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The Teagle Foundation is committed to investing in programs that improve student learning in higher education and promote the benefits of a liberal education. As defined by the Association of American Colleges, a liberal education is

An approach to learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change. It provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g., science, culture, and society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. A liberal education helps students develop a sense of social responsibility, as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings.

The Teagle Foundation advances its mission and the liberal education philosophy through its College-Community Connections (CCC) initiative. Established in 2005, the CCC initiative funds partnerships between New York City community-based organizations (CBOs) and New York City metropolitan area colleges and universities to help talented and underserved high school students prepare for and succeed in college by engaging them in academically ambitious programs.

### Exhibit 1
College-Community Connections Partner Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Program content</th>
<th>Grade levels</th>
<th>Program size</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronxworks Fordham University</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBA Brooklyn College</td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Aid Society New York University</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Discovery Center Columbia University</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem Education Activities Fund Barnard College</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem RBI SUNY Old Westbury</td>
<td>Multi-discipline</td>
<td>9 and 12</td>
<td>65**</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Street Settlement Cornell University</td>
<td>Environmental science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbridge Heights Community Center Manhattan College</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors for Educational Opportunity Skidmore College</td>
<td>Multi-discipline</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Settlement Association Drew University</td>
<td>Arts and science</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI of Math and Science for Young Women Polytechnic Institute of New York University</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The summer program includes a smaller number of students. During the school year, additional students are involved in mini-lectures and courses as part of the CCC-funded program.

** This includes 35 rising ninth-graders who participate in an overnight trip to the SUNY Old Westbury campus.
This is the CCC initiative’s third funding cycle, each consisting of three-year grants. For this cycle, the initiative is funding 11 partnerships. Each CBO selects underserved, motivated students to take college-level courses at a partnering college or university and to participate in other college preparation activities during the school year and/or summer. Through joint planning, the college or university takes the lead in delivering the courses, while the CBO oversees the supplemental support services designed to keep participating students on track. Some programs target only high school juniors and seniors. Others offer college readiness services to ninth and tenth-graders to expose them early to the possibilities of post-secondary education. Exhibit 1 presents a profile of the CCC-funded programs.

Research Approach

This section describes Policy Studies Associates’ (PSA) research approach to exploring the sustainability and potential replication of the CCC-funded programs. Two research questions guide the study:

- What elements of the CCC-funded programs are important to sustaining program services, and how might those elements be promoted?
- What are the essential elements of the CCC-funded programs that need to be replicated in order for the programs to be successful in other settings?

To answer these questions, PSA reviewed grant proposals from each CCC partnership and interviewed primary contacts for the CCC initiative at the 11 CBOs and 11 college partners. In total, PSA conducted 22 interviews with key individuals in the partnerships. The interviews focused on (1) the extent to which the respective CCC-funded programs were integrated into each institution and (2) the essential elements, lessons learned, and challenges of each program. PSA also interviewed Teagle staff responsible for oversight of the CCC initiative to learn about the goals of the Foundation and its vision for the CCC-funded programs.

Data collection activities also included interviews with staff of two similar programs at Scripps College and the University of Chicago. Scripps College Academy (SCA) Scholars is a multi-year pre-college program for high-achieving young women with limited resources from the Greater Los Angeles and Empire areas. These high school students, whose aim is to become first-generation college students, participate in a two-week, academically intensive summer program with supplemental activities during the school year.

Similarly, the University of Chicago’s Collegiate Scholars Program engages Chicago Public School students in a three-year academic-intensive summer program with follow-up supplemental school-year activities. This program targets Chicago Public School students who tend to be underrepresented at the University of Chicago and other highly competitive colleges. The purpose of both interviews was to learn about the key elements and best practices in these college-access and preparation programs. Findings from these interviews are integrated throughout this report for added perspective on the sustainability and replication findings gathered from CCC-funded programs.
Elements of Sustainability

A program is more likely to sustain itself if it is integrated into the larger organization, if it has diverse and stable funding, and if it is able to show evidence of its effectiveness to funders and other potential supporters.

