

Syracuse University

## SURFACE

---

Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects    Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects

---

Spring 5-1-2006

### Upward Bound's success in Interest Group Politics

Jessica Yusaitis

Follow this and additional works at: [https://surface.syr.edu/honors\\_capstone](https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone)



Part of the [Models and Methods Commons](#), and the [Other Political Science Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Yusaitis, Jessica, "Upward Bound's success in Interest Group Politics" (2006). *Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects*. 641.

[https://surface.syr.edu/honors\\_capstone/641](https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone/641)

This Honors Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact [surface@syr.edu](mailto:surface@syr.edu).

## **AN INTRODUCTION**

*It sounds odd, doesn't it, for the President to stand up and say, we need to focus on reading in high school. But that's the state of affairs. Someday, when No Child Left Behind is fully implemented and kicked in, there are not going to need to be early intervention programs or intervention reading programs in high school. But, today, we need them. ~ President George W. Bush, January 12, 2005. (Dept. of Education)*

This is the statement that made many high school educational programs cringe with fear.

### **The Situation**

There is a fierce struggle for survival in Washington among interest groups competing for government resources – and these organizations need to prove that they are worth every penny. I explore how such organizations can survive and thrive in this competitive world. How should a program convince Congressmen and women that it is valuable enough to keep alive? And what do these representatives do once they agree to fund the program? I intend to research the steps that a successful program takes to garner the support necessary for survival, basing my criteria on one successful group – Upward Bound.

Upward Bound is a program within TRIO – an umbrella organization housing seven federal programs (originally three, as indicated by TRIO’s name) that support the educational opportunity of low-income and disabled Americans; TRIO and its programs are all headed by the Department of Education. Upward Bound specifically provides low-income high school students with skills and motivation necessary to enter and succeed in a program of postsecondary education. In 2005, President Bush proposed to cut Upward Bound in order to further fund “No Child Left Behind.” However, with much effort, Upward Bound managed to survive the Congressional test, with support from both ends of the political spectrum.

I intend for this paper to serve as a handbook for small non-profit organizations, with tips on how to lobby successfully for funding in Washington. As the foundation for the “handbook,” I plan to portray Upward Bound as a successful case study. Upward Bound is, indeed, a nation-wide program and part of a professional coalition – not merely a small community-based group whom this document is intended to serve. However, the steps UB took to ensure its survival were executed in a manner consistent with, and undoubtedly within the means of, a smaller organization. Upward Bound used the strategies of citizen-based interest group politics to take its fight all the way to the top – and win.

## **UPWARD BOUND – A HISTORY**

### **The Beginning**

#### *Kennedy and the Educational Turning Point*

Until the 1960s, the education of America's youth had been primarily considered a responsibility of state and local governments. A couple of exceptions on behalf of the federal government include the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 (authorization of state universities), and the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1945 ("G.I. Bill") (Groutt). Poverty, however, was beginning to gain visibility as a major national problem. This was, in large part, thanks to such published works as *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* by Michael Harrington, and Dwight McDonald's *New Yorker* article, "Our Invisible Poor," which highlighted the fact that poverty affects at least one-third of the U.S. population (Groutt).

Once poverty was seen as a severe American affliction, policy was taken into a new direction. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed populist economist Walter Heller as head of the Council of Economic Advisors, to look into poverty in the U.S. and prescribe appropriate action (Groutt).

#### *Johnson and the Great Society*

After Kennedy's assassination, President Johnson followed the late President's policy initiatives with his own "War on Poverty." In his first State of the Union address, Johnson promised administrative efforts towards a

utopian “Great Society” (Groutt). He stated: “Our aim is not only to relieve the symptom of poverty, but to cure it and, above all, to prevent it” (State of the Union address, 1964).

Johnson appointed Sargent Shriver to chair the Task Force on Poverty, and, in record time, legislation was drafted within six weeks, beginning with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Groutt). Thus, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was created to operate the anti-poverty initiatives, the focus of which was to raise visibility by funding experimental programs. Upward Bound was among the first of these experiments, and 17 UB pilot projects were up and running by the summer of 1965 (Pell Institute).

The next piece of legislation to be drafted, the Higher Education Act of 1965, was to be the most inclusive and radical of federal educational law. James Moore from the Office of Education (OE) and Samuel Halperin, the assistant commissioner for legislation in OE, were assigned to draft the bill (Groutt). They worked to reverse the elitist notion of higher education, particularly with their provisions for scholarships awarded to low-income students – a first in the history of federal grants. This act also developed additional programs that would make up the original TRIO (within which UB would eventually exist), and accounted for funding of these programs under Title IV (Dept. of Education).

Johnson felt he had to act quickly to enact this legislation; these educational initiatives had been backed by JFK’s popular administration, so there was short span of time in which Johnson could act without backlash

from Southern conservatives – who headed key Congressional committees that had prevented such dramatic changes before (Groutt). For over 20 days, 79 representatives deliberated over hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act in the House (Donovan). Seventy voted in favor – Republicans had grievances, but they were the minority in both houses.

Perhaps the largest catalyst of conflict was a line contained in Title II in the Act, which called for the “maximum feasible participation” of the poor – empowering those who had previously been without a political voice (Groutt). Local committees comprised of those served by the programs were formed. With the inclusion of numerous voices in this call for civic engagement, unrest arose between the local committees and officials running the programs, as did unrest within the Democratic Party. Government moderation in decision-making was often needed within the projects’ communities.

In 1970, in an attempt to organize similar programs, Upward Bound was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education (Groutt). OEO did not want to let go of UB, one of its original, most prized organizations. However, OE was reluctant to take on UB, as well – UB was thought of as having too much freedom in OEO, and it would be difficult to incorporate the program into OE’s present structure; others in the education office believed UB would be burdened with too many restrictions under OE. Also, many OE positions remained unfilled during the transition

between the Johnson and Nixon administrations, acting as another source of friction in the switch from OEO to OE.

*'I wanted to get rid of the costly failures of the Great Society' - Nixon Memoirs*

Many believed that the coming of Nixon would be the end of OEO and the programs it created – including the now OE-run Upward Bound.

However, the majority of Democrats in Congress would not give in to Nixon's campaign promise to nix Johnson's Great Society efforts. Therefore, in true Republican fashion, it was decided that the TRIO programs would be decentralized, and would instead be run from ten regional offices rather than from D.C., each of which would be given final authority (Groutt). This allowed for diversity and "subcultures" to emerge among the programs from the varying regions. These subcultures, however, began to form conflicting views of how TRIO programs would interact with the federal government.

Region V – the strong, well-funded region in the Midwest, headed by regional commissioner Peter Mousolite – began to encourage project directors from the region's six states to organize and find ways to improve the programs themselves, outside the boundaries of Washington (Groutt). This led to a regional association and the notion that the directors could individually interact with elected officials. The first such instance of taking direct action involves three TRIO affiliates who traveled to D.C. at their own expense – they wanted to discuss the possibility of a more equal distribution of power to those who worked in the field and actually ran the programs

(Groutt). They simply wanted to be heard without fear of intrusion from the administrative middlemen. This is also representative of the growing relationship between TRIO affiliates and members of Congress.

