The Together For Students Milwaukee Blueprint builds on the successes and strengths of Milwaukee Community Schools and its partnership with Milwaukee Succeeds and lays out a pathway for strengthening student-centered learning in each of the three focus areas: Partnerships & Resources, Shared Data, and Equity.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 2018, Milwaukee was selected as one of ten U.S. cities to receive a national Together For Students grant to develop plans for strengthening student-centered learning within Milwaukee's Community Schools model. The Together For Students Initiative was created by three national, education-focused nonprofit organizations — the Coalition for Community Schools, Communities In Schools, and StriveTogether — and funded by Chan Zuckerberg Initiative and the Ford Foundation.

In Milwaukee, the grant provided a tremendous opportunity to bring together two significant educational initiatives – Milwaukee Succeeds and the Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership (MCSP) -- to work collaboratively on a large-scale initiative for the first time. Through the planning grant, MCSP and Milwaukee Succeeds engaged a diverse set of over 30 educational stakeholders to develop a blueprint for strengthening student-centered learning within Milwaukee’s Community Schools Partnership model. This report shares the Blueprint recommendations and commitments for moving forward together.

TOGETHER FOR STUDENT PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership

The Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership is a collective strategy to transform schools into a place where students, families, staff, and the surrounding community can work together to ensure every student is successful. The initiative is a partnership between Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), Milwaukee Teachers Educational Association (MTEA) and United Way of Greater Milwaukee and Waukesha County (United Way). MCSP started with four schools in 2015 and has grown to 10 MPS schools in the 2018-19 school year.

The MCSP model focuses on the whole child by providing academic supports, social & emotional learning, health & wellness, family & community engagement, and a safe and supportive climate. Each school receives a full-time Community School Coordinator hired by a Partner Agency to add capacity for implementing new practices aligned with these guiding values:

• Shared Leadership that engages multiple voices in decision-making and implementation. The Community School Coordinator supports continuous communication between all stakeholders in the development of a strategic plan.

• A focus on Equity to ensure all activities are fair and just so that all can participate, prosper and reach their full potential.

• Cultural Relevance that builds on the assets of the entire community and responds to the self-identities of students, families, school staff and community members.

Together For Students Partners
- Milwaukee Public Schools
- Milwaukee Succeeds
- Milwaukee Teachers Education Association
- United Way of Greater Milwaukee and Waukesha Co.

2018-19 Community Schools
- Auer Avenue
- Bradley Tech High School
- Browning Elementary
- Hopkins Lloyd Community School
- James Madison Academic Campus
- Lincoln Avenue
- Longfellow School
- North Division High School
- South Division High School
- Zablocki Elementary School

Community Partner Agencies
- Journey House
- Silver Spring Neighborhood Center
- 16th Street Community Health Centers
- United Way of Greater Milwaukee & Waukesha Co.
- Milwaukee Urban League
Milwaukee Succeeds

Milwaukee Succeeds was launched in 2011 to unite the community around a common goal: bringing lasting change to the way education works for children in Milwaukee. Milwaukee Succeeds unites more than 300 community leaders and a host of business, philanthropic and nonprofit community leaders, all focused on the same vision – success for every child, in every school – and centered on four key goals:

1. **Kindergarten Readiness**: All children are prepared to enter school.
2. **School Readiness**: All children succeed academically and graduate prepared for meaningful work and/or college.
3. **College & Career Readiness**: All young people use post-secondary education or training to advance their opportunities beyond high school.
4. **Social & Emotional Health**: All children and young people are healthy, supported socially and emotionally, and contribute responsibly to the success of the Milwaukee community.

Milwaukee Succeeds believes that every sector has a role to play in educating children, and that through collaboration and a focus on data-driven continuous improvement, we can and will do better. As partners with StriveTogether, Milwaukee Succeeds advances Strive’s four principles of collective impact:

- **Shared Community Vision**: All participants have a shared vision for change, as well as a common understanding of the problem and how they will work collectively to solve it.
- **Evidence Based Decision Making**: Partnerships make decisions based on local data that shows areas of need and promising practices that are already working for kids.
- **Collaborative Action**: Community members come together to use data to collectively move outcomes.
- **Investment and Sustainability**: Partnerships initiate or redirect resources (time, talent and treasure) toward data-based practices on an ongoing basis, and engages the community to ensure long-term sustainability.

Through the collaborative development of a Blueprint, these two initiatives have begun a process of shared learning. MCSP leverages its coordination of efforts at a school-by-school level and its relationships with students, families and school staff. Pairing this with the strength of a 300+ partners network within Milwaukee Succeeds presents an ideal platform for leveraging existing partners and assets to respond to the real-time, self-identified needs of schools.
Through Together for Students, the partnering organizations identified the following three focus areas for strengthening student-centered learning within Milwaukee’s Community Schools and convened working groups of diverse partners to advance these goals:

1. **Partnership & Resources**: To develop comprehensive community-engaged assessment process to identify priority needs and help connect schools to partners and resources that respond to these needs.

2. **Shared Data**: To develop a road map for creating new data sharing practices and platforms that will allow community organizations working with youth to access information across organizations for more effective and tailored service provision.

3. **Equity**: To examine practices that create a school climate and culture that demands and supports systemic equity and improved student achievement for each student.

As detailed in the following Blueprint, each working group met over three months to assess current practices, identify gaps and opportunities, and recommend strategies for improvement. Although the working groups were united in their goal of strengthening student-centered learning, each group’s objectives, process, and outcomes were necessarily distinct from one another. A Core Team comprised of the co-chairs of each working group also convened bi-weekly to integrate learning across groups.

Collectively, the working groups:

- Convened diverse stakeholders including students, parents, educators, principals, Community Schools Coordinators and leaders, Milwaukee Succeeds staff and leaders, MPS data experts, and MPS administrators and leaders;
- Assessed current practices in each key area including stakeholder assessments, data sharing, and restorative practices;
- Conducted focus groups and interviews with high school students, parents and family members, and school principals to gain direct input on recommendations and strategies;
- Engaged a technology consulting company to conduct a readiness assessment and develop a roadmap for an integrated community data system;
- Developed recommendations for partners to advance strategies for strengthening student-centered learning within the Community Schools model.

The process also resulted in important lessons that informed the organizational commitments and next steps.
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The TFS Working Groups identified opportunities and addressed challenges as they co-created pathways towards a stronger assessment process, shared data platform, and equity practices. Two challenges led to significant lessons learned and informed recommendations and next steps.

MPS Leadership Transition

Challenge: In early 2018, MPS underwent a leadership transition when Superintendent Darienne Driver resigned to accept a new leadership position in Detroit, MI. In May 2018, Dr. Keith Posley, a long-time MPS administrator, was named Interim Superintendent. As is common during transitions, the new leadership reallocated resources, resulting in staffing changes. Over the course of the TFS planning process, two MPS leaders, who were central to the TFS partnership team, left MPS for new positions in other cities.

Opportunity: Despite this challenge, MPS remains firmly committed to strengthening Milwaukee Community Schools. In October 2018, the MPS Board approved a new full-time administrative position to provide district-level support to the Community Schools network. The new position will provide a direct liaison between MPS Central Administration and the Community Schools. The position will also help ensure there is internal alignment of the Community School model within MPS Central Office from professional development to academic curriculum. Additionally, in October 2018, Dr. Posley was appointed as permanent Superintendent, which will help ensure continuity as the district moves forward under his leadership.

Lesson Learned: This leadership transition reinforced the importance of developing a broad network of Community Schools champions across MPS Departments and throughout the district. Building broad support will help ensure continuity during time of transition and increase visibility of this collaborative work.

Partnership Building

Challenge: Both partners are deeply invested and committed to improving educational outcomes for students in Milwaukee. Yet, until this funding opportunity, there had been little collaboration. As partners worked on the TFS initiative, they realized how wide their gap had been in understanding each organization’s priorities, culture and capacity. The quick grant timeline and ambitious scope of work limited the opportunity to fully nurture the partnership development on the front end before lifting the work.

Opportunity: The TFS planning grant provided an important and necessary opportunity for each partner to learn about each other and make commitments to develop a stronger working relationship between initiatives.

Lesson Learned: This planning process highlighted the importance of cultivating a longer “on-ramp” for partnership-building in order to better understand the strengths, capacity, and challenges each organization brings to the table. This partnership work, while time-intensive, is critical in order to lift substantial collaborative efforts.
The Partnership Working Group focused on strengthening a comprehensive community-engaged assessment process to identify priority needs at each Community School and help connect schools to partners and resources that respond to these needs. All Community Schools in Milwaukee currently use an innovative assessment process that engages students, families, school staff, community partners and neighbors. The Working Group worked to strengthen the model by creating clear pathways for stakeholders to increase their level of engagement, improving communications and family engagement methods, building capacity for data analysis, and strengthening relationships with community partners through Milwaukee Succeeds. The following recommendations provide a pathway for strengthening this process and better connecting schools to community partner resources.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Comprehensive assessment:** Adopt a tiered engagement process that creates clear pathway for diverse stakeholders to provide meaningful input, analyze data, identify priorities and plan for school improvements.

2. **Communication:** Increase communication tools and resources in order to provide consistent updates to all stakeholders on assessment findings and action planning and to increase trust and engagement in the process.

3. **Family Engagement:** Strengthen more relational approaches to family engagement that help strengthen authentic relationships between families, teachers, and school leadership.

4. **Data analysis:** Develop and implement data analysis training and tools so that existing survey data can more directly inform priority setting and action planning.

5. **Community Partner Alignment:** Engage with Milwaukee Succeeds to develop a system for better coordinating community partners who can be responsive to Community Schools identified needs and priorities.
Recommendations:

1. **Culture**: Strengthen the culture of data sharing by developing a shared vision and agenda and identifying a backbone organization to drive the initiative’s efforts and secure funding.

2. **Governance**: Establish data-sharing agreements among organizations participating in the technological developments, and develop an initial charter outlining policies, procedures, and the shared vision for the partnership.

3. **Infrastructure**: Implement a standard data format to assist in facilitating coordination of the programs and services offered in schools, and create an open source data management system to encourage sharing of aggregate data sources.

**EQUITY**

The MCSP model uses 15 critical structures to create school environments that foster shared leadership, equity and cultural relevance. (To read all 15 structures, please see Appendix 2.) The Equity Working Group developed a process for fully implementing these structures and determined that those related to restorative practices are a critical starting place for achieving greater equity within schools. Over three months, the working group engaged with students, family members, school staff and school principals to better understand the needs, challenges and opportunities for fully implementing restorative practices across community schools. Based on this feedback, the Equity Working Group advanced the following recommendations.

Recommendations:

1. **Build support for full implementation of restorative practices with MPS District Leadership, families and students, and MCSP teachers and school staff as a necessary foundation for successful implementation.**

2. **Develop a full implementation plan that provides school leaders with the time, support and human and financial capacity to implement restorative practices within their school.**

3. **Provide professional development, training and ongoing in-class coaching and support for educators and staff to ensure they have the support and capacity needed to implement restorative practices with fidelity.**
MCSP and Milwaukee Succeeds are committed to working together to advance the blueprint for Milwaukee’s student centered learning. Both partners recognize the importance of continuing to strengthen their partnership, so they are prepared to lift significant efforts when resources become available. The following partner commitments are intended to increase connectivity between Milwaukee Succeeds and Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership and better align their efforts with each other’s strengths and assets.

**Milwaukee Succeeds Commitments:**
1. Seek and support alignment of innovative educational interventions within Community Schools.
2. Invite a representative of Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership to sit on the Milwaukee Succeeds Operations Team and commit to having a representative sit on MCSP’s Citywide Leadership Team in order to ensure closer alignment and communication at the leadership level.
3. Convene Milwaukee Succeeds staff with MCSP Community School Coordinators to review school-identified priorities and identify points of alignment with Milwaukee Succeeds’ key priorities and partnership networks.
4. Advance a collective vision for data sharing among Milwaukee stakeholders when MPS has introduced its new data sharing policies and identified an administrator who will engage on data sharing practices and policies.

**Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership Commitments:**
1. Invite a representative of Milwaukee Succeeds to sit on the MCSP Citywide Leadership team and have a representative at Milwaukee Succeeds Operations Committee in order to ensure closer alignment and communication at the leadership level.
2. Convene MCSP Community School Coordinators with Milwaukee Succeeds staff to review school-identified priorities and identify points of alignment with Milwaukee Succeeds’ key priorities and partnership networks.
3. Work with the new full-time MPS Community Schools position to build a broad network of Community Schools champions across MPS departments.
4. Identify human and financial resources to implement the TFS Blueprint including the implementation of restorative practices in Community Schools.
The partners are committed to working towards full implementation of the Together For Students Milwaukee Blueprint. With additional funding, partners can build capacity to deepen student-centered learning throughout Milwaukee Community Schools, including:

- **Enhanced communications and family engagement systems** to ensure that all school stakeholders are engaged in the assessment process to identify pressing school priorities and solutions (Partnership Recommendations #2 and 3).
- **Data analysis tools and training** to help ensure that data are used more effectively to inform action planning on school improvement priorities (Partnership Recommendations #4).
- **Stronger coordination of in-school partner organizations**, so that community partners more effectively respond to and align resources with school-identified needs (Partnership Recommendations #5).
- **Increased capacity to educate on and advocate for the importance of restorative practices** in Community Schools (Equity Recommendation #1).
- **In-school restorative practice coaches** to support staff in fully implementing restorative practices within Community Schools (Equity Recommendation #3).
- **Data-sharing agreements among organizations** participating in the technological developments and an initial charter outlining policies, procedures, and the shared vision for the partnership (Data Recommendation #2).
- **New open source data management system** to encourage sharing of aggregate data sources and to set the foundation for a future data sharing system (Data Recommendation #3).

The following Together for Students Milwaukee Blueprint provides a detailed roadmap for this work moving forward. Appendix 5 also shares a full report of the Milwaukee data readiness assessment and community data ecosystem roadmap.
TOGETHER FOR STUDENTS
MILWAUKEE BLUEPRINT
The Partnership Working Group was formed to advance the following objectives:

1. Develop comprehensive community engaged assessment process that places the voices of students and families at the center and provides actionable data.
2. Develop a system for ongoing communication and alignment between the real-time, student-centered needs within Community Schools and the partnership networks of Milwaukee Succeeds.
3. Ensure sustainability through professional development of key site-based staff including Community School Coordinators.

Over the course of three months, working group members met biweekly to assess the strengths and gaps in current practices, adjust the current assessment model, and identify recommendations for strengthening current practices. The workgroup included a diverse representation of key stakeholders within Milwaukee Community Schools, and their broad base of experience and expertise helped inform discussions and recommendations.

Participants included:
- Students
- Parents
- Community Schools Coordinators
- Teachers
- Principals
- Milwaukee Succeeds Staff
- Community Schools Leadership

A full roster of working group members is included in Appendix 1.

The MCSP model includes a strong focus on ensuring that student and families are at the center of helping determine the great priorities for the school improvement and identifying resources needed. Key steps in the MCSP model include:

- **Engage:** A full-time Community School Coordinator increases capacity of the school to engage multiple stakeholders including community partners, families, staff, students and neighborhood residents.

- **Aspire:** Schools collectively identify school and community aspirations and barriers to success by collecting diverse knowledge through Community Conversations, combined with additional school & community data.

- **Prioritize:** A site-based Community School Leadership Team comprised of families, school staff, and partners analyzes data, develops a shared vision, key priorities and strategic plan through local-decision making.

- **Align:** Community partnerships, initiatives and policies are developed and/or aligned to support shared vision and key priorities reflected in School Improvement Plan to ensure collaboration and collective action.

**2017 MCSP Outcomes**

- More than $200,000 in grants and in-kind donations recruited to MCSP schools
- More than 100 community partnerships recruited and/or supported
- 800 volunteers donated more than 1,500 hours of community service at MCSP schools

*Reported in 2017 MCSP Annual Report
BUILDING ON SUCCESS

MCSP uses an innovative model of Community Conversations to engage diverse stakeholder groups in guided discussions around school improvement priorities and gain buy-in and support for implementing solutions. The Partnership Working Group highlighted the success of one Community School -- Lincoln Avenue Elementary School -- to demonstrate the power and potential of engaging diverse voices.

From Conversation to Change: Lincoln Avenue Elementary School
Lincoln Avenue School is a bilingual elementary Community School on Milwaukee’s southside. As a new Community School in 2017, Lincoln engaged in a very robust assessment process that resulted in collecting input from over 300 students, families, school staff, and neighbors.

With strong leadership from the school principal and creative scheduling, all school staff members participated in Community Conversations – including para-professionals, social workers, maintenance and kitchen staff. All 4th and 5th grade students participated in Community Conversations during class time. Multiple parent meetings with food and child care provided helped to engage family voices. In addition, school teams went door-to-door to talk with neighboring residents and small businesses.

From this engagement, three school priorities emerged:
1. Safety in the school and neighborhood;
2. Family communication and engagement; and
3. Environmental Sustainability.

The Community School Leadership Team developed action plans for each priority area and began to implement tangible improvements. As a result, school families and neighbors can see change – new stop signs and speed bumps are helping make traffic safer, a new block watch and block captains are helping with neighborhood safety, stronger partnerships with community organizations have created new environmental partnership programs. The school principal reports that neighbors now look out for the building, vandalism has decreased and parents are more involved with school activities and helping to recruit new students.

Lincoln Avenue has identified that it would be helpful to have support making connections to community partners with resources to address their top three school priorities.
Recommendations For Strengthening Practices
Based on the engagement and input from the Partnership Working Group -- including students, parents, educators, Community School Coordinators, principals, MCSP leadership and Milwaukee Succeeds -- the following recommendations were developed to strengthen approaches for identifying the real-time needs of Community Schools and connecting community resources to these priorities.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Adopt a tiered engagement process that creates clear pathway for diverse stakeholders to provide meaningful input, analyze data, identify priorities and plan for school improvements

Discussion Themes:
• Increase engagement at each level of the assessment process to help ensure there are diverse perspectives informing the priorities and solutions.
• The assessment process requires a strong foundation of trust, communication, and professional development.
• Two processes are needed for first year schools and experienced schools. 1st year schools use community conversations with all stakeholder groups to get input on top priorities and concerns. 2+ year schools use community conversations to reflect on survey data from previous years and discuss progress and new priorities.
• Ensure that school leadership understands the importance of the assessment and engagement process and provides the support to execute fully.

Strategies / Tactics: Partners Needed Support

1. Gain commitment from school principals to create the space and time for all school staff and students to participate in assessment and action planning
   • Protect staff time to participate in assessment
   • Engage Parent Coordinator and staff to support CLCs in increasing family engagement
   • Ensure communication tools are in place to communicate to and engage stakeholders
   • MPS
   • MCSP
   • Principal commitment and support from MPS District Office

2. Provide training and support for school staff including principal, CSC, Parent Coordinators and educators. Dedicate Professional Learning opportunities to assessment and data analysis
   • MPS
   • MCSP
   • Commitment to align professional development trainings to MCSP model
   • Capacity to increase trainings offered

3. Develop clear “points of invitation” for people who participate at each assessment level. For example, parents who participate in Community Conversations are invited to join the next Community Leadership Team meeting.
   • MCSP Staff
   • School Leadership
   • Parent Coordinators
   • Communication and engagement support

Perceived barriers to implementation:
• Competing school priorities and requirements
• Assessment burn out – not seeing positive change result from past surveys and focus groups

Strategies for addressing barriers:
• Communicate assessment results and action planning progress to all stakeholders so they see value of their participation
• Seek funding for additional MCSP staff capacity to provide in-school support
RECOMMENDATION 2:

Increase communication tools and systems in order to provide consistent updates to all stakeholders on assessment findings and action planning and increase trust and engagement in the process.

Discussion Themes:
- Consistent communication is needed to build trust and buy-in. There is currently significant distrust of school assessments. People feel discouraged when they don’t see how the information they provide in surveys or focus groups informs change. They need to see the impact of raising their voice to build trust.

Strategies / Tactics: Partners Needed Support

1. **Build capacity within the school readiness cohort to ensure basic communication systems and tools are put into place before starting Year 1 as a new Community School**
   - MCSP Staff
   - MPS
   - Commitment from school leaders
   - Tools including staff bulletins, 2-way family communication tools

2. **Create a communications roadmap that outlines who, how and when communication will happen with all stakeholders and include key messages to be shared with each stakeholder group**
   - MCSP
   - MCSP staff time to provide direct support to every school
   - Communications tools and calendar
   - Training time for CSC

Perceived barriers to implementation:
- Time required to implement communication system
- Leadership must create “space” for communication updates at staff meetings, parent newsletters, etc.
- Not all schools have communication tools for each stakeholder group, particularly parent and neighborhood residents
- Readiness Cohort has many competing priorities and may not see the need to make this a priority

Strategies for addressing barriers:
- Engage principals early in the development of the communication calendar
- Work closely with Parent Coordinators on communication strategies to parents
- Engage with MPS on implementation of school-wide 2-way family communication tools
**RECOMMENDATION 3:**

Strengthen more relational approaches to family engagement that help strengthen authentic relationships between families, teachers, and school leadership.

**Discussion Themes:**
- The current assessment process works well for incorporating teacher and student input. Family engagement, however, is low and support is needed to increase a broader base of parents/family input.
- Families prefer to give feedback verbally.
- Family engagement is an important contributing factor for improved student outcomes.
- Build upon current points of alignment: MPS is considering adopting 2-way communication tools and may want to pilot with MCSP. Teacher home visiting program is being piloted with MTEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Needed Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a school-wide 2-question verbal assessment tool to gain broader feedback</td>
<td>• MCSP Staff</td>
<td>• Data analysis support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from parents on school improvement. All educators and staff collect info from any</td>
<td>• United Way</td>
<td>• School staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family they interact with and hands off responses to CSC to process responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment from school leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthen parent-teacher relationships to ensure teachers and parents are aligned</td>
<td>• MPS</td>
<td>• 2-way teacher-parent communications tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in supporting each student needs. Schools should consider implementing:</td>
<td>• MTEA</td>
<td>• Technological support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher phone calls to invite parents into classroom and discuss student needs</td>
<td>• MCSP Staff</td>
<td>• Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voluntary teacher home visiting program to strengthen parent-teacher relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(currently piloted with MTEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing two-way communication tool (i.e. Class Dojo, Remind App, Google</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom) to help teachers and parents to communicate, share photos and updates,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and prompt parents to talk with their children about key topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strengthen Parent-to-Parent relationships within the school by creating</td>
<td>• MPS Parent</td>
<td>• Capacity for parent-to-parent programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for relationship-building such as the creation of parent cafes and</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>• Communication tools for families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family field trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived barriers to implementation:**
- 2-way communication tool requires school leadership and teacher buy-in
- 2-way communication tool requires teacher and family training on using tool. Cell phone access may be a challenge for some families.

**Strategies for addressing barriers:**
- Adopt 2-way communication tool strategy in partnership with the MPS Central Office to ensure leadership buy-in
- Pilot with small group to understand training and technical assistance needs among educators and families
RECOMMENDATION 4:

Develop and implement data analysis training and tools so that existing survey data can more directly inform priority setting and action planning.

Discussion Themes:
- Community Schools action planning and School Improvement Plans can be better informed by survey data.
- Sharing survey data and demonstrating how data is informing school improvement plans can help increase stakeholder engagement.
- Currently survey data is given as a large document that is difficult to navigate. Community School Coordinators asked for support with data analysis and suggested having a “school profile” that summarized previous year’s survey data that could become a tool for future Community Conversations.
- There is alignment with MPS Research Department, which has prioritized implementing a data dashboard with school survey results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics:</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Needed Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide training on how to use existing data analysis tools during community conversations</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Professional development on data analysis tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop a new facilitation process that helps Year 2+ schools implement Community Conversations centered on previous year’s school data</td>
<td>MCSP</td>
<td>Training for CS Coordinators leading community conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create a new “school profile” tool that summarizes the 5 Essentials school survey results in a format that is easily readable and can be used for action planning.</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Consultant to build a dashboard for 5 Essentials survey, MPS Research staff support to update survey results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived barriers to implementation:
- School leadership may be hesitant to release survey data if it portrays the school negatively
- Funding is required to support MPS Research Department in building a “dashboard” system that summarizes survey data

Strategies for addressing barriers:
- Engage school leadership in the process for developing a school profile or survey dashboard system to better understand and address their concerns about how school data will be used
**RECOMMENDATION 5:**

Engage with Milwaukee Succeeds to develop a system for better coordinating community partners who can be responsive to Community Schools identified needs and priorities.

