

This brief and its companion case studies examine the funding practices and policies of three California school districts to understand how they ensure students are connected to their sense of purpose and on the path to college and career success through times of economic hardship and prosperity.



As educators and policymakers chart a path toward educational and economic recovery from the pandemic, investments in keeping young people connected to their sense of purpose and college and career goals are more important than ever. The U.S. Department of Education recently announced a \$122 billion investment in K–12 schools, designed to equitably expand opportunity for the students who need it most. This is welcome news to school districts that have been operating for months with great uncertainty about the future of their budgets—and their students—in these volatile times.

Students have missed out on a lot this past year, and this new flexible funding provides districts with a unique opportunity to think expansively about how to recover from the pandemic with equity at the center. Young people need learning opportunities that connect to the real world and engage their minds and passions. They need social and emotional support, because young people have experienced real trauma throughout the pandemic that is still raw. Now more than ever, districts need to invest in strategies and supports that are proven to work for *all* students. When education leaders think of our greatest aspiration for students—preparing them all for college and careers—we find answers in the "and."

Linked Learning is a powerful educational approach designed to advance more equitable student outcomes by ensuring that all students are prepared for college *and* career. Linked Learning students, on average, make extraordinary strides in high school. Independent research shows that compared to peers in traditional schools, students in Linked Learning pathways earn more course credits, they have higher graduation rates, and they are building more of the skills aligned with 21st century workforce needs. The results are particularly strong for students who start high school behind academically and young people of color. Those new to Linked Learning might understandably wonder how they can invest in this approach during times of economic uncertainty, as well as prosperity. Experienced Linked Learning districts show a path forward through their example.

A study of well-established Linked Learning districts

This brief summarizes findings from a series of interviews with leadership in three well-established California Linked Learning school districts: Antelope Valley Union High School District (AVUHSD), Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), and Oakland Unified School District (OUSD). The interviews, conducted by Linked Learning Alliance staff, were designed to uncover funding policies and practices that provide a diverse student body with high-quality college and career preparation experiences through Linked Learning pathways.¹

Through the interviews, and a review of district budget information about Linked Learning expenditures, the Linked Learning Alliance gained insights into how these districts leverage organizational commitments and combine a variety of federal, state, local, and philanthropic funding sources to support their work. The districts' use of these strategies over time illustrates how they have sustained educational pathways through difficult periods like the 2008 Great Recession and continue to operate pathways even as they navigate the uncertainties of the COVID-19 pandemic. This brief further provides key policy and practice implications, which may be instructive for school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools new to Linked Learning, and even LEAs with Linked Learning pathways that are reassessing their funding models in changed times.

While we focus here on California districts and funding sources, and we recognize there are different terms and calculations for state funding to schools from one state to the next, the highlighted practices could apply to an LEA in any state. For readers outside of California, wherever we reference the Local Control Funding Formula, we recommend referring to your state's base educational funding source. For references to state categorical funds, which are funds that LEAs access for specific purposes designated by the state (e.g., K-12 Strong Workforce Program), we recommend considering other specialized funding sources in your state such as those that support Career Technical Education.

Case studies in funding strategy

This insight kit includes companion case studies describing the funding practices specific to each Linked Learning school district consulted for this brief:

- [Antelope Valley Union High School District](#)
- [Long Beach Unified School District](#)
- [Oakland Unified School District](#)

¹ These pathways relate to California's 15 industry sectors (e.g., information and communication technology, business and finance, health science and medical technology, etc.). Each industry sector can contain multiple career pathways in which to develop programs of study. Individual school districts and their nearby colleges and employers conduct research into regional industry needs to determine which sectors and careers best serve their pathway students and communities.

A well-funded start, a need for further sustainability

The expansion of Linked Learning in the late 2000s and 2010s, and the evidence of the approach's positive impact on student outcomes, coincided with the availability of funding to support the launch and maintenance of pathways. In 2009, [The James Irvine Foundation](#) invested generously in a statewide demonstration of Linked Learning. This effort supported the development and scaling of Linked Learning in nine school districts, including LBUSD and OUSD, two of the districts profiled for this research. In 2013, the California Department of Education (CDE) rolled out funding for [Linked Learning Pilot Programs \(AB 790\)](#), which provided \$80,000 to 20 programs to integrate academic and technical programmatic components, along with work-based learning and student support services. From 2014 to 2017, the CDE also rolled out [California Career Pathways Trust \(CCPT\) funding](#). Through a one-time competitive grant process, CCPT provided LEAs and community colleges financial resources to establish or expand career pathway programs in grades nine through 14.

