Background

June 2011

Community Needs Assessment finds education is the top need

August 2011

United Way Board decides to adopt Collective Impact model

January 2012

United Way receives $200,000 grant from Wells Fargo

March 2012

United Way contracts UI/ISC for shared measurement system
Collective Impact Model

- A systematic, data driven approach to solving a complex problem that involves a community-wide group of organizations

- Common Agenda
- Shared Measurement Systems
- Mutually Reinforcing Activities
- Trust and Supportive Relationships
Children & Youth Pilot Project

- Children & Youth focus area was chosen for initial move to Collective Impact model
  - Primary focus is education; identified as #1 need in 2011 Community Needs Assessment
    - 74% of CMS students graduate on time
    - Only 65% of economically disadvantaged students graduate on time
    - In some schools, this figure is as low as 53%

- 10-year project
  - Long-term goal is to increase the graduation rate for at-risk, low-performing students served by United Way agencies
  - Wells Fargo grant funded the first year
Participating Agencies

**Academic Workgroup**
- A Child’s Place
- Ada Jenkins Center
- Communities In Schools
- Right Moves for Youth
- The Urban League
- YMCA
- YWCA

**Early Learning Workgroup**
- Care Ring
- Charlotte Speech & Hearing Center
- Child Care Resources, Inc.
- Council for Children’s Rights
- The Learning Collaborative

**Enrichment Workgroup**
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Charlotte
- Boy Scouts, Mecklenburg County Council
- Girl Scouts, Hornets’ Nest Council
- Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Charlotte
Role of UNC Charlotte Urban Institute

- Track academic outcomes of children in partner agencies using Institute for Social Capital (ISC) database
- Data consultants for participating agencies
  - Meet with each agency several times a year
  - Build agency capacity for data collection and analysis
Goals for Year 1

- Establish relationships with participating agencies
- Capture baseline data for children currently in these programs to provide:
  - Information for agencies about the children they serve
  - Benchmark for measuring annual progress
Agencies- What We Achieved

- Met several times with each agency
- Gathered information about agency data collection efforts
- Provided assistance and support on data issues
- Helped each agency prepare their participant list for the baseline project
Agencies- What We Learned

- Agencies are supportive about improving their data systems
- State of agency data systems varies greatly
- Constraints on agency data systems
  - Funding
  - Staff numbers and expertise
- Potential improvements
  - Standardized outcomes measures
  - Common intake forms and database system
Baseline Project- Overview

- Snapshot of the children and youth in these programs before they received services
  - Demographic characteristics
  - Academic performance
  - Attendance
  - Suspensions
- Collectively, by workgroup, and by agency
- In future years, the baseline is what we will compare against to measure progress
Baseline Project- Research Process

- Agencies submitted a list of participants who received services between March (the start of the project) and September 2012
  - Name, Date-of-Birth, Program Entry Date
- The list was matched against the ISC database, using name and date-of-birth
- For those participants with matching records in the database, their CMS records for the academic year prior to entering the program were pulled into a dataset and de-identified
- Dataset was approved by ISC Data Quality Review Committee
Baseline Project Results

- Number of collective participants
  - 13,909 names received from agencies
  - 13,561 names after list was cleaned
  - 8,571 unique participants found in ISC database
By Number of Programs

- Vast majority of participants were in one program only
- 742 participants were in more than one program

8% in 1 Program
0.6% in 2 Programs
0.1% in 3 Programs
91% in 4 Programs
By Agency

- Half (52%) were in Communities In Schools
- 14% were in Right Moves for Youth
- A Child’s Place, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Girl Scouts, Boys & Girls Club had 5-10% each
- The rest had less than 3% each
- The Learning Collaborative had 0 (all too young to have CMS records)
- Child Care Resources, Inc. had 0 (does not provide direct services to youth)
By Workgroup

- Three-quarters were in academic workgroup programs

- 74% in Academic Workgroup
- 23% in Enrichment Workgroup
- 3% in Early Learning Workgroup
Demographics - Race/Ethnicity

- Majority African American
- Second largest group was Hispanic
- Larger share of African American and smaller share of White students than CMS

*Data Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction 2011-12
Demographics - Gender

- More girls than boys
- Slightly different from CMS, which is more evenly split

Collective Participants

- Male: 47%
- Female: 53%

CMS*

- Male: 51%
- Female: 49%

* Data Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction 2011-12
Demographics - Age

Half were age 7 to 11 in the year before entering a program.
Demographics- ESL and EC Status

- 6% were receiving English as a Second Language services
  - Compared to 11% Limited English Proficient (LEP) for CMS*
- 17% were designated Exceptional Children (EC)
  - Compared to 10% for CMS*

* Data Source: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools 2011-12
Demographics - Grade

- Majority were in late elementary and middle school in the year before entering a program
- Younger distribution than CMS

![Bar chart showing distribution of students by grade level.]

