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Introduction

Bringing folks together to improve student outcomes and meet local challenges is complex work. It involves looking at data across sectors (workforce development, nonprofit, employers, etc.) and across segments of education (K-12, community college and universities). To make significant change toward our common, unified goals, we take existing data, connect the dots and measure progress as a collective. It also takes face-to-face communication with partners to turn data into intelligence that will inform common strategies. All partners need to feel mutually accountable for gathering data and measuring impact at a level above each institution’s data and from a regional perspective.

SHEILA THORNTON, ONEFUTURE COACHELLA

OVERVIEW

Across California, K-12 public school districts, institutions of higher education, economic development groups, and community organizations are collaborating to improve the educational and labor market outcomes of students. These collaborative efforts demand considerable commitment to a shared purpose and attention to the critical practices of data sharing, analysis, and interpretation. This Intersegmental Data Partnerships Resource Guide, and the accompanying PACE policy brief, are products of a year-long qualitative research project exploring promising practices in data sharing and data use among intersegmental partnerships throughout California. This Resource Guide provides institutions engaged in intersegmental partnerships with resources to support the development, planning, and monitoring of their data practices.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOURCE GUIDE

The Resource Guide is intended to serve three purposes: 1) a framework to orient intersegmental leaders to the different aspects of effective strategies for data sharing and use; 2) a tool to facilitate reflection on current regional and institutional priority areas and data practices; and 3) a networking resource to identify and learn about data practices from other partnerships in the state. The guide presents the critical components of effective regional efforts around data sharing and use, with tools to dive deeper into specific factors within each of these components. While there are likely aspects of data use not covered in this guide, our goal is to translate the breadth of experiences and lessons learned from partnerships in our study into a framework for data use. This framework is supplemented with descriptions of partnership approaches and artifacts to support intersegmental leaders, data directors, and analysts.
ORGANIZATION OF THE RESOURCE GUIDE

This resource guide is organized around five intersegmental data partnership components: 1) Leadership, Trust, and Commitment; 2) Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics; 3) Data Sharing and Management; 4) Data Analysis and Reporting; and 5) Data Informed Practices and Policy. While we present each of these data components separately, we recognize that they include principles and challenges that are often interconnected rather than mutually exclusive.

Within each of the five components, we present a description of key subcomponents—that is, three to four of the most critical aspects that partnerships should consider in their collaborative efforts to improve student outcomes. Each subcomponent section includes a set of key resources:

- **Lessons learned** from the development and implementation of regional partnerships in our study.
- **Brief descriptions of partnership approaches** from select partnerships to illustrate the various ways leaders are responding to common challenges.
- **Artifacts** providing concrete examples of these approaches.
- **Priority reflection questions** to engage partnership leaders in assessing the status of their data practices and areas they may prioritize as next steps.

At the end of the resource guide, we provide a directory of the partnerships included in our study. We recognize that there are many more partnerships, formal and informal, working to improve student outcomes within our state. Our hope is that all organizations engaged in intersegmental efforts network with partnership leaders across California to share experiences and gain deeper insights into the complex work of intersegmental data sharing and use.

HOW THE RESOURCE GUIDE WAS DEVELOPED

Sponsored by the College Futures Foundation, this Resource Guide was developed by a team of researchers led by Sherrie Reed and Michal Kurlaender at the School of Education at the University of California, Davis. Over the last year, we sought to understand the practices of existing intersegmental partnerships throughout the state through interviews, surveys, and document review. While there are multiple collaboratives across the state, we focused on partnerships that emerged from our scan of the field as well as recommendations from intersegmental experts. Our research focused on the needs of partnership leaders and their organizations through exploration of the challenges they faced and the types of resources they either found useful or those that would have been valuable if they were available. From the findings of this study, we extracted the key lessons learned and partnership approaches to build the content for this resource guide. We then engaged a review group consisting of intersegmental partnership leaders and experts to provide feedback on both the content and format of the guide. While no singular formula exists for building effective data partnerships, our hope is that the document will serve as a resource for both newly created as well as veteran partnerships seeking to deepen their regional data use practices.
A Framework for Intersegmental Data Partnerships

The resources presented in this guide emerged from our year-long research of intersegmental data partnerships across California. The lessons learned and approaches shared by the partnership leaders and experts aligned to five key components for developing an effective and sustainable data partnership across institutions and segments. These components—Leadership, Trust, and Commitment; Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics; Data Sharing and Management; Data Analysis and Reporting; and Data Informed Practices and Policy—comprise the overarching framework for this resource guide.
LEADERSHIP, TRUST, AND COMMITMENT

Forging a sustainable partnership across education, community, and workforce institutions requires attention to the organizational conditions that support effective collaboration, particularly around data sharing and utilization. Before data can be shared, leaders from multiple organizations must trust each other, commit to the shared purpose of the partnership, and allocate appropriate resources. This Resource Guide presents three subcomponents related to Leadership, Trust, and Commitment: Leadership; Building Trust and Shared Purpose; and Collective Commitment.

IDENTIFYING PURPOSE AND ALIGNING METRICS

Identifying a clear purpose and aligning metrics to that purpose is central to intersegmental partnerships. Leaders must develop explicit goals for solving an identified regional problem in order to build and sustain commitment across institutions. For many partnerships, specific goals, metrics, and data needs typically emanate from clearly defined problems. This Resource Guide presents two subcomponents related to Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics.

DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

Identifying appropriate metrics aligned to goals relies on the sharing and merging of data across segments. If the goals are beyond the scope of any one segment, a critical piece in the sustainability of intersegmental work is bringing together data from multiple institutions to measure regional progress. This Resource Guide presents three subcomponent areas related to Data Sharing and Management: Legal Requirements and Data Sharing Agreements; Data Exchange and Management; and Data Matching.

DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Individual institutions track a range of data for various accountability and improvement initiatives and can become inundated with data reports. However, intersegmental data analysis, whether based on analysis of summary level or individual student-level data, indicates the partnership’s collective impact on the problem the partnership is trying to solve. This Resource Guide presents four subcomponents related to Data Analysis and Reporting: Analysis and Report Planning; Individual/Aggregate Data Analysis; Data Interpretation; and Data Reporting.

