Community Partnership Evaluation

Building Evaluation Capacity, Understanding Collective Impact
Context

- Large, diverse urban school district with 35,000 students and 70+ schools
- New strategic plan focused on 5/8/10 growth increments and schools as unit of change
- District-wide budget cuts
- Culture of accountability
- 122 community organizations have formal contracts to provide services; many others work with youth in OST
- Department reorganization aligned to needs identified in strategic plan
Minneapolis Research Evaluation and Assessment

- Program Evaluation
  - Internal Program Evaluation
  - Youth Participation Evaluation
  - Return on Investment

- Assessment
  - Stereotype Threat
  - Data Use
  - Assessment cycle

- Data Literacy
  - Assessments
  - On-Track System
  - Socio-Emotional Measures
  - Dashboards

- Partnerships
  - Community Partnership Evaluation
  - Expanding OST Partnerships
  - Personalized Learning Systems
Collective Impact Definition (FSG):

“Collective impact occurs when organizations from different sectors agree to solve a specific social problem using a common agenda, aligning their efforts, and using common measures of success.” Local examples:

– LISC
– Northside Achievement Zone/Promise Neighborhoods
– Generation Next
– After School Network (Youth Coordinating Board)
Collective Impact Evaluation

“An approach to performance measurement and evaluation that is as multi-faceted, responsive, and flexible as the initiatives themselves.”

• Key Factors:
  – Recognize context
  – Emphasize continuous learning
  – Change evaluation approach with stages of development

Hallie Preskill (2015):
### Landscape Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Partner</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Community Partners</td>
<td>Any organization that provides programming to MPS students, either in schools or in the community.</td>
<td>Total = 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Community Partner</td>
<td>An organization that provides programming or interventions to MPS students on school property; the programming or interventions take place during and/or after school. Approved community partners have signed agreements with the External Partnerships department to provide services.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education Partner</td>
<td>An organization that provides programming through Minneapolis Public Schools Community Education.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Community-Based Organizations (CBO)</td>
<td>Organizations that provide programming on behalf of Extended Learning and receive Alternative Learning Center (ALC) funding from the state to serve students.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beliefs (Assumptions)

1. Out-of-school time programs are valuable partners in increasing student outcomes
2. Partnerships can be mutually beneficial for MPS and youth-serving organizations
3. Evaluation as process builds relationships and facilitates change
CPE Project Overview

• Developed by Research, Evaluation & Assessment Department
• Designed to build evaluation capacity of community partners
• Leveraged external funding
• Extended on partnership model from Saint Paul Public Schools Foundation’s Tutoring Partnership (383 total programs)
Goals: Community Partnership Evaluation

1. Improve data sharing with MPS community partners
2. Align community partner services with MPS strategic plan
3. Increase the capacity of community partners to utilize evaluation for program improvement
Telling A New Narrative:

• Demonstrate positive interactions with MPS community and staff at the central office

• Provide space for community partners voice to be heard and influence:
  – Authentically ask and listen to their needs
  – Respond to requests and communications
  – Validate the role of out-of-school time in student success

• Consistently demonstrate investment with district staff presence
Communication To Alignment: Process Mapping

Communication:
- Build relationships
- Learn about each other’s work
- Discuss challenges
- Visit programs and sites
- Present data

Collaboration:
- Identify common goals
- Share resources and ideas
- Partner on specific projects
- Share data

Alignment:
- Make changes based on group and shared goals
- Hold each other accountable
- Program resources are group resources
- Utilize group data to reallocate resources and services
Collective Impact Model: Partnership Evaluation

- Roster Collection and Coding
- Evaluation Capacity
  - Monthly Workshops (Socio-Emotional, Logic Model, Theory of Change, Data Collection)
  - Brown Bag Lunches (Youth Evaluations, Survey Design)
  - Coaching and Technical Assistance
- Aggregate Reports
- High Level Evaluations
Starting the Work
Data Sharing

