their higher income peers. The value of increases in educational opportunity for individuals, and to society, cannot be understated. When children are unable to complete high school or leave school without basic, necessary skills, their life-chances are severely limited. Not only are their earnings lower and their risk for unemployment higher, but the community and society they belong to also loses. People with insufficient education impose limits on economies, damage community cohesion and impose a further burden on public budgets through higher spending in public health, support, and the penal systems.

---

5 Ibid
The need for our education system to be turning out highly educated citizens has never been more pressing. Projections indicate that America will face a skilled labor shortfall numbering in the millions by 2025 if there are not serious increases in the number of students graduating with four-year degrees. Historically, when the workforce has made increased demands for labor, the public has supported changes to the education system to address those needs. Since the 1980s, frustration over the lack of improvement in outcomes culminated in a consensus that the entire system needed to be redesigned.

Of the suggestions for what such an overhaul would look like, one rose to prominence: the P-16 pipeline. The remove institutional barriers by reconstituting education governance into a single state education agency overseeing both K-12 and postsecondary, with the federal DoE adding additional support. The pipeline envisioned transforming education governance from a series of isolated sectors into one, cohesive system overseeing preschool through postsecondary activity and regulation. It promised increases in student achievement at all levels through the removal of structural and institutional barriers. These barriers include but are not limited to: “conflicting standards for students, unequal opportunities for different groups of students,

---

placement exam confusion and intensive remediation, high college dropout rates and finger-pointing”.

Inefficiencies in governance structure organization hinder the ability of any additional reform to be carried out successfully. Streamlining the existing, separate sectors into a single institution is therefore a prerequisite to improving outcomes. State law makers and educators alike saw this as a necessary step forward to address educational inequity for students and the country.

Not only did the pipeline offer a solution to equity concerns of educators, it also fit the growing paradigm of neoliberal governance. Neoliberalism emphasizes an economics centric governance model that positions education as a way to provide workers for a growing global marketplace. The P-16 pipeline was embraced by academics, educators, policy makers and the business class as a way to improve American education for all stakeholders, most notably at the 1999 Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

The launch of P-16 pipeline language occurred in 1999. When I went to work for the Ohio Board of Regents in 2012 assessing how prepared the state education agencies were to begin implementing federal policies
requiring a pipeline structure, I expected to find evidence demonstrating its existence. However, I found remarkably little indicating Ohio had a pipeline system of governance in education, despite it being more than ten years after its hearty rhetorical introduction. This was disconcerting to me.

The pipeline had been enthusiastically presented as the next big step in education. Its assertions were bolstered by national neoliberal rhetoric about the importance of highly skilled workers for the new, global and information based economy. It was also vital to the success of policies being implemented statewide that required high levels of coordination between agencies. Even after I left the internship, I wondered why the enthusiasm of the pipelines introduction by educators, policy makers and legislators across the country at the start of the twenty-first century had failed to translate into institutionally transformative action.

Herein lays the fundamental puzzle that this thesis explores: in what ways has the neoliberal paradigm influenced education policy of the twenty-first century? Despite evidence that institutional barriers inhibit student achievement, Ohio continues to govern preschool, K-12 and higher education separately, with overlapping regulations from the federal level.\textsuperscript{15} The purpose of this thesis is to identify how the rise of neoliberalism furthered as well as constrained P-16 pipeline

implementation. The ultimate impact has been the layering of new, neoliberally valued policies onto those in existence, rather than attempt systemic restructuring.

**Education and Neoliberalism**

The ramifications of the neoliberal paradigm on American education is the focus of “Neoliberalism and Education Reform” by E. Wayne Ross and Rich Gibson. The authors of this collection draw connections between the demands of this ideology and changes in education over the last two decades. They argue that neoliberalism’s primary values are at odds with equity and quality in education. According to their logic, as the rhetoric of neoliberalism spread and gained acceptance in America it transformed education from a tool for achieving social, political and economic equality, into an institution intended to achieve purely capitalist ends. To achieve those ends in education policies were narrowed to address issues of accountability and outcomes.

Neoliberalism is the prevailing governance and economic paradigm in the United States. As such, it is a major influencing factor in the political spectacle. The political spectacle is a concept that envisions American politics as a conglomeration of forces that influence each other

---

in ways which distort reality.\textsuperscript{18} According to Murray Edelman, language in the political spectacle has the power to determine what issues are considered problems, possible solutions and which option is pursued.\textsuperscript{19} In this case, neoliberal values of accountability, choice and efficiency aligned with P-16 pipeline goals of equity, alignment and efficiency.\textsuperscript{20} I will rely heavily on Edelman’s conception of political language to demonstrate how the pervasiveness of neoliberal rhetoric contributed to the popularity of the pipeline and then constrained its implementation.

The P-16 pipeline in Ohio does not exist as a governance system. The theory of historical institutionalism can be used to identify and analyze changes that have been made since the introduction of the pipeline in 1999. Historical institutionalism positions institutions as the independent variable with the power to influence actions as well as outcomes.\textsuperscript{21} Institutions, according to Peter Hall and Rosemary Taylor, are formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the organizational structure of the polity or political economy.\textsuperscript{22} Considering both policies and the formal governance structures as institutions in this sense illustrates what changes have and have not occurred in the system

\textsuperscript{19} Murray Edelman. \textit{Constructing the Political Spectacle}. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988. p.18
\textsuperscript{22} Peter Hall and Rosemary Taylor. "Political Science and the Three Institutionalisms." Paper presented at MPIFG Scientific Advisory Board, Colon, Germany, May 9, 1996
over the decades. Mahoney and Thelen describe the addition of new rules, laws or norms over top of or alongside those already existing as layering.\textsuperscript{23} The addition of new policies, programs and reform language, without changing the government structure within education governance is also layering. Ohio’s education governance system, has been subject to layering, not systemic restructuring, since the introduction of the pipeline.

\textbf{Current Literature}

Current literature on the P-16 pipeline tends to ignore the political realities of a country that believes in a neoliberal ideology. American education literature reiterates every few years that a pipeline system could remove structural barriers to student achievement and improve processes of educational service delivery.\textsuperscript{24} Yet, even when calling for state legislatures to pursue the necessary changes, the political realities of neoliberal governance are not acknowledged. Its primary disconnect is that the neoliberal paradigm supports everything -accountability, choice, efficiency- about the P-16 pipeline, except its call for the redesign of education governance organizations. The complaint that education theory


\textsuperscript{24} Pathways to College Network. \textit{Aligning P-12 and Postsecondary Education: Toward a Seamless P-16 Education System}. College Readiness Issues. Boston, MA: The Education Resources Institute, 2007.
fails to take politics into account and vice versa is not new, but in this case it is particularly troubling.\textsuperscript{25}

By ignoring the efforts that have taken place to date under the banner of pipeline rhetoric, education experts neglect to realize that policy makers believe the pipeline already exists. On the same note, by failing to recognize that the true spirit of the pipeline goes beyond accountability, policy makers perpetuate a system of inequity that cannot hope to meet the needs of our global economy. Inequity in this case refers to the systemic inhibiting of students from low-income backgrounds from pursuing postsecondary education.\textsuperscript{26}

The literature that does connect neoliberalism with education has been concerned more with the addition of accountability systems, than with the potential power of the P-16 pipeline. Accountability systems of every variety have been critiqued for not measuring educational growth holistically, for threatening the job-security of teachers, and for subjecting students to hours of strenuous testing each year.\textsuperscript{27} The harm of accountability systems in education has been thoroughly documented.\textsuperscript{28} Of all the attention paid to accountability, little of it has been connected to neoliberalism and none of it to the P-16 pipeline. As such, this thesis is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} E. Wayne Ross, and Rich Gibson. 2007. “Neoliberalism & Education Reform”, 1-14. Hampton Press; Cresskill, NJ 2007
\end{itemize}
uniquely positioned to bring together the works of education, government, and economics scholars to address a major road block to increasing educational attainment for all students, but particularly those in the state of Ohio.

**Outline of Argument**

This thesis demonstrates that implementation of the P-16 pipeline has been limited to the layering of additional accountability systems over existing, distinctly separated education governance structures. My argument has five parts. First, it defines both the P-16 pipeline concept and neoliberalism, demonstrates the rhetorical links between the two, and highlights how this could lead to layering. I use Edelman’s understanding of the power of language to draw connections between the goals of the pipeline and the values of neoliberal ideology. These connections demonstrate how pipeline rhetoric was used to build consensus around neoliberal ideals. It also indicates why the portion of the pipeline with the strongest links to neoliberalism, accountability, was the primary component acted on in the last decade.

I then trace the development of these concepts over the last several decades in America. This section proves the condition of the pipeline and neoliberalism at the turn of the century. Earlier policies, particularly since the 1980s, are briefly discussed so that the fragmented nature of education policy is understood. The developments during the
time of the pipeline’s introduction are discussed thoroughly for their effect in Ohio. This sets the stage for a discussion of nationally implemented policies since 2000.

I use historical institutionalism to explain the effects of national policies enacted since the concept of the pipeline was introduced. None of the three nationally pursued policies of this time period provide states with the tools or motivation to overhaul their systems. Instead, my review indicates that these policies used the language of the pipeline to justify the implementation of multiple reforms, with no component ensuring the existence of the pipeline. The one aspect all of these policies share, besides pipeline language, is insistence on the creation of ever more punitive accountability systems. This section makes it clear that policy layering of accountability systems have occurred.

The next portion of my argument focuses on the ramifications of these accountability centric policies on existing structures of education governance. By comparing organizational structures of the major education agency actors in Ohio: the federal Department of Education, Board of Regents and state Department of Education, I show that change has primarily occurred as expansions of state accountability infrastructures. Ohio was on the forefront of efforts heralding the P-16 pipeline as a necessity for students, yet it is thoroughly lacking the organizational framework the pipeline requires. Even when considering the efforts of regional P-16 initiatives and explicit P-16 job descriptions,
the institutional evidence compiled clearly demonstrates that the pipeline has not been implemented. Instead, Ohio and the nation have allowed the values of neoliberalism to limit change in governance structures to the addition of burdensome accountability systems.

These arguments will be broken into separate chapters.

Chapter two provides a thorough definition of the P-16 pipeline and neoliberalism. It also provides an overview of language theory and new institutionalism to demonstrate the ways policy is influenced. This provides the theoretical basis for the argument.

Chapter three lays out a brief chronology of the pipeline’s development into a policy goal. It also reviews the growth of neoliberalism in popularity during those decades. These tandem timelines allow for the author to make demonstrative links between the language of the pipeline and the goals of neoliberalism.

Chapter four reviews the major education policy works of the last decade: No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, and the Common Core State Standards. Investigating these major initiatives reveals exactly where opportunities to implement the whole system reform the pipeline calls for were missed, or intentionally disregarded, in favor of layering neoliberal accountability systems onto existing structures.

