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Executive Summary

SRI International evaluated the California Academic Partnership Program’s Demonstration Partnership (CDP) grants over three academic years (fall 2013 through spring 2016). During this period, the CDP grants supported collaboration between California high schools and college partners for the purpose of improving implementation of the Common Core Standards and facilitating seamless transitions of high school students to college. Each of the 11 sites receiving CDP grants pursued its own plans for improving mathematics or English instruction (or both mathematics and English) and for addressing policy barriers to college transitions. The objectives of SRI’s evaluation of CDP were to provide formative feedback and to compile a summative report on partnership formation and on work by the CDP grantees. Summarized here are SRI’s key findings and lessons learned over the 3 years of CDP evaluation data collection and analyses.

Findings

CDP Partnerships

Having the right people involved was key to effective work by CDP Partnerships. CDP Partnerships were most effective when instructors, counselors, and administrators were all actively engaged in the work. It was especially important for CDP Partnerships to have administrators with the positional authority in the school, district, or college to make decisions needed to achieve partnership goals. Personal attributes of participants in CDP Partnerships also mattered. Our interviewees listed the ability to see the vision, high-level commitment, willingness to innovate, and flexibility as key attributes of effective team members.

Trust between high school and postsecondary team members was a foundational element for effective cross-level CDP Partnerships. CDP Partnerships built trust by focusing on the shared goal of student success and by developing a mutual understanding and respect for the difficulties of institutional change in high schools and in colleges.

Grounding the work in a shared vision was an important support for collaboration across the secondary and postsecondary education divide. CDP Partnerships were most effective when they were able to define clear goals and next steps that aligned with institutional goals and priorities of both the high schools and the colleges.

Paths to Change

New course development and dual enrollment were the principal mechanisms the CDP Partnerships used to enhance academic college readiness. CDP grants supported new course development to improve academic readiness for college and to give students struggling in mathematics and English help early in their high school careers to stay on track for credit accumulation and a-g completion. CDP grants also helped high schools expand dual enrollment...
options to give more students early exposure to college-level rigor and an opportunity to earn college credits.

**Partnerships focused attention on the need for changes in community college placement practices and, in some cases, were successful in implementing such changes.** CDP Partnerships promoted the use of multiple placement measures such as adding high school course grades and course completion as indicators of academic readiness for college-level coursework. Several partnerships were successful in implementing these changes to college placement methods, thus opening more pathways for students to place directly into credit-bearing courses at their partner community college and avoid taking developmental courses. CDP Partners also implemented academic and logistical supports to facilitate smooth transitions such as offering intensive academic remediation in summer boot camps and making college placement testing available on high school campuses.

**Creating a college-going culture was also important in the CDP high schools because they serve many first-generation college students.** CDP Partnerships worked to familiarize high school staff, students, and parents with the academic preparation necessary for going to college as well as how to apply to college and for financial resources for low-income families.

**Continuous Cycle of Improvement**

**CDP Partnerships struggled to use data to inform joint high school and college work.** Participants did not have sufficient expertise to select and use relevant data to monitor and evaluate implementation progress and short-term effects of CDP work on changes to curriculum, college counseling, and policies to enhance student college readiness and college transitions. Most CDP Partnerships did not look at data on student transitions and college success systematically or regularly.

**Sharing data across institutions proved difficult.** Most CDP Partnerships relied on district data, but those data could be insufficient, inaccessible, and incorrect. Furthermore, the partnerships did not have data sharing agreements between institutions so they had to find work-around solutions to view necessary data.

**Sustainability**

**Negative effects of personnel turnover were mitigated by institutionalizing roles.** Turnover was particularly prevalent at postsecondary institutions. Partnerships counteracted the effects of turnover by creating orientation materials and writing CDP work into job descriptions.

**CDP Partnerships strengthened their sustainability by leveraging positive data.** By publicizing student success data, CDP Partnerships were able to create buy-in from faculty and begin to scale their programs. Analyzing data also provided participants an opportunity to reflect on the successes and challenges of their work, thereby strengthening sustainability.
CAPP Facilitation

Participants appreciated their CAPP Facilitators. CAPP provided each of the CDP Partnerships with an expert consultant to provide ongoing technical assistance. Respondents valued their CAPP Facilitator as a critical friend who provided support and guidance. Facilitators opened doors, provided direction, and modeled team leadership strategies.

CAPP Facilitators supported cross-level connections through their networks and their association with CAPP. The facilitators also fostered relationships by opening the eyes of participants to the realities of each other’s institutions and how to maneuver within the different environments.

As the CDP Partnerships developed, facilitators pulled back from their roles, allowing partners to direct more of the work. With time and as key players developed their skills, CAPP Facilitators became less directive, spending less time managing relationships and monitoring progress.

Conclusion

The experience of the CDP Partnerships demonstrates that the CDP model can be effective in working to improve high school curriculum and instruction and create a college-going culture. CDP Partnerships were less consistently able to remove barriers to seamless transitions posed by college English and mathematics placement and remediation policies. The latter may require more direct engagement of K-12 district and college leadership as well as work at the regional or statewide level.
1. Introduction

In 2013, the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) awarded 11 grants under the CAPP Demonstration Partnership (CDP): Enhancing Instruction That Leads to Student Readiness for Higher Education through full Implementation of Common Core State Standards Project. SRI International was contracted by CAPP to conduct an evaluation of the CDP. This final report summarizes SRI’s evaluation findings and presents the lessons learned over the 3 years (2013–2016) of data collection and analyses.

Since its founding in 1984, CAPP has been supporting the academic quality of California public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of public high school students for college. Over its history, CAPP has awarded grants for a variety of projects to support its foundational purpose at the state, regional, district, and school levels. At the school level, CAPP grants have been used to build capacity in individual high schools to support instructional leadership, enhance mathematics and English instruction, and foster productive postsecondary partnerships. The requirements and focus of the CAPP Demonstration Partnership grants were a direct extension of lessons learned from previous CAPP-supported work. Specifically, the CDP grants funded teacher-led teams in high schools to facilitate partnerships between public secondary schools, school districts, community colleges, and baccalaureate-granting institutions to work in two areas: enhancing the implementation of Common Core mathematics and English language arts instruction and removing policy barriers to seamless transitions into and through higher education.

