Education Insights Center

Advancing Research and Policy
for K-12 and Postsecondary Education

Organizing for Success: California's Regional Education Partnerships

March 2015

Colleen Moore
Andrea Venezia
Jodi Lewis
Bina Lefkovitz

SACRAMENTO STATE

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Tahoe Hall 3065
Sacramento, California 95819-6081
www.csus.edu/edinsights
@EdInsightsCtr

Contents

Acknowledgments **2**

Executive Summary **3**

Introduction **4**

Findings **8**

The Importance of Setting the Stage for Collaborative Efforts 8
Perceived Promising Strategies 11
Challenges Facing the Partnerships 16

Concluding Thoughts **21**

Roles and Responsibilities to Support Regional Partnerships 21

Notes **23**

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, the authors wish to thank the 37 interviewees from across the state who gave of their time and who spoke candidly about their experiences. Thank you to our funders, the James Irvine and College Futures Foundations, for supporting this research and to our program officers, Elizabeth González and Marty Campbell, for their thoughtful advice and counsel throughout the research and writing processes. We are grateful for the wisdom of our expert reviewers: Camille Esch, Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, Paola Santana, and Joel Vargas for pushing our thinking and providing us with excellent critiques. We also thank our editor, Catherine Foss, at the Foundation for California Community Colleges for her excellent editorial work to prepare this report for publication. Finally, we extend our gratitude to Nancy Shulock, the founding Executive Director of the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy (now EdInsights), for her work to conceptualize this project.

Executive Summary

> "There's a saying—collaboration moves at the speed of trust… There's a lot of groundwork that has to be laid…That trust often takes years to develop."
>
> *– Administrator in an Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

As education reforms increasingly focus on the needs of students as they cross education systems and enter the workforce, regional partnerships, or consortia, are developing across the country to meet a wide range of students' needs. While regional partnerships have existed in different forms for decades to serve community needs, current partnerships are focusing on connecting education systems to prevent students—particularly traditionally underserved students—from falling through the cracks. Specific efforts can include: aligning curricular expectations across high school and college to reduce the need for remedial coursework; working with business partners to develop curricular pathways, degree programs, and certificate programs that will help students find meaningful employment and help regions meet workforce needs; and improving student support services to increase high school and college graduation rates.

There is a great deal of experimentation with different kinds of regional partnerships across California. This report is aimed at encouraging new and existing partnerships to learn from the growth and development of current partnerships. It highlights issues that support or impede consortia processes, their work to support student success, and their sustainability. The information used in this report came from 37 interviews with stakeholders from 19 regional consortia located throughout California. The audiences for this report are three-fold: 1) education, community, and business leaders engaged with regional partnerships; 2) state agency staff who could provide an enabling environment for regional partnerships to thrive; and 3) philanthropic organizations that support cross-sector collaboration.

While it is too early to draw conclusions about effective strategies, there are some clear implications that arose from this research. For example, representatives of all the consortia noted that building trusting relationships is one of the largest challenges faced by these consortia in the early stages, and constant attention and time must be devoted to maintaining them for the long run. Having a base of trusting relationships makes it easier to develop and maintain a common agenda to serve the larger community. The job of facilitating trust-building conversations and activities falls to the lead organization, which must be viewed as the appropriate entity for that work by all of the participating entities from the start.

This report describes the following strategies suggested by representatives of the studied partnerships:

- Start with a coalition of the willing,
- Focus on a few main goals,
- Foster involvement of key leaders,
- Leverage existing networks,
- Create opportunities for cross-system communication and collaboration,
- Embed activities in existing organizations, and
- Use data to motivate action and inform activities.

The report concludes with suggestions to help state policy and philanthropic communities better support regional partnerships.

Introduction

Across California and the nation, regional partnerships are becoming an important part of efforts to increase the rate at which students graduate from high school and complete postsecondary certificates and degrees. Regional partnerships usually involve a combination of representatives from among local K-12 schools and districts; postsecondary institutions; and business, civic and community-based organizations (such as chambers of commerce). These consortia can help provide an infrastructure to set goals, provide capacity, link systems, and monitor progress—focused on supporting educational attainment and economic prosperity for individuals, regions, and the state as a whole.

The recent growth of regional partnerships across the state provides an opportunity to learn from consortia that serve a diverse array of populations and have varied goals, objectives, and strategies. This report is aimed at encouraging new and existing partnerships to learn from the growth and development of current partnerships. It includes information gathered from 37 interviews with stakeholders from 19 regional consortia located throughout California in order to identify important components of their structures, relationships, goals, and activities. The studied regional consortia all focused on student transitions across education systems and, often, into the workforce. The report highlights issues that support or impede consortia processes, their work to support student success, and the sustainability of the partnerships. It is critically important to note that changing opportunities for students across education systems—both in terms of what they learn at each stage of their educations and whether they earn a postsecondary certificate or degree—takes many years.

The report begins with a discussion of why better regional coordination is needed. It provides evidence of the need to improve educational attainment in California, and a description of some of the ways in which government and philanthropic organizations are encouraging and funding collaborative work. Then, it highlights promising strategies for regional collaboration, and discusses some of the challenges partnerships face. The report concludes with thoughts about possible state and philanthropic roles to support regional partnerships.

> "We cannot educate children alone…People want to be part of the solution and creating a consortium allows for this…It allows us to leverage resources and better serve students."
>
> *– School District Administrator*

Better Regional Coordination Needed to Improve Educational Attainment

The case has been made that a larger proportion of California's student population must earn a postsecondary certificate or degree.[1] Data show problems in the state's education "pipeline," particularly for the growing populations of students historically underrepresented in higher education. Many high school graduates are not prepared for college, completion rates are low at the colleges and universities serving the large majority of the state's students, and there are significant achievement gaps across student populations. For example, just over half of incoming freshmen in the California State University (CSU) system graduate within six years.[2] The six-year graduation rate for white students is 59 percent, for Latinos is 45 percent, and for Black students is 36 percent.

Higher education institutions are being asked to improve these student outcomes and reduce the disparities with less state funding, due to large budget cuts during the Great Recession. For example, state General Fund allocations per student have fallen by more than 40 percent at CSU in the past decade.[3] In an environment of scarce resources, regional partnerships are a way to leverage funding and personnel.

