

PromiseNet.2008

Communities Investing in Education and Economic Development

Conference Proceedings



Radisson Plaza Hotel
Kalamazoo, Michigan

June 25–27, 2008

Table of Contents

Conference program	1
Guest speaker bios	3
PromiseNet 2008	4
- The El Dorado Promise	5
- The Denver Scholarship Foundation	6
- The Kalamazoo Promise	7
- The Pittsburgh Promise	8
- Comparison of Programs	9
Breakout Session Summaries	
- Getting Started	10
- Community Alignment	13
- Economic Development	16
- Funding	18
- Program Administration	20
- Research and Evaluation	25
- Scholarship Structure	29
- Student Support	33
A Deeper Look: Federal Policy	36
Acknowledgments	37

PromiseNet.2008

PromiseNet Conference

Radisson Plaza Hotel, Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 25-27, 2008

Wednesday, June 25

4:00 - 6:00 PM **Registration** (Radisson Plaza Hotel Lobby)

6:00 - 8:00 PM **Welcome Reception**
Cityscape Event Center
125 South Kalamazoo Mall (see map in conference binder)

Thursday, June 26

7:30 - 8:30 **Continental breakfast & Registration** (Exhibition Hall)

8:30 - 10:00 **Plenary session** (Ballroom)

Welcome

Dr. Randall Eberts, President, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
Bobby Hopewell, Mayor, City of Kalamazoo
Dr. Michael Rice, Superintendent, Kalamazoo Public Schools

Presenter: Ronald R. Kitchens, CEO, Southwest Michigan First

Case studies

The El Dorado Promise

Magen Parker, Strategic Planning Analyst, Murphy Oil Corporation
Dr. James Fouse, Promise Administrator, El Dorado School District #15

The Denver Scholarship Foundation

Louise Myrland, Director of Scholarship Program
Denver Scholarship Foundation

The Pittsburgh Promise

Eddy Jones, Office of the Superintendent
Pittsburgh Public Schools

The Kalamazoo Promise

Dr. Janice Brown, The Kalamazoo Promise

10:30 - 11:45 **Breakout Session 1**
(Please note your individualized session assignment page.)

12:00 - 1:00 **Lunch** (Exhibition Hall)

** Sign up for your choice of Deeper Look sessions Thursday afternoon*

1:15 - 2:30 **Breakout Session 2**
(Please note your individualized session assignment page.)

2:45 - 4:00 **Breakout Session 3**
(Please note your individualized session assignment page.)

5:00* - 7:30 **Reception and Dinner**
Kalamazoo Institute of Arts
314 South Park Street (see map in conference binder)
*“The Figure Revealed” exhibit will be open from 5:00 to 6:30

Friday, June 27

7:30 - 8:30 **Continental breakfast and PromiseNet roundtables** (Exhibition Hall)
PromiseNet Planning 7:45 – 8:30

8:45 - 10:15 **A Deeper Look**

Presentation of draft Brookings Institution paper (Stone Theater)
“Promise of Prosperity: Community Compacts for Economic Renewal and Educational Attainment”
Getting Started (Glens 3)
Community Alignment (Prairies 4)
Economic Development (Prairies 5)
Funding / Scholarship Structure (Prairies 6)
Student Support (Glens 2)

10:30 - 11:30 **Closing session** (Ballroom)
Moderator: Dr. Randall Eberts
Speakers: Timothy and Bernadette Marquez, Denver Scholarship Foundation

Lunch Join your new friends at one of Kalamazoo’s great local restaurants. Groups will be leaving for Food Dance Café, Just Good Food, Olde Peninsula Brewpub and Restaurant, The Soup Kettle, and The Union Cabaret and Grille. (All are a short walk from the Radisson)

Post-conference session

1:30 - 3:30 Question and Answer Session on the Kalamazoo Promise (Stone Theater)

Guest Speaker Biographies

Randall W. Eberts is the president of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Dr. Eberts received his Ph.D. in Economics from Northwestern University in 1978. Prior to assuming the role of Executive Director of the Institute in 1993, he served as Assistant Vice President and Economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. There he directed a research group that focused on issues related to labor markets, regional economic development, productivity, and public finance and also administered the Bank's three research publications.

Ronald R. Kitchens serves as the Chief Executive Officer of Southwest Michigan First as well as the Managing Partner of Southwest Michigan First Life Science Venture Fund and a Director of the Southwest Michigan Innovation Center. He is among the 3 percent of economic development officials internationally who have earned the Certified Economic Developer designation. In addition to his 25 years of experience in economic development, Ron has broad-based experience as a businessman, city administrator, elected official and U.S. Senate staff member giving him a unique perspective on growing a region's business base. Throughout his career in Michigan, Texas and Missouri, Ron has worked with more than two hundred Fortune 500 international or regional corporations that have created tens of thousands of new jobs. Ron is an author of the bestselling book, *Community Capitalism*, a nationally sought-after speaker and host of a weekly television program that airs during CBS Sunday Morning on NEWSCHANNEL3.

Timothy and Bernadette Marquez are the founders of and initial donors to the Denver Scholarship Foundation. Timothy Marquez is founder, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Venoco, Inc. Venoco, Inc. is a public, Denver-based energy company with a focus on producing property acquisitions in California. He also was founder and C.E.O. of Marquez Energy, LLC. Mr. Marquez is an Aspen Institute Henry Crown Fellow and served as Vice President of Santa Barbara City College Foundation and President of the Hispanic Business Council. Mr. Marquez also served on the board of the Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce where he was businessman of the year for 2001. He has served on numerous other non-profit boards in Denver and Santa Barbara. He was appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Energy to serve on the National Petroleum Council; is a member of the Society of Petroleum Engineers and the Society of Petroleum Evaluation Engineers; and is a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of Colorado. *Poder* magazine recently honored him with the "Innovator in Philanthropy" award. Bernadette (Bernie) Marquez, a native of Southwest Michigan, holds a Bachelor of Science degree in nursing from Michigan State University and worked for many years as a nurse—most recently at Presbyterian/St. Luke's Medical Center in Denver. Bernie has been a director on numerous nonprofit boards and has participated in several committees for nonprofit organizations in Denver and Santa Barbara, California. Currently she is co-founder and chief executive for the Marquez Family Foundation, and serves on the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. She and her husband, Tim, have three children.

PromiseNet 2008

PromiseNet 2008 was designed to bring together communities investing in education and economic development to exchange ideas and experiences. The two-day conference was attended by over 200 individuals from 80-plus communities. Representatives of “Promise-type” programs and those considering their creation will meet again June 24-26, 2009 in Denver for the second annual PromiseNet conference.

A Promise-type program can be defined as a city or community where people are working together to provide or facilitate financial resources and support services to a substantial percentage of K-12 students to encourage high school graduation, college success, and community economic vitality.

Such a strategy requires community alignment and, of necessity, efforts that go beyond scholarships to include student support, community engagement, and place-based economic development. It is an approach that is drawing national attention and being emulated in communities large and small, urban and rural, in states across the nation.

The Kalamazoo Promise, the first program of this kind, is a place-based universal scholarship program that guarantees, in perpetuity, college scholarships to potentially every graduate of the Kalamazoo Public Schools. Behind the scholarship program is an economic development agenda that seeks to revitalize the city and the region through a substantial investment in public education. A growing number of communities across the nation have established programs modeled on the Kalamazoo Promise, and many more are in the works. Four programs already being implemented, including those in Denver, El Dorado (Arkansas), Kalamazoo, and Pittsburgh, are profiled in the following pages.

We hope that this inaugural conference will form the basis of an ongoing network that makes possible shared learning among communities engaged in education-based economic renewal.

The El Dorado Promise



Getting Started: The idea for the El Dorado Promise came about as a result of one of our community leaders reading about the Kalamazoo Promise in the Wall Street Journal. The concept was proposed to Murphy Oil Corporation's President and CEO, Claiborne Deming. Murphy Oil is a worldwide oil and gas exploration and production company headquartered in El Dorado, Arkansas. Over the years, Murphy Oil has invested time and money in programs aimed at improving the quality of education offered in the El Dorado Public Schools, and the Promise concept turned out to be a perfect fit for the community. Murphy Oil's Board of Directors agreed to fund the \$50 million El Dorado Promise scholarship program, which was announced on January 22, 2007.