DATA INFORMED PRACTICES AND POLICY

While many partnerships are engaged in data sharing, analysis, and reporting, increasing data access is but one part of their regional efforts. Collaborative work goes beyond data access to identify effective strategies for accurate data interpretations, inform interventions, and monitor a partnership’s progress. This Resource Guide presents three subcomponents related to Data Informed Practices and Policy: Data Personnel; Decision Making Processes; and Program and Policy Implications.
Leadership, Trust, and Commitment

• Leadership
• Building Trust and Shared Purpose
• Collective Commitment
Oakland Promise leaders and community members celebrate the partnership’s goal of improving the educational opportunities for students within the region.

(Photography by Hasain Rasheed)
Leadership

Effective intersegmental partnerships are inspired and sustained through the shared vision and commitment of leaders. Moreover, institutional commitment, both from senior leadership and staff who carry out the work of the partnership, is foundational to the establishment and sustainability of data partnerships over time.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Partnerships require the commitment of senior leaders from each organization both for defining the collective goals of the partnership and for allocating the resources to support partnership activities.
- The constant change in leadership among K–12 and higher education institutions brings shifts in intersegmental priorities, as well as differing levels of engagement in partnership activities.
- Partnership sustainability requires broad commitment that extends beyond senior leaders and includes the buy-in of personnel carrying out the day-to-day work.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

- Growing Inland Achievement’s Governing Board is comprised of institutional chancellors, presidents, and leaders, all of whom committed to meeting in person and to developing a set of principles to guide identification of common priority areas and norms for collaboration.
- The Long Beach College Promise prioritizes cultivating relationships between staff at different levels by bringing together the school district superintendent, college presidents, and the Mayor’s Office, as well as faculty and teachers across regional institutions. The partnership developed committees with explicit goals for collective ownership over students’ progress and norms for joint problem-solving.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

How does the partnership secure the commitment of senior leaders at participating institutions?
How does the partnership engage staff at different levels across participating institutions?
How does the partnership safeguard their priorities and goals from shifts in leadership?
ARTIFACTS

The Long Beach College Promise Guiding Principles
The Long Beach College Promise maintains several guiding principles for its initiative, including principles regarding institutional commitment and collaboration. To encourage collective commitment, LBCP emphasizes that each of the participating institutions collectively prioritize data sharing, professional development, curriculum alignment, and intersegmental collaboration.

Requisite Principles and Elements for a Successful College Promise

- **Institutional Commitment and Collaboration**
  A foundational principle to the success of College Promise initiatives is that key stakeholders are engaged early and maintain collaboration long-term. This buy-in is achieved through formal agreements between institutions, direct communication among institutional leaders, and agreement on clear metrics and benchmarks.

- **Data Sharing**
  Creating longitudinal data sharing across K-12, community college, and CSU is vital to any College Promise partnership as it facilitates better understanding of students matriculating through the K-12 - CSU pipeline. Better understanding of the effectiveness and scalability of interventions on improving adult education attainment in communities and regions will also strengthen partnerships. Data sharing is a key component of any long-term efforts to systemically improve outcomes for students.

- **Professional Development and Curriculum Alignment**
  In order for Promise initiatives to thrive it is important for faculty and key education leaders to participate in professional development activities that improve coordination, alignment, and trust between faculty and key administrative staff. Policy makers may consider ways to encourage this type of human resources alignment and trust building.

- **Collaboration Between California State University (CSU) Colleges of Education and Local School Districts**
  Since the majority of K-12 teachers in California receive some or all of their training from The CSU, policy makers may consider ways to increase the data sharing and collaboration between those colleges of education and local school districts. Effective collaboration will lead to improved teaching skills, greater alignment between the production of teaching credentials and the discipline-specific shortages that exist, and improved implementation of the career pathways and the Common Core.
Building Trust and Shared Purpose

LEADERSHIP, TRUST, AND COMMITMENT

Building a culture of trust among intersegmental partners is critical for ongoing collaboration, data sharing, and data use practices. Leaders from individual organizations must operate from a sense of shared purpose and trust in each others’ intentions.

LESSONS LEARNED

• Partnerships need to devote adequate time and resources during early stages of a partnership towards building collaborative relationships among both leaders and staff.
• A culture of collaboration and trust must be established before tackling potentially sensitive data reviews or data collection plans.
• Partnerships need to adopt a shared purpose around collective problems that are then embedded in individual institutions’ strategic plans.
• Collaboration requires time to build understanding of respective strategic priorities, operational norms, roles and responsibilities, and data practices.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• OneFuture Coachella Valley convened regional K-12, community college, and workforce development leaders to understand respective strategic priorities before examining data about local healthcare jobs, and to develop a plan to address employment gaps.
• Early Assessment Program coordinators at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo visited high schools and district offices to discuss improving the college math readiness among high school students. Cal Poly, with the assistance of Sacramento State, co-developed a senior year math course that local schools integrated into their curricula.
• Innovate Tulare-Kings convenes community and industry leaders to help businesses find the skilled workforce they need. Pathway Advisory Boards and Sector Committees review educational and workforce data to create industry profiles, develop priorities, improve pathways, and increase work-based learning opportunities.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

How does the partnership approach building a sense of community among leaders and staff?
What norms and practices does the partnership enact to promote joint problem-solving and decision making across segments?
How does the partnership ensure that collective regional goals are embedded in each institution’s strategic priorities?
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.

ARTIFACTS

Five Foundational Conditions for Collective Impact

Several partnerships, such as Innovate Tulare-Kings and the L.A. Compact, use John Kania and Mark Kramer’s (2011) five conditions of collective impact to frame the type of regional collaboration and communication needed to advance their common agenda. These conditions support partnerships in establishing a shared vision, common indicators, differentiated activities, and a strong support system.
Collective Commitment

A sense of shared purpose and collective commitment creates cohesion by channeling the strengths of each participating organization. Investments of both human capital and fiscal resources must be made to bring partners together, expand the roles of leaders and staff or hire additional personnel, and acquire the technology for data sharing, analysis, and reporting.

LESSONS LEARNED

• In the early stages, resources are needed for planning and to bring institutional leaders together to articulate a common purpose.
• Participating organizations need to expand the roles of leaders and staff or hire additional personnel.
• Both human and fiscal resources are needed to acquire the technology and personnel for data sharing and infrastructure, data analyses and reporting, and communication around data.
• Funds are needed to support regional institutions with developing and implementing innovative programs and practices aligned with the partnership’s college access and success goals.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• In implementing its data warehouse platform, leaders of all three institutions participating in The Long Beach College Promise share the cost of a data analyst to collect, organize, and analyze student data across the region.
• To support partner institutions’ development of postsecondary degree completion initiatives, Growing Inland Achievement provides annual Innovation Awards up to $150,000. These awards support innovative programs that bring together education segments (K–12, community college, and/or higher education) with multiple sectors (civic, business, and/or non-profit).
• The Sacramento Regional Partnership applied for funding related to their partnership goals of improving students’ college preparation in math. The partnership received $1.28 million in funding to redesign and expand a Senior Year Mathematics (ESM) course and to support teachers in implementation.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Has the partnership aligned the resources needed to meet its short-term and long-term priorities?

