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PROCEDINGS

MS. REBER: Good morning, and welcome to our event, “Who you know: The role of social capital in boosting opportunity for young Americans.” I’m Sarah Reber, a Visiting Fellow at the Brookings Institution in the Center on Children and Families.

Today’s discussion will focus on how the ability to create and seize opportunity has a lot to do with the relationships, networks and connections. We will begin with a presentation of research findings from a new report by Senior Fellow and Director of the Future of the Middle Class Initiative, Richard Reeves.

Then we’ll turn to our panel of distinguished experts working on these issues directly in the nonprofit space. Patrick Corvington, CEO of Minds Matter, Michael DeVaul, YMCA of the USA National Director for Boys and Young Men of Color, and Emily Parrott, Director of Research and
Evaluation at Thrive Scholars. And we want to thank them all for being here.

We’ll have some time for questions from the audience towards the end of the panel. You can submit your question by using #WhoYouKnow on Twitter or emailing us at events@brookings.edu. So without further ado let me hand it over to Richard.

MR. REEVES: Thank you, Sarah. Thank you everybody for joining and especially thank you to our panelists for joining us today for this discussion.

As Sarah said, I’m just very briefly going to give some of the highlights from our report but please do check out the report which is I think being published pretty much as we speak. So check that out on the Brookings’ website. And I’m going to go through it. And thanks to Sarah for the support she gave us during the writing of that report.

So I’m going to share my screen just to go through a few slides. I promise there aren’t too many slides as there are a few things that are worse than millions of slides on a Zoom webinar, but I’m hoping that you can see this. And then if I start the show properly, you should all be getting a decent show. So if one of my fellow panelists could just give a thumbs up or a nod that this is working? Great. Thank you, Michael.

I’m very much looking forward to hearing the discussion after this too. I just want a few shoutouts to my coauthor, Beyond Deng. He’s the
research assistant in our center and honestly has been in a leadership on this work. And it’s a chance for me also to say that four case studies that drill into in the report, one of which is Thrive, as you’re going to hear from Emily a little bit later, were not selected with any scientific precision. And in fact, they are by no coincidence are organizations that Beyond himself had some involvement in so we use some of Beyond’s social capital to help select those organizations.

But as Sarah has already said, this is really about the relationships that can lead to opportunity and what’s the role of those relationships or social capital to use the one key term in promoting particularly educational achievement. And especially the transition from K-12 education, high school, into post-secondary? Well, we know there’s a big challenge especially for those from less advantaged backgrounds.

And so, I was wondering how to start this presentation. And we have a number of individuals in the report who talk about the role of relationships and social capital. And so, you can read more about them. But rather than showing their story, I decided to break every rule in the book and do an N of one. And for the N to be me. For the one to be me.

And talk I think for the first time at Brookings event about my own journey. I think a bit about social capital. So if you’ll forgive me for just a few minutes being autobiographical. I just want to share with you my own
journey. This is my high school in a town called Peterborough. You can probably tell already if you don’t already know me that I’m from the U.K.

It’s a town about an hour north of London. It was a comprehensive school, a public school, which I would say had a middling academic reputation. I love my time there and I was lucky to have great teachers so in no way am I crushing my high school. But I then made an unusual transition from that high school. In fact, only the second to do so to go to either Oxford or Cambridge. So this is my college at Wadham College, Oxford.

And I went there to read law. I didn’t end up doing law. And when I was thinking a bit about how did this transition happen? I was only the second person as I said in my school to do so. I realized this was all about people. It was really about certain people. And so, going a little bit further back in time, this is a press clipping from my local newspaper, which describes the stunning victory of the Peterborough under 13 rugby team over South Leicester. I could talk more about that but I suspect you’re not that interested in that particular story.

But what’s important here is this guy here in the front that’s me. Very proud. I played a little part in the victory, I’m sorry to say. But more importantly for my purposes, is this guy here. This guy is called Risick Shake (phonetic). And through Raz as we knew him, I became friends with
him through school and he introduced me to his elder sister.

This is his elder sister, Sarah. Sarah was three years older than me. A couple of years ahead in school. Two or three years ahead in school and she got me interested in debating and arguing. Something that I continue to enjoy to this day. And you can see us here. We won this local debating trophy and that’s Sarah. And I got to know Sarah Shake pretty well too through this process.

Why does this matter? That’s me again. Just in case you hadn’t noticed. Why does that matter? Well, because this is Sarah’s college. And she said to me, come visit me. And so, I went to visit her. And those of you that don’t know, you don’t apply to sort of Cambridge. You apply to a specific college within it. And so, I ended up going to her college.

And the reason I went was because I applied. I even thought about applying was because I had been there. I knew her. I trusted her and she said have a go. Just try it. To everyone’s surprise, I just rolled the dice and went for it. And so, through my relationship with Rosie, I got to know Sarah. And through Sarah, I got to go through this college.

She was an informal mentor, if you like. This is all done informally. But the fact that she had been from my school. Maybe make me think that maybe I could have a go. And so, in a very, very peculiar way that was social capital in action. That was relationships being activated to get me
across a bridge that I wouldn’t have otherwise have gone across.

Now, I’m not going over claim, you know, I’m not from very
difficult circumstances. And I suspect that even if I hadn’t gone to Oxford for
all the reasons that social scientists can tell us about selection effects. I
probably would have done okay. But I don’t know exactly what would have
happened if I hadn’t had that bridge.

So that’s the background. Just a little personal note. But
today, I’m in the short time. And there’s no time to answer four questions
that we draw in the research. What is social capital anyway? What are we
talking about here?

Secondly, why does it matter particularly for educational
outcomes? Or why might it matter for educational outcomes? How is it
being deployed in practice? We’re really very interested in doing something
about this and what the practitioners are. And then what are the key lessons
for research and practice that we’ve discovered through our own journey
through this literature and in our engagement with the four organizations that
we do the case study in?

So very briefly what is social capital? And the honest answer is
no one really knows and everybody makes up their own definition for every
different study they do. There is no agreed definition. But here’s just a few
to give you a flavor. This is one from Nahapiet and Ghoshal which is about
the resources, which is really based on the resources that we get through the network of relationships. And that’s interesting because it does focus on this issue of kind of resources as something there. But not just available through, but also derived from.

So it’s the value of the relationship to a person or a social unit. This is a classic definition from Wilcox. Information Trust and Norms of Reciprocity in hearing in your social network. So again networks. But something here about trust and norms too. So the importance of the quality of the relationship as well I think is being implied there.

And then our colleague, Camille Busette, in some work that she led that we were involved in with a four-city study of social capital including Charlotte which I’m mentioning because that’s where Michael does a lot of his work. Social networks providing access to support information power and resources too. So all of these networks, shifting power around is one of the things Camille talks about.

There’s a couple of distinctions that’s just worth getting on the table because they may come up a little bit in the discussion. They certainly do in the report. But it’s the difference between bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Many of you will know this distinction.

