



CoPro2.0

CoPro2.0: Shaping Equitable and Sustainable College Promise Programs

Request for Concept Papers

EDUCATION PROGRAM
JUNE 2021

THE KRESGE FOUNDATION

THE KRESGE FOUNDATION

Request for Concept Papers

CoPro2.0: Shaping Equitable and Sustainable College Promise Programs

Issue Date: June 30, 2021

Concept Papers Due Date: August 9, 2021

Questions Accepted through July 30, 2021

Submit questions to:

copro2.0@kresge.org

Subject line: CoPro2.0 Concept Paper Submission Question

About The Kresge Foundation

The Kresge Foundation is a private, national foundation dedicated to expanding opportunities for people with low incomes in America's cities. Kresge uses a full array of grant, loan, and other investment tools in collaboration with our nonprofit, public, private, and philanthropic partners. In total, Kresge invests more than \$160 million annually to foster economic and social change through arts and culture, education, environment, health, human services, and community development.

The Foundation's way of working emphasizes cross-sectoral, high-engagement philanthropy that includes strategic communications, policy and advocacy, and field-building activities. Over the last few years, Kresge staff have deepened our understanding of racial inequities and developed approaches that more closely align with our equity intentions. As an organization, we have adopted [PolicyLink's](#) definition of equity as "just and fair inclusion in a society where all can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential." In 2019, we formally adopted equity as our sixth organizational value. For more general information about the Foundation, please visit our website at kresge.org/who-we-are.

Kresge's Education Program

Kresge's Education Program seeks to expand postsecondary access and success in cities for low-income, first-generation, and other student populations marginalized by higher education systems. The Education Program seeks to eliminate racialized and income-based inequities in graduation and education attainment rates in the U.S. and South Africa. In pursuit of these goals, the Education Program has three main grantmaking strategies:

- Reinforcing Urban Pathways to College
- Promoting Institutional Capacity Building for Student Success
- Aligning and Strengthening Urban Higher Education Ecosystems

For more information on Kresge's education grantmaking, please visit www.kresge.org/our-work/education, follow @kresgedu on Twitter, or subscribe to the bimonthly education newsletter here: <http://kresge.org/subscribe>.

Summary of Perspectives Informing this Initiative

Higher education is critical to the well-being of individuals, communities, states, and our nation. While the United States' postsecondary education attainment rate has steadily improved through the last decade, it is not rising quickly or equitably enough to meet economic, social, or civic demands. Large swaths of society remain on the margins of higher education and are ill-served by our nation's current tapestry of support programs, financial resources, and postsecondary institutions. These trends stand to reify multiple dimensions of disadvantage, while ensuring that only the privileged can achieve the many benefits of a high-quality postsecondary education.

Absent dramatic restructuring of public resources and targeted student supports, inequities will likely increase given the disproportionate negative impacts of COVID-19 on communities of color and the concurrent and longstanding pandemic of systemic racism.

“College Promise,” or “free college programs,”¹ catchall terms for a range of affordability plans, are increasingly seen as a solution to several interconnected education and economic challenges, including stratified college opportunity, burdensome student loan debt, and inadequate workforce preparation.² Free college programs guarantee tuition coverage to students who attend a particular school or reside in a certain place (e.g., neighborhood, city, school district, county, state).³

These programs are widespread and gaining momentum across the United States. One inventory found 368 free college programs operating as of April 2021.⁴ Thirty-one states either operate or passed legislation to establish them statewide.⁵ Much of this activity has occurred during the last ten years.⁶

Many such programs facilitate students’ enrollment at community colleges, often making this option tuition-free for grant recipients. Community colleges play a vital role in providing postsecondary opportunities for people from underserved groups and advancing the well-being of local communities, yet many community colleges are experiencing enrollment declines, financial constraints, and tensions about how to best serve varied student needs with available resources.

While college promise programs have proliferated rapidly, evidence regarding their effectiveness remains mixed. Emerging research indicates that some programs (e.g., the highly resourced) have contributed to increased college enrollment, student persistence, and degree completion.⁷ Yet, there are enduring challenges in the landscape that undercut the potential of the College Promise movement. According to one estimate, nearly three-quarters of these programs maintain last-dollar disbursement designs, whereby cash grants are awarded *after* students receive other forms of financial aid.⁸ Last-dollar programs are cost-effective but often provide no financial resources to students with low incomes attending community colleges, as the maximum Pell Grant is usually higher than community college tuition.⁹ This design is regressive, awarding aid primarily to families who are often ineligible for federal and state need-based grants.