Does the partnership include data priorities in its budgeting processes?

Does the partnership actively identify possible funding sources to support specific training around data needs?

How does the partnership facilitate joint funding of shared data priorities?
**ARTIFACTS**

Sacramento State California Mathematics Readiness Challenge Initiative Budget

The Sacramento Regional Partnership strategically distributed the funds they were awarded to cover partnership operation services and the staffing expenses of each participating institution. In their budget, the partnership skillfully aligned their funding to the ESM course priorities and professional development program for teachers.

**Growing Inland Achievement Innovation Grants**

In 2018, Growing Inland Achievement awarded six Innovation Awards to support regional intersegmental initiatives targeting postsecondary success. For example, funding was awarded to the Promise Scholars Achieves Partnership to develop college role models that will support low-income high school and college students in the Ontario and Montclair areas.

### Table: CSU CMRCI Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>11/1/16-9/3/17</th>
<th>10/1/17-9/30/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Principal Investigator (4 units release time)</td>
<td>$13,850</td>
<td>$14,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Project Coordinator (4 units release time)</td>
<td>$10,946</td>
<td>$11,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Project Director and Faculty (57.75 days x 6621/day)</td>
<td>$35,863</td>
<td>$38,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Faculty, Evaluator (12 units release time)</td>
<td>$63,443</td>
<td>$36,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Faculty, Evaluator (12 units release time)</td>
<td>$27,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Faculty, Evaluator (2.5 summer weeks)</td>
<td>$15,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Faculty (4 units release time)</td>
<td>$11,424</td>
<td>$12,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU College of Education Faculty (4 units release time)</td>
<td>$9,141</td>
<td>$9,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$123,911</td>
<td>$128,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$63,443</td>
<td>$70,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$63,443</td>
<td>$70,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Other Operating Expenditures (excluding Subagreement for Services and Travel)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Travel/Project Staff Travel</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$188,054</td>
<td>$200,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (8%)</td>
<td>$31,044</td>
<td>$16,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education (Subaward) (Includes $10,862 for supplies)</td>
<td>$156,719</td>
<td>$156,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education (Sub)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Subaward</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Subaward</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Sub</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Sub</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Subaward</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Subaward (40.5 days x $1,000/day)</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subagreement for Services</strong></td>
<td>$422,219</td>
<td>$422,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$641,317</td>
<td>$638,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA PARTNERSHIP COMPONENTS/SUBCOMPONENTS

Identifying Purpose and Aligning Metrics

- Identifying Purpose
- Aligning Metrics
Aligned with the goal of increasing college readiness, access, and enrollment in the region, The Long Beach College Promise supports elementary students with a Road Map to College.
Identifying Purpose

Identifying a regional challenge that can only be resolved through collaborative work is key to bringing institutions together. Collective goals are needed to mobilize leaders and staff towards accountability for cross-institution priorities.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- As partners come together, they must agree on the problem they are working together to solve and ensure that partnership goals are aligned to the problem.
- The identification of a purpose may rely on looking at data, but does not necessarily demand the sharing of data. A single data point may indicate a regional challenge, from which collaborative solutions may be developed.
- Each segment must have an action plan tied to addressing the regional problem with accountability to the collective goals.

**PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES**

- The African American Regional Educational Alliances met with K-12, higher education, and community partners to examine publicly available college readiness data for African American students in the Bay Area. In response to the identified opportunity gaps, AAREA directed partnership efforts towards increasing college and career opportunities.
- Leaders of the L.A. Compact examined data on regional high school graduation rates and the percentage of youth ages 16-24 not in school or the workforce. Examining this data led to three partnership priorities including all students graduating from high school, being prepared for success in college, and having pathways to sustainable careers.

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS**

- What data sources does the partnership examine to determine its priorities?
- What key problems have emerged from reviewing regional data?
- What partnership goals are necessary to address these regional challenges?
- What are the corresponding responsibilities of each partner institution in meeting shared goals?
ARTIFACTS

African American Regional Educational Alliances' Theory of Change
The African American Regional Educational Alliances provides a strong example of community organizations creating intersegmental action plans to address a regional challenge. AAREA’s theory of change illustrates that disrupting the identified STEM opportunity gap in the Bay Area for African American students requires attending to multiple areas such as providing professional development, improving student preparation, and increasing parental awareness.

Model 1: Theory of Change Model

- Teacher/Practitioner Development
- Parent/Caregiver Awareness
- Student Preparation
- More Black Students with Higher Math/Science Achievement
- More Black Students Meeting A-G Eligibility
- Enhanced Quality of Life for All
Aligning Metrics

The alignment of metrics to partnership goals helps focus the work, supports a collective mindset, and facilitates measurement of the partnership’s progress in addressing targeted areas (e.g., college readiness, college persistence, graduation).

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- Partnerships need clearly identified metrics to monitor progress and unify institutions.
- Leaders should select metrics that reflect regional challenges, the partnership’s collective goals and partner institutions’ priorities.
- Leaders should select metrics where data can be feasibly collected with partnership resources and capacity.

**PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES**

- *North State Together* worked with leaders to identify common metrics, from early childhood to postsecondary education, aligned with the partnership’s goal of enhancing economic and community well-being in the region.
- *Oakland Promise* assembled leaders, studied institutional data capacity, and examined research on collective impact measures to develop cradle to career metrics and expected outcomes relevant to each partner institution.
- The *African American Regional Educational Alliances* brought together leaders to identify short- and long-term outcomes aligned to their goal of improving the educational performance of African American students (i.e., increasing students in competitive careers, baccalaureate graduates, and graduate or professional students).

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS**

Has the partnership identified metrics aligned with both collective goals and institutional priorities?

To what extent were common metrics identified through a collaborative process with partnership leaders?

Does the partnership have the resources and capacity necessary to collect the identified data?