Chapter five considers the structural changes to the three relevant governing structures in Ohio education: the U.S. Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Education, and the Ohio Board of
Regents. Comparing organizational charts from before the pipeline’s introduction with the current structures, demonstrates where changes have occurred and opportunities to implement the pipeline were disregarded. Those changes are then analyzed with K-12 goals and neoliberal values to identify, as with the policy chapter, where pipeline reforms were pursued or ignored.

The conclusion reiterates all of this evidence. Together it paints a picture of a state and nation that let politics get in the way of difficult, but meaningful reform.
Chapter Two: Connections

It took strong, consistent language, developed over a period of years to create the concept of education as a pipeline. Still more consensus building was required to take that concept and determine what changes would be necessary to make it a reality. The language that made the pipeline possible was closely related to the language of neoliberalism. The power of language will play a fundamental role in analyzing the rise of the pipeline in tandem with neoliberal policies. In this chapter I will define the pipeline and neoliberalism more thoroughly. I will then use political language theory to demonstrate their connections and introduce how historical institutionalism can explain the ramifications of those connections.

Pipeline

According to the Education Commission of the States (ECS), the pipeline is used to convey the idea of a “seamless continuum of public education” from preschool through a baccalaureate degree. P-16 describes a system including preschool (P), current compulsory education from Kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12), and four additional years of schooling (grade 16). Sometimes policy makers will include graduate studies (P-20) or consider the pipeline as starting in kindergarten (K-16), but each variation refers to a vision of education as

---

one cohesive system.\textsuperscript{31} Given that this work is an undergraduate thesis, there is not enough space to address the governance of preschool systems. As such, while the author agrees with the ECS that early learning is crucial to fulfillment of the pipeline goals, the chapters in this work will focus on the issues of the K-16 pipeline. The ramifications of this omission will be addressed in the limitations section at the end of the thesis.

The P-16 pipeline delineates a single system for students as well as for the bodies that govern them. The pipeline concept emphasizes alignment between sectors, rather than isolation within them.\textsuperscript{32} K-12 and postsecondary sectors are currently governed separately by the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents, respectively. The federal Department of Education provides additional governance to both of these agencies.

Separate governing bodies would not themselves be problematic, if their responsibilities and expectations of students and staff were aligned. Unfortunately, an “expectations gap” exists between high school and postsecondary requirements as well as between state and federal governing bodies.\textsuperscript{33} This gap exacerbates the institutional issues students must overcome to succeed. Such institutional barriers include but are not

\textsuperscript{31} Elizabeth Laird. Developing and Supporting P-20 Education Data Systems: Different States, Different Models. N.p.: National Center for Educational Achievement, Data Quality Campaign, 2008; ALSO: http://nebula.wsimg.com/5f60e433923b11c88fa1a486b931e32?AccessKeyId=76EFDDD77703ACB930FCD\&disposition=0\&alloworigin=1


limited to: “conflicting standards for students, unequal opportunities for different groups of students, placement exam confusion and intensive remediation, high college drop-out rates and finger-pointing”. These are incredibly problematic barriers for students. In addition, separate governance structures prevent a cohesive accountability system from being implemented. That leaves space for finger pointing, with no agency held responsible for the outcomes.35

Policy makers who identified these symptoms as a systemic issue insist that improving postsecondary attainment levels would be possible by creating a “seamless pathway between high school and college.”36 The K-16 pipeline system proposes to achieve that by reconstituting education governance in a single state education agency overseeing both K-12 and postsecondary, with the federal DoE adding additional support. This would integrate the responsibilities of all education governance bodies and other stake-holders into the process of running education.37 Such a fundamental change in the organizational structures of educational governance is necessary, at least in Ohio, to combat the institutional pitfalls that face students and all future attempts at reform.

P-16 strives to raise the achievement level of all learners by closing the gaps among different student demographic group attainment

levels.\textsuperscript{38} What such a streamlined system could mean for the improvement of education and the economy in America is nearly limitless, but would require that the long laundry list of issues constantly thwarting education initiatives be addressed.\textsuperscript{39} This list includes tensions between federal, state and local power; issues at the local level between school boards, teachers unions and parents; managing the impact of environmental factors like poverty on education, and insuring the legitimacy of testing metrics, just to name a few. While these have been discussed at length in preeminent education policy journals, there is not space in this thesis to discuss them.\textsuperscript{40} Instead, I will focus my argument on the structural changes the pipeline calls for, the effect of neoliberalism on implementation, and outcomes in institutions since 1999.

The ten expectations of the P-16 pipeline, according to the Education Commission of the States, are: create a streamlined P-16 system; improve student achievement for all learners; improve access and equity in public schools; reduce the need for remedial education; improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures; enhance teacher quality; increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels; enhance the provision of early learning for all children; improve education finance; and create new governance structures.\textsuperscript{41} The existing silos and

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid p.3
anticipated changes are illustrated by the graphic below from the Education Commission of the states\textsuperscript{42}:

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid p.10
Moving Toward a P-16 System

How Legislators Can Build From the Current Fractured System...

Areas of Mutual Interest –
Early Learning/Postsecondary
- Enhancing preparation and professional development of early learning professionals
- Researching developmentally appropriate learning environments
- Creating finance models for systems with universal access

Early Learning
Policy Goals
- Expanding access
- Supporting reliable quality criteria
- Securing adequate funding
- Professionalizing teachers
For details see www.ecs.org

K-12 Education
Policy Goals
- Creating equitable opportunities for all students
- Providing challenging courses
- Connecting exit exams with standards
- Eliminating general track
- Supporting learner needs
- Upgrading teacher quality
For details see www.ecs.org

Postsecondary Education
Policy Goals
- Expanding access
- Improving student success rates
- Developing common transfer procedures
- Strengthening teacher preparation
For details see www.ecs.org and www.communitycollegepolicy.org

Areas of Mutual Interest –
Early Learning/K-12
- Expanding access to early learning for all children
- Creating linkages between early learning and K-12
- Improving school readiness
- Promoting meaningful assessments
- Building relationships between families and schools

Areas of Mutual Interest –
K-12/Postsecondary
- Upgrading teacher preparation and professional development
- Aligning high school exit and college entrance exams
- Phasing out remedial education
- Improving college readiness and college success
- Recalibrating grades 11-14
- Sharing academic performance data

...To Create an Integrated P-16 System

Early Learning
K-12 Education
Postsecondary Education

Tied together at critical points; seamless in look and feel; efficient in operation; balanced and predictable in funding; uniformly of high quality; responsive to societal needs; successful with widely diverse learners
A point of clarification is important here. The graphic above illustrates what the implementation of a P-16 education governance pipeline would entail. We will see in later chapters that this has not been realized. However, there is also literature that refers to education, no matter the organization of its governing bodies, as a pipeline from preschool through grade 16. That reference uses the pipeline as a metaphor to describe the flow of students. While this may be helpful in addressing problems facing students directly, it does not deal with issues in the delivery of resources or of jurisdiction. As such, the pipeline of concern in this thesis is the P-16 education governance pipeline.

The decentralization of education in America is clearly evident in the depiction above. Despite overlapping interests that provide opportunities for shared governance, our education system keeps the oversight of each sector separate. Federal oversight is layered over the top of all these sectors to different degrees. In the American system, education is considered a state issue with local control paramount. As such, the federal government, even if all three branches were in agreement, would not be able to mandate the implementation of the P-16 pipeline as a governance structure. That would be considered a breach of state authority. The growth of federal, particularly executive, involvement in education will be delineated in the next chapter.

---

43 Ex: The school to prison pipeline, the law/engineering pipeline.
Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is an economic model that operates as an ideology, a form of governance and a policy package. The economic theory of neoliberalism calls for policies that create a free market, reduce public spending on social services, deregulate, privatize, and eliminate the conception of ‘public good’ or ‘community’ in favor of ‘individual responsibility.’ Economically these tenets of free-market capitalism, private enterprise, consumer choice, entrepreneurial initiative, and minimizing regulation encourage wealth accumulation in the upper classes. Politically, neoliberalism encourages ‘new public management’ style policies that view citizens as customers. These often stress values of competition, self-interest, and decentralization. The acceptance of neoliberalism both economically and politically has become the prevailing paradigm in the United States and globally.

The paradigm of neoliberalism has been so pervasive as to create a virtual ‘monoculture’ in the United States where alternatives are unfathomable. This has a profound effect on the education system.

49 Ibid p.12
According to David Hursh, the promotion of corporate over social welfare has redefined the relationship between individuals and the government.\textsuperscript{52} As society expects more of individuals, their expectations of schools change. When students are cast as future workers, schools shoulder the blame for economic downturns. Since society views schools as the primary reason for economic insufficiency, it seeks to improve the economy by improving schools.

This translated into federally mandated accountability systems with increasingly harsh penalties. The rise of accountability in American education will be documented fully in the next chapter. For now, suffice it to say that accountability fits the needs of neoliberal governance within a federalist system because it allows for top-level ‘steering’ of change without any actual interference inside of schools.\textsuperscript{53} These evaluative measures provide data for comparison, create new markets for private enterprise, and allow government actors to be seen as affecting change without being blamed for any failure. Since the spread of the neoliberal paradigm in the eighties, schools have become governed by accountability, choice and efficiency.\textsuperscript{54} This represents a neoliberal shift in education, epitomized by “policymakers’ greater faith in markets and

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid p.17
competition than in teachers or students”. Accountability has become the golden child of neoliberal America.

While neoliberalism has ushered in some changes within education, it has restricted others. To achieve goals of privatization, liberalization and deregulation, neoliberalism emphasizes the creation of Public-Private-Partnerships (PPPs). These allow government agencies to partially privatize areas that had been wholly public. These organizations are intended to serve as technical experts, who can bring ‘apolitical’ interests to the management of regulation and governance. Their existence and the preference of neoliberalism for the creation of such additions and reconfigurations prevents the reorganization of existing, public, bodies in new public ways.

This means that the neoliberal paradigm can support most of the explicit goals of the pipeline, but not its most crucial component of restructuring to remove institutional barriers. Without the reorganization of education governance however, the institutional barriers mentioned earlier will remain, only to be compounded by new expectations from reforms that are not aligned between sectors.

The Power of Language

58 Ibid p7
The paradigm of neoliberalism has become so ingrained in American life that it is no longer recognizable by most as an ideology. If it is, it is understood as intrinsic to the American way of life. This chapter is primarily concerned with the development of the language of the pipeline within the neoliberal context based on Edelman’s understanding that “political language is political reality.” Neoliberal rhetoric is pervasive and highly influential in creating modern political reality. As such, neoliberalism is a fantastic study of Murray Edelman’s theory of the political spectacle, the idea that condition of politics in America distorts the way policies are created.

