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Abstract

This paper will examine the formation of the former Transition Program at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). Special emphasis will be placed on four major areas: (a) circumstances that inspired the creation of the former Transition Program at UIUC, (b) history and mission of the former Transition Program at UIUC, (c) characteristics of students the program architects sought to serve, and (d) program models selected by the ad hoc committee.

This paper is inspired by my twenty-one years of work with the former Transition Program housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) at the UIUC campus. The Transition Program included both the former summer bridge component and the academic year component. The primary model of the academic year component is still in operation via the current undeclared component of the Access and Achievement Program. Since the 2009-2010 merger, many of the current processes, procedures and attributes are in line with the first model of the original Transitional Program. My goal is to gather and trace the articles, documents, letters and notes in archives from the former and present UIUC administrators and faculty who designed the former Transition Program; I will be able to identify information that would assist current and upcoming programs with improving academic support for underrepresented populations on the UIUC campus.
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**Background**

It was the summer of 1985. My parents brought me to the UIUC campus for a three-day summer orientation. During my visit, I saw a number of students that looked like me and looked familiar to me. In other words, they were students from underrepresented populations and many of them earned high school diplomas from Chicago Public Schools. Instead of participating in the three day orientation, they were actually moving in the residence hall to live for four weeks in the summer. I asked the orientation leader, “Who are those students?” He informed me that they were in “Bridge.” What is “Bridge?” I asked. He stated that it was a new program the University was piloting to give students a head start in preparing them for the academic rigors of the University (R. L. Waters, personal communication, July 9, 1985). Since the summer of 1985, I have been fascinated with programs that assist students with making a smooth transition from high school to postsecondary education. In essence, these transitional experiences help “bridge the gap” between high school and college. Many of these experiences are called “Summer Bridge” (Woolfolk, 1990). On that rainy summer day, little did I know that I would spend twenty-one years of my professional career working with this very same program (Greer, 2012, p.3).

**Research Protocol**

Academic support programs for students from underrepresented populations at predominantly white universities have a rich history. From the faculty and administration who designed the programs to the missions and models of programs and to the populations the programs were designed to serve, the process varies from institution to institution. Nevertheless,
as new programs are being designed on a number of campuses, including the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), I believe historical memory is significant. If we begin to acknowledge and learn the historical memory of these programs, we can reduce repetitious mistakes, waste less funds, waste less time and increase the academic success of the students the programs are designed to serve. The program I have interest in is the former Transition Program that was housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) on the UIUC campus. The following four questions will be addressed: (a) what were the circumstances that inspired the creation of the former Transition Program at UIUC? (b) What is the history and mission of the former Transition Program at UIUC? (c) What are the characteristics of students the program architects sought to serve? (d) Also, what program models were reviewed and selected by the ad hoc committee?

**Methodologies and Challenges**

In order to understand the formation of the former Transition Program, I decided to meet the challenge by reflecting on the documented facts. As a result, I gathered and reviewed some of the papers of former administrators at UIUC. This search allowed me to trace the development of the program from 1981 to 1986. By searching through campus and personal archives, I gathered documents from the following faculty and administrators including but not limited to: Professor James D. Anderson, Professor Richard Barksdale, Associate Dean Robert M. Copeland, Chancellor John E. Cribbet, Dr. Larry Mann, Director Bruce D. Nesbitt, Professor Maria Keen, Mr. Charles Sanders, Mr. Hugh M. Satterlee, Mr. Robert K. Todd and reports from a number of ad hoc committees.

The search was a challenge. Initially, I thought archives would be the best idea because it would force me to open/read vintage folders filled with history. I would then be able to organize
the papers. However, the process brought about a different reality. For a while, instead of order, the papers became more chaotic than ever. In the early 80’s, some administrators were on multiple committees stemming from the athletic uproar in the newspapers (Cribbet, 1981) (Husar, 1983, p. D6). Thus, the letters and reports I reviewed can fit in a number of categories. Also, when I decided to go in the archives, I really did not know what I was going to find. I am very glad that I limited the dates to 1981-1986. Even with a five year range, it was an overwhelming task to dig through the papers. In light of what I discovered, I decided to place the papers in chronological order. From Chancellor Cribbet, to the ad hoc committees to the trustees to the actual design of the program, the papers tell the story.