To what extent are the identified metrics actionable across the partner institutions?
ARTIFACTS

North State Together Success Indicators
The North State Together partnership unifies multiple collaborative efforts in Northern California around six cradle to career indicators. In addition to partnerships focusing efforts towards these broader academic indicators, each county incorporates supplementary metrics specific to their needs and population.

Oakland Promise’s Brilliant Baby Program Logic Model
The logic models developed by Oakland Promise outline the metrics for which each participating institution is responsible for collecting data, while also specifying the expected outcomes from each of these indicators. Additional information is provided in this artifact regarding partnership interventions, activities, and the different short-term, mid-term, and long-term outcomes.
Data Sharing and Management

- Legal Requirements and Data Sharing Agreements
- Data Exchange and Management
- Data Matching
The African American Regional Educational Alliances convenes community leaders at their Professional Development Summit.
Legal Requirements and Data Sharing Agreements

LESSONS LEARNED

• Partnerships must reach agreement on legal interpretations of FERPA to implement their data sharing plans.
• Partnerships should develop clear data sharing agreements/Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) around collectively identified metrics for monitoring progress.
• Partnerships should allow for ample time to finalize and approve data sharing agreements/MOUs.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• The partnership agreement developed by the California College Guidance Initiative specifies the data elements being shared which includes student demographic and achievement data, course information, and student plans. The agreement adheres to the U.S. Education Code, FERPA, and Assembly Bill 1584, and includes details regarding the data collection process and who is able to access the data.
• The Santa Ana Partnership revised their MOU to incorporate details regarding data transmission practices. The MOU specified who could access the shared data, as well as the required data management and security training for each individual.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

To what extent have partnership leaders reviewed student privacy laws?
Have partnerships reviewed the legal implications for the data collection for the identified metrics?
Which institutions, leaders, and staff require access to data to enable partnership efforts?
Have leaders consulted best practice guidelines in constructing data sharing agreements?
Artifacts

California College Guidance Initiative Data Privacy and Security Addendum

California College Guidance Initiative’s Data Sharing and Services Partnership Agreement includes a data privacy and security addendum. This portion details the federal and state data privacy and security compliance measures the partnership must follow. This agreement outlines who has access to data and what falls under unauthorized disclosure in order to adhere to FERPA, 1998 COPPA, California Assembly Bill 1584, and Student Online Personal Information Protection Act.

III. WHO HAS ACCESS TO DATA (AUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE)

A. The information from student’s portfolios is only disclosed to the officials or employees of the following groups who have a legitimate interest in the information for purposes consistent with this Partnership Agreement:

1. Foundation (collects and maintains Student Data)
2. Vendor (maintains Student Data)
3. California Colleges Website and FTP infrastructure (will not access or use content for any purpose other than as legally required and for maintaining services, and will not directly process or access content)
4. Any Authorized Third Party listed in Exhibit A to this Partnership Agreement (can view Student Data once a student has linked their account to that entity)
5. Any College or College System to which a System User has applied for admission (can be provided Student Data for the purposes of admission, enrollment, matriculation, placement and supportive services)
6. System-wide Offices of Educational Segments in California and their employees, contractors, and vendors with a legitimate educational interest in the data for the purpose of performing longitudinal analysis
7. Any Financial Aid Organization to which a System User has applied for aid, or with whom the District has legally shared Student Data under California law, including, but not limited to, the California Student Aid Commission (“CSAC”).
   a) Under California Education Code §69432.9 Districts are generally required to provide and verify their student’s grade point average to the CSAC for the Cal Grant Program application. The Foundation, on behalf of CCGI, and the CSAC may provide PII to CSAC to support CSAC’s data matching process by providing CSAC data elements that help to associate the correct SSID with the student’s FAFSA if it is launched via the CaliforniaColleges.edu platform. This data matching assistance helps to facilitate the determination of Cal Grant Program eligibility for students who attend and graduate from a District.
8. Foundation may provide Student Data in an aggregated, non-personally identifiable form, to other contracted entities for the purpose of evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the CCGI program.

B. The Parties shall maintain policies and procedures for the designation and training of responsible staff members to ensure the confidentiality and security of Student Data. The Foundation provides data security and privacy training on an annual basis to CCGI staff handling student data. The training covers Federal, State, and Local regulations for maintenance of student data, as well as best practices. All new staff undergo data security and privacy training prior to gaining access to CaliforniaColleges.edu. All data is encrypted both at rest and during transmission using commercially reasonable practices.

IV. UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE

A. The Foundation agrees to maintain an incident response program for purposes of memorializing Foundation’s obligations under applicable law in the event Foundation detects any loss due to a Data Breach, or unauthorized access or use of Education Records or Student Data. Upon confirmation of a Data Breach, Foundation will notify District in accordance with its obligations under applicable law.

B. District is responsible for any notices to parents as may be required under applicable law and for providing the parent(s), guardian(s) or student(s) with an opportunity to inspect and challenge the contents of the Student Data in question. The Foundation shall cooperate with the District in providing such notices and opportunities to review and challenge the content of the Student Data.

C. The District agrees to cooperate fully with Foundation to ensure Foundation can comply with any notification obligations Foundation may have to student or any other parties for which notification by Foundation may be required under FERPA and any other applicable law.

Data Sharing and Services Partnership Agreement
Agreement No. CG-XXX-17
Exhibit B
Data Exchange and Management

LESSONS LEARNED
- Data must be transferred in a manner that ensures the security of student information.
- Data must be securely stored and data custodians identified.
- Partnerships should weigh their internal capacity for data exchange and management with an alternative option of third-party data management organizations.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES
- Fresno Unified Equity and Access developed a centralized data warehouse, the Beta Tool, which allows staff to run queries and generate reports at varying levels of aggregation.
- OneFuture facilitates a cross-institution Data Team that gathers data on the Regional Plan for College and Career Success goals. Riverside County Office of Education co-chairs the Data Team and leads data reporting efforts for the partner districts. The districts signed MOUs with the Linked Learning Alliance to achieve consistency in reporting.
- Some partnerships engage third-party organizations, such as California College Guidance Initiative or Cal-PASS Plus, to manage their data exchange.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS
How do partner institutions transfer data and to what extent do these processes follow security protocols?
What is the most appropriate platform for sharing data that aligns with the goals of the partnership?
Do the partnering institutions have the necessary capacity to transfer, manage, and store data? Would the partnership benefit from third party organizations?
ARTIFACTS