The premise of Edelman’s work is that “language usage is strategic” because politics is conflict over meaning. As such, our understanding of problems in society is shaped by the rhetoric of competing ideologies. Problems, according to Edelman, are created through a complicated and endless process of political and moral competition. In that process, ideologies compete for dominance strategically using symbols and gestures. Symbols can be anything that evokes a particular response based on the meaning ascribed to it. Policy activities and rhetoric are gestures that indicate attention is being given to a problem, even if the underlying causes remain untouched. For Edelman, policies are

---

62 Ibid p.12
63 Ibid p.17
64 Ibid p.8
“shifting, diverse, and contradictory responses to a spectrum of political interests.”65 Altogether, this means that problems are created rhetorically to justify a particular response.66

Applying this view of political rhetoric to the subject at hand, it becomes evident that neoliberalism played a fundamental role in the (non)implementation of the P-16 pipeline. As the next chapter will demonstrate in detail, the pipeline plan for restructuring educational governance developed during the rise of neoliberalism. Given Edelman’s understanding of the power of paradigms to shape policy, it is not surprising that echoes of neoliberal values are embedded in the pipeline. Of interest in this work though, is how that language influenced outcomes. The evidence to be discussed demonstrates that only those portions of the pipeline concept directly associated with neoliberal values have been implemented.

To demonstrate this clearly, I have created a chart linking the nine explicit goals of the pipeline with their relative connection to neoliberal values. The table is a qualitative rendering of the explicit goals of the pipeline with associated aspects of neoliberal economics, governance or ideology as explained earlier. The table is particularly concerned with neoliberal values of accountability, choice and efficiency as those are the

---

65 Ibid p.15
66 Ibid p.18
most closely linked to education. The goal related to early learning has been left off because preschool programs are beyond the scope of this thesis.

Table 1: P-16 Goals and Neoliberal Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice&lt;sup&gt;70&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt; student as ‘consumer’ in higher education and provides them with more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;74&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued&lt;sup&gt;76&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart illustrates, not all of the goals associated with the P-16 pipeline have corresponding neoliberal values. While improvements in accountability, efficiency and choice are within the proclaimed interests

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid
<sup>74</sup> Ibid
of neoliberalism, restructuring of the nature proscribed by the pipeline is not. Accountability connects with three of the pipeline goals. It allows governments to ensure improvements in education finance, the appropriate alignment of curricula and assessments, and forces staff to demonstrate that future workers are gaining necessary skills. The neoliberal value of efficiency is supported three of the pipeline goals. Efficiency can be increased in education by removing the redundancy of college remediation, improving the transfer of students between institutions and maximizing the functioning of bureaucracy while minimizing the amount of funding being used. The neoliberal values of choice combines the concepts of students as future workers and the emphasis on free-market functioning to connect with two pipeline goals. When students of any level are consumers, their ability to choose their school of secondary or postsecondary education is viewed through neoliberalism to increase equity and access. As the chart illustrates, seven of the pipeline goals match with the values of the neoliberal paradigm.

The remaining two goals –P-16 system and new governance structures- are outside of neoliberalism. This is because the type of restructuring necessary is purely public, and neoliberalism prefers change to include a private component. Since the P-16 system would not involve

---

78 Ibid
PPPs in any way, the dramatic changes to pursue the overhaul of the system cannot be supported by neoliberalism.⁷⁹

Therefore, the policy developments to be described in the following chapters illustrate that P-16 was rhetorically embraced by neoliberal policymakers and stakeholders, but that implementation of the system was only pursued on those seven aspects directly linked to neoliberal values as illustrated above. Those remaining points are transformative, however, making them what sets the P-16 pipeline apart. Without the restructuring those goals call for, any policy pursued in the name of the pipeline is incomplete and therefore unable to enact the level of improvement expected.

Edelman’s theory of language explains why the pipeline was introduced and accepted at the start of the millennium. To illustrate the ramifications of implementing only the portions consistent with neoliberalism, however, we must turn to a different area of political science: new institutionalism.

**Institutionalism**

Within political science, new institutionalism positions institutions as an independent variable, arguing that they put weight on actions as well as outcomes.⁸⁰ Institutions are defined as “formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the

---


organizational structure of the polity or political economy”. More simply, institutions, like the state and federal departments of education, are “distributional instruments laden with power implications.”

Of the three forms of new institutionalism- historical, rational choice, and materialist- historical will be used for the purposes of this essay. Historical institutionalism accepts that politics is competition for resources by rival groups and seeks to use institutional organization structures and economies to explain outcome variance. In this instance, the system’s wide change called for under the P-16 pipeline model compared to the accountability centric reality is explained through layering. Layering, within historical institutionalism, refers to instances where new rules, laws, or norms are introduced on top of or alongside those already in existence.

It should also be noted that policies can be constrained by existing institutions. Institutions themselves- formal, informal, rhetorical and structural- may feedback on each other in such a way as to encourage path dependence. According to Paul Pierson, path dependence refers to a self-reinforcing process within institutions. This can include
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mechanisms from the political components of an institution or its relationship with citizen stakeholders.\textsuperscript{87} This means that not only are policy makers constrained by the function of the institution itself, they are also limited by citizen expectations of institutional roles, or policy legacies.\textsuperscript{88} Path dependence and policy legacies tend to reinforce existing processes and jurisdictions despite changes in rhetoric or calls for reform.\textsuperscript{89} Since neoliberalism is not supportive of full system change, its pervasiveness as the paradigm of the time combined with traditional institutional path dependency constrained change to layering.

Layering is problematic in education governance because it compounds systemic barriers and adds additional weight to existing misalignments.\textsuperscript{90} In this case, the institutional structures of education governance are made more convoluted by policies and programs that operate as additional institutions. These issues, although central to the issues reforms have faced in the last twenty years, are rarely the target of their efforts. The pipeline itself was lauded but the results this thesis highlights stem only from its less dramatic components. Unfortunately, individual policies and programs are no more than “large scale tinkering”

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid p.10
\textsuperscript{88} Peter Hall, and Rosemary Taylor. "Political Science and the Three Institutionalisms." Paper presented at MPIFG Scientific Advisory Board, Colon, Germany, May 9, 1996. p.6
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid
that cannot hope to achieve positive outcomes until the system itself is oriented to change.⁹¹

I argue that P-16 pipeline reform was, and remains, too radical to fit within the understanding of educational governance accepted by citizens and bureaucrats. To make the pipeline passable, it needed a palatable rhetoric of reform. That rhetoric was found in the language of neoliberalism. It is for this reason that the pipeline was presented in terms of neoliberal values and its more extreme intention, systemic reform, was ignored. Every other component of the pipeline is contingent on changes to the system structure. Without removing the structural and institutional barriers, improved student outcomes will be not be possible.

Historical institutionalism allows us to consider the power of the language of the pipeline, to analyze the differences between structural changes we would expect to see and those we actually do, and to posit political reasons for the discrepancies between expectation and reality. This thesis is organized accordingly in order to demonstrate that the P-16 pipeline, while likely a positive reform, has been limited to the layering of additional accountability systems over existing siloed education governance structures. Specifically, this thesis will show how those portions of the pipeline connected to neoliberalism, as outlined above, have been implemented via policy layering nationally and in Ohio. The
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application of additional layers of policies and organizational structures, rather than a system change, will be evident.
Chapter Three: Emergence of the Pipeline

Shifts in education policy or governance structures do not happen in the spur of the moment.\textsuperscript{92} The concept of improving education for all students by breaking down governance silos has been around for half a century, but only began to gain policy traction in the last two decades.\textsuperscript{93} In searching for the emergence of the P-16 pipeline, it is therefore necessary to explore the development of its various components within the American domestic policy sphere from its earliest identification up to now. This chapter will review the highlights from 1960-2000 to demonstrate the ideation of the pipeline, the rise of neoliberalism, and the growth of accountability politics. This timeline will emphasize how the development of the pipeline was interwoven with neoliberal ideals. In doing so, the larger paradigm will be shown to constrain pipeline implementation to accountability, rather than systemic change. The bulk of the chapter will be devoted to national education policy, narrowing in on Ohio for the most recent decade.

Setting the Stage: The Sixties and Seventies

It is no coincidence that the most turbulent decades in modern American domestic history laid the foundation that would generate the P-16 pipeline. Politically speaking, the 1960s were significant for moving toward the centralization of domestic policy efforts via categorical grant


Categorical grant funding, given validity via the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Higher Education Act (HEA), provided large amounts of funding to states as long as they met certain standards and criteria, primarily dealing with race and gender equity. These ‘strings’ attached to federal funding were designed to counter decades of decentralized education policy that had focused on maximizing efficiency at the expense of equity, which the Civil Rights era had brought to the forefront.

This led to what is considered by many to be a pattern of “rhetorical school reform.” Those within education were increasingly being told what they should be doing and changing, although that work remained up to their discretion. This shifted the focus of education governance bodies. State and federal level work previously had been primarily concerned with providing resources and encouraging experimentation. New interest in the outcomes of those resources shifted the governmental role from “innovation to evaluation.” When before the federal level had provided money to encourage states and districts to add programs and support, beginning in the sixties the Department of Education began pushing for evidence of impact from the programs it helped to create.
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In education, the sixties were a time of radical anti-establishment experimentation.\(^9\) The reforms pursued during that time were creative, optimistic and aggressive, until 1975 when the New York Times announced that scores on the SAT, the primary college entrance exam, had been dropping.\(^10\) Innovation, it was determined, did not lead directly to improved outcomes. However, the lower scores were at least partially due to more diversity in the backgrounds of the students pursuing college.\(^11\) The lesson to education reformers of the seventies then, was that equality of access was an oversimplification that would not improve education outcomes.\(^12\) This decade changed the relationship between policy makers and government, leading to new roles for state education departments.\(^13\) Whereas previously they had been responsible for gathering, compiling and publishing education statistics, they now were expected to enforce standards, consult and provide expert guidance to local levels.\(^14\)

The evaluative efforts that took hold during the seventies had emerged during the sixties initially at the state level. These then expanded in the seventies as the federal government became involved
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through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).105 This shift continued and grew significantly leading to today’s education policy, especially at the federal level. The structures developed during this transition provided a basic organizational framework at the state level that still exists today. These decades saw an increased federal role, the introduction of nationwide testing, and a shift toward state governments as enforcers. All of these policy shifts set the stage for pipeline language of a single system, with aligned testing, guided by a single state agency.

**Connecting the Economy: The 1980s**

The 1980s brought a conservative shift to American politics. Known as ‘Reaganomics,’ ‘New Federalism,’ or ‘neoliberalism,’ reforms across the federal level reverted back to decentralization.106 New Federalism followed the logic of neoliberalism. The champion of these reforms was President Ronald Reagan. The primary components of his neoliberal education agenda were block grants and an emphasis on education for improved economic outcomes.

Both of these had profound effects for the pipeline; the former for limiting its implementation and the latter for justifying it. Block grants developed in response to a consensus that too much government spending had been allocated during the civil rights era across the federal level.
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These grants were given to the states with no strings attached, unlike categorical grant funding, but in smaller amounts than previously allotted. In contrast, connecting education to the economy expanded justifications for federal involvement. Previously, federal involvement in the states’ issue of education had been for national defense and social justice reasons. This new, explicit, focus on the economy fit with the larger shift toward neoliberal policies of this period.