But bonding social capital is essentially kind of within group type ties. Bridging is across groups. They are complementary but keeping
them in balance is important. And let me just say a little bit about these. So bonding social capital could be even within a family. They are certainly with any kind of small group or neighborhood or perhaps within an ethnic group, a religious group, a geographical area and so on.

Typically, people are quite similar to you. Those ties are very often quite strong. They’re quite thick ties. They are really about integrating people into their own communities or own space. So a small number of thick ties. And one scholar described this as what helps you to get by. This is about solidarity, support, et cetera. So that’s bonding.

But then bridging is ties between groups. So that might be across class lines, across geographical lines, across educational lines and so on. Typically, very often people of different backgrounds, different in one way or another. They very often might be weaker ties so these are not necessarily, you know, ties. People you would use the word love to describe although sometimes you might end up there. And it’s really about linkages across difference. And the same scholar would describe this as this is how you get ahead. So bonding helps you get by. Bridging gets ahead.

The second question we’re addressing is why might social capital matter? And you can see there’s a little bit of hesitation here even some of the words we’re using. Just because it’s incredibly difficult to get high quality empirical data on the work that has been done in this space. But
some reasons are insurmountable just getting good measures.

But the first thing I think to say is we’re going to talk about the value of social capital for something else. But I just want to pause for a moment and say that we shouldn’t forget the relationships may well and, in fact, do matter in and of themselves. There’s an intrinsic value to relationships. So it’s not just about what does this relationship get me? The relationship itself is important. And in fact, good relationships are part of the good life.

But with that said, it can also promote opportunity. For example, and we focus on this in education. But how does it do that? In a number of ways, but to simplify just in terms of the axes of social capital that we’re talking about here. Let’s think about family social capitals that really zoom in on the relationship between parents. The attitudes and norms within families to support what people get from parents and so on. But also, sometimes also some of the reluctance that parents might have which we talk briefly about.

But that seems to be pretty strongly rated the performance in school. For example, parents that are regularly checking in on their homework, the kid’s homework. There’s a nice study that Sarah pointed us to showing that if you have schools letting their parents know how the kids are doing tends to promote more engagement from the parents. Again,
speaking from personal experience. A letter from my school tutor to my parents asking why I hadn’t done any homework for the last three months definitely got my parents engaged in my education performance. That’s an anecdote for an example.

Community and social capital. So here thinking especially about peers and the role of peer groups. In many organizations you’re about to hear about deliberately built peer groups. So we’re deliberately trying to create people like me who I can be -- the way I like to think about this is shoulder to shoulder, and we’re doing this together. And that turns out to be quite powerful particularly things like college going rates.

And then bridging social capital. So here we’re talking about people who may be very different to us. In a different area. Have different networks, different opportunities. So I think you see a classic think about mentor/mentee relationships and so on. And there’s some evidence that might help you get a better college fit. So in other words, that might mean that someone goes to college, which you actually were academically prepared for but wouldn’t have thought about. Or don’t know how to negotiate. Like I had no idea how to negotiate the college application system of Oxford if it hadn’t been for Sarah.

And so, it might well be that I ended up with a better fit than I otherwise would have done. So that’s a very different kind of outcome. And
it’s important, I think even though the distinctions are blurry to take and make them. One of the studies that Beyond dug into for this research when we looked back. I have a particular interest in boys and men. I have a book coming out on that subject and a project at Brookings.

And there’s this very interesting study here by Eric Clevon (phonetic) and others, which I won’t spend too much time on. I promise not too many slides. And you certainly don’t want too many charts. But effectively what this slide does is try to look at what’s the role of social capital and academic preparedness? In explaining the difference between girls and boys in enrolling in college.

And so, what this does is we know that girls are much more likely to enroll in college that’s one the left. But then what about if you control for social capital? And that turns out the family’s social capital is very important there as well as peers. And then you control for GPA. And girls have much higher GPAs on average than boys.

And what you see there is more work is being done by GPA. So as the bars go down, we’re understanding the gender gap a little bit more. There’s a nontrivial contribution there from the social capital variables they had in the study. Of course, it will side depend on the order you put them in the regression. There’s lots of discussion to be had here, but at least it’s sort of face value indication for social capital matters. And it might help us
explain some gaps. In this case, the gender gap.

I just wanted to share this data by Mathew Desmond and Ruth N. Lopez Turley, which is a very interesting study of how important is it for kids to leave at home? I shouldn’t say kids. I should say young adults. These were high schoolers and this is Texas data. And we refer to all of this research in the report, of course.

And here what we’re getting at is what percentage of the respondents said it was important for them to live at home while staying in college? And what you see is very, very steep differences, a steep gradient by race. With black and Hispanic students saying it’s more important to them to live at home for all kinds of reasons that one can imagine or in cost and so on.

But also, about support for families, et cetera. So I think it’s important not to jump to over interpret this data but it’s nonetheless striking that even those in that you see on the left, those who have parents who are college graduates and on the right those who are not college graduates. And those on the right who are. Is you see very, very high numbers even among Hispanic young adults who have college educated parents. Staying at home is very important to them.

So that has consequences I think when you think about education policy. And it shows you the complexity of things. Something like
families in social capital and how it can work in different ways both to promote college capital. So it might have an affect on which colleges people choose if it's important to be at home.

How is it being deployed? We have four case studies that we dive into in the report. And of course, Emily is here from Thrive, but we also focus on matriculate, emerge and college match. And we don't have time to say too much about them here, but just a few things about the way that these organizations work.

One is there's a strong theme of working with families. So there is kind of built leaning into this bonding social capital importance of families. So college match, for example, runs -- actually mandatory family events. So some events were actually in order to continue in the program, there have to be family members involved, for example, in financial aid.

And Thrive, and Emily can talk more about this. Does family coaching sessions, multilingual, family coaching sessions to help students and families through that transition to college, for example. Matriculate allows parents to connect with other parents. This is another phrase into generational closure which gets to the sense of actually knowing other parents, this peer effect thing again also matters.

And then emerge actually creates -- very deliberately creates strong relationships between the Program Managers and the parents as well.
as with the students and those can turn out to be quite close relationships. I’ve also already have mentioned that a number of the organizations intentionally create these peer cohorts to build social capital. So emerging college match kind of create in cohorts all peers within high school.

Thrive, and we may hear more about this in a moment, but create quite interesting residential month-long summer academy programs at elite colleges. And what they’re finding is that the relationships that are formed among the students who attend those summer programs can last through college. And so, again it’s this deliberate creation of peer groups to support each other shoulder to shoulder.

Another element, bridges to opportunity. So mentoring emerge connects people with adult mentors. Thrive has a mentorship program where it’s very, very goal oriented to develop a specific industry. So you’ve got young adults. I’m interested in industry. Yeah, so let’s find you a mentor that’s going to help you in that industry, give you some connections. So it’s quite specific and I think quite important, but it’s specific to helping people out. And so, this is just one quote from the study. It’s actually from a mentor and it is just provided by the organization.

