

Learning Around the Clock: Benefits of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Older Youth



ANNE BOWLES ■ BETSY BRAND



AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM

MARCH 2009



A M E R I C A N Y O U T H P O L I C Y F O R U M

Bridging Youth Policy, Practice, and Research

Mission:

To improve opportunities, services, and life prospects for youth, we provide learning experiences for national, state, and local policymakers and practitioners.

The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF), a nonprofit, nonpartisan professional development organization based in Washington, DC, provides learning opportunities for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers working on youth and education issues at the national, state, and local levels. AYPF's goal is to enable participants to become more effective in the development, enactment, and implementation of sound policies affecting the nation's young people by providing information, insights, and networks to better understand the development of healthy and successful young people, productive workers, and participating citizens in a democratic society. AYPF does not lobby or advocate for positions on pending legislation. Rather, we believe that greater intellectual and experiential knowledge of youth issues will lead to sounder, more informed policymaking. We strive to generate a climate of constructive action by enhancing communication, understanding, and trust among youth policy professionals.

Founded in 1993, AYPF has interacted with thousands of policymakers by conducting an average of 40 annual events such as lunchtime forums, out-of-town field trips, and policy-focused discussion groups. Participants include Congressional staff; federal, state, and local government officials; national nonprofit and advocacy association professionals; and the press corps. At forums, these professionals interact with renowned thinkers, researchers, and practitioners to learn about national and local strategies for formal and informal education, career preparation, and the development of youth as resources through service and skill development activities. Study tour participants visit schools undergoing comprehensive reforms, afterschool and community learning sites, and youth employment and training centers, where they learn experientially from the young people and adults in the field.

AYPF focuses on three overlapping themes: Education, Youth Development and Community Involvement, and Preparation for Careers and Workforce Development. AYPF publishes a variety of nationally disseminated youth policy reports and materials, many of which may be viewed on our website (www.aypf.org).

FUNDERS: AYPF events and policy reports are made possible by the support of a consortium of philanthropic foundations, including the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, WT Grant Foundation, and others.

COPYRIGHT: American Youth Policy Forum, Washington, DC, 2009. The publication is copyrighted, but may be quoted without permission provided the source is identified as: Bowles, A. & Brand, B. (2009) *Learning Around the Clock: Benefits of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Older Youth*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.

ISBN # 1-887031-97-9

This report is made possible by the generous support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Cover photos and photos throughout the publication provided by Citizen Schools.

Learning Around the Clock: Benefits of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Older Youth



ANNE BOWLES ■ BETSY BRAND



AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM

Acknowledgements -

We acknowledge with deep gratitude the many individuals who helped with this publication. First, we give our thanks to the dozens of program directors, evaluators, and researchers whose programs and research efforts are included in this compendium. Their willingness to share their knowledge and expertise proved invaluable to us. We appreciated their continued patience throughout our project as we returned to them with innumerable questions and clarifications, and we thank them for doing the hard work of evaluating their programs. We also applaud their continued commitment to helping children and youth receive quality care, services, and supports from caring adults in the non-school hours.

We benefited from the wise counsel and advice of our advisory group, whose names appear at the end of this publication. They helped us by sharing information on their own work and research on creating quality expanded learning opportunities and afterschool programs for older youth, by raising important issues and questions for us to consider in our reviews of research, and by providing access to program evaluations and research. In addition, they helped review summaries of the evaluations and gave us thoughtful advice about framing the document and using the term “expanded learning opportunities,” as well as ideas about policy recommendations. We also commend our advisors for their ongoing commitment to ensuring that children and youth are well-served by these programs and acknowledge their efforts to build public policy support for such programs.

We thank JoAnn Jastrzab, with Abt Associates, who reviewed each summary and aided us tremendously in ensuring that we represented the findings and data accurately and completely. We appreciate her expertise, knowledge, and professionalism, as well as her easy-going nature which makes working with her such a pleasure.

Thanks also go to Caroline Christodoulidis Brachman, who started this project when she was at AYPF. Caroline helped to organize the first meeting of the advisory group, conducted a great deal of outreach to identify potential evaluations, and developed draft summaries of the evaluations. She started the project off on a high note and contributed greatly to this publication.

Lastly, we sincerely thank our generous funder, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, and our program officer, An-Me Chung, for their commitment to this project and to expanding high-quality learning opportunities for youth throughout the country. Their support over many years has allowed AYPF to work with national, state, and local policymakers to help them understand the value of expanded learning opportunities and build more supportive policies.

Although each of these contributors provided a wealth of suggestions and ideas, the views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of AYPF.

A special thank you to Eric Schwarz, Joel Horwich and Colin Stokes from Citizen Schools for providing the cover photo and photos used throughout the publication.

Contents -

About This Publication	vii
Executive Summary	ix
Part I	
Setting the Stage: The Value of Expanded Learning Opportunities.....	1
Methodology and Research Notes.....	11
Part II	
Elements of Success	17
Program Summaries	23
After School Matters.....	23
Bayview Safe Haven	27
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America.....	33
Boys & Girls Clubs of America: Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO) and Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach (GITTO) Programs	37
Citizen Schools	42
College Now Program.....	48
Cool Girls, Inc.....	52
Families and Schools Together (FAST)	56
Girl Scouts of America: P.A.V.E. the Way (Project Anti-Violence Education).....	60
Project Morry	64
Project Venture	68
Quantum Opportunities Program	71
Seeds to Success	75
Study of Promising After-School Programs	80
Summer Career Exploration Program.....	84
Summer Search	88
The After School Corporation Evaluations	93
The Children’s Aid Society Community Schools: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	100
The Children’s Aid Society: Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program.....	104
The Urban Alliance High School Internship Program	108
Upward Bound Math-Science (UBMS).....	112
Woodcraft Rangers Nvision After School Program	119

Part III

Participant Outcomes.....	125
Policy Recommendations.....	129

Part IV

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success.....	136
Glossary of Terms.....	149
References	151
About the Authors	155
American Youth Policy Forum Publications	157

About This Publication -

This publication is designed to help policymakers and practitioners learn about expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) that have been effective in helping youth improve their academic performance and school engagement, learn skills important for career success, develop positive social and behavioral skills, and improve their health and wellness. Twenty-two evaluations are briefly summarized to give policymakers and practitioners a quick understanding of the research findings on some effective programs along with a description of why these programs work. The 22 programs summarized in this publication clearly do not represent the universe of expanded learning opportunities that are successful in helping youth; rather, they are ones that had quality evaluations. We also limited our review to programs that serve older youth, primarily middle and high school youth; we did not include programs that serve children in elementary school.

Other chapters present information as follows:

Setting the Stage describes the shift in language from afterschool to expanded learning opportunities, discusses how ELOs contribute to the healthy development of youth by improving academics and readiness for postsecondary education and careers, providing opportunities for youth to develop other skills, and improve attitudes and behaviors. The section also briefly refers to some of the mainstream research about effective ELOs with regard to safe and engaging programs, well-trained staff and leaders, and effective collaboration and partnerships, and closes with a suggestion for creating a culture of shared responsibility for youth across communities and education and youth-serving institutions.

Methodology and Research Notes describes the process AYPF used to identify and review evaluations, provides some observations about the limitations of existing research in the field, and suggests improvements in research and evaluations for expanded learning opportunities and other youth-serving and education programs.

Elements of Success describes the characteristics and factors that make the ELOs effective, based on the findings in the evaluations. They are broken into two categories: programmatic elements, which include comprehensive youth development services, experiential learning, financial incentives, high-quality staff and ongoing professional development, safe and structured environment, student-centered programming, and supportive adult and peer-to-peer relationships, and structural elements, which include collaboration, collaboration facilitator, and high-quality implementation.

Program Summaries provides a 5 to 6 page summary for each of the 22 evaluations. The summary includes an overview of the program, an overview of key findings and outcomes, a description of the program population, a description of the evaluation and methodology, an analysis of the elements that contributed to the program's success, information on funding sources, and contact information for both the program and the researcher.

Program Outcomes summarizes the four main areas in which students demonstrate benefits as a result of participation in ELOs, which include academic performance, career preparation, social and emotional development, and health and wellness and provides a chart showing how many of the 22 programs have positive outcomes in each of the four categories.

Policy Recommendations offers suggestions for policy in the areas of creating a vision of comprehensive learning systems for youth; developing shared accountability systems; supporting partnerships and collaboration across systems; focusing on quality by building capacity; ensuring equity and access; improving data collections, evaluation, and research; and ensuring sustainability of programs.

The final section of the publication includes a matrix of programs that includes a very brief description of the program and evaluation, as well as the evaluation outcomes and elements of success, a glossary of commonly-used terms, and references.

Executive Summary -

About this Publication

This publication is designed to help policy-makers and practitioners learn about expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) that have been effective in helping youth improve their academic performance and school engagement, learn skills important for career success, develop positive social and behavioral skills, and improve their health and wellness. Twenty-two evaluations of ELOs are briefly summarized to give policymakers and practitioners a quick understanding of the research findings on some effective programs along with a description of why these programs work. The 22 programs summarized in this publication clearly do not represent the universe of expanded learning opportunities that are successful in helping youth; rather, they are ones that had quality evaluations. We also limited our review to programs that serve older youth, primarily middle and high school youth; we did not include programs that serve children in elementary school.

*For this publication, the term “**expanded learning opportunity**” is used to describe the range of programs and activities available to young people that occur beyond regular school hours. Expanded learning opportunities, particularly for older youth, occur in a 24/7 environment, draw upon the resources of the community, blur the lines between schools and other valuable resources, such as colleges, community organizations, museums, and employers, and incorporate virtual learning when appropriate. ELOs include traditional afterschool activities with an academic focus, but also incorporate activities such as internships with employers, independent study in alternative settings, classes on college campuses for high school students, and wraparound support services.*

Setting the Stage: The Value of Expanded Learning Opportunities

The underlying message drawn from this review of the evaluations is that expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) work. They improve academic performance, college and career preparation, social and

emotional development, and health and wellness for youth. As such, ELOs should be viewed as a mainstream solution to help leverage scarce resources in the effort to ensure youth are well-prepared for post-secondary education, careers, and civic engagement.

Given the amount of time young people spend outside of school, what they do during that time matters a great deal. Ideally, all youth should have access to a continuum of quality expanded learning opportunities throughout the day and across the community that keep them safe, support development of needed skills, provide supportive relationships with adults, and facilitate their transition to productive adult roles.

Increasingly, policymakers and practitioners are interested in ELOs for various reasons. ELOs provide positive youth development experiences and increased support for academic learning, and they can play a part in restructuring the learning environment for older youth, who live with more complex and demanding schedules. Because the school day is not long enough to provide access to all the various skill development activities that adolescents need and want (such as community service, internships, leadership, civic engagement, and strong relationships), ELOs provide time to supplement the learning that takes place during the regular school day and provide enrichment across many domains. ELOs can also provide wrap-around support services (health and mental health or mentoring, for example) to youth who may have special needs or few supports of their own. At the same time, ELOs leverage existing resources and contribute additional resources (including significant numbers of adult volunteers) to augment K–12 and community-based funding streams.

As awareness grows that schools alone cannot and should not do the job of preparing youth, the notion of sharing responsibility for this task by organizations and programs throughout the community gains support. ELOs have a role to play in community-wide systems to support youth, and their flexibility and lack of bureaucracy often allow them to respond quickly to the needs of youth. Although the ELO system is still small in comparison to other publicly-funded systems (e.g. schools), high-quality

ELOs can carve out a niche that meets specific youth and community needs.

Evaluations of Expanded Learning Opportunities

After reviewing dozens of program evaluations of ELOs, AYPF included 22 in this compendium; 16 of them are categorized as demonstrating Stronger Evidence of Effectiveness, and six are categorized as Programs to Watch.

Overall, the evaluations categorized as “Stronger Evidence of Effectiveness” are quasi-experimental and used a treatment group, comparison group, and multiple measures to compare quantitative outcomes. These measures included factors such as attendance, test scores, course grades, credits earned, college-going rates, levels of substance use, pregnancy rates, and school suspension rates for participants and nonparticipants. The evaluations also controlled for differences between and among participants and nonparticipants.

The “Program to Watch” category includes a number of programs that have engaged in comprehensive data collection, but that did not have an independent evaluation performed and primarily utilized nonexperimental methods and focused on qualitative measures, including attitudes and behaviors, such as “perceived life chances,” “awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention,” and “overall anger.” Many “Programs to Watch” used surveys and interviews, and some measured participants at only one point in time. The term, “Program to Watch,” only applies to the quality of the program evaluation and does not in any way indicate that the program itself is not of high quality.

Positive Outcomes from Participation in Expanded Learning Opportunities

Youth who participated in ELOs demonstrated positive outcomes across a range of indicators. Of the 22 evaluations included in the compendium, 14 demonstrated success in academic success indicators, four demonstrated success in career preparation indicators, 13 demonstrated success in social and emotional development indicators, and five showed positive health and wellness outcomes. More often than not, programs demonstrated success in more than one outcome category, which further supports the claim that participation in ELOs is one way to better ensure all students are provided with the support they need to achieve academic and career success and develop into healthy, self-sufficient adults.

Academic

Of the 22 evaluations included in the compendium, 14 included measurements of academic success. The indicators used to measure academic success varied throughout the evaluations. For example, six of the 22 program evaluations specifically measured attendance rates, graduation rates, and/or dropout rates; 11 of the 22 measured course grades, GPA, credit accumulation, and/or achievement test scores; four evaluations measured college preparation outcomes, including taking college preparation courses, persisting to a third semester of college and other postsecondary enrollment rates. Additionally, nine programs measured academic success-related behaviors and attitudes, such as increased engagement in school, taking college preparation classes, and studying more. More often than not, programs that increased participants’ school-related behaviors and attitudes demonstrated an increase in other academic success outcomes, including increased attendance, GPA, and achievement test scores.

Career Preparation

Four program evaluations specifically measured indicators of preparation for career success. A range of indicators were used by the programs for career success preparation outcomes. One program noted participant improvements in basic financial skills, workforce readiness skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology, many of which could be characterized as 21st Century skills.

Social and Emotional Development

A total of 13 programs improved social and emotional development of program participants; three of the 13 programs improved the quality of participant relationships with supportive adults, family, and friends, to some degree. Programs that demonstrated positive outcomes in supportive adult relationships more often than not directly involved or partnered with adults and/or parents in the programming.

Health and Wellness

Five programs showed positive health and wellness outcomes. The outcomes vary and range from increased awareness of bullying prevention to increased knowledge of healthy lifestyle practices and preventative outcomes, such as teen pregnancy prevention and drug prevention.

Elements of Success of Expanded Learning Opportunities

Although the goals and designs of the ELOs summarized in this publication varied considerably, AYPF identified a number of common elements that are leading to positive outcomes for youth. AYPF's analysis of the evaluations highlights several programmatic and structural elements of success that have proven effective, particularly in ensuring that middle- and low-achieving students succeed in ELO programs. The programmatic elements include: comprehensive youth development services; experiential learning; financial incentives; high-quality staff and ongoing professional development; safe and structured environment; student-centered programming; and supportive adult and peer-to-peer relationships. Collaboration across programs, the role of a collaboration facilitator, and high-quality implementation are structural elements of ELOs that contribute to positive outcomes for youth.

Policy Recommendations

How ELOs fit into a strategy to serve all youth is still evolving, but policymakers can help move this discussion forward by creating a vision of a comprehensive learning system that places ELOs front and center in a new approach recognizing that learning for older youth occurs 24/7 throughout the community. Policymakers can also advance this agenda by developing shared accountability systems; supporting partnerships and collaboration across systems; focusing on quality by building capacity; ensuring equity and access; improving data collection, evaluation, and research; and ensuring sustainability of ELOs. Many of these recommendations are relevant to both federal and state policy leaders.

- **Promote a vision for a comprehensive learning system that draws upon all the resources available throughout the community.** Policymakers and leaders need to fashion a vision of how multiple systems, programs, resources, and providers (e.g. K–12 education, social and family services, workforce development, health and mental health, etc.) can collaborate to prepare youth for postsecondary education, a family-wage career, and active and engaged citizen participation. Expanded learning opportunities are a critical component of this vision.
- **Develop shared accountability by identifying outcomes and measures to which all programs and providers in the comprehensive learning system will be held accountable.** Current measurement systems do not take a holistic look across systems at the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes youth need. The accountability systems operate in silos, just like many programs, and make it difficult for communities to consider how each program contributes to the overall success of young people. Policymakers should support communities in their efforts to develop shared accountability by providing flexibility in existing accountability measurements and by helping design data collection systems that would report on the health and well-being of youth in a holistic manner.
- **Support partnerships and collaboration by breaking down barriers and provide support for intermediary organizations to manage the work.** Policymakers can play a large role in ensuring that legislative and regulatory frameworks do not restrict collaboration and that active partnering and sharing is encouraged. Policies can permit cost-sharing or the transfer of funds from one program to another for a similar or common purpose; allow programs to use common reporting forms or limit certain reports when partnering; allow flexibility across eligibility requirements to better serve youth in certain targeted communities; permit programs to use common performance targets or outcomes; and pool funding to support innovative activities or structures. Policies should recognize and support the role of intermediaries in facilitating and sustaining quality services, and when appropriate, intermediaries should be allowed to compete for funds or be eligible recipients.
- **Focus on quality by building capacity across and within systems to ensure high-quality implementation of services.** Policymakers can ensure that ELOs are designed, implemented, and operated to high-quality standards by providing sufficient resources for hiring strong, well-trained leaders and key staff; supporting ongoing training and professional development for staff; building capacity of programs to meet the needs of youth based on research; and collecting and using data and evaluation for ongoing program improvement.

- **Ensure all youth have equal access to high-quality services from various providers.** Policymakers need to ensure that resources are distributed equitably throughout communities, based on need, and that youth in communities of need have access to high-quality ELO programs. Policymakers should make special efforts to ensure that certain groups of youth, such as youth with disabilities, Native American youth, or foster youth, have access to quality ELOs.
- **Improve data collection, evaluation, and research to track youth as they move across programs/systems and measure the impact of their participation in expanded learning opportunities.** Another aspect of data collection that needs policy guidance is a clarification of what data should be collected at what level and for what purpose, how various quantitative and qualitative skills and outcomes can best be measured, and who or what system (ELOs, schools, communities, or states, K–12, postsecondary) should collect the data. Data systems should be longitudinal and follow youth for a number of years so that longer-term impacts can be measured. Policymakers should also require publicly-funded programs to use a percentage of funding for evaluation.

- **Ensure sustainability of efforts so programs continue in the absence of ongoing public funding.** Policy can help program providers learn about effective strategies that lead to sustainability, including evaluating outcomes and demonstrating effectiveness, building broad-based community support, using funds strategically, and ensuring efficiencies through effective management. Funding for the 21st CCLC program should be increased.

Closing

Expanded learning opportunities are an effective use of resources to prepare youth for the complexities that face them as adults. They improve academic, career, social and emotional, and health and wellness outcomes for youth. ELOs deserve ongoing and expanded support and to be fully viewed as a major contributor in the preparation of youth for post-secondary education, careers, and civic engagement.

PART I



**Setting the Stage: The Value of
Expanded Learning Opportunities
Methodology and Research Notes**

Setting the Stage: The Value of - Expanded Learning Opportunities -

Adolescents today are growing up in a challenging and demanding society and economy. Youth not only need to develop strong academic skills to be ready for postsecondary education and careers, but it is also imperative that they develop 21st Century skills (which include analytical thinking, innovation, problem-solving, and effective communication), as well as positive social, behavioral, and civic skills, in order to be successful.

How young people develop such knowledge, skills, and abilities varies greatly, and the myriad of experiences young people have with their families, friends, schools, and communities profoundly impacts their development and life trajectory. Schools play a large part in this development, but given the amount of time young people spend outside of school, what they do during that time matters a great deal. Ideally, all youth should have access to a continuum of quality expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) throughout the day and across the community that keep them safe, support development of needed skills, provide caring relationships with adults, and facilitate their transition to productive adult roles.

While many youth do participate in positive developmental and learning activities in school, after the school bell rings, and beyond the school house walls, more than 14 million K–12 students are responsible for taking care of themselves after school; 51 percent of these students are in Grades 9–12. Children who are left alone are more likely to watch excessive amounts of TV, are at greater risk of obesity and health problems, are more likely to be victims of or commit crimes, and are more susceptible to the temptations of smoking, drug use, and sexual activity (TLA Taskforce, 2007). Only 6.5 million K–12 students (11 percent) participate in afterschool programs, and only 8 percent of those participants are from Grades 9–12, although 2.3 million teenagers say they would participate if more programs were available (Afterschool Alliance, 2008).