Effective collaboration to bridge the gap between the secondary and postsecondary education systems and institutions is never easy. In California, fostering and sustaining collaboration across the secondary to postsecondary divide are even more challenging because the community college system, state university system, and University of California systems are separate and autonomous in their operations. The fact that individual high schools and not school districts (with one exception) were recipients of the CDP grants both constrained the scope of collaborative action on broader systemic change and also enabled collaboration on improvement of local (site-level) practice. Having a long history and deep experience in supporting partnerships between high schools and colleges (see http://arches-cal.org/), CAPP was able to provide expert technical assistance through CAPP-provided facilitators and periodic convenings to support the development and functioning of each of the CDP Partnerships.

During the CDP grant period, high schools throughout California were in the early stages of implementing the Common Core Standards, introducing new and higher expectations for high school student achievement and college and career readiness in English language arts and mathematics. In this context, CAPP’s decision to focus the CDP grants on supporting Common Core English and mathematics instruction was timely and appropriate. While standing as strong arguments for this focus, however, the relative newness of the Common Core English and mathematics standards, the slow pace of changes to district-level curriculum and instruction,
and the uneven understanding of new standards and aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment among teachers in California high schools\(^1\) also presented major obstacles to the CDP Partnerships’ efforts to fully support implementation of the standards.

The CAPP decision to direct the CDP work on policy change in support of more seamless transitions from secondary to postsecondary was also timely, appropriate, and challenging. In 2013, California’s public postsecondary education systems were just beginning to implement a wide range of reforms to academic placement and remediation policies and practices to improve student access and success in college-level coursework.\(^2\) These reforms were undertaken in response to a dramatic increase in demand for postsecondary credentials and degrees spurred by generational shifts in the structure of occupations that have made postsecondary education the basic requirement for access to jobs paying life-sustaining wages.\(^3\)

The inconsistent and incomplete status of reforms to California public college academic placement and remediation policies and practices offered fertile ground for CDP Partnership work on local policy to remove barriers to seamless transitions to postsecondary education and also posed hurdles to achieving such local policy change.

During the first year of the CDP, SRI developed a logic model to serve as a conceptual framework for the CDP evaluation (Exhibit 1). The logic model included the formation of the CDP Partnerships and the twin CDP aims of enhancing high school mathematics and English instruction and removing policy barriers to postsecondary transitions as the primary CDP components and mechanisms for change. The CDP logic model identified program outcomes as well as hypotheses about the contributions of required CDP Partnership activities (most notably, use of data in a continuous cycle of improvement) and CAPP technical assistance. The logic model also identified two important contextual features for the work of the CDP Partnerships. The first feature was the broader effort to implement the Common Core Standards, and the second feature was local policies affecting college access, retention, and success. (See Appendix A for a more detailed version of the logic model.)

---


Exhibit 1: Logic Model

The logic model helped SRI define research questions for the evaluation in the following five areas: (1) CDP Partnership team formation; (2) plans and progress in improving curriculum, instruction, assessment, and the implementation of the Common Core Standards; (3) plans and progress in improving policies and conditions to facilitate more seamless high school to postsecondary transitions and success; (4) CDP Partnerships’ plans and progress in implementing a continuous cycle of improvement; and (5) professional development, including CAPP technical assistance and support.

The logic model also guided the identification of data sources and evaluation activities. Evaluation activities included document reviews and background data collection, interviews and observations of CAPP meetings; case studies of CDP Partnerships; and integrated analysis and reporting of CDP evaluation findings in two formative memoranda and in this final report.

The data for this report came from the 11 CDP Partnerships that were awarded implementation grants (Exhibit 2). We reviewed these partnerships’ CDP grant proposals, annual reports, and other documents in addition to conducting telephone and in-person interviews in each partnership in the first two years of the evaluation. In the third and final year of the evaluation, we focused data collection on five CDP Partnerships selected to represent a range of settings and partnership goals. By limiting data collection to these five CDP Partnerships, we were able to concentrate available evaluation resources for a deeper look and a clearer understanding of factors that facilitated and impeded the CDP grant work in these sites.

Over the 3 years of the evaluation, we conducted 187 interviews with key informants across all partnerships, either in person as part of a daylong site visit or over the phone. Interviewees typically were the high school principal, lead teacher, other teachers engaged in the CDP Partnership work, and a representative from the district, community college, and baccalaureate-granting institution. In addition, we conducted 30 interviews with CAPP leaders, CAPP Facilitators, and CAPP Advisors; attended each of the three annual CAPP convenings for
grantees; and attended several CAPP facilitator meetings each year. Data collected were summarized in structured debrief guides that were systematically reviewed.

**Exhibit 2: CDP Partnership Teams as Proposed in the CDP Implementation Grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
<th>2-Year College Partners</th>
<th>4-Year College Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Union High School</td>
<td>Shasta College</td>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSU Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Valley High School*</td>
<td>Los Medanos College</td>
<td>CSU East Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Righetti High School*</td>
<td>Allan Hancock College</td>
<td>Cal Polytechnic State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin High School</td>
<td>Cosumnes River College</td>
<td>CSU Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood High School*</td>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>CSU Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern High School District*</td>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>CSU Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taft College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Sierra Charter High School</td>
<td>College of the Sequoias</td>
<td>CSU Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Academy*</td>
<td>Solano Community College</td>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orosi High School</td>
<td>College of the Sequoias</td>
<td>CSU Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco High School</td>
<td>Merced College</td>
<td>UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters High School</td>
<td>Solano Community College</td>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento City College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Focus of Year 3 data collection

This report is organized to follow the flow of the logic model. It begins with a discussion of the findings and lessons learned about the collaborative partnerships that were funded through the CDP grant. The report next addresses the work of the CDP Partnerships with a discussion of the findings related to the two areas of institutional change that were expected to result from that work; these paths to change are enhancing curriculum and instruction and aligning policy and improving the school environment to facilitate seamless postsecondary transitions. The next section presents findings on the CDP Partnerships’ efforts to establish and engage in a continuous cycle of improvement. Then the focus shifts to the partnerships’ strategies and work to date for sustaining the CDP work. The penultimate section presents findings on CAPP Facilitators. The report concludes with a summary of implications for future partnerships and for CAPP’s future grantmaking efforts.
2. CDP Partnerships

The cornerstone of the CAPP Demonstration Partnership theory of change is the strength of the CDP Partnerships between high schools and colleges. Building a strong CDP Partnership requires bringing together the right institutions and individuals with the right characteristics to make progress on the goals of supporting implementation of California’s Common Core Standards for English language arts and mathematics and facilitating high school students’ seamless transitions to postsecondary education. Throughout the 3-year time frame of the CDP grant funding, partnerships struggled with turnover and building institutional inroads; yet they also fostered relationships that supported collaboration on common goals. In this section, we discuss findings on the quality of collaboration among partners as well as the supports and barriers for collaboration.

