

---

## **Milestones of TRIO History, Part II**

Milestones of TRIO History, Part II is the second in a series of TRIO History Short Papers that trace the evolution of the TRIO Programs. This fascinating history details the stories and struggles that have made TRIO one of the most unique and successful educational opportunity programs in the United States. Part II follows the TRIO professional movement to a national level, six reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act, elevation of the Office of Education to a new cabinet-level Department and the addition of new TRIO programs.

*- by John Groutt*

**This paper is one of a  
series of TRIO History  
Short Papers  
Commissioned by the  
National TRIO  
Clearinghouse**  
1025 Vermont Ave., NW  
Suite 1020  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 638-2887  
Email: [CH@pellinstitute.org](mailto:CH@pellinstitute.org)  
[www.trioprograms.org/clearinghouse](http://www.trioprograms.org/clearinghouse)

**September 2003**

## **Milestones of TRIO History**

*Milestones of TRIO History, Part II, is the second in a continuing series of National TRIO Clearinghouse TRIO History Short Papers that trace the development of TRIO Programs. The purpose of the History Short Papers is to provide an historical framework for the TRIO Programs. These Short Papers will be available as reprints and archived in full text under Publications at the National TRIO Clearinghouse website at [www.trioprogams.org/clearinghouse](http://www.trioprogams.org/clearinghouse).*

---

**Part II follows the TRIO professional movement to a national level, six reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act, elevation of the Office of Education to a new cabinet-level Department and the addition of new TRIO programs.**

-----

### **Part II: The Emergence of a TRIO Professional Movement**

With the election of Democratic President Jimmy Carter, President Nixon's regional approach to TRIO program administration ended. The programs would again be administered from Washington, D.C. In the summer of 1978, regional personnel returned to the banks of the Potomac. In Washington, the Office of Education (OE) seemed to be caught unawares, and had no plans for how this new organizational structure would operate. TRIO offices were scattered in various buildings and program officers who had been recalled from the regions lived in hotels. Nearly a year of confusion followed.<sup>26</sup>

The new President set up a completely different national administrative structure. Meanwhile, the TRIO subcultures that had developed in various sections of the country during the eight years of regionalized administration, continued to influence the level of individual project funding. They also influenced how those projects would be able to operate in the various regions. Regional officers continued to evaluate the proposals and administer programs located in their former regions, just as they had done previously. But now it was administered from offices and hotels in Washington rather than the ten regional centers.<sup>27</sup>

The board of the Mid-America association (Mid-America Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel - MAEOPP), formed from the six states in Chicago's Region V,<sup>28</sup> met for the first time in 1974. Those present realized that the programs must develop a presence in Washington as a unified entity and not just be represented by individual directors traveling there to speak with members of Congress. Only then would TRIO be taken seriously as representing its disadvantaged students.<sup>29</sup> This realization signaled that professional organizations—rather than individuals—would become the advocates for the programs. It marked a new and unique approach for federally funded programs.

Throughout 1975 and 1976 individual TRIO professionals continued to meet throughout the country and develop plans for forming a national organization. They also

continued travel to Washington, representing fledgling regional organizations and to testify before Congressional committees drafting the reauthorizing legislation.<sup>30</sup>

In January 1975, Leonard Spearman, Director of the Division of Student Support and Special Services in OE, received a report which he had commissioned entitled “National Task Force on the Disadvantaged and Postsecondary Education: Federal Responsibility.”<sup>31</sup> Commonly referred to by the name of its chair, Dorothy Routh, the “Routh Commission” made recommendations that would have radically changed the delivery systems for services to disadvantaged students if they had been enacted into law. Under the Routh Commission’s recommendations, TRIO programs would have been reorganized into two sets of programs. Pre-collegiate “Educational Opportunity Centers” were to assume the pre-collegiate services of Upward Bound, Talent Search, Veterans Upward Bound, and the college admission functions of the Educational Opportunity Centers. Collegiate “Institutes of Postsecondary Achievement” would combine and expand the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students and the tutoring and counseling functions of the Educational Opportunity Centers.<sup>32</sup>

This report provided the basis for OE’s recommendations to Congress as it considered the changes to take place in the Amendments of 1976. Members of the fledgling regional associations strongly opposed most of the Routh Commission’s recommendations.<sup>33</sup> In the end, only a few were incorporated into the new legislation. The Training Authority for Staff Development, a concept supported by both camps, was incorporated into the 1976 Amendments and funded. It recognized the necessity to provide professional training for persons working in programs serving nontraditional students and dealing with problems resulting from poverty, minority status, and lack of educational or cultural preparation for college.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1976 were historic for another reason. Previously, Congress had put together a very minimal statute to govern TRIO and let the OE staff determine what the programs should look like and how they could operate. Many of the then-current regulations seemed to persons in the field to rest on no more than the whim of the OE program officer. In the reauthorization process for the Higher Education Amendments of 1976, the TRIO community began direct involvement with Congress in helping to write the legislation in the face of opposition to recommendations from a major task force set up by OE. Success in influencing this reauthorization provided a strong impetus to the neophyte TRIO political activists to unite and push forward as a national force.

During the three years of the Ford Administration (1974-1977), TRIO funding remained frozen at \$ 70.3 million. In 1977, members of the TRIO community convinced Congress to increase the program’s appropriation substantially. Two consecutive funding increases broke the three-year period of level funding by raising TRIO appropriations from FY 1977 to FY 1978 to \$115-million or a 64% increase.<sup>34</sup> This accomplishment marked a monumental change—from passive acceptance of funding levels offered by Congress or the Office of Education—to active involvement by the TRIO community to secure increases in program appropriations. From that point forward, TRIO programs have received annual significant funding increases. The only exceptions were reductions in two years of the Reagan administration and one level-funding year at the time of the Gingrich-led “Republican Revolution” during the Clinton era.

The increases in the 1970s had been accomplished in large part by enlisting the help of key members of Congress, most notably Shirley Chisholm of Brooklyn,<sup>35</sup> and Lewis Stokes of Cleveland. During this same period, leaders in this neophyte movement joined with associations springing up in other regions and they began developing strategies to help the few regions that were not yet organized to form their own associations.<sup>36</sup>

Encouraged by several other activists, Jerry Lewis, first president of the newly formed Mid-Eastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel (MEAEOPP), hosted a three-day meeting attended by five other TRIO directors in Columbia, Maryland, in September 1977. On the second evening they attended a birthday celebration for the Commissioner of Education, Ernest Boyer hosted by a member of his staff at her home. For the remainder of the three-day meeting, the six directors turned from celebration to discuss ways that would influence the political history of the programs from that time onward. They agreed on three goals during these sessions.

