



# Bridging the Gap

## *A State Leader's Guide to Implementing Summer Bridge Programs*

Every year, more than one million students graduate from high school but do not matriculate to postsecondary education. One in five graduates who have earned admission to college and intend to matriculate never show up on campus, a phenomenon known as “summer melt.” A myriad of obstacles can disrupt students along their postsecondary education journey, from academic difficulties and administrative issues, to financial constraints and social challenges.

One intervention that has emerged across colleges and universities to address summer melt and boost matriculation is a summer bridge program. Originally established as a remedial alternative for underprepared learners, these programs have evolved to encompass a throughline of support during the summer months to ensure students successfully enroll in the fall.<sup>1</sup> While the makeup of summer bridge programs can vary, many provide students with the opportunity to enhance their academic skills, foster a sense of belonging among peers, and navigate the full spectrum of university resources available on campus, all before the start of the academic year.

There is increasing evidence that students in summer bridge programs are more likely to successfully transition into their postsecondary education institution in the subsequent fall semester.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, an analysis of a summer bridge program at a midsize public university found that participants enjoyed higher college GPAs and increased first- and second-year retention rates compared to non-bridge counterparts—despite entering the summer bridge program with lower test scores and high school grades compared to nonparticipants.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to facilitating the transition to the rigors of postsecondary coursework, summer bridge programs also support participants in establishing a robust campus network. These programs can play a critical role in forging relationships among summer bridge students, faculty, staff, and peers through an array of programming components, such as coursework, workshops, and peer-to-peer mentorship. Summer bridge programs additionally provide students with enhanced navigational and social support. In a recent student survey, alumni of summer bridge programs reported feeling more comfortable accessing resources, greater preparedness for college, and improved social connections compared to their peers who did not participate in such programs.<sup>4</sup> The social capital gained from these early college connections bolsters students' sense of belonging and ability to navigate campus resources, enhancing persistence and attainment rates.<sup>5</sup>

**Given these benefits, more students, particularly those traditionally underrepresented in higher education, should have access to summer bridge programs. While many institutions have implemented their own programs, to catalyze the scale of students served and to promote quality, state agencies and institutional systems leaders have an important role to play in leading a statewide approach to summer bridge.**

This brief outlines:

- ➔ The core elements of summer bridge programs;
- ➔ Considerations and strategies for implementing two core models; and
- ➔ Case studies from three leading states.

# CORE ELEMENTS OF Summer Bridge Programs



While the central goal of summer bridge programs is to transition students to college, postsecondary institutions can take diverse approaches and tailor their programming to students' specific needs. The most impactful programs take a holistic approach and integrate a combination of academic, navigational, and relational elements.



**ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING** can help acclimate students to college-level coursework and enhance their academic readiness. Summer bridge programs that offer instructional components can be particularly beneficial for underprepared students who lack foundational skills in core subjects. These programs often:

- ➔ Offer **credit-bearing courses** to help students get accustomed to academic expectations.
- ➔ Provide **supplemental instruction and tutoring services** to ensure that students receive personalized academic support.
- ➔ Facilitate **faculty mentorship** to promote among students a deeper understanding of major requirements and academic pathways.
- ➔ Arrange **college readiness workshops** to equip students with essential college skills, such as time management, note-taking, financial literacy, etc.



**NAVIGATIONAL PROGRAMMING** connects students with key campus resources and equips students with the institutional knowledge necessary to take ownership of their collegiate journey. First-generation students, in particular, can benefit greatly from this type of programming as they may not have familial guidance or prior understanding of higher education systems. These programs often:

- ➔ Offer a **First-year Experience (FYE)** course to provide incoming college students with a comprehensive introduction to campus life.
- ➔ Provide **individualized advising and student success coaching** to help students set and achieve their educational goals and make informed academic decisions.
- ➔ Coordinate **introductory workshops with on-campus resources** (e.g., Library, Writing Center, Financial Aid Office, Career Center) to enhance students' ability to navigate challenges effectively throughout their college experience.



