



BUILDING COMMUNITY COLLEGE/ CBO PARTNERSHIPS

A Report to the
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Workforce Strategy Center would like to thank The James Irvine Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation for their support of our research into effective practices in developing career pathways in a number of states and regions around the country. This report, funded by the Hewlett foundation, is the third in a series of three reports that are part of this project.

AUTHOR

David Gruber

RESEARCHERS

David Dearden

Brandon Roberts

EDITORS

Julian L. Alssid

Melissa Goldberg

Sara Rab

INTRODUCTION

National data increasingly show that the prevailing model of workforce development — job search and basic training leading to an entry-level job — does little to promote economic self-sufficiency or career progression. In the face of strong evidence that some form of post-secondary training and education is needed to support a family, there is a growing belief that creating economic security for the nation's unemployed and underemployed workers will require major change in its workforce development system. Creating and sustaining new career pathways to high-wage, high-demand employment is a promising step in developing a new large-scale, flexible and open workforce development system that offers education and training to all who need it.

A pathways model that targets regional labor markets, focuses on employment sectors, and combines education, training, and on-the-job learning best supports career progression. The focal point of this model is an institution that links all of the entities in the workforce development system — the community college. The nation's 1,132 community colleges serve 10.4 million students each year, offering low tuition, a wide range of education and training, a sustaining funding base, and open-door admissions. Making community colleges the key institution in career pathway models allows local workforce agencies, community-based organizations (CBOs), social service agencies, and employers to work together to build an effective workforce development system that enables disadvantaged individuals to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

This report discusses a key feature of career pathways, namely partnerships between community colleges and CBOs. In order for community colleges to extend their education and training opportunities to the wider local community, it is essential that they work with their most closely connected community partners — the CBOs. These partnerships allow both institutions to draw upon and contribute significant strengths and resources toward developing pathways to employment and career progression.

In this report, we describe some of the best community college/CBO partnerships around the country. Important features of these partnerships are discussed, including: how they were formed; how they are funded; the programs they offer; and the challenges they face. Five case studies of partnerships in California, Illinois, and Texas are presented. In addition, we make recommendations for the successful creation and operation of such partnerships.

This report, funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, is one of three reports that have resulted from a year-long study on promising practices in community college-centered workforce development.¹ We believe the best practices identified will have application nationally.

This report is based upon data collected during 2002. The case studies represent a snapshot in time. Although the numbers represented have not been updated, we feel there is great value in sharing the lessons learned from these outstanding examples of community college/CBO partnerships.

WHO WE ARE

WSC is a national nonprofit that shapes policy and institutional change to create a market-driven workforce system. We build the internal and external capacity of workforce institutions to connect to employers, train low-income people for career track employment in target industries, and to participate in a network of strategic partnerships that engage a wide variety of resources. We also help promote effective workforce development policies by disseminating best practices, targeting funding at key initiatives, and stimulating innovative thinking among policy-makers.

Current projects include: national research on how to put community colleges at the center of regional workforce development systems; advising states, including Kentucky, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Wisconsin, on workforce development policy; and developing and managing region-wide career pathway networks focused on information technology, new manufacturing and biotechnology in New York City and Albany, New York. For more information, visit our web site at www.workforcestrategy.org or contact us at 718-434-8424.

I. BACKGROUND

Why community college/CBO partnerships? In order to build successful career pathways it is critically important to extend the reach and scope of community colleges to encompass individuals who are traditionally isolated from postsecondary education.

In many respects, community colleges and CBOs are ideally situated to work together to meet this goal. CBOs, as the institutions most closely connected to the neighborhood, are both accessible and credible to adults who lack ties to educational institutions and training programs. In many communities, CBOs comprise a self-contained workforce and social service system, offering a full spectrum of services including counseling, case management, social support, rehabilitative services, and, frequently, education and training. According to a recent study by the National Congress for Community Economic Development, 30 percent of community development corporations now offer employment and training programs, and nearly half offer some kind of education and training programs.² At the same time, however, CBOs are often limited by a lack of resources and few links to employers. In addition, they are often unable to offer the quality and depth of education and skills training disadvantaged adults need to attain self-sufficiency.

Community colleges have the resources and capacity to provide a full spectrum of education and skills training. Yet colleges often have difficulty effectively serving individuals who need additional support to succeed in a challenging and unfamiliar environment, a reality underlined by high dropout rates in many institutions. Moreover, as a recent MDRC study suggests,³ many low-income individuals have difficulty accessing community colleges due to lack of awareness of the services available to help ensure success in postsecondary education.

Community college/CBO partnerships link college educational resources with CBO accessibility and support services. Basic skills and entry-level instruction offered to clients at the CBO can become the first step of an integrated career pathway that leads to advanced training and courses offered on the college campus. In a number of instances, colleges have improved access to that first step by establishing satellite “branch campuses” that teach credit-bearing courses at the community group’s site.

These partnerships offer both parties clear advantages. Colleges obtain an additional recruitment source for students, and can use the additional resources generated by new enrollments to subsidize instruction at the CBO site. CBOs focus on their strengths, such as case management and social support, and expand the quality and range of their educational offerings. Through partnership with community colleges, CBOs can employ the colleges’ assets — employer linkages, advanced curriculum, extensive instructional capacity, and links to continuing education — to prepare, train and connect disadvantaged individuals to career paths in high wage sectors. And, CBO clients are able to start on a postsecondary career pathway in an accessible and unintimidating setting.

Despite their demonstrated need, there are few community college/CBO partnerships that offer a well-developed pathway to post-secondary education and career advancement. The reasons are many: First, CBOs and community colleges are traditionally separate institutions that at times see themselves as competitors for scarce outside resources. Second, partnerships of this kind are difficult to create — they require extra resources, staff time, and often the leadership and political will to overcome internal opposition from staff and faculty comfortable with the status quo. Third, since creation of career pathway partnerships has not, to date, been a priority for public policy or private funders, there are few outside incentives to encourage college and community partners to join forces. To promote additional and more effective community college/CBO partnerships, there is a need to better identify and describe model programs, to assess current barriers, and to explore policy and funding incentives that would encourage CBOs, and especially community colleges, to enter into such partnerships.

This report examines the role of community college/CBO partnerships in promoting career pathways for economically disadvantaged adults. It is based on the premise that an effective partnership between these institutions can expand the scope and reach of regional career pathways, marrying CBOs’ community connections and credibility with the educational opportunities offered by community colleges.

OUR RESEARCH

Our research included two objectives: first, to better understand current community college/CBO partnerships; and second to identify ways to encourage state and local policymakers to stimulate new and expanded partnerships between these critical agents of the workforce development system.

In conducting this research, we visited 11 community college/CBO partnerships throughout the country, with a particular focus on California to reflect the interest of the Hewlett Foundation. Five of these partnerships are profiled below.

Our interviews focused on college and CBO partners, but we also participated in discussions with other players in the regional workforce system including: Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs); county social service agencies; Chambers of Commerce; and foundations.

While there are a number of examples where colleges and CBOs have developed some form of relationship, we sought to explore the much more limited number of those that have established comprehensive career pathways for economically disadvantaged adults. In choosing partnerships to examine in this study, we looked for six key characteristics:

- A focus on economic and educationally disadvantaged individuals;
- A long-term pathways framework with programs and services directed to achievement of certified skills, employment, and continuing career progression;
- Credit bearing instruction delivered on-site at the CBO, or direct links to a credit bearing on-campus program;
- Effective integration of social support, counseling and academic instruction;
- Effective expansion of access to ongoing education and training within the community college and postsecondary system; and
- Sustaining funding, particularly that which is gained through integration of existing public resources.

At the same time that we recognize that few partnerships would meet all these criteria, we believe these elements are necessary to create and sustain a career pathways system. For this reason, we centered our research on a limited number of partnerships that focused on career pathways and incorporated at least some of the characteristics outlined above.

OUR REPORT

To best assist state and local policymakers and community college and CBO practitioners, our report is organized into three parts:

1. DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Building on our current and prior research, this section looks at critical questions underlying the establishment, operation and support of successful community college/CBO partnerships. Topics include:

- What goals and objectives characterize career pathway focused partnerships?
- How are partnerships initiated?
- How are partnerships structured?
- How are partnerships funded?
- What major operational issues have arisen?
- What are the major incentives and disincentives for partners?

2. PROFILES OF SELECTED PARTNERSHIPS

This section looks in some detail at five community college/CBO partnerships:

- Austin Community College and Capital IDEA in Austin, Texas;
- Daley College and Instituto del Progreso in Chicago, Illinois;
- The San Francisco IT Consortium including City College of San Francisco, Mission College, Jewish Vocational Services and Glide Church;
- The Los Angeles IT Consortium including Los Angeles City College, Chrysalis, Goodwill and Breakaway Technologies; and
- The East Bay IT Consortium including Peralta and Contra Costa Colleges and Street-Tech, Urban Voice and Eastmont Center.

The profiles include: an overview of the partnership; a description of the partnership participants; a discussion of how the partnership is funded; data on program outcomes; and an analysis of key issues, strengths and challenges faced by the partnership.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides specific recommendations to foster effective community college/CBO partnerships. Specific recommendations are directed to state policymakers, local policymakers, community college and CBO practitioners.

II. DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS, BEST PRACTICES, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

VISION: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The community college/CBO partnerships profiled here are notable in that they have adopted a vision and operating model that is a significant departure from the norm in workforce development. These partnerships have at their core a belief that current programs have not worked effectively in moving adults to economic self-sufficiency.

The traditional workforce development model in the United States — typical of those funded under federal employment and training programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) — includes short-term training (3 to 6 months) conducted by a single training provider with immediate employment as the end goal. Continuing education and career development, while valued by many program operators, is very much a secondary priority to immediate labor market attachment in these programs. Similarly, placement in a job, regardless of wage, has for many programs been a more important variable than wage at placement.

While some organizations formed partnerships to conduct training, the more typical model is a one-stop center, where a single agency, often a CBO, is responsible for all aspects of program operation including recruitment, assessment, case management, instruction and job placement.

The partnerships profiled here, and others studied, are built on a framework that departs from these standards in three key respects:

FOCUS ON EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER PATHWAYS

All of the partnerships we studied are based on a sequential model of education and training that includes basic skills, entry-level training, and for most, some form of continuing upgrade training. These models are predicated on the need to serve low-skilled individuals, while at the same time providing training to meet educational and labor market standards.