So I won’t read you the whole quote but basically what happens is the mentor says, well, they’re interested in the entertainment industry so that’s what I work in. So I can set up a bunch of calls for them
with people in the entertainment industry who are happy to talk to them about their own path and so on.

They said that the mentor learned more about them, but even they learned a little bit about their own industry. And one result of that particular relationship was that the mentee in that particular relationship ended up on the set of the Scooby-Doo reunion. And if that isn’t social capital in action as Beyond says then what is? I mean we’re all feeling envious of that mentee right now.

What are the key lessons? I’m just going to come in here to the end. I think we need to be careful because as I have said before. It is incredibly difficult to get good empirical social science in this area. And I’ll say a little more about evaluation in a moment. But it seems pretty clear that bridging and bonding are important and that getting a balance between the two is important.

And too much of one in the absence of the other is not a good way to go for various reasons. It clear that peer-to-peer networks can support students and that there is a sense that the shoulder-to-shoulder initiatives really do seem to have some pretty interesting and promising results.

The duration matters particularly the relationships. I think every single one of the case study leaders that we talked to so we probably should
start earlier, earlier in high school. Build the relationships over time. This can’t be done quickly. Relationships take time to build so if it’s a relationship-based approach maybe starting earlier is important. You can do good stuff even at those transitional moments, but actually getting in early is important as mentioned already.

And I think something else which is really kind of between the lines but something that we're going to think more about is to focus on student agency. So there’s some emerging evidence that having students be involved in recruiting their own mentors might be a promising way to go, for example. And actually rather than being the recipients of the social capital to help to develop it.

Question. Could Covid have a silver lining? As we shifted to some online college visits, for example. The possibility of online mentoring, I should say the evidence there is pretty weak right now, but is there a way that we could use some of the way that this disruption to normal patterns? We’ve shaken the opportunity structure. Maybe that means there’s an opportunity to rebuild the opportunity structure a little bit.

And then justify quality evaluation. There are some exceptions to this rule but every scholar who looks at a field says, more research required or almost every scholar does. But in this case, I really do think that that’s an important finding here, though. So much of this work is being done
by excellent nonprofit organizations. But because of that it means they don’t necessarily have the budget or the space or the bandwidth to do evaluation. And scholars are typically leaning more towards public policy, publicly funded initiatives which is understandable too.

So there is a gap in the market here, I think for -- and to help these organizations to do more randomized trials, find better research designs and stuff. And that’s challenging for some of those organizations because, of course, everybody wants to feel like everything they’re doing is working, but it would be good to know more. And I think it would be more influential in terms of persuading other organizations if we really could invest a little bit more on evaluation. I think that’s important for us as scholars to think about, for the nonprofits to think about, but also for philanthropists to think about too.

If philanthropy that many of them are supporting these organizations were to build in budget to say, okay, let’s see if it’s working using high quality research designs. It doesn’t mean you go to everything with empirical research designs. Many of these things are hard to measure. And qualitative research has a huge and important role to play here, but I do think that there’s a real opening here to do more work in this space in a way that I think could make these initiatives even more persuasive than they are.

And then the last thing I’ll say is just that I think on a more
personal note again. To think about how we ourselves are using our own networks. The Brookings Institution has launched a Career Day where we bring in young adults from the D.C. public school system in place of Take Your Did to Work Day. We actually called it Career Day in bringing other kids.

Think about your own networks. Think about your own institution’s networks. Think about how porous your boundaries are. Think about your own role in the opportunity structure because very many of the people listen to this call will have power. They’ll have a way to think about how they use their own social capital for good and sometimes even for bad. And so, there’s a bit of a personal element to this story too, I think because definitionally it’s relational and relationships start with people and you’re a person. And so, where are you in all of this network and what can each of us do?

With that I’m going to give the floor back to the panel. Again, just a reminder, #WhoYouKnow if you want to be involved. I’m thrilled that you’ve joined us today and am very excited to hear from the rest of the panel. We have an excellent panel lined up and Sarah is going to moderate a discussion of that. So with that I’ll give the floor back. Thank you so much for your attention. Sarah?

MS. REBER: Okay, sorry. I’m sorry I’m still seeing you.
MR. REEVES: Okay. Well, I’m seeing you.

MS. REBER: Okay. Perfect. Hi, everybody again. Sorry about that. Thanks so much for that, Richard. And sorry, everyone for the little delay there.

So I’m really excited for this panel. And I just want to get right into it and start by asking each of our panelists to sort of introduce themselves and their organizations in a way, but also reflect on based on the work that you’ve been doing with young people especially around the transition to college and thinking about education.

Does what Richard is talking about in terms of the bonding social capital and the bridging social capital and the relationships like how does that play out in the work that you do? And so, we’ll just go in alphabetical order, I guess and start with Patrick and then Michael and then Emily.

MR. CORVINGTON: Well, thank you both. You know, Minds Matters is a nation organization with 14 chapters. We serve kids through high school through a pretty intensive process where they spend every Saturday, four hours a day working on a variety of deep academic topics, critical writing, math, test prep, college admissions, all those things.

And the notion here is to fight undermatching. It’s to get kids into colleges they normally would not have applied to. And so, it’s not just
college access but it’s getting into a topnotch college to solve this very thing that you're talking about, which is access to social capital.

And what struck me, Richard, in your presentation, your excellent presentation is this notion of bonding and bridging. And I'm interested in exploring the idea that both are happening in the same space. So that our kids who come together in a cohort are having that bonding experience, that they will keep with them through high school and then into college. But also, the bridging piece which is they all have access to two mentors.

And so especially the bonding and bridging happening in the same space and that carrying forth into college and beyond. So, for example, we know that many of our students end up in jobs they normally would not have because they're bridging social capital with mentors and their mentor’s friends in various industries.

So this is a great presentation. I'm looking forward to hearing from everybody. And again, I'm struck, Richard, by how you frame so many of these issues and how closely they are tied to the work that we do.

MS. REBER: Thanks. Michael?

MR. DEVAUL: Hey, good morning to all or almost all -- yeah, I guess it’s morning depending on what morning you are.

I'm Michael Devaul and the National Executive Director for
Boys and Young Men of Color. I use the pronouns he, him. My primary focus is to unite about 100 cities across the country to improve the outcomes for boys and young men of color. Some don’t know this history in our organization, but we have long been about obviously boys, young men. For this association, we obviously seek little girls and others now.

But I think our founding was rooted out of London and then into Boston which was the first United States wide, 1851. London was 1844. But it was rooted in how to improve the outcomes for boys. And I think if we look at the current context, right, it’s the challenge broadly across the country and globally is actually boys.

And so, there’s that African proverb that if you don’t -- in order to fill the warmth if they don’t feel it in their village, right, they will burn it down. And so, generally our goal is to try to do the bond, bridging and linking because linking is a part of the bridging, right? It is to get institutions and organizations and mentoring and families all focused on what does that young man want to do as a career pathway?