Although these financial resources helped to grow the footprint and positive impact of Linked Learning, these private and public funding sources are no longer available to school districts. As a result, experienced Linked Learning districts have identified other ways to continue to sustain their pathways, including braided funding strategies that combine two or more funding sources to meet pathway needs. These districts use state, federal, and local funds in accordance with the programmatic requirements and allowable expenditures of those various funding programs, as described next.

Research Findings

AVUHSD, LBUSD, and OUSD use similar strategies to ensure Linked Learning pathways are sustained through both economically prosperous and challenging times. Although there is variation in the funding sources used for particular staff positions and other support services across these districts, there is considerable consistency when it comes to key leadership and strategic planning considerations.

The following findings highlight some of the ways these districts sustain their pathways.

School boards establish policies that provide public affirmation of pathway goals.

Board policies can affirm a district's commitment to Linked Learning and provide strategic direction through fluctuating economic circumstances. For example, Oakland has a school board policy that states: "In order to maximize the learning and application of skills that will allow students to succeed in life... academic and vocational subjects should be combined and fully integrated during all their years of schooling."ⁱⁱ The policy goes on to identify the importance of work-based learning opportunities and career awareness, exploration, and guidance within the curriculum and is supported by an accompanying administrative rule which lays out ways for the district to integrate academics into vocational education.

Similarly, LBUSD enacted Board Policy 6178, which explicitly connects career technical education and core academic instruction, making it clear that integrated college and career preparation is the expectation at that district. This policy states that, “the Governing Board desires to provide a comprehensive career technical education (CTE) program in grades 7–12 which integrates core academic instruction with technical and occupational instruction in order to increase student achievement, graduation rates, and readiness for postsecondary education and employment. District leaders establish Linked Learning as a priority through their Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP).”

In all three districts, funding priorities for Linked Learning are set and collectively owned by senior leadership. The superintendent’s office or the Education Services Division is responsible for ensuring that pathways have access to needed financial resources regardless of external economic conditions.

District LCAP goals call for college *and* career readiness explicitly.

The Local Control and Accountability Plan ([LCAP](#)) is a tool California LEAs use to establish goals and outcomes, plan actions or services, and utilize resources to meet their goals.² Actions or services, which often require funding, describe what will be done by the district, or provided to schools, to reach identified goals and outcomes. These actions or services might include the provision of instructional materials, intervention programs for students, or a training for teachers to support implementation of a particular educational model. Senior leaders in Linked Learning districts make sure that pathway-related actions or services, and corresponding financial resources needed for implementation, are reflected in the district’s LCAP.

LEA goals, outcomes, and actions or services provide insight into programmatic priorities. Though student achievement is a key goal area and priority in LEA LCAPs throughout California, these three Linked Learning districts take it a step further by also identifying the importance of college and career readiness for their students. The “and” focuses educators on meaningfully combining, or integrating, college and career preparation, to put every student in position to pursue the full range of postsecondary options, whether trade school, college, or other credentialing programs. The integration of college and career preparation serves as a key driver for the Linked Learning approach.

For example, AVUHSD’s first LCAP goal is to “Ensure that students are academically proficient and prepared for college and career...” OUSD’s first goal is that “students are college and career ready.” LBUSD has a similar goal: “Students will make academic progress on the Common Core State Standards so that they can be prepared for both college and careers upon high school graduation.” These goals have corresponding outcomes, along with actions or services that are funded to support implementation.

The local Board of Education’s approval of the LCAP each year memorializes a districtwide commitment to student success and ensures that funding will continue to be made available to support that effort, even during lean financial times.

² Senate Bill ([SB](#)) [98](#) has established that an LCAP is not required for the 2020–21 school year. Given the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, California has shifted to a [Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan](#) for the present time.

Local Control Funding Formula dollars are used for staffing and other core instructional services; grants are used for additional programmatic needs.