The Los Angeles, San Francisco and East Bay partnerships, for example, focused on the Information Technology sector, incorporating in their planning three distinct components: a basic skills program, targeted at those reading at the sixth grade level; 14-16 week entry-level training, targeted to those reading at the 9th grade level and leading to job placement; and upgrade training in advanced IT applications such as Cisco, Unix and computer networking for those already working. All three partnerships view these stages as clearly linked in a continuing career pathway,

with well-defined transitions between each stage. Participants in basic skills development, for example, are encouraged to view themselves not as enrolled in a remedial program, but rather as on the first step of training for a high wage IT job. To encourage this connection, basic skills training is “contextualized” with concepts and language from specific information technology classes used as study material for students seeking to increase their reading levels. Upon successful completion of basic skills training, students can move directly into entry-level training. Students completing entry-level training in these California programs move into jobs in the IT field, and earn \$14-23 per hour. Continuing advanced or upgrade training in computer applications is built in to the program.

A similar model is in place in Chicago, in a partnership between Daley College (a community college in the City Colleges of Chicago system) and Instituto del Progreso. In this initiative, students reading at the 4th-6th grade level enter a pre-vocational training course to ready them for transition to an entry-level course in manufacturing training, and job placement. Students then have the opportunity to move on to advanced training offered by the community college in manufacturing skills.

The focus of these and other community college/CBO partnerships on career and educational pathways for economically disadvantaged individuals parallels the mainstream model for the middle class — a long-term combination of training, work experience and advanced education leading to career advancement and wage progression. Partnership staffers often name this pathway model as a key element in the success of the partnerships and in their ability to successfully recruit and retain participants. Indeed, a number of programs note retention rates of 80% or higher for relatively long-term intensive training — unexpectedly high for programs at this level.

The pathway model stands in marked contrast to the more traditional approach of the traditional workforce system, which emphasizes limited, short-term training leading to immediate job placement.

FOCUS ON COLLEGE CREDIT

Another defining feature of community college/CBO partnerships, and again a distinct departure from traditional training programs, is a focus on providing college credit for as much of the training as is feasible.

At Capital IDEA in Austin, Texas the receipt of college credit is the heart of the program, as it provides a means to obtain a formal postsecondary credential. Capital IDEA functions primarily to direct students to credit or degree programs. The three California IT initiatives currently offer nine to thirteen college credits for entry-level training and six to nine credits for upgrade training. In order to extend college credit even to lower-skilled students, the California initiatives are in the process of developing a basic skills component to be delivered for academic credit.

Underlying the emphasis on credit is the recognition that today's economy increasingly requires postsecondary education and certification as a requirement for career progression. Interestingly, a number of CBOs that did not initially believe community college credit was worth the additional start-up effort and cost have changed their views after seeing the value employers place upon postsecondary credentials.

A second purpose for awarding credit lies in the symbolic impact of college credit for students with little prior education or skills. As Instituto del Progreso staff report, credit is very important for students since it motivates them to think about additional education and training and raises their self-esteem.

COLLABORATION WITH DEFINED ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As in most of the country, in many of the communities we visited, the standard model of workforce development remains an individual community agency or college operating a self-contained program that combines training, social support (occasionally at colleges), and frequently, placement. Perhaps the most significant departure from this standard in the model or pilot program partnerships we studied is the recognition that neither individual entity — college or CBO — can adequately provide the full spectrum of services needed to assist disadvantaged individuals in achieving economic self-sufficiency.

The partnerships we studied are based on a clear division of responsibilities stemming from the underlying strengths of each organization: the ability of colleges to develop and deliver a broad range of instruction, and the ability of CBOs to reach and support disadvantaged and low-skilled neighborhood residents.

Each of the initiatives organized itself, in one way or another, in a partnership that builds on these strengths. The partnership model is probably taken to its fullest extent by the California IT initiatives, where a community college establishes what is, in effect, a branch campus at the CBO. In San Francisco, for example, City College of San Francisco provides A+ computer technician training at Glide Church, located in the heart of the city's Tenderloin district. Glide, home of extensive social support services, recruits students (sometimes from the food line); provides assessment; assists students in obtaining needed social services including housing, health services and transportation; refers students to an on-site preparation class if needed; and offers continuing case management for program recipients, with staff on duty during class hours. City College registers students, provides an instructor and curriculum, and delivers classes each night in a Glide classroom.

Apart from providing education and training, all the partnerships studied are notable for the emphasis they place on continuing case management and social support. While it is common for community agencies to provide intensive social services as part of any job-training program, a number of staff members interviewed believe the demands of community college-level training require

additional support. In Los Angeles, for example, Chrysalis, a community agency that serves the homeless, has stationed two staff members to assist the instructor during class. Staff members are responsible for providing general encouragement and support, individualized counseling and assistance as needed and general problem solving. Chrysalis staff attribute the program's high success rate — 90% completion of an intensive college-level 16-week course — to the additional support provided by agency staff.

As further described below, these partnership models, with variations in each of the communities studied, offer new opportunities for integrating services and funding, and for extending short-term training into long-term career progression. They also bring with them, of course, organizational conflict, culture clash, and challenges for community agency, workforce system, and community college administrators habituated to a less complex way of providing training and education.

INITIATING PARTNERSHIPS

One of the most notable characteristics of the community college/CBO partnerships studied is that they were frequently started not by the participating colleges or community organizations, but by an outside entity such as a foundation or community coalition.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a notable example of this practice. The foundation's Jobs Initiative, a six-city demonstration project in communities including New Orleans, Seattle and St. Louis, encourages colleges and CBOs to form partnerships to provide advanced training and education to disadvantaged city residents. Casey support includes funding for direct training and administrative costs as well as technical assistance and dissemination of effective practices among sites.

In Chicago, a new IT training initiative linking Westside Technical Institute at Daley College and Instituto del Progreso was spurred by the city's Chamber of Commerce, the University of Illinois at Chicago and Manpower, Inc., the worldwide staffing agency. In Austin, the Capital IDEA program has been a project of a community interfaith coalition, designed to replicate a successful San Antonio program.

In California, the IT training "branch campus" models in San Francisco, the East Bay, Los Angeles and the Silicon Valley are the direct result of an initiative of the James Irvine Foundation. To catalyze development of partnerships, Irvine created an initiative that builds on a defined program model centered on college/CBO branch campuses. As an incentive to partners, Irvine offers initial funding, technical assistance and the prospect of longer-term financial support.

Both Casey and Irvine sponsor networks of partnership programs, with opportunities for inter-site discussion and support. Other foundations, such as the David and Lucille Packard Foundation and New York Community Trust, are also supporting similar community college/CBO models.

Public agencies can serve a similar role. For example, in Los Angeles, the Department of Public and Social Services is considering funding the expansion of the current pilot collaboration to additional colleges and community organizations.

Community college administrators have played a mixed role in developing and encouraging partnerships. In some sites, such as Los Angeles and San Francisco, college presidents, while not initiating partnerships, have been strong supporters, facilitating college participation. In other sites, the initial contact and support has stemmed from a college dean or vice-president.

While some community college/CBO partnerships evolve from personal contacts, an enterprising administrator, or sheer demand, our experience suggests that such beginnings are relatively rare. In many of the partnerships we studied, an outside entity — with a concept or model, cash, and technical assistance — has been required to encourage, initiate and support new partnerships. The need for outside catalysts is not surprising. Although college and CBOs can effectively complement each other in practice, the barriers to initiating successful partnerships are significant, including:

INERTIA

Colleges and CBOs are separate, and in some respects (such as seeking funding for training programs) competing entities. In many communities there is little sustained contact between these agencies and few defined opportunities or clear incentives for collaboration.

LACK OF FUNDING

Although collaboration can bring new funding opportunities for both colleges and CBOs, this is often not readily apparent to staff at either entity. Staff constrained by tight budgets may well focus on the short-term costs of establishing a new program, rather than the longer-term funding benefits. As stated above, colleges and CBOs also may see themselves as competing for limited WIA, welfare, or other public and private funding.

LACK OF STAFF

As some observers have noted, no individual in community colleges or CBOs is paid to develop collaborations. The absence of such staff limits even exploration of collaborative efforts. If established, collaborations require a good deal of initial planning and development, a clear drain on often strained staff resources.

These factors, and the relatively limited number of existing college/CBO partnerships, point to the need for a deliberate and focused public or private response to create and expand these partnerships. Our experience in surveying effective practices suggests the need for a foundation or publicly-sponsored initiative that offers a defined vision or framework, start-up and some sustaining resources, and continuing technical assistance and support.

STRUCTURING PARTNERSHIPS

Establishing partnerships between colleges and CBOs is a difficult task. As with any operating relationship between agencies, an effective partnership requires initial and evolving agreements in key areas such as institutional role and responsibility, distribution of funding, operating principles and dispute resolution. In the case of some of the initiatives we studied, questions of structure and organization have become perhaps the most critical components.

Beyond the basic organizational issues are those that naturally arise in the attempt to mesh very different cultures and operating styles. Community colleges are large, frequently bureaucratic, organizations that focus on delivering instruction to set standards for set cost. As big institutions, community colleges are often bound by a web of negotiated contracts, relationships and procedures. CBOs are typically much smaller, more informal and more focused on serving the individual client. Unlike the institutional continuity that characterizes community colleges, CBOs are subject to frequent changes in funding, programs and staff.

Our experience suggests that building effective community college/CBO partnerships requires incorporating a number of elements:

A FORMAL STRUCTURE

We saw no set model for structuring partnerships in our site visits. However, after an informal evolutionary period, a number of partnerships have come to understand the importance of a formal delineation of roles and responsibilities. In particular, partnerships needing to navigate the complex structure of community colleges have focused on the importance of designating a point person or coordinator to manage the college portion of the collaboration. This individual's responsibilities include: curriculum development and approval; instructor recruitment and/or certification; negotiation of fees; and overall responsibility for delivering instruction effectively. Typically, college coordinators are drawn from the workforce development or contract education divisions of the college.

There is widespread consensus that individual interest and enthusiasm, rather than position in the college administrative structure, is the key requirement for effective administration of partnerships. Nevertheless, experience in a number of programs suggests that faculty from relevant departments, or administrators of contract education departments, may be more effective than other administrators. One reason may be that these individuals are accustomed to working with a variety of outside partners (in the case of contract education divisions), or that they are particularly focused on providing an effective classroom experience (in the case of teachers). By contrast, those in central administration often have responsibility for a wider variety of programs and internal administrative issues, and thus may be less able to devote individual attention to partnership development and growth.