Community Alignment: El Dorado's citizens responded enthusiastically to the Promise by passing a one-cent sales tax that will generate \$32 million over eight years to fund a strategic plan for economic development and the construction of a new conference center downtown. In addition, a proposed school millage increase was approved overwhelmingly by voters (the first such approval since 1974) to fund the construction of a new high school as well as other school facility improvements throughout the district. An El Dorado Promise Coordinator position was created to work with community leaders to capitalize on the Promise by promoting the positive change that is happening in El Dorado to others considering moving to the area.

Economic Development: El Dorado is currently implementing a strategic plan, entitled El Dorado Forward, for economic development as prepared by TIP strategies, an Austin, Texas-based company. The plan identifies three goals on which the strategies are based: 1) develop, retain, and attract talent, 2) stimulate the economy through business development and industry attraction, and 3) promote and enhance quality of place. The Economic Development Board overseeing the plan's implementation has 23 task forces that are tied to each project recommended by TIP Strategies.

Funding: The El Dorado Promise is funded in full by Murphy Oil Corporation and the \$50 million donation is expected to last at least twenty years.

Program Administration: The El Dorado Promise is operated by an administrator employed by the El Dorado Public School District. Students complete a one-page application, and all Promise monies are sent directly to the state college/university.

Scholarship Structure: This post-secondary scholarship is available to all El Dorado Public School graduates. The only requirements are residency in the school district and continuous enrollment since at least the ninth grade. The eligibility percentage is based upon length of El Dorado Public School attendance. The scholarship may be used to cover tuition and mandatory fees for up to five years at any accredited public or private post-secondary institution throughout the United States. The maximum amount payable is equal to the highest tuition charged by an Arkansas public university (currently \$6,200 annually). Students must attend college full time and maintain a 2.0 GPA.

Student Support: The El Dorado Education Foundation along with many community partners provide support to students, teachers, and administrators through various offerings such as mentoring, teacher grants, after-school and summer programs, tutoring, and numerous other opportunities.

Research/Evaluation: The El Dorado Promise has partnered with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock's Institute for Economic Advancement to evaluate the full impact of the Promise including employment trends, real estate market, educational statistics, population changes, and other relevant data.

Denver Scholarship Foundation

Getting Started: Colorado faces a paradox. The state ranks second in the percentage of adults with at least a bachelor's degree, yet Colorado ranks 45th for the percent of native-born students who earn a bachelor's degree. The Denver Public Schools (DPS), especially, struggles to prepare and inspire its graduates to complete a college education—9 percent of 9th graders enrolled in DPS in 1994 completed college by 2004. In 2006, with a mayor focused on improving education, a school superintendent leading a massive reform of DPS, and a community committed to improving educational opportunities for DPS graduates, the Denver Scholarship Foundation (DSF) was formed to inspire and empower DPS students to achieve their post-secondary goals. DSF piloted its scholarship and student support program in three DPS high schools in 2006-07 and expanded to the entire district the following year.

Funding: DSF is building a \$200 million endowment as a permanent resource for the students of Denver as well as running a \$4 million annual operating campaign. To inspire the entire community to contribute to the effort, Timothy and Bernadette Marquez launched the Denver Scholarship Foundation with a 1:1 challenge grant of \$50 million. DSF is a 501(c)(3) public charity and program that depends on the generosity of corporations, foundations, and individuals for its operating budget. By removing the barriers to higher education so more local high school graduates can complete certificate and degree programs and move into high-skill, high-wage careers, DSF is helping to ensure that the community will be able to maintain economic stability and vitality without relying on importing its educated workforce.

Program Administration: The Denver Scholarship Foundation staff of 25 focuses on scholarship administration, student outreach, post-secondary retention and development. While a wide range of resources are available through the DSF website, DSF also uses an array of intervention techniques to connect with DPS students and their families.

Scholarship Structure: DSF offers need-based scholarships to qualifying DPS graduates. Students may use the renewable first-dollar scholarship at 40 not-for-profit Colorado technical colleges, community colleges, and public and private colleges and universities for up to five years. To renew the scholarship, students must reapply each year, maintain at least a 2.0 grade point average and meet the requirements for satisfactory academic progress. Scholarship award amounts depend on the type of post-secondary institution, enrollment level and financial need; students may receive up to \$6,000 per year.

Student Support: In addition to providing scholarships for qualifying students, DSF offers college preparation services and resources to all DPS students and is developing a retention program to support scholars' post-secondary success. Each traditional DPS high school has a Future Center staffed by an expert advisor in which students and their families receive assistance with the college selection and application processes, completing financial aid and scholarship applications, career planning and more. To support scholars' success in higher education, DSF is developing Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with partner post-secondary institutions. Each MOU seeks to maximize student services and financial resources for DSF scholars and set clear expectations for DSF and institutional collaboration on outreach, evaluation and research.

Evaluation: In its pilot year (2006-07), 203 DSF scholars received \$271,806 in scholarship payments to attend 24 colleges and universities. DSF is currently focused on developing an evaluation plan to measure the extent to which its scholarship and program services are impacting college matriculation and success among DSP graduates. This involves: (1) establishing and implementing a three-year strategic plan accompanied by benchmarks against which annual progress can be measured; (2) developing the capacity to keep and track relevant student data; (3) conducting an analysis of college-going and college persistence behaviors among DPS graduates; and (4) establishing data-sharing partnerships with post-secondary institutions.

The Pittsburgh Promise

Getting Started: The Pittsburgh Promise is a scholarship program designed to help students graduating from the Pittsburgh Public Schools pursue education after high school and to enhance the growth, stability and economic development of the Pittsburgh region. The vision for the Promise was announced in December 2006 by the Pittsburgh School District and City of Pittsburgh. The program was launched one year later with a \$100 million commitment by the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC), the largest employer in the Pittsburgh region. Students of the Class of 2008 are the first recipients of The Pittsburgh Promise.

Economic Development: Like many older urban centers, Pittsburgh is facing a continuing decline in its city school population and an exodus of residents and businesses. Reversing those trends is critical to the future of the Pittsburgh region. The Promise is intended to attract students and families to the City of Pittsburgh, thereby promoting the revitalization of the urban core of the region.

Funding: UPMC's commitment includes an initial \$10 million to mobilize the scholarship program in time to support the 2008 graduates of the school district. The remaining \$90 million is a challenge grant intended to spur a community-wide campaign to raise an additional \$135 million (\$15 million per year over the next nine years).

Program Administration: The Pittsburgh Promise operates as a supporting organization of The Pittsburgh Foundation. Financial and administrative oversight is provided by a seven-member Board of Directors comprising prominent civic and community leaders from the Pittsburgh region.

Scholarship Structure: Students of the Pittsburgh Public Schools may receive a maximum of \$5,000 per year for four years, or up to \$20,000, from The Pittsburgh Promise.

- The Promise is a last-dollar scholarship that is applied after federal and state grants; scholarship funds go toward tuition and mandatory fees.
- Eligibility criteria including GPA and attendance requirements are designed to reinforce hard work, good behavior, and citizenship.
- The residency and continuous enrollment criteria provides an incentive for families to enroll in the Pittsburgh Public Schools early, with the maximum scholarship awarded to students that have been enrolled continuously since kindergarten.
- The Promise scholarship can be used at nearly 100 post-secondary institutions across Pennsylvania.

Student Support: The Pittsburgh Promise is part of a “plan, prepare, and pay” strategy to raise academic performance, improve student achievement and reduce the racial achievement disparity in the Pittsburgh Public Schools under an ambitious reform agenda implemented by Schools Superintendent Mark Roosevelt. Partners such as NEED, a college access program to help African American students, provide supplemental student support.

Research/Evaluation: Ongoing assessments of student performance towards college-readiness, improvement in the Pittsburgh Public Schools, regional economic progress, and the financial and organization health of the Promise organization will be disseminated to the community through an annual report card.

