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Persistent Low College Completion Rates

- 34% of students earn a degree in four years
  - 17% of African American & 21% of Latinx
- Low academic preparation (Bettinger, Boatman, & Long, 2013)
- Lack of cognitive, metacognitive strategies, intrapersonal and interpersonal skills (Conley, 2007; Pellegrino & Hilton, 2012)
- Financial constraints (Bettinger, 2004; Dynarski, 2005)
- Institutional policies and practices (Bound, Lovenheim, & Turner, 2010, 2012; Carey, 2005; Melguizo, 2008; Small & Winship, 2007; Yead, Haycock, Johnstone, & Chaplot, 2014)
Policy Efforts to Improve College and Workforce Outcomes

• CA Career Technical Education Model Curriculum Standards
• Common Core State Standards
• California Career Pathways Trust
• California School Dashboard
• Evolving college remediation policies
Intersegmental Coordination as a Lever for Improvement

- K-12 and higher education partnerships increase high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates (Domina & Ruzek, 2010)
- Early Assessment Program (Jackson & Kurlaender, 2016; Kurlaender, Jackson, & Howell, 2012)
- Summer bridge programs, learning communities, advising (Bettinger, Boatman, & Long, 2018)
- Regional learning councils
Intersegmental coordination as a lever for improvement

• K-12 and higher education partnerships increase high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates (Domina & Ruzek, 2010)

• Early Assessment Program (Jackson & Kurlaender, 2016; Kurlaender, Jackson, & Howell, 2012)

• Summer bridge programs, learning communities, advising (Bettinger, Boatman, & Long, 2018)

• Regional learning councils

• Persistent challenges around bringing data from multiple systems together
Project Goals

• What are the goals and experiences of current intersegmental partnerships?
• How are data used within the intersegmental partnerships?
• What implications exist for scaling intersegmental data partnerships in other regions?
Methodology

• Identifying the Sample
  • Snowball sampling method
  • Identified 26 organizations
    • Intersegmental Partnerships
    • Third Party Service Providers

• Data Collection & Analysis
  • 32 semi-structured interviews
  • 23 surveys EAP Coordinators
  • Extensive artifact review
  • Thematic analysis
Main Findings
Leadership, Trust and Commitment

• Leadership
• Building Trust and Shared Purpose
• Collective Commitment
Leadership

• Implementation of a collective vision across the multiple institutions

• Partnerships involve leaders at multiple levels to build a strong organizational infrastructure

• Continuous turnover undermines partnership efforts - changes in priorities, re-establish relationships, etc.
Building Trust & Shared Purpose

• It takes time to inculcate a sense of reciprocity and reliability among the different players
• Partnering organizations embed a collective culture within their institutional priorities
• Shared purposes took into consideration the different operational norms, roles, and responsibilities
Collective Commitment

• A sense of obligation among the partners facilitates planning and decisions regarding human and fiscal resources
• Planning allows the identification of the needed personnel, funds, and technology to further partnership objectives
• Funds are required to build data sharing infrastructures and to support partnership interventions
Leadership, Trust and Commitment

There Are Five Conditions For Achieving Collective Impact

- **Common Agenda**
  All participants have a shared vision for change including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions.

- **Shared measurement**
  Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.

- **Mutually reinforcing activities**
  Participant activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.

- **Continuous communication**
  Consistent and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and appreciate common motivation.

- **Backbone support organizations**
  Creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organization with staff and a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations.
Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics

• Identifying Purpose
• Aligning Metrics
Identifying Purpose

• Collectively determining the local and regional challenge(s) that the partnership is interested in addressing
• Local or regional challenges necessitated the intervention of multiple educational segments
• The role of data in identifying the purpose may vary across contexts
Aligning Metrics

• Cohesion between partnership goals and metrics supports a collective approach
• Conversations regarding alignment in metrics across institutions facilitate the collection of relevant data
• Consideration of human and fiscal capacity necessary to collect data
Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics
Data Sharing and Management

- Legal Requirements and Data Sharing MOUs
- Data Exchange and Management
- Data Matching
Legal Requirements and Agreements

• Guidelines that clearly outline the data being shared, security protocols, and required training for the data sharing processes
• Legal adherence with FERPA, AB 1584, and the US Education Code
• Time-intensive process that often requires multiple drafts, edits, and adjustments
Data Exchange and Management

• Sharing data required attention to the transfer, management, and storage of data
• Exchange of sensitive student data requires attention to accuracy, reliability, and security
• Partnerships utilized multiple platforms to tend to the data exchange needs of the different partners
Data Matching