However, administrators in OE believed that OE should serve as the link between the programs and Congress. Officials in Washington finally heard of Region V's ventures to D.C., and they immediately released orders to discontinue the meetings, and forbade the directors to travel to Washington to interact with members of Congress (Groutt). Such direct contact was in violation of the Hatch Act, which prohibited government employees from using federal time and money to lobby.

Despite such efforts from Washington, Mousolite and others in Region V continued to clear the way for directors so they could continue to organize and brainstorm (Groutt). Several regional OE officials discretely supported such conglomerations and allowed for political activity in their respective states; this activity was often conducted under the guise of "Regional Advisory Boards." However, such "activity" was not encouraged by all regional commissioners. For instance, programs in the Southeast were underfunded and restricted to the commissioner's direction (Groutt). Directors who tried to organize and improve their programs, simultaneously defying the bureaucracy, lost funding. No appeal could be made, since the case would have had to be brought to the OE in Washington, who disapproved of such activity conducted by individual program directors.

Without the support of Johnson's Great Society, TRIO needed to find support elsewhere. Despite protests from the OE, members of Congress supported and embraced direct contact from those in the field, and TRIO professionals came to develop relationships with individual congressmen and women over the years (Groutt). When it came time to draft the Higher Education Act in 1980, TRIO personnel had become accustomed to the legislative process, and they worked with Congress in making changes. The first measure of input involved the regulation of power of administrators from the Department of Education (Groutt). This has led to the official organization of TRIO directors under 1981's National Council of Educational Opportunity Association, which has since had a major role in determining the wording of laws and increasing funding appropriations.

### **Recent History**

#### *A Costly Error*

Elaine Leavitt, Upward Bound director at Plattsburgh State University, states, "We are our own worst enemy." In 1966, after the pilot programs had run successfully, the first competitive grants were distributed, and Plattsburgh State was one of the first recipients (Leavitt). The newly formed Upward Bound programs were not required to keep records of graduating students. Many years' worth of potentially redeeming information had not been collected – information that is critical when lobbying for funding in Washington. However, programs have since been playing catch-up, and have

amassed informative reports of their students' successes for over ten years (Leavitt). Still, without such comprehensive results on a national scale, this individualized data became inconsequential when faced with a government-launched evaluation of the program.

### *PART*

PART, developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), is an evaluation system that grades the effectiveness of federally funded programs ([whitehouse.gov](http://whitehouse.gov)). For its 2004 evaluation on educational programs, OMB enlisted the surveying tools of Mathematica Policy Research, a nonpartisan social policy research firm. Mathematica, having assessed college outcomes three years after Upward Bound students graduated from high school, found the program had no overall effect on post-secondary education for the average participant, though it did help to increase attendance at four-year institutions (Mathematica). Upward Bound, according to OMB's reading of Mathematica's information, received a grade of 17% in the results component ([ExpectMore.com](http://ExpectMore.com)). These findings officially categorized Upward Bound as an ineffective program.

In the fiscal year 2006 budget for the Department of Education, President Bush cut the \$280 million allocated to Upward Bound, as well as all funding for fellow TRIO program Talent Search (see Table 1). UB and Talent Search weren't the only victims of such evaluation systems – altogether, 154

programs were condemned for reduction or elimination, and Congress ultimately cut 89 (OMB).

However, by this time, TRIO and Upward Bound had already begun to implement their plan of action.

## **LOBBYING – AN OVERVIEW**

Before diving into Upward Bound’s lobbying endeavors, it is important to give a quick overview of interest groups and how lobbying is generally conducted and perceived.

### **Brief History**

#### *Constitutional Roots*

Interest group politics have arguably arisen from two rival political themes found in the U.S. Constitution – liberty and political expression versus the prevention of tyranny (Wright). James Madison, in *Federalist* No. 10, expressed his suspicions of factions and the “effects of the unsteadiness and injustice with which a factious spirit has tainted our public administrations” (Madison). What Madison fears most, however, are majority factions:

If a faction consists of less than a majority, relief is supplied by the republican principle, which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote. It may clog the administration, it may convulse the society; but it will be unable to execute and mask its violence under the forms of the Constitution.

(Madison)

It seems that Madison may have underestimated the capacity of interest groups to go beyond serving as “clogs,” and become major sources of influence over the federal government – and we will soon see how these groups can “mask” questionable practices as Constitutionally sound procedures.

To protect against tyranny of the majority – especially party control – the Constitution contains numerous controlling measures that disperse governmental power across multiple institutions and jurisdictions (Wright). However, by limiting the majority factions (or political parties) in such a way, this diffusion has led to smaller outlets of political control. With so many degrees of separation, parties often find it difficult to maintain unanimity within their elected circles – allowing interest groups to cater to smaller, diverse factions within the larger dynamic and influence legislation (Wright).

### *The Real Thing*

Though the groundwork was laid long before, the interest groups of today hadn't begun to emerge until after the Civil War. John R. Wright, from the political science department at Ohio State, describes the formation of an interest group as the point when “the interests common to unorganized groups of individuals are disturbed by economic, social, political, or technological change” (Wright). Unable to accomplish compromise amongst themselves, they join forces and petition the government. Once one interest group takes shape, a domino effect is then activated, as the resultant policies of one group will likely affect the interests of other unorganized persons, and so on. (Truman). Groups consequently form in rapid succession after one another in one great struggle to advance their own interests.

After the Civil War, dramatic societal changes were in the making, as well as changes in relationships and group dynamics (Wright). During the

postwar period came the completion of the railroads and the launch of the telegraph, along with the intensification of such issues as immigration, population growth, westward expansion, rebuilding the South, and further industrialization.

Another contributor to the upsurge of interest groups during this particular period was the rise of Congressional power – particularly derived from Congress’s impeachment proceedings against Andrew Johnson (Wright). This, combined with the increasing diversity of Congress, fostered the growth of lobbying for Congressional influence.

### **Abramoff Scandal – Perception of Lobbyists Now**

#### *The Regulation of Lobbying – or the Lack Thereof*

Lobbyists – who have traditionally been viewed as providers of information to lawmakers – are, in their growing influence, taking on a reputation of increasing craftiness and cunning. Lobbying organizations are among the institutions that seem to sustain the least amount of public trust, receiving even less confidence than the media or the government (see Table 2). Lobbying as such has been proven difficult to regulate, though there have been attempts.

The Hatch Act (1887), mentioned previously, prevents federal employees from using federal funds to lobby the government. Furthermore, Sec. 501(c)(3), “Exemption from tax on corporations, certain trusts, etc.,” under Title 26 of the Internal Revenue Code, restricts charitable organizations

– those that allow the deduction of individual dues and contributions – in the degree to which they can lobby the government (U.S. Code). The section dictates:

...no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office. (U.S. Code)

Subsection (h) places caps on lobbying and grassroots expenditures – 150% of the activity's nontaxable amount for the organization's taxable year.

However, many organizations have used professional specialization to dance around these provisions, as illustrated by the Sierra Club (Wright). The Sierra Club, with much pressure from the IRS for its lobbying expenditures, switched its tax code from the tax-exempt charity status to 501(c)(4) for social welfare organizations. Under this new code, membership did not drop as anticipated, and the Sierra Club was able to establish branches – the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund and the Sierra Club Foundation – that could fall under 501(c)(3) and exist as tax-exempt affiliates. The Sierra Club is a prime example of how an organization can divide its functions so that it legally

exists as a full-fledged, unrestricted lobby and still provides deductible membership.

