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Note: This paper is the second of two papers that document the development and launch of the Road Map Project. The first paper provides background on the Road Map Project and outlines the phase of work focused on building the Road Map for Education Results. This paper details the second phase of the Project: Organizing for Action.

Introduction

The Road Map Project transitions from “Building the Road Map” to “Organizing for Action”.

December 2010 marked an important transition for the Road Map Project – from “Building the Road Map” to “Organizing for Action”. The Road Map Project was officially launched at a regional conference on December 9, 2010. Leading up to the public launch, dozens of education and civic leaders signed on to endorse the common goal of the Road Map Project to double the number of students in the region who are on-track to earn a college degree or career credential, and to close achievement gaps by the year 2020. With a common goal and shared metrics established in Phase I, the Project then transitioned into Phase II of the work: determining how to work together to achieve the Road Map’s ambitious 2020 goals.

Phase II emphasizes bringing stakeholders together from across the region to organize and collaborate to reach the common goal for 2020, marking a transition from developing a shared goal to determining how to reach the Road Map goal:
In Phase II, there was a need to **refine the Road Map goal** to identify metrics to define “on-track” and specify what the Project aims to achieve in terms of “closing the achievement gap”. This phase of work also focuses on **building key capacities** to support and sustain the work, particularly around the role of data and community engagement in the Project. Phase II emphasizes the **“how” of getting to the Road Map goal** to identify specifically how people from across the region will work together in new and bold ways to achieve the dramatic change that the region needs. This phase of work also focuses on **maintaining the momentum** and interest built during Phase I across many different stakeholder groups and focusing that energy on working together to improve outcomes for the region’s students.

## Who is involved

**Collective impact requires collective action.**

The network of individuals, organizations, and community groups that have been involved in the Road Map Project continued to grow throughout Phase II. The Project’s progress relies on the efforts of various groups that constitute the infrastructure of the Project, each with its own role to play. The Road Map Project is an example of a collective impact initiative, where cross-sectoral actors come together to collectively solve a complex social problem. Collective impact includes five key conditions for success: a common agenda focused on a common goal and understanding of how organizations will work together; a shared measurement system to capture and report common metrics of progress; mutually reinforcing activities where different organizations leverage their strengths in their work; continuous communication to keep everyone on the same page, learning, and improving; and a backbone organization as the engine that brings structure, direction, and momentum.¹ The Road Map Project embodies this structured and data-driven approach to collaboration, with the Community Center for Education Results serving as the backbone organization that keeps the Project moving. (See diagram on the following page.)

---

The six groups shown in the top half of the diagram above serve to provide direction, input and accountability for the Project as a whole. A number of these groups have been critical to building and maintaining the Road Map Project’s momentum and direction since Phase I, including the Community Center for Education Results, the Road Map Sponsor Group, and the Education Results Network. The Community Network and Advocates Caucus and Road Map Aligned Funders group have been formalized in Phase II to ensure the engagement of the broader community and local funders in the Project. The group of Superintendents and Community College Presidents began meeting in Phase I and have continued to be a critical stakeholder in determining the role of institutional leaders in the Project’s success. All of these groups serve as vetting bodies and provide feedback on the Project’s progress and success. The six additional groups, the Road Map work groups, were established in Phase II and are responsible for developing system-building strategies to allow us to reach our collective goal.

**Community Center for Education Results**

The Community Center for Education Results (CCER) has served as the “backbone” organization for the Road Map Project since its beginning. CCER plays a number of roles that keep the various parts of the Project coordinated and moving, and these roles have expanded over time as CCER has hired more staff, particularly around data, community engagement, and project support. CCER regularly convenes groups involved in the Project, keeps them up-to-date, and collects and integrates their input to support the Project’s progress. CCER also provides staffing support to a number of the Road Map groups, including the P-3 and High School-to-College Completion work groups, the Community Network, and the Data Advisors. CCER has worked with Strategies 360, a communications and strategy firm, on
communications on behalf of the Road Map Project, particularly around outreach to local media outlets. CCER also provides communications support via its website, with a Road Map-focused blog and relevant meeting materials and resources available to those interested in and/or involved in the Project. In Phase II, CCER began a rebranding process to emphasize the Road Map Project, and its role in support of the broader effort. This rebranding will continue into 2012. In terms of the Road Map’s focus on data, CCER’s role has been particularly critical, including collecting, analyzing and reporting data to inform decision-making and track progress. At the end of Phase II, CCER published a baseline report to reflect current performance on the Road Map indicators, and CCER will use this report to track the Project’s progress and inform course corrections over time.

Since CCER was formed in early 2010, the staff has grown from one staff member to seven. Throughout Phases I and II, FSG, a nonprofit strategy and evaluation consulting firm that works with nonprofit, foundation, and corporate clients, has provided ongoing support to the CCER team. In Phase I, when CCER had a small staff of four, the FSG team provided additional staff capacity. As the CCER team expanded to seven in Phase II, FSG shifted into an advisory role and worked closely with the CCER team to build their capacity to carry the work forward. At the end of 2011, FSG transitioned to a lighter touch role, serving as a thought partner to the CCER team through the early stages of Phase III.

**Project Sponsors**
The Project Sponsor Group was established at the Road Map’s start, serving as the Project’s advisory committee to provide strategic guidance and decision-making, ensure accountability for reaching the Project’s goals and targets, and give final approval for proposed metrics, targets, strategic actions, and advocacy priorities. The Project Sponsors are a cross-sector group of leaders from the region, including the K-12 and post-secondary education systems, community-based organizations, funders, community leaders, and advocacy organizations. Throughout Phase II, the Sponsor Group has provided ongoing feedback to each of the work groups, and will be responsible for reviewing and approving these groups’ action plans as they are proposed in Phase III. With the Project Sponsors assuming increasing responsibility for the strategic direction, progress, and accountability for the Project, their role has become more formalized. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) was developed in Phase II, with each Sponsor signing on to formalize their role in support of the Road Map Project. *(See Sponsor MOU in Appendix.)*

**Education Results Network**
The Education Results Network has played an important role since the start of the Road Map Project. This group, which includes over 700 people working on education in the Road Map Region, 100 to 150 of whom attend regular meetings, is convened quarterly to learn about the progress of the Road Map Project and provide input and suggestions. In Phase II, this group vetted the on-track measures and targets proposed by the Data Advisors, and has been informed about the selection and progress of various short-term strategic actions, such as a sign-up drive for the College Bound scholarship and the development of a 12th grade plan to support the first cohort of College Bound students who graduate in 2012.
Community Network and Advocates Caucus
A foundational element of the Road Map Project’s success is developing a “Strong Community Voice”. To that end, Phase II included the formation of the Community Network and Advocates Caucus. These groups focus on engaging the broader community in the Road Map Project and developing a set of advocacy priorities, respectively. Throughout Phase II, the Advocates Caucus has defined a set of advocacy priorities with implications at the community, district, and state level where policy change is critical for achieving improved student outcomes. The Community Network, in turn, is working to organize community members and parents around the Project’s advocacy goals as well as the emerging strategic actions and priorities.

K-12 Superintendents and Community College Presidents
Since mid-2010, the Road Map Region’s superintendents and community college presidents have been meeting regularly to identify ways to work together to strengthen the collaboration, coordination, and alignment between the region’s K-12 and postsecondary education systems. In Phase II, this group initiated several actions, including issuing early acceptance letters to the region’s community colleges for high school seniors who graduated in 2011 and convening a math alignment taskforce to work on increasing alignment across the high school and community colleges in the region. This group includes membership from each of the seven Road Map districts, the region’s community and technical colleges, and the University of Washington. In addition to initiating their own actions, the group has also served to vet and provide feedback on the progress and proposals from each of the Road Map work groups.

