STRATEGY 1: Support the development and expansion of re-engagement pathways

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

CCER working with United Way, OSPI, King County Employment & Education Resources, Puget Sound ESD, Seattle Education Access, as well as individual CTCs, CBOs and school districts.

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Assess re-engagement "system" for balance (e.g., geography, credential options, sub-group needs) and identify gaps and targets	• Landscape scan of programs and offerings • Complete a finer-grained analysis of the current supply		• Initial landscape scan and map developed and updated regularly • Open Doors profiles (summer 2015) give some detail on offerings/need • More fine-grained assessment of availability of different services and supports (e.g., employment training/work experience) still needed • Research now underway by outreach team should help identify gaps
Address gaps in supply by working with district, college and community-based organization (CBO) leads to support pathway start-up and expansion	• 2,500 re-engagement "slots" by 2015 • New programs in areas of geographic need • All CTCs and school districts in our region participating in Open Doors • Increased specialization (e.g., pop-specific) • Increased options for OY *with* HS credential		• Roughly 2,000 re-engagement slots (over 2,500 county-wide) • All CTCs in region participating in Open Doors; 6 of 7 districts • More options in S. King; CBO-based option at Friends of Youth Eastside • Highline College piloting ELL pathway • For OY with HS credential: Year Up expansion; completion coaching at GRCC and Seattle Colleges via Project Finish Line; HS21+ launched at Seattle Central; SEA embedded across most reengagement sites • New CBO-based GED sites in S. King struggled to recruit and retain
Compile info to inform system-building, including further segmentation of OY population to understand need, cost	• Next level analysis of OY needs completed • Open Doors cost model developed		• Initial project to understand Open Doors costs/revenue generated some information; was of limited value given early implementation • DSHS analysis of opportunity youth needs/barriers complete • Early cost analysis work was of limited value; programs far enough along with Open Doors revenue that this could be more useful going forward

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

• Supply has expanded. Increase focus on *improving* current supply (including ensuring sites offer key components such as employment training/work experience, behavioral health supports – informed by RDA findings).
• In terms of diversifying supply, figure out how to finance iBest type pathways at CTCs. Continue identifying gaps for sub-pops (e.g, teen parents, ELL, foster youth).
• Gaps remain in S. Seattle, Auburn. Discussions underway with Central, King County and SEA to replicate Learning Center North model at SVI. Could be key location to offer a targeted strategy focused on supporting black males.

Key	
Good progress	
Medium progress	
No progress or major challenge(s)	
Completed	✓

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Need for better data on how different racial/ethnic subgroups are doing in programs. Need to share effective practices (local and national) for serving specific populations, i.e. boys and men of color. Consider need for more tailored programs like ELL Excel. Additional option in S. Seattle could respond to high numbers of eligible African American youth in S. Seattle and program should be developed with that population in mind.

DRAFT

STRATEGY2: Address systemic and regulatory barriers to re-engagement

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

United Way, CCER, OSPI, Puget Sound ESD, WDC and individual CTCs, CBOs and school districts.

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Advocate for improvements to Open Doors	• Changes to Open Doors law or rules that facilitate expanded supply • Increased alignment across district credit retrieval policies/practices	Yellow	• Some additions made to IAPs creating more flexibility • Modest improvements/clarifications to rules (e.g., slight improvement to documentation requirements, credit deficiency calculation) • SBCTC gained seat on Open Doors steering committee • Need for barrier funding, 12-month funding remain, no current legislative champion
Identify companion funding for Open Doors Advocate for policies that enable blended/braided funding	• Open Doors programs access additional funding (e.g., BFET) • Open Doors programs access other K-12 funds in addition to BEA • Co-enrollment in Open Doors & WIOA	Green	• United Way launched major fundraising campaign related to reengagement • BEA increased from $5,755.84 to $6,308.69 for 2015-16 school year • SBCTC clarified how CTCs can braid ABE and Open Doors $ • Highline College receiving TBIP (per-student ELL $) from district in addition to BEA • King County co-enrolling students in Open Doors and WIA • WDC's P3 proposal to support co-enrollment and broaden eligibility approved • PSESD exploring BFET pilot within reengagement, with Open Doors $ as match • King County EER starting BFET pilot for homeless youth employment
Elevate reengagement among district and CTC leadership Establish re-engagement point in each district	• District establish dropout re-engagement point person • Puget Sound Coalition for College and Career Readiness understands and prioritize OY	Yellow	• Not all districts have point person on dropout re-engagement; when they do, they vary significantly in terms of authority (principal vs. deputy superintendent) • Puget Sound Coalition identified OY as a priority in Compact & was briefed twice during 2015. • Significant turnover among district leadership (5 of 7 superintendents)

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

• Progress made linking to additional funding streams and interest in population and programs growing. Could be helpful to document/create infographic on funding streams, purposes, blending opps and barriers.
• Need to double down on quality, outcomes, capacity building to ensure we can demonstrate the value of reengagement programs.
• Build advocacy working group and agenda for next legislative session with focus on easing/incentivizing CTC involvement and addressing barrier funding.
• Deeper dive into accessing BFET to support youth employment training in the context of Open Doors/reengagement.
• Consider revisiting cost/revenue modeling work to illustrate funding options.
• Working with KC to streamline referral linkage between Youth Housing Connect and reengagement system; do the same with JJ. Consider foster care system linkages.