Avoiding the tax code is not the only break interest groups have discovered. When trying to control interest groups and lobbying, Congress has struggled between effectively regulating such activity and upholding the First Amendment's provisions for free speech, assembly, and the right to petition the government for redress of grievances (Wright). In 1946, Title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act – or the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act – established that any individual or group that requests or collects funds for the “principal purpose” of influencing Congressional legislation must register with the House clerk or the secretary of the Senate, as well as submit a financial statement of activities every quarter (Wright). However, there are some loopholes to be found in this law.

Under Section 307(b), the Act applies to those whose actions aim “To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States” (Wright). The Act doesn't clarify which “direct or indirect” actions trigger lobbying tactics and the consequent regulation, nor does it define “principal purpose.” Such vagueness soon involves the Supreme Court in *United States v. Harriss* (1953), in which a broker was accused of making unreported payments to a lobbyist for Congressional influence on agricultural legislation (Wright). Though an appellate court acquitted Harriss, the Supreme Court, in a 5-3 decision, reversed the decision and upheld the Act's constitutionality; to do so, the

Court provided that only “direct” influence suggests lobbying, thus excluding such activities as grassroots efforts. This only made it easier for future organizations to find further loopholes.

However, especially due to recent events, we may soon see legislative action on the regulation of lobbying.

*“The Man Who Bought Washington” (TIME)*

Jack Abramoff, ill-fated hot-shot lobbyist who represented the newer, more extravagant trend in lobbying, had this to say on the naïveté of outsiders on Washington business:

I don't think it's a secret that, in Washington, the role of the lobbyist includes gaining access to the decision maker...There are probably two dozen events and fundraisers every night. Lobbyists go on trips with members of Congress, socialize with members of Congress -- all with the purpose of increasing one's access to the decision makers.

(Crowley)

Abramoff plead guilty to counts of fraud, corruption, and tax evasion in connection with Native American clients. In one such case, he made millions campaigning for a ban on gambling in Texas, then turned to the struggling nearby Tiguas tribe and offered to slip a gambling provision into legislation under the banner of “tribal sovereignty” (Crowley). Abramoff soon learned that his efforts were failing, but continued to collect payment from the tribe.

Even in the good times, Abramoff flaunted considerable monetary influence, having contributed funds to campaigns and PAC's (political action committees – discussed later) of Republican candidates, including President Bush (CapitalEye).

Abramoff, with all of his successes and transgressions in hindsight, discloses:

I think there are people who would prefer that there are no political contributions, people who would prefer that all members of Congress live an ascetic, monklike social life. This is the system that we have. I didn't create the system. This is the system that we have...Eventually, money wins in politics. (Crowley)

*“We’ve all become Eisenhower Republicans.” – President Clinton*

No matter how idealistic one is when he or she enters Washington, there is, nevertheless, a game to play.

President Clinton, upon his inauguration, was ready to initiate significant social policy legislation; however, Washington officials always know to follow the general business climate, and Clinton's meeting with business leaders disillusioned the new president into focusing on budget deficit reduction (Berry). Frustrated, Clinton exclaimed to his aides that he and his administration had all become “Eisenhower Republicans.”

Interest groups have similar rules to play along with, as well. Firstly, it is important to note that politicians tend to stay away from single-issue

politics. Politicians are often accused of picking a few visible issues and interest groups that go along with their platforms. Sometimes, candidates may side with an issue to swing the final vote. However, not only do politicians seem to prefer a broader base, but voters seem to prefer those who address more than one or two concerns – as evidenced by the popularity of a broader two-party system and the disappointments dealt to single-issue parties.

So how do single-issue interests gain support in Washington?

Numbers and money seem to be key, particularly for one of the most successful interest groups in Washington – the National Rifle Association. The NRA boasts 2.6 million members, employs a full-time staff of 400, and has an annual budget of \$88 million, with \$128 million in assets (Wright). The NRA has proven itself particularly influential on legislation, as the organization played a major role in striking down the Brady Bill (Berry). The NRA also receives, on average, the most news coverage of any lobbying organization (Berry).

For smaller interest groups, political action committees are often the conservative answer to the large presence of liberal citizen groups. PACs are usually affiliated with parent organizations, and are required by federal election campaign laws if the organization wishes to make financial contributions to campaigns (Wright). This is an effective, and popular, way for smaller organizations to gain future influence.

Congressmen often hear what they want to hear, interests are primarily heard only when there is something to gain, political contributions carry their

weight in gold, and money usually wins. So, how would a single-issue, non-profit organization – whose annihilation is desired by a powerful administration whose parties dominate Congress – get away with asking the government to give a federally dependent program more money?

## **THE D.C. SHOWDOWN**

### **On the Plus Side...**

It is important to note that no organizations are labeled by the IRS as a *lobbying* organization, since every individual and corporation is constitutionally permitted to lobby the government for a cause. Many of these groups, as discussed earlier, are thusly labeled associations for charitable purposes. This is where Upward Bound finds its strength.

Members of Congress will pay more attention to their voters than to lobbyists. As a program whose primary purpose is to spread equal opportunity throughout the nation's districts, the voices to Congress come not primarily from a lobbying standpoint, but from that of TRIO's participants and affiliates in each community it serves – the voters.

PAC's are not the only method for garnering Congressional support without many initial funds. Grassroots campaigns are another personal, hands-on alternative that can involve multitudes of concerned individuals with relatively fewer costs. Upward Bound's grassroots connections with its respective communities, along with other interpersonal initiatives, have allowed the program to gain the credibility usually afforded to citizen groups rather than typical lobbyists.

Upward Bound's organizational support network, the Council of Opportunity in Education, may, in actuality, be a professional association – comprised largely of TRIO professionals and educational administrators – rather than a citizen group. However, the not-for-profit Council takes such

care, as we will see, to include the community and involve citizens in its endeavors (in fact, much Congressional support for TRIO has come from individual citizen contact with Congress), that the effort is nevertheless a grassroots, citizen coalition.

This citizen component, combined with the organization of a professional association, has had a major impact on Upward Bound's success in D.C.

### **Council of Opportunity in Education**

#### *The Voice of TRIO*

Created in 1981, the Council of Opportunity in Education (COE) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that speaks for institutions of higher education, administrators, counselors, and educators to expand equal educational opportunities for the disadvantaged in the United States. COE primarily works in conjunction with TRIO programs, specifically to “positively position TRIO and other educational opportunity programs in the eyes of congressional leaders” (COE).

Some of the successes that the Council boasts include: at least 2 million college graduates; the establishment of 2700 TRIO programs at college campuses; a near 500% increase in funding for TRIO since 1985's \$174.9 million appropriation – having leveraged \$832.6 million in FY04; increased awareness of equal educational opportunity (COE).

### *The Inner Workings*

As mentioned earlier, CEO is a 501(c)(3), which highly limits the degree to which it can lobby. However, COE is very well-tailored for its lobbying purposes, and the Council conducts several projects that garner support for TRIO programs and increase awareness – which, perhaps, are more discreet, *indirect* methods of garnering positive attention and influence without a “primary purpose” of lobbying. TRIOWorks, for example, is a survey available on COE’s website, which will compile data and profile alumni of TRIO programs, and display their successes on the web for the public, the press, and even *legislators* to share.