Road Map Aligned Funders
The Road Map Aligned Funders group was first convened early in Phase II, and met several times throughout 2011. This group includes funders of all types – including private foundations, community foundations, public funders, corporations, and intermediary organizations – and they have been met several times to learn about collective impact, the cradle-to-career approach to improving education, and the Road Map Project. This group has met regularly to receive updates on the Road Map progress, to provide input and suggestions to inform the Project, and to begin exploring opportunities to collaborate in support of the Road Map Project. The funder group participated in a survey to provide an understanding of the current state of funding in the Road Map Region.

Road Map Work Groups
Given the importance of refining the Project’s goal and metrics and defining strategic priorities, there are six work groups that have been focused on developing the “system building strategies” that will lead to improved Road Map outcomes. The six work groups include cross-sectoral stakeholders from the across the Road Map Region, with the focus areas listed below. Members of each group were invited to ensure representation of key stakeholders with relevant expertise from across the Road Map Region. (Lists of work group chairs and members are included in the appendix.)

- **P-3/Birth-to-3rd Grade** work group, to focus on early learning, the transition to the K-12 system, and the early elementary years
• **High School-to-College Completion** work group, to improve college readiness, access, and success

• **Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM)** work group, to increase STEM outcomes for students in the region

• **English Language Learner** work group, to support the many students in the Road Map Region from immigrant and refugee families

• **Youth Development Executives of King County (YDEKC)** work group, to bring together leaders from youth development-focused organizations in King County

• **Data Advisors**, to provide guidance to the Road Map Project regarding indicators, targets, and ongoing data-related questions

The role and mandate of each of the work groups are described in greater detail in the sections that follow.

In addition to the formal stakeholder groups engaged in the Road Map Project, a wide range of additional individuals and organizations are engaging in the work. This includes civic leaders from the Road Map communities, including mayors and city councils, many of whom have gotten involved in the early actions and continue to be interested in ways that they can support the Project’s progress in the future.

---

**Theory of Change**

**Alignment and action are the building blocks of change.**

To define how the Road Map Project will reach the 2020 goal, the Project’s theory of change was revisited in Phase II. The theory of change includes the three core pieces of work: 1) the foundational capacities of data, community voice, and aligned funding; 2) organizational alignment; and 3) system-building strategies. Each of these components has a critical and distinct contribution to make, and no one element on its own is sufficient for the scale of change we seek. Instead, they work together to complement and reinforce one another to reach our goal as detailed in the diagram that follows.
**Strong Data Capacity**

The role of data in the Road Map Project cannot be overstated. In Phase I, data was critical for making the case for change, as poor student outcomes demonstrated that a new approach was needed to drive system-wide success. In Phase II, data has been central for understanding the region’s current performance and the change that is needed to reach the 2020 goal. The project emphasizes the role of data to track progress as well as to improve practice. Better use of data helps practitioners and community members see clearly what is working and what is not, and learn what works in order to spread it.

**Powerful Community Voice**

In Phase II, the role of the broader community shifted from outreach to engagement. In Phase I, CCER conducted ongoing outreach to civic leaders, community-based organizations, school districts, community colleges, and others in an effort to raise awareness of the Road Map Project and the need for change. In Phase II, the focus has shifted to engagement, and identifying where and how community groups can get involved and take action to support relevant Road Map strategies and/or advocacy priorities. Rallying the community in support of the Road Map’s strategies is seen as an important way to incentivize institutions to change. The project focuses on the need to strengthen public demand among parents, community members, students, and people from all sectors for excellence and equity in education.

**Aligned Funding**

The Road Map Region has a large community of private and public funders that support education locally and across the state. Private and public funders can help accelerate progress by using the Road
Map indicators as investment metrics and by supporting system-building strategies. Funders can align their own outcomes and strategies to support the Road Map goal and can provide a powerful incentive to grantee organizations to adopt the common goal and metrics. Funders can also provide invaluable support to the process and infrastructure of collective impact projects, such as funding for the backbone organization, work group staff support, and content expertise, as many funders have been tracking best practices from their organizations’ work and past investments.

**Organizational Alignment**
With its common goal and set of shared metrics, the Road Map for Education Results is a framework to organize the work of Road Map organizations, including school districts, postsecondary institutions, early learning programs, community-based organizations, and funders. The pace of progress will depend on the level of commitment to the Road Map 2020 goal and targets from education institutions, youth development organizations, and other key stakeholders. Achieving our desired level of change will take massive and sustained effort, and success will only be possible with significant alignment among major implementers.

**System-Building Strategies and Actions**
In addition to aligning individual organizations to the Road Map goal, indicators, and strategies, broader strategies that cut across organizations and systems are necessary for the scale of change that we seek. A central part of Phase II has focused on identifying high-impact, system-change strategies for improving student outcomes across the Road Map Region. As these strategies are developed, they inform the other key components of the theory of change. Data collection and analysis, community engagement and advocacy, and funder and organizational alignment activities are all pursued with the common goal of gaining traction on a set of system-level strategic priorities.

---

**Refining the goal**

Understanding progress depends on clear and specific goals.
At the end of Phase I, stakeholders from across the region had endorsed the Road Map goal - “Our goal is to double the number of students in South King County and South Seattle who are on track to graduate from college or earn a career credential by 2020. We are committed to nothing less than closing the unacceptable achievement gaps for low-income students and children of color, and increasing achievement for all students from cradle to college and career” – but greater clarity was needed in determining the specific metrics and targets we would use to measure our progress and success. In Phase II, the Data Advisors were charged with identifying on-track indicators and developing interim and 2020 targets to track progress toward the Project’s goal over time. They were also asked to identify measures and targets for closing the achievement gap.

**Identifying “On track” Indicators**
The Data Advisors began by selecting which measures to include in the Road Map definition of “on track”. Working from a set of indicators that had been developed in Phase I, the group identified key
milestones along the cradle-to-career continuum that are important to eventual success in post-secondary education. The group used a set of criteria to guide the decision-making process, to ensure that the selected indicators would:

- Represent measures across the cradle-to-career continuum
- Address critical and growing needs in our region (e.g. STEM education and the growth in STEM-related jobs)
- Draw from the Road Map indicators identified in Phase I. These were selected with input from a range of stakeholders over the course of several months based on the following criteria:
  - The indicator must be a valid measure linked to student success
  - The indicator must be easily understandable to a range of stakeholders, including practitioners working with students (districts, CBOs, community colleges, EL providers) and the broader public (including parents)
  - The data must be produced by a trusted source
  - Priority is given to including indicators that are comparable across school districts (or neighborhoods), and that have the ability to be compared
  - All or most of the indicators must be affordable to gather and report
  - The data should be available consistently over time (preferably on an annual basis or more frequently), should be recent (2008 or later), and should be easily disaggregated by county, City / S. King County community, and school (or neighborhood). Priority will be given to data that can also be disaggregated by ethnicity, socio-economic status, ELL and gender. Note - additional/different measures will be added/replaced based on new data that becomes available over time (e.g., WaKIDS data).
  - Trend data should be provided over at least a 3-year period (beginning with or including 2007)
  - Each indicator should be able to be influenced to a significant degree by local action, and be useful in the day to day work of this Working Group and other educators and organizations that are working to improve education

The Data Advisors identified 17 indicators based on indicators from Phase I as well as several new additions. (See appendix for on-track indicators and full set of Road Map indicators.) The selected measures indicate performance across the education continuum, to include transitions between early learning and K-12, and from K-12 into postsecondary, and across a number of academic and non-academic domains. The proposed on-track measures include:

**Healthy and ready for Kindergarten**
- Pre-K indicator *(specific measure TBD)*
- % of children meeting kindergarten readiness standards

**Supported and successful in school**

---

2 For measures that are TBD, the Data Advisors will continue their work and define these measures in Phase III.
% of students proficient in:
- 3rd grade reading
- 4th grade math
- 5th grade science
- 6th grade reading
- 7th grade math
- 8th grade science

% of 9th graders who pass end-of-course algebra exam

% of students not triggering Early Warning indicators

Graduate from high school college- and career-ready
- % of students graduating high school meeting HEC Board (Higher Education Coordinating Board) minimum entrance requirements
- % of high school graduates who completed a career/technical education program
- % of students graduating from high school on time
- % of high school graduates who take developmental education courses in college

Earn a college degree or career credential
- % of students who enroll in post-secondary education
- % of students who persist year to year
- % of students who earn a post-secondary credential by age 24

The proposed “on track” metrics were vetted throughout the spring and early summer of 2011 at meetings with all Road Map stakeholder groups (action planning work groups, Education Results Network, Community Network and Advocates Caucus, Project Sponsors, etc.) and the list was refined based on feedback received. Adding a pre-K measure, for example, was suggested, as it is important to track children’s development from the very early years, well before they get to kindergarten and the K-12 education system. Similarly, a measure of students taking developmental education (remedial) courses in college was added as complement to graduates having met the HEC Board minimum entrance requirements as an additional measure of students’ readiness for college upon completion of high school.