The link between education and the economy was made even stronger by the 1983 commission report “A Nation At Risk.” In introducing the report, then-President Reagan put education squarely on the national policy agenda. Within its larger call to action, the report encouraged higher standards, accountability, and choice/competition as a motivator for all stakeholders. It demonstrated an interest in change across all levels of education governance and defined excellence for each accordingly, asserting “our nation's people and its schools and colleges must be committed to achieving excellence.”
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This served to position education policy as a cornerstone of the national interest in pluralism and individual freedom. The report and the support it received from the president also further linked educational reforms to neoliberal goals. Rather than serve academic and social factors, schools began to be governed by “accountability, choice and efficiency.” Accountability fits the needs of neoliberalism by allowing governments to ‘steer’ change yet be free of blame, because they are merely reporting on the existence of failure, not its causes. The introduction of government supported choice in education introduced market economics into a previously guarded realm. Neoliberal emphasis on efficiency would translate in later decades into justification for federally mandated school closures and other measures that would not have been possible in previous decades.

These goals fundamentally reshaped public education by adding additional federal scrutiny to the existing system. What that scrutiny uncovered, from evaluations and national testing data, was a need for structural change across all levels of education. Sporadic state efforts at improvement, particularly of ‘bridge’ or ‘transition’ points, were reviewed and critiqued, with the conclusion frequently being that a
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framework was needed to tie local reforms together.\textsuperscript{118} Language referring to education as a ‘chain’ or ‘continuum,’ where changes at one level have consequences for other levels, began to circulate in journals and reports.\textsuperscript{119} These often also included a call to state governments to step in and legislate how implementation of reforms already passed should proceed. For the first time, stakeholders throughout education were encouraging the involvement of the higher education community in improving K-12 retention and outcomes.\textsuperscript{120} All of these concepts would later merge to create the P-16 pipeline.

This decade also saw the earliest explicit use of the term ‘pipeline’ in education literature. During this period, the ‘pipeline’ was institutionalized as a metaphor in engineering to illustrate progression through education and professions in a linear fashion, with those exiting “leaking” out with no opportunity for reentrance.\textsuperscript{121} This profession specific early model has since been adapted to justify targeted recruiting efforts in engineering, to identify problematic linear systems within the larger realm of education, and expanded into the full system pipeline metaphor this thesis is concerned with.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid
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In many ways the eighties were the most crucial formative decade for
the pipeline. Not only was it the first time that ‘pipeline’ was associated
with a cohesive education structure, it also was powerful period of
conceptual development. The elevation of education to a federal cabinet
level Department created a new and larger space for nationwide policy
action on educational issues. Economic issues made improving
educational outcomes imperative, and the national acceptance of
neoliberal policies led to interest in changing the way resources were
delivered.\textsuperscript{123}

All of these elements- the increased federal involvement on all levels
of education, emphasis on outcomes, state legislation of local
implementation, involvement of the higher education community in K-
12, and the language of education as a singular process- laid the
foundation for what would ultimately form the pipeline as a metaphor
and policy concept. Perhaps not surprisingly, the evolution of the term
‘pipeline’ in its full sense would still take more than fifteen years, even
after all of the changes of the 1980s. Its first broad and large scale use
was during the resurgence of attention on education at the turn of the
century.

**Preparing for the New Millennium: The 1990s**

Early in this decade, education experts began suggesting
collaborations between institutions of higher education and schools.
School-university partnerships had been pushed for by various scholars before but generally for the sake of the adults within the system.\textsuperscript{124} This particular concept was an immediate precursor to the P-16 pipeline, as it suggested connecting the professionals in K-12 with those in higher education, but did not call for full-scale institutional change. The expectations in this model were confined to better teacher preparation, improved school climate, renewal of policy design, etc.

Perhaps because of their limited scope, school-university partnerships were widely accepted within the education community and considered “virtually de rigueur” by 1993.\textsuperscript{125} However, acknowledgment and acceptance did not translate into widespread practice. Across the country, “inter-institutional symbiosis” was still virtually non-existent in the mid-nineties.\textsuperscript{126} Where it did exist, universities treated working with schools as an act of “noblesse oblige,” rather than one of mutual benefit.\textsuperscript{127} Even though the efforts to create symbiosis on a wider scale were lacking in the early nineties, the consensus that such collaborations would be valuable was crucial to the nationwide acceptance of the pipeline concept by 1999.

During the final year of the twentieth century, there was immense interest in policy improvement. Citing the turn of the century,

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid p.29
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid p.30
stakeholders across the political spectrum were turning critical eyes on the education system as a whole. What they found were separate governing structures controlling K-12 and higher education that had a ‘chasm’ between them, as though they operated “in separate universes.” The spirit of the new millennium called for large-scale, full-system change, which would not be possible in education as long as the chasm remained between them.

It is understandable then, that this was the year that multiple reports, convenings and government organizations began to use the pipeline explicitly as a metaphor to describe the educational system. The way to counter the issues created by existing systems’ organization, it was argued, was to launch initiatives based on ‘linkage ideas’ that had been conceived on smaller and fragmented ways at some state and local levels. The K-16 pipeline served as framework for pursuing the intensification and broadening of those efforts across the country. Previous attempts to connect the two spheres had been primarily focused on target populations in specific locales for purposes of equity, the K-16 pipeline was intended to include content and standards links between the systems in a way that could be mirrored across the nation. Preschool was still considered a concern for Health and Family Services, rather than
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education, which explains why it was not included during this period.\textsuperscript{131} The K-16 pipeline, rather than P-16, was politically feasible because it did not require state or local stakeholders to give up any of their power. Rather, it provided a shared vision for all to work towards while creating a larger role for the federal level.\textsuperscript{132}

**Unfulfilled Expectations: 2000s**

Despite the strong rhetorical introduction the pipeline received, the decade following it did not see those changes called for. Major policies were implemented however, and their justifications used the same language as the pipeline, while the accountability portions moved to the forefront. The reasons the reforms failed to bring about the change called for, despite the positive effects forecasted, had everything to do with neoliberalism and historical institutionalism, and very little with the policy itself.

The decade started off with a new president and an ambitious renewal of the ESEA entitled No Child Left Behind (NCLB). An “impressive legislative victory,” NCLB was made possible by the focus on accountability.\textsuperscript{133} Besides the neoliberal purposes of accountability discussed earlier, it also served as an accessible rhetorical tool for both Republicans and Democrats. Without evidence against it, neoliberal

\textsuperscript{131} See archived department organizational structure in Chapter 5
pressures encouraging it, and the decades of precedent for expanding federal education authority, NCLB passed less than a year after it was suggested.\textsuperscript{134} NCLB will be discussed further in the next chapter. For now it is crucial to point out that this was the first time local schools could be forced to close by a federal department. Such an expansion of federalism at the national level had not happened in education since the introduction of the ESEA in 1964.\textsuperscript{135}

The turning point of the pipeline in Ohio occurred immediately after the passage of NCLB. Professionals and policymakers alike saw in NCLB an opportunity to bring the pipeline to fruition. At the Consortium for Policy Research in Education Conference, leaders discussed how the testing requirements of NCLB could be fulfilled by aligning curriculum to college entrance exams. Those exams could then function as the nationally mandated state graduation test under NCLB.\textsuperscript{136} This would have set off a chain of changes in the organization of education governance in the state. Ultimately though, Ohio opted to create the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT), unique from a pipeline process entirely. Although the state did not pursue the pipeline at that time, a position was created in the Ohio Board of Regents to coordinate with the Ohio Department of Education on efforts across the education spectrum. This position will be scrutinized in chapter five.

\begin{flushleft}
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The decade ended with another new president and an equally transformative federal education law. This time enacted as a grant program through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act rather than as a renewal of ESEA, Race to the Top (RttT) sought to incentivize states to pursue a “vision of a world-class education system in which all students will graduate with a sense of purpose and be college and career ready.” This grant program built directly off NCLB and earlier efforts to federally impose change in K-12 education. What was new was the insistence that all students should be prepared for further schooling beyond high school, whether that be college or a training program. While the extension of schooling expectations is appropriate given the realities of the global economy, the grant itself did not make the changes necessary to the system to provide for student success beyond high school. These federal programs have merely layered over the existing institutions, exaggerating the amount of coherence present in the system to date.

**Conclusion**

From the lens of this thesis, it is clear that the framework of the pipeline was formed using interconnected language over a period of decades before becoming adopted as a policy goal nationwide. The
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language that would evolve into the P-16 pipeline framework coalesced around several concepts: alignment and collaboration of K-12 and post-secondary goals and structures, to serve the needs of each public sector in unique ways, and to create an environment that could encourage better educational outcomes for all students in order to achieve improved economic stability. All of these separate goals in turn fit within the developing language of neoliberalism in America, and as will be discussed further in the next chapter, led to reforms focused on accountability rather than system redesign.
Chapter Four: Mapping Policy Change

The previous chapter demonstrated the establishment of the P-16 pipeline over time in tandem with the development of the neoliberal paradigm. This chapter turns its attention to major events in education since 2000 in order to answer the question: to what extent is the language of P-16 pipeline reform reflected in the realities that followed it? Unfortunately, historical research in the field, as well as that to be outlined in the following pages, indicates that reforms have been “at best, partial, and at worst, fictitious.”141

My argument is confined to evidence of institutional outcomes from the most recent national reform efforts. This chapter seeks to explore the effects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Race to the Top (RttT), and the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiatives on the policy landscape using the lens of historical institutionalism. These three national policies include programmatic expectations that are now embedded in the organizational structures of education governing bodies. First, I will demonstrate the link between the policies pursued, neoliberalism, and the pipeline. This link will demonstrate that only components of the pipeline which reflected neoliberal values were pursued and that they were layered on top of existing policies.
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Institutional Policy Change

Policies are institutions and therefore subject to scrutiny in the same manner as traditional structures of government. As explained earlier, institutions are identified as “distributional instruments laden with power implications.” To be more explicit, institutions are understood as “formal or informal procedures, routines, norms and conventions embedded in the organizational structure of the polity or political economy.” All three education policies reviewed here seek to redistribute funding or resources in order to demonstrate favorable — often construed as “better” — outcomes. Policies can serve to change the arrangement of power in ways which lead existing institutions to serve different ends. Most important for this thesis though, is when more policies or responsibilities are added to existing institutions. This adjustment is known as institutional dynamism, or layering.

In the examples that follow, polices were layered over those already existing. These policies were layered, meaning they were added to existing policies rather than replacing them, unless noted otherwise. When layering occurred, it either altered existing policy to serve new ends, added additional responsibilities to bureaucrats or stakeholders,
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added new regulations or, occasionally, added new funding and allocation metrics.

Institutions “represent compromises or relatively durable though still contested settlements based on specific coalitional dynamics.” The existence of coalitional dynamics was demonstrated in the last chapter by the convergence of varied interests across sectors around one concept: the P16 pipeline. The coalitions succeeded in securing broad approval of the pipeline language, as evidenced by the 1999 National Conference of State Legislators. However, these coalitions were too reliant on the neoliberal paradigm to create the kind of ‘critical juncture’ expected in historical institutionalism in order to change institutions. Had there been a critical juncture, we would have seen transformational changes at every level of education governance institution: structural, programmatic and policy. Instead, efforts at reform were layered onto the existing structure. This is understandable given the varied interests that were able to coalesce around the concept of the pipeline, but not its implementation.