They would create a national association to coordinate the work of regional associations. This association would represent the educational interests of poor and minority Americans in higher education and would improve communications and professional development of persons involved in educational opportunity programs.<sup>37</sup>

More organizational meetings followed in several cities, and finally in December 1977, twenty-one representatives from all but one of the existing regional associations<sup>38</sup> met for three days in New Orleans. They agreed to form a “National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations” (NCCEOA). Arnold Mitchem of Marquette University, was named “Convener” of the Council. They had created a national organization that would work to represent the TRIO professional community and program students, and coordinate contact with the Congress and OE.<sup>39</sup>

## **The Higher Education Amendments of 1980 and the Funding Imbrolio**

The 1979 TRIO grant competition and the Higher Education Amendments of 1980 became a major watershed in TRIO legislative history. The yearlong confusion that followed Carter’s 1978<sup>40</sup> recentralization of TRIO administration in Washington was followed by yet another year of turmoil caused by a different event. The Department of Education Organization Act of 1979 created an entirely new Department of Education (ED), with cabinet status. With this change, the TRIO programs began reporting to the Director in the Division of Special Student Services of the new department in yet another administrative rearrangement.

In 1980, the four current TRIO programs (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students and Educational Opportunity Centers)<sup>41</sup> were scheduled for reading and funding decisions *at the same time*.<sup>42</sup> Grants were awarded on a competitive basis with peer review panels rating proposals and assigning scores. Programs were to be funded guided by scores assigned by the review panels in addition to special concerns of Department officials, until all appropriated funds were committed. With a significant increase in the number of programs, this process had become an overwhelming task under any circumstances and more difficult because of the

recentralization of ED administration in Washington. Staff in the new Department were still trying to find their organizational bearings. To add to the difficulties, one of President Carter's major reasons for the recentralization was to economize. The number of staff in the new Division had been reduced.<sup>43</sup>

There was yet another complication in what became the 1980-funding imbroglio. Two entirely new National Demonstration Projects were to be inaugurated: a Special Emphasis Upward Bound Program (to concentrate on low-income youth with exceptional potential in the natural and applied sciences), and a New Concepts Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program (to prepare college students for graduate and professional schools).<sup>44</sup> The ideas for the new programs originated within the office of the Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Continuing Education, Alfred Moyé, who held a Ph.D. in chemistry. He had, and continues to have, a strong commitment to helping youth become engaged in mathematics and the natural sciences. He and his staff initiated the idea of these National Demonstration Projects.<sup>45</sup> The TRIO community opposed them because they believed these new programs would drain money badly needed to fund the ongoing regular programs. If the new initiatives were begun, many established projects would have had to be eliminated.<sup>46</sup>

A heated battle ensued between the Council and the Department of Education over this issue. This was combined with frustration and anger due to delays in announcing the 1980 funding awards. The looming closure of so many long-established projects strengthened the belief of many in the TRIO community that persons in the Department were again playing favorites. They thought the Department was punishing those who opposed them under the guise of the new initiatives and "special concerns." Dr. Moyé and many of the ED staff viewed the National Demonstration Projects as a new and creative response to the problem of few minorities entering the sciences and graduate schools. He did not believe the existing programs—especially those submitting lower-rated proposals—had an inherent right to continue as if they were entitlements.<sup>47</sup>

One person inside the Department, who was responsible for preparing the slates that listed funded programs that were to be sent to Capitol Hill, describes a situation of paralysis. Those working for a solution would be damned if they did and damned if they didn't. If the National Demonstration Projects were funded<sup>48</sup>, they would reduce the amount available for regular TRIO programs by \$ 2.2 million less than the previous year<sup>49</sup>.

Announcement of the program funding awards kept being delayed. Questions arose over the selection criteria that were being used for funding programs. The criteria permitted Department officials to fund programs outside of the rank order of the scores assigned by the panels of outside readers. This method allowed Department officials to address their concerns for particular issues, such as insuring better geographic or ethnic distribution of programs or meeting what they perceived as a dire need of a particularly underserved population.

Program personnel in the field who had submitted higher-scoring proposals that would not be funded when this procedure was implemented, objected. They argued that this method opened a door to all sorts of possible political chicanery, favoritism and return to the vindictive policies of earlier years when some programs appeared to be defunded for no reason other than disagreeing with Washington officials (regional at that

time). Whatever method was used to award funds to programs, when the appropriated funds were depleted, the remaining program proposals would not receive funds.

Time was short and summer programs across the country needed to be implemented. Still there was no word from the Department. Within the Department some officials were arguing that many long-established programs had submitted weaker proposals and consequently received lower scores than new applicants. Several of these established programs were in districts of powerful Congressmen. Information leaked out that several hundred long-established programs would not be refunded and would be closed.<sup>50</sup> Many project directors and university officials of currently funded programs contacted members of Congress. They in turn began calling and questioning the Department's officials and procedures and demanded that threatened programs in their legislative districts continue to receive funding. Members of Congress denounced the ED staff and made impossible demands for meetings, lists, rationale, and records.<sup>51</sup>

There simply was not enough money to continue funding all the currently operating programs, fund new grantees desired by ED officials because they addressed their concerns, and inaugurate the new experimental programs. Officers of the NCCEOA, as well as college and program administrators, began pressuring Department officials and Congress to resolve the problem. Finally a compromise was reached and the new initiatives were abandoned. This released funds that could be directed to some of the threatened currently operating programs. Even so, a substantial number of established projects were not refunded<sup>52</sup> and this trauma made many in the TRIO community determined that the new authorizing legislation itself must provide a guarantee that this situation would never reoccur.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1980 that resulted became a landmark for the TRIO programs because they set the pattern for all future TRIO legislation. The TRIO community itself provided the major influence for the legislative changes and they included detailed descriptions of how the programs were to be administered as well as the process for funding.<sup>53</sup> Henceforth, programs would be funded by strictly following the rank order of scores assigned by the outside panel of readers. There was no longer allowance for addressing special concerns of Department officials. These types of insertions into legislation are essentially regulations that are written into the law instead of being developed by the department responsible for administering the program. By inserting administrative guidelines into the law itself, Congress (in this instance done with the input from the TRIO community) controls the bureaucracy by taking away some of its discretionary power.<sup>54</sup>

