



# Taking Promise Neighborhoods to the State Level

## Lessons from California and Minnesota

*Alyse D. Oneto and Megan Gallagher*

*December 2019*

**Expanding and sustaining the Promise Neighborhoods model requires more than place-based, data-driven programming. This brief highlights Promise Neighborhoods grantees that are developing partnerships to extend their impact beyond their neighborhoods to the state level. We explore how partnerships in California and Minnesota have established shared goals, invested their time and resources to achieve their goals, and engaged with new stakeholders to build a broader coalition.**

## Partnerships for Systems Change

Promise Neighborhoods are local communities committed to achieving the best outcomes for all children and families who live and go to school in them. Although much of its work happens in the physical footprint of local communities, the Promise Neighborhoods initiative has long recognized that what happens outside the footprint—at the state, regional, and federal levels—can have a lasting effect on local results. Recognizing these important levers for change, the Promise Neighborhoods Developmental Pathway highlights (1) strategic and accountable partnerships and (2) policy and systems influence as two of the critical elements to achieving collective impact.

The Developmental Pathway was created by the Promise Neighborhoods Initiative at PolicyLink, the US Department of Education, and the Center for the Study of Social Policy and in collaboration with early Promise Neighborhoods grantees to provide communities with developmental milestones. According to PolicyLink's Developmental Pathway, Promise Neighborhoods move through several developmental stages as their work matures. Their focus is on long-term sustainability by building

cradle-to-career strategies into codified practices and influencing policy. The Developmental Pathway includes the following milestones to classify Promise Neighborhoods that are sustaining results:

- routinely redirect and raise new resources
- align policies and practices to support the delivery of solutions
- influence policy and funding streams to sustain their work
- use data to monitor progress, ensure strategies continue to be effective as results improve or neighborhood demographics change

Mature Promise Neighborhoods also achieve milestones that demonstrate policy and systems influence:

- local and national policymakers routinely look to the Promise Neighborhoods partnership to inform the development of relevant policies and allocation of funding
- local and national policies are developed or amended in ways that support the achievement of results

This brief offers two examples of Promise Neighborhoods that sustained results by influencing systems change through state-level partnerships. They are building stronger schools and community supports by partnering with peer Promise Neighborhoods, other place-based initiatives, and parents and policymakers.

- The **California Promise Neighborhoods Network (CPNN)**<sup>1</sup> connects four partner organizations across six Promise Neighborhoods implementation grants.<sup>2</sup> The partnership aims to have “a common agenda, shared measurement systems, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication and a backbone organization, all so children and their families will be able to live in communities of opportunity.”<sup>3</sup>
- The **Education Partnerships Coalition (EPC)**<sup>4</sup> in Minnesota “is a network of comprehensive educational partnerships within the Twin Cities and Greater Minnesota that emphasizes local solutions and results-based accountability to close the opportunity gap.”<sup>5</sup> The partnership includes two Promise Neighborhoods—one planning grant and one implementation grant—and six StriveTogether network sites.

## Learning from Leaders

The Urban Institute supports Promise Neighborhoods grantees by providing technical assistance on data and program strategy, making connections between grantees, and sharing examples from across the Promise Neighborhoods network. To learn more about the CPNN and the EPC, we talked with leaders from the partnerships and staff from the Center for the Study of Social Policy and PolicyLink, and we reviewed materials the partnerships shared with us.

Based on insights from California and Minnesota, we identified some steps that these partnerships engaged in that could benefit other place-based initiatives seeking to expand their work beyond their neighborhoods.

**Set a shared goal.** For both partnerships, the shared goal was stable state-level funding to continue their local work and expand cradle-to-career models in their respective states. EPC partners coalesced early around funding needs, while CPNN partners initially united as a network to share knowledge across initiatives. Although different interests brought them together, clearly defined shared goals around state funding and policy have sustained support from diverse stakeholders. Partners need funding to pursue the best strategies and solutions for their communities.