Setting 2020 Targets
Along with developing a proposed set of on track measures, the Data Advisors established associated 2020 goals for each of the on track metrics that would align to the ultimate goal of doubling the number of students in South King County and South Seattle who are on track to graduate from college or earn a career credential by 2020. For each measure, they identified a 2020 target as well as interim targets for 2014 and 2017 to measure progress and inform course corrections along the way.

The 2020 performance targets for the on track indicators were developed by analyzing the achievement of students from the top 10 performing school districts in Washington State which, when taken
collectively, already achieve twice the rate of postsecondary degree or credential attainment than students in South King County and South Seattle. These districts’ performance on each of the on track indicators were adopted as the 2020 targets for the Road Map Region. The group stressed that, though the Top 10 districts are performing at the level the Project seeks to achieve, their student populations are much different than those in the Road Map Region – with less racial and ethnic diversity and fewer low-income and ELL students. While the Project seeks to match the performance of these districts, the strategies we use to support our students to achieve at the same levels will likely be very different given the differences in student populations.

Setting Interim Targets
With the 2020 goals set, the Data Advisors could move onto determining interim targets necessary to track the Project’s progress along the way, in 2014 and 2017. In particular it was important to take into account different rates of change needed at different points in the cradle-to-career pipeline. The 2010 baseline measure of postsecondary completion, for example, is based on the cohort from the high school class of 2004 who completed a college degree or career credential by 2010. For the 2020 target – 10 years out from the baseline – the postsecondary completion goal would apply to the cohort of the high school class of 2014, who started their 10th grade year in the 2011-12 school year. The need for dramatic improvement in getting this cohort, in particular, out of high school and into and through postsecondary education was central to establishing the growth trajectories needed to reach the Project’s 2020 goals for postsecondary completion. Taking into account the different levels of urgency, the Data Advisors established a set of growth trajectories to get from the baseline to each of the 2020 goals for the on track measures, using the following guiding principles:

- We will need **near-term improvement on all indicators simultaneously** since our goals are aggressively set across the pipeline, from kindergarten to postsecondary completion
- Curves for **high school graduation and postsecondary indicators reflect the aggressive near-term growth needed** in order to reach 2020 postsecondary completion goal for 2014 high school graduates (who are in 10th grade in the 2011-12 school year)
- Growth curves reflect a **compounding effect over time**, as students progress through the cradle-to-career pipeline

Based on these principles, the group developed a set of 2014, 2017 and 2020 targets, listed in the table that follows:

Targets for post-secondary enrollment, persistence and completion are based on a 9th grade cohort, as shown in the 9th grade-to-post-secondary completion pipeline chart below:

---

3 “Top 10” districts are identified as those districts with 1) the highest rates of post-secondary completion (two- or four-year degree) based on the cohort of 9th graders for the 2003-04 high school graduates (i.e. # of students completing a two-or four-year degree divided by the total number of ninth graders), and 2) more than 20 high school graduates.
### Road Map High School to Post-Secondary Completion with Targets: The Leaky Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Track Indicator</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 % of students meeting Pre-K Indicator (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 % of students meeting kindergarten readiness standards (WaKIDS)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students proficient in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 3rd grade reading</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 4th grade math</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 5th grade science</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 6th grade reading</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 7th grade math</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 8th grade science</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 10th grade math</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 % of students triggering the Early Warning Indicator #1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(students with six or more absences and at least one course failure in the 9th grade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 % of students triggering the Early Warning Indicator #2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9th grade students with a suspension and/or expulsion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 % of students graduating high school meeting HEC Board minimum entrance</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 % of high school graduates who completed a career/technical education (CTE)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14 % of students graduating from high school on time</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15 % of students who enroll in postsecondary education</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16 % of students who persist in postsecondary from year to year</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17 % of students who earn a postsecondary credential by age 26</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Road Map to Post-Secondary Completion

- **9th Grade:** 100%
- **Graduate HS:** 78%
- **Enroll PS:** 54%
- **Persist PS:** 46%
- **Complete PS:** 24%
Defining “Closing the Achievement Gap”
In addition to selecting metrics and targets for “on track”, the Data Advisors also determined how to define and measure “closing the achievement gap”. The group requested initial guidance from the Sponsor group in terms of the Project’s overarching agenda. The Sponsors were asked to determine whether the Project was striving to narrow or eliminate the achievement gap by 2020. Following some good debate, the Sponsors settled on aiming to eliminate the achievement gap by 2020, a goal that they saw as aspirational but also necessarily bold. With the elimination of the achievement gap as the end-game goal, the Data Advisors discussed how to define the achievement gap – based on race/ethnicity, income, gender – and how to measure progress along the way. Because the region faces large achievement gaps on several dimensions (race/ethnicity, income, gender) on many measures, the group determined that it makes sense to cast a wide net in defining and tracking the achievement gap. The group suggested tracking all types of achievement gaps and determining the improvement that is needed within each sub-group so that every sub-group of students reaches the 2020 targets, based on the Top 10 district benchmarks. Since the Road Map Project aims to close achievement gaps by 2020, the 2020 targets are the same for all groups of students. To close achievement gaps, however, the rates of progress required will be higher for students of color and low-income students than the improvement rate required for all students.

Reaching our goal

Building a strong foundation supports our success.
As detailed in the Road Map theory of change, success in reaching our goal rests on three foundational elements: Strong Data Capacity, Powerful Community Voice, and Aligned Funding. Phase II has included progress in each of these domains.

Strong Data Capacity
To build strong data capacity, Phase II included the Data Advisors’ work to refine the Road Map goal, and a significant effort to collect, analyze and report data for the Road Map Baseline Report. For this report, released in December 2011, CCER collected data from all seven Road Map districts, the Washington state Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, the BERC Group, the Puget Sound Educational Service District, and the King County Department of Health. In order to collect student-level data that can be matched and tracked over time – to inform longitudinal analyses, including student growth – CCER developed data-sharing agreements with each of the seven districts and OSPI. Through its data collection efforts, CCER was able to compile a report of baseline data for Road Map indicators where data is available, including several metrics that had never before been reported to the extent of the Road Map Baseline Report. Those measures include:

---

4 The Road Map Project baseline report, released in December 2011, is available on the CCER website, www.ccedresults.org.
- **High School Graduates Meeting HEC Minimums**: The baseline report includes a complete picture of Road Map graduates who complete high school having met the Higher Education Coordinating Board’s minimum entrance requirements for four-year postsecondary institutions in the State of Washington (this analysis had previously been completed for a subset of Road Map districts and schools)

- **Students Triggering Early Warning Indicators**: The Road Map Baseline Report includes a measure of Road Map students who have triggered the Early Warning Indicators that indicate increased risk of dropping out of school (high absenteeism and failing core course, out-of-school suspension/expulsion) which to date has been an analysis that is done on a district-by-district basis

- **Students Completing Post-Secondary Education, including Degree and/or Credential**: The report’s inclusion of the number and percent of students completing any form of post-secondary degree or credential is a first. Traditionally, available data has included students completing a two- or four-year degree, but has not included credential completion

In addition to these new measures, the baseline report includes baseline data relative to the Road Map targets for the full set of on-track indicators, where data is available, such as proficiency on state assessments, on-time graduation rates, enrollment in developmental education (remedial) courses in college, and enrollment and persistence in post-secondary education.