We’re primarily focused on 11 to 17. And the goal is to get them to a career pathway by 17 so that when they graduate from high school, the career becomes the primary focus. The pathway actually is the way they get out and then graduation is actually a byproduct.

The one thing I will say that struck me, Richard, from the report
was I didn’t know, obviously, because it’s just been released is that black and Hispanics in Texas to being closer to home, which makes sense to me from the context of the structural inequities, right?

And so, that’s a place where you feel more comfort. And so, the comfort would be -- because colleges are placed particularly for black and Hispanics -- if you have come from a less homogeneous place into a very diverse place or vice versa, colleges are one of those places that disrupts your context.

I know from my own boys, college was the place that they felt like they had less minorities, particularly Hispanics and blacks in college, in their colleges. One went to Alabama; one went to Baltimore. And I'm sorry, the University of Alabama, one went to the University of Pittsburgh.

And so, I think those -- it was college when they felt like they had less people that looked like them and it shocked them. Fortunately, they had enough navigation skills to stick it out. So anyway, I'm looking forward to the conversation. Thank you, Sarah.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Emily?

MS. PARROTT: Yes. Thanks, Richard and Beyond, for doing this research and, Sarah, for your insightful questions. I’m really excited to dig in and for the rest of the panelists too.

At Thrive Scholars -- so what we do is we support young
people through to and through college and through upper mobility, right? The idea is into career paths that they may not have historically had access to. So we support folks through -- we start at their junior year. After their junior year of high school for two residential summer academies. Both those summers and they're six-week long programs.

We also do the intensive college access programming during their senior years to fight undermatching. Really thinking about top colleges. What's the best fit for no low loan but also the sociable belonging.

And then all the way through the career so we have college success programming, coaching during that first year of college and then career development programming for the rest of college into their career. So we’re really thinking of this as a holistic social capital development program.

And the way I’ve been thinking about bridging and bonding, right, is exactly what Richard pointed out a little bit earlier, right? The summer academy is often where we set the foundation and build these really strong bonding relationships. And often, some of our scholars say that that’s part of what really drew them to the program is finding people who are like them, who are high achieving, who really want to go to these colleges, things like that.

And then the bridging capital, we kind of start during that process. Start building those linkages and then we vastly continue that
throughout college. So mentorship, coaches that are from the industries and things like that. And events that they can go to, to build that capital. So it definitely seems to my heart. I think that our program, we have a lot of examples of these things.

MS. REBER: Awesome. Thank you all for giving that introduction to your organizations. And so, I want to follow up a little bit on something Michael said, and maybe Emily too. You’re getting at this.

So, you know, Richard talked about the bonding social capital being, you know, these like close ties in families and communities and the bridging is sort of, you know, seeking out opportunities. And, you know, students from more disadvantaged backgrounds, students of color, maybe rural students, it seems to me face like a different tradeoff because sometimes going to college might involve leaving their bonding capital and that is maybe a tradeoff that students from more privileged backgrounds don’t face.

So I’m wondering, I’ll start with you, Michael. But then if anyone else wants to pick up on it. How you help? If that’s been an issue you see? And how you help students navigate those issues? You’re still muted.

MR. DEVAUL: How about now? Can you hear me? Yeah, sorry, sorry. So our goal is to -- how we do it is we use a mobile app
opportunity called Gratify, which allows a young man actually to choose a
career pathway and then utilizing that app, we get their parents involved, the
mentor or their organizations or schools.

And broadly, it is to try to make sure that we're all in support of
that young man's career pathway, but we also look at their school, GPA so
we know broadly, at least in our first cohort about 56 percent of our boys are
between 1.2 to 2.0. And generally speaking, we also measure their
social/emotional intelligence and do an assessment of these (inaudible)
insights.

And what we know about those is that most of our boys actually
have pretty high academic self-efficacy meaning they have a lot of
confidence about academics. The question is are we allowing them to
practically apply that to their grades? And then to a career pathway based
on their own aspirations and their own sense of self?

And so, I think that is several ways that we do it. And then we
talk a lot about the importance of culture, cultural identity. And then we
better equip our staff leaders to talk more around the concept of cultural
identity and cultural responsiveness. So that the leader is equipped to talk
more around culture and culture identity. And the leader by doing that
themselves can activate our boys.

MS. REBER: Thanks. Does Emily or Patrick, do you want to
MR. CORVINGTON: I’m happy to jump in. You know, Michael, I love the way you describe college as a place that disrupts your cultural context.

One of the things we see to your point is for our kids that leaving home, in fact, plays a huge part of that. So if you have a kid who’s growing up in Missouri and gets into Princeton with a full scholarship. The notion of leaving my community and going there is tremendous.

But what’s interesting there is that the breaking -- the potential break of the bonding social capital is not just experienced by the student but also by the family, right? This notion that somebody is leaving me this so critical to my group and my context is really important. And so, we’ve been doing a lot of work with parents around that and trying to get them engaged in that. Because for the kids when they break that bonding social capital, they immediately jump into a bridging social capital when they get to where they are.

And so, that feels, well, difficult contextually they’re going towards something. But for the parents, it’s just a bonding that gets broken, right? And so, how do you marry those two? And how you fix that has been really a challenge. And again, what I love about this report is we haven’t been thinking about it in that way. And so, I think this is really going to
accelerate our thinking in terms of how we find a way to have the parents also have a bridging experience that their kids are having.

MS. REBER: Interesting, yeah. Thank you. Emily, did you want to weigh in or --

MS. PARROTT: Yeah, similarly we found over time that parents are integral, right? I was just talking to a parent yesterday who was saying that, you know, in his family is Latinx. And he talks a lot to other Latinx parents about, you know, you may be in L.A., Los Angeles, having your student apply to colleges across the country and that’s terrifying to them, right? The idea of being so far away to any parent, but especially in communities where you’re enmeshed.

And so, thinking about that and how to have that peer-to-peer. The parents who talk to each other. We have a parenting engagement specialist. We also have coaches do bilingual programming with parents to kind of share that experience. What is your young person, your scholar going through? And what does it mean for them? And also, what does it mean for you and your family? And how to have those conversations as well.

MS. REBER: Thank you. So I want to kind of ask about this from a different angle than the social capital angle. And just think about if what we’re trying to do is improve educational or labor market outcomes for
young people.

Why is the social capital approach kind of the best way to do that versus other types of approaches like, you know, sort of academic tutoring or things like that? And, you know, in particular I'm listening and like these things sound really great, but they're also all of your efforts are pretty intensive so that's going to be pretty expensive. And it's a lot of time for students and families.

So how do you think about kind of, you know, why this sort of relationship building approach versus some other approach? And I know there might be a line at both which is a fair enough answer, but I want to push a little bit on, you know, sort of like how you think about potentially a tradeoff between these kinds of very intensive relationship building approaches and other ways you might approach improving these outcomes.