Integration

Integration describes the degree to which the CCC-funded program is, and is perceived to be, a part of the larger college/CBO partner organization. This means that it is visible throughout the organization, that it is seen as furthering the mission of the organization and the work of individuals within the organization (or, at a minimum, is not seen as getting in the way of their work), and that there is a plan for managing transitions when staff leave the organization. By integrating the CCC-funded program into the college/CBO partner organization, the CCC-funded program has access to the resources of the larger institution to help sustain it. Integration also helps build internal and external champions who help promote and sustain the program (Southcott & McCrone, 2011). These supporters promote good will within the program’s existing and new communities and champion the cause among funders and potential advocates.

**Overall, there tended to be a greater alignment between the mission of the CBOs and the mission of the CCC-funded programs than between the mission of the colleges and the mission of the CCC-funded programs.** For most of the CBOs, their mission aligned closely with the CCC initiative’s mission to provide college access to an underserved population. As one CBO interviewee put it:

\[T\]he reason that we were interested in partnering is because we are a college access, college regimen, college preparation and college completion program and being able to offer our young people, our students, access to a college-level class on a college campus was right in line with everything that we do.

Even in cases where college access was just one part of the CBO partner’s mission, the mission of the CCC-funded program fit with the mission of the CBO partner.

The primary mission of colleges and universities is to educate undergraduates and to promote research. In addition, some CCC-funded college partners also view their work in promoting college access for underserved populations as central to their mission. A respondent at one college described it alignment this way:

*It fits into the college mission...the goal is to increase college readiness, especially for underserved and underrepresented populations and [this college] has a very large population of minority students.... So [the CCC-funded program] fits in with that–with respect to that mission.*

For other colleges and universities, college access for underserved populations was related to, but not necessarily a central part of, their mission. Although college access had not
been specifically a part of one college partner’s mission prior to the CCC-funded program, the respondent spoke of the college’s interest in reaching out to the community:

*We don't usually do these kinds of grants but it also got us out into the community. We're very interested in working with our own community... [the CBO partner] is located ten blocks from here.*

**There needs to be a deliberate effort on the part of the CCC-funded program to show the link between the mission of the CCC-funded program and that of the larger organization.** This is especially important when the link is not obvious. An interviewee at one of the college partners spoke of the need to explicitly integrate the work of the CCC-funded program into that of the college:

*Part of our formula for success is to show [faculty that involving college students in the program] is about the professional development of their [undergraduate] students... [E]ven your skills in communicating with other scientists are only enhanced by your teaching experience [in the CCC-funded program].*

**Building visibility of the CCC-funded program across the college/CBO partner organization helps build support for the program.** The greater the number of people who are aware of the program across the organization, the more likely there will be people to advocate for it. Scripps College has built the visibility of its college-access program, SCA Scholars, across the entire campus. From the beginning program leaders made a concerted effort to build that visibility through “a lot of community presentations.” They communicated with the faculty to build awareness of the program and hosted “a lot of events where we bring community and faculty in and talk about what they do. The program has been so successful and we have been good in acknowledging [the community and faculty’s] role in that success.”

Other interviewees spoke of the importance of talking up the program at every chance. For example, an interviewee from a CBO partner said, “[At] organizational meetings the program is spoken about..... [O]ther administrative departments are aware of it too...from a different perspective.” An interviewee at another CBO partner organization described efforts to make the program visible to other parts of the organization:

*Now it's just naturally on the agenda [at the youth council]. It's one of the announcements that we do in every activity that we have. And because of that, the younger students are introduced very early on to something they can look forward to. And then when those kids come back from the summer literacy institute, they report on their experience, they say that it was beneficial.*

Coordinating and sharing resources with other programs within the larger organization can help raise the visibility of the CCC-funded program across the organization and be mutually beneficial. In one CBO, the CCC-funded program coordinated and shared resources with a writing program:

*Going to the university [as part of the CCC summer program] was a way to enhance that writing program. You have six weeks, but one week you will be away on a college*
Involving faculty and staff from across the organization helps develop their buy-in and raises the visibility of the program. At Scripps, “over 40 percent of faculty have participated in some way. [There is a] large buy-in. We, the faculty believe in it so strongly that the institution agrees with us.” An interviewee at Scripps College also mentioned involving faculty in fundraising as a way of increasing their buy-in:

We also did a scholarship for a Scripps College Academy student to attend Scripps. We had it as a challenge for faculty and staff giving rates when we made that the target of the giving that year. We had full funding for that in three years.

Connecting to those with influence in the larger organization increases the status of the CCC-funded program and helps with sustainability. In addition to involving a broad range of individuals, it is important to involve those individuals in a position to advocate for the program. At Scripps, tenured faculty drove the development of the program. This signaled the importance of the program, encouraging others to see it as an important part of the institution rather than as something peripheral. A University of Chicago interviewee spoke of the need from early on to be strategic in communicating with those with influence at the university:

You need to consider over time who are you going to need to communicate with within the university. To me, for these types of programs, the earlier you can negotiate these things then the more sustainable you are.

For the program to be sustainable over the long term, it needs a means of addressing turnover in staff. When staff turnover occurs, as it inevitably does, program knowledge must be passed on to others. Such support mechanisms can include program documentation or the dissemination of program information among a large number of people. For example, one college interviewee reported that if program administrative staff were to leave, people in some of the academic departments were well enough acquainted with the program to help incoming CCC-funded program staff get up to speed. At one CBO, it was the grant writers who documented the program:

[Grant writers] pass on knowledge through extensive reports [to funders]. Those who are writing the grants, they have all the information in terms of what the program has accomplished, where we started, where we are ending up.

Program Funding

The financial strength of a program or organization determines its ability to continue operations and maintain its impact despite fluctuations in funding (Frumkin, 2010; Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2008). Generating sufficient funds for program operation is a struggle for many CCC-funded programs. According to interviewees, seeking stable funding from a variety of sources and getting central organizational support helps sustain a program over the long run. Support for program operations can also include in-kind donations. For instance, a number of programs received support in the form of staff and faculty time from other parts of the campus. And the numbers [for both programs] increased in terms of the number of students we got.
organization. Raising the profile of the program is also likely to increase in-kind donations as well as funding.

**Programs supplemented Teagle funding with other sources of funding to cover program costs.** For many of the CBOs and college partners, Teagle funding alone was not sufficient to cover the full cost of the CCC-funded program. Many partners provided in-kind support to the program, and most programs, but not all, drew on other sources of funding. For instance, the program director at one of the college partners spends 20 to 25 percent of her time on the CCC-funded program, although her full salary is paid for by the college. She has “presenters come from either admissions or the career center for academic advising,” and their time is also paid for by the college. This in-kind support requires a certain level of commitment to the CCC-funded program within the institution.

**Building central organizational support for the program from the beginning helps with its long-term sustainability.** By tying the program’s funding to the budget of the college, the Scripps College SCA Scholars program was able to tie its own sustainability to that of Scripps College. Scripps College “decided to make it a line item in the operating budget in the college. That is how it was institutionalized. That is part of how it remains sustainable.” The University of Chicago draws program support from the Office of Civic Engagement and from the university’s trustees.

**Collecting Data for Evidence of Program Effectiveness and Program Improvement**

It is important for a program to define success, evaluate the degree to which it is successful, and communicate those successes to others. To funders, an evaluation provides evidence of a program’s effectiveness and whether continued funding is justified (Bradach, 2003). Evidence of program effectiveness helps build support for the CCC-funded program across the participating partner organizations as well as from internal and external funders.