**Invest time and money in the partnership.** Both coalitions dedicated time and money to the partnership. Financial contributions differed by community: Promise Neighborhoods in California contributed equal amounts to the network, but Minnesota partners gave what was within their means. Both coalitions used contributions to build the coalition's capacity. California partners hired a part-time coordinator to manage the partnership's work. Minnesota partners leveraged an existing relationship with their lobbying firm to provide project management support to help with their parent-driven policy agenda and other management functions for the partners.

Both partnerships also asked that staff from member organizations give their time and commit to virtual and in-person meetings. The site visits allowed partners to learn from the host community and better understand their work. Both the financial and nonfinancial investments strengthened partners' commitment.

**Find new partners.** Both coalitions worked with other Promise Neighborhoods and place-based initiatives, as well as parents, policymakers, and coalition leaders. The EPC partners worked with geographically diverse communities, ensuring that communities from Minnesota's urban and rural areas were involved. In the pursuit of state funding, both coalitions worked directly with legislators to advance their advocacy work. Parents and community members were advocacy partners who expressed their interests to the EPC and testified to legislators.

## Meet the Partnerships

### California Promise Neighborhoods Network

The California Promise Neighborhoods Network connects four grantees that are operational leaders on six US Department of Education Promise Neighborhoods implementation grants (table 1).<sup>6</sup> Its mission states that “by having a common agenda, shared measurement systems, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication and a backbone organization, all so children and their families will be able to live in communities of opportunity.”<sup>7</sup>

The collaboration began when grantees who received implementation grants in fiscal year 2012 participated in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Results Count leadership training (formerly the Skills to

Accelerate Results Leadership Development Program) in 2014. During the training, grantees engaged directly with each other’s work to better understand their shared challenges—both in their communities and in their Promise Neighborhoods implementation—and shared performance indicators. Partners believed that by creating a collaborative, they would be better positioned to share best practices and to share their successes with external stakeholders at the local, state, and federal levels.

The original partnership consisted of the four backbone agencies for the California-based Promise Neighborhoods: California State University, East Bay; Mission Economic Development Agency; South Bay Community Services; and the Youth Policy Institute.<sup>8</sup> In 2017, the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians joined the partnership when it was awarded a Promise Neighborhoods implementation grant.<sup>9</sup>

**TABLE 1**  
**California Promise Neighborhoods Network Partners**

Partner	Initiative	Grantee year	Location
California State University, East Bay	Hayward Promise Neighborhood	FY 2011	Hayward, CA
California State University, East Bay	Hayward Promise Neighborhoods	FY 2017	Hayward, CA
Mission Economic Development Agency	Mission Promise Neighborhood	FY 2012	San Francisco, CA
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Everett Freeman Promise Neighborhood	FY 2016	Corning, CA
South Bay Community Services	Chula Vista Promise Neighborhood	FY 2012	Chula Vista, CA
South Bay Community Services	San Diego Promise Neighborhood	FY 2018	San Diego, CA

**Notes:** FY = fiscal year. The Youth Policy Institute was a California Promise Neighborhoods Network partner until it closed in 2019. It received Promise Neighborhoods grants for the Los Angeles Promise Neighborhood (FY 2012) and the Los Angeles Promise Neighborhood in the Promise Zone (FY 2016).

In 2016, after several years of consideration, the five organizations agreed to participate in a statewide partnership and planned to officially convene the partnership in San Francisco in early 2017 for a two-day planning meeting. At this meeting, facilitated by an external consultant, the organizations applied a consensus model to ensure all partners had an equal voice in developing their shared mission for all children and families in California. They created a strategic plan for the network through 2020 and adopted three goals to guide the partnership’s work.

- 1. Learn from one another.** The partners recognize that each grantee has different strengths and areas of expertise. One grantee possessed extensive knowledge in asset building, whereas another was particularly strong in early childhood programming.
- 2. Sustain the work of Promise Neighborhoods.** By joining together, the CPNN members recognized they would be able to use their collective voice to have a greater impact on sustainable funding for the existing—and potentially new—Promise Neighborhoods. Their pursuits included proposals to national funders or combined state-level advocacy.
- 3. Improve the Promise Neighborhoods program model.** In addition to learning from one another, the network aims to use lessons from partners to improve the Promise Neighborhoods

program model. This could include expanding the success indicators to include family economic success or using the Promotora model for community engagement across all the network's neighborhoods. Partners refer to the work of enhancing the Promise Neighborhoods program model as PN 2.0.