In preparing to publish the baseline report, the Data Advisors previewed the data to provide suggestions on how to present and disaggregate the data to ensure that the report would be accessible to a broad audience. They provided input on the types of graphs to use to most effectively communicate key messages and made suggestions for how to disaggregate the data to convey the need to close the achievement gaps. The Data Advisors suggested that CCER include disaggregated data that tell a particularly compelling story – such as looking at very large differences by race/ethnicity, low-income/non low-income, gender or district – to keep the information accessible and informative for a general audience.

*Powerful Community Voice*

In Phase II, the Project has continued to evolve its structure for engaging the broader community and pursuing advocacy objectives. Two complementary and related bodies were established: the Community Network, which focuses on building broad-based community awareness, support and engagement in the Road Map Project, and the Advocates Caucus, which focuses on identifying and pursuing advocacy objectives at the school, district and state levels to support the Road Map goal. In Phase II, the Community Network made progress in a number of areas, including community outreach and mapping, the launch of the Small Grants Fund, parent engagement, youth organizing, attendance at a national Ed Trust conference, and the development of the 2012 advocacy agenda, as detailed below:

- **Community Mapping and Outreach**: From July to September 2011, the Community Network conducted a series of community mapping exercises to identify the diversity of community
stakeholders in the Road Map region. Community Network members contributed individual knowledge as well as asset maps from their respective part of the Road Map region to create a clearinghouse of community assets. The information gathered from conducting these mapping exercises was used to guide overall outreach and engagement efforts. In addition, the mapping document served—and will continue to—as a geographic barometer for Community Network membership, ensuring a representative character of the Road Map region. The Community Network will continue this process on an ongoing basis in 2012.

As a result of the community mapping effort, the Community Network Coordinator has been able to strategically create and deepen relationships with several key community stakeholders in the Road Map region. “Listening and learning tours” have been held with grassroots organizations and community leaders, faith-based organizations and leaders, institutional partners, city councils and elected officials. These outreach efforts will continue in 2012 to facilitate opportunities for collaborative action.

- **Launch of the Road Map Project Small Grants Fund:** In August 2011, the Community Network launched the Road Map Project Small Grants Fund and identified three priority areas for funding: parent engagement, leadership development, and cultural competency. Criteria were also developed for the rating and decision-making processes that were consistent with the Community Network’s goal—building the public will to improve education results—and the overall Road Map Project goal. Members from the Community Network served on the review and decision-making committee on a rotating basis.

  Since launching in August, the Community Network has awarded 15 diverse organizations from the Road Map region and more than $49,000 in the areas of parent engagement, cultural competency and leadership development to improve education results in the Road Map region. In November, CCER staff hosted an evaluation session with review committee members to obtain improvement recommendations. These recommendations resulted in the creation of an online application, streamlined rating criteria, and a more simplified and seamless decision-making process.

  The Small Grants Fund is a community engagement resource that provides small grants to grassroots and community stakeholders in South Seattle and South King County. The main objective of the Small Grants Fund is to fund activities, events, and projects that build the capacity and leadership of local grassroots organizations and community stakeholders to participate in improving education results within South Seattle and South King County.

- **Parent Engagement:** During the course of meeting with various community-based organizations from the Road Map region in 2011, CCER staff gave particular attention to the meetings with parent engagement groups. Nearly two dozen groups, ranging in expertise, were engaged. Rich insight and valuable feedback came out of those meetings, but unanimous and chief among them was an expressed desire to increase capacity, coalition-building and strengthen parent
engagement across the Road Map region. In 2012, the Community Network will deepen its focus around parent engagement. A convening will be held with parent engagement groups from the Road Map region to learn about the local landscape of parent engagement, identify critical needs, and develop a collaborative action plan for strengthening regional parent engagement.

- **Youth Organizing:** From July to October 2011, a landscape analysis of local and national youth organizing efforts was conducted by the Forum for Youth Investment for the Road Map Project. The purpose of the study was to document education reform youth organizing activity and capacity in the Road Map region and document promising national examples that could inform local efforts. Key findings and recommendations will guide the Community Network’s efforts in 2012 to further engage youth organizing entities in the Road Map region and identify opportunities for the Road Map Project to strengthen education reform youth organizing efforts.

- **Delegation to the Education Trust National Conference:** In November 2011, the Community Network sponsored four community leaders and activists from the Road Map region to attend the Education Trust’s National Conference in Washington, D.C. The delegation included community leaders from the Highline, Kent, Federal and Tukwila communities. The conference provided the delegation an opportunity to network with other education reform leaders from across the country, learn about best practice models and resources, and identify takeaways to be implemented locally. In addition to a rich conference experience, the delegation visited Senator Patty Murray’s office to provide a briefing on the Road Map Project, dialogue about the education impact of the national budget climate, and advocate for continued courage and leadership on behalf of both Washington State and Road Map region children and families.

- **Development of the Advocates Caucus and 2012 Road Map Project Advocacy Agenda:** Co-chaired by OneAmerica and the League of Education Voters, the Advocates Caucus was developed to ensure that strategic attention and action is given to the key issues that affect or support the fulfillment of the Road Map Project’s 2020 goal. The Caucus developed a vetting framework that included evaluating candidate issues through a set criteria and finalizing the agenda through a multilevel process. The criteria for selecting topics stated that the proposed policy item should:
  - Resonate at all three levels (grassroots/community, local/school district, state/legislature)
  - Have an impact on education results in the Road Map region and students of color
  - Address English Language Learner (ELL) students
  - Impact how Special Education policies are implemented
  - Potentially spark new coalitions in the Road Map region
  - Include at least one issue that addresses:
    - Early learning
The multilevel process for vetting the full agenda (issues, strategies and actions) entailed the Caucus proposing the preliminary agenda to the Community Network who, after vigorous evaluation and subsequent approval, presented the proposed agenda to the Project Sponsors for, after similar evaluation and debate, final approval.

In November, Project Sponsors approved the 2012 Road Map Project Advocacy Agenda as set forth by the Caucus:

- Preserve higher education funding, particularly for the College Bound Scholarship and State Need Grant (“Keeping the Promise”)
- Improve ELL funding policies
- Reform school discipline policies
- Support the planned implementation of WaKIDS

A key aspect of the vetting framework included the Caucus working closely with Road Map Project work groups. The final issues on the agenda significantly informed by the recommendations from the High School to College, Birth to 3rd Grade, and English Language Learners (ELL) work groups. The Caucus’s action plan will be implemented in several phases over the course of 2012.

**Aligned Funding**

Throughout the course of Phase II, local funders – including corporations, private and community foundations, public funders, and intermediary organizations – have been convened to remain apprised of the Road Map Project’s progress and identify opportunities for potential collaboration and/or alignment. The group was initially brought together in spring 2011 around a visit from Jeff Edmondson, the founding Executive Director of Strive in Cincinnati and now the Executive Director of Strive National, the nationwide network of affiliated cradle-to-career initiatives. Local funders came together to learn about the concept of collective impact and its application to initiatives locally (the Road Map Project) and elsewhere (Strive).