Partnership organizations collect data for various evaluation purposes. For most of the programs, “the number one measure [of success] is the number of students enrolling in college.” At the University of Chicago, an important measure is the program’s success in getting its students into highly selective colleges, including the University of Chicago. The interviewee acknowledged, “The success of getting students into selective colleges, including our own organization, was strong evidence of effectiveness and helped our program raise funds.”

**Partner organizations examined a wide spectrum of outcomes besides college enrollment, such as improved writing skills, confidence and poise, and being able to make a more informed decision about which college to attend.** These measures were collected using such methods as surveys, pre- and post-tests, and interviews. For example, one CBO interviewee reported using pre- and post-tests “to look at the change in knowledge or attitude that the young people develop in the time that they're in the project.”

These additional measures, by documenting the success of the program, often helped persuade funders to support the program. As reported by a Scripps College interviewee, the college’s institutional research office collected a variety of outcome measures including students’ thoughts on their experiences in the program:
In addition, the institutional research office does a good job gathering survey responses from the students on their experiences. These are the things that the donors like to hear about relationships [participants] have built with professors, with [undergraduates].

Many programs also used data for program improvement. These included student feedback on their experiences in the program and what they learned in their classes, and faculty feedback on their preparedness to teach high school students. Program improvement and communication with potential funders were helped with these types of data.

Essential Elements for Replication

Successful program replication requires balancing the need to faithfully reproduce the key elements of the program with the need to allow for sufficient flexibility to adapt to varying local contexts (Summerville & Raley, 2009). Replicating all aspects of a program mechanically without consideration of local context is likely to lead to failed implementation. On the other hand, failing to faithfully replicate key program elements is unlikely to produce the desired results, since presumably those elements are key to the program’s success. Therefore, an essential step in successful replication is identifying which elements of a program need to be reproduced faithfully and which elements can be reproduced with some flexibility or omitted altogether (Harris, 2010; Bradach, 2003).

Identifying the appropriate population; exposing students to a liberal education, including college level courses in a college setting; and enlisting committed faculty to teach students are essential elements of the CCC initiative to be replicated, as reported by the interviewees. This section of the report examines these elements as they were implemented in the 11 Teagle-funded partnerships and in the similar programs at Scripps College and the University of Chicago.

Target Population

In replicating any program, an important consideration is the target population. Programs may work well for some populations, but not as well for others. Identifying which target population the program serves best will help in deciding under what conditions replication is likely to succeed.

The CCC initiative targets students who have academic promise but whose families may have limited resources and minimal exposure to post-secondary opportunities. Within this fairly broad population of students, interviewees indicated that CCC-funded programs work best with students who are emotionally well-adjusted, mature enough to spend time on a college campus, and motivated to work on challenging academic tasks. One CBO partner acknowledged, “We have seen a difference in outcomes when we accept [students] who are ready for it socially, emotionally, and academically.”

Interviewees reported that motivation and curiosity are as important to success in the program as is prior academic performance. According to one CBO interviewee, motivated
students who have the potential to go to college but who need an extra push are the ideal target population. In describing the benefit of its CCC-funded program for motivated students who traditionally are not high achievers, another CBO interviewee reported:

[I]t isn’t always about having the best grades or the highest SAT scores, but that being able to work hard can also get you far. And I think that’s a message that can get lost very easily in high school. No one is above working hard.

Several interviewees indicated that at the other end of the spectrum, students who require considerable resources and supports beyond the scope of the program are less likely to benefit from the program.

**One consideration in thinking about program replication is the role that a student application plays in selecting students who are a good fit with the program.** Several CBOs require students to apply to participate in the CCC-funded program. These CBOs determined that an application process could be helpful to assess student characteristics and potential for success in the program. As one CBO partner reported, “The program works best for students who actively apply. They understand that it’s an academic program. And it’s something that they have elected to do….” For one CCC-funded program, the requirements are flexible. Although that CBO sets GPA and Regents score minimums for its application, teacher recommendations and a student’s steady improvement could help the student get into the program. Whether the CBO partner decides that an application process is relevant for its CCC-funded program depends on the goals that that partnership has set and should be discussed with its college partner.