Fresno Unified Equity and Access A-G Course Monitoring Tool

Fresno Unified Equity and Access developed a centralized data warehouse system that enables data sharing of indicators related to equity and access. For example, the A-G Course Monitoring tool calculates college readiness measures and creates exportable information sheets for staff to reference. The real-time accessibility of this warehouse to partnership personnel reduces the amount of time-intensive manual data entry that other exchange methods require.
Data Matching

LESSONS LEARNED

• Data leaders must document and understand how partner institutions use different coding schemes to identify students.
• Data leaders must identify protocols for matching individual-level data across systems to minimize imperfect matches.
• Partnerships should consider the pros and cons of using third-party organizations (e.g., Cal-PASS Plus, California Council Guidance Initiative) to merge data from multiple organizations.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• To examine students’ progress in career pathways, the Contra Costa Community College District partnership explored different approaches, including facilitating data merges internally with participating institutions and accessing cross-institutional data provided by Cal-PASS Plus.
• OneFuture Coachella relies on the partnership’s Data Team, which includes representatives from partner organizations, to facilitate collection and merging of district- and student-level data such as career pathway completion, college readiness, college enrollment and persistence, and financial aid application.
• The Fresno Unified Equity and Access partnership uses Cal-PASS Plus to match K-12, Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California student data with 95% accuracy.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Which metrics, if any, are priorities for the partnership to collect at an individual-level?
What questions will matched individual-level data enable the partnership to answer?
Has the partnership weighed the pros and cons of internal data matching versus utilizing a third-party organization?
ARTIFACTS

Contra Costa Community College District Partnership and Orange County Pathways Data Matching Processes

Some K-14 partnerships, such as the Contra Costa Community College District partnership and Orange County Pathways, prioritize the collection and matching of student-level data from local high schools and community colleges. Contra Costa Community College District has implemented different approaches, including internal data-matching protocols, to merge data from Contra Costa County Office of Education and Contra Costa Community College District to examine the transition of students from K-12 to community college. Orange County Pathways linked local K-12 and community college student data to examine trends in career and technical education pathway enrollment across institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>Contra Costa Community College District Partnership and Orange County Pathways Data Matching Processes</th>
<th>2014-15 CTE Transition Tool</th>
<th>Percent Enrollment into Related Pathway between K12 and CC</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>CTE</th>
<th>Non CTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUHSD</td>
<td>Potential 2,208 Non CTE 3,409</td>
<td>43% 40%</td>
<td>Enrolled 949                      1,364</td>
<td>Actual   11 47</td>
<td>Percentage 35% 24%</td>
<td>Same PW ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUSD</td>
<td>Potential 93 Non CTE 440</td>
<td>41% 44%</td>
<td>Actual 38                                194</td>
<td>Actual   247 374</td>
<td>Percentage 36% 34%</td>
<td>Same PW 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSD</td>
<td>Potential 2,323 Non CTE 1,807</td>
<td>43% 37%</td>
<td>Actual 999                               669</td>
<td>Actual   452 638</td>
<td>Percentage 43% 45%</td>
<td>Same PW 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJUHSD</td>
<td>Potential 1,897 Non CTE 1,820</td>
<td>39% 40%</td>
<td>Actual 470                               728</td>
<td>Actual   229 712</td>
<td>Percentage 46% 42%</td>
<td>Same PW 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGUSD</td>
<td>Potential 2,659 Non CTE 1,318</td>
<td>46% 31%</td>
<td>Actual 1,223                             409</td>
<td>Actual   671 1,107</td>
<td>Percentage 45% 47%</td>
<td>Same PW 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIUHSD</td>
<td>Potential 2,367 Non CTE 2,033</td>
<td>45% 37%</td>
<td>Actual 1,065                             752</td>
<td>Actual   630 491</td>
<td>Percentage 50% 39%</td>
<td>Same PW 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUSD</td>
<td>Potential 460 Non CTE 1,941</td>
<td>42% 37%</td>
<td>Actual 193                               718</td>
<td>Actual   368 392</td>
<td>Percentage 43% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Potential 185 Non CTE 542</td>
<td>40% 33%</td>
<td>Actual 74                                179</td>
<td>ACTUAL   10,868 11,645</td>
<td>AVG % 42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBUSD</td>
<td>Potential 31 Non CTE 195</td>
<td>35% 24%</td>
<td>Actual 11                                47</td>
<td>Percentage 35% 24%</td>
<td>Same PW ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMUSD</td>
<td>Potential 685 Non CTE 1,100</td>
<td>36% 34%</td>
<td>Actual 247                               374</td>
<td>Percentage 36% 34%</td>
<td>Same PW 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUSD</td>
<td>Potential 1,052 Non CTE 1,418</td>
<td>43% 45%</td>
<td>Actual 452                               638</td>
<td>Percentage 43% 45%</td>
<td>Same PW 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYLUSD</td>
<td>Potential 497 Non CTE 1,696</td>
<td>46% 42%</td>
<td>Actual 229                               712</td>
<td>Percentage 46% 42%</td>
<td>Same PW 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUSD</td>
<td>Potential 1,491 Non CTE 2,356</td>
<td>45% 47%</td>
<td>Actual 671                               1,107</td>
<td>Percentage 45% 47%</td>
<td>Same PW 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVUSD</td>
<td>Potential 1,260 Non CTE 1,260</td>
<td>50% 39%</td>
<td>Actual 630                               491</td>
<td>Percentage 50% 39%</td>
<td>Same PW 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUSD</td>
<td>Potential 856 Non CTE 1,032</td>
<td>43% 38%</td>
<td>Actual 368                               392</td>
<td>Percentage 43% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT PTL</td>
<td>Potential 25,591 Non CTE 30,754</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>ACTUAL 10,868                           11,645</td>
<td>AVG % 42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>10,868 11,645</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG %</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td>42% 38%</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same PW</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Same PW 761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014-15

Percent Enrollment into Related Pathway between K12 and CC

K-14 CTE Transition Tool

2014-15
DATA PARTNERSHIP COMPONENTS/SUBCOMPONENTS

Data Analysis and Reporting

• Analysis and Report Planning
• Individual/Aggregate Data Analysis
• Data Interpretation
• Data Reporting
Innovate Tulare-Kings shares the partnership’s yearly progress to key stakeholders through a readily accessible online report.
Analysis and Report Planning

LESSONS LEARNED

Partnerships should articulate clear inquiry questions that drive their data analysis.