Many other states are developing statewide goals and comprehensive plans to increase educational attainment and improve outcomes across educational systems. California is not. Absent a state agenda that encompasses the various educational systems—and absent state-level P-16 longitudinal data systems, governance structures, finance systems, and incentives for collaboration—regional partnerships appear to be a promising strategy to achieve better-aligned reforms, since they focus on workforce and educational issues that are relevant for particular areas of this large and diverse state. Starting at a regional level is one way to move toward more coherence as a state; if a large number of regions engage in similar reforms, that could create an environment in which there is a shared understanding about what it takes to support increased student success and provide an opportunity for educators across the state to learn from each other.

There are many indications that this type of partnership activity is important to state officials. For example, California Senate Bill 1070 calls for "close collaboration and careful articulation" between regional K-12, postsecondary, and business and labor organizations in order to "reduce the state's unacceptably high rate of school dropouts, increase student success in postsecondary education and training, and contribute to the state's job growth and economic vitality."[4] Along with the state's $500 million investment in the Career Pathways Trust (CPT),[5] and the Governor's recent $50 million appropriation for Awards for Innovation in Higher

> "Our economies are regional and so it makes sense we are working together as a region… [but] we do not have the structure in place to support regional work long term."
>
> *– Community College Administrator*

Education to support such collaborative efforts,[6] there is a growing emphasis at the state level on education, business, and community partners working together, regionally and locally, to support both student success and economic growth. Many philanthropic foundations are also emphasizing regional collaboration through their investments in the state. They recognize that the state's education systems cannot meet demands for a more educated populace in isolation from each other, yet there are traditionally few forums or incentives for sustainable cross-system collaboration, or for education and business partnerships. With the infusion of state and philanthropic dollars in recent years, collaborative efforts have grown—both in terms of the number and size of partnerships.

Funding Opportunities that Support Regional Collaboration

Several state and federal agencies are using financial incentives to support regional approaches. For example, the U.S. Department of Labor's Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) program provides grants to improve career training, requiring that community colleges form partnerships with employers to ensure that programs are meeting regional workforce needs.

At the state level, the California Workforce Investment Board's (CWIB) strategic plan specifically calls for aligning the state's workforce institutions and programs around regional needs.[7] The CWIB's Project SlingShot is seeding

collaborative efforts by workforce, economic development, and education partners to identify and solve regionally-defined employment challenges. The Governor's recently proposed budget includes $750 million over the next three years for a new Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program that would prioritize school districts that apply in partnership with other education entities to provide regional programs.[8]

California's budgets for 2013-14 and 2014-15 set aside a total of $500 million for the California Career Pathways Trust, to provide competitive grants to partnerships of schools and community colleges to develop career pathways and strengthen connections with businesses to ensure the pathways are aligned with regional economies. The CPT expands on efforts initiated by the philanthropic community.

The Linked Learning Initiative of the James Irvine Foundation provides funding to high schools to implement pathways that combine a rigorous college preparation curriculum with support services and work-based learning experiences.[9] The Lumina Foundation's Community Partnerships for Attainment initiative provides grants to support community-based collaborations focused on increasing college attainment, and requires participation from at least three different community sectors.[10] Such funding streams create an incentive for educators and business and community leaders to work together to create stronger local economies through increasing educational attainment.

Research Conducted for This Report

We conducted an exploratory study of 19 regional consortia of three types—three consortia funded by the Irvine Foundation's Linked Learning District Initiative, eight consortia awarded grants through the state's Career Pathways Trust program, and eight consortia not directly affiliated with either of those funding mechanisms. We selected partnerships based on geographic location, urban/rural factors, and the apparent scope of the partnership's work. Where available, we reviewed websites and documents related to the selected consortia. We conducted interviews with 37 individuals participating in the consortia, including representatives from K-12 education, postsecondary institutions, local government, business, and community organizations. We offered anonymity to participating partnerships and individuals in order to encourage candid discussions about the operating conditions of the consortia and the challenges they face. Therefore, this report does not identify the specific partnerships studied, except when we highlight a few practices and strategies as examples of the activities undertaken by these consortia. In those cases, we obtained specific permission from leaders of the partnerships.

Organizations Working to Support Regional Collaboration

Several organizations across the country support regional partnerships as intermediaries, or help local intermediaries provide "backbone functions" for consortia. Intermediaries do not play the same role in every partnership, but are often responsible for fundraising, building capacity for partnerships and/or entities within partnerships, bridging the work of multiple organizations, providing operational support, evaluating effectiveness, and playing an advisory role to grantmakers.[11] Below are descriptions of some of the intermediaries and organizations that were cited in the interviews. Many of these organizations, and many of the consortia examined in this study, utilize a Collective Impact framework (described below).

Alignment Nashville/Alignment USA

- Brings community organizations and resources together to support public school success, children's health, and communities.
- Helps partnerships connect to resources, engage the community, create an oversight entity, gather data to evaluate the effects of the work, and scale and sustain efforts.
- Has a network of nine communities that share promising practices, challenges, and other facets of the work.

(See: http://portal.alignmentnashville.org/home)

The Collective Impact Forum

- An initiative of FSG and the Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions.
- Collective Impact refers to a collaborative approach to complex problems facing communities and includes five components: common agenda; shared measurement; mutually reinforcing activities; and continuous communication and back-bone support (a team dedicated to guiding a partnership's vision and strategy, supporting aligned activities, establishing shared measurement practices, building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing resources).
- An FSG paper published in the Stanford Social Innovation Review brought national attention to the approach (http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact).

(See: http://collectiveimpactforum.org/)

Equal Measure *(formerly the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning)*

- Examined recipients of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Community Partnership grants—seven communities that implemented multi-sector strategies (from 2009 to 2013) to improve postsecondary student completion.
- Developed a framework that includes: aligning policies and practices, building commitment, building sustainable partnerships, and using data.

(See: http://www.omgcenter.org)

Intermediary Network

- The Boston Private Industry Council is the fiscal agent and New Ways to Work is the facilitating partner.
- Offers peer-to-peer networking, data collection and evaluation, professional development, leadership development, and strategic planning.