This chapter will address the federal policies since 2000 in order to demonstrate the layering that has occurred in a top-down manner. A brief history of each policy’s development will be discussed, but the bulk

of this chapter will be devoted to comparing the goals of each policy against the P-16 and neoliberal goals outlined in chapter two. In the interest of coherence, the table used to illustrate connections between neoliberalism and the pipeline has merely been expanded to include the relevant policy components. The institutional layers added by each new national policy will be discussed in terms of historical institutionalism.

**No Child Left Behind**

Attention during the 2000 presidential campaign followed the momentum of the new century by putting a national spotlight on education as a means for global competitiveness. That spotlight highlighted the existence of gaps in the level of educational achievement and attainment between racial, social, and economic groups of students in this country.\(^{149}\) George W. Bush championed education reform during his campaign as a ‘compassionate conservative’ and delivered on it in the form of a blueprint to overhaul the Elementary and Secondary Education Act upon his inauguration.\(^{150}\) After a year in Congress, the No Child Left Behind Act was passed with bipartisan support and signed into law on January 8, 2002 in Ohio by President Bush.\(^{151}\) Below is a graphic demonstrating the progression of the components that created NCLB.
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This builds on the timeline presented earlier by emphasizing the consistent role accountability played in the passage of NCLB. When George W. Bush proposed this legislation, accountability was an ‘elastic’ concept that could fit the political needs of Democrats and Republicans.\(^{153}\) Elasticity does not, however, allow for thorough implementation.\(^{154}\) Ultimately, the introduction of accountability changed the role of the federal government in national education from providing extra support for students with special circumstances to attempting to ensure that all children have an equally good education.\(^{155}\) This was a
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major expansion of top level powers in a federalist system, especially considering America’s long-standing expectation of education as a state and local issue under the 10th Amendment.\textsuperscript{156}

This historic expansion of powers institutionalized federal concern for improving educational outcomes.\textsuperscript{157} Paul Manna, in reviewing the response and education landscape since its passage, found that NCLB made the nation more responsive to achievement disparities.\textsuperscript{158} It also pushed state and local governments to increase their active capacity and opened space for the involvement of education entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{159} These improvements, however, came with an emphasis on rule-following that tended to decrease academic quality.\textsuperscript{160} The wording of NCLB is laden with neoliberal values. The five major policy components of NCLB are listed in the table below.

Table 2: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and NCLB

\footnotesize
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated NCLB Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued(^{162})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability(^{163})</td>
<td>Putting reading first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice(^{164})</td>
<td>More Choices for Parents and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency(^{165})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice(^{166})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability(^{167})</td>
<td>Improving teacher quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability(^{168})</td>
<td>Increased Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency(^{169})</td>
<td>Greater funding flexibility; simplified ESL grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued(^{170})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five stated major goals of NCLB are: increasing literacy, increasing school choice, improving teacher quality, increasing accountability, and providing greater funding flexibility by simplifying English as a Second Language federal grant monies. These five
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components align neatly with some but not all components of the P-16 pipeline: Putting reading first holds educators accountable for the literacy of all students and future workers; Increasing parental school choice options is one way to increase the amount of free-market mechanisms within the education sector; Improving teacher quality is an opportunity to introduce additional accountability systems; the stated commitment to accountability in this case refers to holding accountable for the effectiveness of their curricula and assessments; and greater funding with simultaneous simplification of some funding mechanisms satisfies the needs for improving education finance while focusing on bureaucratic efficiency. NCLB is notably lacking any component addressing higher education or the transition between high school and postsecondary. It also, crucially for this thesis, does not pay any attention to the role structures play in inhibiting student success beyond insisting that states should add accountability mechanisms to their existing systems.\footnote{U.S. Department of Education. *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. By U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: n.p., 2002.}

The chart above illustrates that every major component of NCLB fits neatly with only those aspects of the pipeline that are also connected to neoliberal values. This supports the argument of this thesis: despite the nationwide call of restructuring education governance through the P-16 pipeline, only those policies which fit neoliberal values were pursued. The rhetoric may seem to indicate that NCLB is interested primarily in the goals of the pipeline, but its heavy handed focus on accountability
indicates otherwise. While, as discussed earlier, accountability is a component of the pipeline, it was not intended to be the primary mechanism for change.

Accountability in the U.S. traces its origins all the way back to WWII, but has become the overwhelming legacy of NCLB. Although introduced rhetorically as a federal mechanism to induce improved outcomes for all students, as the law evolved its focus narrowed to accountability. All five of the components in that chart have an accountability metric for oversight purposes. NCLB’s primary evaluative tool is a measure of “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) that states set for themselves in order to reach the goal of 100% proficiency by 2014. Technically NCLB is still current legislation, as Congress has not yet passed a renewal or revision to the ESEA. In the fourteen years since its passage, education experts have lined the shelves with reports indicating that AYP is not an accurate measure of student learning gains. Despite this, it wasn’t until this past year that states were able to receive waivers from the new administration in order to avoid sanctions called for when

they did not meet 100% proficiency for all students.\textsuperscript{176} No state reached that bar by 2014.

David Hursh casts AYP as a major neoliberal tool. His work and that of countless other scholars thoroughly discredits AYP as both a measure of learning and as a tool for educational improvement.\textsuperscript{177} After more than a decade, the U.S. education system still primarily uses AYP as an indicator of educational success despite the proof that it does not provide accurate answers. According to Hursh, its purpose is to serve the neoliberal interest in steering change without being blamed for wrongdoing or failure.\textsuperscript{178} This means that AYP is layered over the existing system through NCLB even though it does not contribute to student gains. If a policy or component of policy does not need to prove effective to be used, its justification comes into question.

Despite the enthusiasm for pipeline policies, NCLB took the language of supporting all students and used it as a rhetorical cover for the rollout of mandated accountability systems that have transformed education. This transformation has affected every aspect, except in the way the pipeline proposed. The layering begun by NCLB has only been built on further, without a pipeline in sight.

\textsuperscript{176} Waiver link
\textsuperscript{177} David W. Hursh, E. Wayne Ross, and Rich Gibson. 2007. "Chapter 1: Marketing Education." In \textit{Neoliberalism & Education Reform}, 15-34. n.p.: Hampton Press, 2007. \textit{Education Research Complete}, EBSCOhost (accessed November 22, 2014); there is not space in this thesis to review all the ways NCLB accountability through AYP was unsuccessful. Thorough reports on this subject can be found from Fredrick Hess and other NCLB experts
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid
Race to the Top

With the election of Barack Obama as President and the onset of the Great Recession, Americans were ready for a new approach to education oversight. Rather than go through the congressional fighting that would be required to reauthorize the ESEA to fit new goals, the administration included a major education component in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Called Race to the Top (RttT), the competitive grant program sought to overcome the failures of No Child Left Behind by side-stepping federalism through an opt-in system of competition and by more fully funding participating states.¹⁷⁹

Specifically, RttT was designed to encourage and reward states that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform, achieving significant improvement in student outcomes, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers, and implementing ambitious plans in four core education reform areas.¹⁸⁰ Those areas are: adopting standards and assessments, building data systems, effective teachers and principals, and turning around low-achieving schools.¹⁸¹ RttT expects all actors to “design and implement a comprehensive approach to innovation and reform” that can succeed in the complex

system of education. This commitment goes further than NCLB because it allows for some collaboration between federal, state and local levels in achieving outcomes, rather than a relationship based solely on oversight.

Table 3: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and RttT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated RttT Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achieving significant improvement in student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Closing achievement gaps; <em>turning around low-achieving schools</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Improving HS graduation rates; ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td><em>Effective teachers and principals</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td><em>Adopting standards and assessments, building data systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The major components of RttT align neatly with some but not all parts of the P-16 pipeline: Achieving significant improvement in student outcomes holds states accountable for the K-12 educational outcomes of all students/future workers; Closing achievement gaps through school turnaround is a ramification of punitive accountability and a necessity under school choice in order for a ‘failing’ school to compete for students; Improving HS graduation rates in ways that ensure student preparation for success in college and careers increases the efficiency of student transfer between high school and postsecondary; teacher quality is addressed by attention to all professional staff; and the type of accountability system to be adopted is indicated to states by the insistence on the use of aligned standards and assessments which collect useful data.193

As the chart illustrates, RttT is lacking any component addressing education finance and does not address the crucial area of transfer and articulation. It also, like NCLB, does not include strategies to mitigate the negative effects of poorly aligned governance structures, besides requiring additional accountability systems. The missing systemic efforts follow the trend towards pursuing only those reforms that have K-16 and neoliberal value.

192 UNRISD  
The collaborative components of RttT put it closer to a K-16 pipeline program than NCLB, while at the same time proving that the pipeline doesn’t exist. RttT does not include an expectation that state and local agencies would restructure in order to streamline coordination with the federal level. Instead, up to 50% of the grant money went to building additional bureaucratic offices to handle the grant administration.\textsuperscript{194} Such additions are more in line with the neoliberal concept of Public-Private Partnerships than the removal of institutional barriers called for in the K-16 pipeline.\textsuperscript{195} These structural changes will be addressed more fully in the next chapter. At this point, it is important to note that RttT included more components of the pipeline and neoliberalism than NCLB, while emphasizing accountability.

In fact, RttT stands out most for including requirements for multiple systems of accountability rather than just student achievement. Under a P-16 system, data gathered on student, teacher, principal, and school effectiveness would be used to inform decisions at every other level. Decisions that could be improved by comprehensive data systems, as highlighted in the graphic from chapter two, include but are not limited to: enhancing teacher/principal preparation programs, designing developmentally appropriate content, and improving college readiness.\textsuperscript{196}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{195} UNRISD
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Lacking a P-16 pipeline however, the data systems become additional tools for oversight and punitive purposes.

Since RttT is a more recent policy addition, there is not as much research on its effect to the education policy landscaping. Especially since its goals were layered over the top of the expectations in NCLB, it may take even more time to determine attributable ramifications. Assessments to date though, have pointed out that RttT could have benefited by pursuing a pipeline.

Ulrich Boser, evaluating American education in 2012, emphasized the importance of creating operational structures that better facilitate innovation and communication among all levels of governance in order to meet RttT grantee goals. The work of Boser and others echoes sentiments from Achieve, one of the businesses supporting RttT, calling for P-20 systems. Achieve has stated from the beginning that pipeline collaboration is crucial for removing “historical barriers” to the success of education systems.