Data planning should include considerations of how results can be presented in accessible forms that facilitate reflection across partner institutions.

Partnerships should assess the need for scaffolding among both leaders and staff in the interpretation of data reports.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

The Fresno Unified Equity and Access partnership’s focus on creating a pipeline to higher education led to the analysis and reporting of multiple measures of college readiness on its regional dashboard.

The African American Regional Educational Alliances employs a comparative methodology which examines multiple aggregate-level data sources to generate hypotheses concerning the educational outcomes of African American students and to inform partnership interventions.

The Santa Ana Partnership has evolved its scorecard to capture and monitor priority college readiness, college going, persistence, and degree completion rates, including disaggregation of results by targeted student subgroups.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

What questions is the partnership interested in answering with available data?

How will the partnership approach analyzing and reporting their identified data?

What opportunities exist to involve community members, business leaders, and other stakeholders in the analysis and reflection of data reports?
**Evaluation Design**

**Data Analysis Framework Worksheet**

**Data Analysis Exercise**

You are analyzing a STEM STEPS summer program. This was a four week program that took place at RT Fisher Educational Enterprises. It was administered in three classrooms. Each classroom is considered a separate cohort for data analysis. Additionally, the same curricula models were administered in each class. The STEM STEPS evaluation team is examining pre and post MDTP data. To better understand performance trends they have compiled data from MDTP, PEAR DoS Observations, and Student Surveys. The team has created a data profile for each class (See Table 1, p. 5). Referencing this table please complete the following.

1. Develop a data summary that analyzes MDTP performance for each class. Present overall MDTP performance and factors that may have contributed to this performance. (Note: this item demonstrates a mixed methods and triangulation approach to data analysis).

2. Develop a comparative summary of MDTP performance across all three classes. What are general trends present in the data? What factors may contribute to these trends (positive or negative)? What recommendations should be considered to strengthen program efforts? (Note: this item demonstrates a constant comparative approach to data analysis).

3. Once you have written your analysis for Question 1 and 2, review the answer key provided on pages 6 – 8 and compare your response to what is presented. In what ways are the analyses similar; in what ways are they different.
Individual/Aggregate Data Analysis

LESSONS LEARNED

• Partnerships should map out the ideal individual and/or aggregate data needed to answer the partnerships’ questions.

• Leaders should explore the extent to which aggregate-level data analysis can satisfy internal and external evaluation needs.

• Leaders should assess the human, fiscal, legal, and technical resources needed to conduct individual-level data analysis.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• OneFuture Coachella Valley analyzes aggregate-level college and career data to meet their five-year goals (e.g., 30%+ students enrolled in career academy, 80%+ students have personalized graduation plans, 85% FAFSA completion rates, 10% increase in high school graduation rates, etc.). Through the use of aggregate-level data, the partnership need not absorb the additional technical and staffing costs associated with student-level data.

• The Santa Ana Partnership analyzed individual-level data from the Santa Ana Unified School District and Santa Ana College to explore the percentage of students entering from the district that place into college-level math and English courses and their course outcomes.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

To what extent can a partnership’s questions be answered with aggregate-level data?

To what extent can a partnership’s questions be answered with individual-level data?

What resources can the partnership devote to collecting, analyzing, and reporting individual-level data?
ARTIFACTS

Santa Ana Partnership Dashboard

The Santa Ana Partnership’s Tableau Dashboard demonstrates how the partnership analyzes individual-level data to examine the academic performance of Santa Ana Unified School District graduates attending Santa Ana College. This level of data analysis provides information regarding Santa Ana College English and math course completion rates.
Data Interpretation

Ongoing professional development standardizes the interpretation of data analysis and results. Partnership leaders may be less familiar with data from other segments.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Partnerships should assess the level of support needed by leaders and staff to interpret data analysis and understand graphs and charts.
- Partnerships should consider a range of individual and group structures to build capacity for data interpretation.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

- The Santa Cruz County College Commitment partnership supports counselors in the use of data to inform advising practices, including using college enrollment data from the National Student Clearinghouse.
- Santa Ana College’s Office of Research offers training workshops and drop-in support for leaders in understanding the partnership’s data dashboards.
- Fresno Unified School District provides training and one-on-one principal supports around interpreting data reports.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

What data interpretation needs do partnership leaders and staff have?
What data interpretation training and supports are needed to build leader and staff capacity?
What opportunities exist to bring leaders and staff from across partner organizations to participate in professional development together?
ARTIFACTS

Santa Cruz County College Commitment Counselor Data Training
The Santa Cruz County College Commitment facilitated professional training to support counselors in their interpretation and use of postsecondary student data from the National Student Clearinghouse repository. Additional support was provided regarding the use of the California Department of Education’s School Dashboard and College and Career Indicator to inform practice. The professional development strengthens collaborative efforts by ensuring the standardization of data across K-12 and postsecondary partnership leaders and staff members.
Data Reporting

Reporting is central to ensuring data is accessible and actionable. To be effective, data reporting must be aligned to the learning and accountability needs of the partnership.

LESSONS LEARNED

• Partnerships should identify the range of reporting requirements associated with grant funding, monitoring of strategic goals, community updates, and internal learning questions.

• Partnerships should explore different platforms for sharing their data, including dashboards, scorecards, progress reports, etc.

• Leaders should ensure that data reporting can inform the evaluation and improvement of partnership programs and activities.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

• The Central Valley Higher Education Consortium developed a publicly accessible dashboard that reports on several metrics including college enrollment, transfer rates, units earned, and degree completion rates.

• The Oakland Promise 2018 Annual Community Report presents outcome data on the partnership’s cradle to career initiatives, including current rates, 2018 goals, and 2025 targets.

• The Long Beach College Promise showcases the results of their collaborative work on college access and success in their Ten-Year Progress Report.

• Innovate Tulare-Kings generates an annual report to the community that presents its shared mission and vision, impact results, champion network, and workforce partnerships.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

What are the partnership’s various reporting requirements?

Which reporting format is best suited to the expectations of each intended audience?

What reporting formats are most accessible and actionable for partnership leaders and staff?
**ARTIFACTS**

**Central Valley Higher Education Consortium Data Dashboard**
The *Central Valley Higher Education Consortium* created an online dashboard for reporting data relevant to their partnership efforts. This dashboard presents community college demographic and achievement results for community colleges in the region based on information from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office DataMart.