(See: http://www.intermediarynetwork.org)

Strive Together

- Network of 53 partnerships in 28 states and the District of Columbia focused on improving academic outcomes from kindergarten through postsecondary education, creating sustainable civic infrastructures through stakeholder group partnerships, and adopting a data-driven approach.
- Guiding principles include: engage community, focus on eliminating disparities, develop a culture of continuous improvement, and leverage assets.
- Rather than having a "backbone organization," Strive Together recommends that partnerships focus on the "backbone functions" that can be played by several organizations.

(See: http://www.strivetogether.org)

Findings

The Importance of Setting the Stage for Collaborative Efforts

Partnerships across California are tied to their local contexts; consequently, one-size-fits-all approaches are not entirely useful. Partnerships must be responsive to their community needs in all aspects—from structures and processes to the goals and related activities. Although all partnerships will differ, our interviews with participants in the 19 consortia revealed several common considerations faced in the early stages of forming a regional partnership. Those considerations relate to the following themes:

- *Origin*, or how and why a partnership gets started;
- *Leadership and operation*, including which organization(s) will be responsible for the "backbone" functions of the partnership;
- *Membership and participation*, including the roles each entity will play; and
- *Goals and accountability*, including who is responsible for which goals and how progress will be monitored over time.

Although these issues emerged in the interviews with all 19 of the consortia we studied, the participants prioritized them differently and were in varying stages of development. Some consortia had better articulated goals and metrics to monitor partners' progress, while others had more formal governance structures or stronger relationships.

Origin

A common thread among all consortia is that they developed from existing relationships in the region that were built, to varying degrees, on trust—whether among education leaders, among business leaders, or across education and business. Some regions had existing networks that were narrower and less formalized upon which to build, such as a dean's group across local higher education institutions or a workforce-related consortium in operation through a local chamber of commerce.

Many of the consortia were formed in response to a recognized need in the community to improve educational opportunities and support the region's economic health. In some cases, local business leaders in regions with low educational capital came together over concerns about meeting employers' needs for a capable workforce. In other regions, local education leaders joined forces out of concerns about low educational attainment, achievement gaps, and goals of creating stronger college-going cultures and seamless education pathways. Other consortia were formed in response to a funding opportunity, such as the Irvine Foundation's Linked Learning initiative, the state-funded Linked Learning Pilot Program,[12] the state's Career Pathways Trust, or the earlier Career Technical Education Pathways Initiatives.[13]

An issue discussed throughout the interviews was that the reasons for forming a consortium, and the relationships that help create a foundation on which to build, have implications for a partnership's longevity and effectiveness. Those established in response to a funding initiative might not have had time in a grant funding cycle to build a foundation that will survive the inevitable challenges involved in maintaining collaborative relationships. Partnerships based on a widespread recognition across a community about the need to improve educational outcomes might be more likely to persist, although funding and sustainability are large concerns in either situation.

Leadership and Operation

The consortia noted the importance of one or several key leaders who were "bridge builders" and had the relationships, skills, and dispositions to bring disparate partners together, build trust,

enable honest conversations, focus on solving problems, and help parties agree on their shared interests for the common good. A major decision faced by these consortia early on was which organization(s) would be responsible for the "backbone" functions of the consortium, including managing funding, convening the partner organizations, providing staffing to coordinate activities, and coordinating communications and marketing efforts. Of the 19 partnerships, 14 chose an educational organization such as a County Office of Education, school district, community college district, or university. Navigating within and across education systems can require deep knowledge of the systems, so partnerships often look toward people within education to lead the work. In a few cases, a lead educational organization worked with others to develop a separate nonprofit organization or committee to reach out to businesses and community organizations and broker relationships between business and the educational partners.

> "We do not have a ready pool of people with the right skills…We need someone who can raise funds, convene partners, message, and manage staff that does not report to them."
>
> *– Community College Administrator*

Five of the consortia are led by an organization outside of education, often referred to as an "intermediary" organization for its role in serving as an interface or connecting entity among the education, business, and community partners. Representatives of such partnerships believe having intermediary organizations outside of education made it easier to consider all the needs of a region rather than just one individual school or district's students. They also noted that educational institutions are often in competition with others in a region over funding or programs, which can complicate leadership issues.

A common theme across the partnerships is that the lead organization and people within it should have the political capabilities, entrepreneurial acumen, trust, strategic abilities, and overall credibility necessary to be effective. Unfortunately, it was not always possible for partnerships to find groups that embody those abilities and attributes, leaving those partnerships in a relatively precarious leadership position.

> "We're neutral and all the other participants have the same skin in the game. That has really helped us. We can have more unbiased discussions without worrying about whether the host organization is going to get mad or feel threatened."
>
> *– Director of Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

Whether coordinated by an educational institution or an organization outside the education system, all the partnerships have (or are developing) a leadership team or committee responsible for establishing goals and setting priorities. Some partnerships believe it is important to have the top executive leaders of the participating organizations serving on the leadership team, due to their relationships in the community and their influence in their respective organizations—individuals such as college and university presidents, school superintendents, non-profit directors, and mayors. Others noted that if the work is contingent upon the top executives attending every meeting, the work can stall out quickly. In addition, there was a fair amount of leadership churn across the partnerships.

Those who do not use the "top executive model" believe it is important that the same people show up to meetings, so their steering committees comprise a deputy-level executive from each partner organization. That designee must have the authority to represent that organization's interests and be able to involve the top executive when high-level problems arise. Some partnerships blended the two approaches by having an executive-level committee that meets infrequently and a group of deputy-level executives that meets more regularly.

Most of the partnerships used some form of a work group model. Work group responsibilities include setting specific goals; identifying means of measuring progress; determining community needs; and organizing the development of programs, resources or activities to accomplish the partnership's primary goals and objectives. Work group membership varies; many partnerships noted that representatives should have expertise in the particular goal area. Some consortia rotate leadership and membership to ensure room for new people to come in with fresh ideas, while still having consistent members for continuity.

Membership and Participation

Another significant decision in the early stages of forming a regional consortium is choosing the roles and types of partner organizations. Many of the consortia we examined primarily include educational institutions from the K-12 sector and/or the postsecondary sector. The biggest struggle in this area for several of the partnerships related to securing workforce representation in the formal governance structures, although there is some involvement by the local WIB and/or several major employers focused on providing work-based learning opportunities for students. Business engagement in these efforts is often obtained through an advisory committee or a separate consortium of businesses that serves as an intermediary between the educational partners and the larger workforce community. A smaller set of the consortia we studied includes a broader array of participants from businesses, local government, and community organizations in the formal structures and processes of the partnership. One consortium has set a goal that the leadership committee will include equal representation from education, business, and nonprofit and civic organizations, ensuring broad representation of community interests and perspectives.