After exploring the collection, this paper is organized in four sections. First, we take a look at the circumstances that inspired the idea to create the former Transition Program at UIUC. Second, the paper will examine the history and mission of this program. Third, the paper will explore the characteristics of students the original program architects sought to serve. Finally, the paper will present the program model(s) selected by the ad hoc committee. The opportunity to explore primary sources and search the UIUC archives has also been refreshing. Thus, I desire to use what I learn to increase the service I currently provide to the students I serve.

What were the circumstances that inspired the creation of the former Transition Program at UIUC?

September 30, 1980, Chancellor John E. Cribbet formally organized the Ad Hoc Athletic Academic Advisory Committee consisting of twelve members (Cribbet, 1980, p. 1). He desired the committee to “serve as an important vehicle on this campus for strengthening the interrelationship between the intercollegiate athletic program and the academic activities of the campus” (p.1). Cribbet specifically wanted the committee to focus on 1) recruitment, admission
and placement; 2) certification of eligibility of continuing students; and 3) beginning freshmen (p. 2). By April 15, 1982 the Ad Hoc Athletic Academic Advisory Committee submitted a comprehensive report to Chancellor Cribbet addressing the three items aforementioned along with an additional category on financial aid (Mann et al., 1982).

“The Committee spent an extended period of time discussing and debating the advantages and disadvantages of current policy, as well as collecting data about student athletes admitted below the normal campus minimums (p. 3).” Appendix A highlights the results of their study (appendix A). The Committee’s charge was large and included a number of issues; as a result, “the Chair recommended…that a special ad hoc committee be appointed to study the academic support services provided through the Athletic Association (p. 5). As a result, June 19, 1981, Chancellor Cribbet appointed the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Services in the Athletic Association (p. 5). More about their charge and results will be shared in the next section.

Meanwhile, Dr. Mann’s Committee examined recruitment, admission and placement procedures (p. 2). During the overview of admission, the following four admission categories were described:

“Category One: the great majority of student athletes are admitted in the regular admission process according to the established competitive admission criteria. Category Two: a relatively small number of student athletes who meet the established competitive admission criteria are specially admitted each year simply because their applications are considered after the regular admission sequence. Category Three: a relatively small number of student athletes are specially admitted each year because they have academic credentials…below the established competitive admission levels, but above the normal campus minimums; some of these students also may be considered after the regular
admission sequence. Category Four: A small number of student athletes (approximately 35-40) are specially admitted each year with academic credentials below the normal campus minimum which is a predicated 3.0 grade point average (on a 5.0 scale) at the end of one semester based on ACT scores and high school rank in class” (pp. 6-7). Therefore, Category Four, a negative newspaper article and discussion about regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and Intercollegiate Big Ten Conference are the leading circumstances that inspired the creation of the Transitional Program.

**What is the history and mission of the former Transition Program at UIUC?**

Through the exploration of the literature, I have discovered that the history and mission of the transition of students from high school to postsecondary school in American education stem from a desire for schools to expand access to higher education (Kezar, 2000, p. 1). According to Myers, summer bridge programs “enable students to get a head start on building academic skills” (Myers, 2003, p. 17).

Kezar (2000) states that the history of Summer Bridge programs reaches back to the 1800’s. Over the past [forty] years, access to higher education has expanded markedly. As in most historical times of expansion, remediation and support programs grow to help new populations make the transition to college (p. 1). “Remediation and support programs grew during the early 1800’s when access expanded to include more ‘common men’ in higher education (p. 1).” According to Kezar (2000), in the 1800’s, the programs grew when the numbers of women and African Americans greatly increased in higher education (p. 1). In 1944, the G. I. Bill and twenty years later, the Civil Rights Act resurrected the need to provide assistance for the emerging populations attending college (p. 1).