The Kalamazoo Promise

Getting Started: The idea of the Kalamazoo Promise was arrived at by a group of anonymous donors. Focused on the big picture and formulated over several years, this educational initiative benefiting Kalamazoo Public Schools (KPS) graduates is also intended to boost economic development and community vitality on a long-term basis. It was expected that the entire community would do the work of the Kalamazoo Promise. Planning and details of the Kalamazoo Promise roll-out took place between September and the program's announcement on November 15, 2005. Much has been accomplished and refined since that time, including an annual "Promise Week" that engages the greater community in reporting on progress to date.

Community Alignment: Community leaders recognize four strategic priorities related to the Kalamazoo Promise – the pre-K through 16 educational systems; student support, the vitality of the urban core, and regional economic development. Each of these areas has a vital role in the success of the Kalamazoo Promise. While much work remains to be done, forward momentum in the community is focused on the vision of becoming an "Education Community."

Economic Development: In the greater Kalamazoo area, there is a clear understanding of the positive relationship between the benefits of higher education and economic development. Groups are involved in collegial partnerships to enhance the total community by using this educational innovation as a catalyst for economic development. Southwest Michigan First, the Chamber of Commerce, the W.E. Upjohn Institute, the real estate industry, businesses, arts organizations, and other economic engines of the community are examples of some of the partners involved in pursuing education-based economic development.

Funding: The Kalamazoo Promise and its organization are funded in perpetuity by anonymous donors. To offset the constant challenge of leveraging student support dollars during the Pre-K through grade 12 period, the broader community is now also involved in a \$2.8 million Advancement Campaign through Kalamazoo Communities In Schools (KCIS).

Program Administration: Currently, the Kalamazoo Promise is operated by an executive administrator who has developed a largely virtual web-based system of management for the scholarship. Accounts are available on line for all students and colleges. Students complete a one-page application, and all Promise monies are sent directly to the state college/university.

Scholarship Structure: This four-year postsecondary scholarship is available to all Kalamazoo Public School graduates who have been enrolled in and reside within the school district for at least all four years of high school. The scholarship may be used for any degree or certification program at any state-supported university or community college. The scholarship amount covers between 65 percent and 100 percent of tuition and mandatory fees at these colleges or universities based on a sliding scale for the number of year's attendance in KPS. The Promise is considered a first dollar scholarship, and there is no GPA or other requirement except for high school graduation and residency. Students must attend college full time and maintain a 2.0 GPA.

Student Support: KCIS and an array of community partners provide support to students in need, using the schools as a full service delivery institution. Focusing on the physical, social and emotional needs to improve learning, KCIS has formed over 200 partnerships with community organizations.

Research/Evaluation: Currently, the Kalamazoo Public Schools and the Kalamazoo Promise are under a five-year contract with the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research to evaluate all aspects of the Promise including its impact on jobs and employment, real estate, academic performance, other student data, and a host of other variables.

	Program Funding	Community Alignment	Economic Development	Administration	Scholarship Structure	Supportive Programs
El Dorado Promise	<p>\$50 million donation from Murphy Oil Corp. to fund at least 20 years of the scholarship program.</p> <p>Other funding sources for supportive programs.</p>	<p>One-cent sales tax for 8 years to fund econ dev plan implementation & construction of conference center</p> <p>School millage to fund new high school & other facility improvements</p>	<p><u>El Dorado Forward</u> – strategic plan for econ dev.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. develop, attract & retain talent; 2. business development & industry attraction; 3. promote & enhance quality of place 	<p>Coordinator position hired to work with community</p> <p>Administrator at SD manages the program</p> <p>Students complete 1-page application – all money is sent directly to schools – student must maintain 2.0.</p>	<p>Must graduate from El Dorado public school and reside in school district</p> <p>Pays percentage of tuition and fees based on years in public schools for up to 5 years at any school in US.</p> <p>Max amount is equal to highest tuition charged by Arkansas public university. (first-dollar)</p>	<p>El Dorado Forward strategic plan</p> <p>Mentoring, tutoring, teacher grants, after-school and summer programs, etc.</p>
Denver Scholarship Foundation	<p>Building a \$200 million endowment as a permanent resource.</p> <p>Started with a 1:1 challenge grant from Marquez family for \$50 million.</p> <p>\$4 million annual operating campaign</p>	<p>DSF is a 501(c)(3) public charity that relies heavily on the donations of corporations, foundations, and individuals.</p>	<p>The program is helping to ensure economic stability without reliance on imported workforce, by removing barriers to higher education for local students.</p>	<p>Staff of 25 focuses on scholarship admin, student outreach, post-secondary retention & development.</p>	<p>Need-based scholarships to DPS kids.</p> <p>Used at CO colleges, universities, tech or community colleges.</p> <p>Students must maintain 2.0 and reapply each year</p> <p>Students may receive up to \$6,000/yr, based on type of institution and need.</p>	<p>Future Centers in each high school – support in mentorship, tutoring, and in filling out paperwork.</p> <p>Developing MOU with colleges to maximize student services & financial support for these kids.</p>
Pittsburgh Promise	<p>U of Pitt Medical Center committed \$100 million.</p> <p>- \$10 million in time for the Class of 2008</p> <p>- \$90 million as a challenge grant to spur a campaign to raise an additional \$135 million</p>	<p>Relies heavily on the support of further donors to keep the program going.</p> <p>NEED – an African-American student support program provides supplemental support.</p>	<p>The Promise is intended to attract students and families back to the City, promoting the revitalization of the urban core of the region and therefore helping the regional economy</p>	<p>Operates as a supporting organization of the Pittsburgh Foundation – with a 7 member board of directors</p>	<p>Students can receive up to \$5,000/yr for tuition and fees at any post-secondary institution in PA – with GPA and attendance requirements.</p> <p>Must first apply for all federal and state grants (middle-dollar)</p> <p>Scholarship is based upon length of time enrolled in PPS.</p>	<p>Promise is part of “plan, prepare, pay” strategy.</p> <p>“Excellence for All” program is working to reform how PPS prepare kids for college.</p>
Kalamazoo Promise	<p>Promise for a group of anonymous donors in which they promise to fund the scholarships in perpetuity.</p>	<p>Community leaders have identified 4 Strategic Priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. K-12 Education 2. Student Support 3. Vitality of Urban Core 4. Regional Econ Dev 	<p>This program has helped people realize the clear relationship between education and econ dev.</p> <p>Many partners working to achieve greatest benefit (Chamber, SW MI 1st, businesses, Upjohn Inst)</p>	<p>Operated by an executive administrator who has developed a largely web-based system</p> <p>Students complete one-page application, and money is sent directly to colleges</p>	<p>Must graduate from Kalamazoo public school and reside in district.</p> <p>Can receive 65-100% of tuition and fees at any MI university of college for 4 years, based on length of enrollment in KPS. (first-dollar)</p> <p>GPA requirements once in college</p>	<p>Kalamazoo Communities in Schools (KCIS) works with other community partners to provide support to students in need – focus on physical, social, and emotional needs to improve learning.</p>

Getting Started Breakout Session

Practitioners

Dr. Janice Brown, The Kalamazoo Promise

Craig Malin, City Administrator, Davenport (Iowa)

Rick Merolla, Service Director, Akron (Ohio)

Steve O'Malley, County Administrator, La Crosse (Wisconsin)

Lila Phillips, Vice President, El Dorado Educational Foundation (Arkansas)

Overview

The session provided an overview for communities just beginning to explore the development of a Promise-type program. This focus was on organizing a community around a student scholarship program and assuring that the community can use its partners and resources to successfully implement this innovative approach within their communities. The goal was to help communities identify their most pressing economic and educational priorities, think creatively about how to build on their assets in the design of a Promise-type program, assess where they stand in terms of community alignment, and consider potential outcomes.