Since the initial spring meeting, the group was convened twice more in 2011. The first meeting included an update on the Road Map Project and started a conversation about the extent of existing funding in the Road Map Region, across the cradle-to-college and career continuum and across communities. Following that meeting, each funder was asked to participate in a survey to understand the extent of existing funding in more detail. Nineteen funders participated in the survey which yielded interesting results, including the breakdown of existing funding across the K-12 continuum and the different levels of funding in South Seattle versus South King County. Specifically, the survey revealed the following findings:

- Funders are investing more than $23 million annually in education in the Road Map Region
• Most funding goes toward K-12 education (55%), with 25% in early learning, 13% in postsecondary education, and 8% across the full continuum
• Two-thirds of funds are invested in South Seattle, and one-third in South King County
• On a per student basis, investment in K-12 education is $466/student in South Seattle and $49/student in South King County

These and other findings were shared with the funder group in September 2011. In addition to reviewing the state of existing funding, survey participants also weighed in on their role with regard to the Road Map Project and opportunities for collaboration with their colleagues. In particular, funders are open to working with their grantees to align to the Road Map indicators in the outcome data they collect. In some cases, funders have begun aligning their work to the Road Map. The City of Seattle’s Families and Education Levy was approved by voters in November 2012, to provide $232 million to the most vulnerable students in the Seattle school districts. The levy is administered by the City of Seattle’s Office for Education, which uses many indicators and milestones aligned to the Road Map to guide and inform its levy investments. In addition, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has adopted the Road Map indicators and targets to guide its education-related investments throughout the region.

Through the funder survey, respondents identified early priorities for potential collaboration as a group. Their priorities for working together through 2012 included: 1) collectively funding priority actions in the Road Map Region, 2) better assessing themselves, as funders, about their impact in the Road Map Region, 3) working together on cross-cutting issues like data and advocacy, and 4) helping to formulate priority actions in the Road Map Region. The funder group will meet regularly throughout Phase III to explore these opportunities for collaboration and weigh in on the Road Map’s continued progress.

Organizational Alignment

Getting organizations to align to the Road Map goal, metrics, and strategies is another key component of the theory of change. In Phase I, organizational alignment focused on the adoption of relevant Road Map indicators by organizations in the region. Focusing organizations on the same set of indicators is an important way of measuring performance, tracking progress, and informing practice. This aligned approach to collecting and using data will help organizations to make improvements that ultimately contribute to the collective progress toward reaching the Road Map goal. Since the Road Map indicators were developed, many organizations across sectors and throughout the region have begun adopting them in their work. Seattle Jobs Initiative, for example, adopted the Road Map measures for college enrollment and completion and job earnings. Community Schools Collaboration adopted a number of academic and non-academic metrics in their work, including 3rd grade reading, student mobility, and parent engagement. The Puget Sound Educational Service District (ESD), which includes all seven Road Map school districts, has adopted the Road Map indicators and targets as its performance management framework. Adopting these measures creates critical accountability for the ESD and ESD superintendent for meeting these goals for the region.
In addition, several groups that are focused on place-based cradle-to-career initiatives, akin to the Harlem Children’s Zone in New York City, are aligning to the Road Map and adopting relevant indicators in their neighborhood-level work. These efforts include High Point and Yesler Terrace in Seattle, White Center in Highline, and East Hill in Kent. In Phase II, CCER and FSG worked closely with Seattle University on the Yesler Terrace project, to understand the process for collecting, analyzing and using data to inform their work at the neighborhood level. This process and related learnings were shared with each of the neighborhood-focused groups at a Data Workshop in spring 2011. These neighborhood-focused projects saw early planning success in Phase II. Seattle Housing Authority, Seattle University, and other partners have worked closely together on planning the redevelopment of the public housing development at Yesler Terrace and improving cradle-to-college and career education outcomes for children in the neighborhood, and applied for a Choice Neighborhood grant from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In mid-2011, SHA was awarded a $10 million grant from HUD to support the Yesler Terrace work.

Building on this strong foundation of organizations’ and neighborhood projects’ adoption of the Road Map goal and indicators, the focus on organizational alignment is expanding to include alignment to Road Map strategies. As strategies are developed, organizations throughout the region are increasingly in a position to align their own work to these strategies, with aligned actions creating greater contributions to the collective goal.

**Bold strategies and better data will support systems-level change.**

A central part of the Phase II question of “how” is identifying broad-scale, system-change strategies that can be adopted across the Road Map Region. In order to identify these strategies, the Road Map work groups were formed to focus on different parts of the education continuum. The P-3/Birth-to-3rd Grade work group was convened to identify strategies for improving early childhood outcomes, and ultimately kindergarten readiness and 3rd grade reading. The High School-to-College Completion work group was formed to focus on strategies for smoothing the transition between the K-12 and post-secondary education systems and for improving college readiness, enrollment, persistence and completion. Each of these two work groups were formed in early 2011, and were convened several times throughout the year to discuss and recommend a set of strategic actions needed to achieve systems-level change across our region.

Information was collected via several avenues to inform the work groups’ discussions and recommendations. Initially, the work groups considered a number of national best practices within P-3 and High School-to-College. As the groups discussed approaches for preparing young children for kindergarten and high school graduates for college, group members became interested in understanding approaches that have already been adopted locally, and examining the potential to leverage these existing practices. In order to understand the local context – in terms of needs, barriers, and promising approaches and programs – additional data were gathered from several sources:
• **Work Group survey:** P-3 and High School-to-College Completion work group members were surveyed to understand their perspectives on the needs, barriers, and promising practices that exist within the part(s) of the continuum with which they are familiar.

• **Education Results Network survey:** Members of the Education Results Network were also surveyed to get a broader perspective on the challenges and promising practices in our region. Input from the survey indicated that there are many barriers across the continuum, but also that there were a number of existing programs and initiatives that showed promise, particularly if they could be adopted at a regional and/or systems level.

• **District and Community College meetings:** To understand in greater detail the programs and practices that already exist in the region, the CCER team held meetings with each of the seven school districts and five community and technical colleges to understand the efforts that they were pursuing to improve student outcomes. These meetings were held throughout the summer and early fall of 2011, and relevant findings were shared with each work group for consideration.

**Strategy Selection Criteria**

With information from each of these sources, the P-3 and High School-to-College Completion work groups discussed the different potential areas of focus for their part of the continuum. In P-3, this could include building a P-3 system where early learning providers and K-12 districts work together to share data and improve practice, and for High School-to College, it could include increasing high school graduation requirements to improve college readiness or reforming developmental education to move college students through remediation and into credit-bearing coursework more quickly. Each group used a set of criteria to assess potential strategies, which included:

- **Momentum:** Effort has potential to make progress quickly and builds on existing momentum
- **Systems-Change:** Effort serves as starting point for broader systems-level change
- **Scale:** Effort has potential to significantly move one or more Road Map indicators at scale
- **Collaboration:** Effort can benefit from collaboration - geographic or across the continuum
- **Leadership:** Effort has a clear lead organization with the commitment and capacity to move
- **Achievement Gap Reduction:** Effort has potential to eliminate relevant achievement gaps (e.g. students of color, low-income students, ELL students)

Based on these criteria, a number of priority areas for each group had begun to emerge by the end of 2011. In early 2012, CCER will work with each group to draft action plans to guide the adoption and implementation of these strategies. Emerging priority areas for each of these work groups include:

**P-3 Emerging Priorities**

- **Supporting 3rd Grade Reading campaign:** The group has proposed focusing on improving 3rd grade reading as a critical indicator of early literacy that is important for later success. This campaign will include increasing kindergarten readiness, providing extended-learning opportunities (after-school, summer), increasing attendance, improving quality of instruction, and engaging a broad set of institutional and community stakeholders.
• **Connecting Early Learning to K-12:** There is a foundational need to build a system that connects early learning providers to the K-12 system in order to better prepare students for success in kindergarten. Bringing together key stakeholders from early learning and K-12 will be an important step in increasing communication, collaboration and alignment to create a unified system of P-3 education in the Road Map Region

• **Increasing Data-Driven Practice:** Using data to support young children’s development and early instruction will be an important part of connecting early learning and K-12. With the launch of Washington State’s Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS), a new kindergarten readiness tool, our region can increase the flow of data and information between early learning providers and kindergarten teachers to promote data-driven practice and increase readiness for kindergarten and tailored support once students are in school. In addition, there are opportunities to increase data-driven instruction in elementary classrooms to better target individual students’ instructional needs