**Discussion Themes:**

- Milwaukee Succeeds has strong relationships with a diverse network of community partners who can help leverage resources and support for schools in addressing key priorities.
- Principals have indicated that it would be helpful to streamline how partners are coming in to work with schools.
- There is often limited coordination among the partner organizations working within schools and staff aren’t aware of the partner programs and resources being offered within schools.
- Partner organizations are often not aware of or responsive to school-identified priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics:</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Needed Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Ensure leadership from MCSP and Milwaukee Succeeds sit at each other’s tables to keep a pulse on the mission and priorities of each organization.</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds • MCSP</td>
<td>Commitment from Milwaukee Succeeds and MCSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Convene Milwaukee Succeeds Goal Managers and MCSP Community School Coordinators to share top priorities identified across Community Schools and determine which areas aligns with Milwaukee Succeeds strengths, assets, and priorities</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds • MCSP</td>
<td>Commitment from Milwaukee Succeeds and MCSP • Staff capacity to advance areas of alignment between Milwaukee Succeeds and MCSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Create a system for better coordinating in-school community partners to ensure more equitable distribution of resources that meet the true needs of schools, students, and families</td>
<td>MPS • MCSP • Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
<td>Commitment from MPS Leadership • MCSP Staff Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Create opportunities for community partners to listen to the issues identified by the Community Schools through the assessment process and engage in solution-driven partnerships with the school community</td>
<td>MPS • MCSP</td>
<td>MCSP and Milwaukee Succeeds staff capacity to convene community partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived barriers to implementation:**
- Community partner organizations are often assigned to schools by the MPS Central District Office, so coordination would require MPS leadership.

**Strategies for addressing barriers:**
- Bring MPS leadership to the table with MCSP and Milwaukee Succeeds to develop strategies for more effective community partner coordination.
SHARED DATA

The Data Working group conducted a planning process to create a shared data system in Milwaukee that would enable schools and community organizations to create child-centered profiles for students in order to better meet the needs of students and their families. The objectives were to:

1. Work with the network of Milwaukee Succeeds’ partnerships, MCSP’s leadership council and Community Schools Leadership Teams to collective information on what data would be most beneficial to drive local and system-wide strategies.

2. Engage the local community in building consensus on the data that would be most beneficial to collect to ensure student success.

3. Engage system leaders in building consensus on the best data-sharing platform, developed data-sharing agreements and clear commitments to adopt a pilot system within MCSP schools.

PLANNING PROCESS

The Data Working Group first convened a small group of partners including Milwaukee Succeeds staff and MPS Research and Data staff to identify a process for conducting an audit data. Once initial tasks were identified, additional members were invited including staff from MPS Student Services and MPS Recreation Department. These additional members helped to identify the diversity of data available through MPS. The Working Group conducted a data audit to map out the diverse data systems at MPS and the broader community landscape. They also engaged students and families in focus groups to understand their concerns and priorities for shared data.

In addition, the Working Group engaged Asemio, a technology consulting firm, to complete a readiness assessment and look at opportunities and barriers to a shared data system. The Asemio team conducted several in-person meetings with key representatives from stakeholder organizations and conducted surveys in order to reach a broader group of stakeholders. These interviews and surveys provided insight into the Milwaukee education sector data landscape and informed the final recommendations shared in Asemio’s Together for Students Data Ecosystem Analysis Report in Appendix 5. Asemio’s recommendations were then locally validated by the Working Group. The assessment of current practices and recommendations that follow are integrated into the Blueprint, but were conducted independently by Asemio.

CURRENT PRACTICES

MPS has a robust student information system that captures all educational data. But, currently, there is no comprehensive data-sharing platform that integrates data across all organizations that impact a student’s success in and out of the classroom, provides real-time information and encourages data-informed collective action.

Asemio conducted an assessment of current practices and found that “the Milwaukee partnership engaged in the Together for Students work is in the early stages of development. Significant technological resources exist in the community; however, these technologies tend to be siloed in large individual organizations. The partners have been motivated by the planning grant funding, and many stakeholders identified a need to invest in culture and governance in the immediate future.” (Together For Students Data Ecosystem Analysis, pg. 7) Therefore, Asemio’s recommendations for building a strong foundation for data sharing focus on the needs identified in each of three key areas: Culture, Governance, and Infrastructure.
Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed by Asemio and shared in full in Appendix 5: Together For Students Data Ecosystem Analysis Report. They are intended to guide next steps within a two-year timeframe. Long-term recommendations for full implementation of a data sharing system are also included in Asemio’s Data Ecosystem Analysis report.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Culture: Strengthen the culture of data sharing by developing a shared vision and agenda and identifying a backbone organization to drive the initiative’s efforts and secure funding.

Asemio’s Findings:
- Verbal anecdotes from partners, confirmed by the survey results, indicate that there exists a need to develop a shared community vision and to strengthen relationships among participating organizations, as well as with those not yet engaged in the TFS work.
- The planning grant was identified as evidence of commitment to this work.

Strategies / Tactics:

| Clearly articulate a shared vision and agenda                   |
| Establish a backbone organization to drive the work of the project and facilitate the development of the student-centered data system |
| Seek organizational support in the form of subject matter experts, their time, and commitment to action |
| Seek long-term implementation and operational funding          |
**RECOMMENDATION 2:**

**Governance:** Establish data-sharing agreements among organizations participating in the technological developments, and develop an initial charter outlining policies, procedures, and the shared vision for the partnership.

**Asemio’s Findings:**
- Survey and interview analyses both illustrate that the partnership’s focus on policy and creating a sustainability plan has been limited, while almost every interviewee identified privacy and security as key to ensuring success in Milwaukee.
- Despite difficulties in navigating regulatory requirements, several partners have had success developing data-sharing agreements with other Milwaukee partners, including Milwaukee Public Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share the MPS newly released template MOU with partnership organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish data-sharing agreements among organizations participating in the technological developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an initial charter or other governing documentation outlining policies, procedures and the shared vision for the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline a sustainability plan for the initiative, so that staffing, funding, policy or other system changes do not threaten its success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION 3:

Infrastructure: Implement a standard data format to assist in facilitating coordination of the programs and services offered in schools, and create an open source data management system to encourage sharing of aggregate data sources.

Asemio’s Findings:
• The TFS partnership created some initial knowledge management tools for use during the planning grant term.
• Most partners identified meetings or other informal communication as the primary method for learning about best practice work in Milwaukee.
• Many partners work on projects using methodological frameworks to address systems-level change, and technologies present in the community range from established enterprise systems, like those used by Milwaukee Public Schools, to basic systems for data collection and analysis used by many programs and services.

Strategies / Tactics:

| Implement knowledge management processes, such as formalizing communications to the partnership and implementing information management in an accessible tool or community resource |
| Implement a standard data format to assist in facilitating coordination of the programs and services offered in schools |
| Create a central repository for student-related data, an open source data management system to encourage sharing of aggregate data sources |
The Equity Working Group was formed to advance the following objectives:

1. Engage in process of identifying the most pressing needs of schools by hosting listening sessions and planning meetings.
2. Key partners will lead by example and draft an Equity Agreement outlining policy and practices they agree to shift to support Community Schools.
3. A larger strategy advocating for sustainable and equitable Community Schools is created with support from National Partners.

The group was comprised of 16 members, including:

- Students
- Community School Coordinators
- MCSP leadership
- MPS administrators
- Milwaukee Succeeds leadership
- Community partners.

A full roster of working group members is included in Appendix 1.

PLANNING PROCESS

Over the course of three months, working group members met to develop approaches for increasing equity within Community Schools. As a starting point, members recognized the need to have a shared understanding of what is meant by equity and agreed to these terms:

**Equity Definition:** Allocation of resources, supports and opportunities based on the needs of students and staff. (Revised from MPS definition)

**Equity Goal:** The MPS Community School’s goal is to create a climate and culture across community schools that demands and supports systemic equity and improved student achievement for each student.

**Equity Guiding Principles** *(Adapted from Hopkins School District Equity Plan)*

1. **Culture of Safety, Respect and Trust:** The culture of community schools are developed so that all students, staff and families feel safe and respected and can build trusting relationships that enable direct and productive feedback.

2. **Student Agency:** Schools provide feedback, coaching and opportunities for students to build skills and mindsets to take ownership of their learning.

3. **Transparency:** The cycle of learning is explicit and transparent so that students know what they need to learn, what proficiency looks like, how they will be assessed and how they are progressing.

4. **Responsiveness, Continuous Improvement and Success:** Community schools use data on student progress to create agile organizations that can respond to student needs, drive continuous improvement and ensure that students are successful.

5. **Consistency and Reliability:** The expectations of the learning objectives and rigor are calibrated with all students being held to the same high standards, including demonstrating mastery and fluency in the foundational skills.
The group also agreed to use the 15 MCSP Structures as the framework for developing an equity strategy. When fully implemented, these structures will help ensure that personal and social circumstances are not an obstacle to achieving educational potential. Recognizing that all Community Schools are on a journey toward full implementation of the structures, the Working Group designed an implementation process to help guide full implementation. The 10-Step Implementation Process is shared in Appendix 3.

Among the 15 MCSP structures, two structures focus on restorative practices:

- **Staff Use of Restorative Practices** - Increase use of restorative practices among adults (support circles, PLC, etc.) and integration into teaching practices and school culture.

Restorative practice is a framework that emphasizes the value of relationships. It is founded on the belief that a high level of accountability and support combine to promote a safe and equitable environment. The restorative framework includes practices for building community and repairing relationships when harm has occurred.

These practices are believed to be effective tools for ensuring greater equity within schools. The Equity Working Group focused on these two structures as a critical starting point. To better understand what would be needed to fully implement restorative practices within Community Schools, the Working Group conducted focus groups and interviews with over 70 individuals, including:

- 4 focus groups with a total of 49 high school students
- Interviews with 20 parents and family members
- Interviews with 7 principals of Milwaukee Community Schools

The key themes that emerged from this engagement process helped inform the development of the working group’s recommendations.

### CURRENT COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PRACTICES:

The MCSP model is committed to transforming how schools relate and interact with their students, families and community in a more culturally relevant and restorative way leading to positive school cultures, strong relational trust, and high quality teaching. They do this through:

- **Culturally Responsive Practices**: Schools receive professional development, resources and support that build on the assets of the entire community, acknowledge personal and institutional biases, and respond to the self-identities of students, families, school staff and community members. Schools promote strategies such as parent-teacher home visiting and community-based learning that bridge relationships between the school and community.

- **Restorative Practices**: Schools receive professional development and resources on Restorative Practices and other positive behavior strategies that work to build proactive, positive relationships and repair any harm that may have occurred in order to restore relationships with dignity and care.

### 2017 MCSP Outcomes*

- MCSP schools demonstrated a decrease in school referrals that was a more positive trend than the district overall
- MCSP schools demonstrated increased graduation rates
- MCSP schools demonstrated decreased suspension rates

*From 2017 MCSP Annual Report
BUILDING ON SUCCESS

Restorative practices are integral to the Milwaukee Community Schools model. Through the 15 MCSP Structures, each Community School is committed to building its capacity to use restorative practices to create a positive school culture. However, resources are limited to support implementation. James Madison Academic Campus (JMAC) is a high school in the Milwaukee Community Schools network that has had the opportunity to implement innovative restorative practices. Through a federal Project AWARE grant awarded to MPS, JMAC received access to a restorative practices coach and is seeing success implementing new practices.

JMAC has worked with school staff and students to improve school culture and build a cohesive and positive environment to work and learn. Staff receive professional development opportunities and can participate in voluntary support circles to experience and model the practices. A new restorative practices course was created to train students to facilitate community-building circles and help with conflict resolution. A peace room is being opened, which creates a safe space and mediation for students experiencing conflict. Students or staff can request a “repair harm circle” to help students facing conflicts or students who are re-entering school after suspension.

The restorative practices coach for Project Aware has found that implementation of restorative practices is more successful at JMAC than other schools because of the extra support that Community Schools can offer. The combination of using the Community Schools model with additional external funding to support a restorative practices coach from Project AWARE increases successful implementation. Community Schools are able to implement innovations within a model that remains consistent even when experiencing school staff and leadership changes.