Afterschool programs are more popular and available for young children, and there are fewer organized programs for middle and high school youth. Only about 36 percent of afterschool centers funded

by the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers program serve middle school students, and only 20 percent of these centers exclusively target this population. Only 15 percent of the centers serve high school students, with just 5 percent of centers exclusively targeting high school students (Afterschool Alliance, 2008). However, three-quarters of the voting public strongly supports the provision and expansion of afterschool programs and believes that afterschool programs can play an important role in keeping older youth in school, helping them to graduate high school, and preparing them for the workforce (Afterschool Alliance Poll, Lake Research Partners, November 2008).

There has not always been growing support for afterschool programs for older youth, as much of the work in the afterschool field originally focused on providing safe care for young children from 3 to 6 p.m., and few programs served older youth. But over the past decade, several forces have put a greater focus on the need to provide expanded learning opportunities for older youth. For example, changes in school schedules and structure to accommodate the diverse learning and social needs of youth, the push to provide more time for learning for older youth, the blending of school and community resources, and the need to leverage and coordinate funding and services have popularized the idea of using afterschool, out-of-school time, and expanded learning opportunities in new and creative ways.

For this publication, the term Expanded Learning Opportunity (ELO) is used to describe the range of programs and activities available to young people that occur beyond regular school hours. The following history of terminology shows how the afterschool field has evolved.

For well over a decade, many people have used the term “**afterschool**” to describe activities that were offered to children and youth in the hours immediately following the school day, generally from 3 to 6 p.m. Many of these activities were designed to provide day care to young children of working parents and to keep them safe. Over the years, most afterschool programs have expanded to provide supplemental academic support, such as tutoring or academic enrichment. The few afterschool opportunities for middle and high school students generally were focused on school-based extracurricular activities such as sports, band, drama, arts, and community service clubs in the afternoon.

As time became more precious for educators who were focusing on improving academic performance and as demands on families increased, the traditional notions of afterschool (3 to 6 p.m.) expanded to include weekend activities and activities before school, during holidays, and over the summer. As a result, many organizations starting using the term “**out-of-school time**,” as a way to acknowledge that a great deal of productive work and activity, particularly for older youth, occurred on weekends and during the summer, not just in the afterschool hours of 3 to 6 p.m. The term out-of-school time incorporated both school-based activities that were offered after the regular day as well as programs and activities provided by community-based organizations. Also, as more programs were designed to meet the needs of older youth, providers realized that they needed to offer much more flexibility in scheduling for teenagers, who often had work and family obligations in addition to school and extracurricular commitments. As a result, some programs serving older youth started staying open until 10 or 11 p.m. or providing flexible drop-in schedules.

More recently, the term “**expanded learning opportunities**” has been used to encompass all these various learning options. Expanded learning opportunities, particularly for older youth, occur in a 24/7 environment, draw upon the resources of the community, blur the lines between schools and other valuable teachers, such as colleges, community organizations, museums, and employers, and incorporate virtual learning when appropriate. ELOs include traditional afterschool activities with an academic focus, but also incorporate activities such as internships with employers, independent study in alternative settings, classes on college campuses for high school students, and wraparound social supports. ELOs are

more fully integrated into the fabric of services and programs provided to all children and youth and contribute to the notion of community-wide learning systems.

In some cases, ELOs are viewed simply as adding more hours to the school day or more days to the school year. While this can be part of ELOs, the concept should be much broader to encompass all the ways, venues, and times that youth can be engaged in productive learning and development. While extra hours of schooling might be important and necessary, if those extra hours of schooling are no different than the regular school day or the expanded learning activities are not of high quality, ELOs probably will not be an effective strategy for expanding knowledge and skill development.

EVOLUTION AND GOALS OF EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER YOUTH

AYPF acknowledges the evolving debate on how to most efficiently and effectively structure learning time to allow youth to develop the skills and knowledge they need to face the future. In addition to the question about when to provide learning is the question of who should provide certain learning opportunities and where. This debate comes at a time when many policymakers and professionals in the education and youth-serving fields are grappling with how to help the lowest performing and most underserved youth get the support they need to succeed, realizing that the school hours are not long enough and schools are not always equipped to provide the kinds of teaching and learning experiences needed by a vast number of young people with very diverse needs and interests. More and more, there is also recognition that youth need healthy developmental opportunities throughout their communities and that other organizations, not just schools, have a large role to play in positive youth development.

Increasingly, policymakers and practitioners are interested in ELOs for various reasons. ELOs provide positive youth development experiences and increased support for academic learning, and they can play a part in restructuring the learning environment for older youth, who live with more complex and demanding schedules. Because the school day is not long enough to provide access to all the various skill development activities that adolescents need and want (such as community service, internships, leadership, civic engagement, or strong relation-

“Youth development is defined as the ongoing process in which all young people are engaged and invested. Through youth development, young people attempt to meet their basic personal and social needs and to build competencies necessary for successful adolescence and adult life. It is an approach, framework, a way to think about young people that focuses on their capacities, strengths, and developmental needs and not on their weaknesses and problems. All young people have basic needs that are critical to survival and healthy development. They include a sense of safety and structure; belonging and membership; self-worth and an ability to contribute; independence and control over one’s life; closeness and several good relationships; and competency and mastery. At the same time, to succeed as adults, all youth must acquire positive attitudes and appropriate behaviors and skills in five areas: health; personal/social; knowledge, reasoning and creativity; vocation; and citizenship.” (Politz, 1996)

ships), ELOs provide time to supplement the learning that takes place during the regular school day and provide enrichment across many domains. ELOs can also provide wrap-around support services (health and mental health or mentoring, for example) to youth who may have special needs or few supports of their own. At the same time, ELOs leverage existing resources and contribute additional resources (including significant numbers of adult volunteers) to augment K–12 and community-based funding streams.

ELOs are also viewed as a strategy to help reshape secondary education by breaking down the barriers between schools and the community, expanding time for learning, and bringing more resources to the challenge of helping all youth improve their readiness for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement. Nationally, the high school dropout rate is approximately 30 percent, and in large, urban areas, it can approach 50 percent or go even higher (Balfanz, 2007). Many of the students who stay in high school say they are disengaged and bored with their learning (Bridgeland, 2006). Good work has been done over the past several years to restructure and reform high schools, but the old models of schooling are not always effective and appropriate for today’s youth. ELOs can provide youth who are at risk with certain supports (health care or

a caring adult mentor) that might not be available from the school to help keep them on track and in school. ELOs and schools share the same goals for helping youth prepare for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement, and together they can provide new venues for learning to more effectively engage youth and their families.

How ELOs Benefit Youth

Expanded learning opportunities provide a range of important services and programs to youth. Some programs provide academics while others prepare students for postsecondary education and careers. Some provide options and choices for learning that are more flexible or accommodating, some work to increase student engagement by providing high-interest programs, and still others help develop civic, social, and health and well-being skills and awareness described in greater depth below. Overall, ELOs have been effective in helping youth be more successful and should be a key part of community-wide goals to support healthy development and outcomes for young people.

Academic Benefits

Most ELOs work closely with schools to provide tutoring, academic support, and supplemental education services, and many coordinate closely with schools to ensure a strong connection and alignment between classroom work and outside activities. Others support, enhance, and expand upon academic teaching by providing applied and contextual learning activities that help youth make connections between what they learn in class work and the real world. Still others provide opportunities for enrichment in subjects or content areas not offered by schools.

Participation in high-quality ELOs is associated with an increase in academic achievement, school attendance, time spent on homework and extracurricular activities, enjoyment and effort in school, and better student behavior (Anderson-Butcher, Newsome, & Ferrari, 2003). The 2007 *Study of Promising After-School Programs* found that middle school students who regularly attended high-quality afterschool programs across two years demonstrated significant gains in standardized math test scores, compared to their peers who were routinely unsupervised during afterschool hours (Vandell, Reisner, & Pierce, 2007). The programs selected for inclusion in the *Study of Promising After-School Programs*

offered age-appropriate learning activities as well as recreational activities, community-based experiences and arts-related opportunities. The programs did not duplicate the work already being done inside the classroom, but instead offered rich and varied academic support accompanied by recreation, arts opportunities, and other enrichment activities. The activities offered substantive learning with positive adult and peer relationships, thereby increasing student attendance and duration in the program (Vandell, Reisner, & Pierce, 2007). In addition to these studies, this analysis of the evaluations indicates that ELOs contribute to stronger academic performance and improved school outcomes and are a valuable resource upon which communities can draw.

Readiness for Postsecondary Education and Careers

Increasingly, there is a strong push for all youth to be ready for postsecondary education and careers, recognizing that the skills and knowledge to be ready for both are very much the same. As indicated in the poll numbers cited earlier, the public believes that the afterschool hours can be productively used to help adolescents stay in school and prepare for the workforce. Schools have increasingly focused on the development of core academic skills as the underlying preparation for college and careers, but it is also important to provide youth with opportunities to develop other skill sets, learn about postsecondary education options and careers, and find high interest pursuits to supplement their academics and keep them engaged in their learning.

Various ELOs expose youth to the idea of college, take them on visits to college campuses, work with the student and family to identify prospective colleges, provide assistance in the college application process, help navigate the student financial assistance jungle, and provide encouragement and support to students who do not see themselves as college material. These types of activities, which many schools do not have the time and resources to invest in, are a key to being college-ready and making a successful transition into college.

Other ELOs provide youth an opportunity to learn about careers, participate in internships or work experiences, participate in community service projects, or earn stipends for work. These types of activities are also important for youth who have little exposure to careers or who are unfamiliar with the workplace, as activities of this nature are rarely

scheduled into the regular school day. Employers that are willing to work with adolescents in these work-based experiences are providing a value service to young people and to the community. Still others provide a combination of services, including exposure to postsecondary education and college-going, opportunities for career awareness and internships, academic support, and access to caring adult advisors.

21st Century Skills Development

A key part of readiness for postsecondary education and careers is the development of 21st Century Skills, which include, but are not limited to, creativity, innovation, critical-thinking, problem-solving, communication, and collaboration (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2009). In 2007, the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce explained that the best employers will be looking for the most competent, most creative, and most innovative people for positions throughout the workforce (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2007). “Advanced economies, innovative industries and firms, and high-growth jobs require more educated workers with the ability to respond flexibly to complex problems, communicate effectively, manage information, work in teams and produce new knowledge (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2009). But, as noted by the OECD, “curriculum, instruction and assessments traditionally used in American schools fail to support the development of critical thinking and creativity (TLA Taskforce, 2007).”

While the *No Child Left Behind Act* has brought much needed attention to the academic disparity between the lowest and highest performing students, it has resulted in a narrowing of academic electives and decreased exposure to arts, sports, experiential and project-based learning, service-learning, and other enrichment activities through which youth can develop 21st Century skills. In many classrooms, students do not learn how to apply their knowledge, or they learn content from a theoretical standpoint, divorced from the real world and rarely placed in context of how the information or knowledge is used to solve real problems. Out-of-school time programs have a rich history of providing opportunities for students to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills to help them succeed in the 21st Century. ELOs excel in providing opportunities for youth to develop these types of skills and abilities by allowing them opportunities to work in teams, design and implement complex projects rooted in real-world

issues, undertake community service, serve in internships or apprenticeships, and learn how to apply their knowledge.

Providing Options and Choices for Learning

Expanded learning opportunities also fit into the strategy that many policymakers and practitioners are promoting of providing more educational options and choices to youth to help meet their varied and unique needs. The traditional high school model does not meet the needs of the diverse student body in the United States, and many students need different types of supports to help their passage through secondary school. Some communities are creating multiple pathways to college and careers or are creating community schools or school/community partnerships that draw on various resources in the community. By providing various types and sizes of schools, schools organized around a theme, or schools that partner with a community organization, students have more choices to find the best fit for their life situations and interests.

ELOs can provide services when youth want or are able to participate in them. Work and family obligations sometimes prevent students from being in school. ELOs cannot replace the work being done in schools, but they can help students stay or get back on track. Some ELOs can tap into the wide range of resources available in the community so that students can access learning at nontraditional hours and through various technologies and new learning media. ELOs can also help students who may not do well in traditional lecture-style classes by giving them opportunities to see how academic concepts are used in context or in applied settings, thus reinforcing academic content through other pedagogies.

Increasing Student Engagement

Expanded learning opportunities allow students to work on real-world problems and projects, which many youth find intensely engaging and interesting. Studies indicate that students will attend school more regularly on the days they are involved in relevant and engaging activities afterschool. Projects and activities that allow youth to be involved in internships, apprenticeships, service learning, or community service provide a window into future careers or interests and allow youth to develop skills and talents in new areas. Many of these activities occur outside of the regular school day and are organized by

community groups or employers, although some are organized in conjunction with the schools. Many of these activities also allow youth to develop relationships with adults who provide needed mentoring and advice. Community organizations and employers that offer youth opportunities to develop key skills are a valuable component of a community-wide learning system and provide a vital service. By partnering with schools, ELOs can share their knowledge of designing and providing interesting activities that captivate youth and increase school engagement.

Civic, Social, Health, and Well-Being

Although there is a desire for youth to be civically and socially skilled and to participate fully in their communities, there is not always an equivalent effort made to help them learn how to become effective citizens. In addition, youth need greater knowledge about their health and well-being and access to safe, supportive, healthy environments. Many ELOs help youth develop social skills and improve social behaviors, participate in community-minded projects, and learn how to advocate for positive community change. Others encourage participation in sports and physical activities, help youth learn about and improve healthy behaviors (e.g. teach about diet or even provide healthy snacks), and reduce risk factors and isolation, such as preventing alcohol and drug use, early sexual activity, and bullying.

Youth Development Focus

Regardless of the program's goal, all ELOs maintain the resounding belief in basing their work on positive youth development, a distinguishing factor from many other education and youth services. Because ELOs understand and incorporate youth development principles into their programs, they provide a very different approach to working with youth, which can complement and augment school-based activities. By offering youth opportunities for leadership development, goal-setting, self-efficacy, contribution, and civic engagement, ELOs add a richness and depth to what youth experience during the school day.

HIGH-QUALITY EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER YOUTH

Working with older youth in ELOs is different than working with young children and can be challenging due to the stages of adolescent development

and other competing demands for teenagers' time. Also, many practitioners and policymakers are not fully aware of effective and high-quality strategies of working with older youth or the policies needed to support such programs. Our analysis of recent research in the ELO field points to specific programmatic and structural factors of effective programs that enhance learning and growth for students.

Programmatic Factors

Some key factors associated with high-quality ELO programming for youth include a safe, engaging environment; a youth development approach that provides participants a broad array of enrichment opportunities; an on-going focus on quality; and well-trained staff. Some recent research illustrates these factors.

A 2007 review of successful afterschool programs identified four approaches that the successful programs had in common. Using the acronym SAFE to identify the four approaches, the review determined effective programs: emphasized "Sequential" activities linked over several days, rather than offering unstructured drop-in opportunities; relied on "Active" involvement of youth, rather than passive reception of messages from adults; set aside time to "Focus" on personal or social skills; and were "Explicit" in identifying which skills they expected to develop (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007). A 2005 study of afterschool programs funded by The After-School Corporation (TASC) determined that programs that successfully increased students' academic achievement shared characteristics around programming, staffing, and support systems that included:

- A broad array of enrichment opportunities.
- Opportunities for skill building and mastery.
- Intentional relationship-building.
- A strong, experienced leader/manager supported by a trained and supervised staff.
- The administrative, fiscal, and professional-development support of the sponsoring organization (Birmingham, Pechman, et al., 2005).

Findings from a 2007 report indicate that "the two most important things staff can do to increase engagement and learning are to effectively manage

groups in ways that ensure youth feel respected by both the adults and other youth, and to positively support the young people and their learning process. The better these tasks were done, the more deeply youth were engaged and the more they felt they got out of activities (Grossman, Campbell, & Raley, 2007)."

It is important for ELOs to provide youth with choices and options to meet their needs and interests. When ELOs provide youth with opportunities to participate in a range of challenging and interesting activities, they are able to develop new skills and interests, build positive and supportive relationships with adults and peers, and develop a sense of mattering through making decisions and taking on leadership roles (Grossman, 2002). Both research and practitioners note that special programming, as well as interesting and age-appropriate activities, contribute to higher levels of participation and satisfaction by youth (Arbreton, 2008).

Practitioners and researchers who work with ELOs have been developing quality indicators that programs can use for a self-assessment, followed by a program improvement plan. According to the Forum for Youth Investment, some key characteristics of program quality assessments include using direct program observation as a means for gathering specific data about program quality and, in particular, staff practice; addressing social processes or the interactions between and among people in the program; ensuring applicability of assessments to a range of school and community-based program settings; and ensuring the assessments are "research-based" in the sense that their development was informed by relevant child/youth development literature (Yohalem, 2007).

One of the most critical factors of high-quality programs is the quality of a program's staff (Weiss, Little, et. al., 2008). Studies have shown that youth are more likely to benefit if they develop strong and supportive relationships with the program's staff, and staff can best cultivate these relationships through positive, quality interactions with youth. Strong and supportive relationships include being caring and responsive and providing guidance that gives young people the capacity to feel connected to others, make positive decisions, and participate in productive activities. Positive adult relationships have been shown to correlate with better outcomes for youth as well as increased participant retention (Arbreton, Goldsmith & Metz, 2008). In a follow-up study of the TASC

evaluation, researchers found that strong and supportive staff-to-student relationships were found in sites where program staff:

- Modeled positive behavior.
- Actively promoted student mastery of the skills or concepts presented in activities.
- Listened attentively to participants.
- Frequently provided individualized feedback and guidance during activities.
- Established clear expectations for mature, respectful peer interactions (Weiss, Little, et al., 2008).

To attract and retain high-quality staff, research indicates that the program must provide sufficient staff training in addition to recruiting staff skilled for specific programs, promote personnel from within the agency, and ensure the buy-in of staff to any new program (Arbreton, Goldsmith & Metz, 2008).

Staff professional development has been found to contribute to strong program infrastructure and positive youth outcomes (Arbreton, Goldsmith & Metz, 2008). In *Putting It All Together, Guiding Principles for Quality After-School Programs Serving Preteens*, the authors assert that programs that continually seek to strengthen quality provide continuous and targeted staff training, monitor and coach staff to support implementation on the ground, and incorporate data collection and analysis of program strengths and weaknesses. Doing so will keep staff and participants focused on program goals and engaged (Arbreton, Goldsmith & Metz, 2008).

Structural Factors

How ELOs are structured and supported also makes a difference in their quality. Because of growing pressure from policymakers and practitioners to maximize return on investments and articulate how and how much ELOs contribute to young people's learning and development, there is increased attention being paid to leadership and the role of intermediaries in creating and sustaining an ELO infrastructure and data, accountability, and evaluation which are discussed below (Wilson-Ahlstom, Yohalem, with Donner, 2008).

The role of municipal and community leadership and support has emerged as an important element

in the development of successful ELO systems and infrastructure. In 2008, AYPF conducted a forum series on building capacity in ELO programming for underserved youth. One emerging theme from the forum presentations and discussions was that effective ELO initiatives are the product of strong municipal leadership and collaborative partnerships, often led by intermediary organizations. AYPF found that municipal leadership is often the key to legitimizing and funding ELOs (AYPF, 2006).

Intermediary organizations often promote and sustain community partnerships and are critical to successful collaboration between school and ELOs. Intermediaries engage in convening and supporting critical constituencies, promote quality standards and accountability, broker and leverage resources, and promote effective policies. Intermediaries are also key players in providing the support to enhance the availability and quality of ELOs (AYPF, 2006). A recent evaluation from the Harvard Family Research Project supports the claim that programs that develop strong partnerships with a variety of stakeholders, especially families, schools, and communities, are more likely to be of high quality (Weiss, Little, et. al., 2008).

ELOs are also moving to improve and increase the collection and use of data. With support from the Atlantic Philanthropies, The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems (CBASS), a partnership of seven ELO intermediaries, was created to shape and inform the work of ELO systems-building by identifying and tracking common measures and investing in the infrastructure and professional development necessary to help programs use data to inform their work (Wilson-Ahlstom, Yohalem, with Donner, 2008). To date, CBASS has identified the importance of collecting data against a common set of measures in order to bring high-quality afterschool systems to scale and the positive role intermediaries play in using data to drive continuous improvement and contribute to the growth of citywide systems by implementing system-level measures. The work of CBASS signifies the growing emphasis on collaboration to increase the quality of ELOs through improved systems of accountability (Wilson-Ahlstom, Yohalem, with Donner, 2008). In addition, ongoing evaluation of programs helps ensure high-quality program implementation and fidelity to the model.