For CBOs, partnerships typically play a larger role in overall operation than they do for colleges. Most CBOs participating in partnerships we studied were initially involved at the executive director level, with the equivalent of a full-time program manager assigned to operate the program. In partnerships that involved a number of community organizations, multiple colleges, and other partners (such as workforce agencies) larger structures have evolved. Some partnerships, such as the East Bay and San Francisco, have designated an executive committee with overall management responsibilities. In some cases, sites have also established subcommittees focused on specific aspects of collaboration such as curriculum and training opportunities. While several partnerships began with this kind of formal structure, others adopted it after initial informal relationships proved unable to resolve program issues.

A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

A number of partnerships have recognized the need to move beyond informal operating agreements to written memoranda or contracts which set the broad terms of the partnership and define, in detail, expected services and responsibilities. San Francisco, for example, has developed an agreement that lays out expected classes, hours, and services to be provided by the college, as well as specific services to be provided by the CBOs. Not surprisingly, memoranda of agreement are also used as a vehicle to define the terms for conveying funds from one partner to another (see below).

In some sites, these documents are also used to preemptively address concerns of individual partners, or to redress problems that have arisen in developing the partnership. In particular, some partnerships have developed specific provisions to deal with expected culture clash.

A FUNDING STRATEGY

A critical task in developing and sustaining partnerships is obtaining continuing resources. Partners note the importance of all agencies seeing a bottom-line funding benefit as a condition for continuing participation. As described below, effective partnerships we researched have developed a diverse funding base by integrating workforce system, community college, public grant and foundation resources, and have developed strategies to continue to seek public and private dollars.

Effective partnerships also need to address the use and distribution of partnership resources. Funding agreements developed between partners drawing on a variety of resources need to provide a framework for the use of diverse funds including community college per-capita funding, workforce system funding, and public and private grants. One means used widely to deploy funds has been to define accepted per-capita costs coupled with achievement of set standards and performance outcomes, an approach now being put in place in Los Angeles to manage current and expected future funding.

A STRATEGY FOR MANAGING CULTURE CLASH

Early experience in many, if not most, of the partnerships we studied included tension or outright conflict between colleges and CBOs over differing expectations and approaches. Several partnerships, recognizing these tensions as inevitable, began to take steps to address them. San Francisco has used its developing memorandum of agreement as an instrument to help smooth cultural and institutional tensions, requiring: that colleges and CBOs agree to pre-determined collaborative meetings; that the college put in place a mechanism to allow community organizations input in selecting instructors (a major issue in some sites) and in developing curricula; and that community organizations allow colleges a role in setting assessment standards for participation. Blurring institutional boundaries in this way, and allowing both partners to take a role in what might previously have been seen as the prerogative of one or the other, appears essential to a well-developed partnership model.

FUNDING PARTNERSHIPS

There is no current designated funding stream for community college/CBO partnerships. However, because these partnerships provide such a wide range of services — including social support, short-term training, long-term training, long-term education, and job placement — they are able to receive support from a broad spectrum of education, workforce and economic development funding streams, as well as private funding. In addition, these frequently high profile initiatives, involving multiple partners and high level employment and education goals, are good candidates for many state and federal discretionary grants seeking projects that can meet just these criteria. For community colleges in particular, partnership with CBOs can open a wide range of workforce system resources that more typically support CBOs in delivering services to the economically disadvantaged.

Our research shows that partnerships can access the following kinds of funding for start-up, initial operation and long-term support:

FEDERAL H1B (DOL GRANT)

To help reduce dependence on high skilled foreign workers who now require an H1B visa, the Department of Labor has established a \$300 million funding pool to train American workers in high demand sectors like IT and health. The funding can support both high level training and longer-term pathways that offer sequential training for low-skilled workers. These framing conditions are ideal for community college/CBO collaborations, offering the opportunity to fund partnerships providing multiple levels of training. The San Francisco and East Bay partnerships have together accessed \$6 million in new funding from this source. (The current administration has proposed ending these grants with the current fiscal year, although there is Congressional support for their continuation.)

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (WIA)

As the designated federal funding pool for employment and training, WIA can support a broad range of short-term training and employment programs. Funding is allocated by the state, often through discretionary grants, and at the local level through WIBs. WIBs typically allocate funding for support services, individual training vouchers, and employment subsidies.

The partnerships studied have been particularly successful in garnering state WIA funding. San Francisco has received \$1.2 million through this source, and Capital IDEA approximately \$380,000. The Daley/Instituto del Progreso partnership has also been funded with state WIA dollars. As noted above, community-college/CBO partnerships are well-positioned to receive this kind of discretionary funding due to their visibility, innovative nature and focus on high wages and career progression.

Local WIA funding has been more problematic. While some partnerships are funded through WIA training vouchers, this funding source typically favors short-term training conducted by a single institution, often a proprietary school. A number of WIBs do not typically fund partnerships and provide only limited funding to community colleges, which are presumed to already be receiving state training money through per-capita funding. WIBs adopting this stance are forgoing an important opportunity to extend their own funding by leveraging community college resources. In addition, this position tends to undercut the larger goal of many states to expand the scope and effectiveness of community colleges as workforce institutions.

TRANSITIONAL AID TO NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)

Welfare resources have proved to be another important source of funding for these initiatives. Generated by falling welfare rolls, some states and communities have access to surplus funding (though reportedly fast disappearing in many locations), which can underwrite a wide variety of activities even for non-welfare recipients such as the working poor. The partnership in Austin receives TANF funding, while Los Angeles recently decided to make as much as \$1 million of this funding available primarily for career pathway-centered community college/CBO partnerships.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDING (FTES)

From the perspective of CBOs, community college funding offers a new resource for paying for training services. Through establishing branch campuses at CBO sites, community colleges can access state per capita instructional funds to pay for training and education — training that might previously have been supported by workforce system or private funding. Community college/CBO partnerships in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the East Bay all employ these resources, which typically pay the full salary of program and lab instructors, as well as some additional instructional costs. Estimated community college contributions range from \$60,000-\$200,000 in these partnerships. To compensate colleges for administrative and program costs of

participating in the partnerships, colleges often receive workforce development funds, providing them an additional source of revenue. One caveat to using this funding is that typically colleges require minimum class sizes of 20 participants.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD)

HUD has increasingly focused on supporting education and training as a means of improving the income of federally funded housing site residents. This source of funding could be leveraged for community college/CBO partnerships.

FOUNDATION AND PRIVATE FUNDING

This is a large and potentially growing source of funding for community college/CBO partnerships. A number of foundations focused on workforce development have recently emphasized the importance of both developing pathways and working to ensure that community colleges play a larger and more effective role in workforce development for disadvantaged adults. The initiatives we studied have been successful in garnering support from foundations including Irvine, Annie E. Casey, Packard and MacArthur.

SIGNIFICANT OPERATIONAL ISSUES

Not surprisingly, a number of major operational issues have arisen during the course of operation of the partnerships studied. Common themes include:

CULTURE CLASH

Any partnership is likely to produce tensions as separate entities seek to work together; this is particularly true when institutions are as different as colleges and CBOs. Many partnerships we studied began in a climate characterized both by perceived opportunity and mutual suspicion. Colleges were seen by participating CBOs as large, bureaucratic, inflexible, and insufficiently sensitive to the needs of disadvantaged students. CBOs were viewed by many colleges as inattentive to standards, and at times, unprepared to manage or facilitate a structured academic program.

These tensions have been manifested in a number of operational problems. There has been concern at several institutions over maintaining standards for classroom instruction, curriculum, and awarding of credit. Practical manifestations have included delays in approving new curricula and in certifying CBO instructors as college adjuncts.

Two examples, drawn from program operations, provide a window into the kinds of issues that can arise when colleges and community organizations work together:

1. Prior to establishing a community college partnership, one East Bay CBO was successfully delivering non-credit A+ training. Partnership with a local college brought with it college credit but also a number of new problems including: the college's desire to develop and approve its own A+ curriculum, a lengthy process; the college's reluctance to certify the CBO instructor as a college adjunct since he did not meet established minimum qualifications; and the high initial payment the college sought to cover administrative and start-up costs.
2. In another site in Los Angeles, one CBO felt that the college instructor assigned was condescending and arrogant towards both staff and participants, and insensitive to the needs of students requiring extra assistance. The CBO complained to the college, but was informed that college standards of academic freedom and union agreements prevented any removal of the instructor absent demonstrated proof of malfeasance.

While both these issues were eventually resolved, they point to the need for sites to develop a formal strategy to manage cultural and institutional conflicts.

COST

While partnerships bring with them new funding opportunities, they also can incur high costs reflecting start-up expenses, new facilities, and the need for additional operational staff. Initial costs in the programs surveyed ranged from \$3,000 to as much as \$7,500 per program graduate.

For many CBOs, particularly those that had previously operated their own training programs, the cost of new partnership programs appears high, and there has been concern that the benefits of college credit and instruction are not worth the price, particularly in a difficult funding environment.

Costs remain high in a number of the programs studied, although they appear to be declining with time. To a large extent, initial CBO concerns over cost have been mitigated by greatly increased funding opportunities (see above) stemming from partnership initiatives, and from an increasing appreciation of college credit as a credential with real value in the marketplace.

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

The partnerships have taken a distinctly different approach to governance and management. Some, such as the developing partnership in New York, have begun with a clear executive or convening body that helped to set rules and structure the terms of partnership operations. Others, such as Los Angeles

and San Francisco, began with more informal relationships and agreements, often negotiated between colleges and community organizations. These agreements were the natural outgrowth of the small scale pilot programs which characterized the first year of the partnerships.

Over time, however, the informal relationships exemplified by the California IT initiatives have proven insufficient to resolve many of the issues that have arisen in the course of the initiatives. There has been tension at these sites regarding operating roles, distribution of funding, and resolution of problems. New funding, while providing resources for long-sought program components (such as paid 'try-out' employment) has also revealed the lack of an adequate infrastructure to manage a new large scale effort that includes funding for CBO service provision, college service provision, paid work experience and administrative staff. Recognizing these issues, two of the California collaboratives have developed a new organizational structure, as well as new operating agreements.

A formal operating structure alone will not solve all program issues. Nevertheless, the lesson that emerges from the experience of these partnerships to date is the need to move toward an executive or management structure governed by written agreements.

FACULTY OPPOSITION

Outright faculty opposition to development of partnership programs was rare in the partnerships studied. This was likely due to the fact that most of the colleges, as primary urban education institutions for their communities, already serve a disadvantaged population, and are experiencing many of the same issues as the CBOs — inadequate preparation, high dropout rates and the need for additional support. Nevertheless, experience shows this is a potential issue at community colleges, as is, for some faculty, any perceived dilution of the academic mission of the college in favor of short-term vocational training.

INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES

To encourage expansion of community college/CBO partnerships, it is important for policymakers, college administrators and program operators to have a measured understanding of the incentives and disincentives for participating in these initiatives. In our research, the following factors emerged:

FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

INCENTIVES

EXPANDED REACH AND NEW STUDENTS

In most states, per capita reimbursement (often known as Full Time Equivalent or FTEs) is a primary source of college funding. Frequently, both the total pool of this funding and individual college allotments are capped at a certain set level. For those colleges under this cap, partnerships with CBOs can provide an important source of new students, and thus revenue, with newly established classes drawing down additional state funding.

The importance of establishing this relationship for colleges is underlined by the experience of City College of San Francisco (CCSF), which recently had its cap reduced by the state due to prior under-enrollment. As the CCSF Chancellor noted, if the college had established these partnerships three years ago, CCSF could have generated needed enrollment and avoided significant budget cuts.

A related incentive for colleges is that students, once enrolled, can advance to higher-level courses (difficult to fill at some colleges), drawing in additional revenue. At Compton College in Los Angeles advanced IT courses are under-enrolled. New CBO students now completing entry-level IT training are a prime recruitment pool.

BETTER PREPARATION

Students at most community colleges are unprepared for college-level work. Nationally over 30% of students are enrolled in some remedial program, while the rate at many urban colleges is over 50%. In Texas, for example, 71% of community college applicants fail to pass the community college entrance test.

CBO partnerships offer colleges the opportunity to deliver necessary preparation and basic skills off-campus, in programs largely funded by other resources. Students completing preparatory programs meet college entry-level standards, are motivated to move on, and are assisted in making the transition to college by CBO and college staff. As the experience of programs we studied shows, program graduates frequently have high success rates in college courses.

BETTER SUPPORT

A recent MDRC study shows that a primary reason disadvantaged students do not succeed in college is inadequate social support.⁴ CBOs providing (as their primary mission) supports including case management, counseling, housing and transportation assistance are in a much better position than colleges to prepare disadvantaged students to succeed. Again, high completion, retention, and advancement rates reported in many of the programs studied provide at least anecdotal evidence that the addition of CBO support aids college enrollment and transition.

NEW FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

In today's environment of high unemployment rates and budget cuts, colleges are struggling with increased enrollment and lower state funding. Many, previously under cap, are now at their state generated funding limit.

Partnership with CBOs offers colleges new access to a wide variety of funding opportunities including federal grants, WIA, and foundation funding. While colleges are not precluded from these resources, partnership with CBOs, particularly around pathway programs, can increase resource opportunities. Increasing research focusing on the role of community colleges in workforce development for disadvantaged adults, and increasing foundation interest in the potential of partnerships between colleges and CBOs have already stimulated interest in and resources for these initiatives.

COMMUNITY VISIBILITY

Partnerships with CBOs offer colleges increased visibility in the community through providing an established presence at neighborhood-based organizations. As one college vice-president noted, this visibility is important for colleges as it increases political support, helps generate greater awareness and interest for colleges seeking public approval of bond financing, and serves as a recruitment and public relations tool.

DISINCENTIVES

START-UP REQUIREMENTS

Creating a partnership with one or more community organizations requires an initial investment of time, resources and staff for already pressed college administrators. Often, effectively overseeing a partnership will require a significant staff commitment, ultimately calling for a designated full or part-time administrator. At the same time, the nature of partnerships is that the initial commitment of planning resources often precedes new cash flow and financial support, increasing the administrative burden.

LIMITED SCOPE

For large urban community colleges serving tens of thousands of students a single partnership with a CBO may not appear to justify the necessary initial commitment of time and resources. This is particularly true when a college has already reached its enrollment cap, thus limiting the potential for new internal funding, while the potential for external funding, which can be significant, is not at first apparent. For this reason, colleges may be more interested in developing partnerships with a network of community and workforce organizations, with increased opportunities for funding and scale.

FACULTY AND UNION ISSUES

As above, few of the partnerships have reported significant conflicts with college faculty. Nevertheless, partnerships that involve new curricula, certification of new instructors, and issues of off-site delivery all have the potential to conflict with pre-existing agreements or regulations. For this reason, effective partnerships need to ensure, through college coordinators, that key faculty and staff are aware of and approve partnership efforts.

FOR CBOS

INCENTIVES

PATHWAYS

For the CBOs we studied, perhaps the biggest incentive to participate in partnerships is the ability to offer a greatly expanded range of educational and career opportunities to participants. Through the college connection, CBOs can provide a bridge to a wide range of community college career pathways, as well as offer college credit training directly, frequently on-site. A number of CBOs reported that participants' ambitions and self-esteem increased as a direct result of the college connection.

IMPROVED ON-SITE TRAINING

Although some CBOs have previously offered similar on-site training on a non-credit basis, others have not. Connection with the colleges has allowed CBOs, assisted by high level, experienced college faculty, to develop new post-secondary level training in areas such as Cisco or Unix, with the added bonus of being able to provide the new classes at their community sites. The college partnership also gives CBOs the opportunity to improve their clients' basic skills through new contextualized courses now being developed in a number of cities.

Where it is sometimes difficult for CBOs providing their own training to track industry trends and assure that training reflects new technology, the college connection opens access to new curricula as it evolves, an important feature in some fields, such as IT. This advantage has been particularly evident in San Francisco where one advising college faculty member is part of the national industry advisory board developing the certification test that all program graduates must pass.

Some CBOs also report benefits from certifying their instructors as college faculty (although this can also be a frustrating process). This has resulted in immediately higher salaries (as much as \$55/hour) paid for by the college, as well as increased instructor satisfaction.

ENHANCED FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

With recent cuts in employment and training resources, and increasing emphasis by WIBs on funding providers that can meet labor market needs, CBOs throughout the country are in a difficult funding environment. As with community colleges, new partnerships have created new funding opportunities, with CBOs we studied receiving federal H1B, WIA, TANF and foundation grants to support direct operations and training and employment opportunities for graduates. In many cases these organizations have received this funding as a direct result of their participation in partnership initiatives. We believe this reflects the increased emphasis among both public and private funders on a systemic rather than organizational approach to workforce development.

DISINCENTIVES

LOSS OF AUTONOMY

Many of the CBOs we studied had, prior to partnership projects, operated entirely independently, with full responsibility for developing and operating training programs. The link to community colleges, however, has meant particularly for branch campus CBOs, that the college partner has responsibility for curriculum and instructor approval, as well as an important voice in determining how courses are delivered. For some CBOs, particularly those that have not previously operated extensive training programs, this may be a minor issue. For others, however, it has proven to be a concern and a source of some tension.

SHARED FUNDING BASE

A related disincentive is the need for CBOs, used to independent fund-raising, to share funds with the college and frequently with other community partners. In many cases the traditional funding base for CBOs overlaps that for newly established partnerships, requiring CBOs to decide whether this distinct change in direction is a fiscal benefit.

HIGH COST

As noted earlier, start-up and operational costs are often higher in partnership programs than in more traditional training programs. For some CBOs, the immediate practical impact of partnerships is that they are paying higher costs for similar training with less control over day-to-day operations. Again, CBOs need to consider whether the longer-term benefits of partnership justify the short-term costs.

III. COMMUNITY COLLEGE/ CBO PARTNERSHIPS: CASE STUDIES

AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE/ CAPITAL IDEA PARTNERSHIP

PARTNERS

AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE (ACC)

The local community college that serves the greater Austin metro region and several outlying counties.

CAPITAL IDEA

A community non-profit organization comprised of a coalition of CBOs and employers in the Austin area that is spearheaded by Austin Interfaith, an affiliate of the national Industrial Areas Foundation.

PROGRAMS

The purpose of the ACC/Capital IDEA partnership is to provide low-income adults with the education and skills necessary to enter and succeed at high-skilled and high-value occupations. The emphasis is on assisting these individuals with earning a postsecondary credential. To this end, Capital IDEA operates three basic programs, two of which are in partnership with ACC.

TIER I

Tier I, Capital IDEA's primary training program, focuses on long-term postsecondary training in health care, high technology (network administration, integrated circuit mask layout design, semi-conductor and electronic technology) and accounting. The program is designed to enroll adults in ACC credit and degree programs that result in associate's degrees or certificates. Capital IDEA recruits participants, prepares them for college-level work and supports them during their time in school. One component of this effort is the "College Preparation Academy." This program is designed to help basic skills students pass the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP), which is required for entrance into degree/credit programs. This program helps students with academic skills in reading, writing and mathematics and is operated in partnership with ACC.

TIER II

This second tier program provides short-term, customized training based on the demands of employers and the availability of specific employment opportunities. The training used in this program involves local vendors, which could include ACC.

TIER III

The third component helps participants gain the education and skills needed to participate in postsecondary education through adult education, ESL, and GED classes. This program is operated in partnership with a consortium consisting of Austin Interfaith, the local school district, and ACC.

All participants have access to support services such as child-care, transportation, emergency assistance and counseling/case management.

PARTNERSHIP

Capital IDEA and ACC operate as partners for both components of the Tier I training (credit programs and Academy training). Capital IDEA does not have its own facility for training (it does not want such a facility), and thus relies on the college for space and facilities. In addition, ACC contributes to the partnership in the following ways:

- Targeting quality instructors for Capital IDEA students/classes;
- Arranging classes to take cohorts of Capital IDEA participants;
- Putting extra resources into college tutoring support;
- Upgrading programs in response to Capital IDEA employer needs; and
- Rearranging lab schedules to accommodate students.

For Tier II, Capital IDEA seeks the best vendor, thus when it works with ACC it is a contracted relationship, not a partnership. Tier III's Adult Education component is a partnership of Austin Interfaith, the Austin public school district, and ACC.

PARTICIPANTS AND OUTCOMES

Capital IDEA enrolled its first group of 44 participants in January 1999. After four years of operation, Capital IDEA had enrolled over 600 participants in its programs: 200 had entered employment and over 400 were in active training. Eighty-four percent of participants had engaged in Tier I training, choosing to obtain a certificate or degree. As of December 2002, 344 Tier I participants were studying at ACC or other institutions: 153 in health care, 92 in high tech, 17 in accounting, and 82 in college preparation. Seventy-eight percent of participants who enrolled at ACC in the fall of 2000 returned for the following fall semester. In comparison, 53% of ACC students who enrolled in the fall of 1999 returned the next fall. By the end of 2002, 84 Tier I participants completed their college programs, most in health-related fields, and 97% were employed and earning an average of \$14.21/hour.