**RELATIONAL PROGRAMMING** supports students in establishing a strong network of peers, staff, and faculty at the institution and cultivating a sense of belonging. By fostering meaningful connections and relationships, relational programming can especially help underrepresented minority and non-traditional students feel supported, validated, and empowered to succeed academically and socially on campus. These programs often:

- ➔ Organize **cohort-centered activities** to build a strong sense of community among students and foster collaborative learning.
- ➔ Offer **peer-to-peer mentorship** to connect incoming students with experienced peers who can provide guidance, advice, and support.
- ➔ Arrange **residential living** for students to create a living environment that enhances their academic and personal growth.
- ➔ Plan **affinity-based programming** to ensure that students with diverse backgrounds, interests, and identities have access to inclusive spaces on campus.

# CONSIDERING TWO IMPLEMENTATION MODELS for Summer Bridge



When launching a state-level summer bridge program, there are two primary implementation models to consider: the institution-led model and the statewide model. Each has its own set of benefits and potential challenges, as listed below.

	INSTITUTION-LED MODEL	STATEWIDE MODEL
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Requires less time and capacity to lift off the ground, given existing resources and processes</li> <li>➔ Potentially less costly, depending on the determined funding allocation per institution and the total number of institutions funded, given existing institutional resources</li> <li>➔ Enables programming to be tailored to institutional context, which can support students with navigating on-campus resources and building relationships with peers, faculty, and staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Increased opportunity to reach students — particularly students from low-income backgrounds and students of color — at scale</li> <li>➔ Standardization by the state promotes consistency across institutions</li> <li>➔ Could be an opportunity to pilot other support models, such as statewide tutoring and/or advising corps</li> </ul>
Potential Challenges to Consider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ More limited opportunity to reach students at scale</li> <li>➔ Lack of standardization and oversight could present issues around quality and impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ More challenging and time-intensive to launch</li> <li>➔ Potentially higher start-up costs</li> <li>➔ More difficult to tailor to institutional context, particularly around navigational and relational supports</li> </ul>

## GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR STATE LEADERS

- ➔ What is the biggest barrier to student success that the summer bridge program is attempting to solve? What does the data tell you about the current level of access, quality, and impact of existing institutional bridge programs?
- ➔ What level of buy-in exists around core programmatic elements among key state, district, and institutional stakeholders? To what extent does the state value and have precedence for local control versus centralized guidance and implementation for related initiatives? How coordinated is the governance structure for higher education in the state?
- ➔ What staff capacity do the state agency and its partners currently have to execute a statewide bridge program? How is this program aligned with their broader work?
- ➔ What state-level infrastructure already exists around academic, navigational, and relational programming to build from (e.g., advising frameworks, advising corps, bridge courses, course placement software, mentorship programs, employer partnerships, individualized learning plans, etc.)? What would need to be created “from scratch”?
- ➔ How significant of an investment is the state able to make to start up the program? How sustainable is that funding? How might available funding shift over time?

# Institution-Led Model

An institution-led model for summer bridge programs is where the state's public universities and colleges each run an institution-specific summer bridge program funded by the state. States launch a grant to fund their public and private colleges and universities that wish to host summer bridge programs for their incoming students. Running an institution-led summer bridge program affords each institution the flexibility to customize its program structure and curriculum to cater to its student body. Leveraging the resources at each institution, an institution-led summer bridge program model has the potential to require less launch time and capacity. Based on our direct experience supporting the establishment of these programs, and analyses of other programs across the country, below are the components ESG recommends should be included in these programs.

## KEY COMPONENTS



### Grant Funding

To maximize student participation, states should launch a competitive or block grant program that will provide funding to institutions hosting summer bridge programs. When determining how grant funds can be used, it is important to account for personnel costs (faculty instructors, tutors, advisors, and program coordinators) as well as student incentives (school supplies, scholarships, and course credit) to enhance student participation and commitment to academic success. To scale program impact, states should annually set a target for increasing both the number of institutions awarding grants and the number of students served per institution. States will also need to account financially for the summer bridge elements they wish to see included within each program.