Focus Questions

1. How does a community begin to think about and plan for the initiation of a Promise-type program? If a formal task force structure is created, who should participate (and why is this important)?
2. How will the organizers or task force communicate to the larger community the case for implementing a program? What is the purpose of such a program and what are the expected outcomes?
3. Should funding be secured before community support is solicited, or should the two processes unfold simultaneously?
4. Is the scholarship program part of a broader vision of community or economic development, and how will this be communicated?
5. Who will facilitate this effort and what will they do? How will the effort be sustained so that it can lead to genuine community transformation?

Summary of Getting Started Discussions

Leading Questions /Burning Issues

- Who is the “go to” person – how is leadership established and held accountable?
- Accountability helps focus community

- How far reaching is a program? Who should be eligible to participate? What colleges should they be allowed to attend? (e.g., private or out-of-state schools)
- How to finance a program?
- How to change city/suburb relationship?
- Do communities bring college-readiness programs together under Promise-like program?

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Many ways to start a Promise-like program
- Begin with the “big idea”- seek clarity of vision: What are the driving reasons for a program, why do stakeholders want it? (e.g., to help those without access to assets/resources, or to attract people back to area., etc.)
- Need to address question of “What is in it for me?” for the broader community (non-beneficiaries). Cost of empty factories, slums, urban decay, crime, panhandlers, other quality-of-life concerns.
- Corporate buy-in: students are future workforce/corporate sector is interested in promoting education
- Identify a “go-to” person who is accountable
- Communicate range of careers and education / training paths to the public
- Time and money are essential – private funding or taxes or combination
- Keep program requirements simple; let colleges enforce GPA requirement
- Different models...corporate, small community, public, endowed, etc.
- Do what it takes, corporate people want to be engaged but don’t know how
- This isn’t a quick fix, takes time
- Most of the programs established thus far had a large donor to get things rolling.
- Survey students about what kind of help they need to access higher ed
- Educational opportunities must be in line with people’s interests, not forced to go into something they are not interested in
- Many options available: community college programs, tech centers, certification programs, trades, health care professions
- Kalamazoo Promise is state focused (students must remain in state). Ways a program can help the state will depend on what that state’s issues are (e.g., in Michigan the issue is out-migration).
- Insisting on a certain GPA leaves out those students who most need an opportunity for higher education. Colleges will enforce their own GPA requirements.
- Program can be a catalyst for economic improvement
- People are waiting to do good things
- Community alignment is an ongoing process
- Don’t neglect issues of poverty, urban sprawl
- Can make a case to potential donors by gathering numbers (e.g., 10 years of data) to

convince them a program is needed. Build on the fact that local businesses want / need quality workers and must invest in their own future; start to sell potential donors on the idea when seeking funding for an initial study.

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- How to align economic development with education...k-16, gov't, student support?
- How to approach wealthy individuals?
- Will college graduates who benefited from a program stay in town or come back?
- Alternative funding models, including those that don't involve large businesses.
- Value / cost of more incremental approaches – e.g., 2 year community college scholarships. What is the economic argument for such a program?
- How to retain college grads in a community?
- How do other cities respond? (e.g., positively, with jealousy, supportive)
- Inclusion / exclusion of alternative schools
- Need for / structure of an appeals process
- Is a program viable without a single major stakeholder or donor?
- Who needs to be at the table for any given decision?

Community Alignment Breakout Session

Practitioners

Dr. Janice Brown, The Kalamazoo Promise

Curt Babcock, Director, WLACE, Muskegon (Michigan) Opportunity

Brian Barber, Assistant Director, WLACE, Muskegon (Michigan) Opportunity

Patrick Naswell, VP of Community Impact, Community Foundation of Greater Flint (Michigan)

Overview

This session addressed the complex task of aligning diverse stakeholders around the common vision embodied in a Promise-type program. Any community that initiates a process of large-scale social change needs to think consciously about how to organize itself around that vision. Each community has a different set of leaders and variations in the way that it organizes its respective organizations. That is why a place-based initiative such as a Promise-type scholarship has the potential to be so effective. No matter what the community or its type, the community can assess who is doing what work and develop an accountability model. Stakeholders need to know all the various pieces and how they fit together. There are many considerations involved in this process, but whatever the path, some time needs to be devoted to the question of how to organize the community and align it around the scholarship initiative.

Focus Questions

1. Who are the main groups that have a key stake in this community-wide initiative?
2. What areas of the community are most important to have a key role in and a level of accountability in carrying out the work of the initiative?
3. How will the community organize these key stakeholders? Who will lead this effort and what is their role? Is there a community group that can represent these stakeholders?
4. How will the planning/accountability model be developed?
5. What type of communication system is necessary for this transformation?

Other Areas of Discussion

The community alignment session may also cover the questions of securing stakeholder participation, buy-in and ownership; alternative forms of governance that can strengthen community alignment; challenges of alignment and best practices for addressing stages of program development.

Summary of Community Alignment Sessions

Leading Questions / Burning Issues

- Are community members involved with poverty and race involved in community alignment efforts?
- How do you develop ownership with private sector actors?
- How does a community develop a cause for it to align around/add focus?
- Partnerships must include higher education for Promise students
- Corporations - promise to children of employees
- Requires long-term funding commitment
- Requires financial literacy on part of students, families and area businesses

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Get school district on board
- Frame from birth to post-graduate. “Ready cash/ready kids”
- Students need mentoring and tutoring
- Need to sell to surrounding community
- Student support is essential
- Promise-type programs seem to have 5 commonalities:
 - True vision for a better future
 - Leadership (all walks of life) (educators, employers, economic developers, workforce experts, engines of social change in communities (politicians, law enforcement, grassroots activist, faith-based community)
 - Partnerships (devotion, expertise, \$)—shed those who are not true partners
 - Innovation—new way of doing things, technology
 - Search for financing
- Unintended outcome—college prep services increased
- Community colleges are good fundraising partners
- Core focus is comprehensive community development through education
- “Scholarship” generates discussion about duplication; community development generates different discussion—turning that corner is difficult.
- Link promise to adult re-training to help address community development outcomes
- Visible giving inspires other giving
- Increasing value of education requires/creates culture change.
- 1st generation college-going requires a cultural change (practical challenges – e.g., filling out FAFSA forms).
- Successful program requires a marketing effort
- Promise programs do not require an endowment; but need safeguards if not endowed

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- How does a community develop a cause around which to align?

- How does a community address race and poverty in its alignment efforts?
- How does a Promise-type program require and create cultural change?
- How to move the discussion from scholarship giving to larger community/economic development perspective?
- How to connect a program to property tax relief with the goal of community development?
- How to scale a program from a local focus to county-wide?
- How to assess likely impact on a community?

Economic Development Breakout Session

Practitioners

Brad Bauler, Senior Consulting Associate, DCA (Boston)

Betsy Brandsgard, Executive Vice President, Davenport One, Davenport (Iowa)

Brian Fukuda, Community Development Specialist, County of LaCrosse (Wisconsin)

Don Wells, President and CEO, El Dorado (Arkansas) Chamber of Commerce

Overview

The overriding purpose of a Promise-type scholarship program is to improve the economic vitality of a community and region. This session served as an introduction to how Promise-type programs can be structured to address a community's economic development needs. Topics included making the case for education as a catalyst for economic development and understanding the components of successful and/or improved economic development as a result of the implementation such a program. The session was also designed to cover outcomes related to economic development such as an improved pre-K–16 educational system; the potential for increased property values and housing sales; decreased out-migration of college graduates; better alignment of workforce preparedness and local business needs; and increased business retention and attraction.

Focus Questions

1. How can Promise-type programs be structured to address a community's economic development needs?
2. How can such a program be “sold” to the public (residents and business owners) and potential funders so that the economic development benefits are recognized and embraced?
3. How can a community's education, workforce development, and economic development systems be aligned to realize the maximum gains from a scholarship program?
4. What kinds of public policy issues (state or local) might arise in connection with the development of a program?

Summary of Economic Development Session

Leading Questions / Burning Issues

- How, and to whom, is it necessary to sell a program?
- Can a program focused on the urban core have a positive economic impact on the broader region? (Need to make the argument that “as the city goes, so goes the county.”)