During 2002, 130 participants enrolled in the College Preparation Academy. Historically, eighty-seven percent completed the Academy and 86% of the completers began ACC credit courses.

Tier II has graduated 91 students thus far. Program participation has declined as demand on the part of both participants and employers for longer-term training has increased. With regard to Tier III, 54 participants finished ESL training and advanced to further training or career employment. Likewise, 59 passed their GED and are active in classes at ACC or employment. At the time of our research Capital IDEA had 59 participants engaged in ESL or GED education.

FUNDING

Capital IDEA's total budget for FY 2003 was just under \$2.5 million. Its primary funding sources were the City of Austin and Travis County, which used general funds to contribute \$1.5 million. These funds are generated by the political efforts of Austin Interfaith, which has made livable wage jobs a priority in local politics. Other funding comes from federal Wagner Peysler, state economic development training programs, private sector contributions, and in-kind contributions.

No funds are generated from the local workforce or TANF systems, which are integrated into one regional body. TANF training funds are not available locally as the system's emphasis is work-first. Capital IDEA now co-enrolls participants with the local One-Stop Center for training and support services, including child care and transportation.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Costs: Tier I training costs approximately \$10,000 per participant, provided they finish in a two-year period. Extra time for completion adds another approximate \$2,500 annually for support services. The operational cost for the Academy is \$40,000 per semester for a class of fifty. Tier II training for the new IT program is approximately \$3,500 (\$1,600 training costs plus \$1,900 support services) per participant for an eight-month program that leads to A+ and Network+ certifications. For Tier III, the Adult Education program costs \$15,000 per semester for a class of 20 students. Flexible resources from the city and county allow Capital IDEA to first fund students with training resources and to then fill in the gaps with the flexible dollars. Capital IDEA has a waiting list of participants and thus could serve more if additional funds were available.

DIFFERING CULTURES

Capital IDEA serves students that ordinarily have difficulty accessing and succeeding in postsecondary education. A primary stumbling block is the TASP, since in 1998-1999 71% of applicants to Texas community colleges failed to pass all three of its sections. Capital IDEA also serves a large population of non-native English speakers. To enter post-secondary education, they must become proficient not only in speaking, but also in reading and writing at the college level. In preparation for the TASP, Tier III students transition to at least one semester of college level English-as-Second Language classes at ACC before entering the College Preparatory Academy.

WORK/INCOME

Capital IDEA does not have resources to provide stipends or internships for students. Capital IDEA counselors help participants budget so that they can support themselves and their families with part-time employment while going to school. Capital IDEA partnering employers are often able to provide part-time "survival" jobs for students in their industries.

FACILITIES

Capital IDEA does not own, or want responsibility for, land and facilities. As such, all training is done at partners' sites. ACC has made room available for the Academy when it had unoccupied space, but has sometimes not wanted to provide a room when other college courses might want the space. Since the Academy does not generate state FTEs, ACC is less interested in letting the program use its facilities. At one point, Interfaith Austin had to intervene politically to keep space for the Academy when ACC wanted to use it for another class. Efforts are now underway to get dedicated space for the Academy.

BAY AREA TRAINING AND EDUCATION COLLABORATIVE

PARTNERS

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (CCC)
 Located in Western Contra Costa County, California.

ALAMEDA COLLEGE (AC)
 One of 4 colleges in the Peralta Community College District.

THE BAY AREA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COLLABORATIVE (BAY ITC)
 A 26 community college membership organization devoted to improving the quality of IT instruction in California.

CBOS

URBAN VOICE (UV)
 A CBO located in Oakland, CA. The organization is dedicated to training and placing low-income residents of Alameda County in living wage IT jobs.

STREET TECH (ST)
 A CBO located in San Pablo, California. The organization is dedicated to training and placing low-income residents of Contra Costa County in living wage IT jobs.

EASTMONT COMPUTER CENTER

The IT training branch of a CBO, the Oakland Citizens Committee for Urban Renewal (OCCUR). OCCUR, founded in 1954, provides a wide variety of services to Oakland residents; Eastmont primarily serves residents of East Oakland, one of the city’s most impoverished communities.

BAYTEC

An Oakland CBO, and a collaborative of approximately 30 organizations in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, including all of the above organizations.

OTHER PARTNERS

CYPRESS-MANDELA TECHNOLOGY TRAINING CENTER (CM)

A program of the Oakland Private Industry Council, located in Oakland, CA.

RICHMOND WORKS

The operations arm of the City of Richmond WIB. Richmond Works is the lead and fiscal agent for a \$3M H1B Technical Skills Grant from the USDOL.

PROGRAMS

The Bay Area Training and Education Collaborative (BayTEC) was established to create pathways to IT careers for disadvantaged adults, and to provide ongoing training for incumbent and dislocated workers who are moving up the IT career ladder. CBOs, government agencies and community colleges jointly operate training programs offering pre-vocational, entry-level and advanced IT training. Pre-vocational training is designed to rapidly prepare adults to gain entry-level proficiency for IT training, because admission to vocational training requires 9th grade reading and math skills. Pre-vocational training requires considerable development of contextualized curricula. Entry-level training combines classroom and lab instruction, delivered for college credit, with soft skills training and wrap-around social support services included in the program. Advanced IT training generally involves incumbent and dislocated workers who already have IT skills.

The total number of hours for pre-vocational training is 180 hours over a college semester of 18 weeks. The entry-level training is approximately 290 hours, providing 12 units of transferable college credit. Upgrade training is approximately 200-400 hours, with the majority of training provided for college credit. All instructional services are delivered on-site at CBOs by accredited college faculty.

At the time of this study, the BayTEC program was in its second semester; during the first semester two pilot A+ classes were offered. One was at CM, provided jointly by UV and the College of Alameda. The second was at the ST site, provided jointly by ST and CCC. During the current semester, pre-vocational training

is being offered at Eastmont (by Eastmont and AC jointly); A+ training is being offered at CM (by UV and AC) and at ST (by ST and CCC); and advanced training, Network Essentials, is being offered at CM (by UV and AC). ST and UV were planning additional advance training starting in January 2003 (Microsoft Certified Professional at ST, Cisco at UV/CM).

PARTNERSHIP

The program model is based on a formal written agreement with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. CBOs and One-Stops, the agencies closest to the community, are responsible for outreach, recruitment, screening, case management and social support, and aid in placement. CBOs also serve as the site for instruction, and in some cases, provide instructors who are certified by a community college. Community colleges develop the curriculum and deliver for-credit instruction on-site, creating a “branch campus.” Colleges draw down per-capita state funding to assist with the cost of instruction. At one site, colleges have certified CBO staff as college instructors, and contribute to salaries and benefits. CBOs and government agencies provide most of the funding for programs, as community colleges are not able to allocate resources to the programs, outside of California state apportionment funds, to pay for instructor salaries.

PARTICIPANTS AND OUTCOMES

BayTEC started serving disadvantaged individuals in 2001. The first AC/UV A+ class graduated in June 2002. Of the 34 students enrolled in the class: 68% graduated with a passing grade; 52% continued their education and enrolled in advanced training; and 17% passed both parts of the CompTIA A+ and have their A+ certification. In addition, 30% of graduates found employment at an average wage of \$20.12/hour.

The first CCC/ST A+ class concluded in July 2002. Of the 25 students enrolled in the class: 68% graduated with a passing grade; 37% continued their education and enrolled in advanced training (Microsoft Certified Professional); 89% passed both parts of the CompTIA A+ and have their A+ certification; and 47% found employment at an average wage of \$15/hour.

FUNDING

BayTEC and partner organizations received over \$5 million in funding to support the program for two years. 60% came from Federal H1B funding and just over 20% from Caltrans. The remainder is from a variety of sources including the James Irvine Foundation, US Department of Education, America Connects Community Technology Center funds, community college FTE apportionment instructional support, State Employment Training Panel, SBC Corporation, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Overall costs: The program costs per participant have not been determined. However, the program is projected to serve approximately 450 individuals over 2 years, and the currently identified funding for the program is \$6,350,000. The majority of the current funding supports CBOs in recruitment, outreach, screening, case management, social support, job placement, job retention, program administration and direct cash aid to participants (in the form of book vouchers, tools, and certification exam fees). The cash value of the community college participation is approximately \$1,200/participant (based on \$30,000/class of CA State apportionment funds, and an average class size of 25).

COMMUNITY COLLEGE COSTS

Community colleges have asked for additional cost reimbursement to cover compensation for faculty in non-instructional activities such as staff development, interaction time with CBO staff to resolve academic and non-academic problems experienced by students, and college management staff participation in ongoing program activities (staff training, regular instructor/CBO staff case conferences, etc.).

INTERNSHIP COSTS

Another cost challenge for BayTEC is funding internships for program participants. Internships were not anticipated or budgeted for in early program models. Recent experience in the job market indicates that program participants are not finding work very easily due to a lack of experience. Internships offer the best solution to the problem of employability for participants, however funding internships (about \$5,400/participant) will be demanding.

WORK/INCOME

The program provides a subsidy to some participants, which will present a resources challenge when current funding finishes. While many participants are working (few receive public benefits), their income is inadequate for book costs (in some cases over \$200/class) and certification testing. Childcare, especially for female participants, is also problematic; some students missed many classes because they couldn't find childcare, and in some instances they had to bring their children to class, which proved to be disruptive at times.

EMPLOYER DEVELOPMENT

In 2000, when the program was originally conceived, the economy was booming in the Bay Area, IT jobs were plentiful, and job placement was not expected to be a problem. As the economy has contracted, BayTEC and partner CBOs have experienced difficulty with job placement, although this situation appears to be improving.

COUNSELING/SUPPORT SERVICES

BayTEC programs include support services, such as academic and social support counseling by full-time CBO staff. Screening and previous experience of CBOs and community colleges indicate that participants will need considerable direct support. An emphasis on services alongside instruction is a major strength of the program. Integrating community college instructor observations of students' needs with CBO responses to those needs is a challenge. Protocols for transfer of this kind of information are few. BayTEC has contracted with Bay ITC to facilitate monthly joint case conferences with community college and CBO staff.