The [Local Control Funding Formula](#) (LCFF) determines funding provided by the state of California to LEAs using uniform grade span grants. These essential financial resources support staffing, including pathway-specific teachers and district leaders. As one district leader noted, LCFF provides base funding to “keep Linked Learning at the core” of what they do. Other state and federal funding sources, like the [Career Technical Education Incentive Grant](#) (CTEIG), the [K–12 Strong Workforce Program](#) (SWP), [California Partnership Academies](#) (CPA) funding, and [Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act](#) (Perkins) are used in various combinations to provide a range of additional pathway supports, such as release time for teachers to collaborate, additional time for staff to support work-based learning initiatives and supervise internships, as well as supplies and materials, field trips, and more.

District funding proposals highlight Linked Learning elements to ensure students benefit from a high-quality integrated program of study, work-based learning, and integrated student supports.

State and other grants, even those not explicitly designed for Linked Learning, can provide additional financial resources for pathways. For example, Strong Workforce Program applications do not require an explicit Linked Learning connection for approval. However, when developing a recent Strong Workforce Program application, district leaders from LBUSD included references to items and services that would support key elements of their Linked Learning practice, like work-based learning, along with professional development that would help teachers integrate high-quality course sequences and advance college and career skills for students. Once the application was approved, Strong Workforce Program funds were then used for these pathway-related expenses. In the case of the California Career Technical Education Incentive Grant, LBUSD district leaders wrote their proposal to include books and supplies for pathway students engaged in dual enrollment.

District expenditures are aligned with Linked Learning.

AVUHSD, LBUSD, and OUSD align their expenditures with the Linked Learning approach. They seek to maximize use of various funding sources to advance their college and career preparation efforts to achieve the best results for students. Linked Learning’s holistic [framework](#) focuses on three key elements: 1) an integrated program of study, 2) work-based learning, and 3) integrated student supports. Below, we highlight examples of expenditures across these elements of the approach for some of the high-leverage funding sources that the three districts found particularly helpful for their pathways.

Integrated Program of Study	
<i>Student-centered learning connected to postsecondary and industry expectations</i>	
LCFF	District director focused on Linked Learning; pathway coach; data analyst; tutors
CTEIG	Career and technical education (CTE) instructional coaches; support for single subject teachers to obtain CTE credentials, additional pathway staff to increase instructional time
SWP	Dual enrollment specialist; dual enrollment programs for students
CPA	Additional time for <i>school staff</i> to coach Linked Learning teachers; curriculum development time for teachers
Perkins	Professional development for teachers

Work-Based Learning	
<i>A continuum of meaningful experiences with work and real-world applications of learning</i>	
LCFF	Work-based learning coordinator
CTEIG	Work-based learning and industry engagement coordinators
SWP	Additional time for <i>district staff</i> to supervise internships, student supplies/materials
CPA	Equipment/technology to support work-based learning; additional time for teacher to supervise internships (often paid as a stipend)
Perkins	Additional time for district staff to support work-based learning initiatives

Integrated Student Supports	
<i>Meeting the developmental needs of each young person to equip all for a successful transition to college and career</i>	
LCFF	Field trips, summer school, tutors
CTEIG	Staffing for after school/summer school digital media program for youth
SWP	Mentoring programs
CPA	Guest speakers
Perkins	College and career exploration programs, support for CTE-focused student organizations

Key senior leaders are tasked with managing pathway-related funds to maximize learning opportunities and ensure coherency.

The district staff that manage these and other financial resources are critical to the ongoing maintenance of pathways. All three districts engage senior district leaders in applying for and monitoring the use of pathway-related funds. In OUSD, a central strategy for pursuing new financial resources is to designate responsibility for all pathway-related funds and engagement of regional partners to a single staff member. This practice ensures that when new grant applications need to be written, a single leader has a full understanding of all the available pathway funding in the district, and areas of financial need, along with the requisite regional contacts for co-drafting applications when applicable.

District braided funding practice combines public and private funds to support students.

All three of Linked Learning districts studied engage local industry partners to fund important elements of their pathways. For example, in AVUHSD, industry partner funding provides ongoing support for pathway STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) initiatives. Although the specific industry partners and the way their funds are used varies from district to district, each views the additional funding generated by these partnerships as invaluable.

