

Considerations for Collaborations to Support College and Career Readiness

A Facilitator's Guide

December 2013

Megan Sambolt

Kathryn Balestreri

INTRODUCTION

Preparing students to succeed in college and careers requires aligned systems that allow for smooth transitions between institutions as well as integrated supports to enable learners to progress toward careers. Student transitions from secondary to postsecondary education and/or careers have long been stumbling blocks because preschool through Grade 12 (P–12) systems of education, institutions of higher education, and workforce stakeholders generally lack alignment in their expectations and supports for the learners with whom they interact.

One of the most effective levers for facilitating transitions across institutions is aligning systems through collaboration. Here, collaboration is defined as “a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals” (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001, p. 39). Although it is relatively easy to recognize the importance of collaboration and to establish collaborative groups, it is often difficult to achieve meaningful collaboration. Both within and outside the field of education, leaders often struggle to engage stakeholders in achieving a purposeful goal and to leverage strong cooperative relationships to create system alignment and improvement. Therefore, it is essential that before embarking on collaborative efforts to address college and career readiness issues, states take time to carefully consider the collaborative purpose, the participating stakeholders, and the practical considerations for implementation and accountability that have the greatest potential to ultimately foster collaborative success.

The guiding questions in this guide are designed to help states explore the complex challenges inherent in facilitating cross-systems alignment through ongoing collaboration. Each question borrows from the systems research base derived from within and outside the field of education. The key considerations that accompany each question are designed to help users frame their own efforts within the conditions that the research base links to collaborative success. Appendix A provides a deeper exploration of the research base and highlights state examples of how the key considerations can lead to successful collaborative work. Although collaboration across systems can be challenging, the questions and key considerations provided can help states foster meaningful relationships and connections with the ultimate goal of ensuring that all students are prepared for postsecondary success.

QUESTIONS AND KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR COLLABORATIVE SUCCESS

PURPOSE OF THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Questions	Key Considerations
1. What are the goals of the collaborative effort?	Goals must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear • Measurable • Realistic and attainable
2. How will achieving these goals impact systems alignment?	When achieved, goals must maximize impact by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the rules that govern the systems involved • Introducing new data or information • Changing the way in which data are used or the direction in which information flows

PARTICIPANTS IN THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Questions	Key Considerations
3. Which stakeholder groups should be engaged in this collaborative effort? What motivation will prompt each participant to engage in this collaborative effort? Which specific participant skills are needed? Which individuals demonstrate both the necessary motivation and skills?	Participants must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share a sense of urgency around collaborative goals • Believe the collaboration serves a unique purpose • Perceive a benefit-cost advantage inherent in collaborating
4. Who will make up the leadership team for this collaborative effort? What skills should they have to enable them to effectively lead the collaborative effort? What additional skills will need to be developed?	Leadership teams must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a clear vision for the collaboration • Effectively and consistently communicate their commitment to collaborative success
5. What will happen when leadership and collaborative members make transitions within their organizations and within the collaborative efforts? What procedures and processes will be put in place to help minimize the impact of turnover?	Collaborative efforts must plan for transitions by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactively establishing succession plans • Developing strong institutional and community support for their vision

IMPLEMENTATION OF AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Questions	Key Considerations
6. How will the plans of the collaborative effort be implemented? What will happen to collaborative recommendations? How will responsibility for implementing the recommendations be distributed within the collaborative?	Successful implementation of collaborative efforts requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Legitimate authority to allocate resources• Legitimate authority to create and enforce accountability for collaborative results• Participants who have influence within their systems and/or organizations
7. How will the outcomes for the collaborative effort be measured? How will the group be held accountable for its collaborative efforts? How will different stakeholder groups be held accountable for implementing the results?	Accountability must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Based on clearly defined outcome measures• Shared among collaborative participants• Incorporated into or implemented in addition to established institutional accountability systems
8. What resources are available to support this collaborative effort? What resources will participants be expected to contribute? How can the state alleviate potential resource burdens to foster collaborative success?	States can alleviate resource concerns by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocating staff time and other resources in addition to participant contributions• Providing resources for implementation in addition to planning• Minimizing costs of or barriers to collaboration