PARTICIPATION OF OLDER YOUTH IN EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Despite the fact that many children participate in afterschool programs in elementary years, studies have shown that as students enter their teen years, their participation in ELOs drops off, partly due to a shortage of high-quality programs that attract and sustain teenaged participation and partly due to the demanding schedules of many teens (Arbreton, Bradshaw, 2008). Many older youth have multiple interests and are involved in various activities in the afterschool hours. Between working part-time, volunteering in the community, tending to younger siblings, participating in multiple clubs and sports, hanging out with friends, and completing homework assignments, teens are pulled in many different directions. When they participate in an ELO, they may participate fully for several months, and then drop out, due to other scheduled activities (e.g. seasonal sports) or family demands.

However, according to various evaluations and studies, regular and ongoing participation in ELOs does result in improved outcomes for youth. Therefore, in order to increase and sustain participation by older youth, ELOs need to provide activities and services targeted for adolescents and their developmental stages, also taking into account their busy schedules. Researchers have identified common characteristics of effective programs for teens which include:

- Youth feel a sense of independence as part of participation in the program, particularly financial independence through earning wages or a stipend.
- Youth voices are listened to and incorporated into decision-making.
- Programs offer employable skills, such as office skills, and include preparation for or direct connection to job training and employment.
- Youth have opportunities to interact with community and business leaders.
- Schools and principals are active partners.
- Participation includes receiving assistance in navigating the post-high school experience.

- Youth are introduced to the world outside their local neighborhood (Hall, Israel, & Shortt, 2004; AYPE, 2006).

Early results from an evaluation examining the role Boys & Girls Clubs play in the lives of teens reveal lessons about attracting and sustaining teenaged participation in afterschool programs:

- Building strong ties when youth are young is likely a key strategy for keeping them connected to the program as they become teenagers.
- Flexible attendance policies and special programming for teens may be crucial to keeping a wide range of teens involved.
- A special teen space that offers the opportunity for an “unprogrammed” social dynamic is a main attraction for teens.
- For teens, many of whom are making their own choices about how they spend their time after school, having interesting activities available when they arrive is particularly important.
- Outreach and programming for teens must take into account the importance they place on friendships (Arbreton, Bradshaw et. al., 2008).

Since it is known that regular participation in ELOs does have a positive impact on certain academic and developmental outcomes for youth, communities should offer a range of high-quality ELOs, available to all youth in every neighborhood, so that youth are able to select an activity of interest that they willingly attend on an ongoing basis.

SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUTH

It is clear that ELOs play a significant role in providing services and programs to help youth develop a full range of needed skills beyond the ones they develop during the traditional school day. As there becomes an increasing awareness that schools alone cannot and should not do the job of preparing youth, the notion of sharing responsibility for this task by organizations and programs throughout the community gains support. As more and more communities are moving to this idea of a shared responsibility for youth across systems and providers, it brings into

high relief the role that ELOs can play, in combination and collaboration with providers from the education, health, mental health, foster care, juvenile justice, and workforce preparation systems.

ELOs have a role to play in community-wide systems to support youth, and their flexibility and lack of bureaucracy often allow them to respond quickly to the needs of youth. However, it is important to keep in mind that ELOs are only one small part of all the resources and programs that a community has to offer. ELOs should not be viewed as the silver bullet or the answer to solving the educational, social, and family problems that many youth face; rather, they should be viewed as a key contributor to a community-wide learning system. Although the ELO system is still small in comparison to other publicly-funded systems (e.g. schools), high-quality ELOs can carve out a niche that meets specific youth and community needs.

There is growing momentum for schools, youth-serving providers, and communities to take on a shared accountability of ensuring all students are provided with the support they need to achieve academic and career success and develop into healthy, self-sufficient adults. Shared accountability supports the concept that all programs and systems are working toward the common goal of helping youth. However, it is challenging to create fair and realistic shared outcome measurements that make sense for all providers, and the task must be approached carefully and thoughtfully. It is not fair to hold ELOs or other programs accountable for certain outcomes that these programs were never designed to impact; but, there is value in searching for ways to take into account the contribution of various education and youth providers to the overall health and well-being of youth. Policymakers are still at the nascent stages of thinking about shared accountability, in terms of appropriate outcomes and realistic measures, how to assign credit for progress across programs, and what data collection mechanisms can be used with the least burden and cost.

SELECTED INITIATIVES THAT USE TIME DIFFERENTLY

In the past several years, there have been numerous legislative proposals and initiatives to support expanded learning opportunities. This is a very brief listing of some key initiatives.

At the federal level, the “Afterschool Partnerships Improve Results in Education (ASPIRE) Act” was introduced to establish and expand afterschool programs for middle and high school students in order to increase student engagement, improve school success and graduation rates, and provide opportunities to increase interest in high-demand career opportunities (Afterschool Alliance; retrieved November 2008). The “Time for Innovation Matters in Education (TIME) Act” was introduced, calling for a federal expanded learning time pilot project to lengthen the school day, week and/or year. The legislation specifies that time should be increased for academic and enrichment opportunities, such as music, arts, physical education, service-learning and work-based learning opportunities that contribute to a well-rounded education. The legislation calls for collaboration between out-of-school time providers and schools and other educational and youth agencies and organizations to increase learning and development opportunities for students. The “Investment in After-School Programs Act of 2008” calls for the creation of a pilot program to establish or improve rural afterschool programs (Afterschool Alliance; retrieved November 2008). The proposed “Full Service Community Schools Act” would encourage schools, out-of-school time providers, and other community-based organizations and public and private partners to coordinate educational, developmental, family, health, and other comprehensive services (Weiss, Little, et al., 2008).

At the state level, Massachusetts has experimented with expanded learning time to support learning and development for youth. Beginning in 2004, Massachusetts 2020, an organization whose mission is to expand educational and economic opportunities for children and families across Massachusetts, began to promote the idea that expanding the school day could be the most effective lever to reach education goals, while simultaneously providing all children with the kinds of rich developmental experiences that afterschool and out-of-school time programs offer (Bernier, 2008). As a result, the state created a pilot program to fund various expanded learning time (ELT)

SELECTED INITIATIVES THAT USE TIME DIFFERENTLY (cont.) -

pilot programs. The key features of the Massachusetts ELT initiative include: a significant increase in the length of the school day or year (30 percent or more) to help students meet higher performance standards; mandatory participation by all students in the expanded schedule at the selected ELT schools; comprehensive restructuring of the entire school schedule; the approval of key constituents, such as teachers and parents, with evidence of support from collective bargaining units, community-based organizations, or higher education institutions involved in implementation; and public financing rather than funding through private foundations. To pay for the predicted costs associated with the added time and programming, each ELT pilot school in Massachusetts would receive an additional \$1,300 for every child enrolled (Bernier, 2008).

Another conception of using time differently was put forth in *A New Day For Learning*, a report from the Time, Learning and Afterschool Task Force, funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, released in 2007. The report states that “we persist in placing all the responsibility for teaching on schools and on a short school day and therefore the aspirations of communities, whether they be affluent or low income, homogenous or widely diverse, are limited by these habits.” In the report, the task force contends that in order to change the outcomes for all students, the whole day must be redesigned to provide a seamless learning experience with multiple ways of learning, anchored to high standards and aligned to educational resources throughout the community. In addition,

the task force argues for a new approach that defines student success as more than the acquisition of basic skills, supports the time it takes to experience success, and develops sophisticated ways to measure it. To do so, the task force suggests integrating various approaches to acquiring and reinforcing knowledge into an expanded learning day, building new collaborative structures across sectors that focus all resources on supporting academic and developmental goals for children, and creating new leadership possibilities and professional development opportunities for teaching in and managing a different learning system (TLA Taskforce, 2007). The report also spells out a key role for afterschool programs in this “new day for learning.”

As more attention is focused on the academic needs of the most underserved students and the role time and place can play in meeting these students’ needs, policymakers and practitioners need to consider ELOs as a means of offering students a continuum of supports. A key policy issue in any discussion of adding more learning time, however, is whether the additional time is structured to be engaging, applied, experiential, linked to real world experiences and community resources, and relevant. If ELOs becomes a simple extension of the 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. school day, improved youth outcomes are not likely to follow. It is therefore critical that policymakers are aware of the programmatic and structural components of ELOs that are based on youth development principles and that have demonstrated effectiveness.

Methodology and Research Notes -

This section describes AYPF's extensive search for evaluations; the categorization of the evaluations based on the rigor of the evaluation methodology; challenges of data collection and evaluation; and suggestions to improve evaluation research. The section closes with a description of the format used to summarize the program evaluations.

Methodology

The search for evaluations to include in this compendium was both challenging and encouraging. There is a dearth of high-quality evaluations in the education and youth field, including the ELO field overall. However, this report does identify a number of very good evaluations that show the value of ELOs.

In September 2006, AYPF began a vigorous search process to identify scientifically rigorous and third-party evaluations to include in a compendium of expanded learning opportunities for older youth. An extensive literature review was conducted to identify research, evaluations, and studies on ELOs as a foundation for the work. AYPF also tapped into its extensive network of experts in the afterschool field, including the Afterschool Alliance, Council of Chief State School Officers, National League of Cities, Harvard Family Research Project, National Center on Time and Learning, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, Policy Studies Associates, Public/Private Ventures, Finance Project, and Forum for Youth Investment, among others. Staff also searched the Internet and contacted universities and research centers. In addition, AYPF convened an advisory group of experts in the field to help identify the program selection criteria and potential evaluations to include and to provide a context for how to frame policy recommendations.

In the search for evaluations of ELOs, AYPF considered all types of potential programming (i.e. traditional school-based, charter school-based, programs operated by intermediary organizations, programs at community-based and cultural organizations, summer programs, and alternative education programs, etc.). As a result, this publication includes a range of programs that involve a variety of program models,

structures, and systems of support, including an array of education and community partners.

An attempt was made to include as many programs as possible in the compendium that have a strong research foundation; however, there are a limited number of scientifically rigorous evaluations of ELOs for older youth for numerous reasons. Many programs are not able to conduct independent or internal evaluations due to limited staff and/or funding. Many programs collect data on a limited number of indicators, such as attendance and participation rates, but may not measure academic outcomes, thereby hampering knowledge of program impact. Other ELOs are not able to collect longitudinal data on certain student outcomes, because they do not have long-term relationships with the youth. Many programs collect data on overall numbers of youth who participate, but many do not disaggregate the data by ethnicity or income level. Many programs collect qualitative data, which help the program administrators understand why they are or are not successful; however, many programs do not also collect quantitative data that provide information on outcomes.

As a result of the limited amount of research found, AYPF identified only 22 studies or evaluations for inclusion. AYPF conducted an internal review of each evaluation, engaged in extended discussions with program directors and researchers, and collected additional data and information on the programs to supplement the material in the evaluations. Based on what was discovered about the rigor of the evaluation methodology, AYPF categorized each evaluation as either "Stronger Evidence of Effectiveness" or "Program to Watch."

Overall, the evaluations categorized as "Stronger Evidence of Effectiveness" are quasi-experimental and used a treatment group, comparison group, and multiple measures to compare quantitative outcomes. These measures included factors such as attendance, test scores, course grades, credits earned, college-going rates, levels of substance use, pregnancy rates, and school suspension rates for participants and nonparticipants. The evaluations also controlled for differences between and among participants and

nonparticipants; in some evaluations, the students are randomly assigned to either the treatment group or comparison group; in others, students in the comparison group are matched to participants, and variables, such as age, gender, race, and ethnicity, are controlled for.

The “Program to Watch” category includes a number of programs that have engaged in comprehensive data collection, but did not have an independent evaluation performed and primarily utilized nonexperimental methods. The “Programs to Watch” primarily focused on qualitative measures, including attitudes and behaviors, such as “perceived life chances,” “awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention,” “overall anger,” and “improvements in money management and banking skills.” Many “Programs to Watch” used surveys and interviews, and some measured participants at only one point in time. The “Programs to Watch” are representative of other programs and are not the only programs that are doing a good job of serving youth or providing unique services, but were picked for inclusion because they represent a range of programmatic and structural components of quality ELOs for youth. It should be noted that the term, “Program to Watch,” only applies to the quality of the program evaluation and does not in any way indicate that the program itself is not of high quality.

AYPF acknowledges the previous scans of after-school and out-of-school time programs conducted by notable experts in the field, including Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) and the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), as well as the number of informative evaluations of primarily school-based programs, such as the national evaluation of Communities In Schools.¹ While scans in the past showed evidence that ELOs were effective in improving certain outcomes with youth, it can be valuable to conduct these types of scans on a periodic basis to determine if things have changed and to see if there is consistency between the findings. To the extent possible, AYPF has tried to include evaluations that are less than 10 years old that serve middle and high school students.

¹ The results from the Communities In Schools National Evaluation did establish that the CIS model is proven to increase graduation rates. For every 1,000 high school students, 48 more students at high implementer CIS schools graduate on time with a regular diploma. The outcomes are based on an analysis of 1,766 CIS schools and comparative analysis of outcomes for more than 1,200 CIS and non-CIS comparison schools over a three-year period.

AYPF worked with a research consultant to categorize the evaluations based on methodology used and outcomes measured and to ensure legitimacy and validity. Every site’s staff were given the opportunity to review the respective profile to ensure it was an accurate reflection of the time period described in the research. Site staff reviewed the descriptions and added clarifications and corrections as needed. The evaluations included in the compendium describe the program as it existed at the time of the study; in some cases, the findings from the evaluation were used to improve the program, which may look somewhat different today.

Challenges with data collection and evaluation

There is a heightened awareness and understanding in the education and youth service fields of the role of data collection and evaluation as a leading mechanism for continuous improvement. It is important for ELO programs to collect and analyze data on a number of indicators to assess program quality and effectiveness, and the data is similarly useful to policymakers to provide accountability and act as a yardstick by which programs can be compared and measured. However, due to staff and funding restraints, many programs primarily continue to collect and maintain qualitative data that provide information on students’ attitudes and feelings toward programs, not quantitative data demonstrating successes in academic and youth development outcomes, such as graduation and college-going rates. Because the data, especially quantitative data, are so sparse, it is difficult to provide definitive answers on the longitudinal benefits of most ELO programs. At the same time, qualitative data can be very important in understanding why programs are effective and in measuring more effective measures of student outcomes. AYPF encourages programs to increase their efforts to collect both quantitative and qualitative data.

In order to determine the range of effects program participation has on different subgroups of students, it is important for ELOs to collect disaggregated student data. Unfortunately, it is difficult for many ELOs to collect accurate data on the demographics of student participants. One example of why this is difficult is that students must self-identify to qualify for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies, and many older students do not feel comfortable sharing information about their family income, which limits the reliability of the data. Additionally, many programs only collect aggregate data on youth characteristics

and do not make distinctions in who they serve.

Data collection about students who participate in ELO programs is also hindered by the reality that students are participants in various systems, including the public education system, and in some cases the private education system or child and family service agencies, as well as ELO providers, which can be housed in schools, community-based organizations, publicly- and privately-supported organizations, or faith-based organizations. Typically, students will have records in multiple systems, but they tend not to be linked, and most cities and states do not have the infrastructure in place to facilitate data sharing between the existing service providers. If providers are private, there is even less information sharing. Building the capacity to share data across systems will take several years to implement and perfect; therefore, it may take several more years for there to be a reliable collection of data whereby to assess the longitudinal value of ELO programs, particularly for certain subgroups of students. As the field develops and more states and cities seek to intentionally link education and youth support systems, there is an opportunity to address these issues and to further design and build high-quality data collection and evaluation systems.

Improving Evaluation Research

Throughout the compendium, the limited availability of high-quality research on ELO programs is noted. While this is an issue for the programs that were considered for this compendium, it is, indeed, an issue that faces all of education and youth services. This lack of data collection and systematic evaluation limits the knowledge base around effective practices and also constrains the policymaking process, which depends on such data for key decisions. Because data and evaluation were considered so critical to improving programs and implementing policies, AYPF suggests the following steps be taken to improve educational research:

- A comprehensive, national research agenda on education and youth issues should be developed so as to (a) determine which strategies and policies have resulted in the most benefit, for whom, and at what cost, (b) determine what types of research and evaluation are most useful to policymakers and practitioners, and (c) provide guidance to practitioners on how to initiate and use program evaluation for ongoing program improvement.
- Funders, both public and private, should require and set aside funding for high-quality program evaluation as part of any grant, and they should utilize and share findings to improve policy and practices. Funders should also help program providers learn more about why evaluations are important, how they can be used to continuously improve, and how to conduct quality evaluations.
- Disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, English language proficiency, disability status, gender, and poverty level is critical for researchers, educators, policymakers, families, and the public at large to create programs that are effective in serving students with special needs.
- Longitudinal data collection that follows students through Grades K–12, postsecondary education, and the workplace, across states and across all types of programs, is needed. AYPF commends the states that are moving to create such longitudinal systems and encourages them to think about including service providers beyond the education system, such as ELOs.
- There must be additional support for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. While quantitative data is often the ultimate factor in making decisions, without qualitative data, it is often difficult to understand why a program is effective or successful in serving certain youth. Policymakers and funders should recognize that qualitative data serves a very valuable and useful purpose in understanding why programs are effective, and taken together with quantitative data, provide a much fuller and complete understanding of the policies and practices that result in positive outcomes for youth.
- Additional support for the inclusion of program quality indicators as part of high-quality program evaluation to encourage continuous program improvement is needed.
- There must be a recognition that evaluations of new programs (e.g. in Years 1-3) will provide information about the process of establishing the program and can be used to help improve the program, and that evaluations of established programs (Years 4 or more) should begin to focus on measuring outcomes and sustainability.

Program Evaluation Format

AYPF designed this compendium to serve dual purposes: to demonstrate to policymakers the value of ELO programs and the need for policies that help in their creation and sustainability, and to provide information to practitioners on best practices in the field.

Each profile of an evaluated program contains:

- Overview of the program.
- Overview of key findings.
- Findings in detail.
- Description of the program population.
- Description of program eligibility.
- Unique program components.
- Overview of the evaluation.

- Description of the evaluation population.
- Description of evaluation eligibility.
- Information on how the evaluation was conducted and the data was collected.
- Analysis of the elements that contributed to the program's success, performed by AYPF.
- Funding sources for both the evaluation and the program.
- Contact information for both the program and the researcher.

Each profile is designed to give the reader an understanding of the program, to highlight its results, and to pinpoint the elements that appear to have led to its success.

PART II



Elements of Success Program Summaries

Elements of Success -

Although the goals and structures of the included ELOs varied considerably, AYPF identified a number of common elements that produce positive outcomes for youth. The Elements of Success described below exemplify the intentional focus that ELOs put on the needs and interests of older youth in order to produce positive outcomes. They are broken into two categories: programmatic and structural elements of success. (Note: these elements of success are drawn from the evaluations, not the entirety of the research on the afterschool and out-of-school time field. There are other elements of program success, such as adequate funding, and using quality indicators, that are important to the success of ELOs; however, this publication only describes elements that were specifically addressed as important programs or structural factors in the included evaluations.)

Programmatic Elements of Success

AYPF's analysis of the evaluations highlights several programmatic elements of success that have proven effective, particularly in ensuring that middle- and low-achieving students succeed in ELO programs. These elements include: comprehensive youth development services; experiential learning; financial incentives; high-quality staff and ongoing professional development; safe and structured environment; student-centered programming; and supportive adult and peer-to-peer relationships. Descriptions of the elements of success are given below along with references to programs and program evaluations that exemplify the elements in action. Included after the heading for the elements of success is a bulleted list of alternative terms used by the practitioners and researchers in the field to describe each element.

Comprehensive Youth Development Services -

- *Comprehensive prevention program*
- *Comprehensive services*

ELOs alone cannot meet all of the needs of each participant; however, by expanding programmatic

goals and activities to meet a wider array of student needs, ELOs with comprehensive services, including nutritional services, health care, preventative services, or college preparation, will further support the academic and social development of the student. Basic needs such as nutritious food and snacks should not be overlooked and extending program hours to later in the evening (11 p.m. or midnight) can help keep young people engaged by offering a safe place for study or play. The Boys & Girls Clubs of America: GPTTO/GITTO Programs, Children's Aid Society (CAS) Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program, and Cool Girls Atlanta demonstrate that programming grounded in a comprehensive approach can lead to positive outcomes for youth participants. The CAS Carrera Center offers comprehensive services that support success in school, meaningful employment, access to quality medical and health services, and interactions with positive role models. Boys & Girls Clubs of America: GPTTO/GITTO Programs and Cool Girls Atlanta maintain that comprehensive programming in the form of mentoring relationships, field trips, health and life skills education, and academic tutoring instill confidence and provide exposure to a world of opportunities.