Before the recent state-level advocacy, the full CPNN met quarterly at a different peer member's site. The meeting location rotated to build relationships and familiarity with partner sites across the network. These site visits allowed partners to see communities, talk to families, and learn about program models. This was especially useful for communities that are new grantees or new to the Promise Neighborhoods model. In addition to the full network, the CPNN established five committees—PN 2.0, policy, steering, fundraising, and communications—to execute a detailed work plan based on its strategic plan. The committees meet monthly and comprise staff from the partner organizations.

The CPNN is not yet an independent organization, but the partners have organized and formalized their work. The formal partnership structure includes a memorandum of understanding between all partners that defines expectations for participants. It also requires both a financial and a staff resource commitment from partner organizations. One partner is the network's fiscal agent, and another manages the leadership and organization. The CPNN hired a part-time staff member to manage and organize the partnership.

Recently, CPNN members discussed ways to expand their coalition beyond Promise Neighborhoods grantees to include full-service community schools and StriveTogether network members.

## EARLY SUCCESS

The CPNN's most significant work has focused on state-level advocacy, specifically Senate Bill 686, which would facilitate the addition of and support for 20 state-funded Promise Neighborhoods across California (box 1). Previous efforts to pass state-level Promise Neighborhoods legislation had not been successful.

The bill was introduced in January 2019 as a component of California's End Child Poverty Plan, a comprehensive strategy to end childhood poverty across the state.<sup>10</sup> This attempt was different from previous attempts to pass legislation because the End Child Poverty Plan was a comprehensive set of recommendations from a state-mandated task force and was submitted at the end of 2018. Several bills in 2019 were put forward on the recommendation of that task force.

Beginning in January 2019, most of the partnership's resources and efforts shifted to support the legislation.<sup>11</sup> The network's part-time coordinator shifted her focus to organizing the partnership around the campaign, establishing weekly calls (rather than monthly) with network members, creating targeted work plans, and following up with members on outstanding items. Members of the partnership credit the progress on this bill with their ability to have a single person work on it with dedicated capacity.

---

## BOX 1

### Senate Bill 686

Senate Bill 686, the California Promise Neighborhoods Act of 2019, is designed to create a state-level program and funding source for Promise Neighborhoods.<sup>a</sup> The legislation was introduced by Senator Ben Allen in February 2019 and was cosponsored by two senators and three assembly members. The legislation was modeled on legislation developed by PolicyLink.<sup>b</sup>

In May 2019, the California state senate passed the bill, but funding was not appropriated for the program in the state budget for 2019–20. The California Promise Neighborhoods Network continues its advocacy to meet this goal.

<sup>a</sup>S.B. 686, 2019 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2019), [http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201920200SB686](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB686).

<sup>b</sup>“PNI’s Model Legislation to Support Cradle to Career Efforts,” PolicyLink, accessed December 16, 2019, <https://www.policylink.org/resources/PNIs-model-legislation>.

---

The CPNN partners recognized that to successfully move the bill through the legislative process, they would need to present a united coalition. In their weekly meetings, members coordinated their action plans and identified point people for tasks, including who would speak to councilmembers and assembly members. Pulling from the experience of Minnesota’s EPC, CPNN members focused on obtaining bipartisan support for the bill and developing tailored messaging for different stakeholders. For example, they might focus on a Promise Neighborhood’s ability to leverage various funding streams for one legislator and focus on how Promise Neighborhoods work with existing education systems for a different legislator.