CONCLUSION

Collaboration across systems can be challenging; however, the questions outlined in this guide and the evidence from the systems research base demonstrate conditions that can help foster effective collaborative relationships. Although these considerations can help states design collaborative efforts that are structured for success, even well-planned collaborations often encounter daunting challenges around engagement, sustainability, and logistics when convened. These questions help set the stage for collaborative success, but there are many other steps in the collaborative process before efforts yield a meaningful impact on alignment. As a result, these guiding questions will be part of a College and Career Readiness and Success (CCRS) Center series that will provide resources and support to use throughout the process of engaging stakeholders, fostering relationships, and developing collaborative efforts designed to facilitate student postsecondary success. The CCRS Center plans to use the questions highlighted in this piece, along with promising practices emerging from multiple collaborative efforts across the country focused on college and career readiness, to develop targeted tools to aid states in applying the research to this challenging process. By drawing from these lessons learned and by harnessing the research, states can begin to build alignment of cross-system college and career readiness initiatives through collaborative success.

APPENDIX A

This appendix provides a deeper look into the research that serves as a foundation for each guiding question. The appendix should be used to examine each question in more depth and to delve further into key considerations that should inform the answers to these questions. In addition, this appendix highlights issues or examples of collaborative endeavors from within the field of education in which this research is applied. Although a variety of active collaborations exist across preschool to graduate school (P–20) and the workforce (P–20W), those referenced in this brief are specifically representative of evidence-based state initiatives and thus do not include any district examples or other examples of more recent promising collaborative efforts, the outcomes of which are just beginning to emerge.

Purpose

What are the goals of the collaborative effort? How will you ensure goals are clear, attainable and measurable?

Although collaborative efforts are often developed in service of greater cross-systems alignment, collaboration should be viewed as a means to an end. As a result, it is important that collaborative efforts be driven by clear, attainable, and measurable goals that help advance the systems alignment agenda. Successful collaborative efforts allow space for participants to guide and set interim benchmarks and goals for the work, provided the objectives for launching the efforts have been well articulated by collaborative leadership or founders. Goals must be realistic and must be achievable given the authority the group has been granted, the resources that have been committed, and the opportunities that exist to effect change. Successful collaborations foster further success, so setting realistic and attainable goals for early cooperative attempts can lay the foundation to tackle issues that are more complex (Sloper, 2004; Cameron & Lart, 2003; Mattessich et al., 2001; Foster-Fishman, Berkowitz, Lounsbury, Jacobson & Allen, 2001).

Setting clear, attainable, and measurable goals may seem like a self-evident prerequisite for any collaboration; however, collaborations across the P–20W spectrum have historically varied greatly in their application of this principle. Councils focused on the preschool-college (P–16 or P–20) spectrum have been a popular collaborative strategy for years. First established in the 1990s, P–16/20 Councils were initially intended to help “create a single system of education underlying all of the segments” (Hodgkinson, 1999), and though not all are still active, Councils have been founded in all but seven states. Council goals range from the highly specific and attainable—such as aligning foreign language requirements across secondary and postsecondary education, establishing a P–20 data system, or developing programs to fill employment needs in targeted local industries—to the important, but somewhat vague—such as ensuring that a high school diploma represents readiness for college, building a unified education system between early childhood and college, or exploring STEM—to the purely ceremonial, such as fostering collaboration between stakeholder groups or providing recommendations to the governor or legislature (Education Commission of the States, 2008). A collaboration that exists merely for collaboration’s sake is as unlikely to engage participants as it is to make a meaningful impact, and, in part as a result, P–16/20 Councils have varied greatly in both their efficacy and longevity.

Lessons from the implementation of P–16/20 Councils demonstrate that any college and career readiness issue must be explored purposefully and with focus. And though any collaborative effort can harness this approach, current state efforts to define college and career readiness provide a specific example of an existing opportunity for states to structure collaborations around a clear purpose. Although defining college and career readiness is by no means an easy task, the purpose of developing a common definition

is easily articulated and likely to result in an attainable, clear outcome. Engaging stakeholders from across the P–20W spectrum is essential to create an aligned definition built on multiple perspectives on what is needed to succeed in college and/or careers. Because of the clarity of purpose this collaboration brings, the effort could help stakeholders develop a track record of past success that would enable them to tackle the more challenging implementation of changes based on their definition as a next step.