Experiential Learning

- *Active programming*
- *Hands-on learning*
- *Internships*
- *Relevant work experience*

Experiential learning gives youth a tangible and practical way to develop academic and social skills, as well as opportunities to develop skills and attitudes that will prepare them for success in college, careers, and civic life. Experiential learning encourages youth to collaborate with one another and learn from and alongside adults and experts in the field. Many ELOs allow young people the chance to experience various learning environments by participating in community or volunteer service or paid work, or by serving as youth leaders for projects.

Experiential learning takes many forms;

however, it is grounded in active, hands-on activities that resonate with youth. After School Matters (ASM) provides paid apprenticeships in the arts, sports, technology, and communications to low-income high school students. The apprenticeship model of ASM is focused on workforce and youth development, and learning job-related and soft skills, as well as professionalism, is emphasized. Seeds to Success takes students out of the classroom to a youth farm stand where youth manage retail outlets in a public marketplace that brings affordable, nutritious foods to consumers. The Urban Alliance (UA) Foundation, Inc. provides high school students internship opportunities with local employers. The findings from the UA evaluation indicate that students improved skills such as researching, taking notes, balancing responsibilities, and goal setting due to their participation in local workplaces.

Financial Incentives

Financial incentives are the methods used to motivate and/or reward youth to participate in ELO programs and can take many forms, including special field trips, recreational opportunities, gift certificates, stipends, paid work, or tuition reimbursement. Research demonstrates that regular participation in ELOs can benefit youth in many ways, and incentives may offer one way to increase youth participation. After School Matters, Summer Career Exploration Program (SCEP), and Quantum Opportunities Program all provide financial incentives in some form. The Quantum Opportunities Program offers three types of financial incentives depending on the needs and interests of the participants, SCEP provides paying jobs to students during the summer, and ASM offers paid apprenticeships for youth during after school hours. Youth indicate these are important incentives for participation.

High-Quality Staff and Ongoing Professional Development

- *High-quality and devoted staff*
- *Professional development for staff*

In order to develop programming that meets student needs and interests, provides a safe and structured environment, and creates real connections with students, ELO staff must be well trained and receive ongoing professional development. Program leadership must intentionally attract and hire high-quality staff committed to and engaged with youth. Additionally,

program leaders must provide an infrastructure that encourages staff development based on youth development principles and offers opportunities to acknowledge good work, support professional growth, and address weaknesses. Successful programs ensure that staff members have the skills to establish and maintain relationships with youth participants, enjoy participating in activities, and show care and concern for the students. There also must be an adequate number of staff.

The After School Corporation (TASC) provides staff training, and in 2006 it developed The Center for After-School Excellence, an initiative to expand higher education opportunities for afterschool educators by helping them earn credits or degrees in the afterschool field at the university level. On average, the Upward Bound Math-Science projects reviewed have 24 staff members, including eight instructors, five resident counselors, four mentors, three tutors, two administrators, one academic or guidance counselor, and one clerical staff member. The average student-staff ratio in summer 1998 was 2:1, allowing students increased access to high-quality staff with expertise in their field.

Safe and Structured Environment

- *Clear, sequenced structure*
- *Program models allow flexibility to adapt to individual needs of the community*
- *Safe environment*
- *Small learning communities*
- *Structured program*

For learning to occur within an ELO program youth must feel safe and supported. For many young people today, the world outside of the school walls can be a very dangerous place, and an ELO may be one of the only safe places to spend productive time. Many youth, whose lives can be chaotic, also thrive in a structured environment. Some successful ELO programs provide highly-structured programming with clear expectations and follow a consistent schedule on the hour; other programs allow for more flexibility, but program participants know what is expected of them and are held accountable.

Bayview Safe Haven (BVSH) is a program for 10-20-year-olds designed to help youth stay in school and out of the criminal justice system, while positioning them for responsible adulthood and improving

the quality of life in their families and community. The Bayview neighborhood has the second highest crime rate in San Francisco and was chosen as the location for a juvenile justice pilot program due to this crime rate and pervasive social and economic risk factors associated with the neighborhood. Academic, vocation, recreation, life skills, and community service programming is offered year-round, including all day in the summertime (Monday through Friday) from 12 to 8 p.m. Participating youth regularly and consistently express how safe they feel at the program. Project Venture (PV) offers participants access to a safe and supportive environment through an array of afterschool, weekend, and summer skill-building experiential activities and monthly challenge activities like hiking and camping.

Student-Centered Programming

- *Focus on minority achievement*
- *Focus on needs and interests of youth, such as Native American youth*
- *Offers a range of activities*
- *Provides choices for participants*
- *Small learning communities*

The needs and interests of a 5th-grade student vary substantially from the needs and interests of a 9th-or 12th-grade student, and programming should take this into account. The purpose of the activities should always be grounded in the best interest of the students, and programming should incorporate knowledge about the students' academic and developmental levels and goals. Programs should assess the skill levels of participants when they enter a program, align programming to the students' skill levels and needs, and monitor student progress throughout participation in the program. Within a program, choices should be provided to meet the wide-array of needs and interests. In developing student-centered programming, ELO providers should pay attention to the needs of older youth, such as their desire to earn money for personal or family needs or for college expenses. To attract, retain, and support older youth, program leaders and staff must make a conscious effort to involve youth in the decision-making processes of the program and in the administration of programs as a way to help youth learn leadership skills and to increase the awareness of the talents the youth possess, as well as areas for further development.

Although structured differently, both Citizen Schools and Woodcraft Rangers offer student participants choices in programming to meet their needs and interests. Citizen Schools incorporates academic support, apprenticeships with adult volunteers in a variety of fields, and community explorations such as dancing classes, hunger awareness campaigns, and visits to universities, neighborhoods, museums, and nature centers. One component of the Woodcraft Rangers program is weekly participation in a themed club, with choices ranging from sports and visual arts to academics and performing arts. Project Venture (PV) is an outdoor experiential youth development program designed for high-risk American Indian (AI) youth. The model is guided by traditional AI values such as a focus on family, learning from the natural world, spiritual awareness, service to others, and respect. The program structure also capitalizes on the skills and interests of older AI youth who serve as junior staff members, help younger participants, and are present throughout the weekend, holiday, and camp activities.

Supportive Adult and Peer-to-Peer Relationships

- *Peer support network*
- *Personal relationships with adults*
- *Personal relationships with staff*
- *Student/family collaboration*
- *Supportive adult relationships*

Expanded learning opportunities provide youth with valuable opportunities to interact with and form supportive relationships with adults in a safe and structured environment. Caring and supportive adults also create an environment that facilitates cooperative and supportive peer-to-peer networks, which are especially important for older youth, who hold the advice and opinions of their peers in high regard. Teens participate in ELOs in large part to spend time with friends, make new friends, and build supportive relationships with adults. Summer Search and Urban Alliance offer weekly mentoring sessions with highly-trained staff mentors, allowing students to form supportive relationships with adults. Additionally, both Summer Search and Urban Alliance emphasize the importance of engaging alumni to support current youth participants in order to expand the support network for both current and former participants.

Structural and System-Focused Elements of Success

Expanded learning opportunities need structural and systemic supports in order to be successful and sustained. AYPF's analysis of the evaluations indicates the role of collaboration, the collaboration facilitator, and high-quality implementation are structural elements that contribute to positive outcomes for youth.

Collaboration

- *Collaboration with a postsecondary institution*
- *Collaboration with schools*
- *Community partnerships*
- *Community support*
- *Education system alignment*
- *Partnerships, support from intermediary organization*

Of the program evaluations included in the compendium, eight of 22 specifically noted the role collaboration between youth-serving agencies played in developing an infrastructure and programming that produces positive youth development outcomes. Collaboration across organizations and educational institutions increases communication between the various youth-serving sectors and encourages an environment of shared accountability and cooperation. Successful collaborations promote the sharing of program facilities, curricula, and professional development as well as crucial information about the student participants themselves, including their academic needs, personal interests, family history, and future aspirations.

Community-based organizations (CBOs) and intermediary organizations often have an expertise in providing a certain service, such as pregnancy prevention, that can supplement or complement what students learn during the school day. CBOs and intermediary organizations also have knowledge of and access to funding streams that schools cannot tap into and vice versa, therefore increasing the amount of funds available for youth development programming and the longevity of the program. Collaboration across organizations can also strengthen parental, family, and community involvement, allowing all entities serving youth to learn from and support one another in the process, ultimately leading to more success for the student participants.

Collaboration with schools can allow ELO programs to better meet the academic needs of participants and help students improve behavior and develop a more positive attitude towards school and learning. In addition, schools can share information about student reading levels, grades, and standardized test scores, allowing ELO programs to better target programming to support the in-school learning of students. Project Morry and College Now both uniquely aligned their programming to that of the education system. College Now offers high school courses specially designed to prepare high school students for college and aligned to high school standards. Project Morry developed engaging curricula specifically on areas identified by the local Department of Education for academic enrichment.

Collaboration Facilitator

To ensure successful collaboration between an ELO provider and an education and/or community partner, it is crucial that a skilled individual take on the role of facilitating communication between the entities. The collaboration facilitator should have the leadership and communication skills to establish a foundation of cooperation between the entities. The facilitator can help partners assess their needs and the needs of the youth and develop strategies for sharing resources, including facilities and professional development to better meet the needs of the youth. The facilitator can help the entities share student data, student interests, and family history, which in turn can help programs better target their services to the needs and interests of young people. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers at Children's Aid Society Public Schools in New York City are an example of how various services from the community are provided to students and families through partnerships between CAS and schools, with the coordination facilitated by an on-site community school director.

High-Quality Implementation

- *Fidelity to model*
- *Program evaluation*

Implementers of ELOs must pay attention to the quality of the program and the elements that lead to high-quality programs. Enough research on high-quality programs for older youth exists to point the way for program implementers.

Programs should include formative evaluation in their design so that it becomes integrated with the regular work of staff and provides useful feedback that can lead to continuous improvements. Program staff should be trained to reflect on evaluations and implement changes and improvements based on the evaluation findings. The After School Corporation (TASC) places a premium on using program evaluations to determine if services are meeting high expectations for quality and if students are benefitting from participation.

When implementing a tested, existing model, it is equally important that program implementers follow the model as closely as possible and ensure that the program includes all key elements and is supported by well-trained staff. The Girl Scouts PAVE the Way format does vary across local Girl Scout councils, allowing each council to tailor programming to meet the needs of the community and participants, but it does insist on certain quality standards. The National Middle School FAST program model provides some flexibility for programs to adapt to the needs of the community, but overall, programs are extremely similar from site to site and are implemented with high fidelity.

Closing

Careful analysis of the included evaluations indicates that, despite differences in program goals and activities, ELOs that produce positive outcomes for youth share a number of programmatic and structural components. Many programs excel at providing comprehensive youth development services, a safe and structured environment, supportive adult and peer-to-peer relationships, and experiential learning, as well as having high-quality staff and ongoing professional development. Collaboration and partnerships with other community organizations and institutions, strong leaders to facilitate partnerships, and high-quality implementation also contributed to effective ELOs.

Program Summaries -

After School Matters—Chicago

Target Population	High school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; treatment and comparison group
Findings	Participants missed fewer days of school, failed fewer courses, and had higher graduation rates and lower dropout rates
Elements of Success	Community support Experiential learning Financial incentives Personal relationships with adults Collaboration with schools

Overview of Program

The mission of After School Matters (ASM) is to create a network of out-of-school opportunities for teens in underserved Chicago communities. ASM provides paid apprenticeships to low-income high school students and is designed to make high school more appealing to these students, thereby motivating them to do better in school and to seek out a more promising future for themselves. ASM was created in 2000 and partners with the City of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS), the Chicago Park District, the Chicago Public Library, and multiple community-based organizations (CBOs). Chicago Public Schools requested ASM to work with youth in about 25 high schools with extremely low graduation rates in order to provide intense support services and to help raise graduation rates. ASM is also starting to target its services to schools with exceptionally low attendance rates.

Key Findings

Overall, students who participated in ASM missed fewer days of school and failed fewer courses than similar classmates. Additionally, students who participated in ASM at the highest levels and students who were enrolled for three or more semesters had higher rates of graduation and lower dropout rates than similar students who did not participate in ASM.

- ASM participants and applicants were already more likely to attend school for more days on average than nonparticipants. When attendance records and grades were controlled for, ASM applicants and nonparticipants miss more days of school than participants.
- ASM did have a positive effect on preventing course failure. Although significance levels are not indicated and only 4 percent of ASM participants were very high participators, the study indicates that very high participators failed a significantly lower percentage of their core courses with 9.6 percent failing versus 15.8 percent for similar nonparticipants.

- Students who participated in ASM had higher graduation rates and lower dropout rates. The longer a student participated, either by semesters and/or by days per semester, the more likely they were to graduate, and the less likely they were to drop out.
- Students with very high participation levels were 2.7 times more likely to graduate than nonparticipants;² students with high participation levels were 2.2 times more likely to graduate than nonparticipants; students with moderate participation levels were 1.6 more times likely to graduate than nonparticipants; and students with low participation levels were 2.2 times more likely to graduate than nonparticipants.³
- Students who participated for at least four semesters were 2.4 times more likely to graduate;⁴ students who participated for at least three semesters were 2.5 times more likely to graduate.⁵
- Similarly, students with low, high, and very high participation levels had significantly lower odds of dropping out of high school.⁶
- Students who participated for three semesters or four or more semesters had significantly lower odds of dropping out of high school.⁷
- “Motivation” characteristics like grades, attendance, and demographics were controlled for at a 99 percent significance level. However, many of these cited positive findings (attendance levels, number of course failures) seem to disappear or diminish after students leave the program. The researchers use this point to indicate that the ASM program was indeed making the difference while students were enrolled in the program.

² Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence.

³ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence, 95 percent confidence and 99.9 percent confidence respectively.

⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence.

⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence.

⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence with an odds ratio of .46, .41 and .30, respectively.

⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence with an odds ratio of .26 and .33, respectively.

Program Population

- Currently, ASM operates in 63 public high schools and over 100 CBOs, serving about 11,000 youth per semester (spring and fall) and 7,000 students per summer through 600 programs.

Program Eligibility

- High school students in any grade in the Chicago Public Schools may participate in the program, although for certain youth, especially those with special needs, eligibility is extended to age 21 if they need the services.
- When students apply, they must first fill out an application, and then they are chosen for interviews. Competitiveness of the application process varies, depending on demand for the specific program for which students are applying.
- Students must attend school on the day that they want to attend the program.
- ASM recruits at the beginning of each semester via presentations, information booths, and flyers.

Program Components

- ASM offers paid apprenticeships in the arts, sports, technology, and communications. Students are taught by skilled professionals and are paid stipends.
- The apprenticeship model of ASM is focused on workforce and youth development; therefore, professionalism and soft skills are emphasized while learning content skills is deemphasized.
- There is a particular focus on showing up for work on time, and youth can be let go from the program if they miss more than a maximum number of days. This is important for youth to learn because, as ASM staff say, “this is the way the real world works, and there are no exceptions.”
- ASM offers several stages of apprenticeship, based on the age of the youth.

- Participants perform their apprenticeships three times per week for about three hours during after-school hours.
- Fall and spring apprenticeships last for 10 weeks each, while the summer program is six weeks long. Many students stay on for multiple semesters, and in fact, ASM encourages students to stay on as long as possible.
- Apprenticeships are held at the youths' schools and at CBOs, except in the summer, when they are only held at CBOs and the downtown campus.
- Currently, there are about two instructors for every 25 youth. The number of youth per program and the number of programs per venue differ depending on demand for the program.
- The design of the ASM program is to offer activities that will suit youths' personal interest in an effort to have them focus on their futures and do well in school.
- In addition, an array of clubs are offered at some of the venues depending on interest areas of the youth. The clubs are less structured drop-in programs, and some include Mayor Daley's Book Club, a weightlifting club, and a chess club.

Overview of Apprenticeship Programs

Pre-Apprenticeships

- Primarily for youth who may not be ready for a standard apprenticeship. Basic job readiness skills are taught through these placements, and youth are provided the opportunity to explore multiple apprenticeship programs to get a better sense of their interests. Instead of stipends, youth in pre-apprenticeships receive gift cards.

Standard Apprenticeships

- Paid at \$450 per semester and cover the fields of the arts, technology, sports, and communications.

Advanced Apprenticeships

- Awarded to youth who have advanced their skills in a particular area quickly by either being in

the program for awhile or by learning the skills through another route. The stipends that are awarded are slightly higher than the standard apprenticeships.

Overview of Evaluation

In January 2007, Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago released a study that used a quasi-experimental design to compare cohorts of students at the same schools who participated in ASM (participants) with those who applied to ASM and did not participate (applicants) and those who did not apply and did not participate (nonparticipants). Information on participation in ASM was collected from the 24 schools that were operating ASM programs during Fall 2003 in order to determine whether participation in ASM was associated with greater school attachment and improved academic performance. Participation was tracked between Fall 2002 and Fall 2003, over three semesters. The study also selected and studied a smaller cohort of students to determine whether participation in ASM was associated with greater graduation rates and lower dropout rates.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- The study sample included all 20,370 high school students attending the 24 public high schools operating ASM programs in Fall 2003.
- Of the 3,271 students who applied to ASM, 1,982 did not end up participating (ASM Applicants) and 1,289, or 6.3 percent, did participate in ASM (ASM participants) at varying levels of intensity.
- Additionally, in order to determine whether ASM participation increased graduation rates and lowered dropout rates, 3,411 students who began high school in September 2001 at the first 12 schools to implement ASM were tracked throughout high school.
- Of the 3,411, 26 percent of those students participated in ASM and were compared to the remaining students at the same schools who were either ASM Applicants or nonparticipants.
- The researchers noted that the 2001 cohort of 3,411 decreased to 2,854 due to factors such as student transfers, incarceration, and death.

- Research staff at ASM noted the cohort comparison groups of participants, applicants, and nonparticipants may suggest selection bias due to student motivational levels; however, ASM staff emphasized that this was the first step in quantitative analysis for ASM, and ASM is also conducting a random assignment study to offset selection bias. Currently, ASM is in the third year of the three-year study.

Study Methodology

- The quasi-experimental study used a treatment and comparison group to determine if participation in ASM was associated with greater school attachment and improved academic performance. Participants were compared against students who applied to the program and did not participate (applicants) and to students who never applied to ASM and never participated (nonparticipants).
- An additional treatment group and comparison group were used to determine whether ASM participation increased graduation rates and lowered dropout rates.
- To minimize bias and create a control group that was statistically similar to the treatment group, the evaluation controlled for school attendance rates, grades, and test scores.

Data Sources

- To measure school attachment and academic performance, information on participation in ASM was collected from the 24 schools operating ASM programs during three semesters from Fall 2002 through Fall 2003; information on school attendance and course failures was collected for Spring 2003 and Fall 2003.
- Graduation rates and dropout rates were collected from the CPS to determine if ASM participation influenced a student's decision to finish high school.

Elements of Success

- Community support
- Experiential learning

- Financial incentives
- Personal relationships with adults
- Collaboration with schools

Funding

- ASM receives 30 percent of its funding from its public partners, such as the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Public Library.
- 51 percent comes from “government,” which includes the City of Chicago and state funds.
- 14 percent comes from corporate grants and fundraising, and four percent comes from foundation grants.
- ASM funded the Chapin Hall evaluation.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Ray Legler, PhD
 Director of Research and Evaluation
 After School Matters
 66 East Randolph Street, 4th Floor
 Chicago, IL 60601
 312-742-8502
 Raymond.Legler@cityofchicago.org
 www.afterschoolmatters.org

Research Contact

Bob Goerge
 Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
 1313 East 60th Street
 Chicago, Illinois 60637
 773-753-5900
 rgoerge@chapinhall.org

Sources Used

Goerge, R., Cusick, R., Wasserman, M., & Gladden R.M. (2007). “After-School Programs and Academic Impact: A Study of Chicago’s After School Matters.” *Chapin Hall Center for Children Issue Brief*, 112, 1–7.

Bayview Safe Haven

Target Population	In- and out-of-school youth ages 10–21
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; randomly matched comparison group compared to participants
Findings	Participants decreased school suspensions, recidivism, the seriousness of delinquent behavior and further involvement with the juvenile justice system
Elements of Success	Community partnerships Experiential learning Safe environment Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

The Bayview Safe Haven (BVSH) program was started in 1997 when it was initially launched by the Delancey Street Foundation as part of the San Francisco Local Action Plan for Juvenile Justice Reform. In 2001, BVSH came under the Hunters Point Family agency umbrella. BVSH is an out-of-school time (OST) program for 10–20-year-olds designed to help youth stay in school and out of the criminal justice system, while positioning them for responsible adulthood and improving the quality of life in their families and community. The program uses a strengths-based approach by focusing on youths' interests, hopes for the future, skills, and hobbies. The Bayview neighborhood has the second highest crime rate in San Francisco and was chosen as the location for a juvenile justice pilot program as part of the San Francisco Local Action Plan due to the crime rate and pervasive social and economic risk factors associated with the neighborhood (e.g. substance abuse, familial involvement with the criminal justice system, gang involvement, poor school performance, unemployment, and pollution).