**High School-to-College Completion Emerging Priorities**

• **Improving Course-taking:** Increasing the rigor of courses students take while in high school is critical for better preparing them for college. This can include increasing enrollment in college preparatory courses, such as Advanced Placement and/or International Baccalaureate, or ensuring that students are fulfilling the minimum entrance requirements put forth by the Higher Education Coordinating Board for admission to Washington’s four-year institutions

• **Building College-going Culture and Awareness:** Creating a culture of high expectations for all students is an important shift that is necessary for supporting our students in aspiring to attend and complete post-secondary education. This shift in beliefs and perceptions is important among the educators and students in our schools and districts, as well as among parents and families in our broader community

• **Securing District Adoption of College-going Goals and Practices:** Encouraging districts to increase their high school graduation requirements, and focus on setting goals for getting their students into college will be important to increasing the preparation of all students. This system-level shift will help ensure a focus on college-readiness and college-going by embedding these concepts in district goals

• **Increasing High School-Post-Secondary Alignment:** Creating greater alignment between our K-12 and post-secondary systems will help smooth the transition for students in our region, and decrease the need for remediation at postsecondary institutions. Ensuring that what students learn while they are in high school is what they need to know to place into college-level courses will help them avoid remedial courses and the associated challenges, such as using financial aid for pre-college courses, losing interest, and/or declining confidence

• **Improving Persistence, including Developmental Education:** With the Road Map Project’s emphasis on postsecondary completion, it is important to get students into college as well as through college. This could mean reforming remedial courses so students can more easily move onto college-level courses, or providing student supports focused on keeping students in school.
Helping students who enroll in college to persist and complete is a critical component of the Road Map goal.

**Short-Term Actions**

Early progress has been made on some shorter term opportunities within these areas. For P-3, the Road Map Project submitted a letter of intent to be an official site of the National Grade-Level Reading Campaign, sponsored by the National League of Cities and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The High School-to-College Completion work group has built on the success of the spring 2011 College Bound sign-up drive, and has focused on developing a 12th Grade Plan to support the success of the first cohort of College Bound scholarship students – in their senior year in the 2011-12 school year – in graduating from high school and going onto college. A sub-work group focused on the 12th Grade Plan, led by the College Success Foundation (with support from College Spark Washington) with members from Road Map K-12 districts, community colleges, and community-based organizations, is establishing a strong foundation to support college-going among College Bound seniors and other 12th grade students. The 12th Grade Plan includes the following strategies to support 12th grade students:

- Strategy 1: Clear Management Structure
- Strategy 2: Data Tracking of College Bound Students
- Strategy 3: Influence Course-taking
- Strategy 4: Placement Testing and Diagnostic
- Strategy 5: FAFSA Completion Assistance

The 12th grade plan lays the groundwork for building out a college-going system more broadly – to support all high school students in getting into and through college. With these short-term opportunities, there is an emphasis on taking on near-term actions that have longer term potential to affect large-scale system-change.

**STEM, YDEKC, and ELL**

In addition to the P-3 and High School-to-College Completion action planning process, other work groups are working to address a number of additional high-need areas critical to meeting the Road Map goal. A group focused on Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) education was formed in late 2011 to focus on improving STEM education in our region. This need is particularly acute given poor students outcomes in science and math, large and pervasive achievement gaps, and the local labor market’s growing demand for STEM-trained workers. For example, 25% of 5th graders in the Road Map Region were proficient in science in 2009-10 – the percentage drops to 16% for low-income students, compared to 37% of their non-low-income peers. At the same time, our region is home to a STEM-intensive economy. Sixteen percent of King County jobs are STEM-related, compared to 12 percent

---

This group has been convened by the Puget Sound Educational Service District and applied for a planning grant from Washington STEM at the end of 2011. The grant would support a regional learning network focused on identifying and implementing high-impact strategies to improve STEM education in the Road Map Region.

The Youth Development Executives of King County (YDEKC) group was convened in 2011. Over fifty non-profit executives have joined the effort to build and organize the youth development field in King County. This group is focused on the challenge of measuring non-academic indicators of student success, including 21st Century skills such as critical thinking, collaboration, and creativity, for inclusion among the Road Map indicators. This group will focus on developing metrics and measurement approaches throughout Phase III.

Similarly, the English Language Learner (ELL) work group is focusing on the need for better data for understanding the achievement and progress of the region’s large ELL student population. Our region includes nearly 70% King County’s total ELL population, and our ELL students are a critical focus for the Project. This group is charged with identifying a metric for measuring the performance and progress of ELL students for inclusion among the Road Map indicators. The ELL work group has also focused on policy priorities, including the state’s funding formula for ELL students to improve how ELL student success is supported in the Road Map Region and across the state of Washington.

### Maintaining momentum

**The Road Map continues to build excitement and gain early wins.**

Throughout Phase II, it has been important to build momentum and excitement for the Project and secure early wins where possible. This has included a number of efforts, all of which have seen great success in Phase II:

*College Bound Scholarship Sign-Up Campaign*

In the spring of 2011, CCER spearheaded a regional sign-up drive to get all Road Map students who qualify for the state-funded College Bound scholarship to sign-up. This scholarship is offered to low-income students throughout the state of Washington, who can sign-up in 7th or 8th grade to receive financial support for post-secondary education upon graduation from high school with a 2.0 GPA and no felonies. As part of the sign-up drive, CCER collected and published bi-weekly data on the number of eligible students who had signed up by district. Those involved included the College Success Foundation, the seven Road Map districts, and the Washington Education Association. College Success Foundation, which focuses on signing students up for the College Bound scholarship across the state, worked with districts and schools to identify and reach out to eligible students. By the end of June 2011,

---

93% of eligible 7th and 8th graders had signed up for the College Bound scholarship, a 19 point increase from 74% in 2010.

**DonorsChoose Fundraising Drive**

In fall 2011, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Starbucks partnered to bring a funding opportunity to teachers and classrooms throughout King County, including the Road Map Region. The Gates Foundation made free gift cards ($10 value) available in Starbucks stores throughout King County. With the cards, people could donate their $10 to a local classroom project through the DonorsChoose website, with the option of adding additional funds to their donation. A range of projects were included on the website through support of the Washington Education Association, and Road Map districts, schools, and teachers. The Gates Foundation made $500,000 available to projects throughout King County, providing funding for over 1500 projects across the Road Map Region. The efforts of many organizations to support this campaign throughout the region was apparent: six of the seven Road Map districts had the largest number of funded projects across the county, more than districts in other parts of the county including Bellevue, Mercer Island, and Lake Washington.

**Strive National Visit and Conference**

Strive National, a national network for cradle-to-career education initiatives based on the pioneering initiative in Cincinnati, has provided ongoing support to the Road Map Project. In spring 2011, Jeff Edmondson, Strive National’s Executive Director and the founding Executive Director of Strive in Cincinnati, visited Seattle to share his experience of starting a cradle-to-career (“C2C”) collective impact initiative in Cincinnati and since expanding to include a national network of C2C communities. Mr. Edmondson met with the CCER staff as well as local funders and Road Map work group members during his visit, to explain Strive’s C2C approach, including their key successes and lessons learned. In September 2011, the CCER team was able to connect with many of the C2C communities at the Strive National conference in Portland, Oregon. This conference was a testament to the growing momentum of the C2C movement, with attendance from over 80 communities nationwide. The conference was an opportunity for CCER to share its experience from working on the Road Map Project in King County and to learn from other sites form across the country.

- **Education Trust Visit:** Kati Haycock, Executive Director of the Education Trust in Washington, DC, visited the Road Map Region and met with the Community Network to discuss Ed Trust’s work to close achievement gaps in states and communities across the country.