**Exposing Students to the College Experience**

An essential element of the CCC-funded program and a part of Teagle’s mission is to expose students to a liberal education. This requires programs that want to follow the CCC model to offer rigorous courses that are based in disciplines such as the biological and physical sciences, history, literacy, and philosophy, and that strengthen students’ critical thinking and their analytic, quantitative, and reasoning skills.

Although college courses offered through many of the CCC-funded programs were adapted in terms of the pace and depth of the material, interviewees indicated that it was important to expose students to the rigors of college-level work. An interviewee from Scripps College underscored the importance of the rigorous college-level courses:

The academics are really important. A lot of the students come in nervous and not sure of their abilities. That hinders them when applying to college about what they think they can achieve. We have a rigorous program, we push them academically. By the end of these two weeks, they cry and say how they came in unsure of themselves but now realize they can be president. We are pushing them, and with that they realize they are capable, that they are smart enough.

**The experience of being immersed in a college setting is an essential element of the CCC initiative.** In program replication, duration and dosage of the college immersion are important considerations. Some CCC-funded programs held their academic classes during the
summer and some during the school year; some programs had a residential component and others did not. What was common across programs was that the coursework was hosted on a college campus. Whether it was for one day a week during the school year or for two weeks during the summer, the immersion on a college campus for an extended period of time was said to be significant because it provided students with a simulated college experience.

*Student supports and faculty relationships with students play an important role in fostering positive experiences for students and keeping them engaged in the program.* One CBO interviewee described the importance of engaging with the students:

> If staff doesn’t have enough time to be with the young people, you can’t hold them, you can’t encourage them, and you can’t engage them except on a superficial level. If you’re not giving them something, they’re not showing up. But, if you have a relationship, they will show up because of that relationship.

CBO staff kept students on track through one-on-one conversations, and discussed with students their aspirations for college and their future. College partners offered academic assistance to students. Some colleges provided access to their writing centers, libraries, and other campus resources. Additionally, some colleges structured their CCC-funded programs to include undergraduates and graduate students as tutors, mentors, and teacher assistants.

**Engaging and Supporting Committed Faculty**

Selecting faculty who are likely to work well with the target population and providing support and training to ensure that they are successful are essential elements for successfully replicating the CCC model.

*Selecting the right faculty to work with the CCC-funded program students is critical.* Interviewees pointed to several characteristics that faculty working with the CCC-funded program should possess. These faculty members must be motivated to work with the talented yet underserved youth whom the program targets, and committed to the objectives of the program. A CBO interviewee described a successful faculty participant as someone who understands the student population, the challenges students face inside and outside the classroom, and their educational goals. Another interviewee expressed similar thoughts on selecting faculty:

> It’s not the person who’s looking for more money during the summer, a little bonus. It’s for the professor who is passionate about this. They believe in this. They’re both social justice advocates who believe—who want to help urban youth. And I think that’s the main reason they do this. And it’s a tremendous asset.

A college interviewee described the ideal faculty participant as one who is not too narrowly focused on his or her scholarship:

> I think that you really need to identify faculty members who take a broader view of what they do. Many faculty, rightly or wrongly, are focused almost entirely on their scholarship. So you want to identify people who aren't—these aren't people who are
uninterested in their scholarship, but perhaps take a broader view of their audience and their responsibility.