Key Findings

Overall, program participation significantly decreased school suspensions, recidivism, the seriousness of delinquent behavior, and further involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Participation

- Length of time in the program varied from 12 days to two years (583 days), with the average being 150 days. The average is calculated by intake date and exit date and does not reflect how many days youth actually came to the club. About half of participants were involved for four months or less. (According to the Co-Executive Director, the other half of the youth come on average for three to five years and are considered long-term participants.)
- Frequency of attendance: 30 percent attended 4–10 days, 18 percent 11–20 days, 16 percent 21–30 days, 19 percent 31–60 days, 17 percent 61–120 days over one year. Some youth attended five days per week while others came more episodically.

School Suspensions

- Of those with a history of school suspensions at intake, the treatment group had a significantly lower proportion of suspensions than the comparison group during the intervention period.⁸
- Of those without a history of school suspensions at intake, the treatment group had a significantly lower proportion of suspension than the comparison group during the intervention period.⁹
- The treatment group showed a significantly greater reduction in the number of suspensions than the comparison group when the time period before intake was compared to the intervention period among youth suspended at least once in either time period.¹⁰

Expulsions

- No statistically significant outcomes were found for expulsions.

Recidivism

- The treatment group was significantly less likely to recidivate than the comparison group when the time period before intake was compared to the intervention period.¹¹
- The treatment group was significantly less likely to recidivate than the comparison group when the time period before intake was compared to the follow-up period.¹²

Number of Arrests

- No statistically significant outcomes were found for number of arrests during the intervention period.

⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

¹⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

¹¹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

¹² Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

- Among youth arrested at any time during the three follow-up periods, the treatment group showed significantly fewer arrests on average during the follow-up periods than the comparison group.¹³

Seriousness of Delinquent Behavior

- Among those who had a petition sustained for an arrest either before intake or during the intervention period, the treatment group showed significantly more positive outcomes than the control group in terms of change in seriousness of crime (either a greater decline, or a smaller increase, in seriousness).¹⁴
- Among those who had a petition sustained for an arrest during the follow-up period, the treatment group showed significantly less serious delinquent behavior than the control group.¹⁵
- Among those who had a petition sustained for an arrest either before intake or during the follow-up period, the treatment group showed significantly more positive outcomes than the control group in terms of change in seriousness of crime.¹⁶

Current Wardship Status

- A significantly greater proportion of youth in the treatment group who were wards of the court at intake were no longer wards of the court at the end of the intervention period compared to the comparison group.¹⁷
- A significantly greater proportion of youth in the treatment group who were wards of the court at intake were no longer wards of the court at the end of the follow-up period compared to the comparison group.¹⁸

¹³ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

¹⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

¹⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

¹⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

¹⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

¹⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

No outcomes were reported for completion of probation and the effect of BVSH participation on youth without a prior history of arrest.

Qualitative Results and Supplemental Findings from Interviews with Youth

- Youth became aware of the program through friend(s) and sibling(s)/cousin(s).
- Initial reasons for attending the program include: they thought it would be fun; wanted to stay out of trouble and be safe; wanted to get a bike (through the bike mechanics program).
- 100 percent of the youth reported they felt safe at the program.
- Youth reported that the program is helping them be better in school and appreciate school more.
- 50 percent reported that the program prepared them to get a job, but the other 50 percent did not report this.
- Youth cited they had learned communication skills, how to work with people despite differences, sharing, obeying rules, and not saying bad words.
- Youth reported that their sense of social and self-acceptance increased.
- 78 percent of youth said the program helped them feel connected with the community.

Outcomes for Neighborhood Crime Study

- The authors note that crime decreased in all the neighborhoods tracked. Although causality cannot be determined, the evaluators believe the program did have at least some effect on the lower crime rates in the program's neighborhood.
- The crime rate did decline in the experimental census tract from 28 percent in 1993 to 10 percent in 1999; furthermore, when the program began, the juvenile crime rate was the highest among all the

census tracts studied, but in 1999 it had one of the lowest rates of juvenile crime among the census tracts studied.¹⁹

Program Population/Eligibility

- Program participants range from ages 10-20 and are referred to the program by police officers and the juvenile probation department (36 percent), friends and relatives (13 percent), Local Action Plan's Community Assessment and Referral Center (16 percent), San Francisco Housing Authority (10 percent) or self-referral (21 percent).
- According to the Co-Executive Director of Hunters Point Family, about 50 "core" youth are served annually and come two to three times per week; including youth who drop in unscheduled.
- BVSH serves 100 youth total per year.
- Most youth (37 percent) are ages 12-13; 28 percent are ages 14-15. The Co-Executive Director explained most youth are actually ages 13-15.
- Approximately 97 percent of participants are African American; 41.5 percent of participants reported past or current affiliation with gangs; 53 percent have documented history of abuse or neglect; 34 percent reported parental involvement in the justice system; 52 percent reported not having a place to go when "things were not going well;" and 87 percent of participants were in school at the time of their intake.
- Of the total population, 73 percent of youth had a Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Probation Referral to the Juvenile Probation Department prior to intake.
- Among juvenile justice-involved youth, one-third were wards of the court at intake, and 57 percent of system-involved youth had a petition sustained for a felony offense.

¹⁹ The evaluators note that there are four research findings that undermine the argument that the program reduced crime in the neighborhood. For instance, in response to the finding that crime decreased in all census tracts reviewed, crime began to decrease prior to the start of the program, crime increased in Year 2 in an adjacent tract where it would have been expected to decline, and crime decreased even more in a comparison tract that was similar to the experimental tract.

- According to standardized test scores, 98 percent of the youth are not performing at their grade level.
- San Francisco youth ages 10-20 are eligible; all come from the San Francisco Unified School District. Most youth are from the Bayview neighborhood, but some are from surrounding neighborhoods. The program does try to recruit the hardest-to-reach youth and many are involved in gangs.

Program Components

- The program is offered year-round, including all day in the summertime (Monday through Friday).
- Summer hours are from 12 to 8 p.m. and more recreational activities and field trips are offered.
- Youth also work weekends at a farmer's market from May through October.
- According to the Program Director, the program has adopted a heavy focus on "Going Green" and has run two certified organic farms for a few years. Youth educate the community about the benefits of eating organic foods, and the program partners with an elementary school to teach students about the environment and gardening.
- There are also some "program interventions" that are offered to youth on an individualized, as-needed basis, including family counseling, alcohol/drug abuse counseling, health services, conflict resolution, anger management, home visits, probation supervision, and therapy. Staff reported that they sometimes take youth to doctor visits, teacher meetings, or court hearings. Parents sign permission slips when the youth join the program to allow the staff to participate in such activities. Parents remain informed by the staff at all times.

Overview of BVSH Program Components

- Academic: tutoring, homework assistance, computer lab (offered daily).
- Vocational: farming, cooking classes, computer classes, entrepreneurship, and pre-employment training/services (offered twice per week).

- Recreational: arts, sports, weekend field trips, karate, Double Dutch annual tournament, dance class, movie night (activities daily and trips quarterly).
- Life skills and community service: Gender-specific workshops with a heavy emphasis on leadership, relationships, assertiveness, and career aspirations; informal mentoring; community service projects (organic produce delivery to needy families weekly, providing information to community about the benefits of eating organic) (daily or twice per week; as needed).

Partnerships

- Collaboration with existing community organizations such as San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), probation officers, counselors, administrators, mental health providers, the Department of Human Services, the San Francisco Unified School District, community-based organizations, a juvenile court judge, parents, youth, and former juvenile offenders.
- Community organizations assisted in the needs assessment for BVSH, recruitment of participants and developed buy-in for the respective groups.
- The police, probation officers, and the Parks and Recreation Department partnered more substantially during the program implementation by providing a sense of safety and protection on site at the Joseph Lee Recreation center, monitoring youths' progress towards probation requirements, negotiating the sharing of space at the Recreation Center and sharing responsibility for monitoring youth.
- BVSH worked with a number of private, community-based partners including: San Francisco Bike Coalition, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG), San Francisco Art Institute, Bayview Opera House, and Peace on the Streets to provide programming and activities for youth.

Overview of Evaluation

LaFrance Associates and BTW Consultants performed a quasi-experimental and nonexperimental evaluation in 2001 (after the program had been in operation for three years) to assess the program's

impact on the youth it served and on the local community. The overall design included two parts, an individual youth study and a neighborhood crime study. The researchers hypothesized that participation in the program would lower school suspensions, expulsions, juvenile crime, seriousness of delinquent behaviors, wardship of the court status, arrests, and increase levels of probation completion for participants compared to nonparticipants. The evaluation also hypothesized the program would lead to a reduction in crime in the community.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- For the evaluation, 126 participant youth and 125 comparison youth were studied over two years from Fall 1997 to Spring 1999.
- Interviews with a random subsample of 38 youth were also completed two years after the program started. The subsample was younger than the regular sample and had less previous involvement with the juvenile justice system.
- For the Neighborhood Crime Study portion of the evaluation, the neighborhood that the program resided in was treated as the “experimental area,” and four neighborhoods with similar characteristics, including types of crime committed, were chosen as “comparison areas.” This portion of the study was nonexperimental, and the evaluation acknowledged that the unit of analysis for the investigation is not the unit of analysis for the intervention; the evaluators were not able to control completely for family history for the control group.

Study Methodology

- A comparison (control) group was used to compare program impacts on participants compared to nonparticipants; the evaluation controlled for demographics (age, gender), juvenile crime record, and school performance. However, a higher percentage of treatment youth had histories of abuse/neglect.
- Comparison group youth were randomly matched to treatment group youth based on the referral source of the treatment group youth; match sources included the 1997 probation database

(randomly selected, but evaluators first chose certain characteristics to ensure a match for treatment youth on probation), Housing Authority (randomly selected, but evaluators first chose certain characteristics to match treatment youth), and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) master roster.

Outcomes Measured

- Suspensions, expulsions, juvenile crime, seriousness of delinquent behaviors, wardship of the court status, arrests, and levels of probation completion for participants compared to nonparticipants were measured for the individual youth study.
- The evaluation also hypothesized the program would lead to a reduction in crime in the community for the neighborhood crime study.

Data Sources

- Pretests and posttests were completed, and data was collected at youth intake, at exit, and six months after exit. For some measured outcomes, treatment and control groups both completed pretests and posttests, and for others, only the treatment group completed them.
- Evaluators extracted information from institutionally maintained data systems whenever possible in order to maximize data reliability. Data sources used include, SFUSD Student Information Systems, SFPD juvenile crime incident data, SFPD youth arrest and probation histories from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) database, and Department of Human Services (DHS)/Child Protection Services (CPS).
- Additional data sources included daily program attendance records, treatment intervention information for participants, case management referrals, and status at time of exit from program.
- Program staff also tracked how and why youth exited program and what their situation was when they left (e.g. whether successful in program).
- A series of interviews were conducted with 16 “key informants” and stakeholders from the

police, BVSH program staff, BVSH youth, BVSH mentors, social service agencies, community representatives, and staff from community-based organizations that collaborate with BVSH to collect qualitative data for the Neighborhood Crime Study.

Elements of Success

- Community partnerships
- Experiential learning
- Safe environment
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

Majority of funding comes from the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Families, the Bayview Hunters Point Community Fund, and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund. The 2001 evaluation was funded by the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Lena Miller
Director of Development
Hunters Point Family
1325 Evans Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94124
415-822-8894
lmiller@bayviewsafehaven.org

Research Contact

Lauren Lizardo
Operations Manager
LaFrance Associates, LLC
251 Kearny Street, Suite 301
San Francisco, CA 94108
415-392-2850
lauren@lfagroup.com

Sources Used

“A Safe Place for Healthy Youth Development: A Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bayview Safe Haven.” (2001, September). LaFrance Associates.

Other Resources

<http://www.hunterspointfamily.org/bayview.html>

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America

Target Population	Boys and girls ages 6–15
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; random assignment impact evaluation compared participants against nonparticipants who were on a waitlist
Findings	Participants initiated drug and alcohol use less, hit less, missed fewer days of school, felt more competent about schoolwork, skipped fewer classes, showed modest gains in GPAs, and improved the quality of their relationships with family and friends
Elements of Success	Fidelity to model Safe environment Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBSA) is a national mentoring program with more than 500 local affiliates across the country. All affiliates must follow a certain BBBSA “curriculum,” although some follow it better than others, and affiliates may customize some portions to meet local needs. Bigs (mentors) and Littles (mentees) are required to meet with each other two to four times per month for around four hours per meeting, for at least one year.

Key Findings

Overall, Littles were significantly less likely to initiate drug and alcohol use and hit other people, missed fewer days of school, felt more competent about school work, skipped fewer classes, showed modest gains in GPAs, and improved the quality of their relationships with family and friends.

Outcomes Measured

- Antisocial activities
- Academic performance
- Attitudes and behaviors
- Relationships with family and friends
- Self-concept

- Social and cultural enrichment

Outcomes

- Littles were 46 percent less likely to initiate drug use during the study period; minority Littles were 70 percent less likely to initiate drug use.²⁰
- Littles were 27 percent less likely to initiate alcohol use during study period; minority female Littles were 54 percent less likely to initiate alcohol use.²¹
- Littles were 32 percent less likely to report hitting someone in the last 12 months.²²
- Littles skipped 52 percent fewer days of school.²³
- Littles felt more competent about school work (10 percent higher for minority girls; 7 percent higher for White boys).²⁴

²⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

²¹ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (P<.10).

²² Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

²³ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (P<.001).

²⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (P<.001).

- Littles skipped 37 percent fewer classes.²⁵
- Littles showed modest gains in GPAs (3 percent higher).²⁶ Gains were strongest for Little Sisters, especially for minority girls.
- The quality of relationships with parents was better for Littles, especially for White male Littles (5 percent higher);²⁷ and the positive impact on trust was also higher, especially for White male Littles (7 percent higher).²⁸ Number of times lied to parents was 37 percent less for Littles.²⁹
- Improvements were found in quality of relationships with peers (“emotional support”) for Littles,³⁰ especially for minority male Littles (6 percent increase).³¹
- There was no statistically significant improvements in self-concept, nor in number of social/cultural activities in which Littles participated.

Program Population

- The majority of BBBSA participating agencies serve boys and girls ages 6–15.
- Agencies enroll children who can benefit from the influence of a positive adult role model; many agencies enroll children who live in single-parent households, live in foster care, have one or both parents incarcerated, and/or those who are not working up to their academic potential.

Program Eligibility

- All chapters have different eligibility requirements and priorities, and thus the eligibility requirements

vary across the participating agencies.

- The majority of BBBSA participating agencies serve boys and girls ages 6–15.
- Children of all racial, cultural, ethnic, disability, sexual orientation, and religious backgrounds are eligible.
- Children must have consent of a parent/guardian and be willing to participate in the program.

Program Components

- In the study, Bigs and Littles met with one another for an average of almost 12 months, with meetings of about three times per month and for about four hours per meeting.
- Activities vary throughout the programs.
- Programs are supposed to follow very stringent guidelines regarding volunteer screening, as well as some guidelines regarding youth screening, training, matching and meeting requirements (some programs let Bigs choose their Littles), and supervision.

Examples of Activities (Based on Information Gathered from Some BBBSA Chapters)

- Bigs and Littles participate in a variety of activities across agencies. Examples include going to plays, the zoo, parks, or movies, hiking or biking, and spending time at a Big’s home to play board games, cook, bake, do arts and crafts, read, and play sports.
- At the school and site-based programs, matches often can choose to participate in a planned activity, such as a craft or scavenger hunt. Afterward, matches choose an activity to do together with available resources, such as board games, sports, or arts and crafts.
- Many agencies also sponsor match parties, such as an End of Summer Cookout and the Biggest Little Holiday Party (Central Maryland).

²⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

²⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (P<.10).

²⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

²⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (P<.001).

²⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

³⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (P<.10).

³¹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (P<.05).

Overview of Evaluation

The random assignment impact evaluation studied eight local affiliates in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), Rochester (New York), Minneapolis (Minnesota), Columbus (Ohio), Wichita (Kansas), Houston (Texas), San Antonio (Texas), and Phoenix (Arizona) for 18 months. The programs were chosen through a stringent interview process. To participate, programs needed to offer a large caseload with a waiting list and geographic diversity. The programs selected were among the largest in the federation at the time. The purpose of the study was to assess whether formal, well-structured one-on-one mentoring programs make a positive difference in the lives of youth. Participants were compared against youth who were placed on waitlists for 18 months after random assignment.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- The sample included 959 treatment and control youth.
- Sample youth were ages 10–16 (average age: 12).
- About 62 percent were boys; more than half (55 percent) were minorities (71 percent of which were African American).
- Almost all sample youth lived with one parent (90 percent, with another 5 percent living with grandparents).
- More than 43 percent of sample youth were from low-income households (defined as receiving food stamps and/or public assistance), and a “significant number” were from households with a prior history of family violence (28 percent) or substance abuse (40 percent).
- Treatment and control group characteristics were statistically similar to one another. The authors state that the only difference between the two groups was participation in the program.
- Note that after the random selection was completed, 78 percent (378 of 487) of the treatment youth were actually matched with a Big.

Study Methodology

This impact study dates from 1991–1993, but the study was included in the compendium to highlight what can be achieved in OST research and programming. Many aspects of BBBSA’s expectations and operating standards exemplify the best practices successful OST programs have undertaken across the country to serve disadvantaged youth.

- The sample was taken from youth who had applied to the program between 1991 and 1993 and were deemed eligible.
- Baseline interviews were performed on 1,138 youth, and they were then randomly assigned to the treatment and control groups (control group participants were placed on an 18-month waitlist).
- Both groups were re-interviewed 18 months later; 84.3 percent of the original youth also did these post interviews, so that group (959 youth) became the sample used in the study. Analysis of the data involved multivariate techniques that controlled for baseline characteristics and compared follow-up survey results for treatment and control youth

Data Sources

- Surveys (interviews) to parents/guardians and youth (at baseline and then 18 months after random assignment).
- Four data collection forms filled out by program administrators (two when study was explained to potential participants, one at time of match, one 18 months after random assignment).
- Interviews with key informants to provide details about agency and program practices. The centerpiece of the data collection was the interview with sample members and their parents/guardians. Interviews were completed immediately after random assignment before youth knew what group they were in and then again 18 months later. The first interviews collected data on demographics and the second on program impact.

Elements of Success

- Fidelity to model
- Personal relationships with adults
- Safe environment
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

See www.bbbs.org for information about organizations finances. Study funded by Lilly Endowment, Inc., The Commonwealth Fund, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and an anonymous donor.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Keoki Hansen
Big Brothers Big Sisters National Office
230 North 13th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
215-567-7000
215-567-0394 fax
Keoki.hansen@bbbs.org

Research Contact

Jean Grossman
Princeton University
279 Wallace Hall
Princeton, NJ 88542
609-258-6974
jgrossma@princeton.edu

Sources Used

Tierney, J., & Grossman, J. B. (2000, September).

Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

<http://www.ppv.org/ppv/publications.asp>

Other Resources

www.bbbs.org

Boys & Girls Clubs of America: Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO) and Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach (GITTO) Programs

Target Population	Youth in-and out-of-school, ages 6–18, at risk of or already involved in gangs
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; compared participants with matched nonparticipants
Findings	Decreased levels of gang behaviors, decreased involvement with the juvenile justice system, increased academic achievement, and positive school behaviors
Elements of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal relationships with adults Safe environment Supportive adult relationships Student-centered programming

Overview of Program

Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) offers several juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, all of which are supported by the US Department of Justice’s Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Two of these programs, Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO) and Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach (GITTO), deal specifically with juvenile gang involvement. GPTTO and GITTO, started in 1991, were designed slightly differently because the needs of the youth in the programs may be different. GPTTO was designed to prevent youth from joining gangs and exhibiting gang-related behaviors, and GITTO was designed to help youth leave gangs and their gang-related behaviors. GITTO youth receive more intense, targeted services, such as drug treatment, tattoo removal, job training, and education services. GPTTO participants are “mainstreamed” into their BGCA Club and often are not aware that they are part of a gang prevention program, whereas GITTO participants are aware that they are involved in a gang intervention program and are not mainstreamed into Club activities until they show progress in the intervention program.