So, Emily, I'll go to you since you are in our research and evaluation.

MS. PARROTT: Yeah. A little bit on the history of Thrive kind of speaks to why we're designed the way we're designed the way we are now.

So we started as more of a scholarship, lighter touch program. Added in academic support, the summer academies. And then since then have discovered that it's not just money. It's not just academics. It's also these relationships, right? And so, having that supportive tiering coach who
can bridge you into the social capital of not only the colleges you might not be thinking about but also the careers you might not know anything about or think about or things like that.

So that’s why I’m probably landing on the both and can’t we do it all, right? And yes, that can be sensitive. So how do you then manage that? And I think the way we do that a little bit is the way that the summer residential academic programming is the bonding and then we start introduce the bridging relationships and then kind of that continues over. But that’s a little bit of over time how we’ve evolved.

MS. REBER: Yeah. Well, it sounds like you’ve kind of found from experience that the other things don’t work alone without having those relationships too. Patrick, do you have any thoughts on that?

MR. CORVINGTON: Yeah, I mean so the Minds Matter approach is this notion of intensive work every weekend with a select group of students, right, with these mentors who then go off to school, et cetera.

What I would say about why the high touch approach works or matters is that’s more enduring, right? That there is endurance to relationships when there is such a deep degree of bonding that lasts for years and years. In fact, one of our Minds Matter alumina is now on my Board of Directors, right?

We see many Minds Matter kids who are now in their 30s
mentoring, coming back to mentor young people, right? And so, the notion of endurance and these relationships lasting for many years allows then for a different kind of bridging. And so, when you have these bonding relationships, they eventually become bridging relationships across alumina and that kind of multi general endurance to me really becomes what happens with same middle-class peers, right?

That my father knew so-and-so who knew so-and-so, et cetera, right? So that to me that endurance and then bridging leads to employment in so many different ways that for me this high touch approach which again is expensive in some ways. Ours is very volunteer based, can be extraordinarily successful.

MR. DEVAUL: Hey, Sarah, can I just add? Because I think Emily and Patrick said -- and I'm going to relate this to my own experience. As an African-American man who grew up in a low to moderate economic house. My father actually worked like in a -- I'm from Evanston, Illinois. And my father worked at a local bus company and my mother was a housekeeper.

We didn't think about college. I mean I wasn't thinking about college. My parents hadn't had a college experience. It was really the bridging. So let me just be real direct. I got in trouble when I was a young man like many of us do, right, when you're 11, 17. And let's just say I used
not good words, sometimes cursed words to teachers and police officers, right? I got arrested a few times.

But it was really actually the teachers and the professors who used their social capital to open up my world. And so, I often say to people, my best experience was seventh grade -- sixth grade when I got suspended for a couple of weeks for cursing at a teacher.

And she said to me, Mr. DeVaul, I've watched you. I observed you and you have a bigger vocabulary. And so, the two weeks that you'll be gone, I suspect that I would ask you to use more words in your vocabulary. And that actually is what opened up my world. It's still something that I can -- that resonates like it happened yesterday.

And I think it was because she said basically, I had a lot of potential. I will have -- you know, you will be accountable for your actions, but you have a lot of potential. And so, I'm going to talk to you about your potential. I'm going to acknowledge that you need to be accountable. And I think it's that kind of cultural or responsiveness. The bonding, bridging and the linking is what opens up people's worlds. And when you can open up the world, right, that's where they see other possibilities.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Thank you for sharing that. So let me see. What do I want -- so I want to ask about sort of not the success stories, but where you may have tried things or in your research you found
things that don't work? And kind of how you incorporate that? Or how your organization has incorporated that into, you know, revising or moving these programs forward? Let’s see. Patrick, do you want to come in there?

MR. CORVINGTON: Yeah. That’s a great question. I think where we have struggled the most is creating bonding social capital at schools where there are multi-Minds Matter alums.

So for example, you know, you have a kid who came from Missouri who is now a senior at Penn. Another one who comes from Iowa or from Detroit who’s a sophomore. Another one from L.A. who’s a freshman. You would think that because they have all gone through the Minds Matter experience, which is really intensive that they would create some kind of bonding social capital there.

But we haven’t been able to do that successfully. I’m not sure why yet. And it maybe that, you know, this notion of Richard’s plan of going from bonding to bridging is going from bridging back to bonding maybe difficult. And we’re still trying to figure out how to do that because that bonding, they have at school would then become bridging later the way it is with their middle-class peers in that we all went to Penn therefore we can so on and so forth.

But I think that a lot of our kids have so many other personal responsibilities back home. Like I went to college. I’ve got to take care of
my family that they get pulled in that direction and going to the bridging can be really hard. So we're still trying to figure out how to do that. And so, if anyone has any ideas, we would welcome them.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Emily, do you have any thoughts on that?

MS. PARROTT: Well, what came to mind from what Patrick was saying is we've started to work on that through -- or we have these regional or campus leads who kind of try to bring the folks together. The young people who are together on the same campus and we're constantly tweaking all of our programming, right?

So I spoke about that the evolution earlier. I think things that we've learned over time are -- yeah, I'm even thinking about Covid a little bit. That, you know, sometimes it is harder to have that bonding experience online potentially. And so, our summer academy looked really different in the pandemic and so one thing. Whereas our mentoring or coaching has been virtual kind of consistently. And so, having that one-on-one connection is what we found more successful in the online space.

And potentially as Richard was kind of alluding to maybe opening your bridging world a little bit more. But that bonding is a little bit harder online is what we found.

MS. REBER: Yeah. That makes a lot of sense. Michael, any
lessons on some things that you struggled with?

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. I'll say quickly one of the things we've learned is that we have to start a lot with adult practice. I think we got going first to try to talk with boys and get the shared voice in the agency without necessarily understanding how our adults may not have been prepared in their own learning.

And so, I think to extract bonding and bridging, we talk a lot about belonging. We took some of the (inaudible) Casey research also that utilizes, particularly for boys of color and men color, and tried to use that single term of belonging as a way to try to simplify even social capital. Is that if you don't provide an environment of belonging that it will be very hard for you to serve and support and nurture a belonging environment.

So it took us a while. It took us about six or seven months and then we had to kind of go back to it to do more of an adult practice assessment to get our adults moving. And then bridging across each other because I'm in a national scale work. And so, it's, you know, how does L.A. talk to Montgomery? How does Montgomery, Alabama talk to Baltimore? How does Baltimore talk to Chicago?

Those are all very different places. Marion, Ohio. And so, it's really important I think to start with the adult practice to equip those -- reequip those skills particularly in this current environment where the world is
sort of in an amygdala hijack. You know, so it's kind of, you know, we're in like a century overload.

So you have to really get adults to a place where they're talking about their own experiences and their own challenges. And then you can get them to then open up to be vulnerable enough to talk to -- in my instance, to boys of color.

MS. REBER: All right. I'm going to take that amygdala hijack world phrase with me from this. So thank you for that.