How will achieving these goals impact systems alignment?

Engaging in effective collaboration is a challenge that requires significant investment of resources, and it is imperative that states design collaborative efforts to meet goals that will have meaningful impact on the systems they seek to align. As a result, goals should be targeted toward potential leverage points, or places within and across systems' structures to which solutions can be applied to resolve issues. Specifically, collaborative efforts should target high leverage points, or critical systems junctures at which a comparatively small change in input can lead to a large change in results. Although systems research and theory provide 12 potential places to intervene within systems—such as staffing, physical structures, and goals (Meadows, 1999)—those most relevant to and effective across systems of education are changing the rules under which the systems operate, introducing new information loops, and changing the direction of existing loops.

Changing the Rules. Altering the rules under which a system operates can lead to a large potential change in its output. Rule changes may come in the form of changing laws, sanctions, incentives, or more general expectations about what that system does (Meadows, 1999). In some ways, the increased emphasis on college and career readiness has already changed the rules for the P–12 education system. No longer is high school graduation a sufficient end point for students. Schools must now prepare students to succeed in the systems beyond, including postsecondary education and careers. In part because of this shift, cross-system issues are also ripe for collaborative efforts to help further change the rules within which individual systems operate. For example, one such issue is developing multiple postsecondary pathways to success through initiatives such as dual or concurrent enrollment programs and career and technical education (CTE) in which high school students can earn college credits or industry certificates while completing high school. A focus on multiple postsecondary pathways can fundamentally change the operation of all involved systems because it redefines the rules, breaking down traditional silos that have inhibited P–12 educators from collaborating with other stakeholder groups and distributing shared responsibility for successful secondary preparation among all engaged parties. Effective CTE programs often include work-based learning supported by employers (Bailey, Hughes & Moore, 2004). Similarly, successful dual enrollment programs are generally supported by articulation agreements across the secondary and postsecondary level (Greenberg, 1989). As a result, cross-system collaboration is almost a necessity for either approach and can help fundamentally transform the isolated way in which the systems have traditionally worked.

Introducing New Information Loops. Streams of information or data can lead to increased performance across systems without any change in requirements or accountability. Though, the surest mean to achieve impact is through interpretation, synthesis and utilization of such information, simply providing additional information or a new perspective on the data that are already available can improve the way in which systems perform their assigned tasks (Meadows, 1999). Data have had increasing cachet within both P–12 and postsecondary education systems, and introducing additional data and/or encouraging data sharing can lead to similar improvements in performance across these

systems. Although data sharing must be coupled with meaningful data use to be truly effective, ultimately, even the act of sharing creates a potential high leverage point. By providing information on how graduates of the P–12 system perform in higher education and the workforce,¹ states can introduce a new information loop that can be used to inform the continuous improvement of the systems involved in this transition. Many states have already explored data sharing through P–20W state longitudinal data systems, which illustrate the value of introducing information loops. For example, data from Washington State’s longitudinal system demonstrated important trends in students’ lack of persistence in community college. This new information, which showed a “tipping point” at which students became much more likely to complete their degree, was essential in motivating state leaders and policymakers to develop the Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training Program to help students reach that critical point. Although the action taken went far beyond collection and use of data, it was the new information loop that served as an important impetus for change (Prince & Jenkins, 2005). As new assessments are developed to align with college and career readiness standards, a new opportunity will arise for states to invest in or revisit this longitudinal data systems work and to add new information to enhance the performance achieved as a result of these data loops.