• Absence of a data platform for identifying students at different junctures in their educational trajectory

• Intersegmental partnerships strengthened their impact by following students throughout their educational experience

• Consistency in coding schemes and matching protocols facilitated data sharing across institutions
  – Helped institutions identify areas of intervention
Data Sharing and Management
Data Analysis and Reporting

• Analysis and Report Planning
• Individual/Aggregate Data Analysis
• Data Interpretation
• Data Reporting
Analysis and Report Planning

• Partnership personnel benefit from additional scaffolding in the data analysis process
• Intentional intersegmental data analysis and report planning
  – Each stakeholder adds to the decision-making process
  – Reporting data that facilitates monitoring and ensures accountability
• Clear inquiry questions that align with the partnership’s purpose
Data Analysis

- Decisions on aggregate versus student-level analysis often take into account the fiscal, human, legal, and technical resources available:
  - Aggregate-level analysis:
    - Provides information to identify regional and local patterns
    - Requires fewer resources
  - Individual-level analysis:
    - Enables longitudinal analyses of students across segments
    - Requires substantive resources
Data Interpretation

• Partnerships created a standardized understanding of partnership findings
  • Data might be different across the institutions
  • Facilitates consensus on partnership interventions, activities, and efforts

• Building organizational structures that provide additional support for key actors
  • Workshops, conferences, drop-in support
Data Reporting

• Identify the audience of interest for reporting the partnership’s progress
  – Grant funding, monitoring of strategic goals, community updates

• Explore multiple platforms for the dissemination of findings
  – Dashboards, scorecards, progress reports
Data Analysis and Reporting

Tableau Dashboard: SAUSD To SAC
Data Informed Practices and Policies

• Data Personnel
• Decision Making Process
• Program and Policy Implications
Data Personnel

• Evaluating the human capacity needed to undertake intersegmental data sharing activities
  – Data management, analysis, and reporting
• Data team across the multiple organizations
• Distribution of tasks among existing staff
• Turning to third-party organizers for additional support in creating the necessary structures for data sharing and use
Decision Making Process

• Involves multiple actors in the decision making process
  – Parents, students, partnership staff, educational leaders, business representatives

• Policy and program decisions that incorporate intersegmental data findings

• Employed a multitude of decision making processes
  – Data walks and steering committees
Data Informed Practices and Policies

• Use of intersegmental work for insights into how to improve intersegmental efforts
• Utilizing the collected data to inform district or local level policy changes
• Findings from collective work highlight possible areas for additional programs and interventions to achieve intersegmental goals
  – College readiness interventions, increasing educational opportunities, and improving teacher education programs
The Long Beach College Promise, in response to low college STEM course completion rates, worked with Long Beach Unified School District to increase high school math graduation requirements.

The LA Compact facilitated data sharing between LAUSD and 6 Universities to link teacher preparation and employment data in order to study teacher placement, employment patterns, career progression, etc.

OneFuture Coachella Valley used data to inform strategies for building a talent pipeline, including establishing career pathways in HS, setting goals for college access, enrollment and financial aid, awarding $1.3 million in scholarships annually.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Understanding the factors that hinder or help foster youth students succeed in college can help higher education practitioners create interventions to improve the educational outcomes for this student group. This section of the report provides a combination of institutional, regional, and statewide recommendations to improve retention and graduation rates of foster youth students in college.

WAIVE TUITION AND FEES

- Private and independent CVHEC member colleges and universities should pursue foundation and institutional development funds to provide tuition waivers for TAFY students.
- CVHEC member institutions should consider waiving application fees for TAFY students.
- CVHEC member institutions with campus housing should explore avenues for providing financial assistance or waivers for housing costs.
- CVHEC member institutions should work closely with students and financial aid offices to ensure foster youth students have access to adequate financial aid.

PROVIDE STABLE HOUSING

- TAFY students should be made aware of the provisions of AB 1393 (priority consideration for campus housing for foster youth students).
- TAFY should be made aware of post-secondary institutions with campus housing.
- CVHEC member institutions should consider implementing "host programs" during school breaks for TAFY students to facilitate housing stability when campus dorms are closed.
- Private, independent, and community colleges CVHEC member institutions that have dorms should provide campus housing during term breaks.
- CVHEC private member institutions should consider waiving housing costs for TAFY students.
Implications

**Policy**
- Statewide data platform
- Universal student identifiers
- Funding

**Practice**
- Intersegmental commitment & resources
- Goals for solving regional problems
- Strategies for interpretation, interventions and monitoring

**Research**
- Dissemination of promising practices
- Impact of regional partnerships
- Equity analysis
QUESTIONS?
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