* Data Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction 2011-12
Demographics - School

- Spread across 178 CMS schools*
- Top 10 account for about ¼ of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Schools</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranson Middle</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Charlotte High</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mecklenburg High</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor Williams Middle (now closed)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mecklenburg High</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Spaugh Community Academy (now closed)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulwood Middle</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance High</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama Road Elementary</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip O. Berry Academy of Technology</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 59% were in Title 1 schools
- 13% were in Project L.I.F.T. schools

*This includes pre-k centers and schools that have since closed.
Academic Performance

- Measured by End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) tests
  - Math and Reading EOGs (3rd - 8th grade)
  - Math (Algebra I and II) and English EOCs (9th - 12th grade)
- Proficiency rate (% at or above grade level)
- By achievement level (I, II, III, IV)
Academic Performance - EOGs

- 40% proficient in reading
- 58% proficient in math
- Below district average in both

EOG Proficiency Rates

* Data Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction, Reports of School Performance Data, 2006 – 2011
Academic Performance- EOCs

- 63% proficient in English
- 61% proficient in math
- Below district average in both

EOC Proficiency Rates

* Data Source: North Carolina Department of Instruction, Reports of School Performance Data, 2006 – 2011
Attendance and Conduct

- **Absences (# of days absent)**
  - Total, Excused, and Unexcused
  - Descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode, min, max)
  - % with 10 or more absences

- **Suspensions (# of days in suspension)**
  - Total, In-school, and Out-of-school
  - Descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode, min, max)
  - % with 1 or more suspensions
Absences

- Average of nine absences
- One-third had 10 or more absences
- More unexcused than excused absences
- Greatest among high school participants
Suspensions

- Average of two suspensions
- 23% had at least one suspension
- More out-of-school than in-school suspensions
- Greatest among middle school participants

![Participants with One or More Suspensions](chart.png)

- **Total**: All Collective Participants
- **Early Elementary Participants**
- **Late Elementary Participants**
- **Middle School Participants**
- **High School Participants**
Academic Workgroup

- Largest of the three groups (74% of total collective)
- Includes participants from A Child’s Place, Ada Jenkins Center, Communities In Schools, Right Moves for Youth, Urban League, YMCA, YWCA
- Most like the collective demographically and academically
Academic Workgroup

- Slightly lower EOG proficiency, slightly more absences and suspensions than collective.
Enrichment Workgroup

- 1,970 participants in this group (23% of collective)
- Includes participants from Big Brothers Big Sisters, Boy Scouts, Boys & Girls Clubs, and Girl Scouts
- More girls (59%), entered programs at a younger age than collective
Enrichment Workgroup

- Higher test scores, fewer absences and suspensions than the collective

Proficiency Rates

EOG Reading | EOG Math | EOC English | EOC Math
---|---|---|---
Enrichment Workgroup Participants | Collective Participants | CMS Average

Absences

- % with 10+
- % with 1+

Suspensions
Early Learning Workgroup

- Smallest of the three groups (3% of collective)
- Includes participants from Care Ring, Council for Children’s Rights, and Charlotte Speech and Hearing
- Larger share White (17%) and smaller share African American (66%) participants than collective
- Majority male (60%), compared to 49% of collective
- Entered program at an older age than collective (half ages 12 to 15)
- 48% designated EC

Percent of Early Learning Workgroup Participants

- Care Ring: 23%
- Charlotte Speech and Hearing: 15%
- Council for Children's Rights: 62%
Lower test scores, more absences and suspensions than the collective
Multi-Program Participants

- 742 participants were in more than one program
- Larger share African American (83%), smaller share White (3%) and Hispanic (11%) participants than collective
- More female (58%) and slightly younger than the collective
Multi-Program Participants

- Slightly lower test scores and fewer absences than the collective

Proficiency Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOG Reading</th>
<th>EOG Math</th>
<th>EOC English</th>
<th>EOC Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Program Participants</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Participants</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Average</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absences

- % with 10+
  - Multi-Program Participants: 30%
  - Collective Participants: 25%
  - CMS Average: 20%

Suspensions

- % with 1+ Suspension
  - Multi-Program Participants: 20%
  - Collective Participants: 15%
  - CMS Average: 10%