- **Annie E. Casey Visit and National Campaign for Grade-Level Reading:** Ralph Smith, Executive Vice-President at the Annie E. Casey Foundation, visited the Road Map Region to promote the national Campaign for Grade-Level Reading sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in partnership with the National League of Cities. The Campaign is a collaborative effort aimed at closing the gap in reading achievement between low-income and non-low-income students, raising the bar for reading proficiency so that all students are assessed by the same world-class standards, and ensuring that all children, including and especially children from low-income families, have an equitable opportunity to meet those higher standards. As part of the campaign, the National Civic League will offer All-America City Awards for cities and regions
participating in the campaign. CCER is spearheading the application for the award on behalf of the Road Map Region and will submit the full proposal in spring 2012.

- **Brookings Institution Visit and research on the Suburbanization of Poverty:** A team from the Brookings Institute visited the Road Map Region to conduct interviews as part of their research on the Suburbanization of Poverty across the U.S. During their time in Seattle and South King County, the Brookings team met with CCER, Road Map community colleges and school districts, The Seattle Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, civic leaders from the Road Map Region, community-based organizations, and housing and human services providers. This research will inform a Brookings Institute book on the suburbanization of poverty in the U.S.

What’s next?

**Phase II has laid the foundation for collective action.**

At the end of 2011, the Road Map Project is embarking on its third phase: Collective Action. In this phase of work, each of the Phase II work groups will continue their efforts, focusing on addressing key needs in each area and making system-wide improvements:

- **Action planning work groups (P-3, High School-to-College Completion, STEM):** Develop strategic action plans, including a set and sequence of priority strategies and details to guide implementation in 2012
- **YDEKC work group:** Develop metrics to be able to accurately measure the region’s current state of students’ performance on 21st Century Skills, motivation and engagement, and other non-academic measures
- **ELL work group:** Identify improved metrics to be able to accurately measure the current state across the region of ELL students’ progression in language proficiency, and develop advocacy priorities

Each of the other groups will also continue into and through Phase III, and focus on the pressing needs in their area:

- **Data Advisors:** Vet strategy groups’ action plans, refine the Road Map measures and add new measures where needed, provide input on timely and relevant analytical briefs to inform progress and practice throughout the region, and advise on how to account for changing measures, such as when state assessments change
- **Road Map Aligned Funders Group:** Meet quarterly throughout 2012 to remain up-to-date on the Road Map Project’s progress, identify potential ways to align to and support the Road Map project, and explore opportunities for collaboration among the regional funders
- **Advocates Caucus and Community Network:** Continue to develop advocacy priorities for 2012, and bring advocacy and community engagement approaches to bear in supporting the implementation of strategies where helpful and/or necessary
CCER, the Road Map Sponsors, the Education Results Network, and the Road Map Superintendents and Community College Presidents will continue to provide critical guidance, input and support for the project’s ongoing progress. At the end of 2012, CCER will issue a progress report to show trends on each of the Road Map indicators relative to performance in the baseline year, and this report will be released in concert with the second Road Map conference. This conference will be an opportunity to reflect on where the Project has been since the Road Map’s public launch at a December 2010 conference, and look ahead at where we are collectively headed. Looking back to the start of Phase I, the Project has made huge strides in developing and refining a shared goal and indicators, and collaborating in new and important ways. As we ramp up our collective action, the hallmark of Phase III, large-scale change feels well within our reach. Our region’s students are counting on it.
Appendix A

Road Map Sponsor Group Memorandum of Understanding

As a Sponsor of the Road Map for Education Results in South Seattle and South King County, I agree to:

- **Adopt and commit to support the Road Map** goal:
  - Our goal is to double the number of students in South King County and South Seattle who are on track to graduate from college or earn a career credential by 2020. We are committed to nothing less than closing the unacceptable achievement gaps for low income students and children of color, and increasing achievement for all students from cradle to college and career. Road Map Region

- **Provide strategic direction and help make decisions** for the Road Map Project (this will include approval of the Road Map goal refinement and targets, priority strategies and action plans, and the advocacy agenda)

- **Provide strategic oversight of the Road Map Project** by reviewing annual results against Road Map targets and regularly reviewing performance on system-building action plans

- **Attend sponsor meetings**, or send a senior-level representative in my absence

- **Serve as a champion** for the goals, strategies, and progress of the Road Map project

- **Play an active role** in one or more of the Road Map’s strategy areas

- **Align the actions of my organization** to the goals, indicators, targets, and strategies of the Road Map project where possible

- **Promote the effective use of data for continuous improvement** in the work of my organization and other Road Map partners

Signature: ___________________________________________ Date: _____________

Printed Name: __________________________________________
Appendix B

Road Map Project Work Groups

Birth to 3rd Grade Work Group

Monte Bridges, Co-Chair, Puget Sound Educational Service District
Karen Howell-Clark, Co-Chair, United Way of King County

Jodi Haavig, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Nina Auerbach, Thrive By Five
Bonnie Beukema, Department of Early Learning
Bill Ptacek, King County Library System
Sonja Griffin, Seattle Early Learning Coalition
Heidi Harris, Auburn School District
Maureen Massey, Team Read
Claire Wilson, Puget Sound Educational Service District
Harla Tumbleson, SOAR
Deeann Puffert, Childcare Resources
Cathy Garland, Children’s Home & Society of WA (Early Learning)
Ken Thompson, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Jill Sells, Reach Out and Read Washington State
Erin Okuno, Foundation for Early Learning
Jessica Werner, Youth Development Executives of King County

Road Map High School to College Completion

Deborah Wilds, Co-Chair, College Success Foundation
Jill Wakefield, Co-Chair, Seattle Community Colleges

Chad Bennett, Independent Colleges of Washington
Janet Blanford, Seattle Public Schools
Violet Clancy, promote-edu
Heather Cope, League of Education Voters
Susan Crane, SkillUp Washington
Karen Demorest, SCAN
Sheila Edwards Lange, University of Washington Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity
Josh Garcia, Federal Way Public Schools
Steve Hanson, Renton Technical Community College
Edie Harding, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Anne Keeney, Seattle Jobs Initiative
Mark Mitsui, North Seattle Community College
Mick Moore, Puget Sound Educational Service District (Dropout Prevention)
Trise Moore, Family & Community Partnership Office, Federal Way Public Schools
Reid Saaris, Equal Opportunity Schools
Deborah Salas, Community Schools Collaboration WA
Adel Sefrioui, STEP Ahead
Ken Thompson, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Heather Gingerich, College Spark Foundation
Daniela Pineda, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Sue Byers, College Success Foundation
Rachel Klein, Highline School District
Kathleen Bailey, Renton School District
Rachel Clements, College Spark Washington
Rosanna Stephens, Seattle Jobs Initiative
Jessica Werner, Youth Development Executives of King County
Chera Amlag, Highline School District
Mary Fertakis, Tukwila School District
Jennifer Parker, Seattle YMCA
Louanne Decker, Auburn School District
Vanessa Reed, South Seattle Community College
Matthew Houghton, City of Seattle Office of Economic Development

**College Bound Supports (Sub Group of High School to College Completion Work Group)**

**Deborah Wilds, Co-Chair, College Success Foundation**
**Jill Wakefield, Co-Chair, Seattle Community Colleges**
Josh Garcia, Federal Way Public Schools
Michelle Alejano, College Success Foundation
Mary Fertakis, Washington State School Directors’ Association
Rachelle Sharpe, Higher Education Coordinating Board
Vickie Merkel, Higher Education Coordinating Board
John Lederer, Seattle Community Colleges
Greg Tuke, Tuke International Consulting
Alicia Makjavich, College Success Foundation
Marina Espinosa, College Success Foundation
Nathalie Jones, FSG
Sue Byers, College Success Foundation
Janet Blanford, Seattle Public Schools
Karen Tollenaar Demorest, Alliance for Education/SCAN