CDP Partnerships were most effective when they included people working in a range of roles at the secondary and postsecondary levels. To be effective, CDP Partnerships needed administrators with the positional authority to make decisions, and they needed team members who understood the vision and were committed, willing, and flexible innovators.

With the focus on instructional change and the transition between institutions, the CDP Partnership teams needed representatives who worked in those domains. Although the team members varied across the partnerships, it was particularly important for the teams to include instructors, counselors, and administrators. Instructors (secondary and postsecondary) worked together on curriculum alignment, instructional change, assessment exams, and course articulation. College counselors at the secondary schools worked with the admissions counselors at community colleges on the policies and procedures for enrollment, assessment, and placement of students into appropriate courses. CDP Partnership teams also needed organizational leaders to build institutional support for their work. Organizational leaders with positional authority, such as principals, district administrators, deans, and department chairs, marshaled resources for the partnership work, identified and addressed policy issues, and made decisions that advanced the work of the partnership. Because the work at the community college often involved instructors and college counselors, CDP Partnership teams needed leaders from both academic and student affairs.

Securing the active engagement of the right people at the college level (especially 4-year colleges) was an ongoing challenge for CDP Partnership teams. University partners and leaders interviewed suggested several reasons why CDP Partnership teams may have had difficulty gaining traction with 4-year universities. Faculty may lack the incentive to participate in partnerships with K-12 institutions if the process of promotion and retention does not reward such efforts. Also, many of the faculty who teach remedial and lower division courses that are likely to be affected by changes at the secondary school are part-time employees, so they lack the clout at the university to lead CDP Partnership efforts. In addition to this lack of incentives, logistical challenges also limit faculty engagement in CDP Partnerships. These include the geographical distance between institutions and very different work schedules (university faculty
may teach in the evening), which can make it hard to attend regular meetings in person or engage in school visits and observations.

Not only was it important to have people on the CDP Partnership team in the right roles— instructors, counselors, decisionmakers—the team members also needed the right attributes, namely, commitment to the vision, good communication skills, flexibility, and a collaborative nature. CDP Partnership team members consistently emphasized the importance of such personal qualities as the willingness to innovate as well as persistence to follow through on the shared vision and the ability to build on existing relationships or to establish new ones. One lead teacher, who emphasized the importance of being self-reflective and open to change, said it was important for everyone to “come to the table knowing that you’re there to change what you’re doing.” Across the board, CDP Partnership team members emphasized the value of relationships. One school-level participant summed up the importance of having the right people on the partnership team: “It’s all about relationships. It really is. I know that sounds pretty overly simplistic, but it’s really about, if built with the right people, then a lot of things can happen. And I think that’s why things are moving in the right direction with [our community college partner], the right relationships are being built, and it doesn’t happen overnight but it’s happening.”

**Trust between high school and postsecondary team members was a foundational element for effective cross-level CDP Partnerships.** Partnerships built trust by focusing on the shared goal of student success and by developing a mutual understanding and respect for the difficulties of institutional change in high schools and in colleges.

Having the right people on the leadership team as well as a shared and mutually beneficial vision are important for a CDP Partnership, but work will not progress without trust. Existing personal connections were helpful for CDP grantees in building trust in the early stages of partnership formation. These connections opened doors and brought people to the table. Partners reported building trust through face-to-face meetings in which people from the different institutions could “break bread” while they surfaced and confirmed their common goals (student achievement) and concentrated on their common work (content area instruction, college counseling and placement). In addition to surfacing common goals, partners also had to raise and work through preconceived notions of one another’s institutions in order to move past blame.

Grounding conversations in data about student success kept partners focused on what matters. Partners built trust when they focused on gaps in student success and when organizational leaders modeled taking ownership for these gaps. Honest communication among partners directed efforts to solutions and not to assigning blame for failure.

Trust and mutual respect among high school and college partners were also built through shared understanding of the roles team members played in their high schools or colleges. Part of that shared understanding was seeing the ways team members’ roles enabled and limited opportunities for institutional changes. For example, in one CDP Partnership, a community
college representative who had been on the team since its inception highlighted compromise and mutual respect as critical to team building. The representative of the 4-year college partner on the same team described the importance of “[having] patience and accepting and respecting the grind of the district, how they have to go through their decisions.”

**CDP Partnerships were most effective when they were grounded in a shared vision that included clear goals and next steps for each partner that were aligned with the institutional goals and priorities of both the high schools and the colleges.**

As noted, trust is essential for building effective partnerships, and that trust depends, in part, on articulating shared goals for student success and overcoming the tendency for college staff to assign blame for student failure to high schools and for high school staff to blame colleges. Developing a clear and shared vision for the CDP team that was aligned with the goals, needs, and resources of the participating schools and colleges created an incentive to participate and helped determine who should be involved.

CDP Partnerships were more successful in developing common goals and fostering collaboration between high schools and community colleges than in engaging 4-year college partners. Declining enrollment and poor student success metrics were internal drivers for one community college to engage with a feeder high school in its CDP Partnership. Being able to connect the work of the CDP Partnership to the mission of the community college helped to justify the work and leverage the community college’s resources to support CDP Partnership activities. Connection to the organization’s mission facilitated the development of institutional inroads in multiple departments including academic affairs, student services, counseling, outreach, assessment, and placement. As noted, the lack of clear incentives for 4-year college faculty to participate in a CDP Partnership was a barrier, and the fact that many of the 4-year college faculty teaching lower division mathematics and English courses are part time was also a barrier to their participation in the partnerships.
As is often the case when different institutions come together, when educators from Righetti High School and Allan Hancock Community College began working together as part of the CDP grant, they had to learn to trust each other. A high school teacher described the situation as follows:

> Our preconceived notion [was] that they were gatekeeping, and they were oppressing our students ... [by] not assessing [students] accurately. Their preconceived notion of us [was] that [we] weren't doing our jobs: “I don't know what they're doing at the high school, but they're not teaching them how to write, obviously.”