In the process of drafting the reauthorization, Congressman Ford's Subcommittee that was working on the legislation responded to the requests of the NCCEOA and invited the Coordinating Council to make "recommendations for changes, additions and deletions" to the Higher Education Act to the Subcommittee.<sup>55</sup> The Council recommended several substantial changes in TRIO legislation<sup>56</sup> based on the experience of the 1980 funding debacle, as well as conversations held in the associations scattered across the country.<sup>57</sup> One of the most controversial changes involved the awarding of additional points to scores of already operating programs at the time of the three-year funding competitions. The Council argued that the additional points for "prior experience" helped take the programs out of the "experimental" category and offered a more stable continuity and credibility with the educational institutions with which the

programs interacted. Students receiving services would not have the programs suddenly shut down and be left without needed support. Council members argued convincingly, that just as poor students need dependable access to financial aid, support services provided by the TRIO programs likewise needed to be consistent.

The points for prior experience provide a substantial advantage to currently operating programs.<sup>58</sup> In some minds, it was too great an advantage, and was strongly opposed by many ED officials as well as several educational organizations outside of the Department. Critics argued that additional points shelter poorly performing programs and made it extremely difficult for new applicants to receive funding for what might be superior proposals.<sup>59</sup>

The Council also recommended the following changes that Congress included in the 1980 Amendments: funding increases for the TRIO programs; income level for participants raised so that participants could qualify if they were from families earning up to 150% of the poverty level (rather than 100 %) of the poverty level; one-third of the participants could come from a family where neither parent held a bachelor's degree (potential "first generation" college student); and standardizing many of the confusing and contradictory description for student eligibility among the different TRIO programs.

Perhaps the most controversial of these changes was the one which permitted at least one-third of the participants to be enrolled, regardless of income, on the basis of being from a family where parents had not earned a bachelor's degree. This modification moved the programs out of the category of pure income-based or race-conscious programs and into class-based programs.<sup>60</sup> Representative Ford, the Chairman of the House Subcommittee considering the change, now knew that his child could possibly benefit from the programs. So could many working-class families who could readily support the programs.

Many considered this change a brilliant political move in that it eliminated any issue of race as a consideration for program participation. However, this was not done without soul-searching and strong opposition from many in ED, the Carter White House and within the TRIO community itself. The opposition held that the new allowance betrayed the intent of the programs, i.e., to serve the poor and minorities. They feared that "first generation" was a code word to change the focus of the programs and open them up to become just another program serving mostly the non-poor and the non-minority.<sup>61</sup>

In working to influence the Higher Education Amendments of 1980, the TRIO community had entered the byzantine world of Washington politics: they had reflected on their mission, enlarged their potential target population and support, and begun to master the ways legislation was drafted and how to effectively influence that process. The future of the TRIO programs would no longer be the prerogative of the officials in ED. Henceforth, the professionals in the TRIO community would exert significant influence over all future TRIO legislation, and more often than not, supersede ED officials in bringing about the changes in those laws.

In March 1981, the NCCEOA dissolved and the Board of the newly incorporated National Council for Educational Opportunity Associations (NCEOA) held its first meeting. The following day, NCEOA sponsored the first Policy Seminar for TRIO personnel to inform them about policy issues affecting the programs. In June, NCEOA

opened a Washington office. In less than two years the Council would need to become a well-organized and effective body to take on a popular U.S. President.

### **The Reagan Administration and “The Twelve-Day War”**

In September 1983, Senator Lowell Weicker of Connecticut introduced the Reagan Administration’s proposal for a \$ 55-million cut in TRIO funding. The response from the TRIO community was the “The Twelve Day War,” so called because it lasted from September 15 until September 27, 1983. This involved a frantic campaign, led by the Council, to quickly educate key Senators about the importance of the TRIO programs in their respective States and enlist their individual support. Hundreds of mailgrams informed TRIO colleagues across the country of the impending funding crisis. Several hurriedly arranged meetings and conversations between key Senators and staff with TRIO professionals from various parts of the country resulted in a remarkable reversal of opinion in the Senate. In the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader, Jim Wright (D-TX), offered a floor amendment to the House Appropriations Bill to add \$10-million to the previous year’s TRIO appropriation. The Senate Committee on Appropriations accepted the amendment. The result was, in place of the original Senate proposal that would have reduced TRIO funding by one-third, the FY 1984 appropriation for TRIO was an increase of \$10-million over the previous year.<sup>62</sup> It was indeed a remarkable accomplishment. “If they had been successful in sustaining the (35%) cut in funding it would have been the end of it,” said Arnold Mitchem, Executive Director of the National Council since its inception. He added, “They understood that once you begin to weaken a program it becomes vulnerable and ripe for annihilation.”<sup>63</sup>

Less than three years later the budget-conscious Congress under President Reagan inaugurated yet another assault on the funding of the TRIO programs. It passed the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Reduction Act that called for a series of automatic funding reductions for domestic programs on a set schedule. The first cut was to begin on March 1, 1986, and combined with other cuts proposed by the administration, TRIO funding would have been reduced almost 30%.<sup>64</sup>

The TRIO leadership responded by requesting that Congress proclaim February 28, 1986 as “National TRIO Day.” It coincided with the eve of the day on which the first round of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget cuts were to begin. The TRIO leadership was successful in obtaining a Concurrent Resolution of the House and Senate that noted the devastating effects these cuts in funding would have on the TRIO programs. It called on the nation to turn its attention to the needs of the disadvantaged young people and adults aspiring to improve their lives.<sup>65</sup>

But the first National TRIO Day involved more extensive political activities by the TRIO community. The Council leadership sent a letter to all directors describing the effect the cuts would entail nationally and in each State and Congressional District. It urged all TRIO personnel to organize local political activities and suggested possible actions. The TRIO community responded. They flooded Washington with mailgrams, phone calls, and letters. They held meetings with representatives during their visits to home districts, worked with local politicians to express their support for TRIO funding and called Congressional assistants to request their representative or senator sign-on to sponsor the Resolution calling for the National TRIO Day. TRIO personnel held teach-

ins and press conferences across the nation and wore black armbands to call attention to the effects of the cuts. All of this was done with local and national press coverage.<sup>66</sup> It was an exceptionally effective political action by the Council staff and its grass-roots constituency in teaching them the techniques of political action.