Changing the Direction of Existing Loops. Feedback loops of existing information are always governed by a direction, positive or negative. Positive or self-reinforcing feedback loops are designed to reward success with more success. The more the loop’s output grows, the better the loop is able to perform in the future. Negative feedback loops, on the other hand, are designed to be self-correcting, monitoring system performance to detect and ultimately correct deviations from the goal (Meadows, 1999). Traditionally, the relationship between P–12 and postsecondary education systems has been predicated on a self-correcting or negative loop. Nowhere is this relationship better illustrated than the case of teacher education. Higher education faults the P–12 system when students are not prepared to enter into colleges of education, and P–12 stakeholders blame higher education when teachers are not adequately prepared to enter the classroom. The relationship between the systems is designed to identify and correct for things that are going wrong. However, a shared focus on teacher preparation could help establish a positive feedback loop. Effective teachers can prepare students to succeed in college and those same students can enter college and be trained to be effective teachers, starting the positive cycle over again. The change in the direction of the feedback loop could create a major change across both systems.

Participants

Which stakeholder groups should be engaged in this collaborative effort? What motivation will prompt each participant to engage in this collaborative effort? Which specific participant skills are needed? Which individuals demonstrate both the necessary motivation and skills?

The participants engaged in any collaborative effort are the true pillars of its success; the ability to fulfill the effort’s defined purposes depends on the skills, commitment, and effectiveness of the individuals and organizations involved. Similar to the goal setting process, states must purposefully recruit stakeholders who span the college and career readiness spectrum, and not just for diversity’s sake. It is essential to engage participants who bring not only the distinct perspectives of their organizations and systems, but who also bring abilities, beliefs, and urgencies that can contribute to the effort’s success. Participants in

¹ The Higher Education Opportunity Act prevents institutions of higher education from maintaining databases that include personally identifiable student data (H.R. 5137, 2007), but SLDS have been used effectively to show trends in collective student performance as they relate to schools and institutions.

a successful collaboration will have specific knowledge and skills that can be harnessed in their collaborative work, influence in the systems where they work, and attitudes that foster effectiveness; however, ideal collaborative members will also come to the table with a shared perception of the urgency of the work's purpose, a sense that the work will result in something unique, and a belief that the benefits that will emerge will far outweigh the resources and time commitments required.

A Shared Perception of Urgency. For collaborations to be successful, all parties must be equally invested in achieving established goals. Stakeholders must be brought to the table to address an issue that they perceive to be of great need, not simply to weigh in on the concerns of other collaborators. All participants must be equally committed to generating solutions with expediency and equally committed to moving the work forward (Johnson, Zorn, Tam, Lamontagne, & Johnson, 2003; Mattessich et al., 2001). Although many issues in college and career readiness carry an inherent sense of necessity, this necessity may not be equally felt by all stakeholders in reference to all issues. For example, defining college and career readiness is a matter of urgency for stakeholders across the P-20W spectrum. Employers in high growth industries are increasingly outspoken about the lack of available employees with the necessary skill set to be successful in their industries (Bieda, 2011), and there is growing pressure on both P-12 and postsecondary education systems to prepare the students that the employers need. And yet, many requirements at all levels of education systems fail to align with workforce need. Developing a shared definition is not only essential for employers who are currently forecasting that they will not have the workforce that they need but also for education stakeholders across the spectrum who are responsible for preventing that forecast from becoming a reality. On the other hand, issues like teacher preparation are of urgent interest to both P-12 and higher education stakeholders but may have only secondary interest to industry stakeholders. When developing collaborative efforts, states must consider the urgency of each group's perception and must effectively leverage these efforts to either engage stakeholders who already view the collaborative purpose to be critical or to persuade stakeholders of the issue's importance to their priorities.

A Unique Purpose Resulting from the Collaboration. In addition to a shared sense of urgency, states should recruit stakeholders who believe that the results of the effort could not be achieved without cross-system collaboration. Participants must be invested in the alignment of the solutions implemented across systems to the same degree that they are invested in the solutions (Conger, 2008; Mattessich et al., 2001; Foster-Fishman et al., 2001; Einbinder, 2000; Oliver, 1990). For example, inherent in the creation and alignment of multiple pathways is a unique purpose that can emerge only from successful collaboration. Although P-12 stakeholders can create programs that offer accelerated options to students or that provide career and technical experience, these programs have no cachet without the investment of other systems, such as institutions of higher education who will accept the credit students gain as a result of their accelerated pace and businesses who can be assured that CTE courses teach the skills that they look for in employees. Because states cannot establish meaningful and aligned pathways without collaboration any more than institutions of higher education or employers can, this issue illustrates the unique purpose that participants must perceive to drive meaningful collaborative work.