Along with committing to the work of the CCC-funded program, faculty have to be able to connect with high school students. One college partner reported that its institution selects faculty who are able to build positive relationships with students:

*I think a large part of it is a personality thing, that they can have a conversation and build a relationship with these students and show them the ways in which college can be both challenging but joyful—that there's an enjoyment involved and the learning challenges that are associated with college-level work.*

In looking to replicate the CCC initiative elsewhere, it is important that faculty involved in the program be engaging and flexible in what and how they teach. A college interviewee reported that faculty cannot teach the same material the same way every time. Instead, they have to be able to adapt material and their teaching techniques. A college interviewee explained:

*I don't think a faculty member who's just a straight-up lecturer would be interested in coming in and giving a lecture to the students because I don't think that would be interesting to either member of the party, and I think the faculty that we select are ones that are willing to engage with the students, create a dialogue, challenge them but nurture them through that challenge.*

The prevailing culture within a college plays a role in recruiting faculty for the program. Based on several interviewees’ responses, recruiting committed faculty with the traits listed above is easier if the college’s culture or the culture of the department overseeing the CCC-funded program is aligned with the CCC initiative’s mission. For example, institutions that place a high value on college access, equity, teaching, and social responsibility may find it easier to identify successful faculty to work with the CCC-funded program. This means that the institution is already engaged in this type of work through other college preparation programs that it hosts or the type of students whom it actively recruits. A college partner acknowledged, “In part because of the mission of [our college], the bulk of the faculty are attuned to this sort of work and are interested in this sort of work.”

**Providing training and support to faculty is important to the success of the program and should be a part of replicating the CCC initiative elsewhere.** While selecting faculty whose characteristics make them more likely to succeed with students in the program is important, providing training and support is also essential to keeping and growing those faculty. Both Scripps College and the University of Chicago invest time in faculty training. They review the goals of the program, the program’s “nuts and bolts,” and topics on diversity. Scripps College and a few CCC-funded programs also use faculty who participated in previous iterations of the program to serve as a resource for current faculty. A CBO partner believed that for faculty to be effective, they had to understand their audience. A college partner explained that its faculty orientation to the CCC-funded program helps faculty to teach in a classroom that is very diverse in terms of age, race and ethnicity, and academic preparedness. Another college partner believed that CBO staff could play an important role in this area by helping to familiarize faculty with background, perspective, and outlooks of students who will attend the program.
At one college, faculty training for CCC-funded programs includes honest conversations about the challenges of the program. The college partner revealed that some faculty who participated in the program had challenges in facilitating the course; they “had bad experiences and were really eager to do better.” The college responded to these challenges by incorporating discussions about issues into the training for faculty. The interviewee advised, “Let’s lay [the challenges] on the table. Let’s acknowledge there are challenges, but let’s also bring solutions from faculty that have worked well.”

The Role of Partnerships in Replication

One of the unique features of the CCC grant is the partnership between CBOs and colleges and universities. Interviews with CCC grantees suggest that there are several benefits to this partnership, some of which have already been highlighted in identification of essential elements.

While by design all the CCC-funded programs consist of a college or university and a CBO partnership, Scripps College and the University of Chicago operate similar college-access programs without a CBO partner. This raises the question: To what degree is a college/CBO partnership essential to replicating the CCC initiative?

Interviewees spoke of the benefits and challenges of a partnership, which should be considered when planning for replication. Many of the CBO and college staff spoke of the importance of their partnerships. Both institutions of higher education and CBOs have assets that contribute to the success of a program geared toward exposing high school students to a liberal education and enhancing their preparation to attend college.

The college and CBO partnerships helped connect institutions of higher education and local communities that, in many cases, were otherwise isolated from each other. Partnerships offered the potential to make colleges and universities more accessible to community members. An interviewee from a CBO spoke of the difference in the two worlds of the CBO and the college partner, despite close physical proximity. The partnership helped to bridge this gap to some degree. As an interviewee from a college partner explained:

In academia we can be isolated and disconnected from everyday life, and the reverse can be true. Everyday life can be disconnected from academia. And for students to succeed, you got to be able to do both. You have to be able to have a scholarly approach to your everyday life if you want to succeed in college. And so I think that's what we bring to each other.