While there is no single, specific model of GPTTO and GITTO programs, both programs exercise a youth development approach by focusing on the provision of pro-social activities that meet the interests of the youth involved. Activities are centered

on character and leadership development, health and life skills, the arts, sports, fitness, recreation, and education. Additionally, each youth is provided with a counselor who tracks his or her progress and provides case management. The comprehensive model seeks to give youth the same sense of belonging they seek through gang membership.

Key Findings

Specific outcomes of interest included decreased levels of gang behaviors, decreased involvement with the juvenile justice system, increased academic achievement, and positive school behaviors.

The following findings are statistically significant at different significance levels, as noted.

- Programs proved to be recruiting high-need youth, especially older youth.
- The majority of youth were still attending the programs after one year, with 73 percent of GPTTO and 68 percent GITTO participants attending. Additionally, program attendance rates were high, with 50 percent of GPTTO and 21 percent of GITTO youth reported attending Clubs several times per week. (However, 23 percent of GITTO participants reported never going to their Clubs.)
- Youth experienced many youth development practices. 96 percent of GPTTO participants and 86 percent of GITTO participants reported receiving adult support and guidance. A majority felt a strong sense of belonging and thought that the Clubs' activities were challenging and interesting. Participants considered Clubs as "safe," and most considered the Clubs safer than school.
- Measured against the comparison group, GPTTO participants experienced a larger decrease in smoking marijuana;³² were less likely to cut class;³³ were more likely to have sought an adult to help with school work;³⁴ and experienced a larger increase in the number of out-of-school time programs they were involved in;³⁵ but also experienced a larger increase in school suspensions.³⁶
- Measured against the comparison group, GITTO participants experienced a larger decrease in cutting class³⁷ and skipping school;³⁸ spent more time on homework;³⁹ and showed a larger increase in positive family relationships.⁴⁰

³² Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

³³ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

³⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.10).

³⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

³⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (p<.001).

³⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (p<.001).

³⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

³⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

- The aforementioned findings were true for all participants regardless of frequency of attendance in programs. However, more frequent attendance (unofficially defined as two or more times per week) for GPTTO participants is associated with:
 - Delayed onset of gang activities (measured by starting of wearing of gang colors).⁴¹
 - Less contact with the juvenile justice system.⁴²
 - Fewer delinquent behaviors.⁴³
 - Improved school outcomes (higher grades; greater value in doing school work).⁴⁴
 - More positive social relationships⁴⁵ and productive use of out-of-school time.⁴⁶
- More frequent attendance for GITTO participants is associated with:
 - Disengagement from gang-associated behaviors and peers, including stealing with gang members,⁴⁷ wearing gang colors,⁴⁸ flashing gang signals,⁴⁹ hanging out at the same place as gang members,⁵⁰ being a victim of a gang attack,⁵¹ and having fewer negative peers.⁵²
 - Less contact with the juvenile justice system.⁵³
 - More positive school engagement.⁵⁴

⁴¹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

⁴² Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴³ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

⁴⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

⁴⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁴⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence (p<.001).

⁵⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

⁵¹ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁵² Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence (p<.10).

⁵³ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence (p<.01).

⁵⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p<.05).

- Reported gang membership percentages (leaving, entering gangs) were similar for both participant and comparison groups over a 12-month period.
- Retention rates were similar for all participant youth independent of method of program recruitment.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Exact numbers of youth served nationally through these two programs to date are unavailable, but between 1995 and 2005, more than 10,571 youth were involved in GPTTO at 229 federally-funded Club sites; 1,074 youth were involved in GITTO at 27 federally-funded Club sites.
- As of 2008, there are 24 federally-funded GPTTO programs serving more than 800 youth and no federally-funded GITTO programs in the US.
- Youth in and out of school, ages 6–18, who are at risk of or already involved in gangs, are eligible for both GPTTO and GITTO, but the majority of participants involved are ages 13–16.
- Participants are recruited to both programs through outreach and referrals (by teachers, probation officers, policemen, etc.).
- GPTTO programs exist across the United States and are always operated through local BGCA Clubs.
- BGCA uses an annual RFP process for programs applying to run GITTO or GPTTO programs. A program may not apply to operate a GITTO program unless it has already run a GPTTO program. Potential grantees must show community need by demonstrating how intense the gang activity is in the community (e.g. number of gang-related crimes, number of gang-affiliated youth, and community perception of gang problem). Applications are awarded based on high community need and capacity for operating the program. The number of funded programs changes every year depending on federal funding levels.

Program Components

The GPTTO and GITTO programs follow similar national models that include the following components:

- *Community assessment of the local gang problem and multi-agency dedication to taking an active role in the GPTTO or GITTO program (completed during application process).*
 - Community need is assessed through surveys to parents, youth, teachers, police officers, and others.
 - The local police force, probation department, schools, youth organizations, and other community members are involved in the planning and training for the program, and especially with the recruitment of youth participants.
- *Recruitment of youth at risk or already involved in gangs.*
 - Risk of gang involvement is determined by whether youth live in gang-inflicted communities or communities at risk for gangs and whether youth display “wannabe” behavior or other vulnerable behavior that makes them susceptible.
- *Promotion of positive development experiences for youth and the mainstreaming of progressing youth into Club activities.*
 - Participants are closely tracked by counselors to assess how well they are progressing and mainstreamed as appropriate.
- *Provision of individualized case management across law enforcement, juvenile justice, school, family, and the Club to targeted participants.*
 - Youth most at risk or already involved in gangs are provided more intensive services with the goals of decreasing gang-related behaviors and contact with the juvenile justice system and increasing school attendance and academic success.

Overview of Evaluation

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) performed a quasi-experimental evaluation of GPTTO and GITTO tracking outcomes over a one-year period, from 1997 to 1998. The evaluation aimed to determine the following:

- Whether the Clubs succeeded in attracting high-risk youth.
- Whether the Clubs could keep the youth participating in the program for an extended length of time.
- Whether the youth served were receiving positive supports.
- Whether the programs had a positive effect on the lives of the youth.

Specific outcomes of interest included decreased levels of gang behaviors, decreased involvement with the juvenile justice system, increased academic achievement, and positive school behaviors.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- A total of 24 Clubs participated in the evaluations, and seven of the 24 were selected for an in-depth review of outcomes.
- All sites were selected through a request for proposals process prior to the start of the evaluation based on the strength of the Club and geographic diversity.
- Despite the sites not being chosen randomly, most programs were new or one year old at the time of the evaluation.
- There were 932 GPTTO youth and 104 GITTO youth in the study.
- A total of 456 youth participants were given the baseline survey when they entered the Club/project.
- Of the 456 youth participants who took the baseline survey, 292 were prevention youth and 85 were intervention youth; 81 percent of the surveyed prevention youth and 78 percent of the surveyed intervention youth completed the one-year follow-up survey.
- A “target youth survey sub-sample” consisting of 236 GPTTO and 66 GITTO youth from the seven Clubs selected for an in-depth study was also formed.

- There were 399 comparison youth recruited from the same communities as the target youth and matched in terms of age, gender, and ethnicity, but less successfully in terms of risky behaviors.
- Of the 399 comparison youth, 264 completed both a baseline and follow-up survey.
- Half of the GPTTO study participants and almost all of the GITTO participants were teens, and 64 to 74 percent were male.
- The level of risk of gang involvement was assessed with a tool, and 64 percent of GPTTO and 94 percent of GITTO participants were deemed to be at high risk of gang involvement.
- About three-quarters of participants in both programs qualified for free or reduced-price lunch, and 25 percent lived in public housing.

Study Methodology

- P/PV conducted a quasi-experimental study that compared GPTTO and GITTO participants (participants) with similar students not in the programs (comparison).
- Comparison youth were youth attending alternative schools who had been suspended or expelled from mainstream schools. These youth were similar to participants in terms of demographic characteristics (age, ethnicity, neighborhood, and gender), but they had engaged in far less delinquent behavior and were faring better in school than participants. Because of the differences in risk between the program and comparison youth, the data was analyzed taking into account statistically the risk factors that might contribute to positive or negative outcomes.
- The Clubs’ intake and case management tracking forms were used for recruitment and participant information of the youth in 21 GPTTO and three GITTO programs. Additionally, program administrators took one-time surveys one year after the evaluation start date to assess program implementation issues. In a subset of Clubs, baseline surveys were given to participants and comparison youth right after their start in the program and then 12 months later (posttest). Interviews and focus

groups with youth and staff, as well as on-site observations of seven (non-randomly-chosen) sites were also performed.

Elements of Success

- Personal relationships with adults
- Safe environment
- Supportive adult relationships
- Student-centered programming

Funding

GPTTO and GITTO programs are funded by BGCA and OJJDP. The P/PV evaluation was funded by BGCA, OJJDP, and The Pinkerton Foundation.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Joseph Mollner
Senior Director, Delinquency Prevention
Boys & Girls Clubs of America
1275 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
651-982-6999
JMollner@bgca.org

Evaluation Contact

Amy Arbreton
Senior Research Fellow
Public/Private Ventures
2000 Market Street, Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
510-273-4601
AArbreton@PPV.org

Sources Used

Arbreton, A., & McClanahan, W. (2002). *Targeted Outreach: Boys & Girls Clubs of America's Approach to Gang Prevention and Intervention*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Other Resources

<http://www.bgca.org/programs/specialized.asp>

Citizen Schools

Target Population	Students in Grades 6–8
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; participants compared to matched nonparticipants
Findings	Increased levels of student engagement and achievement, higher attendance and course pass rates, lower suspension rates, positive impact on English and math course grades, MCAS ELA and math test scores, and the selection of a high-quality high school
Elements of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with schools High-quality and devoted staff Structured program Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

Citizen Schools (CS) partners with public middle schools to provide extended day programs of educational enrichment, career exposure, and high school and college preparation for students in Grades 6–8. CS is premised on a belief that an intensive two to three year Citizen Schools experience in middle school, when combined with transition to a high-quality high school, will put most students on a path toward academic and social success. The program is offered during the school year and is approximately 400 hours for the entire year. The 6–8th-grade program offers a structured extended day program from 3 to 6 p.m. that incorporates academic support, apprenticeships with adult volunteers in a variety of fields, and community explorations that seek to bring the community into the classroom and the classroom to the community. CS also has an alumni program to help students and their families transition successfully during the high school process.

Key Findings

Based on data from Phases 1–4, CS had a positive impact on academic indicators including attendance, school suspension, promotion, English and math course grades, Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) English Language Arts (ELA) and math test scores, and the selection of a high-quality high school. In addition, data from Phases 1–4 indicated that CS has been successful in attracting and retaining educationally at-risk students and in putting these students on a path toward academic and social success. Survey data from Phases 1–3 indicated that participants felt a strong sense of connection to the program, experienced positive relationships with adults and peers, and had opportunities to take on leadership roles. Effects are reported separately for middle school success measures (attendance, suspension, promotion, course grades, and MCAS test scores) and 9–10th-grade success measures (selection of high-quality high school, attendance, suspension, third marking period English course grade, third marking period math course grade, and on-time promotion to 10th grade).

Additionally, effects are reported based on program exposure (high exposure, low exposure, all).

Findings

The following effects are based on data of middle school success measures for CS participants compared with matched nonparticipants in Phases 1–3. Findings are statistically significant unless stated otherwise.

School Attendance

- Positive effect for all 6th- and 7th-grade participants during first year of exposure.⁵⁵
- Positive effect for 7th-grade participants with high exposure in their second year.⁵⁶
- Positive effect for all 8th-Grade Academy participants.⁵⁷
- Positive effects, although not statistically significant, were found for 7th-grade participants with low-exposure in their second year.

School Suspension

- Positive effect for all 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year.⁵⁸
- Positive effects, although not statistically significant, were found for all 7th-grade participants in their second year and all 8th-Grade Academy participants.

Promotion to Next Grade

- Positive effect for high exposure 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year.⁵⁹
- Positive effect for low exposure 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .001$).

⁵⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁵⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁵⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .001$).

⁵⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁶⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

- Positive effect for all 8th-Grade Academy participants.⁶¹
- Positive effects, although not statistically significant, were found for all 7th-grade participants in their second year.

English Course Grade

- Positive effect for high exposure 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year.⁶²
- Positive effects, although not statistically significant, were found for 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year, low exposure 7th-grade participants in their second year, and all 8th-Grade Academy participants.

Math Course Grade

- Positive effect for high exposure 6th- and 7th-grade participants during first year.⁶³
- Positive effect for 7th-grade participants during second year with 99 percent confidence.
- Positive effects, although not statistically significant, were found for all 8th-Grade Academy participants.

MCAS ELA

- Positive effects for high exposure 6th- and 7th-grade participants during their first year.⁶⁴
- Statistically significant positive effects for all 7th-grade participants in their second year with 99 percent confidence.
- MCAS ELA data was not available for 8th-Grade Academy participants.

⁶¹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁶² Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .001$).

⁶³ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .001$).

⁶⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁶⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

MCAS Mathematics

- MCAS mathematics data was not available for 7th-grade participants in their second year.
- Positive effects for all 8th-Grade Academy participants.⁶⁵

The following effects are based on data of 9th-grade success measures for former 8th-Grade Academy participants compared with matched nonparticipants as reported in Phase IV. Findings are statistically significant unless stated otherwise.

Selection of high-quality high school

- Positive effect for all participants.⁶⁶

Attendance

- Positive effect for all participants.⁶⁷

Suspension

- Positive effect for high exposure participants.⁶⁸
- Positive effect, although not statistically significant, was found for low exposure participants.

Third marking period English course grade

- Positive effect for all participants.⁶⁹

Third marking period math course grade

- Positive effect, although not statistically significant, was found for all participants.

⁶⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁶⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁶⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁶⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .01$).

⁶⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

On-time promotion to 10th grade

- Positive effect for high exposure participants.
- Positive effect, although not statistically significant, was found for all participants.

The following effects are based on data on 10th-grade success measures for former 8th-Grade Academy participants compared with matched nonparticipants as reported in Phase V. Findings are statistically significant unless stated otherwise.

Attendance

- Positive effect for all participants.⁷⁰

Pass math course in third marking period

- Positive effect for all participants.⁷¹

Pass English/Language Arts 10th-grade MCAS

- Positive effect for all participants.⁷²

Pass math 10th-grade MCAS

- Positive effect, although not statistically significant, was found.

Comparison to District-Wide MCAS Results

Overall, the gap on MCAS scores in math between CS participants and BPS students seems to be narrowing from 4th to 8th grade, and by 10th grade the gap in math MCAS scores seems to disappear.

- In 4th grade, 6 percent of CS participants achieved proficiency compared to 13 percent of BPS students overall; in 8th grade, 13 percent of CS participants achieved proficiency compared to 22 percent of BPS students overall.

⁷⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁷¹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁷² Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

- In 10th grade, 46 percent of CS participants achieved proficiency on the math MCAS test compared to 44 percent of BPS students overall.

Elements of Success

- Collaboration with schools
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Program Population/Eligibility

- The CS program exists in 21 communities in California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, and Texas.
- In 2008, CS served 4,400 students at 44 school campuses and engaged 3,400 adult volunteers from the community (Citizen Teachers).
- All students at CS sponsored schools are eligible.
- CS serves students in Grades 6-8 in traditional public schools and public charter schools.
- According to Policy Studies Associates, CS recruits and retains students at-risk of academic failure.

Program Components

Programs vary across grades and locations, but the following components are present across the CS network.

6-8th-Grade Program Components

- **Paid apprenticeships:** students participate in experiential learning projects led by volunteer community members (Citizen Teachers) who set goals, focus on academic support, and teach leadership skills.
- **Academic Support:** Students participate in 60-90 minutes of supervised homework time, daily.

- **WOW Presentations:** Each semester culminates in a “WOW!;” a public presentation of the projects that the young people create with their Citizen Teachers through the apprenticeship program.

- **Community Exploration:** Exposes youth to the world outside the classroom and challenges them to think in new ways. On-campus explorations include dancing classes and hunger awareness campaigns; off-campus explorations include visits to universities, neighborhoods, museums, and nature centers.

6th-Grade-Only Program Component

- **School Navigation curriculum:** 6th-grade students learn study skills, including organization and how to ask for help.

7th-Grade-Only Program Component

- **Success Highways curriculum:** 7th-grade students explore their current lives, motivators, actions, and goals through a targeted confidence-building curriculum that incorporates assessments, classrooms activities, and interactions.

8th-Grade-Only Program Component

- **The 8th-Grade Academy:** Offers apprenticeships with adult volunteers and community explorations. It also helps participants apply to and succeed in high-quality high schools and to raise their aspirations for college. To do this, CS holds high school fairs and hosts dinners and other events for parents and students, during which CS staff provide families with information and resources about high schools and the high school application process, if applicable. CS also takes participants on college visits, where students visit classes, attend social events, and engage in other activities that provide a concrete awareness of college life. The 8th-Grade Academy also assigns each student a writing coach (typically a local lawyer).
- **Alumni Program:** Supports students and their families during the high school transition process by providing college access resources and a network of supportive adults.

Overview of Evaluation

Policy Studies Associates (PSA) launched the six-phase quasi-experimental longitudinal study in 2001 and will continue the evaluation through 2010. The evaluation thus far has focused on programs in the Boston area. CS sponsored this evaluation to assess whether their middle school program had a positive effect on students throughout high school. The fourth phase in particular focused on transitions from the 8th to 9th grades and 9th to 10th grades. The fifth year report describes all of the 8th-Grade Academy participants included in the study and looks at how the students fared in 9th, 10th and 11th grades. The sixth phase report will look at success in 12th grade, including graduation rates. Effects measured include the selection of a high-quality high school, attendance, suspension, course pass rates, promotion, etc. The final summary report of this study will be published in 2010. CS participants were studied from their 8th-grade years through high school and effects were compared to a matched control group of students from the same schools. In Phase V, in addition to the control group, the CS participants were compared to all Boston Public School (BPS) students to allow for an understanding of how CS participants fared across the larger context of the BPS school system.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- For the study, five cohorts of 8th-grade students, who attended the CS 8th-Grade Academy in School Years 2001-2002 through 2005-2006, were assessed at three BPS charter schools that have CS programs.
- The total number of participants in the five cohorts was 448 and around the same number of control group students were assessed.
- The evaluators matched the treatment and control group students on the following characteristics: gender, race, grade in school, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, student test scores on the 4th-grade Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System tests in mathematics and English Language Arts, school attended, bilingual education status, and special education status.

- The youth were followed from their 8th-grade years through high school.
- In addition to the control group, the CS participants were compared to all BPS students to allow for an understanding of how CS participants fared across the larger context of the BPS school system.
- Of the sampled youth, CS participants were more likely to be low-income and students of color than all BPS students: 94 percent were minority, with 68 percent being African American, and 85 percent qualified for free or reduced-price lunch versus 86 percent minority and 72 percent free or reduced price lunch in all of BPS. Compared with all BPS students, CS participants scored lower on their 4th-grade math and ELA standardized tests at significant levels.

Study Methodology

- The study was quasi-experimental in design. In all phases, CS participants were compared to matched nonparticipants.
- The matched nonparticipants in the control group may have been enrolled in other out-of-school time programs.
- The study is slated to have six phases, the fifth of which was completed in 2008.
- In Phase 5, two comparison groups were used: the matched nonparticipants used in Phases 1-4 and BPS students as a whole.
- The comparison group of BPS students as a whole was used in order to gauge how CS 8th-Grade Academy students fared on the MCAS mathematics test in comparison to BPS's district population. The evaluators calculated how many of the district's 4th-grade students achieved proficiency on the 4th-grade MCAS mathematics test and compared that statistic with the percent of 8th-Grade Academy participants who scored at those levels during their 4th-grade year. The evaluators followed the same process to compare the 8th-grade MCAS mathematics test scores for CS participants and 8th-grade BPS students to compare academic progress between the two groups from 4th to 8th grades.

- Test scores, grades, and attendance rates were used as pretests and posttests and were recorded when students started the program and then in an ongoing manner as they progressed through the program. Students who dropped out of the program at any time were not assessed after dropping out.
- Data sources came from BPS files and CS data.
- Year 1 of the evaluation took place during School Year 2001-2002; Year 2: 2002-2003; Year 3: 2003-2004; Year 4: 2004-2005; Year 5: 2005-2006.