- Public funding (e.g. local sales tax) is part of funding matrix in some communities but controversial because of fear of hurting economic development (business opposed).
- Have existing Promise-type programs pulled more business to the area?
- How do businesses value workforce, taxes, quality of life?

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Programs need to be tailored to each community
- Need to consider the impact of *not* acting (measure of a program's impact must account for reversal of negative trends – e.g., it's not just how many new students are gained, but what the loss would have been in the absence of a program)
- Usefulness of outside “authority” (report, consultant) in assessing potential impact and “selling” the program to the community
- Community can't turn itself around simply on the basis of the scholarship or school improvement – needs to present itself to the world as a growing community.
- Need to understand the laws involving public money – some communities are pursuing state funding, but may need to change rules regarding bond issuance for “human development” projects rather than infrastructure-type economic development
- Quality of life issues are important – people leave communities not just because of the schools but because of crime and neighborhood issues.
- Selling a vision of better future
- Culture changing program
- Essential to tell the “story,” develop a “brand” for marketing district/area
- Promise program as a city amenity

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- What are the statistics/metrics by which to measure success in economic development?
- What is the impact of including or excluding home-schooled children?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages to small-scale testing or piloting?
- What level of scholarship is needed for families to decide to move into a community?
- How does a community measure success re: economic development?
- How can a community identify its assets and leverage them for economic development?
- What is the sales pitch?
- What is the immediate impact?
- How are metrics set up?
- How much resolve when faced with complexity of program?
- Tax impact? And all other associated costs, infrastructure, more residents, EMS, many costs. Soft services, infrastructure

Funding Breakout Session

Practitioners

Kristi Brant, Director of Development, University of Akron (Ohio)

Tanisha Briley, Assistant to the City Administrator, Davenport (Iowa)

Sandra Byrd Chappelle, Senior Program Office, Saint Luke's Foundation, Columbus (Ohio)

Eileen Curtis, President and CEO, Bay Area Community Foundation, Bay City (Michigan)

Chuck Wilbur, Education Policy Adviser, Office of the Governor, State of Michigan

Overview

For many communities, funding is the first hurdle they face when contemplating the creation of a Promise-type scholarship program. It is extremely difficult to address the question of funding in isolation. A program's cost will be determined largely by its structure and eligibility criteria – topics addressed in the Scholarship Structure breakout session. It may also be affected by the cost of support services for students (some programs include funding for these efforts, while others do not). And, finally, securing funding for a scholarship program is only part of the battle. The alignment and engagement of a community around the goals of the program are also critical to its success. A number of different funding models have been and are being developed for Promise-type programs, including reliance on public, private, and foundation funding. This session also covered alternative strategies for securing the necessary resources for a program's start-up and implementation.

Focus Questions

1. What alternative funding sources exist for Promise-type programs?
2. How can funding strategies be crafted in light of the assets of specific communities?
3. What are some of the political issues involved in public sector funding strategies (whether state or local)?
4. What are some of the lessons learned thus far about raising funds from the private sector (whether individual donors or corporate)?
5. What are some of the lessons learned thus far about raising funds from philanthropic organizations?

Summary of Funding Discussions

Leading Questions / Burning Issues

- How does a community determine necessary funding level?

- What size of initial commitment is needed to spark the interest of other donors?
- Is the challenge grant structure an effective approach?
- Is it possible to fund a Promise-type program through public sales tax? (theoretically yes, but there are no viable examples yet – depends on laws state by state)
- What are pros and cons of endowment fund structure?
- What kinds of safeguards are needed to ensure sustainability of a program?

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Funding needs depend on program structure (see scholarship structure session).
- Donors often want to see a firm case made about the potential impact of their gift.
- One benefit of universal program is that it is difficult to convince people to admit to their financial status
- Long and predictable time frame helps so that others can make funding decisions with knowledge about duration of program.
- One useful approach is to commission a study with existing funds (community foundation, private donors, etc.) to develop the case for broader donor base.
- Challenges:
 - Asking those already invested to think long-term.
 - Hard to make donors understand purpose (scholarship not just going to college, but community development—bringing students back)
 - Hard to convince donors of the need to support all students, even those who “don’t need it.” Support should be given to all, because those are the workers you want back in the community.
- Pros and cons of endowment structure.
 - Some donors don’t believe in endowment; they want to see immediate results.
 - Endowed donations get tax breaks state and federal-wide.
 - Long-term commitment is a possible strategy as opposed to endowment
- Importance of financial literacy (e.g., Junior Achievement, Senior Achievement), life skills and educating the parents

Notes re: Bay Commitment Area

- Motivation was to keep local workforce in the area. Addressing group that graduated and moved away from the manufacturing community (as students leave, jobs leave).
- \$2,000 scholarships to attend local community college provided that local public schools were attended for minimum of six years.
- Universal, not need-based scholarship.
- Goal is to have enough money to sustain award indefinitely. Initial funding was obtained through a quiet process, with one anonymous donor giving \$1 million
- Community foundation is working closely with the public school district and is using the media to get word out about the program. School district funded college support position separately.

Program Administration Breakout Session

Practitioners

Dr. James Fouse, Promise Administrator, El Dorado School District #15 (Arkansas)

Bob Jorth, Executive Administrator, The Kalamazoo Promise

Nancy Miller, Program Director, Jackson Legacy (Michigan)

Jovita Valdez, Scholarship Director and Administrator, Ventura College Foundation, (California)

Overview

This conversation will focus on the process of scholarship distribution. Issues to be addressed may include the application process; necessary documentation; data definition, entry, and maintenance; payment, billing, and refunds; maintenance of eligibility; and the development of Web-based accounts for use by students, schools, and support programs.

Focus Questions

1. What is the scope of scholarship administration? In other words, for what issues is the administrator responsible? What issues fall outside these boundaries?
2. Who or what organization administers the program? Is the organization an existing or new organization? Is it a non-profit organization, a governmental entity, a school district, or another type of organization? Are there special policy issues related to each of these categories?
3. How can administrative costs be minimized? What impact do various scholarship criteria have on the administrative costs/structure? How can administration be simplified?
4. What role does information technology play in scholarship administration? What data is required, where does it originate, how is it maintained, how do stakeholders interface with it, and who is responsible? How can the web be used to facilitate administration?

Summary of Program Administration Discussions

Leading Questions / Burning Issues

- How to handle the mindset that not every student will attend college?
- What kind of databases can be used for administration?
- Should programs cover only full-time college students?
- Can an online system be created to interface with the database?
- How can retention be tracked?

- Have there been problems with the filling out of forms?
- Universal programs seek to send everyone to go to college, but community doesn't share this mindset. How to change that?
- What is the program administrator's realm of responsibility?
- How to deal with other community scholarships already out there?
- How will this affect the impact on growth of colleges and universities?
- Should there be a requirement that students apply for other scholarships?
- Should there be a community service / volunteer component? How to track and enforce it?
 - Jackson program requires 80 community service hours a year; students get involved early, in high school, use resources in community to help direct students to do this
- Are there simple models for release of student information?
- How to help parents navigate the process (e.g., scholarship application, FAFSA)

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Talk to stakeholders/make sure administrators understand program intentions
- Make sure every eligible student understands requirements and what's there for them
 - Pittsburgh coordinator meets with every eligible senior
 - Jackson connected with manufacturing community and also promoting other post-secondary education, technical training, Maybe every student isn't able to go, but more education is good.
 - El Dorado meets with every student, even if they're not going to college, has ways to help them move on their process of college apps etc
 - For larger communities, meeting with every student is unrealistic. Using high school counselors to help isn't a possibility, they have too much on their hands. But kids won't do it on their own, need someone to help push them
- Need to know your community and students and understand what is going on.
- Define boundaries of program administration, who should do what?
- Can create memos of understanding with administrative partners to define the rules
- Partner with schools to develop early support programs to minimize future support needs; student support work can be performed by organization other than program administrator; higher education institutions can help with the tracking of students
- Database options:
 - Kalamazoo database is custom designed
 - Can use West system
 - Web-based database can be reached from anywhere
 - Security / privacy issues
- Need for effective information exchange with school district(s), colleges, state financial aid authorities (e.g., Michigan Educational Trust).