So Richard was talking about the different types of relationships and different types of outcomes we might care about. We might care about relationships for their own sake. And so, I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about, you know, how you think about the different outcomes you're after? Like, you know, I think there's like a desire to transition kids to college or to get a better match in college, to get them into jobs.

And, you know, but then there might be some other outcomes like giving just a sense of belonging or having these relationships for their own sense. And so, I'm wondering if you could reflect on that a little bit and think about like which kinds of relationships? You know, is it the peer? Or the near peer? Or the adults, caring adults? I don't know. Maybe I'm making question too big, but if, Patrick, could you say a little bit about that?
MR. CORVINGTON: Well, first of all, I want to say, Michael, that amygdala hijack is not going to show up in every presentation moving forward. I’m going to have to reference you each time.

Yeah. No, that’s a complicated question, Sarah. I mean trying to figure out what the best outcome is for our kids like what we really want, right? Wanting to go to the schools that they meet other people so that they can then go on to good jobs and all those things, right? But we also want that to be circular, right? That you’re pulling those behind you, right? That you’re not the only one that gets help but that you’re bringing other people with you and that you are then going back to your community to do service in some way.

So while -- I would say our top level goals are to get kids into good jobs, good schools and then good jobs. I would say some of the ancillary benefits are finding way to connect our young people back to their disadvantaged communities to bring others back along with them, right? So it’s bonding, bridging and then bonding again, right?

And that’s really difficult to do because it requires a level of engagement that a lot of organizations have a hard time doing, right? So the parent engagement piece to reference Casey is such a critical part of that because parents talk to other parents, right? So, you know, I’m living in this community in L.A. My kid went there and so I’m going to talk to my parent
peers with whom I have a bond about why their kid can also do the same thing.

And so, to me anyway just to not be too long winded is this stuff of helping people get along beyond and then bringing them back and using the bonding of parents or the bonding within communities to keep having that pull.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Emily?

MS. PARROTT: Yes. Such a great and big question. Similarly, we have kind of three main things that we're thinking about when we have tended to look at, you know, college enrollment, college completion and then career entry because we're focused on economic mobility in the long term so we think about those kinds of things.

But as the Director of Research and Evaluation focusing a lot on trying to figure out what are the pieces that lead to these things and help scholars thrive long term, right? And so, we're starting to look at this through our agency and self-efficacy, sense of belonging both in college and career and social capital development, right?

So and one of those things, right, social capital development, we're starting to measure like how many relationships do you feel like you have that can support your professional development? And we just started measuring this a few semesters ago so we don't have longitudinal data yet,
but it's very exciting to start to think about that.

And exactly for the reason that we’re thinking about here, right? If you only feel like you’ve bridged a connection into a career, you may not -- you're not going to feel that belonging. If you don't see yourself in that career, you're not going to want to be there long term, right? And so, thinking about how to build that long term. And I’ll end there. Michael?

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. So I'm -- Richard knows this. I use this a lot too. You know, belonging is the currency that drives social capital, the increased in social capital.

And so, what I always say to folks. I say to folks to Marion, Ohio. I was on a call with them and then will be in that city. They are home of the manufacturing world proof dryers. And they want to be known as like the world capital of world dryers. And they kept telling me that we don't have a lot of men of color on the floor of the manufacturing floor.

And then I asked a couple of more questions and they actually happened to have the guy that runs the floor is actually African-American. And so, I said to them, well, take him to the boys and let them see that -- so for us, it's college and/or career. So, you know, they can also have a very big trade world.

And so, in this instance, it’s one of these things where people -- we have to extract for boys, in particular, but I would say young people
broadly is, you know, sometimes you think of the job, but you don't think about the career. And so, what I often ask boys, so tell me what job you have, okay?

So how are we going to would turn it into a career? I don't know. Let's say, they work at Wendy's. And I say, well, you know one of the largest franchisees for Wendy's is actually an African-American man, Junior Bridgeman. Okay. You can manage them and you can hone them. You don't just have to work at them. And I think often times that proximity and that presence and then opening them up on very practical things can lead them, right, to that career.

So it's kind of -- we're too focused on economic mobility and we took that report. And that's how we choose the 100 cities, but generally I think the practicality of presence and proximity to whatever it is that's in their community, that asset, to get them to understand that once they experience that. That is actually what gets them out of their economic condition.

But to get them to a place where their own agency discovers that and the ahh-ha comes from them is really important.

MS. REBER: So in a minute I'm going to turn to a few questions that we got from the audience. I just want to remind people if you have a question, you can put that on Twitter with #WhoYouKnow or send it events@brookings.edu and we'll try to get a couple of those questions in.
So let me shift gears a little bit from not so much your program, but just the work you do. The fact that you do work with young people, it gives you some insight into what has been happening for young people in the pandemic. And I'm just wondering if -- I would like each of you to comment a little bit on how you see young people doing?

But particularly with respect to these really important relationships that often happen in person that may have been disrupted by the pandemic. And if you sort of have any thoughts about what nonprofit organizations or public policy more generally needs to be doing to address this. So, Michael, since I have you still big on my screen, I'll start with you.

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. I'll try to be strung along. Let me just say, I think obviously with Buffalo, Texas. We know mental health is really important. And trauma and -- but I will say this to me identifies the important particularly from the nonprofit sector. But I also think that the donors, hours to say you can use your allocation of resources as medicine.

You know, money is medicine. That's I think (inaudible) build a waiver rights about that in decolonizing wealth. What we find here is, I think it's the absence and the chasm of social capital often times even family and family social capital is the extraction of, you know, what's happening in the world today.

And so, the importance of the nonprofit sector thinking
differently about youth development. And I still say you’ve got to go back to
the cultural identity and cultural confidence to get the student to understand
that that is actually something to explore. We’ve had to adapt to that in the
crisis is both trauma mental health and the importance of cultural identity in a
world where sometimes you want to actually suppress your cultural identity
particularly for black and brown boys.

We’ve had to really find ways to bring that out so that it doesn’t
cause more trauma because chronic absenteeism is the paramount primary
problem in schools right now as boys aren’t going to school broadly. So to try to get them back in school.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Emily?

MS. PARROTT: I keep losing my cursor. Yes, I love this. I’m
thinking a lot reflecting on what you’re saying, Michael.

For us to -- coming out of the pandemic, you know, we just held
a career and leadership conference and it was for some of our scholars the
first time they were able to meet in person. And it was thrilling, right? Like
signing up, getting there to the event and things like that. It was the number
one reason people signed up and to have that in person ability and not just a
resume to be able to do the work.

So thinking about how to mix those modalities and figure out
what is the best opportunity. That’s what came to mind as I was thinking
about currently, at least the pandemic, coming out of the pandemic.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Patrick?

MR. CORVINGTON: Yeah. You know, the pandemic has been just -- I mean the data is clear on this, right? It’s been crushing for mental health. We see this across all kids and black and brown kids in particular. Black and brown boys in particular, it’s been extraordinarily difficult because in so many ways the ties that bind people, the bonding social capital has been severed, right?