**Innovate Tulare-Kings’ Workforce Impact**
*Innovate Tulare-Kings* shares the results of their partnership efforts through an annual report. Through this platform, *Innovate Tulare-Kings* reports on progress related to their goals for work-based learning, internships, regional events, etc.
DATA PARTNERSHIP COMPONENTS/SUBCOMPONENTS

Data Informed Practices and Policy

- Data Personnel
- Decision Making Process
- Program and Policy Implications
In December 2016, community leaders participated in L.A.Compact’s Data Walk, using data to inform partnership interventions.
Data Personnel

Intersegmental data activities can in some cases overwhelm existing institutional research and data staff. Effective data partnerships identify adequate personnel and staffing structures to facilitate data use practices.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Partnerships need to map specific roles and responsibilities as they relate to data management, analysis and reporting to determine hiring needs.
- Partnerships should consider creating data teams comprised of members across organizations to identify metrics, conduct analysis, and support interpretation of results with partnership leaders.
- Partnerships should explore the role of third parties to facilitate data usage, such as intermediaries (e.g., county office of education), service providers (e.g., Cal-PASS Plus), or independent consultants.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES

- OneFuture Coachella Valley created several positions—Director of Research, Data Project Coordinator, Data Analyst—to meet a range of needs, including facilitating an intersegmental data team, conducting data collection and analyses, working with intermediaries that support data collection, and generating reports and dashboards for each partner organization.
- Growing Inland Achievement developed a data team to create a regional scorecard, monitor metrics to measure progress towards goals, and support leaders in interpreting data. Additionally, they hired a Director of Research to coordinate the Institutional Researchers from each organization to leverage their institutional data to track regional metrics.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

To what extent has the partnership embedded data use responsibilities into leader and staff roles?
What roles do data committees and data teams play within the partnership?
What data usage activities require external supports and resources?
ARTIFACTS

OneFuture Team Oversight Structure

OneFuture Coachella Valley created a graphical representation of their oversight structure which enables effective use of partnership resources. This map illustrates the partnership’s partitioning of personnel into distinct teams related to college and career success.
Decision Making Processes

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- Leaders must routinely collect and review intersegmental data to monitor progress towards regional goals.
- Partnerships should routinely implement inquiry or reflection protocols to facilitate sense-making across segments.
- Partnerships need to ensure that data teams include leaders with decision making authority.

**PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES**

- As part of their data driven decision making process, The Long Beach College Promise Steering Committee identifies questions to study, examines data, and articulates regional policy recommendations.
- Leaders of the L.A. Compact conduct Data Walks for partners, where members of the Data Workgroup facilitate small group discussions at poster stations displaying local achievement trends.
- Santa Cruz County College Commitment’s decision making process involves a steering committee comprised of superintendents from each of their K-12 districts and representatives from higher education partners. The steering committee is responsible for consensus-based decisions regarding the partnership’s strategic priorities and focus areas.

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS**

How do partnership leaders routinely examine progress towards regional goals?
What processes do partnerships implement to draw actionable implications from data reports?
How do partnership leaders engage staff around findings to promote collaboration?
ARTIFACTS

L.A. Compact Data Walk for Analyzing Student and Youth Progress

*L.A. Compact* employs an engaging approach to intersegmental decision making processes through their Data Walk. The Data Walk creates a space for key partnership stakeholders to discuss and reflect on the partnership’s progress on student and youth outcomes. Guided small group poster discussions promote greater alignment between community and *L.A. Compact* partners.

![Image of Data Walk engaged community members]

**Data Walk Analyzes Student Progress**

L.A. Compact Data Walk engages Compact member to collectively analyze student progress

UNITE-LA released its third and most comprehensive L.A. Compact measures report, entitled “Charting Progress Toward L.A. Compact Goals.” This report serves as a tool for the community and for L.A. Compact partners to better align and improve our collective impact efforts.

To roll out the report and bring attention to recent trends for our students and youth, UNITE-LA held its first L.A. Compact Data Walk on Dec. 12, 2016. At this event, members of the Compact’s 14 workgroups, plus other community leaders, engaged with data by visiting poster stations displaying select charts from the report. Small-group discussions at each poster station were facilitated by experts from the L.A. Compact Data Workgroup (a cross-sector working group of leading data, research, and evaluation professionals from key L.A. institutions). (See twitter feed of the December 12 Data Walk).

The L.A. Compact is a collaborative of Los Angeles’ leading education, government, labor, business, and non-profit institutions, convened by UNITE-LA. The Compact was born in 2008, out of a shared belief that no one agency could singlehandedly solve the complex, large-scale education and workforce readiness problems facing our region. Today, 23 Los Angeles leaders have signed the L.A. Compact’s collective commitment to transform regional outcomes from cradle to career. Signatories have pledged to put the interest of students first; to work together in support of three ambitious, systemic goals; and to regularly measure the progress of our youth:

**GOAL 1:** All students graduate from high school

**GOAL 2:** All students have access to and are prepared for success in college

**GOAL 3:** All students have access to pathways to sustainable jobs and careers
Data is central to driving partnerships’ ongoing improvement of programs and policies.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- Partnership leaders must use findings from data analyses to monitor progress towards collective impact goals and to drive regional change.
- Partnerships must maintain a continuous improvement orientation in applying evidence to improving programs and policies.
- Partnerships must identify specific implications and recommendations for institutions across the region.

**PARTNERSHIP APPROACHES**

- In response to low college STEM course completion rates, *The Long Beach College Promise* worked with Long Beach Unified School District to increase high school math graduation requirements.
- *OneFuture Coachella Valley* used data to inform strategies for building a talent pipeline. Strategies included establishing career pathways in high school, setting goals for college access, enrollment and financial aid, awarding $1.3 million in scholarships annually, and expanding work-based learning opportunities.
- The *Central Valley Higher Education Consortium* conducted research with partner organizations on postsecondary completion barriers for foster youth and generated policy recommendations related to tuition, housing, academic preparation, and campus awareness.

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS**

What structures and processes does the partnership maintain for leaders to discuss implications from the data?

What structures and processes are in place for staff in partner organizations to discuss implications?

What policy changes might support or improve the partnership’s efforts?
Central Valley Higher Education Policy Recommendations for Supporting Foster Youth
The Central Valley Higher Education Consortium utilized data on educational barriers and challenges that foster youth experience to inform their policy and program recommendations. Moreover, their recommendations provide policymakers direction on how to support efforts to improve the educational outcomes of foster youth at the state and regional level.