JMAC is seeing positive results. Student focus groups show that students are taking notice of a change in school climate. They report fewer incidents of bullying and harassment and feel there are more teachers they can go to with problems. Staff surveys show improvement in staff climate and attitudes towards mental health needs, and a greater commitment to restorative practices. Sustaining this work requires additional funds to support continued in-school coaching and training in order to ensure these practices continue to build a safe and equitable school culture.
Recommendations For Strengthening Practices

Based on the engagement of students, parents, educators, Community School Coordinators, principals, MCSP leadership and Milwaukee Succeed, the following recommendations were developed to strengthen restorative practices within Community Schools and ensure greater equity within schools.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:**

Build support for full implementation of restorative practices with MPS District Leadership, families and students, and MCSP teachers and school staff as a necessary foundation for successful implementation.

**Engagement and Discussion Themes:**

- The engagement of key stakeholders during this process identified the need to engage and gain the support of district level leadership in order to prioritize the full implementation of restorative practices across MCSP.
- The Equity Working Group and the school level leadership engaged during the process recognized the need to align with Milwaukee Public School District priorities and advocate for support of restorative practices across MCSP.
- The students and families from across MPS schools that were engaged during the planning process were largely unaware of what restorative practices entailed and the benefit of restorative practices for schools, students and families.
- The school level leadership engaged during the process identified the need to engage and gain support of teachers and staff at the outset of the process to ensure teacher and staff buy-in and support of the full implementation of restorative practices across MCSP network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics:</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Needed Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Advocate and align with Milwaukee Public School District leadership’s priorities to gain support for full implementation** | • MPS  
• MTEA  
• MCSP  
• United Way | • Support identifying an ally within MPS |
| • Identify champions within MPS leadership  
• Leverage points of alignment with MPS priorities | | |
| **Increase awareness and education of families and students about restorative practices and the benefit of restorative practices:** | • MPS  
• MCSP | • Additional human and financial capacity to increase the ability to engage students and families |
| • Develop printed materials describing restorative practices and the benefit of restorative practices  
• Engage students and families to learn about restorative practices and identify ways they can support advocating for full implementation | | |
| **Build support for full implementation of restorative practices with MCSP teachers and staff.** | • MTEA  
• MPS | • Support from MTEA engaging teachers and staff around the benefits of restorative practices |
| • Integrate education and implementation updates during meetings and trainings  
• Ensure significant teacher and MTEA engagement in implementation planning | | |
| **Perceived barriers to implementation:** | Strategies for addressing barriers: |
| • MPS leadership transitions  
• MPS focus on other priorities | • Identification of MPS leadership ally  
• Articulating points of alignment with MP leadership priorities |
Engagement and Discussion Themes:

- School level leaders strongly recommended developing an implementation plan that provided schools with the time, support and human and financial capacity to implement restorative practices within their schools.
- Community School Coordinators identified the need to develop a full implementation process to ensure everyone within the school setting who would need to support implementation understands the goal, timeline and roles and responsibilities necessary for a successful implementation.

### RECOMMENDATION 2:

**Strategies / Tactics:**
- Use insights from key stakeholder to develop the implementation process
- Understand the unique needs of key stakeholders to develop a plan for implementation that meets the needs of stakeholders within Milwaukee Community Schools
- Develop reasonable timeline and identify resources to support implementation
- Understand the unique needs of key stakeholders to develop a plan for implementation that meets the needs of stakeholders within Milwaukee Community Schools
- Perceived barriers to implementation:
  - Lack of funding support for full implementation
  - Perceived urgency around implementation timeline

**Partners:**
- MCSP
- MTEA
- MPS

**Needed Support:**
- Capacity and support to translate key engagement themes to implementation process
- Capacity and support to develop timeline and identify resources for implementation for each Milwaukee Community School

**Strategies for addressing barriers:**
- Partner to identify additional funding for implementation of restorative practices
- Create a timeline in partnership with or informed by key stakeholders who would support implementation

---

Develop a full implementation plan that provides school leaders with the time, support and human and financial capacity to implement restorative practices within their school.
**RECOMMENDATION 3:**

Provide professional development, training and ongoing in-class coaching and support for educators and staff to ensure they have the support and capacity needed to implement restorative practices with fidelity.

**Engagement and Discussion Themes:**
- Principals identified a strong need for robust training opportunities and ongoing coaching and support for educators and other staff to ensure successful implementation.
- Working group members expressed the need to ensure staff and educators were sufficiently equipped to effectively implement restorative practices in the school setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies / Tactics:</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Needed Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop or identity restorative practices training curriculum for educators and staff</td>
<td>MCSP, MPS, MTEA</td>
<td>Capacity and commitment to develop and/or identify training curriculum that meets the needs of Milwaukee Community Schools teachers and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify ongoing in-class coaching and support for educators and staff</td>
<td>MCSP, MPS, MTEA</td>
<td>Full-time coaches working within each Community School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived barriers to implementation: Perceived lack of time and capacity for teachers and staff.</td>
<td>Strategies for addressing barriers: Commitment from MTEA to support increasing buy-in of educators and prioritization of educator professional development for restorative practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES
# APPENDIX 1: TFS WORKING GROUP ROSTERS

## Partnership Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Carson</td>
<td>Community School Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Christensen / Kristin Kappelman</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Curley</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Davis</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Dilley</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maura Donohue</td>
<td>MPS Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Gallagher</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Garrett</td>
<td>Community School Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Garza</td>
<td>MPS Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Henry</td>
<td>MPS Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Hurley*</td>
<td>Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Morris</td>
<td>MPS Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaribeth Rodriguez</td>
<td>MPS Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Walker-Henry*</td>
<td>MTEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwanda Ward</td>
<td>MPS Parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Equity Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danae Davis*</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Adair*</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Latish Reed*</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Hurley</td>
<td>Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanelle Ramey</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Audette</td>
<td>MTEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Celata</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Garrett</td>
<td>Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Costello</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elonna Jones-Turner</td>
<td>MPS Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeland Walsh</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Fenceroy</td>
<td>Greater Milwaukee Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahliissa Edwards</td>
<td>MPS Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Portis</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Marilyn Miller</td>
<td>MICAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Peterson</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Celata*</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Costello*</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton Cooper</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kappelman</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Collins</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Coughlin</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Dilley</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaQuan McMahan</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hennessey</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Davis</td>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rossa</td>
<td>MPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes Working Group Co-Chair
MCSP MODEL

Schools within the Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership work to demonstrate the guiding values of Shared Leadership, Equity and Cultural Relevance. To do this requires putting in place 15 structures within the school improvement plan that help to create the environment necessary for those values to impact student success:

Guiding Value: Shared Leadership

1. Community School Leadership Team (Effective Leaders)
   • Host a monthly meeting that replaces your School Engagement Council and includes student, family, staff, partner and community representatives.

2. Continuous Collaborative Staff Communication (Collaborative Teachers)
   • Design staff committees that are aligned to school goals and held accountable to communicating meetings up, down and across the school.

3. Youth Council (Supportive Environment)
   • Create a safe, youth-led space for a representative group of students to define their own priorities and have voice in decision making.

4. Family Leadership Organization (Empowered Families)
   • Create a welcoming, family-led space for families of students to define their own priorities, have a voice in decision making, and lead school improvement projects.

Guiding Value: Equity

5. School Needs Assessment (Supportive Environment)
   • Conduct annual needs assessment of all stakeholders using qualitative and quantitative data to identify their priorities.

6. School-Community Asset Map
   • Maintain updated listing of current and potential assets in and near the school.

7. Collaboratively Developed and Shared School Vision
   • Conduct a value circle and shared agreements (restorative practice) with students, families, staff, partners and community to develop a shared school vision.

8. Community School Priorities (Collaborative Teachers)
   • Use needs assessment and school/community data to identify shared priorities and action plan.

9. Student Supports Map (Supportive Environment)
   • Track which students participate/receive what supports from partners and non-school based interventions to ensure equitable access based on needs.

Guiding Value: Cultural Relevance

10. Staff-led PLC Focused on Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices (CRTP) (Ambitious Instruction)
    • Host, at least monthly, staff PLC to develop and implement a CRTP action plan that impacts school culture and instruction.

11. Encourage participation of staff in individual professional development opportunities to increase their use of CRTP (ex: CRT Fellows Program)
    • School-Based Professional Development Cycles Aligned to MCSP Values (Ambitious Instruction)

12. Work to align and embed MCSP values into all school-based PD regardless of content or theme.
    • Research-Based Family Engagement Strategy (Empowered Families)

13. Participation of staff in a research-based family engagement strategy (ex: Parent-Teacher Home Visiting Project, FAST Program, etc.)
    • Staff Use of Restorative Practices (Collaborative Teachers)

14. Increase use of restorative practices among adults (support circles, PLC, etc.) and integration into teaching practices and school culture.
    • Restorative Practices in Leadership Training (Effective Leaders)

15. Participation of school leader in learning community, leadership coaching and toolkit use.
1. Focus on an MCSP Structure

Create a diverse working group of partners and stakeholders (including families, students, teachers and staff) to help identify the MCSP structure that requires additional support.

**Progress:** The TFS Equity working group and working group leadership agreed that full implementation of restorative practices across community schools had the highest potential to improve school culture and climate and impact students’ ability to excel in the school environment. District and school level leadership supported prioritizing implementation of restorative practices across the MCSP network.

2. Define Success

With input from a diverse working group, determine what successful implementation of the MCSP Structure looks like across Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership Network. This is necessary to ensure buy-in and support for a successful implementation.

**Progress:** Working group members identified the need to further engage key stakeholders to define what successful implementation of restorative practices will look like. The model defines two structures related to restorative practices as:

- **Staff Use of Restorative Practices.** Increase use of restorative practices among adults (support circles, PLC, etc.) and integration into teaching practices and school culture.
- **Restorative Practices in Leadership Training.** Participation of school leaders in a learning community, leadership coaching and toolkit use.

During the process, key stakeholders, including restorative practices practitioners and coaches working in Milwaukee Community Schools, began the process of identifying the key components for successful implementation of restorative practices in Milwaukee Community Schools. Though several key components were identified, additional input is necessary to more fully inform the vision for success and increase buy-in of the key stakeholders who would support the implementation of restorative practices in the school setting.

**APPENDIX 3: EQUITY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS**

**PROCESS FOR FULLY IMPLEMENTING MCSP STRUCTURES**

The Equity Working Group used the feedback received from students, parents, and school principals through the focus groups and interviews to inform the development of a process for fully implementing the MCPS equity structures.

During the planning process, the Equity Working Group also selected restorative practices as a critical starting place for achieving greater equity within Milwaukee Community Schools. The following provides an overview of the implementation process created by the working group, along with an update on the work completed to date to strengthen restorative practices in Community Schools:

1. **Focus on an MCSP Structure**

2. **Define Success**

3. **Identify Needs**

4. **Research Leading Practices**

5. **Advocate and Align with MPS**

6. **Ensure Awareness & Education for Families and Students**

7. **Build Support**

8. **Develop Plan**

9. **Train and Coach**

10. **Monitor and Evaluate**
3. Identify Needs of Key Stakeholders
Assess the five key community school stakeholder needs and priorities to inform the implementation plan and strategy. This step aligns closely with the MCSP assessment process which engages students, families, school staff, and community partners in identifying school needs and priorities.

Progress: The TFS Working Group conducted focus groups with students and interviews with parents and Community Schools principals to determine the needs for successful implementation of restorative practices.

The needs identified included significant training and ongoing coaching and in-classroom support for staff charged with implementing restorative practices in Milwaukee Community Schools. Additionally, the principals interviewed identified the need to develop an implementation plan that would ensure that restorative practices would be implemented with sufficient capacity and resources to provide the best chance at success.

4. Research Leading Practices
Research current and leading practices for successful implementation of restorative practices across schools and/or a school district.

Progress: Milwaukee Succeeds currently supports restorative practices research in partnership with Marquette University and can help inform what a successful restorative practices model could look like for MCSP. In addition, over the course of the planning project, the working group leadership conducted a national scan to identify some leading practices for implementation of restorative practices in schools. Additional leading practices research would be required to better inform the implementation process.