And the supports that were there before were no longer available. And it is hard to have this discussion now as Michael said without bringing in Buffalo and Texas. And I think about that in particular for our kids and black and brown kids in the sense that, you know, schools are supposed to be the safest places.

And when schools are no longer become safe, I worry that education experience is not safe. And that combination of those two can be lethal, right? So when we try to work with our kids -- and I really love that Michael keeps talking about agency because part of what we’re trying to do is create that agency particularly when kids go to these colleges where they are often alone and their cultural capital gets to (inaudible) at least attacked.

And so, those combinations of schools no longer being safe which could then -- and I'm not sure, but could then translate into education
not feeling safe as a way out. And, you know, how I feel about myself and my culture, my own cultural identity and how that power can turn into agency can be severed. And I think we have to attend to this and pay attention to this in a way. And to Michael's point, working on this belonging work and identity work and people finding power and value in their own identity, which then turns to agency is more necessary now than it ever has been.

MS. REBER: Thanks. Yeah, definitely the research on both the academic and the mental health consequences of the pandemic is not encouraging even relative to what point you might think.

So I'm going to put on my pointed headed economist hat, which I don't know if I have another mode. And ask you, you know, sort of how you know that what you're doing is working? And, you know, what role do you see for sort of rigorous evaluation of your own program or other programs that, you know, sort of you have plans for that? Or just in general, how you think about knowing that what you're doing is working? And I'll start with you, Emily.

MS. PARROTT: Right. Yes. So at Thrive Scholars, we're, you know, we have our kind of big picture goals that we look at. So college enrollment, college graduation and career entry. And then we're expanding a lot of what the research that we're doing.

How do we know that we're doing it? We think about that
upward mobility, right? And that ability to secure a career that is going to provide you with enough to thrive as well as the options for the future. And so, that’s where we're starting to turn our research to figuring out how to -- what does that mean for young people in a mixed methods? And which parts of our curriculum and program lead to that, right, because we do so many things. And kind of tweaking our program as we get there. That is part of our research so.

MS. REBER: You have a control group?

MS. PARROTT: Yeah. I mean there’s lots of things that I want to do. So we’ll figure out what we can do long term, but in part, you know, we have some -- we’ve done a control group a little bit in the past.

Kind of who did summer academy, who didn’t? But that was hard because why you sign up for summer academy when some maybe different, right? And so, long term, yes, we would love to do a RCT and a control group and figure out, you know, is it our program? And what parts of our program and long term, how does that look different across, you know, which social capital? Which relationships? Which coaching models work better so?

MS. REBER: Thank you. Michael, could you say a little bit about how you evaluate your programs? And how you know what you’re doing is working?
MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. We're still early on. So we're just about -- we just got our first kind of a benchmark. We have a long-term goal of 70 percent of our boys will -- well, 90 percent of our boys will establish a career in readiness goal. A 100 percent of our boys will actually get out of high school and they will do that by improving their grades and reducing their suspensions.

But we're so early, it's too early. But I do think we're just becoming to get some -- we're about to do some qualitative, quantitative research externally, a third party. But I think where we are getting to a place is we're finding some best practices and some good policy strategies that we can scale across the country. Obviously, that will improve the program because we're really not a program. We're more of a strategy. As anybody knows we have more than enough programs.

We actually should be doing away with some programs. But that is actually one of our end goals is to get rid of about 15 to 20 percent of the program so that gives the efficiency for staff to go to the places that actually work.

But I think that we're having to learn again because I would say it's Covid and/or, right, the systemic issues that have been facing boys for a long time. We're having to adapt in a way that we didn't think about it two years ago. But Covid has forced us to adapt because of not just the
systemic issues, but also if you go to the low to moderate income areas in particular.

You got to 5506 in Milwaukee which is the most incarcerated zip code in the country for black males. It looks a little bit different and you have to think about it differently. So it's -- I would say, we're in route to that. We're not there yet. But if we did, we're going to share that share.

We're not going to hold onto that intellectual gap at all. Everybody can have it if we get to a place of success because I think all of us need to help everybody. And we're more around collective impact anyway.

MS. REBER: Excellent. So, Patrick, I'm going to let you off on that question because I want to go to some questions from the audience.

So a question from Twitter. Michael, talks about belonging as the glue and I agree. Creating this feeling is not short term. I would like to hear panel members talk about access to ongoing operating funds and how they network with peer programs in their communities? So, Patrick, do you have any thoughts about that? Do you work with some other programs?

MR. CORVINGTON: I rather answer the other question, frankly. I was going to say, if you're putting on your economist hat can't we just assume that it's working?

You know, we do. So we try to work across our chapters,
right? So the 14 chapters, we try to work with them across. Where we've been doing, I think our most work is within universities. So finding the connected organization within universities that can provide support to our students.

I think we do need to do a better job of connecting with other organizations particularly in communities where our students are coming from and going to. I think that's our next big goal is to build out that library of resources and that library of connections.

MS. REBER: And what about I think this person is also getting at funding. Do you -- like I assume it's difficult to keep the funding going? Or how do you do that?

MR. CORVINGTON: Well, we're really fortunate actually that we don't rely on traditionally philanthropy, on foundations and such but we will get there at some point. We rely on private donations. And so, we're able to raise quite a bit of money just through, again through social capital, right? Through our bridging and bonding capital and that's been very successful for us.

And we are unique, I think in that way. And so, it allows us opportunities to experiment, to innovate to those kinds of things, which is really helpful to us.

MS. REBER: Interesting. Thank you. Michael, you want to
comment on connections with other organizations? And funding yourself?

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. And I don't think I’m at liberty to tell folks the amount yet. But I'm going to look up a company, I think which is really important and it's interesting because they actually have really, really good commercials that talk about this.

We've gotten some funding -- first of all, I think there are more corporate and private folks thinking about infrastructure and capacity building than ever before when a lot of times that's not what they want to fund, right? They want to fund the program. I'll go back to using money as medicine and that is their sort of practice and/or their sort of justice. The company I will lift up is Procter & Gamble.

So Procter & Gamble has given us some funding, but they're as interested in how we can help them open up more pipelines to their company for black and brown men. Not just to help and discover our focus. And so, it's kind of and for them. And I think these are the kinds of things that we need, right?

Is you need more folks in your company and organization and your resources are going help not only us, but it's going to help give exposure to what you’re doing. And they have a great commercial about these hands and some of you may have seen the commercial they have about the judge?
I mean these are the ones -- I think these companies should do what they say. And I’m finding more folks that are investing in again more restorative practices using funding as a restorative practice. And so, I would urge folks out there to challenge companies and organizations to do that.

MS. REBER: Okay. Thank you. So we got a few questions kind of relating to rural, urban, differences in social capital and some expressing sort of questions or concerns about how can we develop social capital in rural areas for students?