### Cross-Institutional Learning and Collaboration

In addition to providing financial support, states should provide a community of practice for summer bridge program organizers. A community of practice can facilitate discussions, joint activities, and relationship-building across summer bridge organizers to develop a shared and individual repository of resources, skills, and knowledge to use in practice. Moreover, such a space can provide useful insights and tools on how to enhance student support during this summer-to-fall transition phase. States that host a community of practice for their summer bridge institutions have taken diverse approaches when planning them. For example, in Kentucky, monthly community of practice meetings were held virtually, culminating in an in-person convening at the end of the year where different programs presented on best practices. In Hawaii, the state organized five webinars over eight weeks that focused on troubleshooting technology as well as career and college onboarding.



### Data Reporting

As a condition for receiving state funding, colleges and universities should be required to submit mid-program and post-program reports that contextualize the content and quality of programming at each institution and report on enrollment and outcome data. Program reports provide states with valuable data and insights that help them understand their return on investment and allocate grant funding effectively in future years. From the perspective of institutional organizers, these reports are an opportunity to reflect on their summer bridge programs' effectiveness and identify potential areas for growth and improvement. Furthermore, mid-program reports in particular can help institutions pivot programs to better support students and drive discussion areas for the community of practice. To maximize reporting effectiveness and allow for cross-comparison, states should develop a reporting protocol to ensure institutions are reporting a standardized set of information.

## Designing Institution-Led Summer Bridge Reporting Criteria

As states design reporting criteria for their institutions' summer bridge programs, below are four strategies for ensuring that data received is comprehensive:

- ➔ States should mandate the use of a template for qualitative and quantitative data collection that includes the following:
  - Description of the summer bridge program's design
  - Number of students participating in the program
  - Description of student demographics (examples of student demographics to be included are race/ethnicity, gender, low-income status or free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) eligibility, English language learner (ELL) status, developmental education status, first-generation college status, and high school)
  - Number of faculty and staff participating in the program
  - Description of the specific types of academic or social/emotional support programming offered to students
  - If applicable, descriptions of courses offered or curriculum implemented
  - Description of associated costs of program
  - Description of the trainings or other professional development experiences provided to program faculty and staff
  - Description of student recruitment strategies employed
  - Description of successes and barriers faced during the program's implementation
  - Description of early outcomes or impact of program (examples to be included are Fall semester enrollment, Fall-to-Spring retention, and first-year GPA)
  - List of institution ID numbers for participating students
- ➔ States can encourage or require institutions to provide qualitative data by designing focus group protocols to be used by summer bridge organizers with students. Alternatively, states can run focus groups or interviews with students themselves; for instance, the Commission on Postsecondary Education (CPE) in Kentucky held focus groups with summer bridge students post-program.
- ➔ To receive consistent data across institutions and program years, states can design surveys that are mandatory for all summer bridge program participants.
- ➔ State should encourage summer bridge organizers to work alongside institutional research offices in the reporting process to enable tracking of longer-term outcomes, such as student persistence and, ultimately, completion.

## IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE FOR INSTITUTION-LED PROGRAMS

From start to finish, a well-structured institution-led summer bridge program requires at least ten months, with an approximate six-month planning period for states before the start of their institutions' summer bridge programs. The following timeline outlines the key milestones states and institutions should meet to plan and launch their summer bridge programs.