**History of the Transitional Program**
The enrollment trends at UIUC align with Kezar’s list of events. In 1968, after increased push on the UIUC campus from both African American students and residents in the community, the Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP) was created (Williamson, 2003, p. 3). This was produced to provide academic, personal and social support to 565 black and Latino students brought to the campus through a program called Project 500 (p. 66).

Approximately thirteen years later, the UIUC campus was hit with a *Chicago Tribune* series that shined a negative light on the campus in the area of intercollegiate athletics (Husar, 1983, p. D6). As a result, under the administration of Chancellor John E. Cribbet, an ad hoc committee was formed to review this matter and provide recommendations to strengthen the academic support provided by the Academic Services Office for the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics.

“First, the committee should become familiar with the responsibilities currently performed by the Office. Second, the committee should come to understand the academic background and special academic needs of those students who are served by the Office. Third, the committee should identify other established academic and counseling support services which are available to students on the campus; the extent to which the Athletic Association currently takes advantage of these services; and, finally, make recommendations as to how the Academic Services Office might build or strengthen its relationships with other support services. Fourth, the committee should make such recommendations as may be necessary for the enhancement and strengthening of the academic support services provided by the Academic Services Office” (Cribbet, June 19, 1981).

Only one of the six supported the document (Todd, 1981). The remaining five, expressed a need for another meeting (Anderson, 1981). Robert M. Copeland stated: “In general, I do not feel that the draft report conveys either the breadth or depth of the Committee’s perceptions, concerns, and conclusions in the respective areas of interest” (Copeland, 1981). Copeland also indicated that “If a decision is made to finalize the report essentially as it now stands, however, given the very serious reservations I have, I would respectfully request that a copy of this letter be included with the report” (Copeland, 1981). Satterlee, had a “few concerns …about the ‘meat’ of the report” (Satterlee, 1981). Likewise, Keen felt “that it lacks much of the focus and the emphasis of our Committee’s response to the four charges given us by Chancellor Cribbet” (Keen, 1981). Mr. Nesbitt clearly states, “I would not like for my name to be attached to any report that has the students ACT scores and related academic data attached without their written permission as I find it to be a violation of the Family Rights Act” (Nesbitt, 1981). This feedback led to the November 23, 1981 meeting (Barksdale, 1981).
**Mission of Summer Bridge Programs**

At this time, I have not been able to locate minutes from the various meetings in 1981. However, it is highlighted in the Mann Report that Professor Barksdale resigned as Committee Chair on January 25, 1982 (Mann et al., 1982, p.5). Professor James Anderson was then designated as the Chair of the Committee (Anderson et al., 1982). As a result of the findings of this ad hoc committee, March 10, 1982 a number of recommendations were made. One of those recommendations was a Transitional Program that would provide assistance to both student athletes and other talented students in areas and majors with similar profiles who need the same type of assistance with adjusting to college (Anderson et al., 1982, p. 15-16).

According to the literature, missions, vary from school to school. However, all of the programs that I read about focused on providing the student with a “head start.” Providing opportunities for students to become familiar with college resources, to become acquainted with college expectations and to become accustomed to interacting with faculty are common among the missions of summer programs (Myers, 2003, p. 17) (Buck, 1985). Preparing graduating high school students for postsecondary education, fostering a sense of community and increasing the retention of the targeted population are a few of the common missions of a number of bridge programs (Social Science Research Council [SSRC], 2005, p.2). In the case of the Transitional Program, the history is grounded in the belief that “the admission of students with well-known deficiencies carries with it a moral obligation to provide extensive and sophisticated academic support services to assist them in obtaining a baccalaureate degree (Anderson et al., 1982, p. 5). The mission was to fulfill the University’s obligation to help these students obtain a “marketable” degree (p. 15).