5. Advocate & Align with MPS Leadership and Priorities
Advocate and align with Milwaukee Public School District leadership’s priorities to gain support for full implementation of restorative practices across MCSP network. Successful advocacy will require identifying allies within the current MPS leadership structure and points of alignment with MPS priorities.

Progress: The Working Group has not yet advocated with MPS Leadership. However, there is growing interest at MPS to strengthen restorative practices within schools. MPS is implementing restorative practices at varying levels. For example, in partnership with the Office of Violence Prevention and with funding by the Project AWARE Grant, MPS has engaged a restorative practices coach who is working across several MPS schools.

6. Ensure Awareness & Education for Families and Students
Increase awareness and education of families and students about restorative practices and the benefit of restorative practices.

Progress: The Working Group began conversations about Restorative Practices with students and parents during the focus groups and interviews. Additional education and awareness-raising activities are needed to gain buy-in from families. In one example, high school students who learned about restorative practices advocated with school leadership to make restorative practices a mandatory class.

7. Build Support For Implementation with Teachers and Staff
Build support for full implementation of restorative practices with MCSP teachers and staff by engaging educators and school staff early in the process, working closely with MTEA, and integrating updates and education within in-school meetings and trainings.

Progress: The Working Group has not yet worked to build support among educators. However, MTEA currently leads and supports Restorative Practices professional development for teachers and can inform what a successful restorative practices model could like for teachers and staff with MCSP.
8. Develop the Implementation Plan
Develop an implementation plan that provides school leadership and staff with the time, support and human and financial capacity and resources necessary to fully and successfully implement restorative practices across MCSP network. Use feedback from key stakeholders to directly inform the plan.

**Progress:** The Working Group has recommended this as a critical next step. Additionally, the principals interviewed strongly recommended that a full implementation plan be developed prior to beginning implementation of restorative practices. Principals emphasized the importance of planning for sufficient resources and capacity to ensure implementation is successful within each Milwaukee Community School.

9. Ensure Sufficient Training, Coaching, and Development for Teachers and Staff
Provide professional development, training and ongoing coaching and support for teachers and staff.

**Progress:** The Working Group has recommended this as a critical next step. In addition, the principals interviewed articulated that teachers and staff needed significant training and ongoing coaching to ensure they were prepared and effective in implementing the restorative practices curriculum. Principals agreed that many staff are at different points in their understanding of and belief in the effectiveness of restorative practices in a school setting. Currently, MTEA supports professional development for teachers and staff around restorative practices and could help inform and support full training and coaching support for teachers and staff.

10. Monitor and Evaluate For Success
Create and implement a system to monitor the implementation of restorative practices across MCPS network.

**Progress:** The Working Group has recommended this as a component of the implementation plan to ensure efficacy of restorative practices across Milwaukee Community Schools and inform program adjustments.
TFS EQUITY STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS
LOCATION: WASHINGTON AND PULASKI HIGH SCHOOLS
DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2018

Equity Student Focus Groups: On Monday, September 17, 2018 the P3 Development Group team facilitated conversations with 49 students at Washington and Pulaski High Schools ranging in age from 12 years old to 18 years old about conflict resolution and the concept of restorative practices.

The themes from those conversations are below.

1. How would you describe your current school environment? How does your school environment make you feel? (Give prompts, if necessary.)
   - Theme 1. Students did not have just one way of summarizing their school environments, and answers ranged from “boring” to “good learning.”
   - Theme 2. Wanting access to their personal technology at all times was a high priority for students. They felt that they should have access to their phones and headphones, and did not see this as interfering with their learning environments. Some felt that headphones with music helped them to avoid interpersonal conflicts.
   - Theme 3. Students crave a more engaging environment and had a desire for more field trips, pep rallies, or opportunities for activities outside of the school building offered more frequently.

2. How are issues currently handled in your school (i.e., fights)? How satisfied are you with the way your school handles issues?
   - Theme 1. The responses ranged by school for this question. At one school, students stated that teachers call security and don’t break up the fight, which students said was a good thing.
   - Theme 2. Some students said that mediation is or may be used after fights, while other students said that if there is a fight and it is interrupted or resolved at school it can prompt additional fights inside or outside of school.

3. What role do you think students should play in determining how issues are resolved in a school setting?
   - Theme 1. Having access to their phones and headphones was cited as a way to prevent interpersonal conflict.
   - Theme 2. Students can try harder to get along with each other.

4. Would you participate in a student training about how to solve issues if it was offered?
   - Theme 1. There was disagreement on whether students would or should participate, in part due to whether or not they thought such training would make a difference.
   - Theme 2. Some students expressed uncertainty about whether or not students wanted to solve these problems.

5. Who is familiar with restorative practices? (Give example of Restorative Practices, i.e. value circles where individuals sit in a circle and share the values that are important to them in a school setting)
   - Theme 1. Almost no students were familiar with the term “restorative practices,” or if they had heard of it, they didn’t know what it meant.

6. What would make restorative practice successful in your school?
   - Theme 1. Students felt that people who participated in learning how this was done would need help and support and space set aside in the school for this practice.
   - Theme 2. Implementing restorative practice with movement, perhaps settling things via a sports-based competition, was an idea shared by some students.
   - Theme 3. Students suggested that offering incentives for participation or for getting good grades might help the overall school environment.
Equity Family Interviews: On Saturday, September 22, 2018 the P3 Development Group team conducted interviews with 20 parents or guardians of children who ranged in age from infancy through high school, and some also had children who had aged out of school.

It is important to note that many of the parents or guardians who attended do not have children in Milwaukee Public Schools; their children/children they care for are enrolled in private schools.

The themes (or in some cases question summaries) that emerged from these discussions are outlined below, grouped by question.

1. **Do you have children? How many? What grade?**
   - Children ranged in age from infants through young adulthood. Some of the adults in attendance were grandparents or other guardians with custody of the children. How satisfied are you with the way your school handles issues?
   - The responses to this question varied. The majority of parents/guardians said that they had been very satisfied or satisfied with how issues had been handled at school, with a minority of attendees saying that they were “very unhappy” due to an ongoing bullying situation that had been unresolved or unaddressed. One parent also expressed dissatisfaction from receiving timely responses when trying to resolve problems with the school.

2. **How satisfied are you with the way your school handles issues?**
   - The responses to this question varied. The majority of parents/guardians said that they had been very satisfied or satisfied with how issues had been handled at school, with a minority of attendees saying that they were “very unhappy” due to an ongoing bullying situation that had been unresolved or unaddressed. One parent also expressed dissatisfaction from receiving timely responses when trying to resolve problems with the school.

3. **What expectations do you have for conflict resolution in your child’s school?**
   - **Theme 1.** Parents and guardians generally expected schools to notify them of any problems that were happening at school, and then to communicate with them about the ways that they intended to facilitate a solution between all parties (with or without the family's assistance).
   - **Theme 2.** For parents or guardians who had had poor experiences with resolving issues at school, they wanted to be sure that schools know that parents have high expectations for solving problems, because it’s viewed as the way to prevent problems from escalating.
   - **Theme 3.** Parents or guardians expect that issues will be handled fairly, thoroughly and quickly, possibly with the assistance of a mediator.

4. **What do you know about restorative practice? (Be prepared to give example)**
   - **Theme 1.** Parents or guardians were generally unsure of what “restorative practice” was, but the few who knew about it believed that it was effective as a means of solving problems and creating solutions.

5. **How do you think this would affect the climate in your child’s school?**
   - **Theme 1.** While many parents or guardians were not familiar with restorative practice, once it was explained to them most felt that it sounded like a very wise approach to handling problem solving in the school environment.
   - **Theme 2.** Some parents or guardians were wary of anything else being added to teachers’ plates, fearing that they were already overburdened.
   - **Theme 3.** A small minority of parents or guardians were not sure that such a practice would be necessary in the schools.

6. **If there was a parent training available for restorative practices, would you attend? If so, what would need to be in place to make it easy for you to attend or participate?**
   - **Theme 1.** Most parents or guardians were open to this if their needs for timing, child care, and other accommodations could be met.

7. **What would you need to know to support the implementation of a restorative practices curriculum in your child’s school? Parents and guardians wanted more information about the practice and its possible benefits for their kids’ schools.**
   - **Theme 1.** Parents and guardians would want to know what their roles would be in supporting these efforts in their kids’ schools.
1. What has been your experience with restorative practice?
   • Theme 1. Among administrators who have used restorative practice before, they universally found it helpful.
   • Theme 2. Administrators feel that some of its strengths include: it gets at the heart of issues, it builds relationships to open up alternatives other than physical violence for settling disputes, and can be used by people holding numerous positions within the school.
   • Theme 3. Restorative practice can help build bonds between teachers and students, and works best when everyone is properly trained and the program is implemented with fidelity.

2. Likert Scale: I believe that restorative practice would be valuable for my school? (4 = very valuable, 3= valuable, 2= somewhat valuable, 1=not at all valuable) Why?
   • Theme 1. All interviewees rated it a 4, the highest rating.
   • Theme 2. Restorative practice helps to interact in a more positive way inside and outside of school.
   • Theme 3. Restorative practice helps students to better understand their differences and appreciate them.
   • Theme 4. Restorative practice enables conflict resolution in a way that replaces high rates of suspensions with something more positive that also promotes accountability.
   • Theme 5. Because it relies on the generation or deeper interpersonal relationships, when this program is administered consistently, adults are able to get at the root cause of student behavioral issues at school more easily.

3. What would you need to effectively implement?
   • Theme 1. School administrators must be fully funded and supported through a multi-step process until the practice can be fully implemented within a school. It cannot be done halfway; it must be fully embraced by the entire school community, including at the district-wide level.
   • Theme 2. When there is turnover in schools—and this was cited as very high in some schools—there should be resources to bring in and train new staff on the practice. Training needs to be ongoing and iterative.
   • Theme 3. This practice is easier for some people to implement than others, depending on their personalities and their previous experience. It’s a mindset change that has to be supported for the long-term in order to become the school culture.
   • Theme 4. There are many competing priorities in schools and many demands on teachers, so ongoing support for the implementation process is key, including monitoring for fidelity. Staff must be convinced enough that it works, see it modeled, and buy into it.

4. What do you think is your staff’s readiness?
   • Theme 1. The time to complete professional development tasks like this is hard to come by, but adequate time must be set aside and compensated in order for the training to be completed and to take hold. There is a concern that the process not be undertaken if it will only be done “halfway.”
   • Theme 2. Different buildings are at different places in this process; some have had more experience and/or lost fewer trained staff than others, and this must be taken into account. Turnover is an especially important consideration.
   • Theme 3. Staff in some buildings may need more convincing than others, and misconceptions (like that this practice means that students will not get suspended) may be in place in some schools.
   • Theme 4. Once staff have been fully brought on board through training and support, students must also be educated about restorative practice.
   • Theme 5. There is a feeling on the part of some school staff that “so many things have already been tried before” so some may need more help getting on board than others.
5. What is your vision around creating a healthy culture and climate in your building? How do you see restorative practices factoring into that vision/plan?

- Theme 1. Teachers and administrators want to get to a point where much less time is spent dealing with student fights and other discipline issues so that more students can spend time learning. School should be the place that everyone feels safe.
- Theme 2. Teachers and administrators want more connection to the community/parents and for community/parents to feel more connected to the school community. Restorative practice was cited by some as a way to build community.
- Theme 3. By making stronger connections between the students, families, and school community, restorative practice will have positive impacts well outside of the school building.
- Theme 4. Students who do not settle disagreements with violence would be one way that schools would know that restorative practice is working.
LOCATION: WASHINGTON AND PULASKI HIGH SCHOOLS
DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2018

Data Family Interviews: On Saturday, September 22, 2018 the P3 Development Group team conducted interviews at Hamilton High School with 14 parents or guardians of children who ranged in age from infancy through high school, and some also had children who had aged out of school.

It is important to note that many of the parents or guardians who participated do not have children in Milwaukee Public Schools; their children/children they care for are enrolled in private schools.

The themes (or in some cases question summaries) that emerged from these discussions are outlined below, grouped by question.

Data Focus Group Themes, Grouped by Question

1. Do you have children? How many? What grade?
   • The ages of the children in their care ranged from K4 through the 12th grade, and between the 14 of them they had more than 30 children.