Funding

Current major investors are Atlantic Philanthropies and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Citizen Schools sponsored the study.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Eric Schwarz
President & CEO
Citizen Schools
308 Congress Street, 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02210
617-695-2300 ext. 102
EricSchwarz@citizenschools.org
www.citizenschools.org

Research Contact

Juliet Vile
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Suite 400
1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
202-939-5326
jvile@policystudies.com

Elizabeth Reisner
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Suite 400
1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
202-939-5323
ereisner@policystudies.com

Sources Used

- Pearson, L., Fabiano, L. (2006, December). *Preparing Students in the Middle Grades to Succeed in High School: Findings from Phase IV of the Citizen Schools Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Pearson, L., Vile, J. D., & Reisner, E. (2008, January). *Establishing a Foundation for Progress Toward High School Graduation: Findings from Phase V of the Citizen Schools Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Other Resources

Citizen Schools website:
<http://www.citizenschools.org>

Policy Studies Associate website:
<http://www.policystudies.com/studies/youth/Citizen%20Schools.html>

College Now Program

Target Population	High school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; former College Now participants enrolled as first-time CUNY freshmen were compared to similar first-time CUNY freshmen who had never participated in College Now
Findings	Positive effects found on credits earned, GPA earned and on the probability that former participants persisted to a third semester at CUNY
Elements of Success	Collaboration with a postsecondary institution Education system alignment Focus on minority achievement High-quality and devoted staff

Overview of Program

The City University of New York (CUNY) College Now program serves as the University's major collaborative program with the New York City High Schools. Currently, the College Now central office staff supports 17 campus-based College Now college transition programs for New York City high school students. The goals of College Now are to help students meet high school graduation requirements and prepare for success in college. The program offers high school courses specially designed to prepare high school students for college. Course offerings range from art to physics and are offered in the fall, spring, and summer, before or after school hours. The program also offers campus tours and field trips. If eligible, students can earn free college credit. Most sections of the College Now program are taught in participating high schools by high school teachers who also serve as CUNY adjunct faculty members, also outside of regular school hours. Other College Now sections offer courses specifically for College Now students on a CUNY campus and a small number of sections allow students to register each year for undergraduate courses on the campuses alongside traditional college students.

Key Findings

Positive effects were found on credits and GPA earned, and on the probability that former College Now participants persisted to a third semester at CUNY. Findings were reported separately for students enrolled in an associate program, baccalaureate program, and the total across both degree types. The findings did not take into account any precollege credits or associated GPA; rather, only credits and GPA earned in the first year while at CUNY were considered. The findings are reported for students who had participated in the College Now program in any capacity.

Credits earned

- Students enrolled in an associate degree program earned an additional three-quarters of a credit (.77) in their first year; interpreted as nearly 1,652 additional total credits earned in the first year for students who had participated in the College Now program when compared to a similarly sized comparison group.
- Students enrolled in a baccalaureate degree program earned half a credit (.50) more than non-participants; interpreted as an additional 1,282 credits earned in the first year for all baccalaureate-

ate students when compared to a similarly sized comparison group.

- The overall effect on credits earned for students who had participated in College Now and enrolled in an associate or a baccalaureate program was an additional three-fifths (.60) of a credit on average. The inferred total effect for all students may be interpreted as more than 2,822 credits earned for the first year when compared to a similarly sized comparison group.

GPA Earned

- Across associate and baccalaureate degree types, students with College Now experience earned a GPA that was .06 points higher than their peers from New York City high schools who did not participate in the College Now program.

Persistence to a Third Semester

- Students in an associate degree program had a 5.3 percent increased probability of persisting to a third semester.
- Students in a baccalaureate degree program had a 3.0 percent increased probability of persisting to a third semester.
- Across both degree types, former College Now participants had a 4.6 percent higher probability of persisting to a third semester than similarly situated New York City high school students who did not participate in the College Now program.

Elements of Success

- Collaboration with a postsecondary institution
- Education system alignment
- Focus on minority achievement
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Staff quality

Program Population/Eligibility

The following information was provided by a director in the College Now central office at CUNY.

- In 2006–2007, 28,942 students enrolled in College Now programs, generating more than 44,000 enrollments in college credit courses, zero-credit developmental courses, and precollege courses and workshops. Approximately half of the enrollments were in college-credit courses.
- In Fall 2002, 3,902 first-time freshmen from New York City High Schools with College Now experience enrolled in CUNY.
- In Fall 2007, 6,960 first time freshmen from New York City High Schools with College Now experience enrolled in CUNY.
- A College Now program director at CUNY explained that across the 17 programs, College Now program staff review high school transcripts to determine eligibility.
- Typically, the programs use CUNY eligibility requirements for introductory college-credit courses offered in the 11th or 12th grade: a score of 75 and higher (a scaled score) on the state English or math Regents exams, or a 480 and higher on the Verbal or Math sections of the SAT. Some programs accept PSAT scores of 48 and higher.
- Some programs offer Gateway courses with lower eligibility requirements.
- Most College Now programs do offer “precollege” courses and workshops that help students develop the discipline and specific skills they need to succeed in college if they are not yet eligible for the college courses.

Program Components

- Program components vary across the 17 campus-based College Now programs.
- The majority of College Now college-credit courses take place in participating high schools; high school teachers serve as course instructors and are appointed adjunct professors at CUNY.
- Other College Now programs offer credit and noncredit courses on a CUNY campus. In this case, College Now students enroll as a cohort and do not take classes alongside traditional CUNY students.

- A limited number of enrollments come from College Now students taking courses on campuses alongside matriculated college students.
- Courses are offered in a variety of subjects including Arts & Humanities, Business, College 101, Communications, Computer Science & Engineering, Education, Health, Mathematics, Science, and the Social Sciences.
- A variety of workshops are also offered. The College Now website indicates that workshops serve to prepare students for college-level coursework. Workshops generally provide high school elective credits. Sample precollege workshops include a culinary cooking workshop with a focus on content and skills in the social sciences, business and the hard science fields; a forensic science workshop that connects biology, chemistry and forensic science; and a news-writing workshop, designed to give students exposure to hard news-writing and reporting for newspapers.
- Credit and noncredit courses in summer programs are also offered at the 17 CUNY campuses. Summer program offerings vary across the 17 programs. For example, York College offers a Jazz Music Program, Lehman College offers a Summer Health Professions Academy, Baruch College offers a Summer Journalism Workshop and Hostos Community College offers a Bronx Civic Scholars Institute.

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation was quasi-experimental in design and measured the effects of College Now participation on credits and grade point average (GPA) earned in the first year at CUNY and persistence to a third semester. College Now participants enrolled as first-year CUNY freshmen were compared to similar first-year CUNY freshmen who graduated from the New York City High Schools and had never participated in College Now. The evaluation was conducted in Summer 2006 and Fall 2006 by the research and evaluation unit of CUNY Collaborative Programs. The findings did not take into account any precollege credits or associated GPA; rather, only credits and GPA earned in the first year while at CUNY were considered. The findings are reported for students who had participated in College Now either through a college credit course, noncredit developmental course, summer program or workshop.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- A total of 13,248 students served as the total cohort for the evaluation.
- To be included in the total cohort, students had to be graduates of New York City High Schools and enrolled in a CUNY associate or baccalaureate degree program as first-time freshmen within 15 months of graduation.
- Each member of the cohort had to have an official high school transcript.
- Of the 13,248 included in the evaluation population, 35.5 percent had participated in College Now in some capacity while in high school.
- College Now participation was measured by whether students had enrolled in at least one College Now activity, whether a college credit course, noncredit developmental course, summer program or workshop.

Study Methodology

- The study measured the effectiveness of College Now participation on credits and GPA earned in the first year at CUNY and persistence to a third semester.
- CUNY Collaborative Program's College Now database and CUNY's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provided student level records merged for both enrollment and performance data of first-time freshmen at CUNY.
- College Now participants who enrolled as first-time CUNY freshmen in Fall 2003 within 15 months of graduation were compared to statistically similar first-time CUNY freshmen who had never participated in College Now.
- Approximately 60 percent of first-time freshmen at CUNY were graduates of a New York City High School and approximately 35 percent of these participated in at least one College Now activity while in high school.
- Only credits or GPA earned while at CUNY were measured; Advanced Placement and transfer cred-

its were not incorporated into the credit or GPA measurements.

- To account for missing data or data error, student records from both data sources were matched by student name, birth date, gender, and address.
- Only students with a complete high school transcript available were included.
- Factors that might affect postsecondary outcomes were controlled for using multiple regression as follows: students' race/ethnicity, family income, gender, age, academic preparedness as measured by high school GPA and standardized test scores, high school and college attended, as well as college-level factors such as whether a student took part in other college opportunity programs for low income students, attended part-time, or changed colleges during their first year at CUNY.

Funding

- The following information was provided by a director in the College Now central office at CUNY.
- The CUNY university-wide College Now budget was roughly \$11 million in 2007, including books and supplies, professional development, and campus, high school and Central Office staff.
- Program funding varies by size and program model. For example, the annual administrative costs for one high school-based program, which serves the largest number of students, were \$6,984, and the fall and spring instructional costs were \$55,876 for a total expenditure of \$62,860, or \$114 per student, not including books.
- The per-student cost for the model that involves students attending classes on a CUNY campus was \$122, but that amount does vary depending on the instructor's base salary, all of which is covered by College Now.

Contact Information

Program and Research Contact

Eric Hofmann
CUNY—College Now
101 W. 31st Street, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10001
646-344-7305
Eric.Hofmann@mail.cuny.edu
<http://collegenow.cuny.edu>

Sources Used

Michalowski, S. (2007). *Positive Effects Associated with College Now Participation*. The City University of New York : Collaborative Programs Research & Evaluation. Retrieved on October 8, 2008, from <http://web.cuny.edu/academics/CUNY-PublicSchoolPrograms/databook/library.html>

Other Resources

City University of New York, Office of Academic Affairs (11/1/2006). *University Working Group on Collaborative Programs: Final Report*.

Cool Girls, Inc. 2005–2006 Evaluation

Target Population	Girls in Grades 3–8
Evaluation	Program to Watch; participants were compared to a control group of nonparticipants
Findings	Positive effects on perceived life chances, hope for the future, drug knowledge, physical activity, and levels of school competence
Elements of Success	Comprehensive youth development services Personal relationships with staff Safe environment Structured program Student-centered programming

Overview of Program

Cool Girls, Inc. (CG), founded in 1989 and based in Atlanta, Georgia, is concerned with the self-empowerment of girls in low-income communities. CG provides tools to help girls make positive choices to achieve academic success, break the cycles of teen pregnancy and poverty, and overcome the barriers of racism and sexism. Most components of the program are offered after school, but there is also a small summer component. CG maintains that comprehensive programming in the form of mentoring relationships, field trips, health and life skills education, and academic tutoring instill confidence and provide exposure to a world of opportunities.

Key Findings

Overall, the evaluation indicated that program participation had positive effects on perceived life chances, hope for the future, drug knowledge, physical activity, and levels of school competence. Statistical significance was set at the confidence interval of 90 percent or more. All of the findings are statistically significant at a 90 percent confidence interval (CI) or higher unless noted as nonsignificant. Certain characteristics that could bias the findings, including grade level and family composition (single vs. two-parent family) were controlled for in an attempt to minimize selection bias.

Findings were grouped according to the four programmatic topics that the evaluation sought to measure. Outcomes were measured using a group of scaled questions for each topic. The findings reported below are for middle school outcomes only.

Making Healthy Decisions for Healthy Development

- Cool Girls demonstrated positive effects on participants' levels of healthy decision-making, positive behavior, and goal-setting behavior. No significant effect on "ability to say no to drugs" was found, although scores for both groups were very positive.
- Cool Girls maintained moderately high levels of healthy decision-making skills (2.97 pretest score and 2.97 posttest score) while comparison group decreased (3.03 at pretest and 2.85 at posttest).
- Cool Girls also maintained moderately high levels of positive behavior (2.8 pretest and posttest) while comparison group decreased (2.77 pretest and 2.66 posttest).
- Cool Girls increased their goal setting skills (3.58 pretest and 3.68 posttest) while comparison girls remained stable (at 3.6).

Academic Achievement

- Cool Girls are slightly more motivated to do well in school, have higher school competence (2.9 versus 2.7 for nonparticipants), study more, and have greater computer skills than comparison girls (about 4.8 for nonparticipants and 5.6 for CG at posttest).
- Studying decreased for nonparticipants (from 2.7 at pretest to 2.26 at posttest) but stayed stable for CG (although started lower: 2.57 at pretest and 2.5 at posttest).
- No significant differences were found for reported math and reading scores, school importance, or weekly computer usage.

Health, Wellness, and Nutrition

- Cool Girls increased their level of knowledge about drugs, vegetable consumption, and physical activity while comparison girls' knowledge decreased.
- Cool Girls also remained stable in their reports of likelihood to use cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and/or inhalants in the future (16 percent maybe or definitely will use them), while comparison girls increased (from 25 to 29 percent).
- No effects were found on social acceptance, body image, relationship with family, healthy personal dietary choices, nutritional knowledge, sexual development knowledge, seeking information about sex from adults or from peers, acceptability of premarital sex, willingness to talk to partner about sex (only middle school students were assessed), difficulty saying no to sex if pressured, ability to handle sexual feelings, appropriate age to start having sex (20-21 years old cited for both groups, pretest and posttest), and ever had sex.

Awareness of Life Opportunities

- Cool Girls increased their engagement in extracurricular activities and level of perceived life chances while comparison girls decreased.
- Cool Girls also increased their level of hope for the future and amount learned on field trips while comparison girls' knowledge remained the same.

- No effects on career potential, field trip attendance, exposure to new students, exposure to successful adults, and strategic help-seeking were found.

Program Population

- Girls in Grades 3–8 can participate in the after-school program. High School girls remain engaged through Cool Sisters mentoring program and volunteering in the after school program.
- Currently, 450 girls participate in 11 schools in the Atlanta region.
- The report does not detail population demographics; however, the Executive Director of CG explained that Cool Girls programs target girls in low-income communities. Overall, girls served are African Americans (with increasing numbers of Latinas) who do not have positive role models in their lives.

Program Eligibility/Geographic Area

- Girls in Grades 3–8 at 11 public schools offering Cool Girls in Georgia's Fulton and DeKalb Counties are eligible.
- Girls who do not attend CG schools are technically eligible, but a parent or guardian is required to provide transportation to and from the site.
- Girls self-select for the program; they can also be referred by a guidance counselor. School leaders must request the CG program in order to be a participating school, and schools are eligible if at least 90 percent of their student population is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Program Components

The program consists of six components:

- *Cool Girls Club*: weekly afterschool program focused on life skills development.
- *Cool Scholars*: weekly afterschool academic support program that offers girls tutoring in reading, writing, and language arts.

- *Cool Tech*: technology and education program for CG's elementary and middle school program participants.
- *Cool Biz and Girls LEAD*: weeklong summer programs at a day camp that are focused on entrepreneurial leadership skills, business concepts, money management, and product development/marketing. Program partners with Merrill Lynch and uses a curriculum called Investment Pays Off (IPO).
- *Cool Sisters*: one-to-one mentoring program.
- *Field trips*

There is also a scholarship fund for college education. Girls who were in the program as elementary and/or middle school students can apply for college scholarships. The process is competitive and a separate committee awards the funds. To be eligible for the program, applicants must be a CG alumnae, who participated in CG for at least three years, volunteers with CG and/or other organizations, maintains a cumulative GPA of at least a 2.0, and demonstrates financial need.

Overview of Evaluation

The 2005–2006 evaluation was designed to measure participant patterns of change in comparison to a control group of nonparticipants in four of CG's programmatic areas: decision-making skills; academic achievement; health, wellness and nutrition; and awareness of life opportunities. Pretest and posttest surveys were given to the treatment and comparison group participants. The Psychology Department at Georgia State University has been evaluating CG since 1999. This summary represents data from the most recent (2005–2006) report.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- For the evaluation, girls in Grades 4–8 who were members of CG at nine chosen sites, not randomly assigned, became the treatment group and were compared to a comparison group of girls who were not in CG but attended school at a CG site.
- For the evaluation, 70 CG girls (treatment) and 80 comparison girls took both a pretest and posttest scaled survey.

- The report notes the mean age of the evaluation participants (treatment and control groups) was 11.
- Of the evaluation participants, 90 percent were Black/African American.
- CG participants were less likely to live in two-parent households.

Study Methodology

- The evaluation team at the Psychology Department at Georgia State University created treatment and control groups.
- Nine Cool Girls sites were used for the treatment and control groups and all girls whose parents submitted consent forms were included.
- Assignment to treatment and comparison groups was not random; however, the researchers note that they tried to recruit comparison youth that were as similar as possible to girls participating in the program.
- Girls in the control group (nonparticipants) were chosen by the evaluators, but the authors state that their pretest scores were statistically similar to the pretest scores of the treatment group.
- Pretest data was collected from treatment and control groups at the beginning of the school year and posttest data was collected at the end of the school year.
- Pretest and posttest data were collected in the form of questionnaire packets; the questionnaire packets contained scenarios and scaled questions (generally 1-4 range, with 4 being the most positive) on 4 of CG's programmatic areas: decision-making skills; academic achievement; health, wellness, and nutrition; and awareness of life opportunities. Pretest data was collected during Fall 2004, and posttest data was collected during Spring 2005.
- Analyses focused on identifying patterns of change from pretest to posttest between CG and comparison girls.

- Differences were also examined between elementary and middle school girls.
- Exact indicators and program components that are assessed have changed from year to year since 1999, but all include Making Decisions for Healthy Development; Academic Achievement; Awareness of Life Opportunities; and Health, Wellness, and Nutrition.

Elements of Success

- Structured program
- Student-centered
- Personal relationships with mentors and staff
- Targeted for middle school girls
- Safe environment
- Comprehensive youth development programming
- Strong leadership

Funding

The program is funded by several sources including private foundations, business contributions, and donations. The evaluators state, “the evaluation was funded by Cool Girls, Inc. out of their operating budget. In FY06 the GSU evaluators received a small grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which enabled it to put additional resources into recruiting the comparison group and bolstering efforts to retain youth in the study at posttest.” Cool Girls plans to continue the evaluation as long as funds are available.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Tanya Egin
Program Director
Cool Girls, Inc.
100 Edgewood Avenue, Suite 1030
Atlanta GA 30303
404-420-4362 ext. 2234
T.Egin@thecoolgirls.org
www.thecoolgirls.org

Cynthia J. Moreland
Executive Director
Cool Girls, Inc.
100 Edgewood Avenue, Suite 1030
Atlanta GA 30303
404-420-4362 ext. 2222
C.Moreland@thecoolgirls.org
www.thecoolgirls.org

Evaluation Contact

Gabriel Kuperminc
Jim Emshoff
Department of Psychology
Georgia State University
140 Decatur St. 11th Floor Urban Life Bldg.,
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-651-2283
gkuperminc@gsu.edu
jemshoff@gsu.edu

Sources Used

Kuperminc, G., & Emshoff, J., et al. (2006, August 8). “Program Evaluation of Cool Girls, Inc., Data From the 2005-06 Cool Girls Evaluation.” Georgia State University Evaluation Team.

Other Resources

www.thecoolgirls.org

Families and Schools Together (FAST)

Target Population	Middle school students and their parents/guardians
Evaluation	Program to Watch; nonexperimental methods used to evaluate 1,030 parents from 152 FAST cycles from 2002–2007 and 1,153 youth
Findings	Improvements in classroom behavior, home behavior, self-esteem, family-closeness, parental involvement in school and reduction in social isolation.
Elements of Success	Fidelity to model High-quality and devoted staff Professional development for staff Program models allow flexibility to adapt to individual needs of the community Student/family collaboration

Overview of Program

Families and Schools Together® (FAST) is a non-profit organization dedicated to helping communities build protective factors around youth. FAST's mission is to help communities create barriers to the risks youth face by creating a strong family accountability infrastructure, using a collaborative framework of local support. The organization produces and distributes evidence-based parental involvement programs and alcohol and drug prevention/intervention programs that teach parents how to become empowered and show them how to empower their children to succeed. FAST provides multiple programs held afterschool: Baby FAST, Pre-K FAST, Kids (elementary) FAST, Middle School FAST, and Teen (high school) FAST. Programs operate mostly in schools and community-based organizations (CBOs). FAST is implemented in 48 states and eight countries. It has shown to be effective across languages, cultures, and varying socioeconomic strata. FAST has four main goals: 1) enhance family functioning; 2) prevent the target child from experiencing school failure; 3) prevent substance abuse by the child and family; and 4) reduce the stress that parents and children experience from daily life situations. Programs are offered after school and are not teacher-led or based on any school curriculum. This summary focuses on an aggregate report that was developed by FAST to reflect all survey results from participants in all Middle School FAST programs nationwide from 2002–2007. However, it also references outcomes from other FAST studies.

Key Findings

The N for the following findings was 900–1,000, a large sample population for such findings. Overall results from the evaluation show statistically significant improvements in classroom behavior, home behavior, self-esteem, family-closeness, parental involvement in school, and reduction in social isolation. All outcomes below are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence unless stated otherwise.