**What are the characteristics of students the program architects sought to serve?**
The literature shares that a number of programs focus on the first generation college student, the low SES, the international student and the underrepresented populations such as: African-American, Latin American, and Native Americans. Yet, there are programs that are created for students with specific academic interests such as: Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields, Pre-Law, and Study Abroad. Regardless of the program, the emphasis is on “getting ahead” and not just on “catching up (Drucker, 1982, p. 67).”

Bridge Programs are common among community colleges assisting students with moving to a four year university (Ackermann, 1991, p.213) (Eggleston and Laanan, 2001, p. 92). Denise Myers compiles a number of programs that promote college success (Myers, 2003). She provides a list of the components of a comprehensive program (p.6). These programs provide the following students with service: low SES, African Americans, Latin Americans, Native Americans, women in STEM fields, Native Americans in health care professions, men in nursing and men in K-12 education (Myers, 2003). There are also schools who seek to provide academic support to the entire student body by providing supplemental instructions programs, mentoring programs and culturally conscious programs (Myers, 2003). The goal in serving the different populations is to provide access, retention, persistence and graduation (Barnhart and Stanfield, 2013).

The architects of the first proposed UIUC Transitional Program (TP) made their views regarding the academic-athletic question clear by stating: “We believe that student–athletes should be recruited to come to Illinois primarily to obtain a baccalaureate degree” (Anderson et al., pp. 1-2). Initially, TP was being designed to meet the academic needs of those student athletes that were being admitted via Category Four. Appendix B is a comparative summary of freshmen entrance profiles for Academic Years 1977-1981 (p.4). According to appendix B,
the football sample that the Committee was given shows that the mean ACT composite score
was forty percent to fifty percent lower than the non-athlete students (p. 2). During years 1979
– 1981, the non-athletes ACT composite (ACTC) score was 25.5 – 26 (p. 4). During the same
years, the EOP student ACTC was 18.4 – 18.9 and the select Grant-In-Aid student ACTC
deprecated from 17.8 – 12.6 (pp. 2-4).

“Since its inception, Illinois has served diverse constituencies who could not have
undertaken a college-level program without financial assistance and/or excellent academic
support services e.g., farmers, veterans, rehabilitation students, and EOP students” (p. 5). The
Committee members had success and “experience with current University programs for other
‘high risk’ students” (p. 15). Thus, the proposed program would also be open “to all UIUC
students who evidence need and who elect to enroll as voluntary participants” (p. 15).
Although the program is not listed specifically for students of color and first generation college
students, the majority of the students and GIA student-athletes in the 1985 pilot program
embodied these characteristics.

**What program model was selected by the ad hoc committee?**

Although the general focus of summer bridge programs is “almost exclusively on
academic support,” program activities range vastly (Kezar, 2000. p.1). Literature talks about
schools all over America. This paper focuses on the formation of the former UIUC Transition
Program. Since athletics is an integral reason for the program’s development, for my previous
literature review, I examined the current twelve Universities in the National Collegiate Athletic
Association (NCAA) Big Ten (Greer 2012). I discovered that some schools like UIUC,
Michigan State and Minnesota no longer have a bridge or transition program. Some schools
like the University of Iowa and the University of Nebraska only have national programs such
as: TRiO’s Student Support Services, Talent Search and/or Upward Bound programs. Since every website was different and every model highlighted different features, I compared the following nine categories (Greer, 2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Category</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name of the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Name of the Program being featured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Dates or Times of the year that the program is in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Main goals of why the program was created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations</td>
<td>Who the program was designed to serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>How the student/person can become a part of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promises and Provisions</td>
<td>What a student can glean from the experience of being a part of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Placement</td>
<td>Where the program is placed in the University’s hierarchy/structure [e.g. Is it in student affairs? Is it in a college? Is it in a cultural center? Is it under the provost’s or chancellor’s purview?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>Websites, applications, brochures, videos, other relative programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are different models. Overall, many of the programs tend to provide elements that line up with the literature. Three of those elements are: (1) preparation for the campus, college and curricula, (2) foster a sense of community and connectedness to the University and (3) increased retention of the targeted students. (Social Science Research Council [SSRC], 2005, p.2). Appendix C shows that the original proposed UIUC Transitional Program recommended by the Committee. It was designed to begin during the academic year. “It should be understood that students opting for this program, especially as freshmen, might have to extend their stay at the University beyond the normal four-year period, thus necessitating expanded considerations relative to degree progress and financial aid where needed” (p. 16).