MILESTONE	OWNER (State or Institution)	SUGGESTED TIMELINE (months)									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Determine budget and funding source(s) for institutional grants	State										
Refine grant application materials, process, and timeline	State										
Develop a repository of open-source resources from last year's grant recipients, including a checklist of best practices, to support future program design and implementation	State										
Develop, release, and publicize grant application to institutions	State										
Develop student recruitment strategy, including any turnkey communications collateral	Both										
Select institutions to receive grants	State										
Hold a kick-off convening with grant recipients to facilitate cross-institutional relationships and highlight available state agency support	State										
Lead student recruitment, including facilitating connections with local K-12 partners	Both										
Provide additional technical assistance, as needed, to institutions to plan, develop, and launch their programs	State										
Launch institutional summer bridge programs	Institutions										
Hold communities of practice to foster collaboration across institutions and share best practices	State										
End institutional summer bridge programs	Institutions										
Receive final grant reports from institutions. Consider holding follow-up interviews to lift up learnings and discuss how to extend support through the school year	Both										



## GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR STATE LEADERS

- ➔ What is the overall budget and funding source(s) for the grant program? How much will each institution be able to receive, and how many total institutions can be served? What are allowable expenses?
- ➔ How might the state support institutions with offering course credit or other high-value incentives for students participating in summer bridge programs?
- ➔ What other additional assistance might the state provide to institutions (e.g., sourcing guest speakers, facilitating connections to K-12 partners, convening students across institutions, etc.)?
- ➔ Does the state want to set any parameters during the grant application process around the extent to which programs incorporate academic, navigational, and relational elements into their program designs?
- ➔ Does the state want to invest in any technology platforms to offer to institutions?

### STATE SPOTLIGHT: KENTUCKY



Aligned with Kentucky's aim to achieve a 60% postsecondary degree attainment by 2030, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) initiated a summer bridge grant program in 2021. This institution-led grant fund aims to enhance or establish summer bridge programs, facilitating the transition to college and fostering postsecondary success by equipping students with academic and navigational resources. Over the past three years since the grant's launch, CPE has funded a total of 73 programs at public, private, two-year, and four-year institutions throughout the state.

To receive grant funds, CPE required one mid-term progress report and one final program report, which included a description of programming elements, participation metrics, measures of progress, and a summary of implementation successes and challenges.\* As noted by grantee institutions in their reports, CPE grants have been utilized in various ways by colleges and universities, with some allocating funds to launch a summer bridge program or revitalize a preexisting one. Some institutions additionally incorporated new programming elements to encourage buy-in from different stakeholders; among the incentives include professional development opportunities for staff and field trips and community-building activities for students. Most significantly, the majority of institutions used the grant funds to reduce program costs for students, making them more affordable or free for students and deferring the start of their Pell Grant until the fall. In addition, a majority of grant recipients focused their resources on providing summer

bridge programming for students from underrepresented backgrounds, including first-generation college students, low-income students, and academically underprepared students.

When asked about key program elements, program administrators noted both academic and navigational components. Most programs offered students the opportunity to earn college credits over the summer, and some also focused on developmental education so students could complete remedial courses before the fall semester. Several programs additionally offered continuing support into the fall including tutoring workshops, advising, and classes specifically for the summer bridge cohort. Bridge participants reported feeling more connected to their program and more confident on campus as a result of programming that encouraged connection among peers, faculty, and staff. Examples of programming included mentoring, field trips, and community-building gatherings.

During the summer bridge months, CPE also organized a community of practice for individuals who played a role in the development or implementation of a summer bridge program on their campus. A series of sessions that met both virtually and in-person, the community of practice offered members a chance to delve deeper into topics of concern to program organizers, including building community among program staff and faculty, navigating pre-bridge logistics (recruitment, orientation, training, etc.), developing sustainable programs.

\*ESG supported the impact evaluation for Kentucky's summer bridge program.

# Statewide Programs

A state may choose to centrally operate and manage its summer bridge program. Though not required, based on most existing statewide programs, coursework is often delivered in a virtual or hybrid model in order to ensure consistent quality and to reach significantly more students at scale. The state agency or intermediary can then partner with districts and institutions to provide additional relational and navigational supports, such as campus visits, tutoring, cohort events, and mentorship.