State dollars can provide funding for core staff positions, and grants, philanthropic, and other sources can increase district capacity to provide a range of additional supports. That said, the practice of braiding funds allows districts to take their financial planning for the pathways to the next level. Braided funding is the practice of combining funding sources in service of a broader goal, in this case strengthening existing and developing new Linked Learning pathways. Although no two districts are likely to braid funds identically, due to difference in funding sources available, pathways offered, and local needs, all three districts in our research valued this practice.

As a “wall to wall” pathway district in which all high school students participate in a Linked Learning pathway, LBUSD chooses to centralize pathway support services for schools. The district braids its federal Perkins grant and state SWP grant to provide additional time for district staff to support work-based learning initiatives. In another example, AVUHSD combines Local Control Funding Formula with California Partnership Academies funding (intended for academies to integrate academic and career technical education, business partnerships, mentoring, and internships) in order to pay for release periods for pathway leads. Each pathway lead serves as a department chair for their pathway, coordinating student and staff activities across the pathway, leading teacher collaboration time, and often facilitating industry and post-secondary partnerships.

OUSD braids funds from their local parcel tax, [Measure N](#), with state Strong Workforce Program dollars to cover a dual enrollment specialist and dual enrollment programs for students, and also combines Measure N with California Partnership Academies funds to cover transportation for college and career exploration visits. Additionally, OUSD braids Measure N with local dollars from the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth to provide student stipends for internships

AVUHSD braids federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I, Local Control Funding Formula, Strong Workforce Program, California Partnership Academies, Career Technical Education Incentive Grant, and Middle School Planning Grant funds to pay for additional time for school staff to coach pathway teachers. AVUHSD also combines Local Control Funding Formula and Strong Workforce Program dollars to pay for pathway leads. See Appendix B for a more complete overview of the federal, state, and local funding sources.

Implications For Policy And Practice

Conversations with these districts and a review of their financial information provides a window into state and local policy implications, along with practice considerations for LEA leaders.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

▶ **Districts should adopt local policies to support Linked Learning pathways.**

District governing boards play a critical role in supporting Linked Learning through the approval of the LCAP, with funding targeted specifically for integrated pathways. These boards also adopt policies that reaffirm an ongoing commitment to Linked Learning, and make it clear to all stakeholders how college and career readiness will be prioritized. Such policies are in place during both good and challenging economic times, ensuring a collective commitment regardless of the status of funding levels in a given year. See Appendix C for example policies and other important guiding documents. LEAs new to Linked Learning, and experienced Linked Learning districts interested in strengthening Linked Learning in their community, should consider adopting formal board policies.

▶ **The state should make key funding sources for Linked Learning available on a consistent basis, subject to less fluctuation.**

Funding streams that support Linked Learning have varied over time. At one point, The James Irvine Foundation, AB 790, and CCPT provided resources to expand Linked Learning in California. When those were no longer available, districts turned to other sources of funding, including the Local Control Funding formula (in alignment with LCAP goals) and the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant. However, as a categorical program, CTEIG—along with SWP, CPA, and others—is subject to cuts during economically challenging times. In fact, in response to an expected reduction in state funding levels, the Governor’s May Revision to the 2020–21 budget proposed a roughly 50% reduction to categorical programs. Although those cuts did not ultimately materialize, the uncertainty generated by this possibility adds a layer of complexity for Linked Learning districts as they plan for the future of their pathways. By ensuring that these and other funding sources are not subject to significant cuts from one year to the next, California districts would be able to more effectively sustain and grow local college and career preparation efforts that ready students for the future.

PRACTICE IMPLICATIONS

- ▶ **Districts within California that are new to Linked Learning and/or are looking to fund a new pathway should start with LCFF dollars for core program needs and then braid additional funding sources for a range of targeted supports.**

Local Control Funding Formula funding pays for staff in districts across California. Since Linked Learning is not an off-the-shelf program or model, and truly involves redesigning the high school experience and changing the way learning works for students, it takes people—teachers, counselors, school and district leaders, and many others—to bring this approach to life. If there is not a local tax that is specifically designated for pathways (like [Measure N](#) in OUSD), LCFF can be a go-to source for funding core pathway staff. One of those core staff members could be a district Linked Learning leader, whose work includes managing pathway funds and growing pathway financial resources through the development of proposals for state grants and local philanthropic funding.