This emphasis has gone largely unanswered in policy, outside of rhetoric, despite the opportunity RttT presented. Looking at the chart above, it would appear as though RttT does more to move education towards a pipeline system than NCLB. However, the four core areas
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italicized indicate that the primary focus of the grant is on accountability measures. Neoliberal data systems have therefore been the focus of both major national education efforts of this century. 199

**Common Core State Standards**

The one outlier of the last fifteen years in this story of neoliberal layering are the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Created by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, the CCSS are a series of internationally benchmarked academic standards for Kindergarten through twelfth grade. 200 Designed with input from education and business professionals, the standards are aligned to the ACT college entrance exam in an effort to connect K-12 student learning to postsecondary needs. This represents the first policy targeting education P-16.

What makes this an outlier though, is that this was a state driven and optional initiative. RttT required that states set high, clear and consistent standards, but did not mandate CCSS specifically. It was employed in tandem with RttT in an overwhelming majority of states who opted for the opportunity to save the time and money required to have created their own from scratch. CCSS are also unique in this analysis because they are a standards specific policy, associate with but
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separate from accountability systems, with optional testing components and state rather than federally initiated.

The argument for CCSS was much more thoroughly developed than for either federal policy discussed here because, lacking a mandate, lawmakers had to be persuaded to adopt it. The language used to support CCSS adoption generally follows three lines of argument: security, equality and alignment.\textsuperscript{201} Security refers to preparing students as workers of the future in order to ensure America’s economic security.\textsuperscript{202} Others suggest that the CCSS will increase equality of opportunity, thus fulfilling an expectation of American schools and benefiting the entire country.\textsuperscript{203} The most frequent argument though, is that CCSS will align not just P-16 schooling, but also testing and resources to maximize the effectiveness of the education system.\textsuperscript{204}

Within these arguments for CCSS, there are echoes of neoliberal and pipeline goals. I have added these arguments to the comparison chart, but as CCSS is not a federally mandated policy, it cannot be analyzed in the same way NCLB and RttT were. The chart provides visual proof though, that pipeline goals can be pursued within a context of neoliberalism.

\textbf{Table 4: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and CCSS}

\begin{footnotesize}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline
\textsuperscript{201} Keridan Doyle. Powerful Alignment: Building Consensus around the Common Core State Standards. Boston, MA: Boston College, n.d. p. 8 \\
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid \\
\textsuperscript{204} Ibid \\
\end{tabular}

\end{footnotesize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated CCSS Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued&lt;sup&gt;206&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;207&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice&lt;sup&gt;208&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Equality, security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency&lt;sup&gt;209&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice&lt;sup&gt;210&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;211&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability&lt;sup&gt;212&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency&lt;sup&gt;213&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued&lt;sup&gt;214&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major components of CCSS- alignment, security, efficiency and equality- match with multiple factors of the pipeline. Security assures students with access to good schools are able to attend. Equality justifies the use of accountability structures for the reasons outlined previously. Alignment as understood by CCSS perfectly matches with the curricular goals of the pipeline, in addition to reducing postsecondary remediation.
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and issues associated with transfer and articulation. Notably lacking are attention to education finance and, in a break from its predecessors, teacher quality improvement. However, it is the only major reform considered that does consider education as a single system, emphasizing the alignment between sectors. Although it does not go so far as to demand structural changes, it does begin to treat education policy as a single system.

Given the sanctity of state and local power in education, it is not surprising that the federal government would be unable to require the implementation of pipeline structures.\textsuperscript{215} The federalist separation of power prevents organizational change from being mandated nationally, but it is possible for it to occur at the same time nationwide.\textsuperscript{216} CCSS demonstrates that stakeholders are able to come together for the sake of improved learning, without the threat of sanctions from the federal government. This is a positive sign for future P-16 pipeline efforts. However, it also means that CCSS operates in many states within a dual legal space: implemented by legislatures but required for federal grant compliance under RttT.

This dual positioning makes CCSS perhaps the most layered policy of any currently in existence. That also makes it unstable. If the standards become too controversial in a state, they can be repealed and replaced, as

happened in Oklahoma last year. If a new President chooses to renew the ESEA with a different curricular focus, CCSS may be forced out by new federal expectations, as is already rumored in the new Congress. Whether the CCSS will be able to withstand these countervailing forces to achieve its aims for P-16 alignment, equity and security, will not be apparent for many years to come. The layering of the first ever P-16 policy over top of the accountability expectations of RttT and the expanded federal power of NCLB will add to the confusion that is education regulation in America.

**Conclusion**

The current system has been called fragmented, siloed and ineffective for decades now. These comments refer not just to the quagmire of policy regulation within the federalist system, but also to the organizational structures of each level. The graphics in the appendix emphasize this point by demonstrating that rather than being streamlined or redesigned to fit new policy responsibilities, the major education agencies have been added to. Whole new offices, positions and titles have been added to the U.S. Department of Education, the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education to generate the capacity necessary to complete the new range of tasks assigned to them.
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Of these new positions, only one: Vice Chancellor of P-16 Initiatives with the Ohio B.o.R., is specifically charged with communicating between agencies. The extensive layering of additional structures onto the existing governance framework indicates over a decade of opportunities to restructure that were ignored by policy makers and legislators. Two federal initiatives: No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top, provided critical junctures where path dependency could have been disrupted. State agencies failed to capitalize on these opportunities. As demonstrated by the charts in this chapter though, the neoliberal context did not encourage system restructuring. Whether states were unwilling or unable to restructure, is uncertain. What is certain though, is that reconstituting education governance in order to address the needs of the 21st century was a policy decision rife with the rhetoric of neoliberal politics and undermined by the nature of the institutions that would have been replaced.
Chapter 5: Structures

Given that the P16 pipeline is both a political and structural concept, it is important to consider the organizational changes in government since its inception. Doing so reveals a tendency toward the layering of additional structures and responsibilities over those pre-dating the pipeline’s introduction. This institutional layering is explained through the political theory of historical institutionalism.

As expressed earlier, historical institutional layering (HI) views politics as competition for scarce resources by rival groups. It uses institutional organization structures to explain outcomes, particularly inequalities. Institutions are “distributional instruments laden with power implications.”\textsuperscript{220} Layering refers to the introduction of new rules on top of or alongside existing rules and structures. Layering in education occurs within a context of institutional path dependence. Path dependence refers to the self-reinforcing nature of institutions. Inherent feedback processes lead institutions to continuously reproduce themselves in the same manner, resisting change because of the way they are designed to persist.\textsuperscript{221}

Institutions “represent compromises or relatively durable though still contested settlements based on specific coalitional dynamics.”\textsuperscript{222} The existence of coalitional dynamics was demonstrated in the historical chapter through shared language. The coalitions succeeded in securing broad approval of the pipeline language, as evidenced by the 1999 National Conference of State Legislators Conference, demonstrating the power outside forces to change the goals and strategies of existing institutions. However, these coalitions were too vulnerable to create the kind of ‘critical juncture’ expected in HI in order to change institutions. If that juncture had occurred, we would by now have seen one streamlined state system of education governance from which all policies would originate. Instead, we see layering.

This thesis argues that in the case of the P-16 pipeline, layering is compounded by the constraints of the prevailing paradigm of neoliberalism. Those organizational structures that have been pursued since 1999 are in line with neoliberal ideals and policy rhetoric. Reorganization of such a degree as would be required to create a literal P-16 governance pipeline would not be possible under the paradigm of neoliberal politics that encourages smaller government and fewer education services. Instead, changes pursued are centered on issues of accountability and efficiency.

The following sections will outline the changes that would have been expected in the organization of education governance agencies to achieve the education pipeline, those that have occurred since its inception in the late nineties and how those changes align with neoliberalism. This analysis considers the federal department of education (USDOE), the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), and the Ohio Board of Regents (Ohio BoR) as they are the three preeminent governance bodies pertaining to K-16 education in the state of Ohio.

**Federal**
The U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) structure in 1998 was organized to serve traditional federal agency functions and the needs of underserved populations. No structural attention was given to connecting higher education with the K-12 system and those offices that were not concerned with legislative or oversight duties focused on the needs of students with disabilities, minorities, English language learners or alternative education participants.

The structure of the USDOE at the time reflected the relatively new position of the Department within the President’s cabinet and its growing influence. The department’s priorities at the time did not include any attention to whole system reform that could be construed as forming the P-16 pipeline. The structure as displayed below illustrates this absence, which is not surprising given that the pipeline was only just
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emerging in the national dialogue at this time. Federalism also proscribes the role of the USDOE narrowly, limiting its ability to enact change in the states beyond equity oversight.

Figure 3a: Rendering of the USDOE organizational structure from 1998

The organization of the federal Department of Education at the turn of the century reflected a basic structure designed to pursue its priorities as outlined in President Clinton’s Call to Action. Of those seven priorities, one required attention to the transition between K-12 and
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postsecondary: “By 18 years of age, all students will be prepared for and able to afford college”. However, the pipeline could not be pursued by the federal level, because the constitution leaves education squarely within the jurisdiction of the individual states. This has not prevented the federal level, as evidenced by the policies considered in the last chapter, from creating larger federal programs. The graphic that follows, showing the Departments structure in 2014, demonstrates that changes to the organizational structure do not indicate the institution of a pipeline system. Rather, those changes are once again confined to the expansion of accountability.
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The federal DoE has avoided any structural changes that would bridge the K-12 higher education chasm by constructing its role narrowly as “a means of filling gaps in State and local support for education when
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critical national needs arise.” Addressing critical needs, rather than strategic long-term investments, invites a layered approach to policy because it requires constant additions to address new problems and issues, regardless of already existing programs. This is evident in the current layout of responsibilities within the Department.

The major structural changes include creation, adjustment and dismantling of offices within the larger department. The Offices of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Federal Student Aid; Communications and Outreach; and the Institute of Education Sciences were created in the 15 years between 1999 and 2014. The Chief Information Officer and Chief Financial Officer now operate in separate offices rather than one. The office of Education Research and Improvement was renamed and constituted as the Office of Innovation and Improvement, just as the Office of Vocational and Adult Education is now the Office of Career, Technical and Adult Education. Several initiatives were given office level jurisdiction over programs for particular population groups and there are now additional regional enforcement offices in Cleveland and the District of Columbia.

None of these changes addresses the need for coordination between preschool, K-12 and higher education, despite the existence of programs like Trio and Upward Bound which work at the intersection of
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K12 and postsecondary.\textsuperscript{228} They do however, reflect the goals of neoliberalism. The table below illustrates how the changes in the USDOE structure align, or do not, with stated K-16 and neoliberal goals.