Key	
Good progress	Green
Medium progress	Yellow
No progress or major challenge(s)	Red

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Consider linking increased Open Doors focus in S. Seattle (new SVI based program) to school district's action plan for accelerating achievement of African American males and Mayor Murray's youth initiative also focused on this population.

DRAFT

STRATEGY 3: Establish shared vision and identify and develop shared structures that link pathways into a system

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

CCER, King County EER, Regional network steering committee (SEA, KCEER, iGrad/GRC, Acceleration Academy, FareStart, Goodwill)

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Facilitate and staff community of practice for re-engagement providers	• Regional network of providers established, meets monthly • Increased referrals across programs • Re-engagement program directory live by summer 2015	Green	• Regional community of practice has met monthly since Oct. 2014 • 22 different programs participated; 17 programs on average participate per meeting; average attendance 30, highest 54 • Steering committee established summer 2015 to help identify themes, speakers and build agendas • Feedback consistently positive
Develop shared framework that includes the range of desired pathways and features of effective pathways	• Develop shared framework • Providers endorse and use shared framework	Yellow	• Action plan reflects a shared framework for system-building • Program-level shared values and framework drafted in late 2014 to establish commonalities across group; many programs involved • Framework used inform and frame monthly network meetings • Programs seem to generally support framework content, however no formal adoption process has been developed or attempted
Identify areas where shared structures might help, pilot shared structures and review results	• Programs adopt shared practices and make necessary organizational changes • Regional re-engagement function(s) developed to connect youth to best pathways	Yellow	• Program leaders identified outreach/marketing as shared priority • Regional outreach strategy launched w/ King County 10/15 • Data capacity scan completed and initial work to share (and possibly create) common data tools, processes • Support for system manager position secured 10/15

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

- Progress building a network/community of practice. Strong interest among providers to share and learn together. Need to identify best practices locally and nationally and share widely throughout network
- Opportunity to take interest in coordination to the next level and formalize system or network "commitments" in both directions – here's how you benefit as members, here's what is expected.
- Shared network-level targets to help build cohesion, urgency (link to Reconnecting Youth goals).
- Prioritize development of strong regional outreach function. Pilot outreach and communication strategies to determine best approaches.
- Revisit shared framework in the context of logic model development so it can be more useful to collection and program improvement purposes.

Key	
Good progress	Green
Medium progress	Yellow
No progress or major challenge(s)	Red
Completed	✓

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Ensure regional outreach strategy builds on grassroots community expertise and includes culturally relevant messages, materials, etc. Review/develop shared framework or logic model with a racial equity lens. Intentionally use regional network meetings as a space to address how programs can better meet the needs of youth of color. Need to help programs hire staff who represent the youth they serve.

DRAFT

STRATEGY 4: Develop shared continuous quality improvement tools and processes

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

CCER, King County EER, BERK? PSESD?, SOWA?

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Develop shared tools and processes for collecting and using data for quality improvement	• Providers endorse and utilize a shared definition of quality	🟥	• Shared framework drafted (focused more on key program components than quality standards) •
Secure professional development on quality practice for re-engagement staff	• Providers participate in a data-driven quality improvement cycle, using common tools for measuring quality & outcomes • Providers participate in a series of PD/training aligned with quality assessment definition/tool	🟥	• Monthly regional network meetings and occasional workshops (racial equity, youth mental health) have offered PD "light" • Data capacity review completed with Open Doors programs; pointed to significant challenges related to data collection, reporting and use but strong interest in using data for program improvement • YPQI introduced as possible framework/process for continuous improvement
Ensure all pathways offer or link to employment supports and postsecondary bridging	• All pathways offer or link to several core components: postsecondary navigation; employment training/experience; wrap-around supports.	🟨	• Increased emphasis across network in creating a college/career culture • Expansion of SEA postsecondary navigation services within Open Doors network

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

- High priority going forward. Though SIF funding is helping to build postsecondary focus and support across programs, limited progress in terms of more general quality standards/PD work.
- Additional funding from Raikes secured to offer YPQI or similar PD/quality improvement process with aligned assessment, planning, coaching and training.
- Consider convening interested group soon to review and discuss YPQA, JFF Back on Track tool, Learning Center North's instructional quality framework.

Key	
Good progress	🟩
Medium progress	🟨
No progress or major challenge(s)	🟥
Completed	✓

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Programs need and want strong PD related to cultural competence and effectively supporting youth of color. Bring a racial equity lens to decisions about quality improvement frameworks/processes.