So I want to kind of like augment those with my question about the use of virtual technologies, what are the promise and what’s the limits of that? And would that be a way of sort of helping rural students? And let me start with Emily. If you can comment on that?

MS. PARROTT: Yeah. So, so far, we focus nationally, but we have kind of some specific cities, urban areas that we have programs in and do specific recruitment in. But we’re definitely thinking about rural students and scholars. And that is one of our next things that we’re starting to really focus on.

Is what does that difference look like? What could drive academies, you know, summer academy grows to be able to serve students across the U.S. including rural communities? And so, what does that -- how important that is? And then I would say that the research is mixed, right?
On whether this virtual technology actually is supporting education and social capital? Or whether it’s like drawing away from it?

And I think if our young people -- what we found is that when they use it to use all the tools at their disposal, they can kind of use it to do the bridging. And I think it would be interesting to find out, you know, is it supportive in the bonding as well? Or is it a support versus a foundational aspect in thinking through rural and urban communities?

MS. REBER: Yeah. There were also some questions about young people building social capital in all of the electronics and phones and things. So you sort of gotten at that a little bit in your answer too. There’s maybe a trade on figuring out how to use these -- get these tools more focused on the building than interfering with that. Patrick, do you have any thoughts on this?

MR. CORVINGTON: Yes, sure. I just want to comment on this because there is, I think an assumption from those who work in cities that there is somehow some access to social capital in rural areas. And, of course that’s not true. It just looks different. And we can because we tend to work in urban communities because we focus mostly on black and brown boys and girls that it doesn’t exist because it looks so different.

And so, we want to apply our own model to those communities. And I have done quite a bit of work in Montana, Idaho and Wyoming. And I
find a tremendous amount of bonding and social capital, it just looks very
different. And looks ways that we might not expect. And so, part of the work
of people like us, I’m going to say, is to better understand what social capital
looks like in the rural communities and then to capitalize on that.

Because like I said there is this assumption that they live -- like
how can they possibly have social capital? When in fact, of course they do,
right? We just need to figure out what it is and find the model that we have
for years discovered in communities in which we work in but not so in rural
communities.

MS. REBER: Yeah. That’s really important, an important
point. Michael, did you want to add anything on the urban/rural question?

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. Just real quick. Our model intentionally
looks at rural areas. So in my mind, I think of rural Georgia right outside of
Atlanta. I guess partial why I mentioned Marion, Ohio.

And I think the mobile device is universal. So I think
particularly if we’re going after students, the technology and to go to them
and to the mobile device is, you know, we find that at least there’s no lack of
mobile devices in rural communities versus cities, it’s the same. Everybody
has a mobile device, particularly young boys.

So that’s universal. Again, it’s basically the strategy that has to
be different. That’s why you have the local organizations tell you. But our
intentionality is Marion is rural and red. And so, we tell people this is a purple policy issue. Social capital is about bring people to the purple. And so, I mention them because I think they are serving boys and young men of color in a rural place, but equally as concern as a big city because I think they want folks in their tax base.

You know, we tell people like these kids do one of two things when they get older. They either make or pay taxes. And we want to make them. That's social capital at its finest, right? When everybody is in contributing.

MS. REBER: Yeah. Convert the social capital into financial capital for the government. Okay. So we had a question. Do any social capital models take into account racial equity? For example, how are issues like co-switching or pressure to conform or assimilate into mainstream society handled?

So I think the answer is clearly, yes. All of you are very focused on racial equity, but starting with you, Michael, if you can just say a couple of more words about that?

MR. DEVAUL: Yeah. It's why I drill down on, you know, I mentioned earlier it calls for cultural identity. Working on cultural responsiveness with an agency of the leader is really important. And we focus a lot on a culturation, not assimilation. In other words, what are the
important pieces for the young men to bring to the table that are assets?
Instead of losing sense of self, let’s drive sense of self and cultural identity.

And so, I think, yes, the equitable equity strategy, right, belonging to me is an overarching umbrella of the EI work. So the answer is cultural identity.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Patrick?

MR. CORVINGTON: Yeah. I mean I think Michael briefly said it all. I mean it really is the work, right? So a lot of the identity work we do is we don’t want kids to go to certain schools to have to color-switch, right? I mean co-switching is something we’ve had to do in black and brown communities our entire lives, right, around a variety of ways.

And so, the notion of not having to do that defines agency and real identity is so critical. And finding value in that and coming to a table with such agency and strength that, you know, because color-switching can be so detrimental to the self, right? It could be an assault on the person, on their own psyche.

And so, trying to find ways to help kids fit into the communities in which they may not have been in the past while maintaining their identity and their agency to me is that critical balance that we have to find. And it works on both sides, right? It works in black and brown folks but also in the white community of being able to understand what we value and what folks
value, those kinds of things.

So it is I think one of the most critical parts of the work. In order to advance the work and advance people’s lives is doing the identity agency work.

MS. REBER: Well, thank you. Well, we’re just coming up towards the end of our time. And so, I want to just end by giving you each 45 seconds to, you know, give any last thoughts on things that you’re excited about looking forward with your organization? Or from Richard’s presentation or however you want to use that last bit of time. So I’ll start with you, Emily.

MS. PARROTT: Yes. Thank you all so much for bringing us together. Also, for writing this report and thinking through different case studies on this and hopefully having more research needed will continue.

And I’m really excited to dig into the report and the case studies and think, you know, as I’ve been reflecting on this panel even moving forward how are we measuring? How are we thinking about social capital? And how all these things intersect, right? Belonging, social capital, identity development, you know, cross-cultural competencies and all these parts of our program. And I was looking forward to it. Thank you.

MS. REBER: Thank you so much. Michael?

MR. DEVaul: Yeah, I’ll just echo. Thank you very much for
the call. And I think let me challenge the audience. I think until you talk more about culture, the development and increase of cultural responsibility or competency and then I would say cultural responsiveness as a fundamental youth practice, I think we'll continue to talk more about the crisis than the opportunity.

The opportunity is actually rooted in bonding, bridging and linking. And so, let's all get back to who we are as humans. To stay human is to believe in social capital.

MS. REBER: Thank you. Patrick?

MR. CORVINGTON: You know, it's very rare that you join a panel where you learn much more than you intended or thought you would. This has been an experience for me.

I think that what is -- what I take away from this most is, of course, in our work is this notion of bonding and bridging. But how those can happen in the same space and how the power of identity of belonging of agency is really -- those come together in a way that is so powerful. And I'm going to have to do a lot more thinking about and really meditating on this notion of how we turn the bonding to the bridging. But then the bridging back to the bonding for communities. And so, I'm thinking hard about that.

And I so appreciate Emily and Michael. And just having blown up my thinking on these things. I'm always happy when that happens.
MS. REBER: Well, I want to thank our panelists. This has been a really great conversation. And thanks, Richard, for the presentation and thanks to the audience for watching. Have a good day everyone.

* * * * *
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