TRIO Day built support for the Council among program staff and other supporters who feared the results of the large automatic spending reductions triggered by this legislation. By obtaining, in a very short period when the Congress was in winter recess, the signatures of 221 Representatives in the House and 34 Senators as sponsors of the TRIO Day Resolution, the TRIO community suddenly became aware of the strong support they had built in Congress.<sup>67</sup>

Since that time, students and staff of TRIO programs gather annually on campuses and state capitols across the nation on the last Saturday of February. On these annual “National TRIO Days” they celebrate victories, programs, and a movement of poor people and their hope for a better life through higher education.

## **Continued Growth of the TRIO Programs**

The Higher Education Amendments of 1986 added yet another program to TRIO: the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program.<sup>68</sup> This program revived an idea first proposed in OE’s “Routh Report” eleven years earlier when it became entangled in the 1980-funding imbroglio. The TRIO community opposed the concept at that time largely due to the fact that they considered it would drain funds from existing programs. This time the idea arose from the Association of American Universities<sup>69</sup> and a supporter of TRIO, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois. They worked closely with staff from the NCEO to develop the language of the legislation authorizing this program. Although authorized in the 1986 Amendments, it did not receive funding appropriations until several years later.<sup>70</sup>

This most recent of the TRIO programs offers services to low-income, “first generation” *and minority* college students to prepare them for doctoral studies and careers in college teaching. It includes the opportunity for its participants to become involved in research and other scholarly activities. It serves as a capstone of these programs intended to make American higher education reflect the rainbow colors of its population. The first fourteen programs began in 1989 with funding of \$1.5-million.

In 1990, ED used its statutory authority to create another version of the oldest of its TRIO programs. The Administration wanted more low income and minority youth involved in the sciences. It was an idea that had been proposed in the Routh Report and resurfaced again in 1980, prior to the funding crisis. This time extra monies were available for such an expansion. Dr. Richard Fairley, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, enlisted the support of the Council and proposed a new initiative supported by all. The Department funded thirty “Upward Bound Math Science Programs.” This required no changes in the authorizing legislation in order to be implemented.<sup>71</sup> These projects focus on preparing high school age eligible youth for entrance into the sciences and mathematics, where students from poor, first generation and some minority groups are grossly underrepresented.

When reauthorization for the programs was enacted in the Higher Education Amendments of 1992,<sup>72</sup> the NCEOA proposed a large number of changes. Many were technical, but these changes once again further restricted the ability of the ED to develop its own regulations.<sup>73</sup> Thus, in many ways, the Council has evolved to operate as a “Shadow Department” in regard to TRIO legislation and regulations. Instead of the executive branch, through its Department of Education, researching and influencing legislative changes by the Congressional Committees, the majority of legislative changes accepted and written into law since the Higher Education Amendments of 1980 have been the ones proposed by the TRIO professionals through their Council.<sup>74</sup>

The effectiveness of the Council in influencing legislation lies partly in the efficient system it has developed to gather information from the programs, propose solutions to problems that it uncovers, obtain feedback on those ideas, and then prepare a unified set of recommendations supported by a majority of its members. These proposals are presented and discussed with the members of Congress and their staff well in advance of the reauthorization hearings.

During the last decade, the TRIO community has cultivated bipartisan support among the members of Congress. It is effectively organized so that program staff, students, college personnel and graduates remain in contact with their Senators and Representatives. Congressional support is enlisted annually in a formal manner when the Council sponsors a three-day spring pilgrimage to Washington for the “Policy Seminar,” ending with the highly choreographed “Walk on the Hill.” TRIO personnel and representatives from every state and territory spend the first two days learning about the current issues facing the programs. On the third day they visit Capitol Hill to meet with each of their Senators and Representatives and/or Congressional staff persons. At this time, they share information about the work and successes of the programs and ask the member’s support for an agreed-upon set of legislative or fiscal recommendations.

## **The Clinton Years**

With the election of Democrat Bill Clinton to the White House in 1992, many in the programs believed they again had an influential advocate for their cause. When the mid-term elections of 1994 resulted in a surprising victory for a Republican “New Majority” in both House and Senate, a determined, fiscally conservative majority took control of the House of Representatives. Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, led the charge with his “Contract with America.” It produced a radical new vision for America that did not include government programs to help the poor or education.

Representative John Kasich (R-Ohio), House Budget Committee Chairman, applied the “Contract” to TRIO. Dubbed by one news reporter as “New Gingrich’s budget pit bull,”<sup>75</sup> Kasich did not merely reduce, but “zeroed out” funding for the TRIO programs. The Democratically controlled White House, and a more cautious and nearly evenly divided Senate provided the allies needed and used by the TRIO community to counter the “Republican Revolution.” The substantial bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress also came to the aid of the programs. In the House of Representatives, Republicans Henry Bonilla of San Antonio and Jay Dickey of Arkansas stepped up to support the TRIO programs. The appropriations for TRIO were restored, though not

increased. However the ongoing serious threats reinforced the belief for many TRIO persons that a strong and active national organization was the only way the programs were going to survive and grow.

In the Higher Educational Amendments of 1998, President Clinton neither strongly supported nor disavowed TRIO. Rather he used his presidential influence to support an entirely new “signature program” designed to help low-income youth prepare for college: GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness for Readiness for Undergraduate Programs).<sup>76</sup> It provides services to an entire class cohort in targeted schools that enroll a substantial population of low-income students and follows that class through to high school graduation. Many services it provides to students resemble and expand those offered by the more modestly funded TRIO Talent Search Programs, such as helping participants with college selection, tutoring and completing applications for college and financial aid, etc. GEAR UP also includes an emphasis on school reform and professional development of staff serving those schools.