- Where to house program administration? Public, Non-Profit? Private? With the school system? Community foundation is one possibility. Another is to establish own 501C3 organization.
- Have community help realize educational goals – can provide counselors, community college sponsors, college access center.
 - El Dorado example: Community in poverty in Arkansas, feels the need to be really hands on, in the process of designing, help fill out scholarship forms and integrate creating college applications/essays in the English curriculum. Also have community leaders there to help counsel individual students/parents, work with them 1 by 1 to make it work for everybody
 - If all students are required to fill out FAFSA, it makes pot larger and colleges' financial aid departments go out and help
- Forms get more complex with added requirements, minimal generous requirements make forms simple, anyone can fill them out.
- Have to administer added requirements which make things difficult
- Confidentiality: Students sign release form for scholarship and for the colleges, every document is available online to students and schools.
- Be transparent about the process to make sure people (students and parents) understand the scholarship and how they can be eligible; try to make the community as aware as possible about how everything works
- Funds should go directly to the colleges.
- Use the universities to track students post college; helps to track what happens and how the promise worked

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- As program administrators, how do we deal with fundraising?
- What are the pros and cons of a scholarship focus v. a focus on student support services?
- Database use?
- Integration of multiple scholarship programs
- First dollar vs. last dollar spent
- Boundaries of program administration?
- Pros and cons of simple scholarship program compared to those that include / fund support services
- Integration with other endowments

Practitioner Notes:

Jackson Legacy Program

- 2 years of planning; county-wide
- Has a staff of only three, helps cut costs
- Does include Christian/Catholic schools
- Original funding came from private donors, \$5 million
- Requires community service hours
- Community foundation administers program and handles funds
- Uses national college access network and web based tracking system; fee for WEST and college access network is \$300-\$700 membership depending on budget
- Utilizes volunteer and higher ed students to support program
- Partnerships in community have strengthened the foundation of this program
- Have hopes to make larger, but is more a pre-promise structure

El Dorado Promise

- Does not have to raise money
- Murphy Oil Company (donor) writes the checks, all funds flow through Promise administrator.
- Has appeal system for determination of eligibility
- Based on a sliding scale; must be in by 9th grade to receive 65%; K =100%
- Began by evaluating students every semester, changed to evaluation on yearly basis
- Has a publicity committee (yard signs, bumper stickers)
- Has a “mothers’ organization” to help with program/paperwork
- Has lots of aid from community college
- Student has five years to use scholarship and maintain a 2.0
- Excel database custom created and paper files
- Does not pay for vocational programs
- Everything flows through administrator: money, appeals, student application process
- Pay by invoice from the university
- Length of 20 years initial
- Small community makes it possible for administrator to meet with the students and parents once a month

Kalamazoo Promise

- All program decisions affect administrator cost and processes, during planning think about consequences of all requirements and costs
- Promise requires grade reports; reports come from schools, not students
- Keep it simple
- Take the time at beginning, talk to people, work thoroughly in setting up scholarship. Talk to all schools, schools won’t accommodate, you have to do the work
- Kalamazoo Promise is administered virtually (not on paper); colleges and students both have online accounts; use technology to help

- No responsibility for raising money

Ventura Promise

- Small community college in Ventura, California; 13,000 students
- Ensure that all high school graduates get the chance to attend college
- Considered a grant rather than a scholarship
- No academic requirement
- Will pay for first college year using this grant
- If have 3.0 GPA scholarship will pay for second year at Ventura Community College; can then transfer to 4 year university and may receive scholarship
- Students must graduate from Ventura County high school
- Must complete FAFSA
- They have a year to apply for the scholarship
- No min or max requirements for credits of college
- Funded by community foundation and private donors
- students that used it come back and talk to future students
- Use a Microsoft access database
- Proof of enrollment is submitted by the student to the administration; administration pays the university
- Established a text book lending library for all students
- Students have to write a thank you letter to the board of directors to receive the scholarship
- Let to increased enrollment in Ventura County
- Tracking retention of students, grades, etc
- Size of staff: 2 full time
- College counselor and support staff work hard to promote the scholarship

Research and Evaluation Breakout Session

Practitioners

Tim Bartik, Senior Economist, W.E. Upjohn Institute, Kalamazoo
Nancy Landrum, Associate Professor, Department of Management,
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Vaughan Wingfield, Institute for Economic Advancement,
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Overview

This session provided an introduction to the metrics needed to evaluate the impact of a Promise-type program, and addressed how communities can best meet their research and evaluation needs. Among measures considered are those that address educational attainment and access; the local and regional economy, including the housing market; scholarship use; and workforce impact. Other issues addressed include enrollment projections, how to create a baseline measurement, data sources, comparison groups, complex interactions, subjective measures, and the use of surveys and polling.

Focus Questions & Summary of Discussion

1. *Why is it important for Promise-type programs to be evaluated? Who are the audiences for research and evaluation efforts?*

- To sustain a promise type program it is essential to show that benefits are greater than the cost; have to make a case that it's worth investing the money; research fulfills this function.

2. *What should be measured, and how?*

- Need to decide what you're trying to measure, what are the large and small effects. Is measurement of the impact of the program itself or impact on the community (need to include measures of student success and economic success)
- Need to compare impact to what would happen in the absence of a program (e.g., in Kalamazoo, KPS enrollment increase should be measured relative to ongoing decline in enrollment prior to announcement of the program).
- A database kept by the Promise administrator can be used to evaluate impact
- Data on schools, test scores, graduation rate, standardized data, number of kids going to college, enrollment, employment and population in community, property values. Most communities already collect a lot of this data; what you track can vary based on what your community has collected data on in the past
- May want to create some survey instruments to track changing attitudes – e.g., parents' attitudes toward schools (this can change after a promise type program)
- Data access: Are there difficulties (e.g., privacy concerns) in having access to the data?

- Bring more players to the table; the more people you work with the easier it will be to have access to the data
- Employ lots of different data sources and have everyone work together
- Data exists; you just have to be persistent
- Confidentiality - KPS students (parents, actually) sign a release
- Federal government is addressing the ideas of research requirements may soften requirements

3. *Who / what kinds of organizations can provide research and evaluation services?*

- Lots of work has been done and data collected on school reform – what works – which can be used to help community decide where to focus its resources. Same with community development strategies.
- Go to community and people working in schools get information and return that information to the community
- National Student Clearing House - can follow up on students' college attendance

4. *What are some avenues for funding research and evaluation efforts?*

- Research centers at the university can aid in data formation and evaluation

5. *How should research and evaluation efforts be disseminated? Is there a role for PromiseNet in linking research and evaluation efforts?*

Examples of evaluation efforts:

El Dorado Promise

- School system is gathering educational data on students
- Chamber of Commerce and Murphy Oil also gathering data
- Evaluation is being done by university faculty members (University of Arkansas-Little Rock). Professors do research for their jobs, so that's how they are involved.

Kalamazoo Promise:

- Data being tracked by the Upjohn Institute; information available at www.upjohn.org
- Increase in enrollment in KPS
- Increase in number of graduate
- Spike in number of minorities graduating
- Still far too early to judge impact

- Additional evaluation project being done by WMU Evaluation Center

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- Could a venue be created for research and evaluation efforts by multiple communities that could serve as a national repository of best practices?
- Impacts that may be important but that aren't being tracked:
 - Does this impact siblings and others in the family; does it increase the siblings' likelihood of educational success?
 - Health indicators – stress, etc.
 - Quality of life indicators from birth onward and collective ability for community to meet the needs of students within that are not taking advantage of a promise
 - Impact on crime, the juvenile justice system, reduction of crime
- If we do not see any economic benefit, should a program be discontinued? What is the appropriate time frame for judging this issue?

The purpose of the Scorecard is to offer a list of key indicators to be considered when estimating the impact of the Kalamazoo Promise on the Greater Kalamazoo region. A rigorous evaluation of the impact of the Promise on these outcomes requires more than tracking them year after year. We will use statistical techniques in performing the evaluations, which allows us to construct comparison groups and to account for other factors not associated with the Promise, but which could bias the estimates. We will report these results as the evaluation is completed. For now, this set of outcomes serves as a template for conceptualizing the multiple ways in which the Promise can impact the community and those who live here.