## KEY COMPONENTS



### Institution Engagement

While states have primary ownership of state-led summer bridge programs, institutional collaboration and partnership are nonetheless critical to success. To ensure seamless alignment and transitions, states should include districts and postsecondary partners at all stages of program development and implementation. In Texas, for instance, English coursework and modules were shared with English higher education faculty members during the curricular development process; their approval of the curriculum boosted the program's credibility and ensured that students were prepared for college-level coursework. Engaging districts and local postsecondary institutions during recruitment and transition stages can also be beneficial to states. In Indiana, Ivy Tech Community College assisted high school graduates impacted by the pandemic in gaining college and career readiness over the summer. Eligible students received electronic and mailed invitations from the college and bridge participants were connected with an Ivy Tech representative. The continuous touchpoints students had with Ivy Tech bolstered their familiarity with the institution and confidence in navigating their campus.



### Curriculum

Curricula for summer bridge programs should incorporate online courses aligned with students' academic and transitional needs. Many programs offer students the opportunity to take for-credit, first-year ELA and/or math, and some have also provided college preparation courses; Indiana, for instance, required its bridge students to complete a college preparation course as part of the program. To ensure student success in these courses, the presence of a teacher facilitator or "mentor" alongside the online curriculum is crucial for student support. States can either centrally manage the delivery of these online courses or provide districts with grants to cover the cost of the online curriculum and to hire summer staff as mentors and advisors. The state may also consider connecting the program to additional tutoring supports at higher education institutions. Some students, particularly those on the cusp of meeting college-readiness benchmarks, such as ACT/SAT scores, may find substantial benefit from the online curriculum alone.



### Funding

Funding for state-led summer bridge programs will most likely take the form of non-competitive, formula grants for partnering institutions. To maximize participants, grants should cover the price of developing and operating online curriculum, as well as the management of district-level staffing. In estimating the cost of the program on a district level, attention should be given to the number of students likely to utilize online curricula, determining their subject of choice, and whether students will need dedicated summer staff members, such as class mentors. Similar to the institution-led model, states should consider offering incentives that can encourage student participation; these might include school supplies, tuition scholarships, book scholarships, and course credit. In addition, states should explore the possibility of enhancing the program's impact by connecting students to additional tutoring support resources available at higher education institutions.





## Recruitment

States should budget for necessary marketing and recruitment materials to ensure that the program is reaching its target audiences. Comprehensive announcement guidelines and communication tools ensure all stakeholders—parents, students, teachers, and faculty members—are accurately informed about the program. Furthermore, protocols can be put in place to tackle potential recruitment challenges across districts and institutions. For example, states can leverage key high school personnel such as counselors who can conduct direct, in-person outreach to eligible students and families. States should also prepare counselors and other school staff to explain financial incentives and/or course credit associated with participating in a summer bridge program to offset opportunity costs of summer employment and other priorities. Lastly, to verify that target students are participating in the program, streamlining recruitment analytics with broader data-sharing practices can ensure that a program is reaching and enrolling its intended students.

## STATE SPOTLIGHT: TEXAS



Established as a result of Texas House Bill 5, Texas College Bridge is a state-led program that was launched by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) via the Texas Home Learning Network in 2020 to address the disruption COVID-19 caused to state college readiness. Texas College Bridge provides increased flexibility to districts that want to offer college preparatory courses to senior and junior students to support their English and math skills development and advise them through the transition to a postsecondary program.

Two key programmatic characteristics of Texas College Bridge are its emphasis on personalization and its state standards alignment. Prior to beginning their coursework, students complete a diagnostic assessment at the start of the course so that a personalized study plan can be created to meet their specific learning needs. Students, teachers, and district leadership then have dashboards to help them monitor student progress as they move through their self-paced coursework. In addition to being tailored to each student, the program's English and math content, which was developed in conversation with higher education faculty, is aligned with the Texas Success Initiative Assessment (TSIA). As such, students who complete these courses can earn a TSI exemption at partnering colleges; this means that students are exempt from taking the state's placement test and are able to immediately begin college-level coursework.

Furthermore, students who complete the program can count it towards the College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicator that is part of the state's A-F Accountability System.