CONSTITUENCY

As expected, BayTEC pilot programs, conducted in spring 2002, were not very diverse; women in particular were under represented. Fall 2002 recruitment proved to be difficult. The One-Stop was not involved in the process (due to a breakdown in negotiations about cost to BayTEC for One-Stop services), and the One-Stop had been the single largest source of program referrals. Also, interest in IT training dropped dramatically in the Bay Area. Community colleges in the Bay Area report that enrollments for on-campus IT classes are, in some cases, down by 50%. As a result, Fall 2002 classes barely made minimum enrollments, and the readiness (academically, interpersonally and financially) of participants may be less than desired.

LOS ANGELES INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) CONSORTIUM

PARTNERS

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A single college district serving a largely Hispanic and African-American population. With the support of Microsoft, Compton recently constructed an IT training center.

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE (LACC)

Part of the nine-college Los Angeles District. LACC offers a wide range of programs, including extensive training in IT.

CBOS

GOODWILL

A national non-profit, with a Los Angeles center located in the northeast part of the city. Goodwill serves a diverse population including working adults, welfare recipients and disabled individuals. The Los Angeles location is also a satellite in the city's One-Stop system.

CHRYSALIS

A community non-profit, located in the heart of Los Angeles' skid row, that targets the city's homeless population. Chrysalis operates basic training and employment programs, including a staffing agency and street and neighborhood clean-up crews.

BREAKAWAY

A community technology center located in South Central Los Angeles, a primarily African-American neighborhood. Breakaway operates computer training programs at its own site, as well as at a network of neighborhood technology training centers.

PROGRAMS

The Los Angeles Information Technology Consortium (LAITC), which also includes Workplace Hollywood, an entertainment industry-sponsored workforce development entity, the Los Angeles City WIB, the county social services agency, and Workforce Strategy Center, was established to create pathways to IT careers for disadvantaged adults.

The community colleges and CBOs jointly operate a 16-week training program leading to A+ certification. The LAITC program offers 13 college credits to participants upon program completion. Participants passing the A+ test also receive industry driven national certification. Community college credit has proven to be important to employers who view the college connection as providing increased credibility to program graduates, particularly those without any formal educational credentials. Entry into the LAITC program requires 9th grade literacy skills. The program combines credit-bearing classroom and lab instruction with non-credit soft skills training. The program also incorporates a number of paid try-out employment placements following program completion. Total number of hours is approximately 300, including 220 college credit hours. College instruction is delivered on-site at the partner CBOs.

Two of the CBOs currently offer some form of preparatory training intended to assist those with lower reading and computer skill levels. In addition, the program provides an intensive emphasis on support services, including having a counselor present in the classroom during instruction to assist students and provide any needed individual counseling. Staff members feel this has been a major strength of the program, contributing to the high retention and certification rates of the pilot classes.

A formal contextualized literacy program, targeted to those reading at the sixth grade level, is planned for the fall of 2002. The LAITC also plans to develop upgrade training in network administration and Microsoft system administrator certification.

PARTNERSHIP

The program model is based on a formal partnership with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The division of responsibilities is as follows:

CBOS

- Recruitment and selection of participants
- Pre-training preparation
- Curriculum development
- Case management
- Placement
- Post-placement retention and advancement

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

- Curriculum development
- A+ instruction
- Post-placement retention and advancement

OTHER PARTNERS

- Placement (Workplace Hollywood and Workforce Strategy Center)

CBOs, as the agencies closest to the neighborhood, are responsible for recruitment, screening, case management and social support, and aid in placement. CBOs also serve as the site for instruction, and in some cases, have provided instructors who are then certified by the community college.

Community colleges develop the curriculum and deliver for-credit instruction on-site, creating a "branch campus." Colleges draw down per-capita state funding to assist with the cost of instruction. In one site the colleges have certified CBO staff as college instructors and assumed responsibility for salaries and employment.

The extended pathway model, linking community colleges and CBOs in a growing citywide IT career ladder has provided significant benefits to participating CBOs and their clients. CBOs have been able to offer new training and employment opportunities, improve the quality of their training, and develop a higher profile with employers such as the Los Angeles Unified School District. The pathways framework has also assisted in fundraising, extending foundation opportunities, leveraging new public funding and opening the opportunity to apply for large-scale regional grants such as the federal H1B proposal. Most importantly, the pathway has proven to be an incentive for participants, who view it as an opportunity to receive more advanced training and higher wages.

To date, participation in the pathways framework has offered less clear benefit to colleges, likely due to the small scale to date and consequent limited impact on large institutions such as LACC. Planned expansion of the Consortium to include as many as ten new classes, as well as the addition of new kinds of training, such as contextualized basic skills, will likely increase benefits to colleges for participation.

PARTICIPANTS AND OUTCOMES

The program, which began in February 2002, enrolled 50 students and graduated 45 in the first two classes, with 42 achieving A+ certification. The certification rate for the first class was 84%. To date, approximately 50% of graduates in the recently completed first class have been placed in jobs with wages starting at \$14/hour and above.

FUNDING

The LAITC receives approximately \$1 million in funding. Eighty percent comes from the James Irvine Foundation and Workplace Hollywood with the remainder provided by community college FTE per capita instructional support, state WIA discretionary funding, and the Los Angeles Unified School District.

The total cost per participant is approximately \$5,000. The program model anticipates community colleges drawing down state instructional support in return for additional funding for administration and program costs provided by the workforce system and private funders. To date, the program has not benefited from local WIA resources, as Los Angeles has focused current WIA funding on core services and employer outreach and support. LAITC does expect to access WIA funding to support try-out employment. LAITC also anticipates support from the Los Angeles County Department of Social Services, which plans to employ TANF funding to serve up to 100 students under 200% of the poverty level.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

COSTS

As noted above, program costs average \$5,000 per person. Of this amount, approximately \$4,000 supports CBOs in recruitment, outreach, case management and social support, as well as program administration. Approximately \$1,000 per participant helps defray the cost of community college participation. To aid in employer recruitment, the program has recently instituted a three-month try-out employment component, including a 50% wage subsidy. This subsidy, which has proven effective in employer engagement, adds approximately \$4,000 per person to program costs.

Currently the majority of costs are covered through Workplace Hollywood and the James Irvine Foundation. As the program matures, an increasing portion of funding will need to come from the public system. The Consortium is currently pursuing three additional sources of funding: LA County TANF funds, which county staff has proposed as a potential source of support for 100 additional participants; LA WIA funding that can support employer development; and the federal H1B program, which can underwrite a wide variety of program costs. The LAITC is also continuing to employ state community college per capita funding to underwrite instructional costs for the program.

DIFFERING CULTURES

Differences in institutional culture contributed to tensions during the first year of program operation. In one of the two partnership classes, the CBO reported that the outside community college instructor was insensitive to student needs and culture, and the partner organizations had difficulty developing an effective working relationship. In the other partnership class, the instructor was recruited from the CBO, and certified and employed by the community college. Not surprisingly, this proved to be a more effective instructional model and has been adopted by the partnership as the basis for future classes.

FORMAL AGREEMENT

The program began without a formal written agreement between and among program partners, leading to increased difficulty in resolving issues. The program has now adopted a formal memorandum of agreement, which includes expectations, standards, roles and responsibilities, allocation of funding and provision for frequent consultation.

WORK/INCOME

The program provided no subsidy to participants. Most participants in the evening classes were either working or receiving some form of public or private support.

EMPLOYER DEVELOPMENT

Initially, program planners expected Workplace Hollywood to be the primary source of employer development, building on its pre-existing relationship with the entertainment industry. In practice this has not been the case, as entertainment industry positions have proved scarce. The program has turned to developing relationships with large IT employers in other sectors such as government, retail and computer services. For example, the program will place 18 graduates in paid internships at the Los Angeles Unified School District, which school officials believe will likely lead to full-time, civil service employment. Working in collaboration with other partners, the program has had success in developing an employment model that begins with a ninety-day subsidized placement.

SAN FRANCISCO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CONSORTIUM

PARTNERS

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO (CCSF)

California's largest community college, which offers a broad range of training to nearly 100,000 students.

GLIDE CHURCH

One of San Francisco's largest social service providers. Glide serves one million meals per year and offers a comprehensive array of services including health care, drug and alcohol counseling, housing assistance and job training. Glide is located in the Tenderloin, one of the city's poorest neighborhoods.

JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICES (JVS)

A community training provider targeting both the refugee and resident low income populations. In addition to English and basic skills, JVS provides career pathway training in health and information technology careers.

PROGRAMS

The San Francisco Information Technology Consortium (SFITC), which also includes two other CBOs — Goodwill and the Bay Area Video Coalition (BAVC) — as well as the city's Department of Human Services (DHS), the San Francisco WIB, and Workforce Strategy Center, was established to create pathways to IT careers for disadvantaged adults. The community colleges and CBOs jointly operate entry-level training programs leading to A+ certification, as well as more advanced training in Cisco networking and Unix. The SFITC program offers nine college credits to participants upon program completion. Participants passing the A+ test also receive an industry driven national certification. The community college credit has proven to be important to employers who view the college connection as providing increased credibility to program graduates, particularly those without any formal educational credentials. A number of the employment options explored, such as those with city government, also call for a college degree.

Admission to the entry-level programs requires 9th grade literacy skills. Entry-level training combines classroom and lab instruction, delivered for college credit, with soft skills training. The program also incorporates a number of paid try-out employment placements following program completion. The total number of hours for most of the entry-level training is approximately 300, including 220 college credit hours. Upgrade training is approximately 200-400 hours, with the majority of training provided for college credit. College instruction is delivered on-site at CBOs.

Glide currently offers preparatory training, intended to assist those with lower reading and computer skill levels. The Consortium programs include an intensive emphasis on support services, including, at the Glide site, a counselor present in the classroom during instruction to assist students and provide any needed individual counseling. The San Francisco programs also emphasize an in-depth assessment process to determine participant readiness prior to enrollment. Staff members feel the emphasis on services alongside instruction has been a major strength of the program, contributing to the high retention and certification rates of the pilot classes.

A formal contextualized literacy program, targeted to those reading at the sixth grade level was planned for later in the year. The SFITC also planned to develop upgrade training in network administration and Microsoft system administrator certification.

PARTNERSHIP

The SFITC program model is based on a formal partnership with clearly defined roles and responsibilities:

CBOS

- Recruitment and selection
- Pre-training preparation
- Curriculum development
- Case management
- Post-placement retention and advancement

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

- Curriculum development
- Entry-level skills instruction
- Upgrade skills instruction
- Post-placement retention and advancement

CBOs, as the agencies closest to the neighborhood, are responsible for recruitment, screening, case management and social support, and aid in placement. CBOs also serve as the site for instruction, and in some cases, have provided instructors who are then certified by the community college.