DRAFT

STRATEGY 5: Monitor system reach and outcomes

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

CCER with United Way, Road Map Data Advisors

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Identify key system outcomes and targets Identify data needed to monitor outcomes Review disaggregated data whenever possible to keep a focus on disproportionality and progress of sub-groups	• Opportunity youth indicators are established with a baseline report in 2014; corresponding outcome targets are set and reported on regularly • Providers endorse and regularly report on common outcome metrics		• OY indicators (community-level and reengagement system level) developed with input from Road Map Project data advisors and work group. • Baseline data to be included in 2015 results report (forthcoming in early 2016) • Targets developed for United Way RY effort, SIF grant (both with specific racial equity metrics) and Raikes proposal. Once 2014-15 Open Doors data is in hand will revisit target setting with network.
Review data on participation, quality and outcomes to inform system design and performance Review disaggregated data whenever possible to keep a focus on disproportionality and progress of sub-groups	• Program persistence and completion (stick rate) increase. • Postsecondary enrollment, persistence and completion increase		• Data capacity review completed with Open Doors programs; pointed to significant challenges related to data collection, reporting and use but some commonality in terms of metrics and strong interest in using data for program improvement and increased alignment. • In December 2015, launching additional analysis of current program output/outcome/cost data, in partnership with Raikes Foundation and KC EER

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

- Data work has been slow, especially at program level. Open Doors programs focused on managing administrative and compliance challenges; most do not yet have a useful flow of information for program improvement. BERK report generated useful documentation and recommendations for moving forward.
- Once 2014-15 Open Doors data are in hand (imminent) we will be in a more informed position to facilitate a regional target setting conversation, keeping in mind setting ambitious targets is only helpful with adequate commitment to program support and capacity building.

Key	
Good progress	🟩
Medium progress	🟨
No progress or major challenge(s)	🟥
Completed	✓

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Be consistent about disaggregated reporting of OY indicator data. Look at the rate at which different sub-groups leave school vs. re-engage, not just how successful programs are with sub-groups once they re-enroll. When developing reports, slides, etc., use Casey Race Matters tool on reporting data using racial equity lens. Include specific racial equity metrics for any community-level target setting.

DRAFT

STRATEGY 6: Develop and implement opportunity youth outreach strategies (including youth-led strategies)

Key Partners and Lead Implementer(s):

CCER, King County Youth Advisory Council/SOAR, KC EER, Reel Grrls, YDEKC/211

Activities	Goals/Short-Term Outcomes	Status	Progress as of 12/6/15
Explore regionalizing outreach/marketing for re-engagement programs	• Regional outreach function(s) will be established	🟩	• Funding secured via Raikes and P3 (WDC) to support regional outreach strategy. • Regional outreach manager and two Americorps hired, fall 2015 • 2016 work plan under development
Implement youth-led peer outreach to raise awareness and connect youth to pathways	• Series of short videos featuring different youth stories and different re-engagement pathways developed by youth	🟨	• Youth hired and trained, developed 3 videos developed for Open Doors programs with unfilled seats • Input gathered from King County Youth Advisory Council on re-engagement campaign messages and images
Develop accessible, regularly updated directory of re-engagement pathways	• Online directory of re-engagement programs is live by summer 2015	🟨	• www.youthprogramdirectory.org is now live (beta version), includes 27 re-engagement programs • Re-engagement program list managed by CCER to transition to county outreach team, broadened and updated regularly
Design compelling communications and community engagement activities that raise awareness and build urgency	• Pilot community-based re-engagement summits or other peer outreach strategies	🟨	• Funding secured via Raikes to develop re-engagement campaign materials to support regional outreach • Peer outreach positions at two CBO-based programs; lessons learned documented to informed regional outreach efforts. • Conversations underway with housing authorities and libraries
Document current district and college practices for reaching out to students who have left without finishing; Identify and share promising practices	• Every district has a mechanism to reach out to students who leave without completing, possibly linked to EWIS • By fall 2016, attempt is made to reach out to every "D" or "U" from all Road Map districts	🟥	• Kent, Federal Way provide D/U lists regularly to iGrad and Acceleration Academy. Renton and Tukwila have shared list with County but not regularly. Not clear on Seattle, Auburn, Highline. • Learning from other cities (Portland on their annual late fall door-knocking campaign focused on September no-shows; CO Youth for a Change)

Implications for 2016: Continue to Prioritize? Change Course? New Opportunities?

• With launch of regional outreach effort, need to focus on sustainability and partnerships from the beginning.
• Need to maintain and expand youth involvement in this work.
• Need to step up focus on district engagement now that dedicated staff are in place, and increase focus on potential linkages to early warning systems.

Key	
Good progress	🟩
Medium progress	🟨
No progress or major challenge(s)	🟥
Completed	✓

Racial Equity Considerations or Best Practices?

Involve and support CBOs as partners in outreach work, including grassroots organizations with strong ties to specific ethnic communities. In looking at sustainability of regional outreach strategy consider roles (paid roles) for such organizations. Ensure youth voice increases in the development of outreach and communications efforts.

DRAFT