Another interviewee offered the CBO perspective on bridging the gap between the college and community:

We are ... on the Grand Concourse, and [the college partner] is at the top of the hill. And for a lot of our participants and community, it’s sort of this gated institution that seems out of reach. So it was a perfect partner for us in terms of our location and just knowing what they have to offer. It's been a great relationship.
Another benefit of the CBO-college partnership is the expertise that both institutions bring. Several interviewees reported using the strengths of each partner:

We would allow each party to be an expert in their respective fields. [Since] they know content, we let them be the experts on the content and we inform them based upon our expertise with our population. And so they defer to us when it comes to our population and we defer to them when it comes to the content material.

The colleges and universities have rich academic resources, faculty, undergraduate students, and admissions staff that are critical to any college access program for high school students. They provide a real-life college or university campus experience that gives students participating in a CCC-funded program a concrete example of what it means to attend college.

CBOs have access to high schools and students for recruitment. Most CBOs have long histories in their communities, which helps them connect with families and gain buy-in, support, and trust. Several interviewees felt that this was important to student engagement and participation. Six of 11 participating CBOs are multi-service organizations that can provide wrap-around services to students and families, supporting them in their efforts to help students do well academically. CBOs can tap into their existing organizational structures and networks to support students and families socially and emotionally as they proceed through the rigorous demands of the program.

Although partnerships have their advantages, there are challenges to bringing together two entities that differ in their organizational cultures and structures. Shared goals, compatible organizational cultures, and commitment and involvement of staff and key stakeholders help facilitate successful partnerships and collaboration by ensuring that the partners have an investment in a successful outcome (Thomson & Perry, 2006). Developing a common understanding of the different organizational cultures, setting aside time to develop effective communication between the two organizations, and balancing responsibilities more or less evenly between the two organizations were mentioned by interviewees as challenges to overcome for a successful partnership.

The CBOs and colleges tended to have different work cultures. Small differences in how the two organizations operated sometimes led to misunderstandings. For example, college or university staff may have certain practices in place for communicating and managing tasks that differ from the procedures of a CBO. One partner may have more formalized procedures with deadlines, regular email communication, and meetings, whereas the partner organization may take a less formal approach of checking in with each other on an ad-hoc basis. As an interviewee at one college explained:

[Y]ou're not located in the same space... you don't know the norms of [the other] institution.... [T]here's always little things like protocols that both of you [use], but you don't know the other person's. Like due dates or protocols....

Even the different schedules of colleges and high schools (and their partner CBOs) can disrupt the CCC-funded program if not managed effectively. For example, an interviewee at a CBO pointed out that the difference in class schedules between college students and high school students had to be negotiated. Since “the college semester ended in December and the school
semester ended in January, [the college] had to stretch the class out because it wasn’t acceptable to have kids not being in class. Canceling class is not an option in high school when you have to supervise students.”

In some cases, interviewees expressed frustration that their partner organization did not contribute equally to the partnership. This concern was heard more often from CBO partners than from college partners. When asked how to improve the partnership, one CBO interviewee responded that the college partner could have more of a “presence here observing and getting to know our kids rather than just us. Because this is a split grant. We do the lion's share of the work, but the grant is split.” Another CBO interviewee spoke of the impact that the imbalance appeared to have on the:

We were about the only program that has our staff there the entire week. It sounds like [with other partnerships] there's usually more of the university or the college contributing staffing resources for the overnight. What that does for a program like us is it takes two of my staff members out of being able to run stuff here for an entire week and leaves the staffing team spread so thin here.

Several interviewees shared ways in which they addressed partnership challenges. One CBO interviewee spoke of the importance of having a single person as a clearly identified point of contact to help facilitate the logistics of partnering:

On the university side, obviously, professors have a ton of things going on. And so, for them to feel like they’re not getting responses from people or they can't address issues or they can't have a set contact person, I would imagine that would be a deterrent. And so, I think making the logistics planning part as easy as possible or at least as accessible as possible, that could be a game changer for certain institutions.

In a similar vein to understanding each partner’s work culture, having clear and open communication between partners is essential. Interviewees spoke of the need to allow “enough time to make those kinds of transitions or allowing the time that's really needed to go over this, the details of what's involved in implementation and make sure that everybody is on the same page.”