The impact of choices about the breadth of participation is unclear, and there are likely trade-offs in choosing between broad or narrow membership participation. Partnerships involving solely K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions may find it easier to establish and maintain relationships and agree on key goals and activities, because all participants have an understanding of the state's education system. Alternatively, having a broader set of participants from business, local government, and civic and community organizations could enrich group discussions, lead to greater awareness of and commitment to student and workforce needs across the community, and provide opportunities to embed activities into existing community efforts and organizations, making the partnerships more sustainable.

Goals and Monitoring of Progress

Another significant aspect of forming a regional partnership is choosing primary goals, ways to monitor progress, and the means to incentivize continued commitment. Many of the consortia we studied focused on college and career readiness and success, including graduating from high school, enrolling in postsecondary education, and completing college or career training programs. Their objectives include aligning curricula across educational institutions, developing career pathways, and engaging students in work-based learning opportunities. Several consortia in more rural areas with historically lower college participation have a goal of creating a stronger college-going culture in the region.

Other consortia described their goals more broadly, with a focus on student success along the entire educational pipeline beginning with preschool or kindergarten. Several partnerships also focus on "the whole child," including concerns about physical, social, and emotional health issues in addition to educational progress and outcomes. Other objectives include economic growth, a well-prepared regional workforce, and overall quality of life. Several partnerships in more rural and geographically isolated parts of the state were motivated by an interest in keeping young people in the region by ensuring better educational and employment opportunities.

As with decisions about membership in the consortium, there are likely trade-offs in choosing to focus more narrowly on college and career readiness and success or to adopt a broader set of goals and objectives. Partnerships that adopt a more expansive set of goals may find it difficult to identify a common agenda, create metrics to measure progress, and achieve adequate focus. But broader goals could attract participation of groups that might not see college and career success as a primary focus. Having broader goals could make it more difficult to obtain the data to track student outcomes across segments and into the workforce, but there is potential for partnerships to, over time, develop mechanisms to gather the necessary data.

Perceived Promising Strategies

Our interviews with the 19 consortia included questions about the partners' perceptions of practices and strategies within regional partnerships that appear promising to them, and of approaches that they would recommend to stakeholders seeking to develop such consortia in other communities. As this is only an exploratory study, an analysis of the actual impact and effectiveness of these approaches is beyond the scope of this report. However, interviewees had important advice about how to approach collaboration.

Start with a "Coalition of the Willing"

As discussed earlier, the kind of collaborative work involved in these coalitions is dependent on strong, trusting relationships. Building those relationships and developing a culture of collaboration is an ongoing process. While it is critical to solicit input from a broad group of community stakeholders early on, getting all the right players at the table will likely take time. Interviewees recommended starting with those who are interested in collaborating and those who have foundational relationships and conducting outreach to bring others into the effort later. Although it can be helpful to have some pushback and a critical lens throughout the partnership activities, initial participants must be able to come to agreement on the over-arching vision and goals.

> "We don't try to tackle the things we disagree on every day…We find areas where there is an opportunity to collaborate…It's hard enough to change systems when everyone agrees on what should happen."
>
> *– Administrator in an Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

Focus on a Few Main Goals

Interviewees reported that gaining broad support will be easier if the coalition focuses on a few key goals that all partners can support. Interviewees reported more success when they framed the goals in general ways that helped partners envision their own contribution toward accomplishing them. They also recommended developing metrics that can be used to focus stakeholders' attention on setting priorities—metrics that all partners can use as indicators of progress toward the goals. Tying key goals and metrics to an overarching community vision helps create broad support and can make the work more sustainable.

Foster Involvement of Key Leaders

The support of key leaders in the educational institutions can set the tone for their respective entities. When leaders act as champions for collaborative efforts, it can help to remove barriers and resolve interagency conflicts. Having the top leaders on board and in communication with each other was viewed as important when organizational processes or policies conflict, or when particular messaging is needed within organizations or in the community writ large. Knowing when to include top leaders, and when to ask them to act, was also viewed as important.

Many interviewees recommended establishing a cross-agency leadership team that meets regularly to guide the coalition's work. This team does not need to include top executives, but should include representatives of partner organizations who are in regular contact with those executives and can influence their organizations. Interviewees recommended requiring that these individuals, and not designees, attend all meetings to provide consistency and ensure that the right decision makers are at the table.

Leverage the Work of Existing Networks

Many communities have existing networks that work on issues related to educational success and workforce readiness, such as groups of businesses and career technical education (CTE) faculty addressing the need for graduates in particular industries. Interviewees reported success in leveraging the relationships and experiences of existing networks while working to establish a wider regional consortium. For example, the selected CPT-funded partnerships often built their foundations on programs and connections developed through the work of individual high schools in the region.

> "The first year of our grant is around helping people understand what the goals are, what is expected of them. Getting this information to all audiences is critical. People need to be on the right message."
>
> *– Community College Administrator*

Create Opportunities for Cross-System Communication and Collaboration

For each of the partnership's key goals, interviewees recommended establishing a work group or action team to assess regional needs, set specific objectives, develop metrics for determining progress, and design strategies. A recommended strategy is to solicit the participation of individuals with related experience to serve on the work groups, but ensure a broad-based representation of the partner organizations on the groups to help break down silos and encourage everyone to work together. An educator from a CPT consortium noted that this gives each partner a stake in the process and outcomes. In addition, some grantees created cross-sector communities of practice to share information and design solutions related to, for example, curricular reform. Such groups can design programs of study and align curricula across systems and advocate for changes in practices, processes, and policies inside their own schools or institutions.

Embed Activities in Existing Organizations

When designing and implementing programs and activities, interviewees suggested that connecting partnership activities with the work of existing community organizations helps those entities understand how their own work is related to the partnership's activities. This can then help community organizations become more invested in the consortium's work.