Districts can braid LCFF and other funds, including local, state, and federal funding to pay for a range of additional supports, including, but not limited to, student internships, tutors, and coordinators for dual enrollment programs at local colleges.

For LEAs outside California the same broad concepts captured here would apply. State dollars may serve as a key source for essential staffing. Braiding those state funds with other sources of local and federal funding can provide a variety of additional, targeted supports for students and staff. LEAs can also examine how to reallocate and use existing funds more efficiently to support the major elements of the Linked Learning experience.

- ▶ **Districts should engage school leaders in the practice of braiding funds.**

District leaders are not the only ones that can braid funds in support of Linked Learning pathways. School leaders often manage budgets with a variety of funding sources. Providing these leaders with training and tools to support budget development can also help to serve pathway needs. Districts new to Linked Learning might look to [OUSD's template](#) that organizes pathway fund allocations and their allowable uses, and supports comparisons for projected costs within the different budget categories, as a helpful example.

Conclusion

As school and district leaders throughout California and the country navigate the uncertainty caused by COVID-19, important lessons and insights can be gleaned from the three experienced Linked Learning districts that were interviewed to develop this brief.

According to these districts, some of the most impactful funding sources used in the braiding process include the Local Control Funding Formula, Career Technical Education Incentive Grant, Strong Workforce Program, and federal Perkins funding. Through a knowledgeable centralized staff, districts are able to use and braid different funds for a variety of allowable expenses, to support student college and career preparation within and beyond the classroom walls.

By centering their practices and policies around Linked Learning, AVUHSD, LBUSD, and OUSD have maintained Linked Learning as the way they “do high school,” providing students with high-quality, integrated academic *and* career preparation offerings. These districts have used a holistic approach in braiding multiple funding sources together, while simultaneously minimizing the impact of potential cuts.

Appendix A: About Linked Learning

Linked Learning is a proven approach to equity and excellence in education.

Linked Learning transforms student experiences—bringing meaning and motivation to the school day. It puts each young person at the center of high-quality learning, surrounded by adults and structures dedicated to their growth.

Schools and academies adapt Linked Learning to fit their contexts. Students learn through career-themed pathways tied to local industries. The approach integrates four crucial elements:

- Rigorous academics aligned to admissions requirements for state colleges and universities.
- Career technical training, delivering concrete knowledge and skills through a structured sequence of courses.
- Work-based learning, providing real-world experience via job shadowing, apprenticeships, internships, and more.
- Comprehensive support services, including counseling and supplemental instruction tailored to individual needs.

About the Linked Learning Alliance

The Linked Learning Alliance is the engine that drives a movement to help every young person determine their own future through a proven approach to education called Linked Learning. The Alliance helps create public will for equity and excellence in education, elevate the practice of Linked Learning across America, and advance policies that serve and support all youth.

Appendix B: Common Funding Sources

State Funding

[Local Control Funding Formula](#) (LCFF) creates funding targets based on student characteristics and provides flexibility to use these funds to improve student outcomes. For school districts and charter schools, the LCFF funding targets consist of grade span-specific base grants plus supplemental and concentration grants that are calculated based on student demographic factors. For county offices of education, the LCFF funding targets consist of an amount for COE oversight activities and instructional programs.

State Categorical Funding

[California Partnership Academies](#) (CPA) funding provides annual resources for the currently operating CPA programs included in the California state budget. CPAs are effective school-district-business partnerships providing integrated academic and career technical instruction to students who are at risk of dropping out of school or who are not motivated by traditional curricula. The CPA model, a school-within-a-school for students in the 10th through 12th grades, establishes viable partnerships with either the business community or the public sector, or both. Emphasis is placed on student achievement, attendance, and program accountability.

[Career Technical Education Incentive Grant](#) (CTEIG) is a state education, economic, and workforce development initiative to provide pupils in kindergarten through grade 12 with the knowledge and skills necessary to transition to employment and postsecondary education. CTEIG is administered as competitive grants.

[K–12 Strong Workforce Program](#) (SWP) is designed to support K–12 LEAs in creating, improving, and expanding career technical education courses, course sequences, programs of study, and pathways for students transitioning from secondary education to postsecondary education to living-wage employment.

Example Federal Funds

[Title I](#) of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA) provides financial assistance to LEAs and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards. Federal funds are currently allocated through four statutory formulas that are based primarily on census poverty estimates and the cost of education in each state.