During the reauthorization hearings for the 1998 Higher Education Amendments, Senator Jeffords, chair of the Senate authorizing committee, supported a small new initiative labeled the TRIO “Dissemination Partnership Grants.” These projects are designed to expand and leverage the best practices learned from the TRIO programs to institutions and organizations that do not have a TRIO program.

A few years later, the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001 amended the TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) Program. It provided funding so that grantees can offer special financial aid grants to participants, in addition to their Pell Grants, during their first two years of college. This idea had arisen in the Clinton White House as a “College Completion Grant.” It was eventually labeled the “College Enhancement Initiative” and was the first time that a TRIO program could provide financial aid to its students.

### **The TRIO Programs in 2003**

In FY 2002, TRIO served 872,032 participants in 2,646 projects and received \$802.5 million for that year.<sup>77</sup> This is a sizeable amount, although the programs are serving less than 7% of the eligible population.<sup>78</sup>

In a budget message attached to the FY 2003 budget, President George W. Bush labeled Upward Bound “ineffective” and Special Student Services “effective,” based on recent national studies.<sup>79</sup> He requested only level funding for the TRIO programs and GEAR UP. After a lengthy delay with Continuing Resolutions, Congress finally agreed on a FY 2003 budget that increased TRIO funding by \$24.6-million, or a 3% increase. The President’s budget request for FY 2004 for TRIO calls for funding at a lower level that is equal to the amount of the FY 2003 figures prior to the Congressional increase.

Another reauthorization for the Higher Education Act that includes the TRIO programs is scheduled for 2003-04. The Department of Education and Council for Opportunity in Education (NCEO changed its name in 1998) both plan to present recommendations to the Senate and House Congressional Committees that will hold hearings on the reauthorization legislation. The Council’s recommendations have been clearly delineated and were forwarded to the Committee chairs in December 2002.

Council members claim their changes will expand opportunities and access to higher education for an increased number of students, simplify student and institutional aid, and promote student academic preparation for postsecondary education. In April 2003, the Department's recommendations are only in their initial stages of development. They are currently stated in terms of broad goals and objectives reflecting the Bush administration's priorities rather than written with the specificity seen in the Council's proposals.<sup>80</sup>

If the Council's recommendations are written into the new authorizing legislation and appropriations, the number of eligible participants served will increase from 7% to 10%, and the discretionary power of the ED to issue regulations for the programs will be further limited. If the Department's philosophy is accepted and operationalized, the emphasis will be on efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. The process continues in the manner first begun in the Higher Education Amendments of 1980. The TRIO community presents alternative legislative proposals to those of the Department and both must work to have their new visions for TRIO accepted by Congress and written into law.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>26</sup>David Johnson interview by author, 14 November 2000. Marcus Bell interview by author, 25 June 2002. Matthew Taylor interview by author, 28 June 2002. Clark Chipman interview by author, 6 March 2003.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>The states in Region V at the time were Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

<sup>29</sup>Arnold Mitchem, *Politics and Education: A Short History of a New Institution and a New Professional Class* (Unpublished manuscript, 1981 (?)), 3.

<sup>30</sup>In April 1975, Dr. James Hamilton, President of the Michigan Chapter of the Mid-America Association, Dot Routh of Georgia and Eugene Ellis of New York testified before Congress about TRIO's importance in expanding educational opportunities for disadvantaged students.

In September 1976, Jerry Lewis, President of the Maryland TRIO association and Monte Perez, President of the National Association for Equal Educational Opportunities joined the leadership of the Mid America Association along with the Director of the National Student Lobby (now the US Student Association) to work directly with House and Senate staffers on what became the Higher Education Amendments of 1976. Ibid. 4.

<sup>31</sup>Note for Dr. Leonard H. O. Spearman from T.H. Bell, 14 April 1975.  
Memorandum to: Dr. T.H. Bell, Commissioner of Education, from: Director, Division of Student Support & Special Programs, 30 January 1975.  
Untitled document proposing Educational Preparatory Centers, Institutes for Postsecondary Achievement, and Training Institutes.  
Summary report: Recommendations for New Delivery Systems, prepared by Task Force of The Disadvantaged and Postsecondary Education, January 1975.  
All in box 4, folder "Task Force Legislation," John Rison Jones Collection, LBJ Library, Austin, TX.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>One of the programs that was suggested in the Routh Report, but only implemented fifteen years later, was the Upward Bound Math Science Program. One of the most interesting programs recommended was the Service Learning Centers. They were to supplant and expand the SSDS programs. The Learning Centers were authorized in the Higher Education Amendments of 1976 but funds were never appropriated. Although they remained authorized for four years, and were often discussed in interdepartmental OE memos, they were viewed by persons in the TRIO community as a threat to existing TRIO programs. The Learning Centers were removed in the 1980 Amendments on the recommendation of ED and NCCEOA. *Higher Education Daily*, 30 July 1979, 6, and "Remarks of Mr. Arnold L. Mitchem Representing the NCCEOA, Hearings on the Reauthorization of the HEA," Conducted by DHEW 4 January 1979, box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of HEA, David Johnson Collection (hereafter referred to as DJC), Pell Institute, Washington, DC (hereafter referred to as PI).

<sup>34</sup>Arnold Mitchem, "The History of TRIO," *NCEOA Journal* (Winter 1997), 3.

<sup>35</sup>In 1974, Arnold Mitchem convinced Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm of Brooklyn, the recognized representative for "Black" issues in the House, to offer an amendment in the House Committee on Education and Labor to raise the TRIO authorization from \$100 million to \$250 million. It was later reduced to \$ 200 million by a Senate-House Conference Committee. This amount still represented a 100% increase in the TRIO authorization. Mitchem, *Politics and Education*, 3 and Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 17 December 1999.

---

<sup>36</sup>Mitchem, *Politics and Education*, 4.

<sup>37</sup>The six persons participating were Rozelle Boyd, President of the Mid American Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel, Irma Burks, first president of the Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel, Arnold Mitchem, Oscar Hernandez, Dr. Monte Perez, and Mr. Lewis. Mitchem, *Politics and Education*, 8.

<sup>38</sup>Of the regional associations then in existence (the Caribbean Association did not yet exist as an independent association) only the Western Association was not represented. Their president was kept involved via telephone Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 17 December 1999.

<sup>39</sup>Mitchem, *Politics and Education*, 10.