2. When you think about data, what does that mean to you? Your data? Your child's data?
   • Theme 1. Parents and guardians would want to know ahead of time what would be collected and how it would be used. Confidentiality was a big concern.
   • Theme 2. Parents and guardians are concerned about things like identity theft, so would want to know ahead of time who would have access to data and who the school would be sharing it with.
   • Parents and guardians had a high level of comfort with sharing medical information with the school.
   • Theme 3. What role do you think students should play in determining how issues are resolved in a school setting?

3. What do you know about the data or information that is currently collected from/about your child? What, if anything, concerns you about the information being collected from/about your child?
   • Theme 1. Parents and guardians know that personal contact and basic medical information is already collected and stored by the school.
   • Theme 2. The comfort level with sharing data varies a bit from person to person. There was some hesitation expressed about sharing photos or videos of children in case it got out of the school’s possession.

4. What are the things you wish that teachers, doctors, afterschool programs knew about your child? How would you want them to get this information?
   • There was not much response to this question, just four respondents out of 14 had an opinion. Parents and guardians want the school to have data that’s relevant for their uses, would like to have real-time communication about grades as the semesters progress, and want strong parent-school communications in general.

5. How do you feel about the idea of different people sharing data/information with each other?
   • Theme 1. Parents and guardians know that data storage and management can open up privacy and hacking concerns, and it makes them concerned about sharing too much personal information.
   • Theme 2. Implementing restorative practice with movement, perhaps settling things via a sports-based competition, was an idea shared by some students.
   • Theme 3. Parents and guardians want information in advance about how data will and will not be shared, if collected.
LOCATION: WASHINGTON AND PULASKI HIGH SCHOOLS
DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2018

Data Student Focus Groups: On Monday, September 17, 2018 the P3 Development Group team facilitated conversations with 31 students at Washington and Pulaski High Schools about data/information sharing.

Two sets of questions were used for these discussions, one focused on data and one focused on equity. The themes that emerged from these discussions are outlined below.

Data Focus Group Themes, Grouped by Question

1. When you think about data (all the stuff people collect from you, i.e., surveys, Facebook, apps), what do you want people to do with that information? What do you hope people will not do with that information?

   Note: Some to most students, depending on the focus group, did not understand this question, and it may have been explained slightly differently by the focus group leaders.

   • Theme 1. Many students feel that some of this data collection amounts to an invasion of privacy, and that some of that data is personal in nature.
     • “People don’t need to know that much about me. Why?”
     • “You just need to know what I want you to know”

   • Theme 2. Some students had a specific fear of teachers having too much student information, feeling that it might (or had already) led them to be “profiled” or “singled out” by teachers in a negative way.
     • “You shouldn’t be judged by your past. Just because that’s how you are doesn’t mean that’s how you will always be.”

   • Theme 3. Students fear that only bad data/information would be shared, instead of good data/information.
     • “They just use the bad stuff against you.”

   • Theme 4. Many students have a particular fear about their home addresses being shared, fearing that it might lead to being targets of violence.
     • “Nobody needs to know where I live.”

   • Theme 2. The comfort level with sharing data varies a bit from person to person. There was some hesitation expressed about sharing photos or videos of children in case it got out of the school’s possession.

2. What are the things you wish that teachers, doctors, after school programs knew about you? How would you want them to get this information? (Give examples, text survey, ask me in person, etc.)

   • Theme 1. Students expressed a willingness to share medical information with the appropriate people (doctors or other health care providers) because they saw this as necessary. They questioned the need for others—especially teachers—to need much information about them, like where they lived, whether or not they had a disciplinary record inside or outside of school, etc.
     • “The school needs to know stuff from your doctor.”

   • Theme 2. Students had a high level of comfort, overall, with people being aware of any mental health conditions they had, or any need they had for special education services.

   • Theme 3. Students would like teachers to know about and be responsive to their individual learning styles.
     • “If you know more about me, you can know what I need to be a good student”

   • Theme 4. Students would like teachers to know more about what’s happening in their lives, and this ranged widely from religion, to sports participation, to likes and dislikes.
     • “They always want to know the bas stuff and don’t care about the good stuff.”
     • “I am involved with a lot of positive stuff but no one ever asks about that.”
• Theme 5. Students were generally uncomfortable with any of the groups of adults mentioned sharing information that they considered private, such as information from their childhoods or personal problems.
  • “Teachers should only know what I do in school. That’s it.”
• Theme 6. The best way to gather information from students is to ask them questions face to face, in order to build trust. There was some specific concern about online records being too share-able/prone to breach of confidentiality.
  • “Surveys don’t work. Just sit down and ask me the questions.”
• Theme 7. Some students mentioned the need to make sure that if any data system were set up that it would record good stuff such as community service. “Surveys don’t work. Just sit down and ask me the questions.”
  • “I do clean up and help my grandma. They should know about that too.”

3. How do you feel about the idea of different people sharing data/information with each other? (Example: your school sharing information with an after-school program or Facebook sharing information about you with your school.)

• Students were also asked:
  • Why do you feel this way?
  • If the idea causes worry or concern, probe further with:
    • What concerns you; what would make you worry less;
    • Are there specific things you wouldn’t want shared?
    • Are there specific things you wouldn’t mind being shared?

• Theme 1. Any system that is set up should have very strong security to prevent it from getting into the wrong hands.
  • “I don’t want my information falling into the wrong hands.”
• Theme 2. Students would want to know up front what will and will not be shared, and with whom. They want a say in how these things are determined, and when and how the information is shared.
• Theme 3. Students prefer in-person data gathering through interviews rather than online questionnaires or other online data tools.
  • “If you are getting my information. Just ask me in person.”
  • Why can’t it just be a conversation?”
• Theme 4. Students want reassurance that the data would not be used to expel or otherwise discipline them.
  • “I don’t want anything used against me.”
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Executive Summary

Through a Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative and Ford Foundation planning grant, the United Way of Greater Milwaukee & Waukesha County, Milwaukee Succeeds, and Milwaukee Public Schools commissioned stakeholders in the education and social services sectors to promote student-centered, equitable access to resources and services. A key aspect of this vision includes a data-sharing system that gives partners access to student data.

Through this grant opportunity, the Together for Students (TFS) partnership was formed. This partnership aims to develop a way for Milwaukee service providers with ties to the education sector to access student information that will facilitate more effective and tailored service provision. The Asemio team has conducted several in-person meetings with key representatives from stakeholder organizations identified by the TFS Data Workgroup, and conducted surveys in order to reach a broader group of stakeholders. The outcome of these meetings and surveys provided insight into the Milwaukee education sector data landscape, which enabled analysis of the sector’s collective culture, governance, and infrastructure. The results of this analysis are outlined throughout this document and are accompanied by recommendations for next steps and technical considerations.

Below are six key insights, which we explain further in the Key Insights section. Recommendations informed by these insights and our interactions with the community are found in the Data-Sharing Platform Recommendations and Summary of Recommendations sections.

KEY INSIGHTS:

- A clearly articulated vision and shared agenda are key to short- and long-term success.
- Resource commitment for this work is in the early stages.
- Data sharing with Milwaukee Public Schools and other partners can be strengthened.
- A wealth of infrastructure exists in large, siloed organizations in Milwaukee.
- Creating a student-centered data system would be an innovative approach to student data in the Milwaukee community.
- Students have access to many programs and services offered at Milwaukee Public Schools.
Approach and Methodology

WHAT DO WE DO?

Technology is rarely a magic bullet. More often, it is a Trojan horse for change. Our clients are often looking for help to either improve the services they provide or increase access to information about the efficacy of interventions.

To support our clients and partners in these efforts, we offer our Data Ecosystem Consulting Services\(^1\) and Agile Software Development Services.\(^2\)

HOW DO WE DO IT?

DATA ECOSYSTEM FRAMEWORK

Asemio developed several tools to help clients better articulate their work’s context and identify the challenges they face. The Data Ecosystem Framework is at the core of our tool set.

This framework demonstrates the complexity and power of integrated data projects in the community and provides language that can be used to discuss these efforts. It helps us talk about, align, connect, and integrate community resources focused on solving complex social problems.

The Data Ecosystem Framework identifies three areas that contain the components of systems-level change:

- **Point of view:** Payer (funding sources), provider (service, treatment, and program providers), and person (clients, consumers, and patients)
- **Level of work:** Provider, sector, and community
- **Areas of advancement:** Culture, governance, and infrastructure

Our framework shows community stakeholders their roles within the community data ecosystem and helps us efficiently identify root causes of barriers to systems-level change.

---

\(^1\) Appendix A: Data Ecosystem Consulting Services

\(^2\) Appendix B: Agile Software Development Services
Our Process

Our team engaged with community stakeholders with the goal of learning more about the emergence of the student-centered data-sharing partnership in Milwaukee. The process began with a series of one-on-one conversations, and included biweekly participation in the TFS Data Workgroup, broad information gathering via electronic survey, and a series of in-person interviews with key stakeholders.

Surveys
In order to begin evaluating the Milwaukee community, Asemio conducted an online survey of a broad range of stakeholders associated with the Milwaukee education sector. The responses informed our assessment of the community’s maturity in the areas of culture, governance, and infrastructure, and aided us in making recommendations for the TFS initiative.
Interviews
Asemio conducted in-person interviews with stakeholders identified as having particularly valuable perspectives on issues related to the TFS initiative. These interviews also informed our assessment of the community’s maturity in the areas of culture, governance, and infrastructure, as well as our recommendations for the TFS initiative.

Data collected through the surveys and interviews was analyzed through an Asemio-developed process to quantify the baseline scores; identify critical community systems, key data, and technical elements; and develop the recommendations presented in this report.

A list of organizations participating in the surveys and assessments is included in Appendix C. Inventories of critical community systems, key data elements, and key technical elements are included in Appendix D.

Key Insights

Through our survey analysis and on-site interviews with stakeholders, our team distilled six key insights.

A clearly articulated vision and shared agenda are key to short- and long-term success. In multiple dialogues and throughout our survey-based data capture, stakeholders and partners unanimously expressed that a lack of clarity around the shared vision is the primary challenge facing the TFS work, and also that this shared vision will be the primary driver for success. Further, no single organization was recognized as the backbone entity that would manage this work moving forward and take ownership of the student-centered data system. Potential owners identified were Milwaukee Succeeds, United Way of Greater Milwaukee & Waukesha County, or possibly a neutral third party. The most commonly expressed solution to this was to form a governing body within a consortium of the participating agencies.

Resource commitment for this work is in the early stages. Many TFS partners identified the planning grant and potential for implementation funding as crucial to the success of the initiative. With dedicated and continuous investment from organizations, support for their representatives’ expertise and time, and action-oriented commitment, TFS will be able to sustain the partnership's efforts while working to secure long-term implementation funding.

Data sharing with Milwaukee Public Schools and other partners can be strengthened. While the majority of TFS partners find that sharing data with MPS is challenging, a small cohort of
partner organizations have been successful in establishing data-sharing agreements with MPS, reinforced by strong relationships and clearly defined data use. During our interviews, we discovered that MPS had recently released a data-sharing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) template that will allow partner agencies to make student data more accessible.

A wealth of infrastructure exists in large, siloed organizations in Milwaukee. Based on our experience with other communities, this is not unusual and can serve as a catalyst for early learning in the data-sharing and governance-building process. Both the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee Public Schools have implemented technologies that facilitate data sharing. By initially focusing on smaller projects with these larger organizations, TFS can increase capacity for smaller partner organizations.

Students have access to many programs and services offered at Milwaukee Public Schools. Several partner agencies are working to align student and community needs with the programs and services available at each school; however, many programs and services can enter a school without coordinating with Community School Coordinators, Milwaukee Succeeds, or other partners. This can result in duplicative programming and other areas of need being underserved.

Creating a student-centered data system would be an innovative approach to student data in the Milwaukee community. In the TFS focus groups conducted by the Equity and Data Workgroups, many interviewees recognized that a student-centered data system looks beyond attendance, behavioral, and coursework metrics. Data points about students’ interests, long-term goals for their lives, challenges they face at home or in their neighborhoods, and medical conditions were all identified as important for maintaining a true student-centered perspective. Furthermore, focus groups and interviewees addressed the importance of engaging with parents and students on what is being done with student data.