1. Basic Grants provide funds to LEAs in which the number of children counted in the formula (formula children) is at least 10 and exceeds 2% of an LEA's school-age population.
2. Concentration Grants provide funds to LEAs that are eligible for Basic Grants and in which the number of formula children exceeds 6,500 or 15% of an LEA's total school-age population.

3. Targeted Grants are based on the same data used for Basic and Concentration Grants except that the data are weighted so that LEAs with higher numbers or higher percentages of children receive more funds. Targeted Grants are based on the same data used for Basic and Concentration Grants except that the data are weighted so that LEAs with higher numbers or higher percentages of formula children receive more funds. Targeted Grants provide funds to LEAs in which the number of formula children (without application of the formula weights) is at least 10 and at least 5% of the LEA's school-age population.
4. Education Finance Incentive Grants distribute funds to states based on factors that measure a state's effort to provide financial support for education compared to its relative wealth as measured by its per capita income, and the degree to which education expenditures among LEAs within the state are equalized.

[Title II, Part A—Supporting Effective Instruction of ESSA](#) intends to increase student academic achievement through strategies such as improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

[Title IV, Subpart 1—Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants](#) is intended to improve students' academic achievement by increasing the capacity of states, LEAs, schools, and local communities to: 1) provide all students with access to a well-rounded education, 2) improve school conditions for student learning, and 3) improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students.

The [Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 2006](#) makes federal funds available to develop more fully the academic, career, and technical skills of secondary and postsecondary students who elect to enroll in CTE programs. In accordance with the statute, states must allocate at least 85% of the funds to eligible recipients, which include LEAs, two- and four-year colleges and universities that offer sub-baccalaureate CTE programs, area CTE centers, and postsecondary education institutions controlled by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Education.

Example Local Funds

[Measure N](#) is a \$120 per-parcel tax on each taxable parcel in the city of Oakland. Under Measure N, 90% of the funds (over \$12 million a year estimated, or \$1,000 per student) goes directly to school sites on a per-pupil basis. High schools use this money to create customized plans to place all students in high-performing career pathways. An independent commission of qualified experts approves and supports these plans and schools are held accountable for success through annual and three-year progress reports. In addition, Measure N is subject to annual independent financial audits.

Appendix C: Policies and Documents for District Linked Learning Activities

Antelope Valley Union High School District

[Antelope Valley Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)

[BP 6178 Career and Technical Education](#)

Long Beach Unified School District

[LBUSD Graduate Profile](#)

[BP 1700 Relations Between Private Industry and the School](#)

[BP 6143 Courses of Study](#)

[BP 6178 Career and Technical Education](#)

[BP 6178-1 Work-Based Learning](#)

Oakland Unified School District

[Oakland Board Policies](#)

- BP 0540
- BP 6030
- BP 6146.1
- BP 6178
- BP 6178.1
- BP 7116

[Oakland Graduate Profile](#)

[OUSD Strategic Plan 2015-2020](#)

End Notes

- i *Student Outcomes*, Linked Learning Alliance (October 2020): <https://www.linkedlearning.org/impact/student-outcomes>
- ii “Integrated Academic and Vocational Instruction,” Oakland Board Policy 6030: <https://boepublic.ousd.org/Policies.aspx>

Additional References

Willon, P., Luna, T., Myers, J., & Blume, H. “Newsom pledges aid for California schools’ reopening plans,” Los Angeles Times (December 2020): <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-12-30/newsom-promises-cash-for-california-schools-to-create-covid-19-reopening-plans>

Guha, R., Caspary, K., Stites, R., Padilla, C., Arshan, N., Park, C., Tse, V., Astudillo, S., Black, A., & Adelman, N. (2014). Taking stock of the California Linked Learning District Initiative. Fifth-year evaluation report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.



ABOUT THE ALLIANCE

The Linked Learning Alliance serves the coalition of educators, employers, and community organizations dedicated to advancing equity and excellence in education through Linked Learning. Based on evidence of positive effects for students, the Alliance sets standards to ensure Linked Learning quality and access. School districts seek certification through the Alliance to ensure that their pathways are operating with the fidelity required to benefit all young people. Visit us at: [LinkedLearning.org](https://www.LinkedLearning.org).