The participating teachers were able to shift these misperceptions and build trust by sitting down together and talking about their work. A community college teacher described the meeting:

> The high school teachers showed us about Common Core and, of course, nobody in my department really knows anything about it. And we showed them sample essays from freshmen composition and we showed them how we grade them ... . So my department was like, “Oh, my gosh, you mean they're trying to teach them how to go to college?” And [the high school teachers] were, “Oh my goodness, they have to write a [long] research paper with [multiple] sources?” So it was ... a really good learning experience. And since then, ... we started to trust each other.

This meeting was a turning point after which the participants were able to concentrate on their mutual goal of helping the students.

As a result of their work together, the faculty has made strides in reducing the number of students in remedial classes by (1) offering college placement testing on site at Righetti to mitigate challenges to taking the test, (2) using multiple measures for English and math placement at Allan Hancock Community College, (3) creating a summer boot camp at the college for students who did not place into college-level English, and (4) developing accelerated courses that enable students to skip remedial courses if successfully completed.
3. Paths to Change

The goal of the CAPP Demonstration Partnership was to develop seamless postsecondary transitions for students. The framers of the CDP project sought to draw grantees’ attention to the need to prepare students for credit-bearing college-level courses. By focusing the cross-level partnerships on the implementation of the Common Core Standards, they intended to foster a dialogue between secondary and postsecondary educators that would surface possible disconnects between the new academic standards and entry-level college courses. In addition, the framers focused grantees on the local policies and procedures that determine students’ placement into college courses.

Our logic model for the evaluation identified two paths to institutional change that were expected to result from the CDP Partnerships. These institutional changes represent interim outcomes for the CDP Partnerships. The first path was to enhance curriculum, instruction, and assessment so as to ensure that students were ready for college upon high school graduation. The second path was the alignment of placement policies and transition supports and the improvement of the college-going culture in high schools to facilitate seamless postsecondary transitions.

Enhance Curriculum and Instruction

Supporting full implementation of the Common Core Standards was the starting point for planning and conversations between high school and college partners, but work on Common Core implementation was not the primary focus of CDP Partnerships’ work to improve high school student achievement in mathematics and English. Instead, the CDP Partnerships offered an opportunity to examine community college remediation rates and the space to hold conversations about how to address them. Several CDP Partnerships realized that students were entering remediation classes in part because of a lack of alignment between high school curriculum and college-level mathematics and English coursework. These conversations across institutions led to efforts to address demonstrated gaps in high school students’ academic readiness, with particular attention on reducing English and mathematics remediation.

Partnerships worked to align curriculum and courses in order to increase academic rigor in the high schools, overcome high remediation rates, and facilitate placement into credit-bearing courses.

Once the lack of curricular and course alignment surfaced, partnerships took steps to address the issue. High schools offered new, aligned courses or dual enrollment options. Three of the five case study partnerships that were the focus of data collection in 2015-16 focused on providing new courses to prepare students for the academic rigor of college-level classes and to support a-g completion. This included adding a non-Advanced Placement math option for seniors who otherwise would not be able to take a fourth year of math, opening a summer accelerated geometry course to support more students in completing the a-g requirements,
and creating a 2-year algebra class to support “students to successfully complete [algebra] as a first step in the successful completion of the full a-g math course sequence.” All these classes provided students with a deeper grounding in math and opened doors for them as they “break the cycle of failure...and reduce or eliminate the need for remediation at the postsecondary level.”

Other CDP Partnerships added dual enrollment courses to raise academic expectations and promote postsecondary success. In addition to offering dual enrollment classes, one high school buttressed these higher level courses with support classes, AVID and vertical alignment in English from middle school to college. The end result was a whole new culture at the school that was “a light year and a half from where we were just 3, 4 years ago. Because 3-4 years ago, we just accepted the fact that 60-70% of our kids were going to have to take remediation classes at either the community college or state, wherever they were going.”

Creating vertically aligned curriculum and courses was not without obstacles. These included insufficient teachers to staff new sections, limitations in the master schedule to accommodate new courses, and a lack of buy-in from administrators and teachers. In the words of a participant, “getting buy-in from the people who actually implement has at times been tough, and that’s because communication lines [are not perfect] ... and sometimes there was a lag on getting the hurdles removed and getting the word to implement.”
MIT Academy: Dual Enrollment

Through the CDP work, MIT Academy’s vision of Common Core Standards implementation homed in on defining college and career readiness as ensuring students are “remediation-proof” upon enrolling in college. The primary lever to eliminate remediation was establishing a broad array of dual enrollment courses at the high school site, thereby increasing the academic rigor of the high school curriculum. Offering college courses at the high school has reduced students’ barriers to meeting the MIT graduation requirement to complete 9 college credits. Additionally, the dual enrollment program has shifted expectations at MIT Academy, as students now satisfy the 9-credit requirement in part through English and math courses, instead of entirely through electives.

through this process with CAPP, we have upped the ante, we have raised expectations, and the kids have risen to the occasion. – MIT Academy CAPP Leadership team member

The school’s curriculum is now built on the expectation that all students should graduate ready to enroll in credit-bearing college courses. During the school day, seniors attend college-level English and math courses at MIT Academy, with materials provided, at no cost to them. Support blocks accompany these dual enrollment offerings to provide students with additional scaffolding to succeed in their college-level English and math courses.

The CAPP program has transformed the MIT secondary program, and I think in many ways [dual enrollment] has become one of our marquee programs. – MIT Academy CAPP Leadership team member

The CDP work extended beyond the academic year. MIT Academy now offers at least three college courses at the school’s campus each summer including a credit-bearing statistics course. Starting in summer 2016, rising freshman participated in the initial seminar of “Get Focused, Stay Focused,” a 4-year program to support college and career readiness.
Seamless Transitions to Postsecondary

Part of the vision of the CDP Partnership grants was to support school and district leaders to prepare high school students for a seamless transition to postsecondary education. As we discuss in the Introduction, the theory of action was rooted in the idea that implementation of Common Core English and math standards in high school would provide a context for conversations to better align the skills of high school graduates and the expectations of high school staff with those of college faculty. In addition to the changes in curriculum and course alignment discussed above, these conversations also brought about revised placement practices and new ways of supporting a college-going culture aimed at smoothing the transition from high school to college.