Many programs also do not assist with other cost of attendance expenses, such as food, housing, transportation, and books. Some have adopted merit (e.g., high school GPA, standardized test scores) and other criteria (e.g., long-term residency, post-degree work and residential commitments) that undercut their universality.¹⁰ Due to fundraising challenges, many have modified the level of financial awards and services they provide from year to year, thereby increasing the unpredictability of the support students can anticipate.¹¹

Analysts are also uncertain whether these grants are transformative at the community college level, given tenuous connections between College Promise programs and outcomes like degree completion and transfer to a four-year college.¹² Analysts are also concerned about racialized effects on student outcomes and loan borrowing.¹³

Despite these challenges, the Biden-Harris Administration has made tuition-free community college a national priority, arguing that just as adopting free and universal high school was critical to providing opportunity a century ago, it is now time for the nation to provide two years of postsecondary education for all to meet the needs of the 21st Century. It has proposed \$109 billion in its American Families Plan to achieve this end.¹⁴

Recognizing that tuition is not students' only hurdle, the Administration's plan includes a \$62 billion investment in student retention and degree completion strategies and up to \$80 billion to increase the size of Pell Grants. It also calls for other investments that would benefit community college students, including reducing childcare costs, expanding nutrition assistance, and establishing a national paid family and medical leave program. The American Families Plan foregrounds a policy environment that supports the evolution of promise programs and welcomes guidance to create a national strategy that capitalizes on their potential. There is also a possibility that existing programs will need to take different directions (e.g., intensify or expand student supports), facilitate different student outcomes (e.g., transfer, employment), or cast a larger net to further promote social change. Moreover, these programs will likely require strategic and technical guidance to leverage and maximize the influx of funds likely to emerge if some form of the American Families Plan is adopted and implemented.

What We Hope to Achieve Through CoPro2.0

The College Promise movement has the potential to destabilize inequity in higher education. To make that happen, College Promise programs need to evolve. Kresge sees CoPro2.0 as a modest part in sparking that evolution. For example, we would like to see College Promise programs facilitate accelerated pathways to credit-bearing work at community colleges, thereby disrupting high rates of placement in developmental courses, for which students pay tuition but earn no credits. Similarly, we would like to see programs work with academic partners to address and rectify students' loss of academic credit as a major barrier to transferring from a community college to a four-year institution and completing a BA. We would like more free community college programs to acknowledge – and serve – the diversity of students who could benefit from postsecondary education (including adult learners, Pell Grant recipients, undocumented/DACA students, and student parents) and ensure that all students – particularly Black, Indigenous, Latinx, and underrepresented Asian American Pacific Islander students – can realize the many benefits of postsecondary education. Finally, to realize its potential and ensure that it has the social and economic impact desired, funding for free community college must be sustainable.

College Promise programs provide an opportunity to strengthen community colleges, improve equity in higher education attainment, and increase the economic and social contributions of postsecondary education to local communities. While programs have the potential to provide students a tuition-free path to higher education, they also hold the potential to institutionalize evidence-based reforms that facilitate degree completion. Well-designed programs can catalyze cross-sectoral partnerships that, taken together, comprise a system of coordinated support. They also provide an opportunity to reimagine the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at different levels (e.g., federal, state, and local) in providing accessible, affordable, and high-quality postsecondary education.

The Kresge Foundation is excited by this potential. We are also intrigued by the opportunity College Promise programs have to reinforce ecosystems – networks of interconnected higher education institutions, nonprofit organizations, K-12 school districts, government agencies, and urban systems of employment, housing, food and childcare – that play a role in students’ higher education experiences. Our intrigue stems from the hypothesis that when a [higher education ecosystem](#) is strong, aligned and centered on student needs, low-income students and students of color are more likely to graduate.

Kresge’s Human Services Program, a collaborator on this initiative, uses a Two-Gen approach which includes an emphasis on postsecondary education and an applied racial equity lens to advance social and economic mobility from one generation to the next. Another collaborator, Kresge’s American Cities Program, views this initiative as an opportunity to enable equitable community development that centers resident and community voice.