Each network member identified which community members would come to the state capitol in Sacramento, including families, parents, partners, and Promise Neighborhood staff members. The partnership also solicited expertise and guidance from PolicyLink, a national research and action institute, when drafting the legislation.<sup>12</sup> PolicyLink provided the network with model legislation and reviewed language as the bill was being drafted. It also helped the CPNN target its policy strategy to succeed in California’s political landscape (box 4).

Without the CPNN, partners would not have been able to build an advocacy coalition to mobilize support for state legislation. Because it had put in the time and resources to get to know each other and the work of each Promise Neighborhood, the CPNN was a strong coalition when the policy window for state-level funding opened.

As of this brief’s publication date, Senate Bill 686 had passed through the California legislature and was waiting for a determination on whether it will make it into the governor’s fiscal year 2021 budget. Once funding is attached to the bill, the CPNN hopes to be the technical assistance provider to the new California Promise Neighborhoods. As recipients of the federal implementation grants, many CPNN members have been working with the Promise Neighborhoods model for nearly a decade. Their experience would be invaluable to new communities implementing the model with future state funding.

Additionally, this state-level advocacy has allowed some communities to do system-level work locally. South Bay Community Services worked with its county on local legislation that would create a new Promise Neighborhood as a part of the county's Live Well San Diego initiative, and the Mission Economic Development Agency is working on a plan to do the same in San Francisco.

## Education Partnerships Coalition

The Education Partnerships Coalition is located throughout Minnesota and includes two Promise Neighborhoods—one previous planning grantee and one previous implementation grantee—and six StriveTogether network sites (table 2). The partnership aims to use collective impact “to close the opportunity gap.”<sup>13</sup>

The partnership was born out of a shared need to develop long-term, sustainable funding to support cradle-to-career initiatives in Minnesotan communities. The Northside Achievement Zone (NAZ) was the first to recognize the need for partnership to achieve this larger goal. During the first years of NAZ's Promise Neighborhoods grant (awarded in 2011), Wilder Research published a return on investment report (Diaz et al. 2015a, 2015b) and Boston Consulting Group published a five-year business plan (Northside Achievement Zone, n.d.) dedicated to this work. Most importantly, the plan highlighted that NAZ would need to secure public funding to ensure its work could continue beyond the federal grant, and it began to look for partners to join a coalition.

In 2014, NAZ reached out to organizations doing similar work across the state. Officials knew the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood received a planning grant in 2011 and asked the neighborhood to join the coalition. But staff noted that—unlike in California, where multiple Promise Neighborhoods received federal implementation grants—they would need to partner with initiatives that were not Promise Neighborhoods but were still aligned with the cradle-to-career model. They also recognized that, to be successful at the state level, the partnership would need to include rural—or Greater Minnesota—communities as well as urban communities. As a result, Northfield Promise, Every Hand Joined, and Partner for Student Success joined the partnership. More recently, Austin Aspires and Cradle 2 Career joined the EPC. All five are StriveTogether network members (box 2).

**TABLE 2**  
**Education Partnerships Coalition Partners**

Partner	Initiative	Initiative type	Geography
Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood	Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood	Promise Neighborhood planning grantee	Saint Paul, MN
Austin Aspires	Austin Aspires	StriveTogether site	Austin, MN
Rochester Area Foundation	Cradle 2 Career	StriveTogether site	Rochester, MN
Jones Family Foundation	Every Hand Joined	StriveTogether site	Red Wing, MN
United Way of the Twin Cities	Generation Next	StriveTogether site	Minneapolis and Saint Paul, MN
Northfield Healthy Community Initiative	Northfield Promise	StriveTogether site	Northfield, MN
Northside Achievement Zone	Northside Achievement Zone	Promise Neighborhood implementation grantee	Minneapolis, MN
United Way of Central Minnesota	Partner for Student Success	StriveTogether site	Saint Cloud, MN

**Note:** Growth and Justice, a statewide organization, has played a supporting role in the Education Partnerships Coalition since 2015.

**BOX 2**

**StriveTogether**

StriveTogether is a network focused on aligning education efforts to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps. StriveTogether emerged from knowledge and expertise developed in Cincinnati Strive’s cradle-to-career initiative and is designed to expand the model across the country. Today, the network has almost 70 members.