A Cost-Benefit Advantage. Meaningful collaborations require an investment of resources from all stakeholders involved. It takes more time, energy, and money to generate solutions with stakeholders who are external to your team. As a result, the outcomes of any collaboration must be perceived as being worthwhile investments of each participant's or organization's resources to ensure the

continued engagement of the group (Johnson et al., 2003; Mattessich et al., 2001; Gray, 1985). For example, as teachers begin to implement the Common Core State Standards and other college and career readiness standards, both P–12 and postsecondary systems of education will have to make significant investments in teacher preparation and professional development. Both systems, however, have incentives to collaborate that outweigh the likely costs. P–12 stakeholders are likely to be motivated to work with institutions of higher education because effective teacher preparation can reduce the costs of induction and professional development later in a teacher’s career. Institutions of higher education also are likely to perceive a benefit-cost advantage to collaboration because the prospective teachers whose preparation is aligned with that of the districts’ and schools’ professional development are much more likely to successfully get jobs upon graduation.

Who will make up the leadership team for this collaborative effort? What skills should they have to enable them to effectively lead the collaborative effort? What additional skills will need to be developed?

Any successful collaborative effort must be captained by a strong leadership team that is viewed as representing the interests of all stakeholders (Sloper, 2004; Johnson et al., 2003; Mattessich et al., 2001; Foster-Fishman et al., 2001; Gray, 1985). Collaborative leaders are tasked with addressing many challenges, not least of which is establishing a collective vision for the effort by uniting stakeholders’ disparate agendas and perspectives. The challenge of unifying stakeholders in service of a common vision or mission is often particularly difficult because of systemic differences in ideologies or agendas that can stymie efforts to establish meaningful collaboration. For example, P–12 education historically has been compulsory for all students, while higher education, by definition, has not. These different historical purposes and the students that they view as their responsibility directly influence each agency or institution’s priorities and, as a result, its culture (Sloper, 2004; Wildridge, Childs, Cawthra & Madge, 2004; Cameron & Lart, 2003). However, working toward a clear purpose is essential for collaborative success, so effective leadership must lend coherence and unity to the work in spite of these differences.

In addition to establishing a vision for change, leaders must also have the capacity to foster ongoing collaborative success. Leaders do this by consistently communicating their commitment to the effort, engaging in related events and publicly communicating with other collaborative stakeholders; facilitating the goal setting process by establishing well-defined and clear purposes for collaboration that will foster investment across the stakeholder spectrum; and investing community support in expected results to create outside pressure for collaborative success (Business–Higher Education Forum, 2009).

What will happen when leadership and collaborative members make transitions within their organizations and within the collaborative efforts? What procedures and processes can be put in place to help minimize the impact of turnover?

Although providing strong leadership is essential to collaborative success, it is also possible for a collaborative effort to become overly reliant on one or two strong leaders. Given the frequent restructuring and staff turnover that are the realities for many states and other systems, collaborative success hinges not only on strong leadership, but on continued support for the collaborative goal even in that strong leader’s absence. Collaborative efforts must ultimately be tied to shared institutional visions for change rather than the visions of individuals. By doing this, and by establishing a leadership succession plan at the outset of the collaboration, states can ensure that meaningful collaboration is driven by the issue and the stakeholders as a group rather than by a committed individual (Cameron & Lart, 2003; Oliver, 1990). This principle is illustrated through the historical performance of many P–16/20 Councils across the nation. Because many state councils were established by an executive order or other leadership from

the governor, many have become defunct as a result of state administration changes; however, in some states, such as Georgia, Indiana, and Arizona, these governor-led councils have survived the transition. In these cases, there was a strong investment from the community, the state legislature, and/or the stakeholders who were engaged in the work of the council that contributed to the sustainability of the collaborative work despite the leadership turnover.

Implementation and Accountability

How will the plans of the collaborative effort be implemented? What will happen to collaborative recommendations? How will responsibility for implementing the recommendations be distributed within the collaborative?