Another such project mentioned on COE’s site is Fair Share, “the sharing of budgetary responsibility needed for the Council to operate based on the relative number of TRIO projects in an area.” These funds are collected either by membership dues, subscription fees, or contributions. COE urges advocates to ensure that youth receive equal educational opportunities by providing tax-deductible gifts, particularly during a time when the COE is using its resources to the max in the fight for Upward Bound’s and Talent Search’s restoration (COE). In the case of the latter, funds may have to be reported as lobbying expenditures; however, much of COE’s lobbying efforts are grassroots campaigns – as seen earlier in *United States v. Harris*, grassroots activities are exempt from the amended “direct” implications in the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

COE even sponsors an Annual National Student Leadership Congress (NSLC), for which outstanding students from the nation's TRIO affiliates – including the UB programs – are chosen to spend six days in Washington D.C. as delegates to the congress. Besides the enhancement of leadership skills and multicultural experiences, the NSLC is designed to “establish a national network of emerging leaders from among the student population served by TRIO Programs,” and help students understand the current events that may have an impact on their futures (COE). This not only improves public relations, but it also influences TRIO students to become advocates for TRIO in the future.

Yet another endeavor includes COE's official TRIO Day, during which individual programs are encouraged to provide a service to their communities as a “thank you” for their support (COE). This further strengthens the ties between the TRIO programs and their respective communities, which, as we will see, serves as an important factor in times when the program's existence is threatened.

#### *Lobbying and the Policy Seminar*

COE has specific measures in place for lobbying purposes. Each year, COE hosts an annual Policy Seminar to educate TRIO professionals about legislation affecting TRIO and appropriations, establish relationships with Congressional staff, advocate for disadvantaged students, and network with TRIO colleagues from around the nation (SAEOPP). Here, directors and other TRIO leaders can receive the informational tools necessary to advocate

for continued funding. COE is careful to remind attendees that since the Policy Seminar involves lobbying, federal funds should not be used in association with the event.

COE sustains large Internet mailing endeavors to inform members about current events and encourage them to keep up the work. Everything from official government documents to news postings to personal letters is circulated. At all times, even as legislative action seems progressively optimistic for TRIO's restoration, COE continues to urge advocates to attract and retain bipartisan support (COE). The following is an e-mail forwarded to TRIO affiliates from the COE – a typical follow-up of a success, combined with the reminder that there is still, and always, work to be done:

This vote was a critical first step because it gives appropriators the fiscal flexibility to fully restore TRIO and GEAR UP funding—but we are nowhere near the end of this battle. The next challenge is to make sure that this level of funding is retained when the Senate goes to conference with the House... After briefly enjoying this victory, please continue your good work, placing as much pressure as possible on the House and Senate. We have a long way to go!

### **Party Influence**

Leavitt describes the party politics as a “pendulum” (Leavitt). The influence of parties in Washington often fluctuates, so it is important to work

with such changes. COE makes a point to urge all members to maintain *bipartisan* backing, as it recognizes the importance of having extensive support networks that cross party lines. However, how does a specific single-issue interest group, especially liberal-minded groups, gain support from both ends of the spectrum?

### *Conservative Interest Groups?*

In the 1960s, there was a surge of new, liberal-minded citizen groups, particularly as the civil rights movement acted as a catalyst for further organization (Berry). Liberal-minded interest groups, or those that back significant liberal issues (like COE and equal opportunity), have historically enjoyed success, regardless of the political party in Congressional power.

Since the early 1960s, agenda in American politics shifted from the preoccupation with material issues to concerns of the quality of life (Berry). Citizen groups were credited as a catalyst for this trend, particularly those from the left. Since then, conservative citizen groups have been marginal players in the legal process (Berry). Trends show that conservative-minded interest groups do not become as active in the legal process, nor do they fundraise on as broad a scale or create extensive networks (Berry, see Table 3). Many believe that the smaller conservative groups turn their focus away from Washington and put their efforts into a local scale. When referring to much larger conservative interests, there tends to be more focus on *becoming* leaders rather than merely influencing them.

Even in today's Republican-led 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, liberal citizen groups are still successful, largely because they are more active in the legislative process, and such legislation is not often challenged by conservative citizen groups (Berry). Not only is this evident in the handful of Republicans who crossed over party lines to support a TRIO-inclusive amendment to the budget (Kennedy amendment discussed later), but the *majority* of those who supported the House version of the bill were Republican (discussed later).

For many who support or join interest groups, the identification of a political party is superficial when faced with issues they really care about. However, just because liberal groups have relatively successful results, it does not mean that there was never an uphill battle.

#### *Support from the Unexpected*

Many educators disclose that since these programs are primarily associated with Democratic politicians, Bush targets them for the money he needs to pay for his "pet projects" (Jaschik). However, his fellow Republicans may not prove to be as strictly loyal to conservative agenda.

Leavitt explains her firsthand experience with party pressure and Upward Bound's cause. Republican Congressman John McHugh, whose 23<sup>rd</sup> district of New York State includes Plattsburgh, had been advised to support military funding – not social – which was the basis of his platform (Leavitt); his personal committees include those on the armed forces and intelligence (Congress.org), and Iraq is at the top of his list of legislative issues (McHugh).

The 23<sup>rd</sup> district also happens to be the highest funded district for TRIO in the state – PSU housing the third highest funded Upward Bound program in NY (Leavitt).

Leavitt invited McHugh to visit the program during its summer operation – during which the high school students spend six weeks on a university campus, attend classes, and absorb first-hand experience of going to college and living in dorms. Leavitt described the visit as “awkward.” McHugh seemed unsure of himself amidst a sea of excited teenagers traveling to class and enjoying the college experience. Nevertheless, McHugh was impressed.

Thanks in large part to Leavitt’s relationship and interaction with McHugh, he signed the letter for reinstatement and became an inside advocate for the program (Leavitt). This left a stale impression on fellow Republican representatives, including Congressman John Sweeney, from New York’s 20<sup>th</sup> district, whose educational aids have literally asked, “What’s McHugh doing?” (Leavitt).

However, at a national level, New York’s hands were tied, with only McHugh and Senators Charles Schumer and Hilary Clinton on board (Leavitt). Many UB directors were not talking to their Congressmen and women. There was still much work to be done.

## **The Campaign Continues**

### *A Good Start*

One effective tool of which COE makes extensive use is the Council's massive e-mailing network. Aside from frequent updates, COE has made particularly regular and far-reaching reports during this legislative struggle to unite the TRIO community. COE president Arnold Mitchem often provided updates on strategy and inside information. One such letter from Mitchem includes:

Dear Colleague:

High level officials in the White House today have confirmed that the President's budget, to be released on February 7, will propose to terminate the Talent Search and Upward Bound programs at the end of the 2005-2006 school year. These cuts totaling \$460 million will then be used to fund the President's new high school initiative - an extension of No Child Left Behind.