While the program itself is state-operated through the EdReady online platform, the recruitment and facilitation of programming relies heavily on institutional partnerships. Districts and postsecondary education institutions across the state have partnered with Texas College Bridge to bring the program to their students via a formula block grant. By either amending the current ISD/IHE Partnership MOU to incorporate Texas College Bridge online courses or signing onto the Texas College Bridge MOU, districts and partner institutions were able to provide their students with access to Texas College Bridge. Staff members were also provided with modules and professional development that prepared them to advise their students on college and career-related topics. As of March 2021, the program has 269 district partners and 27 higher education partners.

A recent evaluation of the program from 2023 found that Texas College Bridge participants are overall more likely to persist into their second semester of higher education compared to non-bridge students. Overall, bridge students were found to be more likely to persist into their second year of higher education than non-participants.<sup>6</sup>

## IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE FOR STATEWIDE PROGRAMS

From start to finish, a well-structured institution-led summer bridge program requires states at least ten months, with an approximate six-month planning period before the start of their summer bridge programs. While states can decide to launch a summer bridge program model earlier in the year, it is best to finalize that decision by October or November. The following timeline outlines the key milestones states will need to meet in order to plan and launch their statewide summer bridge program. To meet each goal by the intended deadline, summer bridge organizers will need routine meetings with relevant staff, sufficient time to develop materials, and a direct line to agency leadership for approval.

MILESTONE	SUGGESTED TIMELINE (months)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Identify the curriculum/vendor										
Identify the students who qualify										
Determine total budget (based on identified vendor, number of qualified students, etc.)										
Determine the system/model for advising (e.g. staffing, tools, etc.).										
Determine the platform for the advising system/model										
Develop all relevant communications materials for announcement										
Sign contract/agreement with vendor										
Announce the program to target districts and institutions										
Share list of identified students to participate with districts										
Develop communications toolkit for districts and institutions										
Develop training materials for tutors and advisors (recommended with support from curricular vendor)										
Conduct training (led by state or non-profit partner)										
Recruit math, ELA, and advisors across districts (counselors, near peer advising groups, intermediary organizations already in the community, etc)										
Launch summer bridge program										
Develop and execute student data transfer plan										
End summer bridge program										
Collect and analyze student data										

## GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR STATE LEADERS

- ➔ Is the primary intention of the program designed for admissions, course placement / remediation, or offering early college credit for math and English courses? Relatedly, who are the students you are trying to serve: graduating high school seniors, upcoming high school seniors, all, or a portion of the student population?
- ➔ Who is involved? Can the state run the program and issue the grants? Or is there a need for a non-profit partner to assist in purchasing and grant agreements?
- ➔ Does the state want to fund the whole program or provide the basic structure of the program and require districts to support mentors, incentives, etc. with their own funding?
- ➔ Will the state purchase a single curriculum or have a narrowed vendor list for districts to select from?
- ➔ How will the state collect and track data on students?
- ➔ How will postsecondary institutions “sign-on” to guarantee admissions, placement, and/or credit?

## STATE SPOTLIGHT: HAWAII



During the COVID-19 pandemic, Hawaii faced unprecedented challenges in ensuring the successful transition of its high school graduates to postsecondary education. The initiative to create the Hawaii Summer Bridge program thus emerged as a collaborative effort at the state level and aimed to address the gaps in college and career readiness. Despite its rapid development in just five weeks in 2020, Hawaii's Summer Bridge program was made feasible by building upon a virtual advising initiative that the state had been piloting, utilizing the initiative's existing technological infrastructure and procurement contract. Moreover, the program was made possible by Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds, along with financial backing from Harold K.L. Castle Foundation.