CDP Partnerships focused attention on the need for changes in community college placement practices and, and in some cases, were successful in implementing changes in college placement methods and related transitional supports.

Several partnerships were either in the process of negotiating revised placement practices or had actually implemented them. For instance, two of the five case study partnerships were using multiple measures to place students in English and in math at the local community college. Students who successfully completed the just below college credit-bearing English or math courses at the high school were automatically placed into a CSU/UC credit-bearing course at the community college. In contrast, other CDP Partnerships have attempted but not been able to work out an agreement with the local community college to accept multiple measures for student placement.

Partnerships also created academic and logistical supports for students to ease their transition from high school to college. Two CDP Partnerships created summer boot camps offering short-term intensive mathematics instruction to support students on the cusp of placing into credit-bearing courses. The community college in one of these partnerships also offered an accelerated class for students who did not place into credit-bearing courses. Students who successfully completed this semester-long class placed directly into college-level classes, thereby skipping remedial classes they would otherwise have had to take.

Additionally, CDP Partnerships worked to provide logistical support for students, with mixed results. Two partnerships provided on-site ACCUPLACER (college placement) testing, and one supplied students with a community college ID at the placement test. Although these partnerships were able to streamline placement and enrollment, another partnership’s work was hampered by a lack of online enrollment. The high school counselor circumvented this obstacle by chartering a bus to take students to campus so that they could enroll. Data and information sharing practices were hurdles to most partnerships. For example, in one CDP Partnership the inability of the high school and community college to share student data hindered college priority course enrollment. The same partnership had difficulty providing dual enrollment courses because of challenges sharing high school attendance and teacher information with the college.
Hollywood High School Partnership: Curriculum Alignment

The CDP grant was a catalyst for the Hollywood High School (HHS) partnership team to align HHS curricula and expectations for student performance with those of the community college partner, Los Angeles City College (LACC). To address poor placement results, HHS adopted a curriculum for the 12th-grade English course and developed a mathematics course that are aligned with the one level below credit-bearing courses at LACC. HHS students who pass their final exams may be placed directly into credit-bearing English and mathematics courses at LACC.

The new courses and placement agreement came about through a summit meeting and subsequent professional development. Grounding the HHS-LACC summit meeting in student performance data, student work, curriculum, and syllabi made the work concrete for instructors. Joint professional development was instrumental in aligning expectations across institutions. Cross-institution professional development included visiting each other’s campuses, observing each other teach, and developing and scoring final exams.

Although it is too early to assess the long-term results of the new courses, their addition has already changed student course-taking patterns. As one CDP Partnership leader explained,

Every senior has a chance to take a math class. Prior to CAPP, only 38% of students had a 4th-year math class, now 80% of seniors do. ... We realized we created a barrier for student success by not having a 4th year of math.

In addition, the courses may be affecting student placement results. Given results on the common finals, 23% of HHS students who took the 12th-grade English class and 23% of the students who took the new mathematics course will be able to enroll in credit-bearing courses at LACC.
In high schools that serve many first-generation college students, building a college-going culture is an important step toward increasing postsecondary enrollment. All the CDP Partnerships recognized this and worked to facilitate a college-going culture at the high schools.

All the partnerships saw the need for and benefits of building a college-going culture. This meant familiarizing high school staff, students, and parents with college academic and behavioral expectations as well as the logistics of applying to college. Further, it represented a change in expectations about college, with a new norm that students were presumed to go to college. Creating a college-going culture was especially important in the CDP high schools because many students were first-generation college students who “don’t know what they don’t know.” In the words of a high school counselor,

> What we want is for them to walk into their institution of higher education as first-time freshmen and not feel like a first-time freshmen in a sense, understand the process, understand what’s expected of them with academic rigor ... and classroom behavior and relationship-building with faculty and things like that so that that way when they get to college they understand the demands.

The CDP Partnerships supported greater awareness of college-going culture and expectations in a variety of ways. As described, CDP provided opportunities for conversations between high school and college staff members that led to new understandings of what is expected of students at the college level and subsequent changes in curriculum and course offerings. One CDP Partnership adopted an innovative program to support knowledge about and completion of a-g requirements. In recognition of parents’ integral role in determining whether and where their child will go to college, one high school initiated a program that trained parents to train other parents on how to prepare for college. As part of that program, staff from the local community college explained to parents how affordable the college is for students. In another partnership, high school and community college counselors collaboratively reached out to the local community and provided information for students and their families on enrolling at the community college and supported students in the enrollment process.
Deer Valley High School Partnership: “Collect All 15” Campaign

In the first year of the CDP grant, the Deer Valley High School CDP Partnership team developed the idea for a “Collect All 15” campaign to promote student completion of a-g course requirements. To be eligible for admission to colleges in the CSU and UC systems, California high school students must complete 15 units (each unit equivalent to 1 year of study) of coursework in college preparatory core academic subjects (see http://www.csumentor.edu/planning/high_school/subjects.asp). The Deer Valley team decided to print posters to inform students about the a-g requirements and also to have 15 pins that students could earn and display on a lanyard as they completed the required courses.

Starting in Year 2 of the grant, the team hung a-g posters in every classroom and in the library and cafeteria. The campaign has been very successful in sparking student interest and spreading information about a-g requirements not only among students and their families, but also among faculty. According to one member of the Deer Valley High School team,

the a-g’s are visible, and we get a lot of questions from parents and students about that because of their visibility. They are in every classroom that is an a-g class. There is a banner in every office. There are very large banners in both the cafeteria and the library. We have a handout in all of the house offices and in the main office. So [it has been] very productive.

The Deer Valley High School “Collect All 15” campaign quickly spread to other high schools in the district and beyond. The attractive design of the original posters and pins done in Deer Valley school colors can easily be adapted by other schools and districts as a simple yet effective method of increasing awareness and spurring interest in a-g course completion and thus encouraging more students to meet the basic eligibility requirements for admission to a CSU or UC campus.
4. Continuous Cycle of Improvement

The CDP Partnerships had limited success in collecting and using data in an articulated continuous cycle of improvement (CCI). In the logic model for the CDP evaluation, we posited that through a systematic and meaningful analysis of relevant data, CDP Partnerships would have the information necessary to make ongoing adjustments to their strategies and approaches to enhancing instruction and facilitating seamless transitions to college. We identified institutional outcomes and student experience and performance outcomes that we might expect to see included in a CCI used for this purpose. Three cornerstones to developing and implementing a CCI are an understanding of data-driven decision making, a theory of action to guide the selection of relevant indicators for measurement purposes, and a data system that supports the storage, retrieval, and analysis of relevant data. In addition to these three criteria, we believe it is important to have an established process and timeline for the systematic collection and analysis of relevant data. CAPP required CDP Partnerships to develop a CCI, but given the wide range of partnership contexts and goals, no specific CCI definition or operational guidelines for establishing a CCI were provided. The lack of clearly defined expectations and supports for implementing a CCI plus structural barriers such as limited data access were key factors limiting CDP Partnership teams’ development and use of a CCI.