Our response to this outrage must be certain and deliberate to assure that both Republicans and Democrats reject this proposal in both the House and the Senate. However, to prepare for what will surely be a long fight, I would ask that you immediately do the following. This will assure that the entire TRIO community will be prepared to react immediately when the President's budget is released on Monday, February 7. (Mitchem)

Mitchem then went on to assign immediate tasks that would well equip the community for the pending battle on the Hill:

- \* Notify your President or Chief Executive Officer of this problem.
- \* Identify outstanding alumni of your program who would be willing to speak on its behalf. Ask alumni to provide you a one paragraph statement about his/her background and what TRIO programs have done for him/her.
- \* Identify three or four of your most successful students who will be able to explain the Program's benefit to them. Make sure that you communicate with these students' parents about what you are asking these students to do.
- \* Identify local leaders, especially clergy, business people, parents, teachers, and leaders of civic organizations, such as the Chamber of Commerce, who are willing to advocate on behalf of TRIO either locally or in Washington.
- \* Organize the data you will need to mount a defense of your program. (Mitchem)

Letters were then sent in a domino effect – to legislators, alumni, community members, and the like.

Such connections (like the first-hand knowledge of the budget prior to its release), quick reaction, and detailed organization gave the threatened TRIO programs a vital head start.

*The Hunt for Information and PART*

The success of many lobbies is due, in large part, to their abundance of original research (Berry). Such investigation exhibits to the press and legislators the caliber of the organization's expertise. This is why many lobbyists devote much of their valuable time and funds on research initiatives.

“Often, lobbyists are the only source of information that members of Congress and staffs need to make good decisions on policy before them,” says Oklahoma Rep. Tom Cole, a Republican and a member of the House ethics committee (Cochran). Cole used such information from his district's own TRIO programs to fight for funding in Washington. Cole adds, “How many issues do Congressmen deal with? How many can you expect them to be an expert on?...People who can provide you with timely information...you're going to listen to them.”

Obviously, among the first issues to be researched by COE were the PART results that led to OMB's failing of Upward Bound and Talent Search. When reviewing Mathematica's statistics, COE came to some interestingly positive conclusions that it later shared with members of Congress. First of all, the Council pointed out that no program that educates students and that was kept in the Department of Education's \$69.4 billion budget was rated effective (SAEOPP).

Secondly, PART's results seemed not to take into account the length of time the student stayed with the TRIO program, but rather based its research only on those who were accepted into the program. In fact, the

longer a student remained in the program, the more he or she succeeded in post-secondary education (Mathematica, COE). Thus, the questioning behind Mathematica's evaluation seems to be off target.

When comparing the results found in Mathematica's evaluation to separate, objective statistics, TRIO's findings seemed to negate PART's claim of ineffectiveness:

- 89% of UB participants graduate from high school (Mathematica, 2004, p. 26), compared to approximately 68% of low-income 18 to 24 year olds. (U.S. Census Bureau)
  - More than 2/3rds of UB participants attend any postsecondary institution (Mathematica, 2004, pp. 36-37), compared to 54% of all low-income students. (Adelman, 2004)
  - Nearly 50% of UB participants attend a four-year institution (Mathematica, 2004, pp. 36-37), compared to 22% of low-income students. (Condition of Education, 2002)
- ~ COE

COE also collected program surveys, and depended on each program's individual results.

### *How the GOP was Won*

Now Congress had to decide who to believe – Bush and his information, or COE and its information. Three key components are

prominent among successful interest groups who hold influential power – attention, credibility, and organizational capacity (Berry).

*Attention:* COE knows that educational issues are not readily covered by the media. As a result, COE encourages advocates to do the work for the press and share with them compilations from their “media kits,” as illustrated on COE’s website; examples include editorials, success stories, and press releases – any piece that can be passed along to the media at any convenient time. Press releases are a particular tool of interest, as those from COE, universities, and other affiliated organizations are encouraged and highly considered.

TRIO advocates have reacted quickly to the cuts, jumping right into close, personal interaction. Representatives from various TRIO programs, lobbyists for the programs’ parent colleges/universities, and those affected personally by TRIO were all at the forefront in Washington, speaking their cases at press conferences, Congressional Briefings, on the floor, one-on-one. The focus was to circulate information face-to-face.

*Credibility:* Legislators want to feel that the information they receive from one group matches or exceeds that from another – that it is high-quality research and comparable to the best objective data available. Lawmakers also want to make sure that the issue in question is one of credible significance to their respective constituencies, as voters are key and politicians are often only as strong as their support from home.

When dealing with policy makers who are highly familiar with the issue, successful lobbyists benefit more from having new, original research rather than what has already been documented by academics (Berry). Upward Bound programs had been collecting data that could be found nowhere else – statistics on student retention. Though PART concludes that there had been no current method of measuring TRIO’s results (Dept. of Education) – which makes the assessment questionable, in the first place – for over ten years, individual Upward Bound projects had been keeping track of their graduates and their success rates (COE, Leavitt). The longer the student stayed, the more successful he or she was in post-secondary education – Hispanic students particularly saw vast increases in educational benefits (COE, Leavitt).

To what standards the media and credible advocates hold such research is equally important to legislators. Members of Congress have heard from unassailably credible sources in regards to TRIO, including presidents of universities, professionals with roots in TRIO, and fellow Senators and Representatives (COE).

*Organizational Capacity:* The TRIO programs have had incredible means of organization that stem back to their aforementioned days in the Great Society. Not only have TRIO affiliates been establishing ties with legislators and creating a Congressional network for decades, but the COE has carried such efforts into today’s world of intensifying interest groups and lobbying tactics. The COE, as mentioned before, was created with the help of

legislators to act as the collective voice of TRIO programs, thus establishing its organizational jurisdiction beyond government strongholds.

The COE continues to sponsor its annual Policy Seminar, which keeps all TRIO leaders on the same page in terms of strategy, agenda, and mission. Such consistent unification and preparation, even in times of political stability, have allowed COE and TRIO to implement immediate action when problems arise, as illustrated by COE's instantaneous delegation of responsibilities upon word of President Bush's TRIO cuts.

*And how the GOP Fared...*

Thanks to TRIO's efforts as described thus far, Republican converts found ways to incorporate their support into their agenda. McHugh includes the undesired single-issue factor of Upward Bound and TRIO in the larger "fundamental needs" of American citizens, as he defends his vote to pass the appropriations bill that restores TRIO funding (McHugh). Perhaps to avoid a large amount of skepticism, McHugh gives a "mixed review" of the bill in a press release:

Certainly parts of this bill are less disappointing than others...but I am glad we are moving in the right direction. In this climate, with a historically high deficit and shrinking funds to allocate, there is no easy answer. We must act responsibly for taxpayers, while doing everything possible to continue to provide for such fundamental needs as health care, education, and assistance to workers. (McHugh)

The next question arises: Were there any repercussions? Maybe; maybe not. During the 2003-2004 election cycle – before McHugh voiced his support for Upward Bound and TRIO, the Congressman received \$338,869 in PAC contributions (Congress.org). However, in the 2005-2006 cycle, after TRIO was reauthorized, McHugh's PAC contributions amounted only to \$145,000 – substantially less than half of the monetary support he received previously. Perhaps this was a community backlash against his support of issues of little concern to the district – or an inside conservative boycott against McHugh's traitorous actions. Or, maybe he just didn't need the money. On the plus side, even with so little funds, McHugh nevertheless managed to be reelected after his TRIO support.

### **Legislative Timeline of Upward Bound's Restoration**

Despite the struggles lawmakers have faced in restoring – or even denying – funding for Upward Bound and TRIO, the legislative process continued forward. Within a year, TRIO had withstood the Congressional threshold and was granted its new lease.