Education: Kalamazoo Public Schools

K-12

- Grades
- Test performance (MEAP, etc.)
- Grade progression
- Total enrollment (September FTE counts)
- High school retention
- Application to college rate
- Attendance rates
- High school four-year graduation rate
- Graduation rate CPI (Cumulative Promotion Index)

Kalamazoo Promise

- Accumulated data

College - Data for this section will be available shortly from the National Student Clearinghouse.

- College enrollment
- Type of school
- Yearly progression
- College retention
- College major
- College graduation rate

School/administration

- Enrollment (new students, exits)
- Resources (state foundation aid, other sources)
- Teacher turnover
- Teacher applications
- Teacher composition
- Attitude/policies toward pursuing The Promise

Community/school support

- Parental attitude/support
- Community organizational support

Community: Kalamazoo Public Schools district

- Residential sales: units sold/sale price
- Vacancy rates
- New housing starts
- Origin of new residents
- Tax base effects
- Population change
- Time on listings

Urban core: City of Kalamazoo

- Downtown development: residential/commercial
- Vacancy rates
- Tax revenues

Region: Kalamazoo County

- Population change
- Employment change
- Type of jobs available
- Educational attainment
- Industrial mix
- Entrepreneurial activity
- Migration

Scholarship Structure Breakout Session

Practitioners

Eddy Jones, Office of the Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools

Bob Jorth, The Kalamazoo Promise

Louise Myrland, Denver Scholarship Foundation

Overview

This session addressed the critical task of structuring a Promise-type program so that it creates incentives that support the community's intended outcomes. There are numerous large and small decisions that need to be made about how a scholarship is structured. On the macro level these criteria become the tool for achieving the broadly defined goal(s) of the scholarship: in most cases, educational achievement and economic development. On a more practical level they will determine everything from who can take advantage of the opportunity, the college(s) they can attend with their scholarship, the cost of the program, and the ease or complexity of its administration, as well as many other issues.

Focus Questions

1. What criteria need to be defined in order to construct a scholarship program?
Criteria include eligibility restrictions, how levels of funding are determined, and any obligations on the part of students in exchange of the use of the scholarship. (See list of additional criteria below.)
2. What structural factors have the most significant impact on the scholarship's broad objectives? (In other words, what incentives do they create for users and others?)
How do the various decisions about structure affect the administrative components of the scholarship?
3. What kinds of financial models exist for calculating funding needs for a Promise-type program? How can these models be adapted for different communities?
4. What aspects of scholarship structure have the strongest effect on cost? How have different communities structured their programs in light of available funding?
5. How / when should the structure of the scholarship program be adjusted?

Other Areas of Discussion

Some of the many factors to be considered are which K-12 school systems will be included (e.g., public, private, charter); which colleges are to be covered by the program (e.g., public, private, local, in-state, out-of-state), scholarship amount; length of residency in community; duration of enrollment; high-school GPA cutoff; financial need; and community service or

return to community requirements. The following is a sampling of criteria that are often considered (directly/indirectly/consciously/unconsciously):

1. Who is eligible?
 - Secondary school enrollment/residency – City / School District / County
 - Secondary enrollment duration - Graduation / 1 Year / High School / More / Other
 - High schools that are eligible - Public / Private / Charter
 - High school GPA requirement – None / 2.0 / other / Escalating
 - Other high school requirements – attendance / discipline / academic program

2. How is scholarship shaped at college level?
 - College satisfactory academic progress – As defined by school / As define by Scholarship
 - Colleges that are eligible - Public / Private / In-State / Out-State
 - Scholarship place in financial aid package - 1st Dollar / Last Dollar / other
 - Scholarship amount - % / Fixed Amount / Stepped Amount
 - Need Based – Yes / No
 - Post secondary programs covered - Degree / Certificates / Trades
 - Scholarship duration - 1 Year / 2 Year / 4 Year / other
 - College enrollment Status - Full time / Half time / Part time
 - Scholarship amount restriction – Tuition only / Tuition & other / Other When college enrollment must begin – immediately / within time frame
 - When course of study must be completed – 1 year / 2 year / 4 year / other

3. Obligation to return to community – Yes, 1 year / Yes, 2 year / No / other

Summary of Scholarship Structure Discussions

Leading Question / Burning Issues

- How should a community go about setting eligibility criteria (Which students? Which schools? Which colleges? Any other criteria – see above)
- Should a program be first-dollar or last dollar – what are pros and cons, as well as cost difference? How to decide? Are first dollar programs more helpful for families with limited economic resources?
- What are the costs and benefits of partnering with schools or other community

organizations around pre-college planning/student support? How can this relationship be structured?

- How do the dynamics of determining scholarship structure change when public funding is involved?
- How to define “success”? (e.g., 4 year attendance mark is not a good reference)

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Restricting attendance to public universities in a state specifically benefits students in that state; in-state tuition rate is much less, which impacts the cost of the program.
- Support people are helpful but one may not be enough. Students need help with financial aid/college applications.
- Last dollar programs (where scholarship meets students’ remaining need after all other sources of funding are tapped) are VERY difficult to administer. Tradeoff between utilizing all available dollars and complexity of administration (Denver abandoned last-dollar program)..
- Need-based programs are cost effective (stretches money further, helps more kids) however very LABOR INTENSIVE.
- After the 1st year, there is real data to help determine costs.
- Davenport is an example of a proposed public funding structure - 75% of new sales tax would pay for the promise (\$13.8 million a year), 20% would go to police/safety
- Tax increment financing mechanism (Michigan)- “promise zones”
- Many low income families don’t file taxes, which are required for financial aid
- Promise mentors- come back to elementary schools and speak with future promise students, building a community of support
- Career counselors in high schools (trained in financial aid)- pre-high school intervention
- Parent education is essential (beginning at elementary school age), partner with community based organizations/government organizations

Comparison of programs

- **FAFSA.** Denver and Pittsburgh only serve students who complete FAFSA so they do not address undocumented students.
- **Eligibility.** Pittsburgh: students have 5 years of eligibility for a 4 year college program Kalamazoo: students have 10 years.
- **Retention of scholarship.** Denver- 1 academic grace period to help students get back on track with GPA; Kalamazoo- all students have the 1st year of college to get on track, then semester to semester, probation after one semester of unsatisfactory performance; Probation gives the opportunity to intervene and identify students who are having trouble at the university level

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- Viability of public funding for promise programs
- Implications of first vs. last dollar on program administration and availability of other \$, ease of applying for families
- How do you plan for how much money you need? (when enrollment could change)
- If/how to serve incarcerated youth (middle/high school)?
- If/how to serve undocumented students
- How to quantify what the advisors are doing in the schools?
- Who sets the agenda - minority participation issue
- What financial models exist? Obtain historical data about the students and make assumptions about future (high success, moderate, low), numbers quoted based on moderate success (Pittsburgh)
- Do Promise-type programs result in higher college completion rates- too early to tell
- How are other scholarships (e.g., institutional aid, Rotary, church, etc.) affected by a Promise-type program?
- Does the establishment of a Promise-type program have any impact on other philanthropic activity, such as giving to community foundations?
- Is it useful to begin with a few schools as a pilot program? How to choose pilot program high schools?
- Pros/cons of allowing private universities included in the scholarship?
- Creation of alumni association/ how to track students to mentor in future etc.

Student Support Breakout Session

Practitioners

Pam Kingery, Executive Director, Kalamazoo Communities In Schools

Paula Langston-Ware, Program Director, Legacy Scholars (Battle Creek, Michigan)

Steve Thorndill, Executive Director, Scholarship Programs, College Success Foundation
(Tacoma, Washington)

Overview

This session addressed the need for a comprehensive system of support for students from pre-K through college and some strategies for creating and funding such a system. Among the chief questions addressed were how to define student support, the role of the community v. the school system(s) in the provision of student support services, promising models for organizing student support, the mechanisms that must be in place to assure a system of integrated student support services, and strategies for achieving a common vision and plan across multiple stakeholders. Other areas of discussion included strategies for financing and sustaining such services, confidentiality and data collection, tracking and evaluating student support, and measuring the effectiveness and impact of student support services.