**CDP high school partners identified limited support from the district and limited data sharing between high schools and colleges as ongoing hurdles to developing a continuous cycle of improvement.**

Most of the CDP high schools had to rely on their districts for the storage, retrieval, and linking of student data across secondary and postsecondary systems. Across the CDP Partnerships and over the 3 years of the CDP grant, support from district offices varied. Partnerships moved forward with the data they had, although some were struggling with district data systems that were insufficient or difficult to access and some found errors in reporting.

CDP Partnerships were not able to establish data sharing agreements between the community college partner and the secondary school or district. Lacking agreements, faculty at some CDP community colleges and the high schools developed work-around solutions to track students and share data in the aggregate. For example, in one CDP Partnership the high school and community college shared data on student performance in college transition summer boot camps and first-year college courses.

**Success in implementing a continuous cycle of improvement was impaired by poor access to data and limited capacity among high school leaders of CDP Partnerships to manage and use data for partnership-level decision making.**

Most CDP Partnership teams had the capacity for classroom-level and school-level data use and were thoughtful and strategic in using data to design interventions, gathering relevant data to measure the effect of the interventions, and using those data to make adjustments to their interventions. For example, one CDP Partnership that developed multiple interventions looked at student performance data to determine which interventions to continue and which to spread...
to other high schools. Similarly, another CDP Partnership team used multiple data sources including student performance data in newly designed courses to make decisions about staffing and strategies to support teachers adopting new curriculum. However, these improvement cycles were primarily at the classroom and school levels. There was less capacity to take a CCI to scale as a way to guide ongoing improvement of CDP Partnership teams’ overall curriculum and seamless transition efforts.

While each CDP Partnership team looked at quantitative data points, it was not clear how they were attributing movement on student-performance metrics (e.g., a-g completion/on-track rates, course passing rates, graduation rates, attendance) to specific partnership-related efforts. Using data for purposes beyond instructional improvement requires a skill set and experience that high school teachers rarely possess. One CDP Partnership noted that it still had work to do to make sure its data were analyzed and interpreted correctly, based on an understanding of what the data actually measured, and then used to make informed decisions about programs and policies. As part of this learning curve, one CDP Partnership team was still making the transition from using data to report out to interpreting those data and using them to drive change.

In addition, some CDP Partnerships looked at data less frequently and systematically than others. Some examined data annually, relying on the time set aside for review and planning at the annual CAPP convening to jointly analyze the high school and community college data.

5. Sustainability

Over the course of the study, CDP Partnerships named staff turnover as an important barrier. Strategies for mitigating the negative effects of turnover included institutionalizing partnership roles, providing funding for continuation projects, and publicizing successes to build interest and credibility. These continue to be the central issues for sustainability.

Turnover of personnel, particularly at postsecondary institutions, poses a significant challenge to building and sustaining relationships among partners. Partners have mitigated these challenges by institutionalizing roles.

Staff turnover and changes in staff roles emerged as important factors affecting the sustainability of partnership relationships. As discussed earlier, strong, trusting relationships among key players who hold a shared vision serves as the bedrock for a strong partnership. Even with strong relationships among partnership members, however, it is inevitable that leaders across institutions will leave or experience a shift in their roles or responsibilities that limits their ability to act as partners. Each time a position turns over, the new participant must be introduced to the CAPP work, learn his or her role in it, build relationships, and start to engage in the work. Therefore, onboarding new players takes significant resources. Turnover occurred more frequently among postsecondary institution partners, creating an “ever-shifting landscape of people.”
Members of CDP Partnership teams sought to mitigate these challenges by embedding their practices into policies and systems within their institutional control. As a participant said, “Where it becomes systemic, then it will survive turnover.” One partnership addressed the issue of orienting new partnership team members to the CDP work by creating an onboarding binder. This resource, coupled with clear expectations from the institution’s leadership, provided the scaffolding necessary for a new institutional leader to step in and support the existing partnership. Furthermore, this partnership embedded key aspects of its work in several key staff members’ job descriptions, establishing a documented expectation of how the team’s work will continue to be a part of that job when someone leaves.

**Kern High School District Partnership: Building on Existing Relationships**

The partnership between the English departments at Kern High School District, Bakersfield College, and CSU Bakersfield is rooted in decades of collaboration. For more than 25 years, Bakersfield College and CSU Bakersfield have been in conversation about English course placements for students as they transfer between institutions. They have also been working together to improve articulation across institutions in the English course curriculum and instructional professional development under the auspices of the annual Building Bridges conference. Kern HSD has joined these institutions and Taft College in professional development with the goal of improving student literacy. Through these partnerships, staff and institution leaders alike have built trust and shared understanding in pursuit of their common goals of improving students’ literacy and postsecondary success. While many of the initiatives in Kern County’s educational institutions share a common vision, historically, until the CDP Partnership, they had not been coordinated under a common banner.

The long-standing relationships were a strong base for the CDP Partnership to build upon when coordinating the aligned but not quite coordinated cross-institutional efforts on literacy and postsecondary success. The CDP work was also supported by leadership in the form of attendance at CDP Partnership meetings. This leadership support, the alignment of the CDP Partnership’s work with existing initiatives, and strong relationships and coordination across institutions have led some staff to feel confident that the work will continue when the CDP grant ends. As one partnership member said,

This grant … [is] the most significant grant we’ve ever had because it’s brought all the principal players to the table to work on the education of students in this community…. That’s never happened before.

Publicizing data on success supported the visibility and sustainability of the CDP work in high schools and school districts as well as beyond the partnerships. Partnership teams also built internal capacity as they worked with the data and on dissemination plans.
When it was available, data on student success played two important roles in CDP Partnerships: (1) It increased teacher and administrator buy-in, and (2) it facilitated scaling. Data can persuade faculty of the benefits of the CDP Partnership work, thereby promoting sustainability.