**Models of TP**
The 1982 version of the UIUC Transitional Program was proposed to operate only during the fall and spring terms. However, the actual 1985 pilot Transition Program at UIUC included both the former summer bridge component and the academic year component. The primary model of the academic year component is still in operation via the current undeclared component of the Access and Achievement Program housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Both versions of TP held true to the Committee’s view that the program should “be administered by an established academic College of the University which grants undergraduate degrees” (Anderson et al., 1982, p. 15). The role of the College administering the program (a) would provide general oversight of the program; (b) share staffing of courses with other academic units; (c) share development of courses, material and teaching strategies; (d) regular program evaluation (p. 16). The committee stated that:

“…the administrative college shall include the development, designation, and support of courses that are applicable for most majors, basically skill developing, and susceptible to innovative instruction and learning. The administrative college shall also insure the existence of support services that are designed for students with both learning problems and time scheduling difficulties. (p. 16)”

Initially, the Committee noted that since the Transitional Program was not an academic unit, eligible students who opt to participate would be admitted to the University through the colleges of their choice (p.16). The students would also have the opportunity to change their area of study upon the recommendation of the TP Coordinator (pp. 16 -17). However, once the administrative college was identified, acceptable special needs courses created and acceptable TP courses for general education courses selected, the design shifted 1984-1985 (p. 17). Instead of
the four to five semester academic model with a basic skills component, it moved to a two component admission model.

The name changed from the Transitional Program to the Transition Program. The following highlights from the 1990 TP brochure provide some of the model changes.

“Each summer fifty of the 100 students placed in the Transition Program were required to participate in a six-week residential summer session on the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) campus sponsored by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) which engaged these fifty students in intensive coursework in mathematics, composition, and basic skills development. In short, the aim was to help the fifty select students to "bridge the gap" from high school to college; consequently, this intensive academic experience was referred to as Bridge. Each fall, the successful Summer Bridge participants join the newly admitted fifty Academic Year Component first-year students, along with 100 returning second-year scholars to make-up the Transition Program population….After students have successfully completed four semesters in the Transition Program, they have an admission space reserved in the College and/or curriculum of their choice if they are in good academic standing ("C" average and better) and have completed the required core courses for admission to that College and/or curriculum” (R. L. Woolfolk, 1990).

**Effective Program Features**

The common elements previously listed in the model section are significant to the mission of many bridge and transition programs. Both in the classroom and outside of the classroom, the models appear to show that purposeful planning is placed throughout the entire summer bridge process (Lauridsen, 1982, p. 97). Strategic planning leads to more enriched and
successful experiences for the students. Programs are more effective when they continue to
teach the students how to associate the activities in the summer with the upcoming involvements
in the fall (p. 98). The integration of “both the academic and social milieu of the campus”
provides the students with greater opportunity to experience good success during the summer
and during the academic year (p. 98). Why and under what circumstances do transition
programs work? Some answers are: (1) campus and college buy-in, (2) monetary resources, (3)
academic administrative authority, and (4) structured models.