Collaborative efforts must be afforded necessary status and authority to implement the results of their work. Rather than serving a ceremonial or purely intellectual function, effective collaborations must have real power to implement meaningful change. This authority may come from the recruitment of the right leadership team, the ability of that team to create and hold stakeholders to accountability measures, and the power to make decisions that will impact the allocation of future resources. This not only helps further invest stakeholders in the collaborative work, but also allows the group to address barriers to implementation, such as unfavorable political climates or reluctance to accept change (Sloper, 2004; Wildridge et al, 2004; Cameron et al., 2003; Mattessich et al., 2001; Foster-Fishman et al., 2001). States have demonstrated varying degrees of success in endowing collaborative efforts, such as P–16/20 Councils, with authority. Although the existence of many of these Councils have been codified through Executive order of the Governor, State Board resolution, or legislation, very few have been given legitimate authority to implement change. One notable exception is the Oregon Joint Boards of Education. The Joint Boards, a council that has been codified by state law, meets at least once a year and includes the State Board of Education, the State Board of Higher Education, and other representatives from community colleges and universities. Because both boards of education are convened as part of this P–16 council, the Joint Boards has authority to develop policy that will be implemented by both the Oregon Department of Education and the state college and university systems. The Joint Boards has used its authority to prioritize creating better secondary to postsecondary transitions for students by working toward curricula and standards alignment and credit transferring policies (Weldon, 2009). Because most P–16/20 Councils serve in an advisory capacity or exist solely to improve collaboration, often they are unable to effect meaningful change (Kirst & Shulock, 2009; Education Commission of the States, 2008). And if states seek to maximize the effectiveness of their collaborative efforts, they must carefully consider how each effort will be provided with legitimate authority before convening stakeholders to embark upon the work.

How will the outcomes for the collaborative effort be measured? How will the group be held accountable for their collaborative efforts? How will different stakeholder groups be held accountable for implementing the results?

In any organization or agency, often that which is measured for accountability purposes is that which gets done. Therefore, the goals of states, institutions of higher education, departments of labor, and other workforce agencies are often driven by their accountability measures. As a result, it is essential to establish outcome measures, the accountability for which will be shared among all stakeholders. These accountability provisions may not align naturally with those already established in each system, so it is important that the council have legitimate authority to hold stakeholders to established provisions (Wildridge et al., 2004). Although stakeholders ultimately will be held accountable by the systems in which they work, the state can design accountability metrics for the collaboration itself. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, for example, set a precedent for state

development of collaborative performance measures. Because the Perkins Act requires collaboration across secondary, postsecondary, and other agencies, states are required to develop metrics to show evidence of collaborative progress. By implementing these metrics, states can not only make the expectations for collaborative performance clear but can also demonstrate objective measures of success on which to build future collaborative efforts.

What resources are available to support this collaborative effort? What resources will participants be expected to contribute? How can the state alleviate potential resource burdens to foster collaborative success?

As previously stated, successful collaborations require a significant investment of time and money, and states should not rely on stakeholder willingness to front these costs without a similar investment from the state. The investment of resources, such as funds and/or staff time, is essential to planning for meaningful collaborative work; however, a delicate balance must be achieved so that the effort is not perceived as overly financially burdensome to any subset of stakeholders or to any individuals engaged in the work (Sloper, 2004; Wildridge et al., 2004; Cameron et al., 2003; Johnson et al., 2003; Foster & Meinhard, 2002; Mattessich et al., 2001; Foster-Fishman et al., 2001).