\textbf{Table : The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and the USDOE}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{P-16 Goal} & \textbf{Associated Neoliberal Value(s)} & \textbf{Related Change}\textsuperscript{229} \\
\hline
Education as a P-16 system & Not valued & - \\
\hline
Improve student achievement for all learners & Accountability & Rhetorical, through NCLB and RttT but not specified in structure \\
\hline
Improve access and equity in public schools & Choice & Specific office dedicated to financial college assistance and 4 offices for attention to needs of different racial groups \\
\hline
Reduce remediation in college & Efficiency & - \\
\hline
Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures & Efficiency, Choice & Not in federal jurisdiction currently \\
\hline
Increase teacher quality & Accountability & Research and Improvement \\
\hline
Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels & Accountability & Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development \\
\hline
Positive effect on education finance & Accountability, Efficiency\textsuperscript{230} & More money available \\
\hline
New Governance Structures & Not valued\textsuperscript{231} & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\textsuperscript{231} UNRISD
Although federal jurisdiction and programs are not fully dissected in this chart, the structures alone demonstrate some minimal alignment with P-16 intentions. The addition of a specific office dedicated to financial college assistance and four offices for the needs of students from different racial groups furthers the goals of increasing access and choice throughout the P-16 continuum. Teacher quality is scrutinized through the office of Research and Improvement in ways that justify accountability systems. The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development develops accountability mechanisms based on the increased alignment of curricula and assessments across all levels. Increases in federal funding of education are also considered to be a positive indication of interest in improving efficiency through educational finances.

These structures support nationwide accountability and equity issues, but do nothing to provide for the creation and maintenance of a K-16 education pipeline system. Despite using the pipeline language in its recent, large-scale policy initiatives as discussed in the previous chapter, it is clear the federal government does not believe it part of its role to develop such a system. Instead, the new Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development works with the rest of the system to ensure that accountability measures are being used and adapted to the current, siloed structure in every state. NCLB and RttT may have used the rhetoric of
improving student achievement and efficiency to roll out their initiatives, but the structural legacy of these has been oversight.

The combination of neoliberal and pipeline language has been demonstrated in earlier chapters. This language at the federal level however is also contingent on the executive and legislative agendas. Cabinet agencies in the U.S. must execute the agenda of the President within the confines of the budget appropriated by Congress, without usurping any power held by state and local governments. This position is precarious and incredibly political for any agency, but particularly for education where local governance has been a staple and highly esteemed value since its beginning. As such, it is not surprising that the USDOE expects any efforts at system organization reform to come from state and local collaborations that it can then support. Federalism, combined with neoliberalism in this case, works to prevent (or excuse) the United States Department of Education from pursuing whole system structural reforms. The bulk of the attention of this argument therefore rests at the state level.

Ohio Department of Education

There has been significant growth in the Ohio DoE in the last fifteen years, however not all of it is structural or easily accessed by the public. The charts rendered and provided in this case indicate only the top level of the organizational structure currently in operation. The analysis will be completed based on the information provided, with the
understanding that any omitted functions are necessarily smaller than the pipeline would require, and that programmatic actions are not within the scope of this thesis.

**Figure 4a: Organizational Rendering of the Ohio Department of Ed 1999**

The graphic, based on archived websites from the Ohio DoE, indicates that the focus of the department had been on work with
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individual schools and district groupings, with only minor attention to assessment and evaluation. This has changed, although language referring to student success along the education pipeline has still not been included. The next graphic demonstrates that by 2014, the growth of the department has increased attention to individual student achievement by means of accountability systems.

Figure 4b: Ohio Department of Education Organizational Chart 2014

The graphic above illustrates that the department of education now primarily organizes its activities around assessment, choice, and accountability for teachers and students. Having two of the largest groupings, or centers, focused on assessment and accountability and the
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Ohio Department of Education Human Resources Department. "Ohio Department of Education Organizational Hierarchy." Infographic. 2014.
third on increasing choice is indicative of the degree to which neoliberal
goals have guided the change process in Ohio education governance. The
comparative chart introduced earlier models how the additions and
reorganization of the department further only those K-16 goals which
have neoliberal value.

Table 6: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and the ODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Related Change$^{234}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued$^{235}$</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for Student Support &amp; Education Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Multiple new offices dedicated to school choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Center for Curriculum and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for the Teaching Profession, Center for Accountability and Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for Curriculum &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>Fiscal Services Department elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued$^{236}$</td>
<td>None*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^{235}$ UNRISD
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ODE growth during the time period reviewed indicates more focus on areas of accountability. Specifically, the new Center for Curriculum and Assessment addresses pipeline goals of reducing remediation and improving alignment while furthering neoliberal goals of accountability and improved efficiency. Accountability for teachers is now addressed through the Center for the Teaching Profession as well as the Center for Accountability and Continuous Improvement, which also propose to serve P-16 pipeline goals of improving teacher quality. Neoliberal interests in choice are expanded through the Center for Student Support & Education Options. All of these, in addition to the elevation of the fiscal services department to provide it with more power to improve education finance, indicate that ODE growth has followed the pipeline goals as far as they align with neoliberal values in the state.

The growth of the ODE can in part be attributed to the increased bureaucratic activities required to accommodate the growing federal presence in education. That presence, as witnessed in the previous chapter through NCLB and RttT, required a tremendous increase on the part of the states in terms of assessment and reporting. Neoliberalism, as the prevailing paradigm, is intrinsically linked with the policies pursued. In this case, the additions to the ODE governance structure reflect increased interest in accountability and free-market capitalism. If the K-16 pipeline had been pursued, there would be structural evidence of attention to student needs before and after K1-2. At minimum, an
established connection to the body governing higher education, the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), would be expected in the ODE. However, nothing of that sort exists in ODE structurally, as witnessed by the infographic. Indeed, the only structural addition that could not be construed as directly related to neoliberalism is a position for RttT, and that is only temporary while the grant is being funded.237

Changes in the structure of ODE K-12 governance have been additions to forms of accountability and choice, both of which are also express goals of neoliberalism. Evidence of structural change that would move the department toward incorporating higher education into one system is absent. Only those goals which are rhetorically linked to neoliberalism appear to have been of interest to the department.

Ohio Board of Regents

The Ohio BoR has a slightly more active engagement with the pipeline than its K-12 equivalent, ODE. Ohio’s primary efforts around the P-16 pipeline originated at the top of the system within the Board of Regents (BoR). The BoR is charged with overseeing the University system of Ohio and has been to various degrees since its creation in 1963.238 As of 1999 their four stated responsibilities were to “provide higher education policy advice to the Governor and General Assembly;
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map strategies involving the state's colleges and universities; advocate for
and manage distribution of state support for public colleges and
universities; and implement statewide legislative mandates.”239 Although
language addressing education as a pipeline did not yet exist in 1999,
there were two positions within the Board’s agency staff that did: the
Director of K-16 Initiatives and the K-16 Linkages Administrator. The
archived website used to gather this information did not include job
descriptions, but given the landscape of Ohio at the time, it can be
expected they were charged with exploring how the BoR could facilitate
the development of a K-16 system in the state of Ohio.

The existence of those positions could be considered a head start on the road to the P-16 pipeline. In this case though, that head start has not proved to be very productive. The graphic below outlines the organization of the BoR to date.

Figure 5b: Ohio Board of Regents Organizational Structure in 2014²⁴¹
(Larger version available in Appendix)

---
²⁴¹ Ohio Board of Regents Human Resources. "Ohio Board of Regents Organizational Chart." Infographic. 2014.
The graphic above illustrates the growth of the agency supporting the work of the Ohio Board of Regents in overseeing public higher education in the state. The continued existence of a P-16 staff position of high rank indicates that the pipeline is still of interest to the BoR. The lack of reciprocal positions in the ODE however indicates that the work of creating the pipeline is being done primarily from the top of the system, or in only a communications aspect. It would certainly take more than one person to coordinate the work of both agencies on every aspect of the pipeline they share.

It is also worth noting here that there are several programs occurring at the local, district and regional level around P-16 in Ohio. These, however, are programmatic and while promising, are beyond the scope of this thesis. It is important to note however, that if those prove to be effective at achieving neoliberal ends, Ohio might make more progress toward embracing the pipeline structure statewide than we have seen to date. For the time being, the structural organization within the current agency indicates a strong neoliberal policy direction.
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242 Ohio Board of Regents Human Resources. "Ohio Board of Regents Organizational Chart." Infographic. 2014.
Table 7: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and the Ohio BoR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Related Change²⁴⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued²⁴⁵</td>
<td>Pre-existing position elevated to improve communication between DoE and BoR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Expanded opportunities for adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Expanded adult funding options, new offices designed to assist students in locating funds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>No structural targets, known programmatic activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>Expanded Articulation and Transfer office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Increased oversight of teacher education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Higher Education Information system (HEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>Fewer state grant monies, despite increased attention to student finances the BoR has been unable to slow rising college-going costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued²⁴⁶</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BoR structural changes show more evidence of fulfilling the P-16 pipeline goals than any other agency. Expanded opportunities for
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adult learners elevates systemic accountability through the end of the K-16 vision; expanded adult funding options and new offices designed to assist students in locating funds are improving the choices of students pursuing public education; expanded articulation and transfer activities meet that explicit pipeline goal while improving efficiency and expanding student choice; increased interest in teacher oversight provides more opportunities for the use of accountability systems; expansions to HEI provide statistical support for the accountability decisions made; and the decreasing amount of available state grant funding has an effect on finances, although not necessarily a positive one. 

In the expansion of the BoR, there is evidence of increased attention to students of public higher education as consumers. More offices dealing with finances, additions of campus service oversight, new delivery methods, and increased transfer options, all indicate a focus on students as individuals, rather than on the system as a whole. This is not to say that those are problematic to focus on, rather that this is additional evidence of a neoliberal form of change. Such change has come instead of the organizational restructuring of the governing bodies, as proscribed by the K-16 pipeline idea.

**Conclusion**

The enthusiasm with which the state of Ohio embraced the pipeline concept is not reflected in the changes that have occurred over the last fifteen years in either policy or governance structure. What is evident, is
the significant layering of new accountability mechanisms over top of the
existing agency functions. Such additions, when combined with increased
options for school choice, reflect a structural internalizing of neoliberal
values.

The lack of offices or job titles reflecting P-16 efforts combined
with the magnitude of additions addressing accountability and efficiency
show that neoliberalism has constrained the pursuit of pipeline goals. The
historical and linguistic links, the national and state policies pursued, as
well as the changes in all of these agency structures, reflect a strong push
towards increasing accountability and choice in the last twenty years.

To be fair, the state of Ohio and the USDOE have various
programs that work on a micro level to connect higher education to K-12
and sometimes even preschool, but those activities are not reflected in the
structure.247 This discrepancy alone is worth noting, as structural
positioning would grant a certain degree of acknowledgement to the
actions that they are otherwise denied.

For the purposes of this analysis the lack of offices or job titles
reflecting P-16 efforts combined with the magnitude of additions
addressing accountability and efficiency, demonstrate the argument that
neoliberalism has constrained the pursuit of pipeline goals.

Indeed, Americans have neoliberalism in large part to thank for the rise
of educational accountability and choice in our public schools. The

http://higherdpolicies.wiche.edu/content/policy/state/OH.
historical and linguistic links, the national and state policies pursued, as well as the changes in all of these agency structures, reflect a strong push towards increasing accountability and choice in the last twenty years.