At UIUC, because the Ad hoc Committees were initiated by Chancellor Cribbet, campus
buy-in began at the top of the academic hierarchy. The Ad Hoc Committees consisted of faculty
and administrators who represented an array of views on campus. The Committees were aware
of the supports and oppositions to admitting student-athletes in Category Four (Mann et al.,
1982, p. 24). The Ad Hoc Athletic Academic Advisory Committee observed three possible
options:

“First it could be decided that the University’s academic integrity is compromised
by the special admission of a limited number of student athletes below the normal
campus minimums and, as a result, the practice should be discontinued….Second, the
burden of academic success or failure is primarily a student responsibility and, in effect,
no change in current practice or policy is necessary….Third alternative, suggests that
Category Four is not inconsistent with the academic mission of the UIUC because of the
University’s longstanding underlying commitment to providing educational opportunity
not only for the academically advantaged, but for a limited number of students with
special talents who also have special educational needs (p. 25).”
The Ad Hoc Committees completely bought-in to the creation and mission of TP. As a result, the financial support would be provided for the development of TP. While at UIUC, approximately a year after he retired, Dean Robert M. Copeland informed me that annually he went to the Office of the Provost to remind them of their commitment to the Transition Program. He reminded administration that in order to successfully continue “the selection process, structured instruction model and academic advising are essential. In order to maintain these components, the financial support must be available to meet these basics. If they were not going to continue providing that support, they needed to cancel the program” (R. Copeland, personal communication, April 2002). The Transition Program was expensive, yet, every year, under Dean Copeland’s leadership, the program continued.

Along with buy-in and monetary support, academic administrative authority is required. Administrative authority involves the ability to select the students being served and monitoring their academic process during the academic year. If a student has missed a deadline, the director of the program is more effective if s/he has the authority to review and make decisions on late drop petitions, withdrawals, academic advising and late adding of courses. If the administrator does not have these authorities, s/he is only able to make recommendations to the student. However, if the administrator has these authorities, s/he provides recommendations to the student while actually knowing the outcome. From the 1985 pilot program to today, the College of LAS administration who serves these populations still have this authority. Over the years, this “one stop shopping/home away from home approach” has been understood to be critical to student retention (Woolfolk, 1990).

Finally, structured models that include but are not limited to: (a) providing academic advising during both the summer and academic year, (b) sponsoring courses with instruction that
adapts to the learning styles of the students (e.g. Uri Treisman’s Model, small classroom, hands-on learning), (c) providing outreach activities that build both community and leadership skills and (d) providing support in one location are just a few of the structures that increases the opportunities for a successful program that can stand the test of time (Myers, 2003, p. 25) (Trent et al., 2007). Both models included the aforementioned requisite tools for success. However, the model that was selected for the 1985 pilot program allowed the summer to be a practice before the academic year. In other words, if a student began his/her academic journey during the summer bridge component of TP, s/he had to successfully complete the summer experience in order to officially be a student at the UIUC in the fall. If the student was not able to successfully complete the summer experience, s/he left the program with a plan toward attending another school or returning under a specific advising agreement designed by the TP Director. Later in 1989, the grading for the summer changed from actual letter grades to pass/fail. This allowed the students who did experience academic difficulty to leave without academic penalties and/or poor grades.

In the final model, whether the student began in the summer or during the academic year, s/he was “assigned a Graduate Advisor (GA) who is a graduate or professional student at the University. Each GA is responsible for providing academic, career, and personal counseling to a group of twenty students; each student is required to meet with his or her GA at least once a week. The GAs, along with the Director and Assistant Director of the Program, carefully monitor the academic progress of the students daily to ensure their success” (Woolfolk, 1990). The guidance that the GAs deliver and the courses provided by the program during the academic year are integral pieces to the success of the students in this model.

**Findings and Limitations**
One of the road blocks I encountered was, that I did not find certain papers I sought in the actual archive library. Remaining objective and staying on topic after reading the papers was a challenge. Whether finding items in President Ikenberry’s files or not finding certain meetings in Chancellor Cribbet’s appointment book, it was interesting trying to fill in the missing pieces to the story. Since this is an area that I have a passion for, I believe I did find many relevant documents and articles for the final paper. However, there is still so much more material to sift and sort. I do believe examining the program more closely via interviews with students and staff, observations and more written documents would be an interesting task to tackle.