For example, if a partnership is going to initiate efforts to raise awareness about financial aid eligibility and opportunities, it could work with a community organization that runs after-school programs for middle school students to provide a financial aid awareness program. This approach helps to avoid making these organizations feel threatened by the new structure, leverages existing resources, and increases sustainability.

Use Data to Motivate Action and Inform Activities

A few of the consortia examined in this study found success in using data to inform their development of goals, objectives, and strategies, and to monitor the effectiveness of their work. Using data is often a challenging issue for many partnerships, given the time and capacity required to gather and make sense of data from a variety of sources (challenges are discussed in the next section). However, several interviewees were able to provide examples of ways they used data to motivate the partners and inform consortia activities. These examples are described in more detail below and on the following pages.

> "I wished we had included a communications person in the grant; it's a big job and we are having to split up those responsibilities among our existing team."
>
> *– County Office of Education Administrator*

Humboldt Decade of Difference Develops Kindergarten Screening Tool

Humboldt County's Decade of Difference initiative began after the local business community identified a need to focus on developing a "ready, willing and capable" workforce for local employers. With an investment from the Headwaters Fund, the Humboldt County Office of Education coordinates the effort, which focuses on student achievement across the pipeline from kindergarten to college. The goals are: 100 percent of students at grade level in reading and math by 4th grade; 95 percent high school graduation rate; and 90 percent of high school graduates enrolled in college. According to the coordinator, Heidi Moore, a major accomplishment to date is the development and use of a kindergarten readiness assessment across the county. Instead of using an "off the shelf" assessment, a group of 12 local kindergarten teachers worked together to develop a more responsive tool for Humboldt's context, aligned with the Common Core State Standards—the Kindergarten Screening Tool (KST). The KST is administered to students using a tablet such as an iPad, and provides immediate data that can easily be aggregated in various ways. Trimester benchmarks are used in reassessing children for progress over the kindergarten school year. Nearly all (98 percent) of entering kindergartners in Humboldt County are now assessed using the KST, and schools in four surrounding counties also use it. The team is currently working on a companion tool for use in first grade. According to Ms. Moore, "the accomplishment [for the Decade of Difference] was really about the process – getting the right people at the table involved with it and working together to produce this resource for the community" (See: http://decadeofdifference.org/).

Fresno Area Strive's Roadmap to Success

The Fresno Area Strive program is coordinated by the Fresno Compact, and is a member of the national Strive Together network. The consortium seeks to improve the academic success of students in the Central, Clovis, Fresno, and Sanger unified school districts and their higher education partners in the region, and ensure that all students graduate from high school prepared for higher education/training and careers. The program asks participating businesses, educational institutions, government agencies, and community organizations to sign a Community Partnership Agreement to demonstrate their commitment to the effort. Fresno Area Strive has developed a Roadmap to Success that specifies important milestones along the educational pipeline from kindergarten readiness to completion of higher education or career training, and publishes an annual report card that shows progress on 18 indicators related to those milestones. The partnership's Action Teams use the data to set priorities and guide activities and to increase the commitment and effort by partners to achieve the goals. The annual reports can be viewed on the consortium's website at http://fresnoareastrive.com/.

Long Beach's Evolving Effort to Provide Seamless Education

In the early 1990s, Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), Long Beach Community College (LBCC), and CSU Long Beach (CSULB) began formally collaborating through the Seamless Educational Partnership, with a goal of increasing the number of students graduating from high school ready for college. The partnership set up structures for sharing data among the three institutions, and used the data to identify and respond to student needs. The partnership prioritizes equitable student access to college as well as postsecondary retention, progress, and degree completion. The partnership's efforts are facilitated by the close relationships among the leaders of the three institutions. In 2008, a more formal partnership was created called the Long Beach (LB) Promise. The LB Promise provides a free semester of tuition at LBCC, guaranteed admission to CSULB, early outreach to students, and intensive supports. According to the most recent published progress report, the LB Promise has provided tuition-free semesters at LBCC to 4,000 students. There has been a 43 percent increase in the number of LBUSD students who enroll in CSULB since 2008, and representatives report that students from LBCC and LBUSD are more likely to stay enrolled in CSULB than other students who were not part of the LB Promise. The LB Promise and the Seamless Education Partnership facilitated LBUSD's work on Linked Learning by providing a structure for staff of the district and higher education institutions to work together. Linked Learning's career pathway model brought further focus to the partnership's work, and is seen as a key strategy to ensure that students graduate from high school well-prepared for college. LBUSD is also extending Linked Learning into the middle and elementary schools. Additional information on the Seamless Education Partnership is available at www.csulb.edu/president/education-partnership/, on the LB Promise at www.longbeachcollegepromise.org, and on the Linked Learning efforts of LBUSD at www.lbschools.net under Linked Learning in the A-Z index.

L.A. Compact Develops Data Sharing Agreements between Higher Education and LAUSD

Los Angeles area colleges and universities tried for years to negotiate data sharing agreements that would allow them to follow teachers who had graduated from their programs and were employed in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) schools. The institutions of higher education (IHEs) wanted de-identified student data from LAUSD that would indicate how their teacher graduates were performing, with the intent to use this data to improve teacher preparation programs. However, sharing student data between education segments has historically been difficult in California, and educators in Los Angeles were continually unable to reach an agreement. When the L.A. Chamber invited the region's colleges and universities to join the L.A. Compact in 2007, the prospect of using the consortium's collective impact to complete data-sharing agreements was an important draw.

The IHEs joined the Compact as a collaborative of 11 institutions, which provided them an opportunity to communicate with LAUSD as a group to give more power to their call for cross-system data. UNITE-LA, the education division of the L.A. Chamber and the convener of the L.A. Compact, helped the parties reach agreements that reflect the needs of the IHEs and the district and—importantly—protect student data. "Ensuring trust among partners was critical, because all of the partners needed to be assured that the data would only be used for continuous program improvement, to try to drive changes in teacher preparation programs, and not for any other reason," said an L.A. Chamber staff member involved in the negotiations. In 2014, eight data-sharing agreements were executed between teacher preparation programs and LAUSD. "The data-sharing MOUs are testimony to the health of the relationships and partnerships, and the level of trust in the partnership," one higher education partner said.