Overview of Funding Opportunity

Through this \$2.6 million funding opportunity, Kresge will award up to seven grants of varying award amounts. Separately and together, funded projects are expected to show how College Promise programs at community colleges can:

- 1) advance equity and help dismantle systemic racism;
- 2) improve postsecondary outcomes for historically marginalized populations;
- 3) reinforce the capacity of community colleges to provide high-quality postsecondary education and improve the well-being of students and local communities; and
- 4) partner with other organizations to leverage resources and maximize program contributions to ensure long-term sustainability.

This funding opportunity elevates these possibilities by exploring the following guiding questions:

- 1) Can philanthropy catalyze student-centric College Promise design and programming innovations that eliminate gaps in support and foster institutional

transformation at community colleges? If so, can early insights lead to systems change that helps build a more racially just society?

- 2) Can philanthropy amplify financial models (public-private, multiple public entities, various streams of capital) that forecast increased sustainability? If so, do these models aid in implementing a national promise program and corresponding federal-state matching program?

Concept papers, comprising 500-word answers to individual narrative questions, a project budget, and letters of support from project partners, are invited for projects that focus on one of three streams of work:

- 1) Program Innovations and Redesign;
- 2) Research on Financial Sustainability; and
- 3) Strategic, Local and State Implementation Guidance for the Biden-Harris Administration's tuition-free community college proposal.

This opportunity invites applicants to consider how funding can accomplish these ends in a shifting federal policy environment.

Stream 1. Program Innovations and Redesign: Facilitating partnerships that expand or enhance services, re-imagine eligibility criteria, and foster institutional reforms.

Applicants are encouraged to develop or consider scaling innovations, partnerships, or systemic changes that foster financially and politically sustainable free community college programs that improve equity in student experiences and outcomes. Funding may be used to help College Promise programs improve outcomes for groups that are now less commonly eligible, including Pell Grant recipients, adult learners, undocumented/DACA students, students with disabilities, and student parents. Funds may also be used to identify effective approaches for communicating the message of a tuition-free policy or program. For instance, funding might be used to understand how recruitment and partnerships with K-12 schools, family advocates, faith institutions, and other community-based organizations, as well as media campaigns, can create awareness, understanding, and participation among underserved groups.

Concept papers might re-envision a way of targeting students and/or families with the goal of becoming more inclusive, supportive, and equity-minded. Program leaders might partner with human service agencies to address the intersecting domains of health, nourishment, housing, and career pathways. Some partnerships might systematically pair free college programs with a suite of other supports, including tutoring, mentoring, and advising offered by a third-party provider.

Programs might also consider different approaches to aid disbursement. Applicants might develop partnerships that integrate different lines of financial support to students (e.g., public benefits), while also facilitating faster academic progress. Programs might consider how to leverage other funding sources (e.g., savings accounts), as well as financial and other resources from non-postsecondary agencies and stakeholders (e.g., K-12 schools, employers, housing, health, employment). An applicant might propose considering how a state promise program should layer onto a local promise program (or vice versa) and how a state promise program could build on and create synergies with other state policies.

City-level programs might consider how to complement a state-level program, enabling students' transfer from two- to four-year colleges without losing credits. Compelling applications might propose "promising" developmental education reforms to aid recipients, credit reclamation projects, or a guided pathways sequence that facilitates faster credit accumulation and progression. Concept papers might feature plans to improve staff training, address administrative barriers to program participation and implementation, and collect and use new data to improve program outcomes.¹⁵

The per-grant maximum for this stream of funding is \$300,000 total for up to two years. Competitive applications would include a research partner to document project activities, organize emergent or associated data, and evaluate project outcomes. We encourage applicants to consider how these ideas or projects would be scalable and transferable to other contexts.

Stream 2. Research on Financial Sustainability: *Investigating public-private financing partnerships and exploring innovative financial models.*

For this stream, applicants should propose research on models that bolster programs' financial sustainability with attention to how multiple levels of public and private entities can collaborate. We invite inquiry into possible public revenue sources (e.g., debt, sales, education, property, income or business tax, intergovernmental transfers) and their implications for students, colleges, cities, and states. We also welcome investigations into the viability of particular models (e.g., tax-increment financing, appropriations, endowments, trusts) and their prospects for long-term sustainability.

Researchers could explore how program leaders identify, secure, and mobilize financial resources and how they collaborate to advance cross-sector partnerships and large-scale change. Research that investigates the feasibility of a federal-state matching program, with maintenance of effort provision, and its impact on students, colleges, and communities would be welcome.