The literature is fairly saturated with examples of programs and models. However, little data are provided to evaluate and substantiate the success of the students (Garcia and Paz, 2009, pp. 30-31). In the future, I look forward to finding more statistics. However, for this specific project, I enjoyed examining the care and research the Ad Hoc Committees appeared to exhibit as they tackled the tasks set before them by Chancellor Cribbet. The uncovered results of the architects of TP, laid the foundation for creating a successful program. Successful meaning that this program developed a twenty-year record of preparing talented students in intercollegiate athletics, dance, and writing with different backgrounds for the academic rigors of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. These results lined up with the original mission and design of the program (Mann et al., 1982, p. 25).

**Conclusion**

Bridge programs are not new to the twentieth century. Researchers identify bridge concepts being used in the 1800’s (Kezar, 2000, p.1). The mission of various programs center around: preparing students for college, equipping the student with a sense of belonging, and motivating students to persist to graduation (SSRC, 2005, p. 2). From low SES first generation
underrepresented populations to third generation gifted students pursuing a degree in a STEM field, the spectrum of students served in bridge programs vary across the country. Programs that seek to teach a balance between both scholastic achievement and social life skills tend to be more pleased with the final evaluations (Lauridsen, 1982, p. 98).

The UIUC Transitional Program and the former Transition Program derived from a crisis that was happening to student athletes who were admitted via Category Four of the admission process (Mann et al., 1982, p. 7). After investigation, other talented students who were considered “high risk” were present on campus and they were being successfully served via academic assistance such as: ability assessment, special counseling, the reading clinic, the writing laboratory, tutoring programs and more (Anderson et al., 1982, p. 5). The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Services in the Athletic Association was the key architect for the design of the program (Anderson et al., 1982). In spite of the shift in Committee Chairs, change in the name of the program and change in the model, the mission remained the same. The Committee wanted a program housed in an academic unit that would equip talented student athletes and select non-student athletes with the requisite academic tools needed to successfully navigate the academic rigors at UIUC.

**Self-Reflection**

As a student in EOL 574, throughout the entire process, working on this project was eye-opening. Initially, I knew that I wanted to select a topic/project that stemmed from my work experience with the former Transition Program. However, that is all that I knew. For the first four to six weeks, I struggled with deciding if I would interview people, dig through archives or write a self-ethnography. I wrestled with focusing on the students, zeroing in on the administrators or actually featuring the program. Eventually, I realized that all of it would be a
challenge. However, I knew that I had a strong interest in historical memory of the UIUC and how it has led to contemporary policies and procedures. That is why the Ethnography of the University Initiative (EUI) is a perfect fit for me. As a result, I chose to explore the archives and focus on the formation of the former Transition Program.

Since the topic is personal, I have had to create a distance that would allow me to be as objective as possible. This has not been easy. However, I believe the project provides a basic beginning to the general overview of the former Transition Program with loads of room for me to expand over the next few years. In spite of it all, I would not have traded this experience for the world. As I have shared with Professor C. Span and classmates during our spring 2013 biweekly meetings, I love primary sources. I am positive that I seek to understand the origin of people, places and things. In spite of the tedious process, it has confirmed my passion for the history of education. I look forward to a time when I am confident in my knowledge of the many aspects of the history of American education and expertise in the information on programs like the former Transition Program.

Per my April 24, 2013 conversation with Professor Baber, evaluation really was not placed on the back burner. As he stated, many who are doing the work are focused on serving the students and may not know how to properly evaluate the program (L. Baber, personal communication, April 24, 2013). Likewise, we further discussed that many of the administrators doing “the work” do not have time to do the research. My hope is that the information that I continue to gather will provide me with information for both my early research paper and for my dissertation. I look forward to examining the construction of the former Transition Program and deconstructing its layers so that I can identify the requisite success features that provide an effective program. Also, I would like to examine ideal characteristics of the administrators that
provide leadership for this program and others like it. It is an honor to continue building on the foundation so well laid by the architects who formed the Transition Program.
TO: Larry Mann
FROM: W. Peter Hood
SUBJECT: GRANT-IN-AID ATHLETES