Like Promise Neighborhoods, StriveTogether supports children in their neighborhoods through systems change. It focuses on seven results: kindergarten success, early grade reading, middle grade math, high school graduation, postsecondary enrollment, postsecondary completion, and employment. It is guided by a theory of action, which includes systems-level change and policy advocacy.

For more information on StriveTogether, see <https://www.strivetogether.org/>. For more information on StriveTogether’s theory of action, see StriveTogether, “StriveTogether Theory of Action: Getting Better Results for Every Child, Cradle to Career” (Cincinnati, StriveTogether, 2019), [https://www.strivetogether.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Theory-of-Action-Poster\\_052019\\_Final.pdf](https://www.strivetogether.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Theory-of-Action-Poster_052019_Final.pdf).

After identifying partners, the EPC spent its first year building relationships between partners, establishing a shared agenda and mission, and developing shared metrics for the partnership’s results. The EPC shares three overarching goals for its work:

1. **Develop funding sources for cradle-to-career initiatives, particularly at the state level.** From the beginning, partners have focused on ways to sustain their work financially. This collaborative work has mostly focused on state-level advocacy and funding. But partners are



starting to identify national organizations, such as StriveTogether, to support capacity building for both the collaborative and individual partners.

2. **Develop and support parent leadership and advocacy.** The EPC decided early on to invite parents from across the coalition to shape the coalition's direction and to play an active role in the advocacy work. For example, parents delivered most of the testimony for the legislative work. The coalition also includes parents in planning for the partnership's long-term agenda.
3. **Expand state-level advocacy beyond funding.** Based on feedback from parents, the EPC has started to plan its long-term advocacy strategy beyond its initial goal of finding stable funding. In particular, parents have pushed the collaborative to focus on early childhood education and supports for their communities. EPC members noted that parents from several sites have spoken at events for early childhood braiding funding on the childhood assistance policy and have testified on behalf of increasing access to early childhood education programs.

The coalition holds monthly meetings that partners attend in person or virtually and has an online folder for shared documents, including site-specific collateral and marketing materials. EPC members developed strong relationships by traveling together to conferences and the state capitol for their advocacy work. They also regularly visited one another's communities with parents and community partners. The initial EPC model asked partners to contribute what they could financially, and NAZ and the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood covered much of the initial work.

In 2015, the coalition welcomed the full membership of Generation Next, the Twin Cities StriveTogether site and a part of the Greater Twin Cities United Way. Its original role was to host and facilitate coalition meetings, but it now provides much of the business and administrative support, managing shared resources and the EPC website.<sup>14</sup> The coalition secured funding for its joint work through StriveTogether. These funds are administered through Generation Next. The EPC dedicated resources to hire its existing lobbying firm to provide project management support to help with its parent-driven policy agenda.

The partnership's grant from StriveTogether to support its parent mobilization work includes such activities as engaging parents in partnership and legislative issues and facilitating opportunities for them to offer testimony to inform state funding and policy. The intention is that the parent mobilization work will create the EPC's state policy agenda, particularly around areas of shared interest (e.g., early childhood funding and access). Parents also have the opportunity to advocate for issues that are important to their communities. In Saint Paul, for instance, parents focus on advocating for affordable housing for their community. To share its work with others, the EPC is working with parents to create a manual on developing parents' voices.

## EARLY SUCCESS

The EPC originally coalesced around the idea of developing a source of long-term, sustainable funding for communities across Minnesota. Naturally, its first joint initiative focused on state-level advocacy to secure base funding for existing cradle-to-career initiatives. The coalition worked with PolicyLink to develop legislation from the available Promise Neighborhoods model legislation and from failed

California legislation that attempted to establish base funding for the Promise Neighborhoods. The EPC then focused its strategy on identifying and developing the right partners, including coalition members, legislators, and community members. Because of this work, the EPC created Education Partnerships Coalition Fund, which provides funding to seven EPC members, including Promise Neighborhoods and StriveTogether sites (box 3).