<sup>40</sup>Although the decision to recentralize the administration of the TRIO programs was made in 1977, the actual move of TRIO personnel from the regions to Washington was only implemented in the fall of 1978.

<sup>41</sup>The name “TRIO” can cause confusion, since more than three programs have been included under this name as new programs began to be developed and funded to help low-income persons enter college. The term is not an acronym, but rather was coined informally in the early 1970s when only three programs existed.

In 2003, Upward Bound has a “classic” format as well as two with special emphases: Veterans Upward Bound, and Math Science Upward Bound. TRIO programs providing services to students, in addition to Upward Bound, are Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers and the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program. A Training Authority provides opportunities for professional improvement of program directors and staff, and a Dissemination Partnership program encourages the replication or adaptation of successful practices of TRIO projects at non-TRIO institutions. All are included in the “TRIO” family.

<sup>42</sup>Hereafter competitions would be on a staggered schedule. In that way different programs would be read in different years so that all would not have to be evaluated and read in the same year.

<sup>43</sup>Press release (HEW), 11 April 1977, and Memorandum from Chief, Planning Staff/BHCE to Alfred L. Moyé, 30 November 1978, folder “Carter Centralization,” DJC, PI.

<sup>44</sup>*Federal Register*, 44, no. 207 (24 October 1979): 61259.

<sup>45</sup>Alfred Moyé interviews by author, 11 March 2003 and 22 April 2003.

<sup>46</sup>Letter, David Johnson to Patricia Urbas, 20 March 1980, box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of Higher Education Act, folder “1980 UB and SSDS Nat’l Demonstration Projects,” DJC, PI.

<sup>47</sup>Alfred Moyé interviews by author, 11 March 2003 and 22 April, 2003.

<sup>48</sup>Letter to Honorable Shirley Hufstедler, Secretary, Department of Education from Claiborne Pell, Thomas F. Eagleton, Richard S. Schweiker, Jacob K. Javits, Carl D. Perkins, William D. Ford, John Buchanan, 13 March 1980, box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of Higher Education Act, folder “1980 Funding Problems,” DJC, PI. David Johnson interview by author, 14 November 2000.

<sup>49</sup>David Johnson “Lessons from the Past: Milestones of TRIO History” co-presentation with John Groutt, Annual Conference, Council for Opportunity in Education, Chicago, September 2001.

<sup>50</sup>Lorenzo Middleton “225 Counseling Services Face Suspension,” Chronicle of Higher Education (June 2, 1980), 11. Alfred Moyé interview by author, 22 April 2003.

---

<sup>51</sup>David Johnson, "Lessons from the Past." Document entitled "From the Calendar of David Johnson, 1980," folder "1980 Funding Problems," box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of Higher Education Act DJC, PI.

<sup>52</sup>In a "Dear Colleague" letter Charles Ratliff, Executive Secretary of WESTOP writes that even after additional funds were restored from the aborted National Demonstration Programs and redirected to fund additional existing programs "more than 180 programs funded during the FY 79-80 were discontinued for FY 80-81." Letter, Charles Ratliff to "Dear Colleague," 20 August 1980, folder "NCCEOA vs. WESTOP," DJC, PI

Others who were intimately involved believe that number is exaggerated, but agree that the number of ongoing projects finally lost was considerable. The threat of losing an even greater number of projects was a trauma that Council members did not want to see repeated. Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 1 April 2003.

<sup>53</sup>This situation can be compared to the seismic shift that occurred in the Education Amendments of 1972 that reshaped the Federal financial aid program. In that instance it was determined that the aid would go, not to the universities, but directly to the students.

In the case of the HEA of 1980, the landmark change was that the TRIO community itself, not the Office/Department of Education, became the primary influence affecting TRIO legislation from this point forward.

For an in-depth study and analysis of the Education Amendments of 1972 see Lawrence E. Gladieux and Thomas R. Wolanin, Congress and the Colleges: The National Politics of Higher Education, (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1976)

<sup>54</sup>Kenneth J. Meier, Politics and the Bureaucracy: Policymaking in the Fourth Branch of Government, 4th ed. (Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers, 2000), 126.

<sup>55</sup>Letter to Arnold Mitchem, Convener, NCCEOA from William D. Ford, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education to, 15 September 1978, folder "Mitchem Testimony for HEA 1980," box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of HEA, DJC, PI.

<sup>56</sup>Memorandum to Postsecondary Education Task Force from Mike O'Keefe, 26 October 1978, box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of HEA, DJC, PI.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives by Arnold L. Mitchem, Convener, National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, 10 April, 1979, folder "Mitchem Testimony for HEA 1980," box 1, 1980 Reauthorization of HEA, DJC, PI.

<sup>57</sup>Report of the National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations regarding the recommended position of the Council on the reauthorization of the Special Programs for students from disadvantaged Background (TRIO) section of the HEA of 1965 as amended, 14 October, 1978, and Report of the Reauthorizing Task Force to the National Coordinating Council, 29 September 1979, Arlington, Virginia, folder "NCCEOA Recommendations Reports," box 1, 1980 Recommendations of HEA, DJC, PI.

<sup>58</sup>A maximum of one hundred points could be awarded to each proposal by the team of readers. Up to fifteen additional points (the maximum additional points differed somewhat among the various programs) could be added by ED program officers to currently funded programs, provided those programs had fulfilled the requirements of the previous grant period. This system thus offered a significant advantage to funded programs over new applicants since scores for winning proposals often fall within a very narrow range.

<sup>59</sup>Alfred Moyé interview by author, 22 April 2003.

<sup>60</sup>"Class-based" is used here in the sense of Max Weber's social ladder with gradations of status and power, based on education, occupation and income rather than Karl Marx's antagonistic economic

---

classes locked in conflict on the basis of ownership or non-ownership of income-producing property. For an excellent discussion of race and class in the context of entrance into higher education in the “A Better Chance” program, see Chapter One, “From the Ghetto to the Elite” and Chapter Seven, “Race and Class in America,” in R. Zweigenhaft and G. William Domhoff, Blacks in the White Establishment: A Study of Race and Class in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

<sup>61</sup>Silas Purnell interview by author 26 September 2001. Silas Purnell interview by Paul Beasley at the Annual Conference of COE, Chicago 7 September 2001. William Blakey interview by author 2 May 2002. Draft memorandum to William Blakey from Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Continuing Education (Alfred Moyé) 17 October 1979, box 1, “1980 Reauthorization of HEA,” DJC, PI.