The following data reports the academic progress of a sample of grant-in-aid athletes at the University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign Campus. All the individuals who comprise the study are grant-in-aid athletes who predicted below a campus 3.0 selection index as freshmen or entered the University with less than a 3.25 grade point average as a transfer student. The selection of this sample was determined by the Office of Admissions and Records. This study comprises grant-in-aid athletes who enrolled on this campus from the fall semester, 1974 through the fall semester, 1978. The data was collected during the spring semester, 1981.

The following comments are made regarding this study:

A. 21% of the sample are still active students who have not completed their enrollment at the University.

B. The withdrawn and failed to register category includes individuals making satisfactory progress toward their degree and eligible to return.

C. At the time this data was gathered, several students were lacking only a course, a paper, or an examination to fulfill all graduation requirements. If all of these requirements were completed, the graduation rate would increase to perhaps as high as 15%.

Additional data was gathered which show the progress toward a degree in the areas of University degree requirements and general education for each college in which the student was enrolled. This data should be reviewed for progress toward a degree of those individuals reaching junior standing. A second review should be made of the active students enrolled during the spring semester, 1981 and since to determine their academic outcome on this campus.

WPH: djf
Attachment
### Appendix A continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Active #</th>
<th>Active %</th>
<th>Inactive #</th>
<th>Inactive %</th>
<th>Dropped #</th>
<th>Dropped %</th>
<th>W/D and Failed to Register #</th>
<th>W/D and Failed to Register %</th>
<th>Graduated #</th>
<th>Graduated %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.L.S. (36)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.B.A. (17)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (20)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (22)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.A.A. (24)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A.S. (32)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These students represent a small proportion of the total student athlete population, and they are those who are least well prepared for collegiate study.*
### Table 1.

*Comparative Summary of Freshmen Entrance Profiles AY 1977-81*

ACT Composite Scores and High School Percentile Rank (HSPR) for
All Campus, Educational Opportunities Program, and **Football Grants-in-Aid Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ent. Class</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mean HSPR</th>
<th>Mean ACT Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UofI EOP GIA</td>
<td>UofI EOP GIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>6021 351</td>
<td>86.78 79.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>5685 269</td>
<td>87.00 77.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>5958 300 25</td>
<td>86.81 78.86 56.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>5858 365 27</td>
<td>87.55 60.97 51.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>5808 344 12</td>
<td>87.00 81.00 34.83</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Academic Support Services Office, EOP Statistical Reports, U of I School-College Relations Bulletins

** Freshmen Football Grants-in-Aid recipients. This group represents highest risk category and largest number of academic problems

*** Estimated figure. Final report not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester I</th>
<th>Semester II</th>
<th>Semester III</th>
<th>Semester IV</th>
<th>Semester V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC SKILLS COMPONENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>EPS 199 (academic skills development)</strong></td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EPS 299 (academic skills)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhet 104 (special needs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhet 104 (tutorial)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhet 105 (special needs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhet 105 (tutorial)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math 101 (special needs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp. Com 101 (special needs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL EDUCATION COMPONENT</strong></td>
<td>Humanities (Art, dance, music, theater)</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat. Sci. (Astr., Biol., Chem, Geol.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Sci. (Hist, Psych, Soc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Course Load</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>12-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students entering the TP as freshmen may remain in the program for up to 5 semesters and/or earn 60 hrs as needed.
** Students will be placed in appropriate basic skills courses through the use of diagnostic testing by the TP.
References


Other Resources


Wicks, E. C., Barksdale, R. K., Camel, J. E., Conry, T. F., Humphreys, L. G., Murtha, J. P., … Watts, E. S. (1983, October 10). [Final information from the ad hoc committee on
Admissions and Educational Programs for Student Athletes]. Copy in possession of Pamela Greer.