Inquiry on non-education benefits (e.g., workforce outcomes, program impact on families, socio-economic mobility, K-12 outcomes, social cohesion, cultural vibrancy) is also welcome. For example, exploratory studies on the relationship between promise programs and inclusive community development would be of interest.

We welcome applications for research using different methods and units of analysis (e.g., student, institution, community, state). Funding might also be used to understand how to develop financially and politically sustainable free community college programs that improve equity. Such approaches might consider ways to advance a universal goal of college-going while also targeting resources to underserved groups.¹⁶ Compelling applications would feature the implications of different funding sources for program sustainability and equity, as well as how to advance cross-sector partnerships and create institutional- and community-level change. Of particular interest, we welcome applicants' inquiry on how a federal or state program can distribute resources to advance equity, while recognizing place-based differences in wealth, current investment, and population need.

The per-grant maximum for grants in this stream is \$200,000 total for up to two years.

Stream 3. Strategic, Local and State Implementation Guidance: *To support the Biden-Harris Administration's proposed national tuition-free community college program.*

This stream will fund projects or thought leadership that supports the future implementation of the Biden-Harris Administration's free community college proposal. There is a national need to amplify strategies that result in under-resourced students succeeding in College Promise programs and to use those lessons to shape the emerging national program and its potential impact at the state and local level. Because the timeline for this legislation remains uncertain, any potential federal-state partnership would need to build on current state and local efforts.

Whether the free community college movement can realize its potential will depend on implementation. Implemented programs have different eligibility requirements, financial awards, and non-financial supports. While the body of relevant research is growing, there is much unknown about how the implementation and outcomes of free community college programs might actually unfold in state and local settings.

One- to two-year grants of up to \$150,000 will be available for policy, research, and intermediary organizations to provide strategic guidance on implementation. These grants will support the dissemination of information, including completed (or nearly completed) research and evaluations, that will help policymakers, at multiple levels, implement the national tuition-free community college promise proposal. Rather than funding new ideas or projects, Stream 3 grantees would facilitate engagement between policymakers, education leaders, and other stakeholders in the context of a potentially expanding national free college movement. These engagements could present insights from completed research projects, or provide on-demand technical support to assist in the various legislative, adoption, and implementation processes to establish or strengthen tuition-free community college programs. This particular stream of work is somewhat fluid as the federal policy landscape takes shape.

Managing Partner

Kresge has separately identified a nonprofit organization to serve as the CoPro2.0 managing partner. Its role will include some administrative functions as well as convening CoPro2.0 grantees, thought leaders, education decisionmakers, and other stakeholders interested in learning emergent, timely lessons from work funded through all three streams of this initiative. We plan to announce a managing partner to serve as the initiative's convenor and administrator in November 2021 once grantees have been selected and revealed publicly. The leadership and facilitation skills of the managing partner will be key in connecting project insights with federal, state, and local policymakers.

The managing partner will develop communications assets, produce summary briefs and extended reports, and provide a strong platform for within-cohort and grantee-to-policymaker exchanges. Convenings involving grantees and the initiative's stakeholders (separate from possible meetings funded through Stream 3) will likely take place once a year, while the initiative's products and outputs will occur more frequently. The CoPro2.0 managing partner may also facilitate intermittent smaller meetings and facilitated dialogues.

Eligible Applicants

Stream 1: Concept papers are invited from place-based college promise programs, community college districts, state higher education coordinating boards, systems, or commissions, and other public or nonprofit organizations (501c3 entities). It is unlikely that a single community college program would be awarded a grant, but some exceptions may apply.

Stream 2: Researchers from a range of professional settings (e.g., academic, think tank, community-based organization) are invited to apply for this stream. Applicants that actively engage community colleges as partners are of particular interest.

Stream 3: Applicants representing intermediary networks, think tanks, and advocacy organizations, as well as College Promise researchers at all levels, are invited to apply.

All project partners **must** submit a letter of support. Kresge makes a key distinction between project partners and participating entities. *Project partners* are defined as the key organizations or individuals who contribute resources to develop, decide upon, and execute project activities. *Participating entities* might be a group of community colleges across a state, or high schools within a school district. In such case, it is not required that every high school or community college participating in the project sign a letter of support. However, applications without letters of support from all entities comprising the project partnership team will be disqualified. At minimum, letters of support should outline the resources the project partner will provide, the project activities in which it will

participate, the outputs/outcomes it expects the project to achieve, and the lessons it anticipates learning and disseminating.