The community college develops the curriculum and delivers for-credit instruction on-site, creating a "branch campus." The college draws down per-capita state funding to assist with the cost of instruction. In one site, colleges have certified CBO staff as college instructors and assumed responsibility for salary and employment. The SFITC and Workforce Strategy Center share the responsibility for job placement.

The extended pathway model, linking community colleges and CBOs in a growing citywide IT career ladder, has provided significant benefits to participating CBOs and their clients. CBOs have been able to offer new training and employment opportunities to participants, improve the quality of their training, and develop new recruitment and referral relationships with other community-based training providers. A substantial portion of the

JVS Cisco class, for example, consists of Glide graduates. The pathways framework has also assisted in fundraising, extending foundation opportunities, leveraging new public funding and opening the opportunity to apply for large-scale regional grants such as the federal H1B proposal. Most importantly, the pathway has proven to be an incentive for participants, who view it as an opportunity to receive more advanced training, higher wages and to advance their educational credentials.

Participation in the pathways framework has also offered some benefit to the CCSF, which has raised its community profile, is developing new relationships with CBOs, and has benefited from state and federal grants. As its Chancellor has noted, if the college had participated to any significant extent in partnerships with CBOs earlier, it could have avoided recent budget cuts due to failure to meet enrollment goals. The intensive support provided to participants has also created a high retention rate for college courses.

FUNDING

The SFITC receives nearly \$5 million in funding, largely from state WIA discretionary funding and federal H1B funding, and also from the James Irvine Foundation, the Osher Foundation, and community college FTE per capita instructional support. The program model anticipates community colleges drawing down state instructional support in return for additional funding for administration and program costs provided by the workforce system and private funders.

PARTICIPANTS AND OUTCOMES

The SFITC college training programs have enrolled approximately 170 students, with graduation rates at approximately 75%. Several entry level computer technician cohorts achieved 100% A + certification rates, although success has been significantly lower in the last two classes. 72 students have been enrolled in upgrade training in Cisco, Unix and networking skills. Approximately 50% of students completing initial upgrade training classes in Cisco and Unix have been placed at average annual wages of approximately \$40,000.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

COSTS

Program costs average \$5,000 per person. Of this amount, approximately \$4,000 supports CBOs in recruitment, outreach, case management and social support, as well as program administration. Approximately \$1,000 per participant helps defray the cost of community college participation. As with other sites, there was initially some resistance from CBOs to the relatively high cost of college participation, which has mitigated over time. With support from state and federal grants, SFITC plans to put in place a three month try-out employment component, including a 50% wage subsidy. This subsidy, which has proven effective in employer engagement, adds approximately \$4,000 per person to program costs.

COLLEGE PARTNERSHIP

The Consortium initially had difficulty engaging the sustained interest and support of CCSF in developing partnerships with participating CBOs. As a result, the Consortium sought a partnership with Mission College of Santa Clara, which provided instructional services, on a contract basis, for the first year of program operation. Continued discussion, and pressure from CCSF board members led to a renewed relationship between the college and CBOs, which is now evolving into an effective and expanding partnership.

DIFFERING CULTURES

In contrast to other Irvine initiative sites such as Los Angeles, there has been little evidence of tension between community colleges and CBO culture in the classroom. There have, however, been agency and bureaucratic tensions over issues such as crediting instructors, approving curriculum and determining minimum class size. As the Consortium has matured, these issues appear to have diminished.

FORMAL AGREEMENT

The SFITC began without a formal written agreement between and among program partners, leading to some difficulty in resolution of issues. With the assistance of outside facilitation, the initiative has now adopted a formal memorandum of agreement, which includes expectations, standards, roles and responsibilities, allocation of funding and provision for frequent consultation.

WORK/INCOME

The program provides no subsidy to participants. Most participants in the evening classes are either working, or receiving some form of public or private support.

EMPLOYER DEVELOPMENT

At the start of program operations in 2000, the economy was booming in the Bay Area, and IT jobs were plentiful. At that time, most program graduates were placed through IT contracting agencies with employers such as Unisys, Intel, and Charles Schwab. As the economy has contracted, the Consortium has begun a more aggressive placement strategy with a greater focus on public sector paid internships and jobs with employers such as the public schools and city government. Employing grant funding, the Consortium is developing an employer incentive package that includes customized training, paid on-the-job-training, and upgrade training. Recently the Consortium has been asked to fill 15 three to six-month contract positions at the Gap at wages of \$15/hr.

WEST SIDE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AT DALEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND INSTITUTO DEL PROGRESO LATINO

PARTNERS

DALEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Part of the City of Chicago's community college system (City Colleges of Chicago), Daley serves the southwest region of the City, which is where Instituto is located. Daley CC operates the West Side Technical Institute, which is located in the Instituto neighborhood. Among other training opportunities, the Institute has a machine shop for metalworking skills training.

INSTITUTO DEL PROGRESO LATINO

A 25-year-old community nonprofit serving the southwest side of Chicago. The community is primarily low-income Latinos with low basic skills and English as a second language. The area is also industrialized with significant manufacturing.

PROGRAMS

Instituto and West Side Tech jointly operate a 16-week metalworking program designed to prepare economically and educationally disadvantaged adults for jobs in manufacturing. The program also helps local employers find workers for skilled positions.

The program requires 8th grade reading and math and combines classroom instruction with lab or machine shop instruction for a total of 480 hours. Participants completing the 16-week program receive a Certificate for Metalworking from Daley, and five hours of credit toward a degree program. Daley offers a nine-month precision Metalworking program that provides students the skills commensurate with a NIMS level 1 certification. Instituto believes the credit is important since it motivates students, encourages them to think about additional education/training, and raises self-esteem.

In order to meet the needs of more community residents, Instituto now offers an extensive pre-training prep program designed to help prepare participants for the machinist training program. It targets those who test 4-6th grade level on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). The program focuses on basic skills, vocational ESL, and GED. The program is offered in three sites across the community and although open-entry and open-exit, operates on a 14-week session basis. Students typically take two 14-week sessions before entering the machinist training program.

In addition, Instituto has recently started a new IT initiative designed to prepare students for A+ certification. The program is being conducted in partnership with West Side Tech, the City of Chicago, Manpower Inc. and the Chicago Civic Committee. The

program is expected to serve 80 students in the four classes and has a budget of \$260,000 (\$3,250 per participant).

Instituto has also expanded its efforts to train residents for other occupations. This includes creating a welding program and potentially another manufacturing program for a new Ford assembly plant on the southeast side of Chicago. Both of these efforts will require partnerships with different institutions in the City College of Chicago system.

Instituto is working on securing these partnerships and thus serving many more low-income people in the City.

PARTNERSHIP

Instituto could not operate a training program without partnering with West Side Tech. Instituto does not have the facilities or instructional program required to deliver machinist training. In addition, as Instituto has grown and exceeded the capacity of its facilities, West Side has allowed Instituto to use its computer lab facilities for that component of the training.

West Side appreciates the partnership because of its ability to generate new students for the college. In order to facilitate entry into the next level of Metalworking training, West Side has developed special developmental education classes that help prepare students for the more rigorous program. This has presented some scheduling challenges, but the College has worked hard to accommodate the needs of Instituto's students. The partnership operates under a formal agreement. Staff with the two institutions share information, such as attendance data, on a regular basis. The division of responsibilities is as follows:

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

- Technical Specialty Training

CBO

- Recruitment and selection
- Pre-training preparation
- Case management
- Technical Foundations and VESL preparation
- Placement
- Post-placement retention and advancement
- Secure funding to cover costs of program and tuition to the college

PARTICIPANTS AND OUTCOMES

The manufacturing program has graduated 401 participants since its start in 1997. Although exact data is not available, it appears that approximately 550 individuals have enrolled in the program, which results in a completion rate around 75%. For the most recent year studied, Instituto enrolled 153 participants and 138 were scheduled to graduate, for a 90% completion rate. Once again, while no hard data is available, it appears that close to 85% of the graduates become employed in manufacturing with an average starting wage of over \$9.00 an hour. Forty participants have continued their training by enrolling in the advanced manufacturing program at West Side Tech.

Over the past several years, over 200 individuals have enrolled in the pre-training preparation program known as “Pre-Bridges.” It is estimated that all of the students financed with trade adjustment assistance finish and enroll in the Bridge program, while approximately 50% of all other participants make the transition.

FUNDING

Instituto uses a variety of sources to support its program. Funds come from the:

- U.S. Trade Adjustment Assistance program, which provides individual contracts for students at \$5,400 per person over a 12 month period
- WIA training vouchers
- WIA contract dollars as a provider of “core” and “intensive” employment services for WIA participants
- Chicago Empowerment Zone dollars
- State of Illinois job training and economic development dollars

Many of the resources come with the participant, as in a voucher. For example, the \$5,400 Instituto receives for an individual from the Trade Adjustment Assistance program covers participation in the preparation program, machine training program, and the delivery of case management and support services. For participants without a grant of that amount, resources are pulled from various places to support their participation. Altogether, Instituto has a \$1 million dollar budget for this program to serve 200 students annually. Another \$1 million supports three satellite sites to serve residents with core and intensive services under WIA.

There is no separate funding for the preparation program although Instituto does receive state Adult Basic Education dollars. These dollars are used solely for basic literacy programs, as there is great demand in the area from residents. Having done this, however, Instituto has the expertise and experience that allows them to operate its prep program.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

COSTS

As noted, Instituto receives \$5,400 from the Federal trade adjustment program to serve participants over a 12 month period. There is no precise costing detail available from Instituto relative to whether this covers all costs and how it breaks down. Instituto does note that it essentially pays West Side Tech \$600 per participant for the training that takes place in the machine shop and computer lab. The other costs are all born by Instituto as it provides the instructors for all the other classroom lessons of the Bridges and Pre-Bridges programs. Instituto is responsible for all other program activities starting with recruitment and ending with retention and advancement services.

DIFFERING CULTURES

Instituto believes strongly that its role in the project helps to merge the culture of the two institutions into a productive enterprise. Instituto is more performance-driven and focused on the specific outcomes of each participant than is the college, and as a result the CBO offers a type of individualized attention that a community college has difficulty providing for its students. West Side is sensitive to the circumstances of the target population and is committed to working closely with Instituto to share information and to structure programs and instructors so that they are the most appropriate for the target population.