Leadership must consider not only the costs of undertaking a collaborative effort but also any costs that might be generated as a result of collaborative work. An important aspect of this assurance is examining policies and practices to remove disincentives for alignment. Codifying or mandating collaboration through a state law has proven to be an effective incentive for some P-16/20 Councils when coupled with other conditions for success (Weldon, 2009), but many states have codified policies that inhibit collaboration. For example, states differ dramatically in how dual/concurrent enrollment options impact student funding levels. In some states, if students enroll in a certain percentage of dual enrollment courses, the community college or university receives a significant percentage of their state funding for the year. Although this alleviates the burden of the student having to pay to enroll in a college course, it also creates a disincentive for the district and schools to promote dual enrollment options that will result in a loss of funding. Many states have grappled with this issue, including Iowa, where districts are required to pay up to \$250 to local community colleges per student per dual enrollment course. Recognizing the disincentive that this created, Iowa developed a weighted funding formula through which districts can receive additional per pupil funds for each student who is shown to be earning credit in a dual enrollment course (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 2012). This illustrates the careful consideration that states should devote to the policy implications that may affect the implementation of recommendations emerging from collaborative efforts.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, T. R., Hughes, K. L., & Moore, D. T. (2004). *Working knowledge: Work-based learning and education reform*. London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bieda, A. S. (2011). *Closing the gap between career education & employer expectations: Implications for America's unemployment rate*. Washington, DC: Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools.
- Business–Higher Education Forum (2009). *Improving education through collaboration: A case study of the Long Beach Seamless Education Partnership*. Washington, DC: author.
- Cameron, A., & Lart, R. (2003). Factors promoting and obstacles hindering joint working: A systematic review of the research evidence. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 1(2): 9–17.
- Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-270 (2005). Retrieved from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/109/s250>
- Conger, S. B. (2008). *En route to seamless statewide education data systems: Addressing five cross-cutting concerns*. Boulder, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers.
- Education Commission of the States. (2008). *P-16/P-20 councils*. Retrieved from <http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=910>
- Einbinder, S. D. (2000). Interorganizational collaboration in social service organizations: A study of the prerequisites to success. *Journal of Child Poverty*, 6(2), 119–140.
- Foster, M. K., & Meinhard, A. G. (2002). A regression model explaining predisposition to collaborate. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(4), 549–564.
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Berkowitz, S. L., Lounsbury, D. W., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. A. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29(2), 241–261.
- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10), 911–936.
- Greenberg, A. R. (1989). *Concurrent enrollment programs: College credit for high school students*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.
- Higher Education Opportunity Act, Pub. L. No. 110-315. (2007). Retrieved from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/110/hr4137>
- Hodgkinson, H. L. (1999). *All one system: A second look*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership and National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Johnson, L. J., Zorn, D., Tam, B. K. Y., Lamontagne, M., & Johnson, S. A. (2003). Stakeholders' views of factors that impact successful interagency collaboration. *Exceptional Child*, 69(2), 195–210.
- Kirst, M. W., & Shulock, N. B. (2009). *States, schools, and colleges: Policies to improve student readiness for college and strengthen coordination between schools and colleges* (National Center Report 09-2). San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Mattessich, P. W., Murray-Close, M., & Monsey, B. R. (2001). *The wilder collaboration factors inventory: Assessing your collaboration's strength and weakness*. Redford, VA: Wilder Publications.
- Meadows, D. H. (1999). *Leverage point: Places to intervene in a system*. Hartland, VT: The Sustainability Institute.

- Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(15), 241–265.
- Prince, D., & Jenkins, D. (2005). *Building pathways to success for low-skill adult students: Lessons for community college policy and practice from a longitudinal student tracking study*, CCRC Brief No. 25, New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. Retrieved from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/pathways-success-low-skill-adult-brief.pdf>
- Sloper, P. (2004). Facilitators and barriers for coordinated multi-agency services. *Child Care Health Development*, 30(6), 571–580.
- Weldon, T. (2009). *Focus on: P-16/20 school governance: A Trends in America special report*. Lexington, KY: The Council of State Governments.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (2012). *State higher education policy database: Iowa*. Retrieved from <http://higheredpolicies.wiche.edu/content/policy/state/IA>
- Wildridge, V., Childs, S., Cawthra, L. & Madge, B. (2004). How to create successful partnerships: A review of the literature. *Health Information Library Journal*, 21(1), 3–19.

COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS & SUCCESS Center

at American Institutes for Research ■ ccrcenter.org

**1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007**

**Phone: 800-634-0503
Fax: 202-403-5875
TTY: 800-634-0752**

Copyright © 2013 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced with funds from the U.S Department of Education through the National High School Center under cooperative agreement number S283B050028 and through the College and Career Readiness and Success Center under cooperative agreement number S283B120034. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.