<sup>62</sup>“NCEO: Ten Years of Advocacy for Low-Income, First Generation and Handicapped Youth & Adults, 1981-1991” copy from unidentified journal 1991 (?), 5-7, box 1, folder “History,” John Groutt Collection, PI. Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 23 May 2003 and “The History of TRIO,” 4.

<sup>63</sup>Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 1 April 2003.

<sup>64</sup>Letter, Arnold Mitchem to “Dear Colleague,” 5 February 1986, box 1, folder “TRIO Day,” John Groutt Collection, PI.

<sup>65</sup>Res. 278, Sponsors, William D. Ford, Louis Stokes, Silvio O. Conte, House, 99<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, H.Con.. box 1, folder “TRIO Day,” John Groutt Collection, PI.

<sup>66</sup>Letter, Arnold Mitchem to “Dear Colleague,” 5 February 1986.

<sup>67</sup>Arnold Mitchem interview by author 1 April 2003.

<sup>68</sup>In the original bill, this program was called simply a Postbaccalaureate Program. It was soon named in honor of the African-American astronaut and scientist, Ronald E. McNair, who died in the fiery lift-off of the space shuttle Challenger in January 1986. This name came as a result of the special request of Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, the home state of McNair. It was given to the program in the Technical Amendments that “clean up” the final version of a bill. Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 7 February 2003.

<sup>69</sup>The Association of American Universities (AAU) is an elite association of the leading research universities in the United States and Canada. John Vaughn, one of their officers, wrote a position paper advocating this type of program and worked with others to insure its formation and funding. Senator Paul Simon and his staff as well as the Council staff adopted the idea. Arnold Mitchem interview by author, 1 April 2003. William Blakey interview by author, 23 May 2002.

<sup>70</sup>The program remained unfunded for several years because of an already existing similar small program that was eventually scuttled in favor of McNair. William Blakey interview by author, 23 May 2002. Maureen Hoyler interview by author, 3 March 2003.

<sup>71</sup>Richard Fairley interview by author, 22 April 2003 and 16 May 2003. Frances Bergeron interview by author, 30 November 2001.

<sup>72</sup>For an overview of what this Act contains outside of the TRIO framework and its significance and legislative history see Thomas R. Wolanin, “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Federal Policy Making for Postsecondary Education,” in National Issues in Education: The Past is Prologue, ed. John F. Jennings (Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa International, 1993), 89-105.

<sup>73</sup>The NCEO Board proposed twenty legislative changes, many of which spelled out considerable administrative detail for the operation of the programs. Congress included fourteen of the Council’s proposed changes in the legislation, accepted four with modifications and rejected only two. One

of the changes lowered the eligibility age for Talent Search to include youth as young as eleven years of age.

The Council was also successful in influencing legislation outside the direct TRIO legislation. It convinced Congress to initiate a new Presidential Access Scholarship that awarded a 25% Pell Grant bonus to students successfully participating in an EOC, Upward Bound or Talent Search.

Memorandum, Arnold Mitchem to NCEOA Board of Directors, re: Congress Passes Higher Education Amendments of 1992, 9 July 1992, box Legislation and Comments, folder "Higher Ed Amendments of 1972," PI.

NCEOA was not successful in securing appropriation of funds for the "Super-Pell" (Presidential Access Scholarship) and it was eventually removed in later legislation. Email to author from Maureen Hoyler, 11 March 2003.

<sup>74</sup>Thomas Wolanin pointed out "when Congress passed the reauthorization of 1972, the TRIO programs in the law were one and a half pages long. Today (1997) the TRIO programs are 11 pages long in the law. They haven't changed that much in the 20 years...What has changed is to increasingly elaborate and to write into the law the administrative conditions and administrative operations of the TRIO programs – that is, to increasingly take out of the discretion of the Department of Education, previously the Office of Education, how TRIO is to operate..." Thomas Wolanin, "The History of TRIO: Three Decades of Success and Counting," *NCEOA Journal* (April 1997): 3. Article is Internet accessible, <http://www.trioprograms.org/abouttrio.html#history>.

<sup>75</sup>Margaret Warner, "Budget Ceasefire," Online Newshour, 25 January 1996. [http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/congress/kasich\\_1-26b.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/congress/kasich_1-26b.html) Internet; accessed 2 April 2003.

<sup>76</sup>GEAR UP arose from the joining of several bills designed to accomplish similar ends. An earlier National Early Intervention Scholarship and Partnership Program (NEISP) had been sponsored by then-Republican Jim Jeffords from Vermont and authorized in the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. The Jeffords' program sought to improve college access by providing federal funds to encourage states to enter into partnerships with school districts, higher education institutions and community organizations to offer college counseling and financial aid to at-risk, low-income students. In the House, Congressman Chaka Fatah, Democrat from Philadelphia, proposed a "21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars Program" that would inform low-income students about federal financial aid available to them. President Clinton embraced the two plans and joined them to his administration's "High Hopes" initiative, which targeted low-income, middle school students with an emphasis on early awareness. In the conference negotiations the three initiatives were joined and emerged as GEAR UP in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

National Association for College Admission Counseling, GEAR UP: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, September 2001. Article on-line; available from <http://www.nacac.com/downloads/gearupissuepaper.pdf>; Internet; accessed 11 March 2003.

See also, Cheryl D. Fields, "Can TRIO & GEAR UP Continue to Coexist?," *Black Issues in Higher Education* (6 December 2001): 27 –30.

<sup>77</sup>"Office of Federal TRIO Programs Funding," Report available from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/trio/recentfunding.html>; Internet; accessed 2 April 2003.

<sup>78</sup>Tom Mortenson, "TRIO Market Penetration," *Postsecondary Education Opportunity* 95 (May 2000), 10-16. Mortenson calculates that less than 5% of eligible persons are served. COE estimates that the percentage served might reach 7%. It is difficult to calculate the exact percentage of eligible persons due to the lack of precise data and the necessity to correlate available information, e.g. parental educational attainment. Further complicating the calculation is the fact that the low income, parental educational level and other criteria can overlap and there are still some differing criteria among the programs, e.g. disability, non-native English speakers, minorities, age criteria, etc. In any calculation, a very small percentage of the eligible persons are being served.