I think we have to have teachers and administrators ... understand that ... [the CDP Partnership work] meets the goals set to them by the state of California.... You sustain it by proving it helps them do their job. I think you sustain it by having ... multiple years of longitudinal data that show that it’s really making a difference.

Some CDP Partnerships also used data to build support for scaling it to other sites. For instance, one CDP Partnership was able to successfully promote expansion of its efforts into the other two district high schools and secured district funding for this work. As one member of the team said,

I think over the past couple of years, as we have completed things that have been successful, we've tried to really be visible to our administrators as well as to our district administrators, so they saw the success. And then also sharing the success with our other district schools. So a couple of the programs ... have already been picked up at the other schools.

This CDP Partnership demonstrates how positive outcome data can support both programmatic and funding sustainability at the high school and school district levels.

In addition to building buy-in and supporting scaling, working with the data and on dissemination plans built internal sustainability as CDP Partnership teams reflected on what had gone well and on areas for improvement. The dissemination plans focused on successful programs and strategies, relationship building, and lessons learned. One partnership particularly called out lessons learned in the hope of saving future partnerships from making the same mistakes it had. In the words of the superintendent,

Basically, we hope that schools and leaders will learn what it took us 3 years to figure out related to these topics. We’d love to save them at least part of the agony we experienced in the process, while getting all of the benefits! Our vision is to lay out a yellow brick road that would get people to positive outcomes without too many lions and tigers and bears along the way.

6. **CAPP Facilitators**

In addition to the grant funds, CAPP provided each CDP team sustained support from a CAPP Facilitator, periodic professional development, and support from the CAPP Director, CDP Project Director, and CAPP Advisory Committee in carrying out the responsibilities of the grant. While the CDP teams appreciated each of the supports, almost all respondents singled out their CAPP Facilitator as a significant contributor to their success.
Broadly speaking, the CAPP Facilitators were tasked with supporting CDP Partnerships’ fulfillment of the goals of the CDP grant. To do this, CAPP Facilitators worked directly with CDP Partnerships to support the implementation of their strategies. In addition, CAPP Facilitators functioned as a communication channel between the CDP Partnerships and CAPP leaders. Whereas the CAPP Facilitators continued to fulfill these roles as the partnerships developed, how they did so evolved over time, with the facilitators pulling back as the partnerships strengthened. Here, we describe the roles the CAPP Facilitators played with the CDP Partnership teams, what supported their work, and how their role changed over time.

**Most CAPP Facilitators were highly valued by the CDP Partnerships.**

Over the years and across the 11 CDP Partnerships, most respondents praised the work of their CAPP Facilitator. Many appreciated the facilitator’s bringing a different perspective to the table, playing the role of critical friend and asking the tough questions that would not be safe for an internal player to ask. Partnership leaders valued the CAPP Facilitator’s ability to provide guidance and support and keep the focus on actualizing their plans. One respondent who observed the work of the CAPP Facilitator in group meetings explained, “She comes in to make sure it’s all about goals we expressed and how can she help with that.” The CDP Partnerships also credited the CAPP Facilitators with directing conversations as needed, especially in the early years, modeling how to facilitate meetings and develop agendas, and helping the CDP Partnership teams build trust. In imagining life after the CDP grant and “post-facilitator,” one lead teacher said the team’s plan for group facilitation is to ask each other what the CAPP Facilitator would do if faced with that dilemma.

**CAPP Facilitators opened doors to the CDP Partnerships through a combination of their personal networks and by virtue of their association with CAPP.**

CDP Partners also appreciated the CAPP Facilitators’ offering their own personal and professional contacts to support the work. CAPP Facilitators were uniquely positioned to facilitate the development of cross-level partnerships. Over time CAPP has developed a cadre of educators from all segments (K-12, community college, CSU, UC) who are experienced at developing cross-level partnerships and who join new CAPP initiatives as facilitators. Because of their personal networks and their position within CAPP, the facilitators have an easier time opening doors at postsecondary institutions than principals or lead teachers of individual high schools.

CAPP Facilitators also helped CDP Partners understand the organizational structures and realities of their partnering organizations because of their knowledge of education systems. In particular, CAPP Facilitators helped the secondary school team leaders understand the postsecondary systems, navigate those systems, and learn to speak the language of their postsecondary partners. The CAPP Facilitators built school leaders’ ability to work across institutions through their role in the partnerships. One district leader expressed it this way:

[The CAPP Facilitator] is somebody who comes in with a very different perspective than [members on my team], and she [shares] the community
college perspective and here’s how we can make this work. ... [The Facilitator is the] ... bishop on the chessboard that can move in ways that I can’t. I’m more like the king, I can move in any direction but only one plodding step at a time.

As partnerships developed and evolved, CAPP Facilitators described becoming less directive and reducing their role.

CAPP Facilitators reported responding to CDP Partnerships’ evolving needs based on their stage of development as well as their established goals for the grant and their context. Thus, CAPP Facilitators work looked different across the CDP Partnerships and over time as the context for the partnerships changed. For example, during the capacity building and early implementation phases of the CDP grant, CAPP Facilitators concentrated on building trust and developing relationships. As CDP Partnerships prepared to conclude the implementation phase of the CDP work, CAPP Facilitators increasingly directed them toward sustainability, and they expanded their work to include the dissemination efforts.

After building trust, getting to know the people, establishing a plan for the work, and getting the work under way, CAPP Facilitators began to step back from managing relationships and monitoring activities to become a resource and provide guidance. Knowing the people and their work meant that the CAPP Facilitators could more quickly make recommendations and move work forward. A CAPP Facilitator described this transition as follows:

If I look back to how we started, which was very focused on more specific and detail-oriented things, to now I think ..., even though I don’t see them all that often, [we have] a much closer relationship. I believe trust has been built and we can now work together closely without a lot of time going through stuff. ... I see myself more as a guide and resource ... and they have come ... to look at me as someone they trust in giving guidance to them.

7. Conclusion

In this concluding section, we summarize the key lessons learned from the evaluation findings and implications for future CAPP grantmaking. We begin with some high-level observations about the findings on components of the CDP logic model: partnerships, paths to change, continuous cycle of improvement, and CAPP facilitation. Finally, we offer remarks on the original intent and subsequent achievements of the CDP Partnerships overall.