*FEBRUARY 7, 2005*

The Bush administration submitted its proposed program eliminations in Section III of the FY 2006 Budget Summary (Dept. of Education).

*MARCH 18, 2005*

Senator Kennedy's (D-MA) Higher Education/Job Training Budget Amendment to the Senate Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) passed, adding an additional \$2.7 billion to higher education funding (Library of Congress). This increase allotted sufficient funding for the restoration of TRIO programs, along with that of GEAR UP and an increase in Pell Grants to \$4500 per award. The amendment narrowly passed, 51-49, with all 44 Democrats, the only independent, and six Republican senators in favor. COE gave the six Republicans recognition on its website, and urged advocates to send the senators letters of gratitude for their willingness to cross party lines: Mike DeWine (OH), Olympia Snowe (ME), Susan Collins (ME), Lincoln Chafee (RI), Arlen Specter (PA), and Norm Coleman (MN).

*JUNE 24, 2005*

The House appropriations panel passed their bill, H.R. 3010, which fully restores TRIO's funding to 2005's level (U.S. House of Representatives). Surprisingly, a vast majority of Republicans voted in favor of the bill – 206 voted for the appropriations, while only 10 dissented (see Table 4) However, an equally significant majority of Democrats voted *against* the bill – this is a striking outcome, considering the Democrats' widely-known support of TRIO programs. One plausible reason for the party's opposition is the bill's cuts to the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services.

Whatever the reasons, the Republican support was still an uplifting direction to full restoration of Upward Bound and TRIO. Republican Congressman Mike Simpson (Idaho) even voiced his support in a press release during the floor debate on the appropriations bill. Simpson states, “It is clear to me that the TRIO and Perkins Programs are already accomplishing the President’s goal of keeping our students competitive in the 21st century. Why replace these programs with untested, new initiatives...?” (Simpson).

*SEPTEMBER 8, 2005*

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions passed its own version of H.R. 3010, but included \$5 million more than the House bill (CEO).

*DECEMBER 14, 2005*

The conference report between the House and Senate versions (without the \$5 million addition) passed in the House by two votes (215-213), after having failed a month earlier due to disputes over health appropriations (CEO; Kyl).

*DECEMBER 21, 2005*

The Senate approved the report by voice vote (CEO).

*DECEMBER 30, 2005*

President Bush signed the FY 2006 appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education PL 109-149, into public law, including those that fund TRIO programs (THOMAS).

## **THE NETWORK**

Dear Colleague:

On February 7<sup>th</sup>, President Bush announced a proposal to stop funding for federal programs that are integral to preparing low-income students for a collegiate career. Upward Bound and Talent Search – two extremely important pillars of the long-standing and effective TRIO programs – ...are slated for elimination...

We talk to our members of Congress about many priorities, but I believe this is a time when our collective and sustained voice is of the most importance. TRIO...students and their families are relying on us to act now, and I hope you will join me in this effort.

Sincerely,

Nancy Cantor, Chancellor

Syracuse University

Syracuse University's own Chancellor, Nancy Cantor, appealed on behalf of Upward Bound and other programs threatened with elimination. Thusly, she was part of the vast community that worked to keep TRIO alive – a large network of people ranging from educators, politicians, to concerned citizens.

## **Who Cares?**

There is a problem of “free riding” that is evidently inherent in human beings; as such, organizations must provide some kind of incentive for individuals to volunteer contributions (Wright). People aren’t naturally drawn into interest groups – which places a burden on groups that are just starting out and need to gain an initial support network. Such groups can provide material or solidary incentives, which involve more instant gratifications – such as discounts or socializing. However, another benefit includes expressive incentives, or the ability to express personal ideologies and values as a contributing member to a group that embraces those values (Wright). The expression of political values usually trumps actual tangible achievement. This incentive can feasibly be attributed to TRIO and COE, as their primary offer is the opportunity to provide equal educational opportunity.

Many lawmakers in Congress assume that the public doesn’t care about programs that aid low-income students. However, Widmeyer Research and Polling recently conducted a public opinion poll on general attitudes about college preparatory programs for students. The study found that a clear majority of people across all backgrounds are in favor of such programs. President of the COE, Arnold Mitchem, believes this will help them with their case against apathy: “We get told [by some in Congress] that there isn’t much interest or support. This shows that is not the case” (Jaschik).

### “Maximum Feasible Participation”

As mentioned earlier, Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 calls for the “maximum feasible participation” of those whom the Act serves. Morris Fiorina of the political science department at Stanford University explains:

At the local level, the watchword of the Great Society was *maximum feasible participation* — want[ing] to bypass existing power structures and empower new constituencies in the cities. There has been a proliferation of local bodies in the United States, boards of all kinds made and filled on a volunteer basis...The advocacy explosion refers to the huge increase in interest groups in the country...in the number of formal groups and organizations in the last 30 years. [Examples are] increased use of propositions...increasing elections around the United States...[and a] proliferation of polls...Polls were almost non-existent in the newspapers and so forth until about the late '60s. (Inouye, Lin).

Upward Bound has taken this role to the max, particularly Plattsburgh State’s project. PSU’s Upward Bound has – as have, undoubtedly, the Upward Bounds elsewhere – put a large amount of effort into increasing awareness and the community’s interest in politics and their Congressional leaders. Leavitt discusses the initial parental response to their receipt of such devastating information regarding their children’s beneficial program. Plattsburgh is a relatively conservative community with high approval ratings of President Bush and the war effort. However, when parents of Plattsburgh’s

Upward Bound students were notified of the program's budget elimination, they were prepared to stand up to the administration and fight for their children. With the parents and the students on board, it was now time to branch out. "We spearheaded a letter-writing campaign among former staff, alumni, current students and families, as well as the area schools and businesses," Leavitt explains. "It was part of a national effort that truly worked."

TRIO alumni are a staple in this network. Not only are they members of the community, but they have been directly affected by their TRIO programs, thus truly making the most of the Great Society's pledge for the maximum participation of the poor – or, of those who receive the help. Alumni are the source of TRIO's wealth of data and success stories that draw in even more advocates. These students have learned of their programs' struggles, and have developed a sense of loyalty to the organization for all it has done for them – thus leading to future sentiments of obligation and consequent contribution.

Upward Bound, and TRIO as a whole, is one of the exceptionally successful groups that have combed in varying aspects of the political, educational, and communal arenas. COE has assisted TRIO in using professional lobbying strategies of connecting with legislators and influential leaders in Washington – while the organization has managed to maintain a grassroots, citizen-based effort. This vast but tightly-knit network is the

success behind Upward Bound's survival – and now we can review how this network is within the means of any citizen-based, nonprofit interest group.