WORK/INCOME

Instituto does not have resources for student stipends in the metalworking program. Students who come from the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program have unemployment insurance funds, which last up to 18 months. Participants must continue in training in order to get funding for this extended period. Other students are expected to make ends meet on their own.

FACILITIES

Instituto has its own facility to provide some of the classroom instruction for participants in the Metalworking program. It does not have machine shop equipment and thus uses the facilities at West Side Tech. This is a primary reason for the partnership. Instituto is also looking to develop programs in other occupational areas such as welding and as such is seeking to partner with other city community colleges that have appropriate facilities and equipment.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

We offer two kinds of recommendations: recommendations to policymakers to provide incentives for development and expansion of community college/CBO partnerships; and recommendations to college and CBO administrators to promote effective operation of partnerships once established.

A. TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND GROWTH OF PARTNERSHIPS

1. THE STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM SHOULD DIRECT SYSTEM RESOURCES TO ENCOURAGE PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. SPECIFICALLY, STATE SYSTEMS SHOULD:

SET ASIDE DISCRETIONARY RESOURCES TO DIRECTLY STIMULATE PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT.

Some states, such as North Carolina, currently set aside funding for community colleges to support pathways programs aimed at low skilled populations. State systems should follow this example by offering interested community colleges seed funding to support start-up costs for CBO partnerships targeted to disadvantaged individuals. Grant dollars should be used to encourage partnerships focused on career pathways with a potential for expansion. System resources should be contingent upon a match of public and private funding.

ADJUST INDIVIDUAL COLLEGE GROWTH LIMITS TO ENCOURAGE ENROLLMENT THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS.

College enrollment limits are set by state systems according to a complex formula. Where feasible, states should allow additional enrollment growth to those colleges that actively seek to establish partnerships for the purpose of increasing recruitment and retention of under-enrolled or low skilled individuals. This would allow partnerships to access FTE funding, while providing an opportunity for colleges to leverage outside resources.

ENCOURAGE COLLEGES TO DELIVER CONTEXTUALIZED BASIC SKILLS TRAINING AS PART OF CAREER PATHWAYS PROGRAMS.

A number of states, including California and North Carolina, have established separate funding pools to support colleges in providing basic skills training. Several programs we visited have used these resources to develop basic skills training contextualized to career pathways and often delivered in alternative settings. These resources can be employed to support community college/CBO partnerships in providing the basic skills needed to ready students for postsecondary training.

PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DISSEMINATION.

Limited staffing means that community colleges lack the personnel and expertise to develop partnerships with CBOs. State systems should fund or designate staff to work with colleges to help develop a vision, framework and guidelines for partnerships, and should assist in initial development activities. As a companion effort, state systems should disseminate successful partnership efforts system-wide and support practitioner networks.

2. THE STATE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD AND GOVERNOR'S OFFICE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE WORKFORCE SYSTEM TO SUPPORT PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. SPECIFICALLY, STATE POLICYMAKERS SHOULD:

DIRECT DISCRETIONARY RESOURCES TO SUPPORT PARTNERSHIPS.

States typically withhold 15% of overall WIA funding for discretionary projects, and have access to other resources, such as worker retraining and economic development funds, as well. To reach underserved populations and promote career pathways, states should set aside some of this funding to support community college/CBO partnerships developed in collaboration with the workforce system.

ENCOURAGE LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS AND WELFARE AGENCIES TO SUPPORT PARTNERSHIPS.

Many WIBs have taken only a limited role in developing regional workforce strategies. This is true to an even greater extent of county welfare agencies. Both entities can, however, set aside resources to support career pathway projects and can encourage development of community and regional partnerships as part of a broader workforce strategy. Washington State, for example, has supported community colleges in development of career pathways as state policy. State workforce agencies and the Governor's office should, to the extent feasible, follow this example and encourage community college/CBO partnerships as one element of workforce strategy.

PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

State WIBs and Labor Departments frequently have an existing structure to offer technical assistance and support to regional workforce agencies. States should employ this mechanism to aid regional WIBs in working with colleges, CBOs, and other partners to create regional career pathways strategies targeted to underserved populations. State staff should assist WIBs in convening partnerships, targeting high wage career pathways, integrating partnerships and developing programs.

3. THE PHILANTHROPIC COMMUNITY SHOULD STIMULATE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE/CBO PARTNERSHIPS. SPECIFICALLY, THE FUNDING COMMUNITY SHOULD:

DEVELOP PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES.

Recognizing their potential influence on public policy, funders should develop initiatives that incorporate regional career pathways built on a partnership of workforce agencies, community colleges, CBOs and employers. Initiatives should emphasize: a sectoral approach; sequential career pathways extending from basic skills through upgrade training; “branch campus” partnerships of colleges and community organizations; defined roles and responsibilities for each partner; and provisions to leverage sustaining public resources.

PROVIDE INITIAL SUPPORT AND SUSTAINING FUNDING CONTINGENT ON PUBLIC RESOURCES.

One of the strongest findings of our research is that some form of catalytic or seed funding is needed to stimulate partnerships. Foundations are in an ideal position to offer relatively small planning or start-up grants to excite institutional support and cover initial planning and administrative costs. Grants can be offered in conjunction with the state community college system as a means of leveraging resources and stimulating public support.

Foundations are also well positioned to encourage public sector funders, including WIBs, city governments, and state and county welfare agencies, to pledge or invest public funds in a community-wide career pathways initiative. Our experience suggests that public funders are very receptive to public/private partnerships and particularly open to partnerships with foundations or corporate funders. Employing influence and resources creatively, private funders can seek a 2:1 or higher match of public dollars for a community college/CBO partnership, with public partners drawing on WIA, TANF, or community college discretionary funding.

PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT FOR DISSEMINATION.

Of all potential partners, foundations are in perhaps the best position to support outside organizations and intermediaries that can supplement public agencies in offering needed technical and strategic support. This can be particularly helpful in multi-regional initiatives where foundation-supported outside intermediaries can draw on experience and expertise gained through working with multiple CBOs, colleges, and workforce agencies.

Foundations are also well placed to support dissemination of best practices among partnership sites, and to create practitioner networks to share operational lessons.

B. TO DEVELOP EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIONS

1. COMMUNITY COLLEGE PARTNERS SHOULD DESIGNATE A COLLEGE STAFF POSITION TO MANAGE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION.

Creating a partnership with a community college requires negotiating a number of cross-cutting issues including resources, curriculum, instruction, credit, and enrollment. In most institutions there is no single person or position with jurisdiction over all of these issues; and seldom is there an available administrator with the time and resources to take on these multiple roles. To address the many tasks of partnership development and operation, community college/CBO collaborations should designate (and fund) a college-based position as a manager or coordinator with responsibility for all aspects of the college role. The college manager should be in a position to: arrange participation of college faculty and staff, as needed; negotiate service and resource agreements; and provide operational assistance in delivering all college-provided services.

2. PARTNERSHIPS SHOULD DEVELOP A FORMAL OPERATING STRUCTURE.

Although partnerships may begin informally, experience suggests the need for a formal operating structure including a designated director or coordinator, advisory board, and mechanism for managing and distributing resources. All partnerships will, as a matter of course, require a means to convene partners, make decisions and support ongoing program operations. In larger or more complex partnerships, there likely will be a need to incorporate a structure with the capacity to: hire and supervise staff; raise funds; negotiate agreements and service contracts with colleges, community organizations and employers; distribute funds to contractors and service providers; provide ongoing fiscal management and reporting; and manage data collection.

3. PARTNERSHIPS SHOULD DESIGNATE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES SUPPORTED BY WRITTEN AGREEMENTS.

Partnerships incorporating multiple services delivered over time will require written agreements laying out the roles and responsibilities of each partner. These should include:

FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES:

- Description of training including hours and credit;
- Role in providing instruction;
- Coordinator role and responsibilities;
- Individual faculty roles and responsibilities;
- Policy regarding required number of enrollments;
- Assessment procedures;
- Performance standards or goals;
- Budget and planned outcomes; and
- Cash and in-kind support.

FOR CBOS:

- Description of planned training;
- Number of planned enrollments;
- Assessment procedures;
- Program standards and guidelines;
- Detailed description of services;
- Description of facilities to be provided;
- Description of staff roles and responsibilities;
- Budget and planned outcomes; and
- Cash and in-kind support.

4. PARTNERSHIPS SHOULD DEVELOP A PROCEDURE FOR MANAGING CONFLICT.

Experience shows that some conflict in partnerships is almost inevitable. Partners should include procedures in memoranda of agreement to deflect and manage conflict. Conflict management provisions include: assignment of managing staff for both the college and CBO; detailed agreement on roles and responsibilities in key areas including curriculum, instructor selection and certification, and payment arrangements; agreement on standards and outcomes including remedial measures should standards not be met; and agreement on regular, scheduled meetings to discuss operational issues.

5. PARTNERSHIPS SHOULD DEVELOP A FUNDING STRATEGY.

Partnerships should incorporate planning for a sustaining resource strategy as a critical component of the initial planning process. Partnerships should estimate ongoing costs and develop a funding strategy to access state and regional WIA, welfare, community college and housing funding, as well as other public funding sources, to provide a long-term resource base. In particular, partnerships should seek to be included in the distribution of WIA ITAs and on-the-job training funding. In meeting with public sector funders, partners should emphasize the potential of community college/CBO linkages as a tool to leverage a variety of public and private funding, thus expanding the impact of each agency's allocations. Partnerships should also seek to investigate and apply for all relevant public grant funding including federal DOL H1B solicitations and Department of Education funding for community collaboratives.

Similarly, partnerships should target local and regional foundations, emphasizing three key components: a long-term education and training pathway; a systemic approach; and the potential to support continued operation through public funding.

ENDNOTES

1 See Julian L. Alssid, David Gruber, Davis Jenkins, Christopher Mazzeo, Brandon Roberts, and Regina Stanback-Stroud. *Building a Career Pathways System: Promising Practices in Community College-Centered Workforce Development*. Workforce Strategy Center, New York, NY and San Francisco, CA. August 2002, and Christopher Mazzeo, Sara Rab, and Julian L. Alssid. *Building Bridges to Colleges and Careers: An Examination of Contextualized Basic Skills Programs and Community Colleges*, January 2003.

2 Local Initiatives Support Corporation, "The Whole Agenda: The Past and Future of Community Development." March 2002. p. 7.

3 Lisa Matus-Grossman and Susan Gooden. *Opening Doors: Students' Perspectives on Juggling Work, Family and College*. MDRC, New York, NY. July 2002.

4 Ibid