

Regional Re-Engagement Network
September 19, 2014 Meeting Summary

Participants

Name	Organization	email
Jeff Corey	Seattle Education Access	jeff@seattleeducationaccess.org
Jessica Norouzi	Year Up	jnorouzi@yearup.org
Roslyn Kagy	SOAR	Roslyn@childrenand youth.org
Mike Sita	Highline Public Schools	michael.sita@highlineschools.org
Markio Kakiuchi	Shoreline Community College	mkakiuchi@shoreline.edu
Curt Peterson	Career Link, SSC	cpeterson@southseattle.edu
Molly Ward	Career Link, SSC	mward@southseattle.edu
Carol Cleveland	iGrad	Carol.cleveland@kent.k12.wa.us
Mary Anderson	iGrad	Mary.anderson@kent.k12.wa.us
Kaaren Andrews	Interagency Academy	klandrews@seattleschools.org
Debbie Thiessen	Interagency Academy	dlthiessen@seattleschools.org
Steve Daschle	Southwest Youth & Family Services	sdaschle@swyfs.org
Michael Davie	YouthSource/King County	Michael.davie@kingcounty.gov
Lori Guilfoyle	United Way of King County	lguilfoyle@uwkc.org
Roslyn Kagy	SOAR	Roslyn@childrenand youth.org
Danika Martinez	Seattle Education Access	Danika@seattleeducationaccess.org
Angela Pierce	Seattle Education Access	Angela@seattleeducationaccess.org
Jen Miller	Seattle Education Access	Jen@seattleeducationaccess.org
Natalie Drummond	Interagency Academy	njdrummond@seattleschools.org
Ashley Baird	Seattle Education Access	Ashley@seattleeducationaccess.org
Nicole Yohalem	CCER	nyohalem@ccedresults.org
Alessandra Pollock	CCER	apollock@ccedresults.org

Program Values

During introductions participants shared one core value of their program (see list below). In our follow up survey I shared the list and asked participants to identify their top 5 – this will help us move toward defining a set of shared values for the network.

- Strengths-based
- Relationships
- Accessibility
- Low Barrier
- Love
- Kindness
- Keep youth connected
- Youth-informed
- Youth-driven
- Hope and options
- Whole child/youth
- Committed to education
- Individualized
- Equity
- Student-centered curiosity
- Meeting students where they are
- Persistence
- Everyone deserves a good education

Overview & Purpose

Nicole reviewed the purpose of the network and member/CCER commitments, and summarized findings from the survey conducted in September which nearly every invited program responded to.

Purpose of the network

- Cross-program sharing and networking
- Data-driven learning and improvement
- Regional collaboration
- Tracking regional progress

The network is a key vehicle for implementing the [Road Map Region Opportunity Youth Action Plan](#), which is focused on **building a robust, coordinated, diverse system of re-engagement pathways** that help youth reconnect to education and progress towards a credential and living-wage work. In particular, the provider network will be critical in implementing strategies in the plan related to **increasing coordination** and **improving quality**.

Commitments

Member programs agree to:

- Send one or more program staff to monthly meetings
- Share strengths and challenges with the group
- Provide feedback to CCER and help inform meeting agendas
- Share data (unidentified) on student enrollment and progress

CCER agrees to:

- Build meeting agendas that reflect member interests
- Plan and facilitate productive, engaging meetings (with snacks!)
- Identify, develop and share tools and frameworks that support quality practice
- During 2015, small grants opportunity for participating programs

Survey Results

Professional development priorities (in order of priority):

1. Data collection, use and reporting
2. Youth leadership & engagement
3. College readiness/access
4. Career exploration/work readiness

Format preferences for meetings (in order of priority):

1. Improvement planning based on program data
2. Troubleshooting or “workshopping” specific challenges with peers
3. Peer networking and sharing program updates
4. Q&A with OSPI, SBCTC or other entities

Regional collaboration priorities:

1. Joint professional development
2. Quality standards for effective re-engagement
3. Common data, data systems or data sharing
4. Coordinated entry, referral, navigation “no wrong door”

