Appendix A

The Riverside Education Collaborative (RCEC) was formed in July 2014 in response to participation in a working session at the U.S. Department of Education. Representing members from area school districts, higher education, city/county officials, and private industry, RCEC collectively committed to the following goals geared to increase postsecondary access and attainment through the 2019 school year: Increase the percentage of students applying to three or more colleges by 60%, increase percentage of FAFSA completions from 52.3% to 93% through school years 2018-2019, increase the percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education from 52% to 65%, and increasing the percentage of students who are college-ready per the Early Assessment Program (EAP), by 20%.

As part of the RCEC, we developed a research partnership between the School of Education (SOE) at UC Riverside and the Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) to examine what high schools across Riverside County are doing to prepare Riverside County students for college. RCOE has developed a collaboration between districts and local colleges and universities to expand college-going across the county. The initial research objectives of the UC Riverside/Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) Research Partnership were to:

- Identify policy, programs, and practices that districts and schools are implementing in Riverside County to increase college readiness and college-going
- Identify and seek to understand "Best Practices" in high schools across Riverside County that have higher than predicted college readiness and college-going through case studies.

Citation: Kolluri, S., Smith, T. M., Li, Y., Ream, R. K., & Guarino, C. (2026). Outliers for equity: Choosing (and not choosing) college preparation in California's Riverside County. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 34*(54). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.34.9130

Appendix B

Table 1

Characteristics of students in the schools in the top and bottom categories of effectiveness in promoting college enrollment and persistence

	Average		
	Top Six	Middle Pack	Bottom Six
% Female	0.52	0.51	0.49
% Free/Reduced Price Lunch	0.72	0.56	0.67
% Disability	0.10	0.11	0.13
% English Learner	0.10	0.06	0.09
% Parents College Graduates	0.16	0.30	0.15
% URM	0.82	0.72	0.81
Average 8th Grade Math SBAC	0.05	0.18	0.07
Average 8th Grade ELA SBAC	0.08	0.17	0.08
HS graduate class size	408	517	317
College enrollment size	261	346	166
HS cohort graduation rate	0.93	0.95	0.91
% A-G Satisfied	0.51	0.56	0.41
% AP taker	0.26	0.28	0.19
% AP taker (>3)	0.17	0.25	0.10
% College going	0.52	0.60	0.49
% College persistence (12 month)	0.88	0.90	0.83

Note: The above % college going and % college persistence are observed outcomes. This is not to be confused with the outlier analysis, in which the top and bottom schools are selected based on the size of the difference between the observed and predicted outcomes.

Citation: Kolluri, S., Smith, T. M., Li, Y., Ream, R. K., & Guarino, C. (2026). Outliers for equity: Choosing (and not choosing) college preparation in California's Riverside County. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 34*(54). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.34.9130

Appendix C

1. *Persistence ranking* sorts the residuals from the model on persistence rate (with the number of students who graduated in the high school as the denominator) only[1].
2. *Mean residual ranking* takes the average of the residuals from the five models and then ranks the schools by their mean residual.
3. *Frequency ranking* counts the number of occurrences a school appeared in the top five or the bottom five of each of the five residual rankings and then ranks the schools according to their counts[2]. For example, if *school A* appeared four times in the top five out of the five residual rankings, and *school B* appeared three times in the top five out of the five residual rankings, then *school A* ranks higher than *school B*. The highest count a school can get is five, and the lowest count is zero.

Appendix D

Table 2

Pairwise Correlation of the three combined rankings

	Mean Residual	Frequency	Persistence
Mean Residual	1.000		
Frequency	0.8544	1.0000	
Persistence	0.9197	0.8508	1.000

Table 3 shows characteristics of the schools in the top and bottom categories. As seen in the table, there is little evidence that exogenous school characteristics are correlated with the effectiveness categorizations. There are both higher and lower income schools, higher and lower performing schools, etc., in each category. This hoped-for balance is the direct consequence of using residuals from a regression that adjusted for these characteristics.

However, variables that were not controlled for in the regression because they were likely the result of school efforts (e.g., AP taking variables and A-G coursework) did demonstrate differences and support the main conclusions of the qualitative findings in this paper.

[1] We prioritized this persistence ranking because we think it is a better indication of student readiness for college. This ranking accounts for success in both the college enrollment and college persistence, as the numerator will increase only if both factors increase.

[2] The reason we decided to use the top five and bottom five as thresholds is that they approximate the top ten percent and bottom ten percent of our sample (5/52=~0.10).

Citation: Kolluri, S., Smith, T. M., Li, Y., Ream, R. K., & Guarino, C. (2026). Outliers for equity: Choosing (and not choosing) college preparation in California's Riverside County. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 34*(54). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.34.9130

Appendix Table 3

Characteristics of students in the schools in the top and bottom categories of effectiveness in promoting college enrollment

	Average			Exceeding Expectations						Not meeting expectations					
	Top Six	Middle Pack	Bottom Six	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6	School 7	School 8	School 9	School 10	School 11	School 12
% Female	0.52	0.51	0.49	0.55	0.48	0.50	0.53	0.60	0.49	0.56	0.52	0.39	0.49	0.51	0.49
% Free/Reduced Price Lunch	0.72	0.56	0.67	0.84	0.54	0.34	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.78	0.34	0.69	0.80	0.79	0.60
% Disability	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.08	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.04	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.20	0.10	0.08	0.19
% English Learner	0.10	0.06	0.09	0.22	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.14	0.04	0.14	0.15	0.02
% Parents College Graduates	0.16	0.30	0.15	0.07	0.22	0.31	0.14	0.04	0.16	0.15	0.10	0.20	0.06	0.06	0.31
% URM	0.82	0.72	0.81	0.93	0.76	0.48	0.94	0.88	0.92	0.83	0.97	0.57	0.89	0.96	0.64
Average 8th Grade Math SBAC	0.05	0.18	0.07	0.13	-0.11	-0.07	0.08	0.11	0.19	0.32	-0.27	0.29	-0.01	0.10	0.00
Average 8th Grade ELA SBAC	0.08	0.17	0.08	0.14	-0.03	0.00	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.36	-0.16	0.01	-0.02	0.16	0.12
HS graduate class size	408	517	317	433	544	452	495	57	465	192	462	52	344	453	399
College enrollment size	261	346	166	288	357	299	296	34	294	93	271	28	169	214	218
HS cohort graduation rate	0.93	0.95	0.91	0.93	0.96	0.98	0.94	0.83	0.94	0.90	0.94	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.92
% A-G Satisfied	0.51	0.56	0.41	0.40	0.50	0.53	0.47	0.46	0.71	0.53	0.43	0.42	0.40	0.31	0.38
% AP taker	0.26	0.28	0.19	0.24	0.18	0.23	0.19	0.33	0.47	0.23	0.21	0.23	0.16	0.15	0.22
% AP taker (>3)	0.17	0.25	0.10	0.06	0.20	0.20	0.12	0.22	0.26	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.15
% College going	0.52	0.60	0.49	0.52	0.56	0.57	0.40	0.58	0.52	0.44	0.58	0.51	0.49	0.42	0.51
% College persistence (12 month)	0.88	0.90	0.83	0.90	0.89	0.92	0.87	0.84	0.83	0.99	0.81	0.56	0.81	0.90	0.92