## **THE HANDBOOK – A BREAKDOWN**

We will summarize the aforementioned information into important focal points for organizations and interest groups to consider, and recap how Upward Bound specifically follows each approach. The matrix below briefly reviews these points:

### **Strategy Matrix for Interest Groups (continued on next page)**

<b><u>WHAT TO DO</u></b>	<b><u>HOW UB DID IT</u></b>
Organize, organize, organize...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● UB included under umbrella organization, TRIO – creates solidarity among programs</li> <li>● COE provides collective voice of TRIO – keeps all TRIO leaders on same page in terms of strategy, agenda, and mission</li> <li>● Regularly provides Policy Seminar and instant e-mail updates</li> </ul>
Have a clear message and play to your strengths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● COE is categorized by IRS as a non-profit association for charitable purposes</li> <li>● Allows for <i>expressive</i> incentives of spreading UB’s message of equal educational opportunity</li> <li>● Concise goal – reinstate funding for TRIO</li> </ul>
Connect with community – Congress pays more attention to voters than to lobbyists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Involved citizens in grassroots effort to spread influence and contact Congress</li> <li>● Starts with those closest to the program – alumni – then branches out to family of alumni, program’s local community, influential community leaders, and to lawmakers</li> </ul>
Have your own research available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● UB maintained original data on student retention and success</li> <li>● COE conducted its own analysis on PART findings and questioned validity of Mathematica’s methods</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Influential advocates used COE's statistics and findings in their own petitions</li> </ul>
Be seen.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Advocates prepare press-ready materials in "media kits"</li> <li>● Personal interaction with influential staff and members of Congress</li> <li>● Face-to-face circulation of information at venues in D.C.</li> </ul>
Strive for <i>bilateral</i> attention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Maintained close personal contacts with legislators from both parties</li> </ul>

### *Organize*

Organization is the absolute first step to a successful interest group. As illustrated earlier, it takes a large network of people to maintain the strength of circulation that is necessary to gain influence. All the affiliates within that network need to be on the same page to get the desired message across. Such organization unifies their priorities and strategies, so that when someone drops the ball on their organization, they can react quickly and efficiently, as Upward Bound was prepared to do. Creating common goals and plans of action can maintain solidarity both within the group and among affiliated organizations.

### *Clear Message and Strengths*

As an organization with expressive incentives, Upward Bound can appeal to politicians' ideologies, allowing them to skirt the problem of single-issue politics and include UB's funding as a principle-based part of their agenda. The key is simply getting people to care. If an organization can offer

such opportunities for members to express and implement variants of their ideals, then they will be more willing to contribute.

However, members also need to know to what issue they are contributing – thus, groups should make sure to exude a clear message – the more clearly laid-out the goal, the more feasible and appealing the task will seem. Upward Bound’s goal was concise – reinstate funding for TRIO.

### *Connect With Community*

Individuals associated the programs’ communities were included to a significant extent. These programs had, over time, developed close relationships and had become synonymous with their respective localities; therefore, in many cases, TRIO’s efforts became synonymous with their communities’ efforts. The grassroots effort to reach influential legislators in substantial numbers was successful thanks, in large part, to the multiple concerned voices offered to members of Congress – especially as these numerous voices are potential votes.

In these circumstances, strength is definitely in the numbers. It is most effective to reach out first to those closest to a group’s specific efforts – as were the alumni to TRIO’s cause. These students are the reason for TRIO’s existence; they will act most strongly to the events that affect their programs and will be the easiest to recruit. After they and their families are mobilized, the effort can then be more effectively expanded, as there are many more advocates who are fighting under one banner.

Therefore, maintaining great relations with the community in which you serve and with those you specifically serve are the beginnings of a strong, cohesive support network

### *Obtain Your Own Research*

Original analyses, especially combined with objective data, are refreshing to policy makers already knowledgeable in a specific issue. They already know the textbook definitions and existing information – they are looking for new data and fresh views. This is what Upward Bound provided when it presented its data on student retention and its analysis of Mathematica’s results. An organization can take full advantage of this by keeping good, detailed records, and investing in research components.

### *Be Seen*

TRIO programs know that media outlets don’t pursue educational issues. Therefore, they take the initiative to compile the pieces for the media. For instance, many of the photos of Upward Bound found in local newspapers are taken by UB staff themselves and offered to the press (Leavitt); op-eds are yet another way to find press-time. Journalistic efforts are often required by smaller organizations that are not easily noticed and must generate their own interest.

Persistent contact with legislators is also crucial. Inviting the district’s representative to an organization’s event is an effective way to both inform

and entertain members of Congress – thus igniting the beginnings of long-lasting connections with influential lawmakers. Politicians are often invited to such venues as TRIO Day and program anniversaries – just recently, PSU’s Upward Bound invited members of the New York Assembly, along with the university’s president, to its 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary party (Vock).

### *Bilateral Attention*

Though Upward Bound is typically Democratically supported, affiliates were encouraged to contact *all* legislators – regardless of political background. Therefore, the strategy is not only to garner attention and support in places where you are most likely to get them, but to convince even those who are unlikely to give you the time of day – which is where the ultimate struggle will lie in the end. Obtaining such unattainable support will make the inevitable legislative battle easier.

Party influence is very fickle and changes all the time, so concentrating on support from a particularly party is not always the best way to go. Contacting one’s own district and state representatives on an individual level proves to be most effective, as Leavitt illustrates in PSU’s persuasion of McHugh – who just happened to be a Republican.

The first Congressional TRIO briefing in 2004 opened up a new venue for bilateral discussion of TRIO’s assets (COE). The event was sponsored by Representatives Donald M. Payne (*D-NJ*) and Mike Simpson (*R-ID*). COE president Mitchem, accompanied by several TRIO students with inspiring

stories, spoke at the briefing about how TRIO changes lives. Mitchem concluded his segment with, “One common thread in every student’s story was the sense of a community offered by TRIO; an opportunity to interact with others” (COE).

### **Can Everyone Do This?**

These are basic approaches that any interest group can apply to their strategies for success. Upward Bound, under TRIO and COE, utilized the persona and tools of citizen group politics to appeal to large numbers and gain unexpected political support.

Though COE may seem like a large, well-connected lobbying organization, such effective organizational capacity began with three guys headed to Washington, who were fed up with the oppression of larger interests.

## REFERENCES

- Berry, Jeffrey M. 1999. *The New Liberalism*. Washington: Brookings Institute Press.
- Capital Eye. 2006. "Jack Abramoff Lobbying and Political Contributions, 1999 – 2006." (January 12). [http://www.capitaleye.org/abramoff\\_recips.asp](http://www.capitaleye.org/abramoff_recips.asp)
- Cochran, John. 2006. "The Influence Implosion." *CQ Weekly* (January 16).
- Congress.org. 2006. "Representative John E. Sweeney." <http://www.congress.org/congressorg/bio/?id=427>
- Congress.org. 2006. "Representative John McHugh." <http://www.congress.org/congressorg/bio/?id=429>
- Council for Opportunity in Education. 2006. [www.coenet.us](http://www.coenet.us)
- Crowley, Michael. 2005. "A Lobbyist in Full." *New York Times* (May 1).
- Donovan, John C. 1967. *The Politics of Poverty*. New York: Pegasus, Western Publishing Company, Inc.
- ExpectMore.com. 2005. "TRIO Upward Bound Assessment." <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail.10000210.2005.html>
- Groutt, John. 2003. "Milestones of TRIO History, Part I." *Opportunity Outlook* (January).
- Jaschik, Scott. 2006. "On the Chopping Block Again." *Inside Higher Ed* (February 7). <http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/02/07/trio/>
- Kyl, Jon. 2005. "Highlights of the Conference Report." *U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee* (December 14). <http://rpc.senate.gov/files/Dec1405ConfRepHR30102.pdf>
- Leavitt, Elaine. 2005. Personal Interview (July 21).
- Madison, James. 1787. "The Federalist No. 10." *New York Packet* (November 23). [http://thomas.loc.gov/home/histdox/fed\\_10.html](http://thomas.loc.gov/home/histdox/fed_10.html)
- Myers, David. 2004. "The Impacts of Regular Upward Bound: Results

from the Third Follow-Up Data Collection.” *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.* (April) <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/upboundimpact.pdf>