Whatever the ultimate outcome from these policies, the changes were heralded under the auspices of the P16 pipeline, which has not come to pass.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

The pipeline was proposed to address identified educational disparities in American education. To address those inequities, the P16 pipeline suggested streamlining education service delivery and oversight institutions in order to remove institutional barriers to student success. The rise of this recommendation however, occurred in tandem with the growth of the economic and political paradigm of neoliberalism. Through the power of language and institutional layering, neoliberalism shaped the pursuit of the P-16 pipeline, constraining its implementation to only those aspects which had neoliberal value. All of the considered P-16 pipeline goals can further neoliberal values, except those related to overhauling and reconstituting the system of governance.

If the implementation of the pipeline, including the structural changes it required, had occurred, the system of education governance would look radically different today. Changing organizational structure into a single system is necessary both for the implementation of the pipeline and the improvement of educational outcomes because institutional barriers hinder student success. The lingering ‘expectations gap’ between secondary and postsecondary education systems is having wide ranging, negative effects on students, staff and stakeholders. As mentioned earlier, these include: “conflicting standards for students, unequal opportunities for different groups of students, placement exam confusion and intensive remediation, high college drop-out rates and
These insidious, institutional issues must be eradicated by the implementation of a new structural configuration that eliminates their possibility. Nothing less than the P-16 Pipeline will remove these long-standing, institutional issues. Unfortunately, such a redesign conflicts with the prevailing paradigm; neoliberalism.

The result in education policy has been a series of large-scale reform policies that have added significantly to the burden of testing on students and teachers, increased the amount of school choice, and emphasized accountability for the sake of efficiency while expanding the size of federal and state education government, rather than shrinking it. This is problematic because each of these individual attempts at reform have been well intentioned and supported by positive rhetoric, but fails to attack the underlying causes of the problems they claim to address. Large scale but separated efforts at reform do not take the root of systemic issues into consideration. To address institutional issues, there will need to be institutional changes. Unfortunately, comparing neoliberal values to the policy language indicates that systemic reform is not the goal.

Without the structural changes that the P-16 pipeline calls for to remove structural barriers, student success will continue to be hampered regardless of new policies. Even large scale efforts cannot hope to overcome systemic issues if they do not contain an institutional reform

---

The constant layering of new policies and bureaucracy on top of and alongside the old is counterproductive and even possibly harmful to the overall mission of public education.

That is if it is still the goal of public education to serve as the great societal equalizer, a gateway to social mobility and the fortifier of a strong national economic future. The hegemonic way that neoliberalism has taken over in American education however, has emphasized free-market opportunities, accountability and efficiency. Despite the strength of the pipeline’s introduction, it is these neoliberal values of that we see as the legacy of education policy from the last twenty years. In Ohio at least, rhetoric used to pursue these has echoed and relied on the language of the pipeline that garnered support, but failed to deliver on the crucial structural aspects of it.

**Consequences**

Without structural change, these new national and state policies are merely layered over those existing already. While this serves very effectively to let the education governance bureaucracy grow and suggest to the public that work is being done to improve education, the result for students is not positive. Those institutional barriers that which the pipeline was designed to remove are compounded by the addition of so many policies. Not only is that unhelpful, but since many of those additional policies are assessment based, teachers and students will be

---

increasingly punished for not demonstrating growth. This will then lead to more evidence encouraging accountability and the need for choice, thus by-passing the institutional issues to focus on their symptoms.

Ultimately, this focus also means that the mission of education has been narrowed. Rather than focus on the success of students defined broadly as their life-chances and quality of life, accountability through testing metrics focuses on success as defined by performance on a few assessments. This is also true for teachers, who are increasingly asked to prove their worth by demonstrating student test score improvement. The neoliberal paradigm is correct in linking education to economic performance. However, the current conception of what it means to be successful in education does not connect to workforce needs. Family income is much more indicative of later economic productivity than test scores for American students in the system today. That is a troubling reality and one that will not be fixed by accountability and choice unless the institutional barriers are removed first.

This is not to say that government officials, policy makers, business and non-profit leaders in education do not care about our students or are unaware of the problems facing them. On the contrary, the rhetoric highlighted in this thesis is evidence that issues facing students and educators are being documented and taken seriously. The concern this work highlights however, is that the efforts that can be pursued in the current political context are not those that will have the largest positive
effect on outcomes. It could be considered a disjuncture of federalism that the only branch with the political will to mandate a national overhaul of the education system is precisely the branch that is legally prevented from doing so: the US Department of Education. Separation of state and federal policies is sacred in America. Perhaps then the P-16 pipeline has not been implemented because states that would pursue it are bogged down in the mandated implementation and reporting of the major federal initiatives.

The increasingly complicated layers of American education make it difficult, if not impossible to untangle exactly where the system is most troubled. Suffice it to say that the first concept that could have begun the process of removing the institutional barriers has not been implemented, and the paradigm of neoliberalism is at least partially to blame for that.

Limitations and Future Research

As an undergraduate work, this thesis is limited by time and resources. More thorough historical structural information on the departments might be available, but lacking sufficient departmental connections they were irretrievable. In addition, despite being concerned with what is ultimately the P-16 pipeline, this thesis did not consider the preschool level because the governance structure was deemed too disjointed to be adequately compared to the others in the space available. It also fails to consider programmatic ways in which Ohio and the nation are pursuing P-16 policies. All of these omissions limit the work, but the
expectation is that any further research into them would reveal only more evidence supporting the hypothesis.

This thesis has barely scratched the surface on the intersection between political environments and education policy. A more thorough report would include a review of preschool governance in order to truly analyze the entire spectrum of change needed to realize the P-16 education pipeline. In addition, programmatic attempts to implement concepts of the pipeline should also be reviewed to get a more complete understanding of where Ohio and the nation are in terms of pursuing this concept. Particularly illustrative might be further research into the creation of pipeline related PPPs in Ohio and how those support or detract from this thesis. This work might also benefit from consideration of other states or countries that already have streamlined education governance structures.

**Conclusion**

Until such time as further research is possible, let this thesis serve as a call to awareness for all stakeholders. The political cannot be separated from the educational as long as political systems oversee education. Given all that we know about the power of education to transform futures for individuals of any background, it is our responsibility as citizens to ensure our representatives are keeping as careful watch on their institutional outcomes as they are on the testing outputs. This is not a simple task, nothing in politics ever truly is, yet the future of our nation
rests on our ability to equitably and adequately educate all of our students.

The link between education and economics at least, neoliberalism has not exaggerated. Where to begin improving our education system to meet the economic challenge though, is up for debate. This thesis posits that breaking down institutional barriers, rather than layering more on them, would be a good first step. Such actions however will require a clarity of purpose that is currently lacking from our policy discourse given the rhetorical power of the neoliberal paradigm. Now that this disconnect between political rhetoric and educational need has been highlighted, perhaps a new way forward can be designed.
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### Tables

**Table 1: P-16 Goals and Neoliberal Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and NCLB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated NCLB Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Putting reading first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>More Choices for Parents and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Improving teacher quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Increased Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>Greater funding flexibility; simplified ESL grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and RttT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated RttT Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Achieving significant improvement in student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Closing achievement gaps; turning around low-achieving schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Improving HS graduation rates; ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Effective teachers and principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Adopting standards and assessments, building data systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and CCSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Associated CCSS Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Equality, security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and the USDOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Related Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Rhetorical, through NCLB and RttT but not specified in structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Specific office dedicated to financial college assistance and 4 offices for attention to needs of different racial groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>Not in federal jurisdiction currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Research and Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>More money available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: The Pipeline, Neoliberal Values and the ODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Related Change$^{251}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued$^{252}$</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all learners</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for Student Support &amp; Education Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public schools</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Multiple new offices dedicated to school choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Center for Curriculum and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation policies and procedures</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for the Teaching Profession, Center for Accountability and Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and assessments across levels</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Center for Curriculum &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>Fiscal Services Department elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued$^{253}$</td>
<td>None*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$^{252}$UNRISD

$^{253}$UNRISD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-16 Goal</th>
<th>Associated Neoliberal Value(s)</th>
<th>Related Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education as a P-16 system</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>Pre-existing position elevated to improve communication between DoE and BoR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student achievement for all</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Expanded opportunities for adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access and equity in public</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Expanded adult funding options, new offices designed to assist students in locating funds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce remediation in college</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>No structural targets, known programmatic activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transfer and articulation</td>
<td>Efficiency, Choice</td>
<td>Expanded Articulation and Transfer office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher quality</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Increased oversight of teacher education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alignment of curricula and</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Higher Education Information system (HEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessments across levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effect on education finance</td>
<td>Accountability, Efficiency</td>
<td>Fewer state grant monies, despite increased attention to student finances the BoR has been unable to slow rising college-going costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Governance Structures</td>
<td>Not valued</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Postsecondary Education
Policy Goals
- Expanding access
- Improving student success rates
- Developing common transfer procedures
- Strengthening teacher preparation
For details see www.ecs.org and www.communitycollegepolicy.org

Areas of Mutual Interest – Early Learning/K-12

- Expanding access to early learning for all children
- Creating linkages between early learning and K-12
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- Promoting meaningful assessments
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Areas of Mutual Interest – K-12/Postsecondary
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- Sharing academic performance data
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Figure 2: The Politics of No Child Left Behind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Standards Established</th>
<th>Deadline for Proficiency</th>
<th>Disaggregation of Performance</th>
<th>State Testing</th>
<th>Adequate Yearly Progress</th>
<th>High-Stakes National Assessment</th>
<th>School Improvement Plans</th>
<th>Sanctions Restructuring of Schools</th>
<th>Public School Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reagan administration/George H. W. Bush administration (1981-1992)</td>
<td>Yes, voluntary standards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proposed, NAEP as benchmark (not passed)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proposed, tuition tax credits and Title I vouchers (not passed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103rd Congress (1993-1994)</td>
<td>Yes, for Title I students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, three tests between grades 3 and 12</td>
<td>No, but vague</td>
<td>Proposed (only passed the House)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106th Congress (1999-2000)</td>
<td>Proposed, for all students (only passed the House)</td>
<td>Proposed, ten years (only passed the House)</td>
<td>Proposed (only passed the House)</td>
<td>Yes, three tests</td>
<td>Proposed, voluntary (implementation banned)</td>
<td>Proposed (only passed the House)</td>
<td>Proposed (only passed the House)</td>
<td>Proposed not passed</td>
<td>Proposed (only passed the House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush presidential campaign (2000)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes, annual tests for grades 3-8</td>
<td>Yes, NAEP as benchmark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act (2001)</td>
<td>Yes, mandatory for all students</td>
<td>Yes, 12 years</td>
<td>Yes, by race/ethnicity, LEP, disability, and Title I students</td>
<td>Yes, annual tests for grades 3-8, one in 10-12</td>
<td>Partial, NAEP required but not linked to funding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial, plus supplemental services vouchers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3a: Organizational Rendering of the U.S. Department of Education 1998
Figure 3b: USDOE Organizational Chart 2014
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Figure 4b: Organizational Structure of ODE 2014
Figure 5a: Organizational Rendering of BoR 1999

Figure 5b: Organizational Structure OBR 2014