The parties collectively hired a data consultant to determine which data the district currently tracks about each teacher, such as details about his/her induction process (training, mentorship), in addition to types of data the IHEs are collecting about each teacher candidate, such as previous work experience and characteristics of his/her teacher preparation program. The parties are also looking at where teachers go in the district when they complete their programs. One potential challenge identified by a higher education partner is that the data might show that a few programs are performing better than others. "We have to convince the institutions that there's enough room for everyone to shine in the sun," he said. "We are not looking at this as a ranking system" (See: http://compact-unitela.nationbuilder.com).

In 2014, the L.A. Compact also released the first Measurements Report to follow its 2010 baseline report (http://events.lachamber.com/sbaweb/events/evite/EDUCATION/Compact/Compact_Measures_ExecSummary.pdf), providing outcomes on measures that support its goals for Los Angeles-area students.

Challenges Facing the Partnerships

The consortia we studied identified challenges they face when establishing and maintaining regional partnerships. The challenges fall into the following categories:

- A lack of systemic incentives to participate and to implement changes;
- Trouble developing and maintaining long-lasting and trusting relationships required for cooperative work, particularly given leadership churn and differences in organizational cultures;
- Difficulty obtaining funding to sustain the work and connecting the dots across different funding streams; and
- Difficulty building internal capacity for and identifying and obtaining technical assistance to help partnerships develop necessary skills for collaborative work.

> "The state does not have a vision of how all of these pieces fit together so we are always having to…make sense locally. It would help if the state could see the interconnections…but give us flexibility to do the work locally."
>
> *– Community College Administrator*

Lack of Systemic Incentives for Participation

Many of the consortia we examined cited as a major challenge the lack of incentives for the various institutions to engage in the difficult work involved in developing and maintaining a regional partnership. Several people noted that at the state level, there is not an overall vision of regional collaboration or a coherent set of policies and outcome goals to support regional education and workforce development. Their perception is that the Legislature and the Governor do not think about how various funding streams and policies work together, leaving local officials to figure it out. Local leaders are confused about existing regional structures and unclear about whom to work with on particular issues (see box on page 18).

Others mentioned there are not enough fiscal incentives for schools and colleges to collaborate with other institutions or organizations. There is little to no funding for faculty time required to, for example, align programs of study across high schools and postsecondary institutions or develop programs to connect students to career opportunities and the business community. Even buying out one or two classes does not provide enough time for teachers and college faculty to fundamentally redesign all of their courses, much less to develop completely new educational pathways across education systems. In addition, businesses have few incentives to partner with educational institutions, or invest time and money into work-based learning experiences that are a critical element of the state's Career Pathways Trust.

Managing Relationships

Representatives of all the consortia noted that building trusting relationships is one of the largest challenges are one of the largest challenges faced by consortia in the early stages. Having a base of trusting relationships makes it easier to develop and maintain a common agenda to serve the larger community. The job of facilitating trust-building conversations and activities falls to the lead organization, which, in turn, must be trusted by all of the participating entities from the start.

Participants naturally see through the lens of their own organizations or roles, and the different interests of the various partners can make it difficult to build relationships, and can obscure the concern for the common good. To get people to sign on to the effort, leaders have to identify strategies that would be beneficial fairly quickly to the consortium, and would also help the different stakeholders. These relationships are

voluntary and often fragile and there is frequently a concern about staying in "safe territory" and not taking on issues that could upset representatives from a particular organization or constituency. This concern often leads partnerships to go after the easiest work to tackle, when what is really needed are strategies to address the most challenging problems facing the region. If partnerships do not tackle the most difficult issues, some people who signed on to the mission could become frustrated that nothing significant changes and they could leave the partnership.

> "The relationship thing can make you or break you…Developing relationships is the number one skill anyone needs to have for consortium building."
>
> *– Director of a County Agency Participating in a Consortium*

Differences in organizational culture can impede the process of building relationships, including the differences between educational institutions and the business community. Business leaders often view the education community as inefficient, too focused on process over outcomes, and resistant to change, while education leaders often view the business arena as overly focused on the bottom line and not sensitive enough to the challenges of educating a highly diverse population. Another cultural divide affecting the partnerships is when the K-12 and postsecondary systems blame each other for a lack of postsecondary readiness, which can derail this work at the earliest stages and make it impossible to tackle challenges.

Obtaining Adequate Funding

The time it takes to build trust and a common agenda for these collaborative efforts is often longer than a funding cycle. Partnerships funded through the CPT noted that the three-year timeframe of the grants is not long enough to build the infrastructure needed for pathway programs that are both rigorous and sustainable, and it is not enough time to see results in terms of student attainment. It is barely enough time to develop trust and working partnerships in the places where those did not exist prior to the grant. In addition, the partnerships consistently reported problems funding an organizational backbone. If an effective governance infrastructure is not put into place in the three-year timeframe, continuing the coordination required to sustain the pathways beyond the three-year period will be difficult without continued funding.

Finding funding for planning, coordinating across the entities involved in the partnerships, and evaluating progress is particularly challenging. Most of the interviewees mentioned that some of the partner organizations do not have adequate funding for the kind of time-intensive work involved in these collaborative efforts and they often need to use general operating funds to support staff time. The consortia are generally leveraging funding from a number of sources to support their efforts, with each source having its own requirements and restrictions, making it a challenge to figure out which source of funds can be used for the various activities of the partnerships. Finally, interviewees noted challenges in figuring out if the goals and objectives of the various funders are in line with each other; competing or unaligned funding objectives can create a lack of cohesion in the development of goals, objectives, and strategies.

> "Funders don't want to fund operating costs anymore—they want to fund only activities, so we spend an inordinate amount of time chasing dollars."
>
> *– Director of an Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

Building Internal Capacity and Identifying and Obtaining Technical Assistance

At the regional level, in addition to challenges in obtaining funding to support the consortia, representatives reported that they often lack the skills and knowledge to do this kind of collaborative work, and finding and obtaining technical assistance is challenging. Most interviewees reported difficulty identifying someone familiar enough with the partnership's work, relationships, and context to provide effective technical assistance.

What is a Region in California? Definitions and Challenges

It is difficult to determine what an appropriate "region" is for the purpose of developing partnerships. State agencies and organizations define regions differently, including:

- The California Workforce Investment Board's (CWIB) 49 Local Workforce Investment Areas, each with its own local WIB;
- The California Community Colleges Division of Workforce and Economic Development's 15 regions;
- The Association of California School Administrators' 19 regions; and
- The California Department of Education's 11 regions.