Selection Criteria

Kresge will assemble a panel of internal and external reviewers to select grantees based on the following characteristics:

Stream 1:

- Goals, purposes, and expected outcomes of the proposed project. The concept paper should answer the narrative questions, identifying the precise problem, issue, or need that the project will address, activities that will be conducted with the funding, and expected outcomes of the project.
- Theoretical guidance (or theory of change) that specifies how and why expected outcomes will be achieved.
- Transferability of insights from the proposed activities to other programs, community colleges, and contexts, and potential usefulness of project insights to policymakers, institutional leaders, school practitioners, youth and family advocates, and other stakeholders.
- The long-term sustainability of partnerships, potential projects, and ultimately improved outcomes for students with low incomes and students of color. Sustainability can be viewed from multiple perspectives, ranging from the financial stability of the partnership or its services, to a permanent policy change that creates a new normal. Applicants will be most competitive if they address how the change created by the partnership will endure beyond the grant period.

Streams 1 & 2:

- A clear description of what data will be leveraged to understand project outcomes and details on any required data-sharing agreements or policies that will support collection and analysis.
- A rigorous, comprehensive methodological plan for analyzing data and a solid framework through which to draw implications of the research.
- A thoughtful communications plan to disseminate project findings across varied audiences and often disparate education stakeholders.

All streams:

- A strong track record of insightful contributions to campus, local, or national knowledge and practice of how free community college programs may improve equity in postsecondary outcomes, improve the capacity of community colleges, and/or advance partnerships between community colleges and other organizations.
- A well-articulated and demonstrated focus on racial equity and strong understanding of community college students' lived experiences and the lives of the practitioners who serve them.
- An established partnership with a strong track record of collaboration and shared commitment to upward mobility for people with low incomes as evidenced by letters of support and/or financial commitment by the partners.

Final selection will be based on the quality of the proposed projects. Although not required, special attention will be paid to organizations with connections to and experiences in one or more of Kresge's focus cities (Detroit, Memphis, New Orleans), or cities in the Education Program's focus states (California, Florida, Michigan, and Texas). Projects that include matching funds and in-kind support from participating community colleges, other partners, or local funders will also be given special consideration.

Additional Benefits

In addition to funding, applicants selected for this opportunity will experience other benefits. First, the Foundation, in partnership with the initiative's managing partner, will convene grantees as a part of a national learning cohort, twice over a two-year period. These convenings will provide opportunities for grantees to share insights, discuss emerging findings and challenges, and receive feedback on potential next steps. Grantees will be expected to participate in in-person grantee convenings once travel can safely resume. Kresge will provide additional funds to cover the costs related to attending convenings once a convening timeline is confirmed. Second, the Foundation plans to engage an external evaluator to review and provide feedback on the funded projects.

Third, the Foundation and managing partner will amplify findings and insights from funded projects by producing and disseminating policy briefs and other communications. Kresge will also provide longer term communications support to grantees by facilitating the writing and publishing of project findings and student stories, opportunistically pitching grantee work to reporters, and helping to develop op-eds. Active dissemination efforts will be important in order to share the knowledge gained by this initiative with interested and influential audiences.

Applicant and Selection Key Dates

Interested applicants should first submit a concept paper (phase 1). By early September, the Foundation will invite selected applicants to submit a full proposal (phase 2). In October, the Foundation will make final selections for grant awards (phase 3), with the goal of announcing them by November.

To apply, submit a concept paper comprising responses to narrative questions, a project budget, and letters of support from project partners through Kresge's online grantee portal (Fluxx) **no later than 11:59 p.m. (PST) on August 9, 2021. Access this portal at <http://kresge.fluxx.io> or find a link on the Current Funding Opportunities page at Kresge.org.**

If you are or have previously been a Kresge grantee, please use your existing Fluxx credentials to apply. If you are a new applicant, you will need to register for an account before applying. Please note that it can take up to seven days to receive your Fluxx credentials. You are encouraged to register for Fluxx credentials as soon as you decide to apply rather than waiting until you are ready to complete your application. The CoPro2.0 Funding Opportunity Fluxx Guide and Preview provides step-by-step instructions to begin your application. If you experience any problems when creating a Fluxx account, please contact Grants Management at grantsmanagement@kresge.org.

Once you have secured a Fluxx account and accessed the online portal, under grant opportunities, select "Start a new RFP" and then select the CoPro2.0 initiative.