Baseline Assessment

We have grouped our findings and recommendations by culture, governance, and infrastructure. These three components make up the areas of advancement within Asemio’s Community Data Ecosystem Framework. Baseline scores for each area are calculated with the quantitative and qualitative data captured by the survey and are vetted through supportive anecdotal evidence collected during the interview process.
Areas of Advancement Findings

These baseline scores indicate that the Milwaukee partnership engaged in the TFS work is in the early stages of development. Significant technological resources exist in the community; however, these technologies tend to be siloed in large individual organizations. The partners have been motivated by the planning grant funding, and many stakeholders identified a need to invest in culture and governance in the immediate future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Ideating</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Mature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CULTURE

*Culture speaks to the community data vision, resource commitment, and cooperation and trust.*

Verbal anecdotes from partners, confirmed by the survey results, indicate that there exists a need to develop a shared community vision and to strengthen relationships among participating organizations, as well as with those not yet engaged in the TFS work. The planning grant was identified as evidence of commitment to this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Ideating</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Mature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNANCE

*Governance speaks to regulatory influence, community policy, and overall sustainability model.*

Survey and interview analyses both illustrate that the partnership’s focus on policy and creating a sustainability plan has been limited, while almost every interviewee identified privacy and security
as key to ensuring success in Milwaukee. History and individual experiences shared with us presented a motif of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) being leveraged as a way to block data sharing. Despite difficulties in navigating regulatory requirements, several partners have had success developing data-sharing agreements with other Milwaukee partners, including Milwaukee Public Schools.

Infrastructure speaks to knowledge management, level of fidelity to systems-level change models, and technical capabilities.

The TFS partnership created some initial knowledge management tools for use during the planning grant term, and most partners identified meetings or other informal communication as the primary method for learning about best practice work in Milwaukee. Many partners work on projects using methodological frameworks to address systems-level change, and technologies present in the community range from established enterprise systems, like those used by Milwaukee Public Schools, to basic systems for data collection and analysis used by many programs and services.
Data-Sharing Platform Recommendation

Through the baseline assessment process and inventory of community systems, key data elements, and technical elements, we arrived at a two-phase approach to the technical component of this project as the partners work toward increased data sharing in the Milwaukee education and social services sectors. Phase One largely focuses on work that can be done with in-kind or minimal resource commitments. With significant additional investment, Phase Two expands this work to realize a broader vision of a student-centered data system.

Phase One

**Begin Implementing OpenReferral to Align Community Descriptors of Program Information**

There exists a need to better identify and coordinate the programs and services offered in schools. We recommend partners begin by describing existing programs and services using the OpenReferral Human Data Service Specification (HSDS). OpenReferral is a standard format for directory information about organizations, programs, services, and locations that provide health, human, and social services. It can also link to appropriate service taxonomies, such as OpenEligibility. OpenReferral data can be created using simple spreadsheet applications that are saved as CSV files.

Several partners already collect non-personally identifiable, aggregate student-related data in table form. Using OpenReferral, Milwaukee partners with aggregate data can manage and organize their data systematically and with other partners in the community.

**Create a Central Repository for Aggregate Data**

Data from partners should be easily accessible by people and programs. Creating a central repository for student-related data using the Comprehensive Knowledge Archive Network (CKAN), an open source data management system, allows users to browse and find the data they need as well as preview it using maps, graphs, and tables. In addition to a fully featured user-facing portal, CKAN supports programmatic access via an API, which streamlines the process for transmitting data to the repository. Partners may manually or automatically upload data packages (metadata+data) to the central CKAN repository.

Both OpenReferral and CKAN are free, and can be implemented by the existing data and technology teams working in the TFS partnership over the next 24 months.

---

3 https://openreferral.org/
4 https://github.com/auntbertha/openeligibility
5 https://ckan.org/
Below is a sample OpenReferral table listing organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>id</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899600a-649c-11e6-8b77-86f30ca893d3</td>
<td>Sanctuary Example City</td>
<td>Sanctuary assists homeless individuals in finding housing and employment.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sanctuary@example.com">sanctuary@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18996320-649c-11e6-8b77-86f30ca893d3</td>
<td>Youth in Focus Example City</td>
<td>Youth in Focus programs provide pathways for low-income young people to rebuild their lives and community through work and education.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:YIF@example.com">YIF@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899673a-649c-11e6-8b77-86f30ca893d3</td>
<td>Food for Charities Example City</td>
<td>Food for Charities acquires in-date food that would otherwise be wasted and works with local organizations to redistribute food to vulnerable communities.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:city-food@example.com">city-food@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase Two**

After devoting an estimated 18 months to the recommendations outlined in Phase One, the partnership will have formed a foundation to implement a long-term solution. A data-sharing platform will allow users to query fine-grained, personally identifiable information as well as perform aggregate queries. The data contained in a new data store must be proportionally granular in multiple dimensions, including time (i.e., capturing real-world changes over time). In order to implement the solutions presented for Phase Two, the partnership will need to determine system ownership, ensure privacy and security regulatory compliance, and establish data-sharing agreements with participating organizations. To start, we recommend focusing with two to three partners, adding partners as the work progresses. More information around nontechnical recommendations can be found in the Summary of Recommendations.

**Implement the Ed-Fi Educational Data Standards Across TFS Partners**

Milwaukee Public Schools has already implemented an Ed-Fi\(^6\) Operational Data Store (ODS) for student information. We recommend expanding on this work to accommodate non-MPS data. In particular, we envision a union Ed-Fi data store containing normalized data from MPS and other partners in the platform. The most direct path to implementation would be loading MPS and non-MPS data into a new union store.

The Ed-Fi educational data standards and associated frameworks and technologies are designed to bridge disparate student-related data systems. A number of its features are especially relevant to the TFS initiative:

- Student-centered unifying data model
- Broad community and vendor support

---

\(^6\) [https://www.ed-fi.org](https://www.ed-fi.org)
- Extensibility to define new domains, entities, and associations as first-class members of the store
- Web-based dashboards for aggregating and displaying coarse-grained metrics derived from fine-grained data
- Programmatic access via API

The union store should be implemented incrementally, progressively incorporating data from more providers, starting with MPS and proceeding according to the ease of mapping existing data to normalized relational models and creating new dashboards to report on that data in aggregate. Tools such as Data Flow\(^7\) can be used to extract-transform-load CSV files into the union store.

The union store would be largely application-agnostic, but it can serve as a foundation for a number of other applications, such as a data warehouse for reporting or a web application for care coordination, depending on the goals of the community. Below are examples of the expanded technological solutions the partnership can explore as they develop the long-term shared vision and agenda.

**Populate a Data Warehouse for Reporting and Ad Hoc Queries**
Ed-Fi’s normalized relational database model and encapsulating API are best suited for querying individual entities (e.g., students, classes, etc.) and not for complex queries over multiple entities. Ed-Fi dashboards rely on precalculating and storing metrics at regular intervals, rather than ad hoc analytics queries. In the long-term, we recommend leveraging the normalized union store to populate a dimensional data warehouse for faster ad hoc queries. The Ed-Fi Alliance publishes a dimensional database schema that could be used as the basis for this data warehouse.

**Explore Differential Privacy Tools to Facilitate Sharing Personally Identifiable Data Sets**
If the long-term vision evolves to include the development of a data warehouse, differential privacy\(^8\) could be an effective means of allowing exploratory queries over the store without sharing entire personally identifiable data sets. Differential privacy quantifies the potential privacy loss of summary queries—the additional risk to an individual that results from her data being used. Given this quantification, privacy loss can be bounded by imposing a privacy budget on queries.

**Invest in a Community-Wide Care Coordination Application**
A care coordination web application could be built directly on the union store, providing a student-centered view of the store for teachers, program coordinators, or administrators. This kind of system can be used by program and service providers and school faculty and staff to communicate across organizations about student needs, coordinate services, and provide

\(^7\) [https://github.com/schoolstacks/dataflow](https://github.com/schoolstacks/dataflow)

\(^8\) [https://privacytools.seas.harvard.edu/differential-privacy](https://privacytools.seas.harvard.edu/differential-privacy)
students access to their data, depending on the goals of the community. A web application could be built with any standard software stack, such as Ruby on Rails, ASP.NET MVC, or LAMP.

**Budget Estimate**

The following budget estimate is intended to inform implementation efforts for a student-centered data system. This budget is informed by assumptions regarding size of the future partnership backbone organization, as well as program implementation goals and community data vision. We outline an estimate for technology-related investments in data analysis, recommended architecture/tools, and relevant areas such as ETL implications, security, and the effect of the data and technology infrastructure on care coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase One 0-24 months</th>
<th>Phase Two 18 months and on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Estimate for Data System Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>$60,000 - $160,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>Free or open source tools such as Python, R, etc. would constitute the entire architecture of the initial system. Automation would be minimal. Much of the focus of the backbone's initial work will be on relationship development, trust building, and governance. The use of free or open source tools will enable forward movement of the initial work without significant investment ahead of the development of the backbone organization.</td>
<td>As the organization develops both trust and process, architecture can also mature. This could be an appropriate point for technology improvements, such as building out the union data store that includes MPS data as well as integrated data from community service providers. This architecture can help answer data-related policy and service questions while providing the foundation for more intensive care coordination-related services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data-Related Staffing</strong></td>
<td>In the initial phase of development, the data analytics and data wrangling would not be automated, and much of the work would be done by a single full-time employee who would coordinate and direct activities around the student-centered data system.</td>
<td>As the organization matures and the technology becomes more advanced, the role included in Phase One may expand to include software administration functions, prioritization of infrastructure enhancements, and activities that go deeper into the data science as more processes get</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ETL

Extraction, transformation, and loading (ETL) will be done manually by the employee. Free tools exist that would facilitate this process, but it is unlikely that an automated workflow would be attainable. As the system grows and matures, functionality could be added, such as a partially automated system for extraction, transformation, and loading.

Analysis

Analysis within this data system would be mainly focused on policy and efficacy decisions, and automation of reporting would be minimal. In this phase of system growth, analysis could be automated to regularly provide pertinent information for community-level decision-making. Automated ETL capabilities would allow for real-time analysis, alerts, dashboards, and workflow.

Care Coordination

This system would have no care coordination capabilities. The Phase Two architecture provides a foundation for adding care coordination abilities through a web-based application.

Security

Most security will be enforced through policy and agreements. The system is unlikely to include sophisticated methods such as K-anonymity, multiparty computation (MPC), or even less sophisticated role-based privacy and field-level auditing. The system will likely include some level of role-based privacy and field-level auditing, and has the potential to accommodate more sophisticated methods such as K-anonymity or MPC.

Summary of Recommendations

In this section, Asemio has included a summary of the recommendations organized by areas of advancement in two phases. The estimated time frames for completing the work of each phase take into account that progress is largely dependent on long-term, sustainable funding and will rely on functioning interdependencies across all areas of advancement.

Phase One Recommendations

Time frame: zero to 24 months
Culture

- Clearly articulate a shared vision and agenda.
- Establish a backbone organization to drive the work of the project and facilitate the development of the student-centered data system.
- Seek organizational support in the form of subject matter experts, their time, and commitment to action.
- Seek long-term implementation and operational funding.

Governance

- Share the Milwaukee Public Schools’ newly released template MOU with partner organizations.
- Establish data-sharing agreements among organizations participating in the technological developments.
- Develop an initial charter or other governing documentation outlining policies, procedures, and the shared vision for the partnership.
- Outline a sustainability plan for the initiative, so that staffing, funding, policy, or other system changes do not threaten its success.

Infrastructure

- Implement knowledge management processes, such as formalizing communications to the partnership and implementing information management in an accessible tool or community resource.
- Implement a standard data format to assist in facilitating coordination of the programs and services offered in schools.
- Create a central repository for student-related data, an open source data management system to encourage sharing of aggregate data sources.
  - Examples of organizations that have aggregate data available include: Milwaukee Public Schools, City of Milwaukee, United Way of Greater Milwaukee & Waukesha County, City Year Milwaukee, and City of Milwaukee Health Department. These systems already have their own data storage processes and can share in aggregate relatively easily.

Phase Two Recommendations

Time frame: 18 months and on

Culture

- Secure long-term implementation and operational funding.
- Maintain shared vision and recruit additional partner organizations committed to the vision.
- Build up technological maturity and data literacy across partnership through training.
funding for dedicated staff, and technical assistance.