Commitment to the program from both partners is important. As one college partner reported:

It is really about both sides recognizing the full potential and wanting to get their full potential and committing to the work. That is our experience. There is some vision, enthusiasm for these subjects, and a commitment to do what is required to do it. Everyone gets motivated by seeing [the program] happen.

According to interviewees, the Teagle Foundation played a positive role in supporting partnerships. The Foundation has a unique perspective that allows it to see across programs and grantees. With this perspective, it can create opportunities for programs to share knowledge and learn from each other. Several interviewees spoke of the benefit of the Teagle-sponsored convenings. As one higher education partner put it:
Teagle has gathered us as universities with our CBOs on a number of occasions of just sharing best practices and sharing challenges and problem solving together. And those are really useful.

In addition, Teagle is in a position to act as a neutral party to help partner grantees work through challenges. According to one CBO partner, “At points where there could've been some real tensions in the partnership with [the college, Teagle was] very helpful for us in bringing issues to the table and helping to resolve them.”

Summary

Below we summarize the primary findings on sustainability and replication based on interviews with 22 individuals from the CCC initiative partner organizations, Teagle Foundation staff, and Scripps College and University of Chicago staff.

There needs to be a deliberate effort on the part of the CCC-funded program to show the link between the mission of the CCC-funded program and that of the larger organization. This is especially important when the link is not obvious.

Building visibility of the CCC-funded program across the larger organization helps build support for the program. The greater the number of people who are aware of the program across the larger organization, the more likely there will be people to advocate for it.

Involving faculty and staff across the organization helps develop their buy-in and raises the visibility of the CCC-funded program. In addition to involving a broad range of individuals, it is also important to involve those individuals in a position to advocate for the program.

For the CCC-funded program to be sustainable over the long term, it needs a means of addressing turnover in staff. When staff turnover occurs, as it inevitably does, there needs to be mechanisms in place to pass program knowledge on to others.

Programs supplemented Teagle funding with other sources of funding to cover program costs. For many of the CBO and college partners, Teagle funding alone was not sufficient to cover the full cost of the CCC-funded program.

Building central organizational support for the CCC-funded program from the beginning helps with long-term sustainability of the program. Tying a program’s funding to the budget of the larger organization helps tie its sustainability to the sustainability of the larger organization.

It is important for CCC-funded programs to define success, evaluate the degree to which they are successful, and communicate those successes to others. Grantees examined a wide spectrum of outcomes including college enrollment, improved writing skills, increased confidence and poise, and the ability to make a more informed decision about which college to attend.
Interviewees reported that motivation and curiosity are as important to student success in the program as is prior academic performance. On the other hand, students who require considerable resources and supports beyond the scope of the program are less likely to benefit from the program.

In thinking about program replication, one consideration is the role that a student application process plays in selecting students who are a good fit with the program. CBOs who used a student application process noted that it was helpful in assessing student characteristics and potential for success in the program.

The experience of being immersed in a college setting is an essential element of the CCC initiative. Student supports and faculty relationships with students are a part of that experience and play an important role in fostering positive experiences for students and keeping them engaged in the program.

Selecting the right faculty to work with students in the CCC-funded programs and providing them with the appropriate training and support is critical. Selecting faculty who are committed to the objectives of the CCC initiative and providing them with training and support to better work with high school students are important elements of the program.

The college and CBO partnerships help connect institutions of higher education and local communities that, in many cases, would otherwise be isolated from each other. Such partnerships have the potential to make colleges and universities more accessible to community members.

The CBOs and colleges tend to have different work cultures. Small differences in how the two organizations operate can lead to misunderstandings.

In some cases, interviewees expressed frustration that their partner organization did not contribute equally to the partnership. Commitment to the program from both partners is important.

According to interviewees, the Teagle Foundation played a positive role in supporting partnerships. The Teagle Foundation has a unique perspective that allows it to see across programs and grantees.
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