Our evaluation findings on CDP Partnerships revealed the importance of having the right people involved, building trust, and grounding the work in a common vision of supporting students. Beyond these findings, general lessons emerged from our data on partnerships. First, we heard many times in interviews with CDP participants that partnership work was slow and progress was uneven and subject to frequent setbacks. Therefore, persistence is the key to success. Also, we learned that CDP participants often saw the process of partnership as being just as important as the products. Specifically, participants saw clear benefits in terms of professional
growth from cross-level teacher collaboration that transcended the short-term objectives of the collaboration.

The CDP Partnerships each developed strategies and plans for addressing the aims of enhancing instruction and facilitating more seamless transitions to college. Some Partnerships chose to focus their work on enhancing student academic readiness for college on mathematics, some on English, and some on both. Across the plans and approaches adopted by the CDP Partnerships, we saw new course development and dual enrollment as common strategies. We also noted a variety of approaches and varying degrees of success among CDP Partnerships in addressing barriers posed by college placement practices and in building a college-going culture in the high school. As a general lesson, the CAPP strategy of allowing each CDP Partnership to develop its own plans for addressing the aims of the CDP initiative was a key strength. Identifying broad focus areas (in this case, enhancing instruction to improve academic readiness for college and addressing policy barriers to seamless transitions) was a productive approach for CAPP grantmaking. The overall results of giving CDP Partnerships wide leeway in defining their work were uneven in terms of goal achievement, but the results were consistently strengthening of local capacity and surfacing and addressing of local issues with local solutions that would not have been possible under more rigid parameters.

The CAPP requirement for all CDP Partnerships to establish a data-driven continuous cycle of improvement for internal monitoring and improvement of the grant work was a good idea in principle but ineffective in practice. The CDP Partnerships did not have the data management capacity or access to data needed to make a CCI work. For future grantmaking, CAPP may need to provide grantees with a more clearly specified CCI model and technical assistance.

Effective use of data also plays a key role in the sustainability of the CDP Partnerships, as does documenting partnership roles and responsibilities in ways that can prevent disruptions from inevitable staff turnover. CAPP’s decision to follow up on CDP with grants to support dissemination of the CDP work was wise. Turning the attention of the CDP Partnerships toward documentation and sharing of their experience and success had the added benefit of enabling them to examine and reflect on their experiences in ways that will support sustainability.

The CAPP Facilitators and general technical assistance were important supports for the CDP Partnerships. In general, CAPP Facilitators were able to respond flexibly and effectively to CDP Partnerships’ needs and were also able to help CDP Partnerships make connections across education levels and institutions. As a whole, the CAPP Facilitators brought an exceptional breadth and depth of expertise to the task of supporting the partnerships. For future grantmaking, it may be fruitful to explore ways of better distributing the expertise of the CAPP Facilitators. Giving each CDP Partnership access to more than one CAPP Facilitator might have helped to address a broader range of each Partnership’s needs for assistance. For instance, one facilitator might have expertise in curriculum and instruction while another may have expertise in developing partnerships or data systems.
Looking back over the 3 years of work by the CDP Partnerships covered in this evaluation report, it is evident that two central aspects of the original CAPP vision did not play out as planned. First, the CDP grants did not directly support the “full implementation of Common Core Standards.” The CDP Partnerships did have notable successes in improving curriculum and instruction to enhance students’ academic readiness for college, but that work did not remain focused on aligning instruction with Common Core Standards. Talking about the Common Core Standards was more often an opening to a deeper conversation within high schools and between high school and community college faculty about bolstering high school instruction through more detailed and more local understanding of readiness for college-level English and mathematics. This is as it should be. By design, Common Core Standards define college-ready levels of English and mathematics only in broad strokes. The CDP Partnerships made real progress on the goal of enhancing instruction when they moved beyond discussion of implementing Common Core Standards and took the next step of comparing and aligning high school and college expectations for student achievement in English and mathematics.

Second, although every CDP Partnership started out with one or more 4-year colleges committed to the partnership, substantial and sustained engagement of a 4-year college partner was rare. A number of factors, including a lack of clear incentives for participation, worked against full engagement of 4-year colleges in the CDP Partnerships. In the end, representatives from 4-year colleges played a relatively small role in the CDP Partnerships. Even so, their lack of engagement was not a major barrier for the partnerships’ work to enhance college-ready English and mathematics instruction and was not the most significant barrier to the work to address policy barriers to seamless transitions to postsecondary education. CDP high schools working with community college partners were often able to identify problems in college placement policies and practices impeding seamless transitions. However, CDP Partnerships’ progress in changing college placement policies was severely limited in most cases. Removing barriers to seamless transitions posed by community college placement policies will require broader regional or statewide systemic change efforts. The CDP Partnerships were not designed to create systemic changes at that scale. The fact that the locus of action and change was an individual high school in partnership with a local community college was a distinctive feature of the CDP Partnership model. This feature of the CDP Partnership model enabled building local knowledge and capacity for instructional improvement and for facilitating more seamless transitions to college. It also enabled the CDP Partnerships to change local instructional practices and build local college-going cultures in ways that broader systemic change initiatives can rarely achieve.
Exhibit A1: Expanded Logic Model

Goal: To establish seamless transitions for students from high school to colleges and universities, particularly for students traditionally underrepresented in postsecondary education.

Context: District-wide Implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) And Local Policies Affecting College Access, Retention, and Success

CDP Partnerships
- Formed partnerships
- Developed plans to support CCSS during CBG
- Create professional development opportunities
- Evaluate student needs and policies to facilitate college access and success
- Engage in a continuous cycle of improvement

Path to Change: Enhance Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Strategies and interventions to support CCSS implementation and improve instruction and assessment
- Curriculum alignment to reduce need for postsecondary remediation
- Cross-level course development
- Joint professional development

Path to Change: Align Policy and Improve Environment to Facilitate Seamless Postsecondary Transitions
- High school course offerings, graduation requirements, etc.
- College admissions, placement and remediation, and transfer requirements, etc.
- College-going culture

Improved Student Outcomes
- High School
  - College and career readiness
  - a-g completion
  - High school graduation
- Community College
  - Placement in credit-bearing courses
  - Retention
  - Associate’s degree or certificate or transfer
- Bachelor’s Program
  - Admission
  - Retention
  - Bachelor’s degree

Continuous Cycle of Improvement