Focus Questions

1. How does the community define student support services and establish common agreement on what services should be provided?
2. For whom should student support services be available? (All students? Low-income students only? Across the pre-K-12 continuum? At a particular grade level?) How does the community decide this?
3. Where and when should student support services be delivered? (Within the schools? In the community? Both? During school? After school? Both?) What successful models and best practices already exist?
4. Should student support be delivered using a single focus---e.g. tutoring? Or should a comprehensive system of student support delivery be utilized based on assessed individual and/or school needs? How can services be coordinated effectively at the individual student level, school level, and system level?
5. How does a community create ownership, authority/sanction and accountability for student support services? Where does ongoing authority and responsibility rest for student support services? What is the role of the school system vs. the community in the delivery of student support services?

Summary of Student Support Discussion

Leading Questions / Burning Issues

- What is the role of guidance counselors at the high-school level?
- What is the role of parents?
- What is being done to help support students with special issues – e.g., incarcerated, pregnant
- How best to go about engaging the entire community, not just the schools?

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

- Presumption that once a student has a scholarship, the war is over. This is wrong. It is incumbent on everyone to make sure the community understands the need for student support and success. Scholarships by themselves do NOT solve problems.
- College readiness is also a critical piece: the end of the road is not getting to college, but staying in college
- Programs need to be able to turn to the entire community for support, collaborate with existing providers in the community
- GEARUP counselors/ advisors valuable
- Work in the classroom and not wait for students to come for counselors
- Parent leaders in the schools (KCIS), Parent Network (Legacy)
- Middle School workshops (Sf State, city, city school district and the mayor)
- Employers release time to work with students in schools (City of Kalamazoo, Chamber of commerce, business tool kit)
- Portland community support to welcome returning students from juvenile system
- Appeals committee to getting in programs
- Begins at birth - talking, singing, reading from birth on...

Issues Requiring a Deeper Look

- How to serve incarcerated students, undocumented students, students who are homeless, in foster care, pregnant, or in the detention system?
- How do we work with the community to provide counseling and support to the students?
- What comes first? The scholarship or the student support?
- Effects of Michigan graduation requirements on students' abilities to receive scholarships
- Time for instruction and support for additional needs (tutoring, mentoring, and counseling)

Practitioners:

College Success Foundation (Tacoma)

- Receives funds from Gates Foundation
- Legislature provides staff in each high school for support services
- Foundation works with six big high schools and 10 middle schools.
- TCSN- Tacoma College Support Network- tries to get everyone engaged in community
- 125 million project- grant ends in 2010.
- every resident on free or reduced lunches can apply for new scholarship program- support services more important
- work with M.S. students, all students get mentors in high school, certificates from governor

Legacy Scholars (Battle Creek)

- Targets students in two public school districts from 6th grade to 12th grade, receive two year scholarship to the local community college.
- Funded by W.K. Kellogg Foundation
- Based on philosophy that all students have skills and abilities
- Approached the scholarship from a student success standpoint, effort to look at students holistically
- Relies on community partners -- GEARUP is heavily involved in providing support services
 - employs case managers
 - college fairs, visits, all go through GEARUP
 - has data on behavior, attendance
- Works closely with BBBS - does not want to duplicate what is already in existence
- Identifies parent leaders in Battle Creek and resource centers, tries to understand barrier to college, help students see the benefit of good grades. Parent network- group of parents who come together and find out what parents want information about. Key goal of parent network is to be a resource for one another. Parents can help other students as well. Encourage parents to be involved in every aspect all of the time.
- Originally targeted 500 “at risk” students, but because of perceived stigma of being “at risk” decided to expand program to anyone who wants to join program – now universal

Kalamazoo Communities In Schools

- KCIS existed prior to the Kalamazoo Promise
- public/private founders
- critical partners- Kalamazoo City, KPS, and chamber of commerce, all sit on board
- approached student support services with notion that school would tell them what they need and then KCIS finds the people and resources
- draws in community organizations-138 organizations and 500 volunteers

- attached to school to eliminate problems of access- takes services to students
- once Promise announced- both good and bad news- bombarded with ideas
- protects schools from being bombarded with volunteers
- must look at what the priorities are (handout)
- commissioned a comprehensive review of research (handout)
- after Promise, 73 percent increase in service delivery hours
- churches in all parts of community volunteer with KPS students
- has a parent information and resource center grant with parent leaders in ten schools.
Very effective in getting parents who are not mainstreamed into the school district.
Help parents find ways to engage and encourage their children's education.

Deeper Look Breakout Session: Federal Policy

Practitioners

Dr. Janice Brown, The Kalamazoo Promise

Dr. Britany Affolter-Caine, Research Associate, The Brookings Institution

Alan Berube, Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, The Brookings Institution

Overview

The session will provide an overview of a forthcoming policy paper from the Brookings Institution's Metropolitan Policy Program as part of the Blueprint for Prosperity series. The paper focuses on the Kalamazoo Promise and other similar programs in communities across the country as a market-driven approach to reversing the enrollment declines of struggling schools and surrounding communities by attracting middle class families with the promise of free higher education and all this promise entails, such as quality education and competitive preparation. The policy proposal suggests a role for the federal government in this new education-centered economic development strategy. More specifically, the federal government should designate, support, and test a limited number of "Promise communities" by doing the following:

- Select through national competition a limited number of areas with high student poverty, low graduation/college-going rates, and wider economic underperformance
- Require Promise communities to demonstrate plans to: (a) increase student/family preparation and support for higher education; (b) match federal contributions locally; (c) align other economic development investments with Promise goals
- Provide tax credits in these communities to offset costs of: (a) higher education for graduating students and their families (i.e., strengthened HOPE/LL credit); (b) individual contributions to local community trusts that provide these students with scholarships.

Focus Questions

1. What are the strengths of education-centered economic development policies – utilizing Promise-type programs as community economic development strategies?
2. What is an appropriate role for the federal government in promoting and/or supporting the expansion of Promise-type programs across the country? How can the federal government play this role most effectively?
3. How do the proposed federal policies outlined in the paper (doubling the tax deduction for contributors to a Promise-type program and a refundable tax credit for students and families) promote and support Promise-type programs? Are these adequate? How can these be strengthened?
4. What are the challenges facing such a policy proposal at the federal level? At the state and community levels?

Acknowledgments

The PromiseNet.2008 Planning Committee would like to thank the individuals and organizations that helped make this conference possible.

PromiseNet.2008 Sponsors

Irving S. Gilmore Foundation
Kalamazoo Communities in Schools
Kalamazoo Community Foundation
The Kalamazoo Promise
W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

PromiseNet.2008 Facilitators

Meg Blinkiewicz
Brooke Nobis Buys
Suprotik Stotz-Gosh
Janet Jones
Elizabeth Jordan
Marc Meulman
Emily Scott
Teresa Thrash
Martha Warfield

PromiseNet.2008 Recordors

Stephanie Butler
Bethany Clay
Ben Copeland
Amanda Kanter
Noah Kingery
Jessie Liszewski
Jeremy Minar
Brian Pittelko
Kristi Potts
Elsy Thomas

PromiseNet Planning Committee

Jim Bosco, Western Michigan University
Janice Brown, The Kalamazoo Promise
Kim Didier, Newton (IA) Economic Development Corporation
Randall Eberts, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
Eddy Jones, Office of the Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools
Elizabeth Jordan, Ruth Mott Foundation, Flint (MI)
Bob Jorth, The Kalamazoo Promise
Pam Kingery, Kalamazoo Communities in Schools
Sarah Klerk, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
Michelle Miller-Adams, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
Louise Myrland, Denver Scholarship Foundation
Patrick Naswell, Greater Flint Community Foundation
Lila Phillips, El Dorado (AK) Educational Foundation
Steve Thorndill, College Success Foundation
Bridget Timmeney, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research