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.
Map of Intersegmental Data Partnerships

Note: Some of the above partnerships cover multiple cities and counties. Thus, this graphic is not meant to display the full reach of the partnerships.
Directory of Partnerships

African American Regional Education Alliances
Robyn Fisher
Executive Director
robyn@rtfisher.com

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
Frances Mayer
Lecturer, School of Education
fmayer@calpoly.edu

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
Sidonie Wiedenkeller
Lecturer, School of Education
swiedenk@calpoly.edu

Central Valley Higher Education Consortium
Benjamin Duran
Executive Director
bduran@csufresno.edu

Central Valley Higher Education Consortium
Virginia Madrid-Salazar
Strategies Lead
vmadridsalazar@csufresno.edu

Fresno Unified Equity and Access Partnership
Adam Bonilla
Administrative Analyst
adambonilla@fresnounified.org

Growing Inland Achievement
Ann Marie Allen
Senior Director
annmarie@inlandempiregia.org

Innovate Tulare-Kings
Jennie Bautista
Business Services Program Manager, Workforce Investment Board of Tulare County
jbautista@tularewib.org

Long Beach College Promise
Simon Kim
Associate Vice President, Research and Sponsored Programs, California State University, Long Beach
simon.kim@csulb.edu

L.A. Compact
Lisa Catanzarite
Vice President, Research and Evaluation
LCatanzarite@LACHamber.com

L.A. Compact
Paola Santana
Director of Education and Workforce Development
PSantana@LACHamber.com

Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortia
Stephanie Feger
Grant Director, K-14 Career Pathways, Coast Community College District
sfeger@cccdd.edu

North and East Bay Pathways Consortium
Janine Spadafore Kaiser
Principal, Compass Policy Strategies
kaiser@compasspolicy.com

North State Together
Kevin O’Rorke
CEO
kororke@shastacollege.edu

Oakland Promise
Tim Marlowe
Project Director for Data and Evaluation
tmarlowe@oaklandnet.com

OneFuture Coachella Valley
Sheila Thornton
President/CEO
sheila@onefuturecv.org

Orange County Pathways
Jeff Hittenberger
Chief Academic Officer, Orange County Department of Education
jhittenberger@ocde.us

Sacramento Regional Partnership
Joy Salvetti
Director, Center for College & Career Readiness, Sacramento State University
jsalvetti@csus.edu

Santa Ana Partnership
Alicia Kruizenga
Dean, Office of School and Community Partnerships, Santa Ana College
Kruizenga_Alicia@sac.edu

Santa Cruz County College Commitment
Cristine Chopra
Executive Director, Santa Cruz County Office of Education
cchopra@santacruzcoe.org
Intersegmental Data Support Organizations

ALLIANCE FOR REGIONAL COLLABORATION TO HEIGHTEN EDUCATION SUCCESS

The Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) is a statewide voluntary confederation of regional collaboratives. Composed of schools, community colleges, four year colleges and universities, businesses, community and family organizations, ARCHES aims to create and sustain alliances dedicated to addressing the disparities in achievement for California students. ARCHES supports intersegmental, multi-sector regional collaboratives (ARCHES Alliance) to eliminate the resource and opportunity gaps among student groups, boost student success, and facilitate college and career readiness for students from socio-economic and racial-ethnic communities with historically low college-going rates. ARCHES provides technical assistance to Alliance members at each stage of their development to increase their success towards their common aim of closing opportunity gaps and increasing student’s college readiness, enrollment, and completion.

CAL-PASS PLUS

Cal-PASS Plus, created through leadership and funding by California Community College Chancellor’s Office, is an accessible, actionable and collaborative pre-K through 16 system of student data. Cal-PASS Plus’ mission is to provide actionable data to help improve student success along the education-to-workforce pipeline. Regional collaboration using this data will inform better instruction, help close achievement gaps, identify scalable best practices, and improve transitions. Cal-PASS Plus offers longitudinal data charts, detailed analysis of pre-K through 16 transitions and workplace outcomes, information and artifacts on success factors, and comparisons among like universities, colleges, K-12 school systems and schools. The system is free and voluntary, and the data currently covers three quarters of all K-12 students, all California Community Colleges and about half of the CSU and UC campuses.

CALIFORNIA COLLEGE GUIDANCE INITIATIVE

Housed at the Foundation for California Community Colleges, the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI) works to ensure that all 6th-12th grade students in California have access to a systematic baseline of guidance and support as they plan, prepare, and pay for post-secondary education and training. CCGI has two overarching objectives: 1) All high school seniors graduate with a thoughtful, well-informed, post-secondary plan, and 2) Students’ academic transcript, unique identifier, and college and career planning data follow them in a manner that reduces information gaps that hinder student success. CCGI partners with K-12 school districts to support students, counselors, parents, and community-based organizations with technological tools that help guide the college and career planning and preparation process. The same technological platform houses, audits and transmits student data to help ensure more accurate and efficient decisions regarding admissions, financial aid and course placement.

INTERSEGMENTAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) is the programmatic arm of the California Education Round Table. Composed of staff, faculty, and student representatives from all sectors of education, the ICC has responsibility for fostering collaboration within California’s educational community at all levels through conducting activities and supporting strategies that link the public schools, community colleges, and baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities. In addition to working on specific educational projects, this Committee is situated to be a communications hub for discussions about policy issues of mutual interest to the educational sectors in the state.
LEADERSHIP, TRUST, AND COMMITMENT

DATA INFORMED PRACTICES AND POLICY

IDENTIFYING PURPOSE AND ALIGNING METRICS

DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT
ABOUT PACE

Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) is an independent, non-partisan research center led by faculty directors at Stanford University, the University of Southern California, the University of California Davis, the University of California Los Angeles, and the University of California Berkeley. PACE seeks to define and sustain a long-term strategy for comprehensive policy reform and continuous improvement in performance at all levels of California’s education system, from early childhood to postsecondary education and training. PACE bridges the gap between research and policy, working with scholars from California’s leading universities and with state and local policymakers to increase the impact of academic research on educational policy in California.

Founded in 1983, PACE

- Publishes policy briefs, research reports, and working papers that address key policy issues in California’s education system.
- Convenes seminars and briefings that make current research accessible to policy audiences throughout California.
- Provides expert testimony on educational issues to legislative committees and other policy audiences.
- Works with local school districts and professional associations on projects aimed at supporting policy innovation, data use, and rigorous evaluation.