The online grantee portal will require applicants to offer summary information about their funding request, complete an organizational profile, provide demographic information about the beneficiaries of this project, and submit the following:

- Narrative Questions
- Project Budget
- Letter(s) of Support from Partners

These materials, together, comprise the concept paper application. To support the creation of your submission, please find four appendices:

Appendix 1: Narrative Questions Preview. A document outlining the narrative questions for each funding stream.

Appendix 2: Frequently Asked Questions. A document responding to frequently asked questions.

Appendix 3: Budget Template. An Excel spreadsheet that can serve as a sample budget.

Appendix 4: Fluxx Guide and Preview. A document providing a Fluxx preview and instructions for submitting the concept paper.

Narrative Questions: Responses to each narrative question are limited to 4,000 characters (approximately 500 words). This is not a long document given what is obviously a complex issue. Finalists will be asked to provide a longer discussion in full proposals.

Preliminary Project Budget: Please feel free use the budget template included with this release. Please include the full project budget, inclusive of the Kresge request, other funders, and any in-kind support from partners. Please note that line items can be changed as needed. The budget can include up to 15% of the total grant as indirect costs but then may not claim rent, utilities, or other costs typically bundled into overhead.

Letters of Support: Submit letters of support, preferably combined in one PDF, that demonstrate meaningful engagement and support from project partners. These documents will ideally specify the role and contribution of each partner. (Finalists may be required to have a signed MOU before a grant will be awarded.)

Please submit any questions to CoPro2.0@kresge.org. Due to anticipated volume, we will not be available for phone calls but will be as responsive as possible via email to each inquiry.

By September 1, 2021, Kresge will select finalist candidates from the concept papers it receives and will invite full proposals via an online application portal.

Timeline to Select Grants

- Request for Concept Papers released June 30, 2021
- Deadline for questions: July 30, 2021
- Webinar for potential applicants: July 14, 2021
- Concept papers submitted: August 9, 2021
- Invitations sent for full proposals: September 1, 2021
- Full proposals submitted: September 20, 2021
- Funding decisions announced: November 2021

¹“College promise,” “promise,” and “free college programs” are used interchangeably.

² Miller-Adams, M. (2021). *The path to free college: In pursuit of access, equity, and prosperity*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard Education Press.

³Ibid

⁴ Kanter, M., Blancas Cloud, R., & Lazarowitz, D. (2021). *College promise for all: Preparing America's talent pipeline with universal access to, through, and beyond postsecondary education*. Washington, D.C.: College Promise Campaign.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Miller-Adams, M. (2021). *The path to free college: In pursuit of access, equity, and prosperity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

⁷ Bartik, T. J., Hershbein, B., & Lachowska, M. (2021). The effects of the Kalamazoo Promise Scholarship on college enrollment and completion. *Journal of Human Resources*, 56(1), 269-310. Perna, L. W., & Smith, E. J. (2020). *Improving research-based knowledge of college promise programs*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

⁸ Perna, L. W., & Leigh, E. L. (2018). Understanding the promise: A typology of state and local college promise programs. *Educational Researcher*, 47(3), 155-180.

⁹ Compared to first-dollar awards, last-dollar awards are less expensive per student; programs with last-dollar designs may serve more students with available financial resources.

¹⁰ Mishory, J. (2018). *"Free college: " Here to stay? "* Washington, D.C.: The Century Foundation.

¹¹ Smith, E. J. (2020). *A promise in motion: An exploration of Michigan's Promise Zones with implications for program design and college choice*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

¹² Carey, K. (2019, December 9). The free college fantasy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-free-college-fantasy>. Perna, L. W., & Smith, E. J. (2020). *Improving research-based knowledge of college promise programs*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

¹³ Jones, T., Ramirez-Mendoza, J., & Jackson, V. (2020). *A promise worth keeping: An updated equity-driven framework for free college programs*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust.

¹⁴ White House, Executive Office of the U.S. Government (2021). *Fact Sheet: The American Families Plan*. Retrieved from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/28/fact-sheet-the-american-families-plan/>

¹⁵ Willard, J., Vasquez, A., & Lepe, M. (2019). *Designing for success: The early implementation of college promise programs*. MDRC. https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/CPSI_Policy_Brief-Final_0.pdf

¹⁶ Powell, J. A., Menendian, S., & Ake, W. (2019). *Targeted universalism: Policy & practice*. Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, University of California, Berkeley. <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/targeteduniversalism>