Office of Management and Budget. 2004. “Circular A-21.” [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a21\\_2004.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a21_2004.html)

Office of Management and Budget. 2006. “Department of Education.” <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2007/education.html>

Patterson, Crystal. 2005. “Senator Kennedy on the Higher Education Amendments Act of 2005.” *TedKennedy.com* <http://www.tedkennedy.com/journal/236/senator-kennedy-on-the-higher-education-amendments-act-of-2005>

Pell Institute. 2003. “The First Summer of Upward Bound – 1965.” (July 3) <http://www.pellinstitute.org/Clearinghouse/triohistory/FirstSummerofUpwardBound1965.doc>

Simpson, Mike. 2006. “Trio Programs are a Must.” *News from Congressman Mike Simpson* (March 9). [http://www.house.gov/apps/list/press/id02\\_simpson/trio\\_programs.html](http://www.house.gov/apps/list/press/id02_simpson/trio_programs.html)

Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel, Inc. 2005. “Educational Advocacy and Annual Policy Seminar Handbook.” <http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:aNnXloQuTfcJ:saeopp.org/Docs/Guidebook.pdf+%22policy+seminar%22+lobbying&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=2>

THOMAS. 2005. “H.R. 3010: Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006.” <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d109:HR03010:@@L&summ2=m&>

Truman, David B. 1951. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Knopf.

U.S. Code Online via GPO Access. 2003. “Title 26--Internal Revenue Code.” [wais.access.gpo.gov](http://wais.access.gpo.gov)

U.S. Department of Education. 2005. “Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Summary.” (February 7) <http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget06/summary/edlite-section3.html#trioub>

Vock, Casey Ryan. 2006. "Celebrating 40 Years of Achievement." *Press Republican* (April 16).

Wright, John R. 1996. *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying, Contributions, and Influence*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon, a Simon & Schuster Company.

**APPENDIX****TABLE 1: FY 2006 Budget for Dept. of Education, partial (continued on next page)**

<b>Department of Education</b> (In millions of dollars)			
	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	
		<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Spending</b>			
Discretionary Budget Authority:			
Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Title I Grants to LEAs <sup>1</sup>	12,342	12,740	13,342
Reading First and Early Reading First	1,118	1,146	1,146
State Assessments	390	412	412
Teacher Incentive Fund	—	—	500
Adjunct Teacher Corps	—	—	40
Teacher Quality State Grants	2,930	2,917	2,917
Charter Schools programs	256	254	256
Choice Incentive Fund			50
Impact Aid	1,230	1,244	1,241
Safe and Drug Free Schools Programs <sup>2</sup>	674	672	317
21st Century Community Learning Centers	999	991	991
English Language Acquisition	681	676	676
IDEA Part B State Grants <sup>3</sup>	10,068	10,590	11,098
High School Programs:			
High School Intervention	—	—	1,240
High School Assessments	—	—	250
Striving Readers	—	25	200
Mathematics and Science Partnerships	149	179	269
Advanced Placement	24	30	52
Vocational Education	1,195	1,194	—
<b>TRIO Upward Bound</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>TRIO Talent Search</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>—</b>
GEAR UP	298	306	—
State Scholars Capacity Building	—	—	12
Higher Education:			
Community College Access Grants	—	—	125
Pell Grants—Discretionary Funding (legislative proposal)	12,007	12,365	13,232

<b>Department of Education</b> (In millions of dollars)			
	<b>2004 Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	
		<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<i>Pell Grants—Mandatory Funding (non-add, legislative proposal)</i>	—	—	4,721
<i>Enhanced Pell Grants for State Scholars (non-add)</i>	—	—	33
Historically Black Colleges and Graduate Institutions	276	297	299
Research and Statistics <sup>4</sup>	335	338	338
All other	10,265	9,776	7,046
Total, Discretionary budget authority <sup>5</sup>	55,662	56,577	56,049

Source: Dept. of Education, Ed.gov

**TABLE 2: Public Confidence Levels in Selected Public and Private Institutions (continued on next page)**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Level of confidence</b>				
	A great deal	Quite a lot	Some	little	Can't say/ no answer
Religious organizations	31.9	29.5	26.7	9.7	2.1
Higher education (colleges or univ.)	22.9	35.6	26.6	8.1	6.9
Private elementary or secondary education	17.0	33.8	32.5	10.3	6.4
Youth development and recreation organizations	33.0	38.9	20.1	4.9	3.0
Federated charitable appeals	16.1	28.8	33.2	16.4	5.6
Health organizations	15.0	27.5	35.4	12.8	9.3
Environmental organizations	13.3	25.7	36.0	15.8	9.2
Human service organizations	29.0	38.7	23.6	5.5	3.2
Recreational organizations (adult)	19.9	38.2	30.2	7.3	4.4
Arts, culture, & humanities organizations	16.6	34.0	32.3	11.1	6.1
Private and community foundations	8.7	26.5	36.2	12.5	16.2
Public /society benefit organizations \1	10.9	22.5	41.4	18.4	6.8
International/foreign organizations	7.7	19.9	38.5	20.9	13.0
Small businesses	16.4	38.1	33.4	8.7	3.5
Military	22.2	35.0	29.4	10.8	2.6
Public higher educ. (colleges or univ.)	19.1	42.4	28.7	7.4	2.4
Public elementary or secondary education	15.9	35.0	32.6	14.9	1.5
Organized labor	9.9	18.1	39.1	27.5	5.4
Media (e.g. newspapers, TV, radio)	7.6	20.7	37.4	32.5	1.8

Work-related organizations	6.6	23.5	47.1	14.7	8.2
Major corporations	7.4	21.5	43.5	23.0	4.6
State government	7.9	23.1	45.0	21.6	2.4
Organizations that lobby for a particular cause	5.3	15.6	42.6	28.1	8.4
Political organizations, parties	4.3	14.5	37.3	40.5	3.4
Local government	8.7	24.1	42.8	22.0	2.4
Federal government	7.9	19.5	43.4	26.9	2.3
Congress	6.4	15.8	40.2	34.9	2.7

\1 Civil rights, social justice, or community improvement organizations.

\2 Culture exchange or relief organizations.

Source: Saxon-Harold, Susan K.E., Murray Weitzman, and the Gallop Organization, Inc., Giving and Volunteering in the United States: 1999 edition.

**TABLE 3: Percent of Liberal and Conservative Groups Lobbying on High-Salience Issues**

Groups Active	1963	1979	1991
Liberal	46.8	69.0	65.9
Conservative	6.4	11.9	4.5
N	47	42	44

Source: Berry, 90.

**TABLE 4: HR 3010 Final Vote Results for Roll Call 321**

	<u>YEAS</u>	<u>NAYS</u>	<u>PRES</u>	<u>NV</u>
REPUBLICAN	206	10		14
DEMOCRATIC	44	140		18
INDEPENDENT		1		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>151</b>		<b>32</b>

Source: House of Representatives <http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2005/roll321.xml>