The academic support component of the program was specifically aimed at addressing the phenomenon of summer melt; to best fit students' needs, the program provided students with both academic and transitional support in the form of free college-level courses and advising. In addition to providing students with free university courses, the summer bridge program emphasized advising services to prevent summer melt. To facilitate the program's navigational programming, advisors were hired under the University of Hawaii (UH) system, many of whom also served as high school counselors during the academic year. This was an

intentional decision, as these individuals were experienced with transitional advising and were not working at their respective high schools during the summer. Along with offering a set of webinars and a Community of Practice (COP) to address evolving programming needs, the program trained advisors to help students navigate essential tasks like health forms, transportation, and placement tests. Moreover, advisors helped connect students to career resources, sharing job opportunities and providing information related to military service.

Hawaii's Summer Bridge program has undergone a number of changes related to funding and student recruitment. To incentivize participation, the state initially offered students with scholarship opportunities that were open to any student heading to any college. In subsequent years, the program narrowed its focus, limiting scholarships to in-state opportunities. The program has furthermore evolved its communications approach to better recruit its target audience. In the first year of implementation, most students were already high-achieving before entering the program, but in subsequent years, the program has improved its recruitment approach by working with high school personnel to better reach underprepared students. In addition, teachers and advisors were able to identify students who did not have a clear postsecondary plan and market the program personally to them via text nudging.

# CONCLUSION

As states and higher education institutions look to address the significant enrollment declines exacerbated by the pandemic, targeting support during the summer months can serve to address the barriers to enrollment students face, and in turn, create momentum for students' postsecondary readiness and success. Whether supporting institutions to lead their own programs or launching a virtual statewide program, implementing high-quality summer bridge programs can be a valuable strategy for states to help ease the transition between high school and college for students and their families.

## Acknowledgments

This report was authored by Vivian M. Nguyen and Lauren Norton. The authors wish to extend gratitude to the following individuals who provided invaluable insight on summer bridge efforts in their states:

- ➔ **Robin Hebert**, Senior Fellow, Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education
- ➔ **Lynsey Bow**, Counseling and Advising Program Director, Hawai'i P-20 Partnerships for Education
- ➔ **Eric Ban**, Executive Director, Economic Mobility Systems
- ➔ **Rebecca Rahschulte**, Vice President of Academic Affairs & Associate Provost, Ivy Tech Community College
- ➔ **Angie Smajstrla**, Regional Membership Manager, The NROC Project

Additional thanks to Ryan Reyna, Briana Falduti, Janice Le, and Heather Justice for their content expertise, Dany Rossman and Kelly Van Beveren for their editorial and communications leadership, and Kathy Ames and the Next Chapter Communications team for their design work.

This report was made possible with financial support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

## Endnotes

- 1 Bir, B. & Myrick, M. (2015). Summer Bridge's Effects on College Student Success. *Journal of Developmental Education*. National Center for Developmental Education.
- 2 McCreless, P. (2017). JSU summer bridge program helping students, growing enrollment. *TCA Regional News*. Chicago: Tribune Content Agency LLC; Suzuki, A., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Perry, N. (2012). A summer bridge program for underprepared first-year students: Confidence, community, and re-enrollment. *Journal of the First-year Experience & Students in Transition*. University of South Carolina.
- 3 Bir, B.; Myrick, M. (2015). Summer bridge's effects on college student success. *Journal of Developmental Education*. National Center for Developmental Education.
- 4 Flaherty, C. (2023, September 13). *Survey: How summer bridge benefits first-gen college students*. Inside Higher Ed | Higher Education News, Events and Jobs. <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/college-experience/2023/09/15/survey-how-summer-bridge-benefits-first-gen>
- 5 Howard, B.L. & Sharpe, L. (2019). The summer bridge program: An effective agent in college students' retention. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*. Jonesboro: Open Journals in Education (OJED), STAR Scholars Network; Lo, S., Flores, L., Drane, D., Swarat, S; Beitel, G., & Light, G. (2014). Increased retention from a summer-bridge program focused on academics, community, and leadership (618.34). *The FASEB journal*. The Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.
- 6 Cicero Social Impact. (2023). Texas college bridge: Statistical impact analysis. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HMkogzfLlo7Q4CQ4OLlguxbKyg6bus6r/view?usp=sharing>