Shared Framework

In small groups, participants reviewed the [draft Shared Re-engagement Framework](#) and discussed what might be missing, as well as which pathway components they feel they deliver effectively and which they need to strengthen. Some things people felt weren't well reflected in the current draft:

- Internships/paid work
- Interventions related to basic skills
- Need for stabilization and emergency funds throughout the pathway
- Learning how to be a student
- Technology
- Actual college credit/coursework
- Importance of partnerships and "handoffs"
- Re-entry process
- Transportation
- Show how un-linear this can be
- Make sure behavioral health is included
- Budgeting, self-advocacy skills
- Linking to campus resources
- Make sure case management is clear

Data Capacity and Use

During this session, programs shared what data elements they currently collect and began discussing how data are used to support individual student progress and program improvement.

Data Capacity and Use for Re-Engagement Programming

During this session, programs shared what data elements they currently collect and began discussing how data are used to support individual student progress and program improvement. The session and insights gained are described below. This provided helpful information for future meetings and will be revisited regularly.

Introduction

Survey results indicated that *data collection, reporting and use* is both the top professional development priority for the group and a key area for regional collaboration. In order to better understand the group's perspective on data collection and use, we had a structured conversation to support peer learning and inform future meetings.

In general, there are 3 ways that data supports re-engagement programming:

1. Compliance and funding data collection and reporting
2. Using individual student data to support student progress and success
3. Aggregating data across multiple students to support continuous learning and program improvement

Re-engagement programs spend a lot of time working to meet compliance and funding requirements—mostly to prove programs are serving the students they say they are serving and to support reimbursement/funding requests. The conversation at this meeting focused on the second two uses of data.

CCER developed a [Re-engagement Data Framework](#) to organize our own thinking about program data. Consider this a reference rather than a recommended data agenda (it will likely be too general in some areas and may not include all components of your program.) The purpose of the framework is to find areas of commonality for the group. Below are some comments about the framework's design that might aid in its use:

- Program processes/elements are the columns, labeled across the top.
- Data elements are on the first row. Note that the framework includes data from many different sources.

- The second row lists ideas for how the data can be used to support individual student success.
- The third row lists ideas for how data can be used to support program learning.
- There are limitations in the framework, particularly around how data elements can be applicable across program stages. In addition, a program needs to identify and collect data elements from the whole student experience in order to answer many of the program questions. Finally, programs are distinct and will have specific questions they need to answer to come up with actionable information. For example, for YouthSource’s work with court-involved youth they may have specific criminal justice-related questions. Also, SEA tracks data for multiple programs across the stages of the program process and could be a key partner in answering certain questions.

Data Collection

For this exercise, programs used sticky labels to mark what data elements their program collects. Elements were organized according to the data framework. Some insights from reviewing the results of the exercise:

- Programs collect similar data elements, most of which are captured in the data framework. Pursuing shared data collection efforts may be possible, even given the diversity of funding streams and unique specialization of many programs.
- Relatively few programs collect data on outreach efforts.
- Other areas in which fewer programs report collecting data include student pathway or career interests, academic goals, and changes to academic goals.

Data for Student Success

In the next exercise, participants took a moment to write down how they use data to support student success. Common areas of data use include providing extra human services support, academic support, career placement, connection to resources, and some post-program planning.

Data for Program Learning

In the final exercise, participants interviewed each other to determine how programs use data to support program learning as well as what forums data are used to help answer questions about program success or learning. Conversations yielded the following insights:

- Learning community members mentioned challenges in terms of having the capacity to have meetings to review program data. At the same time, some programs have institutionalized the review of basic program information on a regular (weekly) basis.
- Learning community members recognize that using data requires a cycle of inquiry—starting with a review of data, revising strategy based on the data, acting, and then checking the results to see if they had the intended effects.
- There are some differences between how community based organizations and school districts use and record data.
- Learning community members have different access to resources to support program learning.
- Programs want access to information on other programs to aid in outreach efforts.
- Programs want to connect aggregated data from before their work begins as well as after the program ends. For example, earlier K12 records to learn more about the needs of entering students (as a group) as well as college or employment data to better understand program outcomes.