---

### BOX 3

#### Education Partnerships Coalition Fund

The Education Partnerships Coalition Fund was created in 2015 by the Minnesota House Omnibus Education Bill (H.F. 1676, S.F. 1276). The fund initially provided two years of funding for the partners: the two Promise Neighborhoods received \$2.4 million per site over two years (2016 and 2017), and the three original Greater Minnesota partnerships each received \$344,000 over the same two years.

The legislation was introduced to the state House by Representative Tim Kelly in March 2015. The legislation was modeled on legislation developed by PolicyLink.<sup>a</sup>

The bill was passed in the 2015 session. Full text is available on the Office of the Revisor of Statutes for the Minnesota legislature's website.<sup>b</sup>

The statute's most recent update in the 2019 session includes language maintaining the Promise Neighborhoods' funding at \$1.3 million per year and increasing funding to \$250,000 annually for each of the now five Greater Minnesota StriveTogether sites through 2021.

<sup>a</sup>See "PNI's Model Legislation to Support Cradle to Career Efforts," PolicyLink, accessed December 16, 2019, <https://www.policylink.org/resources/PNIs-model-legislation>.

<sup>b</sup>H.F. 1676, 89th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Minn. 2015), [https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF1676&type=bill&version=1&session=ls89&session\\_year=2015&session\\_number=0](https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF1676&type=bill&version=1&session=ls89&session_year=2015&session_number=0).

---

NAZ leadership sought diverse communities to build a strong coalition. Staff noted this was partially to fight the perception that state funds went overwhelmingly to urban communities. Partners attribute the success of their efforts, in part, to their ability to appeal to rural and urban policymakers. By joining with Greater Minnesota communities with similar socioeconomic conditions and achievement gaps, the partners demonstrated that the issues they were addressing were universal.

The EPC also engaged policymakers as partners from the start. Some sites had preexisting relationships with their representatives; NAZ had (and continues to have) a strong relationship with its state senator and House representative and with the Speaker of the House. All the partners developed stronger relationships with their legislators by including them in developing the legislation and inviting them to visit their neighborhoods. Partners would bring community members (e.g., parents and students in their programs) to the state capitol to meet their representatives. This engagement helped the partnership obtain buy-in from policymakers.

Finally, the EPC partners stressed the importance of having parents as key partners in leading and participating in the advocacy work. The coalition of parents and their leadership role started when the EPC partners would meet at the state capitol together, which connected the urban and Greater Minnesota parents. Parents would develop strategies together to galvanize other community members. Parents were also a key part of the site visits with legislators. For example, the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood hosted dinners for legislators to meet families. Rather than having only the partner organizations' executive directors testify, the EPC focused on having parents and youth testify on behalf of the bill. EPC partners took a supportive role and learned how to support parents' advocacy work.

These efforts were ultimately successful. Each Promise Neighborhoods partner received \$2.4 million in base funding for 2016 and 2017 and \$2.6 million in base funding every subsequent two-year period. For 2016 and 2017, the Greater Minnesota partners also received \$344,000 per site. This amount will increase starting in 2020 to \$250,000 annually for each Greater Minnesota partner through 2021. But funding for the rural communities is not in the base funding, and the EPC is working to extend that base funding to Greater Minnesota partners and to Generation Next.

Recently, the coalition has fielded inquiries from new communities interested in implementing a cradle-to-career model. Sometimes, these new communities are not ready to implement the model, so members of the EPC will help them identify what they would need to be successful. One community was recommended to the coalition by its legislator. The community, however, did not feel prepared to support the initiative. The EPC worked with community partners to develop their capacity, which has helped the community prepare for implementation.

---

#### BOX 4

##### **Promise Neighborhoods Model Legislation**

The CPNN and the EPC used the model legislation developed in 2014 by the Promise Neighborhoods Institute (PNI) at PolicyLink as the basis of their proposed legislation. This model legislation ("The Cradle to Career Act of 201\_") is intended to secure support for cradle-to-career initiatives at both the state and local level. The PNI developed this resource in a way that would allow it to support the efforts of various cradle-to-career initiatives and strategies.