Adding to the challenge is the complexity of the public education systems. In the state's K-12 system, there are 58 County Offices of Education, 560 elementary school districts, 87 high school districts, and 330 unified districts. There are 72 community college districts with 112 colleges. There are 23 California State University campuses, each with a defined service area.

In some cases, natural geographic boundaries or very clear feeder patterns among educational institutions (when students "feed" from K-12 into a postsecondary institution, and from a community college into a four-year university) have made the decision easier. But other areas of the state are not as clearly delineated into regions, particularly in areas that are large geographically, are highly populated, or have residents with a wide range of needs. For example, large rural areas can present problems when businesses are not in close proximity to a school or postsecondary institution. Large urban areas can have several community college districts, each with its own culture, programs, and procedures, and perhaps very different relationships with school districts. While urban areas may have more businesses and community organizations that can serve as partners, it can be more challenging to develop and manage relationships and activities. Several consortia in urban areas have created micro regions, each with different lead organizations and partners.

Another tension is localism—such as high school-college partnerships focused on issues such as curricular alignment—and larger scale efforts focused on regional economic development. Locally focused efforts can occur within the larger partnerships. Several people in larger communities noted that it requires a larger scale of investment and effort to effect change, and funders were viewed as preferring to make smaller investments in more contained regions where it is easier to measure impact. Some in smaller, more rural regions mentioned that there was not a large employer base that could provide the type of work-based learning opportunities required for the kinds of approaches called for by Linked Learning and the CPT.

> "Helping funders understand the need for funding this coordinating backbone staffing can be a difficult sell. Funders pay for results. Having them understand the coordinating function and the need to fund that is difficult."
>
> *– Director of an Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

Interviewees expressed the need for technical assistance in building curricular pathways, data collection and analysis, and communications.

At a local level, partnerships required more technical assistance in order to develop the kinds of career pathway programs envisioned in the CPT. In addition to adequate resources, the ability to develop, implement, and sustain an effective pathway is dependent on a vast array of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. It requires skills in such areas as leadership and networking, administrative capabilities, analytical abilities with regard to using datasets effectively, pedagogy, and content knowledge of both the academic and applied aspects of the pathway (across several education systems). Many consortia expressed particular problems with helping educators engage in the applied aspects of pathways development, including work-based learning. School districts struggled to find ways for teachers to become aware of workforce issues, such as through externships in local businesses, with a goal of integrating what they learn into their lesson plans. Paying teachers to do externships in the summer is viewed as a good option, but is difficult to implement and fund.

> "Partnerships need a package of tools and some training on more of the nuances you need to actually do this work."
>
> *– Administrator in a University that Participates in a Consortium*

At both the regional and local levels, partnership representatives also cited a need for assistance in accessing and making sense of data to understand the impact of their work. Deciding which data to collect and how to design indicators to measure progress toward goals, share data across educational institutions without violating the federal Family Educational Rights to Privacy Act (FERPA), and quantify regional labor market needs were all significant issues. Beyond obtaining appropriate data, the groups face challenges in finding adequate expertise to analyze and interpret the data and understand how to use the data as a tool.

> "Communication is the biggest challenge…Because there are so many players, the message isn't going to come out of everyone's mouth the same way and we have to keep reminding people to keep the big picture in mind."
>
> *– Director of an Intermediary Organization Leading a Consortium*

Communications is another area of the work for which the partnerships need technical assistance, both among the partners and with the larger community. Specific needs include helping people understand the vision, goals, and potential benefits of the collaborative effort; negotiating agreement among partner organizations; and keeping people informed about specific activities and responsibilities.

Stages of Effective Data Use

Using data effectively spans a wide range of needs, roles, and purposes; there is not one process that guarantees success for partnerships. The list below provides examples of the different stages involved in using data effectively (a 2013 Equal Measure, formerly OMG, brief, "Using Data to Advance a Postsecondary Systems Change Agenda" helped to inform the development of this list). The list is not entirely sequential, since some of the activities should occur simultaneously and some are cyclical, such as creating feedback loops.

- Putting together the logistics related to sharing data across systems (such as creating templates for confidentiality and data sharing agreements);
- Collectively identifying problems and determining related goals, research questions, metrics, priorities, timelines, roles, and responsibilities with regard to the learning and measuring processes;
- Using the information about needs, goals, and objectives to build an internal commitment for the work and to develop a message for external constituencies;
- Collecting and analyzing data together, across educational entities and divisions;
- Sharing data and using the findings to stimulate cross-system, cross-disciplinary conversations and actions;
- Testing, honing, and communicating messages and building public commitment; and
- Using the data for both formative (cycles of improvement) and summative (evaluative) purposes, which includes measuring both the effectiveness of the internal "workings" of the partnership and progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

Concluding Thoughts

Roles and Responsibilities to Support Regional Partnerships

As this report outlines, the regional partnerships studied here suggest that it is important to:

- Start with a coalition of the willing,
- Focus on a few main goals,
- Foster involvement of key leaders,
- Leverage existing networks,
- Create opportunities for cross-system communication and collaboration,
- Embed activities in existing organizations, and
- Use data to motivate action and inform activities.

The relational and political aspects of developing and sustaining a functional and effective partnership cannot be overstated. Issues include having the right people at the table, ensuring that the lead organization and people have the right relationships and skills to lead, and engaging each partner in ways that leverage the appropriate knowledge and skills. Interviewees consistently mentioned involving business representatives in more productive ways—particularly around their participation in partnership governance structures and meetings, and with opportunities for work-based learning.

The efforts must go beyond engagement, though, and create an environment in which each partner organization has a sense of ownership about goals, objectives, and strategies. A tension inherent in partnership development is to provide the time and space for people to learn about each other's entities and work, while also ensuring that the meetings go beyond a series of check-ins. Establishing mutually agreed-upon goals and actionable strategies is critical.