**Governance**
- Maintain a governing body, updating governance policy and procedures as the organization and its work evolves.
- Implement a strategic sustainability plan that may be employed as staffing, funding, policy, or other systemic changes occur.
- Develop data-sharing agreements that facilitate sharing of data covered under FERPA and, as needed, HIPAA.

**Infrastructure**
- Implement the Ed-Fi educational data standards and associated frameworks and technologies designed to bridge disparate student-related data systems through a union data store.
  - Data can then be shared to allow for analysis of academic outcomes, attendance, and student demographics.
  - Focus the work with two to three partners initially, adding partners as progress builds.
- Add in personal, student-level data to expand analysis capabilities for questions about trauma, personal, and health status.
  - Student-level data will ensure the system is student-centric and asks question about students’ future goals, interests, and exposure to risks.
- With additional technological investment, evolution of the shared vision, and advancement in governance, develop strategies to implement longitudinal, real-time, or other vision-defined student data analytics, care coordination, or other community-defined goals for the application.
Appendix A: Data Ecosystem Consulting Services

Asemio’s consulting is person-centric. We incorporate best practices of human-centered design to ensure our solutions keep the people we’re solving for in focus. Our consulting process is highly adaptable and tailored to each engagement.

The core tenets of our consulting methodology are described below.

GAINING SHARED UNDERSTANDING

- Human-centered design
  - Building solutions with the end users in mind
- User story mapping
  - A holistic approach to designing the right thing
- Use of high-interaction feedback tools

COMMUNICATION

- Frequent status meetings
  - Progress evaluation and continued value proposition alignment
- Group and individual meetings and workshops

SYNTHESIS

- Verbal and visual dissemination of information
- User experience-focused solutions
Appendix B: Agile Software Integration and Development Services

Agile software development principles espouse an iterative, incremental approach and have been lauded for 10 years as an ideal way to complete complex software projects. Foundational to Asemio Agile (AA) methodology is close collaboration between Asemio and our partners or clients, ensuring frequent delivery of value, bringing project risks to light as they arise, and guaranteeing that we are working on your organization’s current highest priority.

Below are a few of the core practices of AA.

COMMUNICATION

- Demonstration meetings every two weeks
  - View and evaluate new functionality
  - Evaluate features within client environment
  - Incorporate new insights into requirements
- Project status meetings every two weeks, alternating with demonstration meetings
  - Review progress against project budget
  - Discuss project health indicators

TECHNICAL PRACTICES

- Test-driven development
  - Automated tests are developed prior to implementation and are continually re-executed to ensure functionality
- Continuous integration
  - Code changes from every team member are integrated multiple times a day
  - Automated regression test suite failures are reported to the team
- Continuous delivery
  - Successfully integrated code changes are automatically deployed to a staging/testing environment
### Appendix C: Participant Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America SCORES Milwaukee</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club of Greater Milwaukee</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Hospital of Wisconsin</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>● Data &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee Health Department: Office of Violence Prevention</td>
<td>● Data</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Year Milwaukee</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Interview</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Public Schools</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Data</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
<td>● Data</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Mutual</td>
<td>● Data</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way of Greater Milwaukee &amp; Waukesha County</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Data</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way of Greater Milwaukee &amp; Waukesha County</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds: Kindergarten Readiness Partnership</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Community Inventory

As part of the recommendations for the areas of advancement and the identified data-sharing platform, Asemio captured an inventory of critical community systems, key data elements that would be used to report on long-term outcomes and indicators, and technical elements that drive systems integration efforts, including adopted community standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community Systems</th>
<th>Data Elements</th>
<th>Technical Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club of Greater Milwaukee</td>
<td>Word, Excel, and Google applications</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Has API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Public Schools</td>
<td>Sophisticated statistical analysis tools, custom web-based application, off-the-shelf web-based application</td>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Share</td>
<td>De-identified research data warehouse that receives, reviews, and fulfills data requests</td>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Succeeds</td>
<td>Sophisticated statistical analysis tools, off-the-shelf desktop application</td>
<td>Analytics and intervention</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Tools and Applications</td>
<td>Analysis and Intervention</td>
<td>Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Year Milwaukee</td>
<td>Sophisticated statistical analysis tools, custom desktop application</td>
<td>-Survey and assessment -Evaluation -Personnel/staffing -Demographic -Geographic -Financial -Student -Service location -Scheduling -Administrative -Service delivery -Metadata</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way of Greater Milwaukee &amp; Waukesha County</td>
<td>Aggregate database that collects standardized survey data for out-of-school providers</td>
<td>-Survey and assessment -Financial -Service location -Administrative -Service delivery -Referral</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Health Department</td>
<td>Will be getting a custom web-based database soon and uses sophisticated statistical analysis tools</td>
<td>-Survey and assessment -Evaluation -Financial -Service location -Administrative -Service delivery -Referral</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America SCORES Milwaukee</td>
<td>Custom web-based application and spreadsheet tools for data collection and analysis</td>
<td>-Survey and assessment -Evaluation -Personnel/staffing -Demographic -Student -Scheduling</td>
<td>Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>data.milwaukee.gov - dashboards of data from 28 systems and sophisticated tools for data analysis and reporting</td>
<td>-Survey and assessment -Service location -Personnel/staffing -Demographic -Scheduling -Financial -Administrative -Service delivery -Geographic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNCOM (coalition of settlement houses) database system shared by various partners</td>
<td>-Service location &lt;br&gt;-Service delivery &lt;br&gt;-Student</td>
<td>EPIC electronic health record system; Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child initiative data &quot;system&quot; (may not be a tool or application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dashes indicate that information was unavailable or unknown.
Appendix E: Personas

The following fictional characters represent key data system users and stakeholders of the future-state data-sharing system. We believe this system would align with the vision and goals of education and social service organizations in Milwaukee.

**Public Policy Expert and Decision Maker**

**Scott Butler**

- **Biography**
  Scott is the chief policy analyst at the Southeastern Wisconsin Center for Public Policy Research. He has been involved in public policy across the United States for 15 years, largely with the Public Policy Department of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights. He still considers himself a newcomer to Milwaukee, where his work has been focused for the past two years. He strives to advocate for interventions that effectively promote equity. He is energized about the opportunities for change that are ripe in Milwaukee.

- **Community role**
  Scott has been involved with the Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership as a community representative and a parent. Within his role at the Center, he has advocated for evidence-based educational interventions and for greater collaboration between organizations within the Milwaukee education and social service sector.

- **Responsibilities**
  Scott is responsible for leading the Center’s policy research efforts and ensuring that those efforts are relevant to the most pressing policy issues in southeastern Wisconsin. He oversees and supports the Center’s research team, spearheads new projects, and represents the Center in the community.

- **Goals and motivations**
  Scott aims to take part in creating the kind of systems-level change in Milwaukee that he has participated in at a national level for 15 years. He relies on the student-centered data system in Milwaukee for real-time aggregate reports on student behavior, housing, academic, attendance, nutrition, and health outcomes correlated to participation in various community initiatives and demographic information. This year, his team at the Center used data from the student-centered data system to advocate for increased state grants to coordinate effective secondary student support initiatives in the Milwaukee area.
Louisa Campbell

- **Biography**  
  Louisa is an incoming ninth-grade student at Milwaukee Public Schools’ Hamilton High School. Though she has been in MPS schools since kindergarten, she has transferred to several different schools within the district.

- **Community role**  
  Louisa’s long-term academic and community intervention data has been stored in the student-centered data system for much of her academic career. She has been involved in COA since she was 8 years old.

- **Responsibilities**  
  Louisa and her mother have worked hard to overcome her academic challenges. The only child in a single-parent household, Louisa is close to her mother and her friends and strives to please them.

- **Goals and motivations**  
  Louisa and her friends plan to join the Junior ROTC program at Hamilton, but her mother is concerned that extracurricular commitments will keep her from getting her homework done. Louisa emails the JROTC instructor at Hamilton to ask for help winning her mom over to the program. The instructor sends Louisa a link to the school outcomes dashboard on the public-facing student-centered data system site, which shows that students who participate in JROTC and other extracurricular activities typically earn higher grades across subjects than their peers who do not participate in extracurriculars. Louisa uses her student ID and enrollment information to set up a student account in the student-centered data system and shows her mother how she can track her grades, behavior, and attendance information through the site. They make a deal that she will be able to participate in JROTC as long as she maintains good grades, attendance, and behavior in all her classes.

DeAndre Harris

- **Biography**  
  DeAndre is a 25-year-old graduate of Marquette University with a degree in economics. He was a peer mentor in high school and continued in the social services community as an intern throughout his undergraduate career. He is the youngest of three, and neither of
his siblings completed high school. DeAndre believes his admission to Rufus King International School set him on a separate academic trajectory from his siblings, and he is passionate about investigating ways to extend the opportunities he benefited from to more Milwaukee students.

- **Community role**
  DeAndre is enrolled in a master’s program in public service at Marquette University, and is completing his practicum within the scope of his employment as an analyst at Rise United of Greater Milwaukee, an established local collective nonprofit fundraising organization.

- **Responsibilities**
  DeAndre works to demonstrate the community-wide impact of targeted funding for initiatives that collaborate to provide comprehensive services to a common population. He aims to demonstrate that collaboration between service providers significantly increases the effectiveness of interventions, and to encourage charitable resources to be distributed with this criteria in mind.

- **Goals and motivations**
  DeAndre uses public, aggregate data from the student-centered data system to investigate the link between academic outcomes and collaboration between various education-focused community initiatives. He is part of a study that is evaluating the coordination of youth mentoring programs offered across the MPS district. He finds that duplicative efforts are making it difficult to target schools with the greatest need. The study recommends refocusing youth mentoring programs on areas of highest need and reducing redundant programming in individual schools.

---

### School Administrator

**Diana Rudo**

- **Biography**
  Diana spent three years as a middle-school math teacher at Louisa-May Alcott before moving into an administrative role. She then went to James Madison Academic Campus, where she has remained for 15 years. Her two daughters are in the ninth and eleventh grades at James Madison. Once her daughters have graduated, Diana plans to begin working for the Office of the Superintendent at MPS, as she has been recommended for positions there multiple times in recent years.

- **Community role**
  Diana is the assistant principal of James Madison Academic Campus high school, a position she has held for 10 of her 15 years there.

- **Responsibilities**
Diana is responsible for directing and coordinating student-success-related initiatives within the school. She administers discipline to students, welcomes and orients new staff, and serves as an unofficial confidant and mentor to staff and students alike.

- **Goals and motivations**
  Diana has chosen to remain in this position for 10 years despite multiple opportunities for more influential or lucrative positions because she is passionate about the work of James Madison, which she believes is high-impact and effective. She appreciates the concepts of data-informed decision-making and evidence-based interventions, but is most energized by seeing students succeed and most comfortable when interacting directly with the staff and students. She uses the student-centered data system to find and remember important and relevant personal information about students who are new and to inform her discipline interactions and decisions. She appreciates that the student-centered data system provides instructors and program leaders with information they can use to demonstrate the successes of their programs and to highlight specific areas in which her students need more targeted interventions.

---

**Community School Coordinator**

**Krishna Hayley**

- **Biography**
  After completing her degree in English at Concordia University Wisconsin, Krishna moved from her family's farm in Mequon to an apartment in central Milwaukee for her two years with Teach for America at Browning Elementary. Now that she has completed her time, Krishna plans to continue to gain experience with students and families in her new role as the community schools coordinator at Browning. Eventually, she plans to go to law school and begin a career as a public servant.

- **Community role**
  As the community schools coordinator at Browning, Krishna plans to spearhead a team that will help the Browning community overcome its particular challenges, with guidance and support provided by the Milwaukee Community Schools Partnership.

- **Responsibilities**
  Krishna convenes groups of students, families, school staff, and community members at Browning to identify key problems and develop and implement solutions. She also works closely with the existing programs at Browning to ensure students have access to the most appropriate services for their needs.

- **Goals and motivations**
  Krishna loves the urban life she has found in Milwaukee, and she enjoys deepening the relationships she formed with students, families, and community members when she was serving in the classroom at Browning. She wants to see systemic change realized for the Browning community. She and the Browning Community School Leadership team use the
publicly available aggregate information on the student-centered data system site to prompt and guide their conversations and to compare data about Browning’s strengths and weaknesses with perspectives from team members.
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