For more information, see "PNI's Model Legislation to Support Cradle to Career Efforts," PolicyLink, accessed December 16, 2019, <https://www.policylink.org/resources/PNIs-model-legislation>.

---

## Conclusion

The Promise Neighborhoods highlighted in this brief have taken steps to expand and sustain their work in their states through partnerships and systems change, consistent with the sustaining-results phase of PolicyLink's Developmental Pathway for Promise Neighborhoods.

Both have aligned their efforts to influence state policy and used their coalitions to pursue state funding for Promise Neighborhoods. The EPC has established stable state funding for the urban Promise Neighborhoods partners and is working to expand stable funding to Generation Next and rural communities. The CPNN is working toward establishing stable state-level funding for existing and new Promise Neighborhoods.

With sustainable funding sources and networks of relationships, they are better positioned to achieve their long-term goal of improving outcomes for children and their families. Promise Neighborhoods that have not yet participated in policy work at the state or local level can use the examples from Minnesota and California to explore what partnership across communities can accomplish at the state level.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> For more information about the California Promise Neighborhoods Network, see <http://capromisenetwork.org/>.
- <sup>2</sup> Two agencies received multiple grants for separate neighborhoods.
- <sup>3</sup> “Collective Impact Model,” San Diego Veterans Coalition, accessed December 18, 2019, <http://sdvetscoalition.org/about-sdvc/collective-impact-model/>.
- <sup>4</sup> For more information about the Education Partnerships Coalition, see <https://epc-mn.org/>.
- <sup>5</sup> See <https://epc-mn.org/>.
- <sup>6</sup> Two agencies received multiple grants for separate neighborhoods.
- <sup>7</sup> “Collective Impact Model,” San Diego Veterans Coalition.
- <sup>8</sup> The Youth Policy Institute was a CPNN partner until it closed in 2019.
- <sup>9</sup> Between fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2018, three Promise Neighborhood implementation grants were given to backbone agencies who were already awarded an implementation grant for a different Promise Neighborhood.
- <sup>10</sup> For more information, see the End Child Poverty Plan at <https://www.endchildpovertyca.org/>.
- <sup>11</sup> Federal funding was not used for the CPNN’s advocacy work.
- <sup>12</sup> For more information about PolicyLink, see <https://www.policylink.org/>.
- <sup>13</sup> See <https://epc-mn.org/>.
- <sup>14</sup> See the website for the Education Partnerships Coalition at [www.epc-mn.org](http://www.epc-mn.org).

## References

- Diaz, Jose Y., Sarah Gehrig, Ellen Shelton, and Carl Warren. 2015a. *Prospective Return on Investment of the Northside Achievement Zone*. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research.
- . 2015b. “Prospective Return on Investment of the Northside Achievement Zone: Executive Summary.” Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research.
- Northside Achievement Zone. n.d. *Business Plan: Northside Achievement Zone (NAZ), FY 2015–FY 2022*. Minneapolis: Northside Achievement Zone.

## About the Authors

**Alyse D. Oneto** is a research analyst in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute. Her research focuses on homelessness and housing policy and on community development.

**Megan Gallagher** is a senior research associate in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center and the Center on Education Data and Policy at the Urban Institute. She studies how housing policies and neighborhood initiatives affect schools and how schools and education policies affect neighborhoods.

## Acknowledgments

This brief was funded by the US Department of Education. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at [urban.org/fundingprinciples](http://urban.org/fundingprinciples).

We appreciate the time that CPNN and EPC contributed by answering our questions about their partnership work. We are also grateful to Jessica Pizarek (PolicyLink), Anand Sharma (Center for the Study of Social Policy), Sarah Gillespie (Urban Institute), and staff from both partnerships' member organizations for feedback on earlier drafts.



500 L'Enfant Plaza SW  
Washington, DC 20024

[www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org)

### ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people's lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.

Copyright © December 2019. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.