The success of regional partnerships relies mostly on local and regional entities, but also on enabling conditions provided by the state and philanthropic leaders. In terms of state policy and funding implications, preparing traditionally underserved youth for postsecondary education and successful careers is a long-term undertaking and requires a sustained focus. It will take many years to see major changes in learning and in certification and degree completion rates. At the same time, there is a sense of urgency for students. It is important for the state's education reform agendas to be consistent and to align goals and priorities in areas that relate to regional partnerships (see related policy brief). In addition, interviewees discussed the need for the state to learn from regional efforts and modify policies and regulations to be as supportive as possible and increase consistency. Many interviewees noted the need for the state to create a public plan, agenda, or framework that spans education systems and supports their work—both conceptually and analytically (in terms of housing or enabling the development of cross-sector datasets). A frustration voiced by all the interviewees is the inability to easily access cross-sector data. California has not made headway in this area and this impedes the progress of the partnerships by creating logistical hurdles that are costly and inefficient to overcome, and by making it very challenging to learn about progress in a timely fashion.

Another state role relates to the capacity of California's public education entities to offer high quality learning opportunities for all students. Budget cuts during the Great Recession have damaged infrastructures—both physical and educational—across systems. This capacity problem can curtail opportunities within and across the state's education systems. For example, if K-12 partners develop curricular pathways in areas that

Oregon's Model of Regional Collaboration

The Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB) was created through legislation (Senate Bill 909) in 2011 and charged with developing an education investment strategy to improve learning outcomes and create seamless transitions from preschool through postsecondary completion. The OEIB has launched the Regional Achievement Collaborative (RAC) Initiative as a means of forging connections within regions of the state. RACs leverage Oregon's long history of local control as a way to help the state reach its 40-40-20 goal by 2025—40 percent will earn an associate degree or meaningful postsecondary credential, 40 percent will obtain at least a bachelor's degree, and 20 percent will complete their formal education with a high school diploma or equivalent. RACs bring leaders from the various education sectors together with community, business, and civic partners. The OEIB provides funding and organizational support to the RACs to build their infrastructure and capacity, and is fostering learning networks to allow the RACs to share strategies and build a statewide system for improving educational achievement.

are impacted at the postsecondary level (do not have enough space and therefore use selective admission processes), many students will prepare for non-existent future opportunities. Interviewees believed that there is a state role in creating capacity for critical certificate and degree programs to thrive, while not neglecting the liberal arts.

Across the interviews, people stressed that their work would be greatly enhanced if the various funders could connect or streamline their goals, objectives, metrics, and reporting requirements. State and philanthropic investments in technical assistance could make a significant difference for regional partnerships. The state could create a repository of resources, such as commonly used goals, objectives, indicators, and metrics; tips for using data effectively; prior surveys of student and parent voices; information about community engagement; and information about different collaborative frameworks.

Finally, given the number of large education policy shifts underway in California, now is the time for the state and foundations to provide forums to help educators in all systems learn from each other, and to implement key policies, programs, and redesign efforts.

For example, many interviewees mentioned the need for cross-regional partnership learning communities with thematic foci that would bring partnership representatives together around particular issues of interest—a structure similar to Oregon's Regional Achievement Compacts (see box above).

It bears repeating that the partnerships need time to develop, assess their effectiveness, and find ways to be sustained. Given California's size and the relatively localized economic needs across much of the state, these regional cross-system approaches hold great promise to help the state reach its educational and workforce goals. There is potential for new and existing partnerships to learn from current efforts, and for the state and philanthropic foundations to better support regional work. Partnerships must be enabled to own their own solution sets, given their own contexts, and be empowered to experiment responsibly to close achievement gaps, support increased rates of educational attainment, and work collectively to support their communities.

Notes

1 For some examples of the call for increased college attainment, see the following reports: Johnson, Hans and Ria Sengupta. 2009. *Closing the Gap: Meeting California's Need for College Graduates*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California; Carnevale, Anthony P., Nicole Smith, and Jeff Strohl. 2010. *Help Wanted: Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements Through 2018*. Washington, DC: Center on Education and the Workforce, Georgetown University; Moore, Colleen, Connie Tan, and Nancy Shulock. 2014. *Average Won't Do: Performance Trends in California Higher Education as a Foundation for Action*. Sacramento, CA: Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy; Committee for Economic Development. 2013. *Boosting California's Postsecondary Education Performance: A Policy Statement and Call to Action*. Washington, DC: Author.

2 California State University Graduation Rates Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange, graduation rates for the freshman cohort enrolling in Fall 2007. Available at http://asd.calstate.edu/csrde/index.shtml.

3 Johnson, Hans. 2015. *California's Future: Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California. For more information on the impact of recent higher education budget cuts, see the following reports, also by PPIC: *The Impact of Budget Cuts on California's Community Colleges* (2013), *Defunding Higher Education: What are the Effects on College Enrollment?* (2012), and *Higher Education in California: Institutional Costs* (2014).

4 California Senate Bill 1070, Chapter 433, Statutes of 2012.

5 California Assembly Bill 86, Chapter 48, Statutes of 2013. A total of $500 million has been allocated to the CPT, $250 million each in the 2013 and 2014 Budget Acts.

6 California Senate Bill 852, Budget Act of 2014. For more information on the awards, see http://www.dof.ca.gov/innovationawards/.

7 *California's Strategic Workforce Development Plan: 2012-2017.* California Workforce Investment Board. 2012.

8 K Thru 12 Education. Governor's Budget Summary (2015-2016). http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2015-16/pdf/BudgetSummary/Kthru12Education.pdf.

9 "How Linked Learning Works." The James Irvine Foundation. https://www.irvine.org/youth/linked-learning.

10 "Community Partnership for Attainment." Lumina Foundation. http://www.luminafoundation.org/community-partnerships.

11 Szanton, Peter L. *Toward More Effective Use of Intermediaries* (September 2003). Foundation Center. http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/practicematters_01_paper.pdf.

12 Assembly Bill 790, Chapter 616, Statutes of 2011.

13 California Senate Bill 70, Chapter 352, Statutes of 2005 and Senate Bill 1070, Chapter 433, Statutes of 2012.

Education Insights Center

Advancing Research and Policy
for K-12 and Postsecondary Education

This report was made possible by funding from the James Irvine Foundation and the College Futures Foundation.

The James Irvine Foundation

COLLEGE FUTURES FOUNDATION
More Graduates for a Thriving California

SACRAMENTO STATE

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street, Tahoe Hall 3065
Sacramento, California 95819-6081
www.csus.edu/edinsights
@EdInsightsCtr