<sup>79</sup> Bradford Chaney, Lana Muraskin, Margaret Calahan, Rebecca Rak, *National Study of Student Support Services, Third-Year Longitudinal Study Results and Program Implementation Study Update: Executive Summary* (February 1987): iii-iv.

Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education by Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD. A key finding was that SSS showed a small but positive and statistically significant effect for all three measures of student outcomes: increase in college GPA's, number of semester credits earned, and retention.

David Myers and Allen Schrim, *The Impacts of Upward Bound: Final Report for Phase I of the National Evaluation, Executive Summary*. Submitted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Washington, DC to the U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Services, (April 1999): iv-v.

Its findings at this stage were necessarily interim and tentative since many of students included had not yet had the opportunity to attend college. At this preliminary stage, it reported that many students remain in Upward Bound for only a short time, the program had limited impacts on students during high school, but that it had substantial impacts on certain groups of students: those entering with lower initial educational expectations, boys, Hispanic and white students, and students qualifying as low-income and as low-income potential first-generation.

For a news report and reactions on the President's labeling Upward Bound "ineffective" see Richard Morgan, "Upward Bound's Slippery Slope: The college-preparation program, in a fierce battle for federal funds, faces scrutiny from the Bush Administration," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (3 May 2002): A21.

<sup>80</sup>In December 2002, COE submitted fifteen recommendations to the Senate and House Committees, which will hold hearing on the reauthorization legislation for the TRIO programs. The first recommended the TRIO authorization be increased to \$1.7-billion for FY 2005. All TRIO grants would be for five years rather than four and all projects that are funded at the minimum level would receive automatic annual increases for inflation. Veterans Upward Bound programs would be allowed to serve disabled veterans regardless of low-income or first-generation status as well as those who serve in the Reserves and National Guard. The requirement of providing a foreign language in Veterans Upward Bound would be eliminated. McNair and Upward Bound students' stipends would be increased and McNair students could receive a \$5,000 assistantship during their first year of doctoral work. McNair students could begin research earlier in their college experience. The National TRIO Clearinghouse would become a legislatively mandated training priority. Student loans indebtedness would be forgiven for TRIO personnel. The GEAR UP partnership grants would become a sixth TRIO program.

Letter from Arnold Mitchem to Honorable(s) John Boehner, George Miller and Howard McKeon, 31 December 2002 and "Will the Council's Reauthorization Recommendations for TRIO and GEAR UP Partnership Grants, if enacted, Make Any Difference to Real Students and Real Programs?," both available online <http://www.TRIOprograms.org>; Internet; accessed 26 May 2003.

Stephen Burd, "Programs for Disadvantaged Students Feud over Their Futures: Battle is expected over plan to merge Gear Up and TRIO," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49, no. 27 (14 March 2003): A21.

The Department of Education requested comments and recommendations to be submitted by February 2003 as it began to consider proposals to reauthorize the Higher Education Amendments. Their Web site lists a series of broad goals and objectives such as: enhancing the quality of access to postsecondary and adult education; strengthening the accountability of postsecondary institutions; developing and maintaining financial integrity, and management and internal controls; and managing information technology resources to improve services for their customers (sic); leveraging the contributions of community- and faith-based organizations to increase the effectiveness of Department programs; and linking federal education funding to accountability for results. <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/reauthorization> Internet; accessed 18 March 2003.

A comparison of the two sets of recommendations at this stage is interesting, both in the content areas and in the developmental processes. The COE proposals at this stage are quite specific and even

---

include the language that could be used to integrate them into the legislation. They have resulted from almost a year of gathering and discussing suggestions and ideas from the state and regional associations. They were provided to the Members of Congress in December, 2002, well in advance of the hearings. Undoubtedly, the Council will use the "Walk on the Hill" during the annual Policy Seminar prior to the reauthorization to have members discuss these ideas with the representatives from their respective Congressional Districts and States.

The Department appears to be at the beginning stages of its process in developing the changes it wants to be included in the new legislation. In addition to soliciting suggestions by email, it includes one public meeting for the entire country, as opposed to the numerous meetings occurring over the past year in COE's ten regional associations where the proposed changes were debated. By mid-March 2003 ED has not developed anything near the finished and specific proposals similar to those of the Council. Its ideas reflect the philosophies of the Bush administration about accountability, management, outcomes and cooperation with faith-based institutions.

---

The National TRIO Clearinghouse, an Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Opportunity affiliated with the ERIC Higher Education Clearinghouse, collects and disseminates information, program materials, resources and research focused on TRIO programs and students. Housed in the Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education, Council for Opportunity in Education, The National TRIO Clearinghouse is funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Federal TRIO Programs. For additional information, contact Andrea Reeve, Director, Educational Opportunity Clearinghouse, 1025 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1020, Washington DC, 20005, Phone: 202-638-2887, email [CH@pellinstitute.org](mailto:CH@pellinstitute.org), website: [www.trioprograms.org/clearinghouse](http://www.trioprograms.org/clearinghouse).

---

John Groutt is currently working on research for a book on the history of the TRIO programs. He served as Director of the Upward Bound Program at the University of Maryland Eastern Shore for 27 years and coordinator of the La Jolla Science Project of the Harvey Mudd Upward Program in Claremont, California during the summers 1999-2001. He has been a field reader for the U.S Department of Education. He has written articles and made presentations based on his historical research that includes locating and identifying TRIO archival materials and an oral history component taping interviews with key figures in TRIO history. He has received grants-in-aid to support this research from the Council for Opportunity in Education, the Pell Institute, the Rockefeller Foundation, the LBJ Presidential Library and an individual TRIO professional. Dr. Groutt received his Ph.D. from Temple University in Philadelphia. He can be reached at [jwgroutt@hotmail.com](mailto:jwgroutt@hotmail.com).

---

---

The National TRIO Clearinghouse encourages and welcomes the submission of archival materials dealing with TRIO history such as photographs, letters, memoranda, news releases and clippings, etc. both of a national and regional interest. The material will become a part of a National TRIO Archives, to further research on the Programs and their history. Contact John Groutt ([jwgroutt@hotmail.com](mailto:jwgroutt@hotmail.com)) for further information.