- Community partners submit student rosters twice each year
- Fall:
  - MPS REA uploads participation roster into student database for teachers and families
  - Identifies gaps to better meet student needs
- Spring:
  - MPS REA creates aggregate reports from EOY rosters to provide organizations with data
  - Improves ability to analyze effect of OST programming
### 2014-2015 Roster Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Partner</th>
<th>Rosters Collected</th>
<th>Total Eligible Organizations*</th>
<th>Percent Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Community Partners</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that 12 organizations provide health-related services and therefore cannot provide a student roster to MPS REA due to HIPAA protections.*
Alignment

- Collected and mapped participation in community partner programs
- Aligned data collection and partnerships across MPS departments
- Created infrastructure for data-sharing with community partners
- Mapped program alignment with MPS strategic plan
Generating Buy-In

- Consistently reinforced vision for the project and how it impacts students
- Developed mutually beneficial data-sharing with partners
- Started with easy wins, e.g., evaluation workshops, site visits, aggregate reports
  - Provided opportunities for MPS departments to give input
- External Partnerships
- Extended Learning
- Community Education
- Behavior Standards/Restorative Practices
- IT

- Shared credit for results
Products
Aggregate Reports

• Program data
• District comparison
• Include:
  – Student Demographics
  – MAP and MCA Achievement and Growth
  – Attendance
  – Behavior
High Level Evaluations: Collective Impact

• REA staff as external evaluators
• Examine impact and implementation of youth programs
• Organizations selected on criteria:
  – Program size
  – Evaluation capacity
  – Type of partnership with district
Example: MPS - CAN

• 18 organizations
• Serving over half of MPS students in grades 6-12 (9,739 of 19,368)
• Group wanted to know about overlap and gaps, but cannot share rosters with one another due to FERPA
• Limitations
  – Small sample sizes
  – Comparison groups have incomplete data about OST participation
### Who is included in the analysis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of students on roster provided by organization (may contain duplicates)</th>
<th>Number of middle and high school students served SY15 that could be matched with MPS ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AchieveMPLS</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVID</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyan Community</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough Twin Cities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Possible</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts of MN and Wisconsin River Valleys</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minds Matter Twin Cities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Community and Technical College</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandale Community College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Success</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota - CEHD</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Multicultural Achievers</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear Up</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Ready</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check and Connect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,733</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique Student IDs</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,739</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Year 1 Evaluation Questions

- Who participates in college access programs?
- Does participation vary by subgroup?
- What types of services do the programs provide to students?
- What are the desired outcomes for students participating in these programs? Are there common outcomes or categories of outcomes across programs?
- What does participation look like across programs (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity)?
- What combination(s) of programs is most common? What is the most common pathway?
- To what extent are programs serving students in alternative schools or pathways?

We’re sharing this data with you today.
Review of Year 1 Evaluation Questions

- Who participates in college access programs?
- Does participation vary by subgroup?
- What types of services do the programs provide to students?
- What are the desired outcomes for students participating in these programs? Are there common outcomes or categories of outcomes across programs?
- What does participation look like across frequency, duration, intensity?)?
- What combination(s) of programs is most common? What is the most common pathway?
- To what extent are programs serving students in alternative schools or pathways?

We still need help answering these questions.
Who is being served?

District-wide, grades 6 - 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Served (N=9,739)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Served (N=9,629)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (N=19,367)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who is being served?

District-wide, grades 6 - 12

- Lunch Eligible
  - Served (N=9,739): 76%
  - Not Served (N=9,629): 24%

- Not Lunch Eligible
  - Served (N=9,739): 24%
  - Not Served (N=9,629): 47%

Total Population (N=19,367)
  - Served: 65%
  - Not Served: 35%
Who is being served?

District-wide, grades 6 – 12 and continuously enrolled at the same school

- Grades 6 to 8: 61% served
- Comprehensive High Schools: 57% served
- Alternative/Contract Alternative: 23% served
Future Considerations:
Collective Impact Year 2

• Evaluation for decision-making
  – Cost-effectiveness within context
• Determining collective impact on traditional academic outcomes
  – Aligning programs with district measures
• Continued Funding
• Increase participants in project
• Providing participation data to teachers and schools (Dashboards)
• Integrate community partnership data with personalized learning system