**Data Advisors**

**Pete Bylsma, Co-Chair, Renton School District**
**Brock Grubb, Co-Chair, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**
Simon Amiel, City Year  
Duane Baker, BERC Group  
Corey Chatis, Chatis Consulting, Inc.  
Heather Cope, League of Education Voters (LEV)  
Fia Eliasson-Creek, Green River Community College  
Candace Gratama, BERC Group  
Betheny Gross, Center for Reinventing Public Education  
Bob Hamilton, Department of Early Learning (DEL)  
Dave Larsen, Tukwila School Board  
John Lederer, Seattle Central Community College  
Juliet Scarpa, Seattle Jobs Initiative  
Sid Sidorowitz, City of Seattle  
Alan Spicciati, Highline School District  
Ken Thompson, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation  
Sarita Siqueiros Thornburg, Puget Sound Educational Service District

**English Language Learners (ELL) - Policy**

*Isabel Muñoz-Colon, Co-Chair, City of Seattle Office of Education*  
*Ada Williams, Co-Chair, OneAmerica*  
Marissa Beach, OneAmerica  
Toby Guevin, OneAmerica  
Pramila Jayapal, OneAmerica  
Edward Vargas, Kent School District  
Linda Del Giudice, Kent School District  
Israel Vela, Kent School District  
Rona Popp, Kent School District  
Vickie Damon, Renton School District  
Veronica Gallardo, Seattle Public Schools  
Bernard Koontz, Highline School District  
Dave Larson, Tukwila School District  
Judy Lemmel, Federal Way Public Schools  
Helen Malagon, OSPI  
Diem Nguyen, University of Washington College of Education  
Tom Stritikus, University of Washington College of Education  
Manka Varghese, University of Washington College of Education  
Jessica Werner, Youth Development Executives of King County  
Nina Williams, Tukwila School District

**English Language Learners (ELL) - Data**

*Isabel Muñoz-Colon, Chair, City of Seattle Office of Education*
Marissa Beach, OneAmerica
Julie DeBolt, Auburn School District
Ipek Bulduck-Cooley, Kent School District
Pete Bylsma, Renton School District
Miguel Castro, Seattle Public Schools
Elizabeth Coghlan, Federal Way Public Schools
Linda Del Giudice, Kent School District
Theresa Deussen, Education Northwest
Linda Elman, Tukwila School District
Josh Garcia, Federal Way Public Schools
Razak Garoui, Kent School District
Jon Hall, Federal Way Public Schools
Maya Magarati, University of Washington Indigenous Research Institute
Paul McCold, OSPI
Andrew Sahalie, Community Center for Education Results

**STEM Initial Working Group**

John Welch, Puget Sound Educational Service District
Mary Alice Heuschel, Renton School District
Ethelda Burke, Tukwila School District
Alan Spicciati, Highline School District

**Advocacy Caucus**

Kelly Munn, League of Education Voters
Ada Williams Prince, OneAmerica
Amanda Scott-Thomas, Schools Out WA
Nathan Phillips, South King Council on Human Services
Alma Villegas, Community Member
Brooke Brod, Stand for Children
Simone Jones, Solid Ground
The Road Map for Education Results

Our goal is to double the number of students in South King County and South Seattle who are on track to graduate from college or earn a career credential by 2020. We are committed to nothing less than closing the unacceptable achievement gaps for low income students and children of color, and increasing achievement for all students from cradle to college and career.

**Readiness**
- Healthy and ready for Kindergarten

**Achievement**
- Supported and successful in school
- Graduate from high school -- college and career-ready

**Attainment**
- Earn a college degree or career credential

We will set 2014, 2017 and 2020 targets for the following on-track indicators.

1. % of children meeting kindergarten readiness standards
2. Pre-K indicator TBD
3. % of students proficient in:
   - 3rd grade reading
   - 4th grade math
   - 5th grade science
   - 6th grade reading
   - 7th grade math
   - 8th grade science
4. % of 9th graders who pass end of course algebra exam
5. % of students triggering Early Warning Indicator #1
6. % of students triggering Early Warning Indicator #2
7. % of students graduating high school meeting HEC minimum entrance requirements
8. % of high school graduates who completed a career/technical education program
9. % of students graduating from high school on time
10. % of high school graduates who take developmental education courses in college
11. % of students who earn a postsecondary credential by age 26
12. % of students who enroll in postsecondary education
13. % of students who persist year to year

1 These indicators represent those the “on-track” indicators for the Road Map Project, and have associated targets for 2014, 2017, and 2020 against which the Road Map Project will track progress. We will also track progress for a longer set of indicators (see reverse side) where associated targets have not been set. Wherever possible we will disaggregate by race, ethnicity, income, and gender. 2 Measured by WaKIDS = Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills and/or DIBELS = Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy. 3 Triggering Early Warning #1 would entail having 6 or more absences and at least one course failure in the 9th grade. 4 Triggering Early Warning #2 would entail having a Suspension and/or Expulsion in the 9th grade.
# Full Set of Key Indicators to Be Tracked

## Healthy and ready for Kindergarten
- **Early Childhood Indicators:**
  - % children meeting kindergarten readiness standards (e.g., WaKIDS, DIBELS)
  - % children utilizing a health care home
  - % eligible children enrolled in ECEAP, Early Head Start, Head Start, and other evidence-based early learning programs
  - % children with untreated tooth decay
  - % families reading to their children daily
  - % children born less than 2500 grams
  - % mothers who report breastfeeding at 2 months postpartum
  - % children ages birth to 5 identified as having special learning needs who received appropriate services
  - % licensed child care centers and family home child care providers performing at Level 3 or above on an Environmental Rating Scale (ERS)
  - % families reporting increases in protective factors, e.g., knowledge of parenting and child development, and social and emotional competence of children, on the Protective Factors Survey

## Supported and successful in school
- **K-12 Indicators:**
  - % students enrolled in full day kindergarten
  - % students proficient in 3rd grade reading
  - % students proficient in 4th grade math
  - % students proficient in 5th grade science
  - % of students proficient in 6th grade reading
  - % elementary students who start and complete the year at the same school
  - % students in 6th grade passing all classes (C or above in all classes)
  - % students proficient in 7th grade math
  - % students proficient in 8th grade science
  - % 9th graders who pass end of course algebra exam
  - % students in 9th grade passing all core classes with a grade level C or above
  - % students proficient in 10th grade math
  - % students motivated and engaged in school
  - % of students triggering Early Warning Indicator #1 (students with 6 or more absences and at least one course failure in the 9th grade)
  - % of students triggering Early Warning Indicator #2 (students with a suspension and/or Expulsion in the 9th grade)
  - % parents who believe a college degree is important and actively support their child’s education
  - % of schools that are rated “Good” (4.00) or better on the State Accountability Index
  - % of ELL students who gain one or more level of English proficiency each year
  - % eligible 6th-12th graders signed up for and on track to receive College Bound scholarship
  - % students triggering less than 5 of 13 physical/mental health and safety items on the Healthy Youth Survey
  - % students exhibiting ‘21st century’ social skills

## Graduate from high school - college ready and career ready
- **Graduation Indicators:**
  - % high school students who graduate high school (cohort graduation rate + extended cohort graduation rate)
  - % students graduating high school meeting HEC minimum entrance requirements
  - % high school graduates who completed a Career/Technical Education program
  - % students who take SAT/ACT and/or take community college placement test in high school
  - % high school graduates who take developmental education courses in college

## Earn a college degree or career credential
- **Post-Secondary Indicators:**
  - % students who earn a postsecondary credential by age 26 (Credential = any degree, apprenticeship, or certificate AND at least 45 college-level credits)
  - % students on Free & Reduced Lunch who received a PELL grant
  - % students who enroll in postsecondary education
  - % students who persist year to year
  - % students enrolled in postsecondary education who complete college-level English and math within one year of enrollment
  - % students enrolled in postsecondary education who complete 30 college-level credits within two years of enrollment
  - % students employed within 1 year and 5 years after completing or leaving postsecondary education, including wage
  - % students who did not complete high school who achieve a postsecondary credential

---

Recommendations provided by Road Map work groups. Data for several of these indicators are not readily available.