Middle School 2007 Study Findings

- On the Family Relationship Index, posttest scores were significantly more positive than pretest scores, indicating an improvement in cohesion, expressiveness, and total relationship scores, while conflict decreased.
- Parenting Style (parent survey): Involvement with Children, Anger Management, Communication, and Total Parenting Style scores all improved.
- Substance-Related Rules scores did not change.
- Social Relationships (parents): Community Social Relationships, Relationship with FAST Child, and Total Social Relationships scores improved.
- Social Support and Other Parents (parents): all significantly improved.

- Strengths and Difficulties of Children (parents): Prosocial Behaviors improved; Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, and Peer Problems decreased.
- Parent Involvement in Education (parents): All scores improved.
- Parents' Substance Use: No significant changes, but authors state that use levels are so low that significant changes are not likely.
- Parents' Knowledge about alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (ATOD): All scores improved.
- Community Relationships (youth surveys): improved.
- Family Relationship Index (youth): Cohesion, Total Relationship improved; Conflict decreased at .001 level. Expressiveness significantly improved with 95 percent confidence.
- Positive Coping Responses (youth): improved.
- Strengths and Difficulties Reported by Youth: Emotional Symptoms and Conduct Problems decreased, Hyperactivity decreased significantly with 90 percent confidence. "Peer Problems" did not decrease significantly; Prosocial behaviors scores did not change.
- Parents rated their satisfaction with FAST as 8.9 out of 10. Youth rated FAST at 3.3 out of 4. The ratings are not statistically significant.
- The majority of youth indicated that they were unlikely to use alcohol (82 percent), tobacco (90 percent), or marijuana (92 percent) within the next five years. The percentages are not statistically significant.

Other Studies

Teen FAST:

- According to teen survey results from an internal two-program-cycle aggregate summary report from 2007, Teen FAST had effects on youth that were only minimally statistically significant in all areas surveyed: Relationships with Community, Positive Coping Skills, and Social Support. (Note that sample N is less than 30 for this study.)

- In this same report, parent surveys indicated that they think Teen FAST has had a positive effect on their Relationship with [their own] Youth and Relationship with Community; their youth's Social Self Efficacy, Anger Management, and Communication; their Support Provided to Others and Received from Others, Tangible Support, Affectionate Support, and Emotional Support; their youth's Peer Problems and Impact of Difficulties [on them]; and their Involvement in School. All results were statistically significant.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Participation in FAST programs is strictly voluntary. School personnel and additional FAST staff do reach out to families via presentations, mailings, and phone calls and home visits. Families who volunteer to participate must sign a consent form prior to parental or youth involvement in the program.
- Some programs have eligibility requirements. Schools, CBOs, and other community organizations apply to run a FAST program; many times, a mental health organization will approach a school to partner and run a program together. Because the program costs money, any organization that can pay may run a program. FAST does have an interest in serving at-risk populations, although the Vice President of Marketing stresses that the programs work for all types of families, so many sites indeed target recruitment efforts toward at-risk populations such as teen moms, English Language Learners, and low-income families. About 80–90 percent of families who are actively recruited participate, and 80–90 percent of them graduate from the programs.
- The Vice President of Marketing for FAST estimates that about 30,000–40,000 families worldwide have participated in FAST programs since the organization was founded. About 5,000–7,000 families are served per year, and this number is increasing yearly. Currently, there are more than 300 sites operating FAST programs.
- Middle School FAST serves students in Grades 6–8. From 2002–2007, 1,246 families graduated from FAST, meaning they completed the program, but thousands more were actually served.

- Characteristics of youth in the Middle School Program demonstrate that “in the past year,” 29 percent of youth reported being suspended from school at least once, 36 percent skipped school at least once, and 5 percent were expelled.
- Grades of those youth who graduated indicate: 75 percent make relatively good grades; 12 percent received mostly As; 29 percent half As and half Bs; 8 percent mostly Bs; 26 percent half Bs and half Cs; 8 percent mostly Cs; 10 percent half Cs and half Ds; 5 percent mostly Ds; and 2 percent mostly below D.

Program Components

- All FAST programs are facilitated by collaborative leadership teams, which are trained in an ongoing manner by national FAST staff. The collaborative teams comprise at least six members: a parent partner, a school partner, a community-based mental health partner, a community based substance abuse partner, a youth representative, and a youth advocate. The two community based partners are locally decided. For example some communities may choose to have a domestic violence representative or a nutritionist based on the issues the local community is trying to overcome. All programs also offer meals and offer FAST-WORKS after “graduation” from the programs, where graduate volunteers run monthly follow-up meetings for two years with the collaborative team providing backup support as needed.
- Baby FAST is a widely used multifamily group intervention model for parents and their infants and toddlers (ages 0–3). It works especially well for first-time mothers and is intended to protect vulnerable families with risk factors, such as single-parent families, teen moms, isolated families, or families within communities with higher risk factors.
- Middle School FAST is the core of the FAST program. It involves 10 weekly family meetings whose purpose is to strengthen bonds within the family and their community. In addition to the family meetings, youth attend meetings for 14 weeks outside the family meetings; youth start meeting four weeks before parents join. Youth then help recruit their families. The meetings consist of seven core

elements including: 1) a meal shared as a family unit; 2) communication games; 3) time for couples or buddies; 4) a self-help parent group; 5) a youth support group; 6) one-on-one quality interaction; and 7) a fixed lottery in which each family wins once. Families graduate at the end of 10 weeks.

- Teen FAST is very similar to the Middle School program (including two-year follow-up), except it is eight weeks long. The teens, instead of the parents, are the focus in the sessions. There is a heavier emphasis on leadership, accountability for oneself, and planning for the future. This program is still under development and has not been formally implemented.
- All FAST participants are given a preprogram survey to complete (during a home visit by FAST personnel) after the parent(s) voluntarily agree(s) to participate in the program. The data is collected and analyzed at the national office. The internal data collection is used to assess program quality and efficacy and is a required component of the program for all participants.

Overview of Evaluation

Multiple internal and external evaluations have been performed on all of the FAST programs, with the most rigorous studies (including four randomized control trials) being completed with elementary-aged youth in the programs. However, nonexperimental methods have mostly been used to evaluate the FAST programs that serve older youth, such as Middle School FAST and Teen FAST. Pretests and posttests aligned with the program goals were given to both parents and youth.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- For the Middle School 2007 study sample, 1,030 parents from 152 FAST cycles from 2002-2007 (nationwide) completed pretests and posttests, and 1,153 youth completed them. Program-wide, all families who volunteer to participate are given the pretest and posttest (if they stay until the program’s conclusion.) The evaluation sample is comprised of all families and youth who completed both the pretests and posttests from 2002-2007 (nationwide).

- Ages ranged from 10–17 with the mean being 12.2 years old.
- 40 percent were European American, 24 percent were African American, less than 1 percent were Asian, less than 1 percent were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 7 percent were of mixed ethnicity, and 3 percent were “other.”

Study Methodology

- All FAST programs are required to administer pretest and posttest surveys to their participants for every cycle of FAST. Communities can operate several cycles in one year.
- Parents complete a survey measure that asks questions about social relationships, social support, involvement in education, family environment, parenting style, and youths’ social strengths and difficulties.
- Demographic and “consumer satisfaction” information is also collected from parents. Youth complete a survey that asks about social relationships, family environment, stress levels, coping responses to stress, and perception of their own strengths and difficulties; they are also asked about their satisfaction with the program.

Data Sources

- Family Environment Scale (FES)-Family Relationships Index, Parenting Style, Social Relationships Questionnaire, Social Support, Reciprocal Support with Other Parents, Parental Involvement in Education, Youth Stress Checklist, Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire, Self-Efficacy Scale, Substance Use Questionnaire, Coping Responses Checklist, and School Behavior.
- Middle School 2007 Report: the aggregate survey results from 2002–2007 have been used for this report.

Elements of Success

- Fidelity to model
- High-quality and devoted staff

- Professional development for staff
- Program models allow flexibility to adapt to individual needs of the community
- Student/family collaboration

Funding

- Most of the funding for FAST comes from the organizations that buy services from this fee-for-service program.
- FAST also receives corporate and private donations.
- FAST does not receive any government funding, although many of the community organizations that use it.
- Individual cycle evaluations are funded by the fee for service collected by FAST.
- FAST programs cost approximately \$7,000 per year per site. The fee includes trainings, technical support, mandatory evaluation, and national staff travel costs for the trainings (if a local trainer is not available).

Contact Information

Program and Research Contact

Pat Davenport
Families and Schools Together Inc.
2801 International Lane
Suite 212
Madison, WI 53704
608-213-9557
608-663-2336 fax
pdavenport@familiesandschools.org

Sources Used

McDonald, L., & Price, K. (2007). “Evaluation Report for Middle School FAST,” Aggregate Summary 2002–2007. FAST National Training & Evaluation Center.

Other Resources

www.familiesandschools.org

Girl Scouts of America: PAVE the Way (Project Anti-Violence Education)

Target Population	Girls ages 5-17
Evaluation	Program to Watch; national evaluation of PAVE programs at 26 Girl Scout councils, which includes case studies of five of these 26 programs
Findings	Improvements in awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention
Elements of Success	Community partnerships Peer support network Personal relationships with staff Professional development for staff

Overview of Program

PAVE the Way (Project Anti-Violence Education) is a Girl Scouts of USA antiviolence program that encourages girls to think critically about their personal safety and utilizes innovative programming to unearth girls' innate ability to build healthy, productive lives. Girl Scout councils develop and implement PAVE programming for girls that focus on at least one of the following topics: crime prevention, bullying prevention and intervention, Internet safety, and/or gang prevention. The PAVE program began in 2000, and during the 2006–2007 grant cycle, PAVE was implemented in 25 Girl Scout councils in the United States and as part of USA Girl Scouts Overseas – North Atlantic region. Girl Scout councils apply for and receive PAVE grants directly from Girl Scouts of USA, and each council structures its programs according to the needs of the girls within its geographic jurisdiction.

Key Findings

Statistically significant improvements in awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention were found for middle school and high school girls. Outcomes were reported separately for middle school and high school girls on the four topics of crime prevention, bullying prevention and intervention, Internet safety, and gang prevention. Girls were asked to rate how well they understood a particular topic and/or how often they participated in an activity pertaining to that topic. Scores went up, showing an increase in

understanding and awareness for crime prevention, bullying prevention and intervention, and Internet safety. In addition, a four-part scale was used with the choices: Always, Often, Sometimes, and Never. It can be inferred that “awareness about” a subject increased, but not that “knowledge about” the subject increased. Findings are statistically significant at a 95 percent CI, unless stated otherwise.

Outcomes for Middle School Girls

■ Regarding crime prevention:

- ❑ 12 percent more girls reported that they “always” solve problems peacefully after involvement with the program than before.
- ❑ 11 percent more girls reported that they could “always” stay calm when they have a problem after involvement with the program than before.
- ❑ More than 60 percent of girls “always” know what dating violence is after being involved in PAVE, versus about 50 percent before involvement in PAVE. This finding is not statistically significant.

■ Regarding bullying prevention/intervention:

- ❑ 13 percent more girls felt they “always” knew what bullying was after being in PAVE than before.
- ❑ 15 percent more girls felt that they “always” knew what abuse was after involvement with the program than before.

- ❑ 21 percent more girls “always” knew what sexual harassment was after involvement with the program than before.
- ❑ 15 percent more girls reported “never” leaving out or excluding girls to hurt them after involvement with the program than before.
- ❑ 11 percent more girls reported “never” spreading rumors or gossip about others after involvement with the program than before.
- ❑ 19 percent more girls “always” know how to talk and hold themselves so they look strong after involvement with the program.
- ❑ 17 percent more girls “always” tell a trusted adult if someone is hurting them or making them feel unsafe after involvement with the program.
- ❑ 17 percent more girls “always” say “No!” if someone is making them feel uncomfortable after involvement with the program.

■ Regarding Internet Safety

- ❑ 14 percent more middle school girls and 13 percent more high school girls indicated they always knew what cyberbullying was after participating in the PAVE program.
- ❑ 11 percent more middle school girls and 6 percent more high school girls said they always tell a trusted adult about mean online messages after PAVE participation.
- ❑ Of the middle school respondents, 8 percent more reported that they “never” give personal information over the Internet after involvement with PAVE than before.

■ Personal Growth

- ❑ 18 percent more middle school girls reported that they “always” seek out places to hang out that make them feel safe after participating in the PAVE program than before.
- ❑ 21 percent more middle school girls know how to be safe in all places after participating in the PAVE program than before, significant at a 95 percent CI.

Outcomes for High School Girls

- ❑ Of the high school respondents, 40 percent more reported that they “always” create safety plans for wherever they go after involvement with the PAVE program than before.
- ❑ 27 percent more girls reported they could “always” find constructive ways to deal with their

emotions after involvement with PAVE than before.

- ❑ 25 percent more high school girls reported that they “always” work with their peers, teachers, and trusted adults to prevent crime after participating in PAVE than before.

Program Population Statistics from the 2007–2007 Program Year

- Participants ranged from ages 9-17.
- The majority of girls served were ages 12-14.
- In order to participate, councils apply to receive grant money for PAVE programming directly from the Girl Scouts of USA.
- Of the participating councils, 75 percent served at least some girls at high risk of violence, 68 percent served at least some girls in high-risk communities; and 54 percent served at least some girls at high-risk schools (the study does not provide information on risk factors).
- Additionally, 73 percent of councils served at least some White girls, 68 percent served at least some African American girls, 61 percent served at least some Hispanic/Latina girls, 30 percent served at least some American Indian girls, 28 percent served at least some Asian girls, and 19 percent served at least some Hawaiian/Pacific Islander girls (more detailed ethnicity information is not available).

Program Components

- The evaluators note that program duration, longevity, and intensity all differ across local councils. For example, some troops will hold one workshop a week for six weeks to get six hours of PAVE programming in, whereas others will offer one all-day session, and still others will provide one week of programming, every day that week. This range is due to the fact that Girl Scouts programs take on different forms and occur at different times.
- All programs included programming on crime prevention, bullying prevention and intervention, Internet safety, or gang prevention.

- Program format also varied across local councils. Of participating councils, 65 percent utilized a series format in their programming, and about 38 percent employed single workshops to deliver the PAVE programming. Fifty-four percent of participating councils provided programming on a weekly basis, as opposed to biweekly or less frequently, 42 percent of councils provided a total of one to five hours of programming total, and 40 percent of councils provided more than 10 hours of programming total.
- The PAVE program is predominantly provided by community-based organizations and schools (33 percent and 31 percent, respectively). However, some implementation takes place in camps (8 percent), juvenile detention centers (4 percent), at home (3 percent), and at “special events” (2 percent). (“Other:” 18 percent but not defined.)
- Multiple curricula were used, including “Staying Safe,” “Take Charge,” “Uniquely Me!,” and “The Real Deal,” as well as outside materials such as Bullysafe USA, Netsmartz, and many others.

Evaluation Overview

The Improve Group was hired by Girl Scouts of the USA to conduct an outcome evaluation to assess program characteristics and the impact of the program on participants’ personal growth and leadership development. An additional goal of the evaluation was to uncover any cross-council program characteristics. The evaluation team designed a research methodology that included quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis from all 26 programs. In addition, there were five case studies completed to provide further details about and best practices from successful programs.

Evaluation Population

- Based on program staff predictions of the numbers of girls present on the day of survey administration, 117 high school and 195 middle school girls participated with a 72 percent and 87 percent response rate, respectively.
- Of the 26 councils, the researchers chose the five most “successful” sites on which to do case studies. This designation of “successful” was based on the Program Assessment Rubric (PAR) results

(which measures outcomes on age, race, target populations, primary setting, type of programming, and frequency and participation rates) and answers to surveys and interviews with program staff.

- A main component for selection of the five most “successful” sites was having girls in the program for long enough to be able to assess their changes; some sites were also chosen for geographic and demographic diversity.
- The authors note that the sample of girls chosen does not represent the population of PAVE since their programs were selected based on their quality.

Study Methodology

Outcomes Measured

- The population served by PAVE and services they received.
- Programmatic goals and activities.
- Programmatic strengths and successes.
- Impact of the program on girls/young women in the areas of personal growth and leadership.
- Perception among girls and staff of the impact of the program on girls’ lives.
- PAVE material review of curricula used, program protocols, etc.

Qualitative and Quantitative Data Collection Tools

- PAVE material review—all 26 councils were assessed in this way; the evaluation did not detail the extent of the material review.
- Program Assessment Rubric (PAR)—all 26 councils were assessed with this tool, which was created specifically for this program. Results from the PAR helped to determine how sites were chosen for other assessments (see below).
 - Items measured in the PAR include: length of time program has existed at the council; the

degree of emphasis on PAVE goals; programmatic successes/challenges; general/specific observed impacts and changes in participants; target population of program; number of sites served; number of girls served; number, length, and frequency of sessions provided; age, race, ethnicity, cultural background of girls; program setting; topics emphasized in program; and curricula used.

- Adult surveys (program staff)—10 councils were assessed.
- Middle school girls' survey—nine councils were assessed; high school students and middle school students were assessed separately.
- High school girls' survey—nine councils were assessed; high school students and middle school students were assessed separately.
- Adult interviews—five success case study councils.
- Girl group interviews—five success case study councils.
- Session observations—five success case study councils.
- Council material review—five success case study councils.

Elements of Success

- Community partnerships
- Peer support network
- Personal relationships with staff
- Professional development for staff

Funding

The PAVE program and the evaluation referenced above is funded through a grant to Girl Scouts of the USA from the US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Due to a change in the amount of DOJ funding made available to Girl Scouts of the USA during the 2007–2008 grant cycle, there are nine PAVE-funded councils during the current program year.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Alison M. Trachtman Hill, MPA
Project Manager, PAVE the Way
(*Project Anti-Violence Education*)
Girl Scouts of the USA
420 Fifth Avenue, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10018
646-522-7092
212-852-6515 fax
ahill@girlscouts.org

Evaluation Contact

James Riedel
Senior Researcher
Girl Scouts Research Institute
420 5th Ave # 9
New York, NY 10018
212-852-6552
Jriedel@girlscouts.org

Sources Used

Eichinger, M. K., et al., of the Improve Group. (2007, March). *PAVE the Way (Project Anti-Violence Education) Evaluation DRAFT Report for Girl Scouts of the USA*.

Other Resources

http://www.girlscouts.org/program/program_opportunities/community/

<http://www.nassembly.org/nydic/programming/newideas/documents/PAVETHEWAY.pdf>

http://www.theimprovethegroup.com/girlscouts_usa.html

Project Morry

Target Population	Middle school students
Evaluation	Program to Watch; nonexperimental study followed cohort for four years
Findings	Overall scores for anger of all campers dropped; scores for life effectiveness and protective factors increased
Elements of Success	Education system alignment Experiential learning Safe environment Structured program Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

Project Morry is a nonprofit, year-round youth development organization, anchored by a residential summer camp with an educational focus. It has changed its name to Project Morry to better reflect the fact that the camp has a year-round structure and is not only a summer camp. Project Morry focuses on building academic skills and improving youths' leadership, self-esteem, social skills, core values, and personal responsibility. Enrollment in the four-year "Undergrad" (previously named "4x4") program of the camp starts the summer before youths' 5th-grade year and ends the summer they enter 8th grade. Students are expected to participate every summer. After graduation from the Undergrad program, students can reapply to the "Postgrad" program, which is available for the next five summers, the last one being the summer after high school graduation. The camp is four weeks long each summer for Undergrads and varies for Postgrads (four-week minimum). The year-round component consists of monthly gatherings aimed to help students focus on personal goal achievement.

Key Findings

One of the key findings was that the camp experience led to positive changes in the youth. After controlling for variables such as maturation, the evidence indicated the camp experience was a critical link to change. A second finding was that the six-month follow-up data showed much of the positive change that occurred while at camp was not maintained, which indicated the need for continued focused support once the youth return to their communities. Lastly, while most of the four-year overall findings were not statistically significant, many individual years' pretest and posttest outcomes were indeed significant. For example, boys showed a statistically significant drop in their four-year overall anger scores, and the overall four years' scores for all program participants for anger, life effectiveness, and protective factors indicated positive effects. Outcomes reported below are for both boys and girls unless stated otherwise.

First-Year Findings

- Anger: Frustration level and authority relations dropped from pretest to posttest.
- Protective Factors: Neighborhood resources and conventional behavior decreased from posttest to six-month follow-up (negative outcome).

Second-Year Findings

- **Anger:** Decrease in overall anger from pretest to posttest, but increased significantly from posttest to six-month follow-up. These two statistics together lead to “no statistical significance” between preprogram anger levels and six-month follow-up anger levels.
- **Life Effectiveness:** Task leadership and emotional control increased from pretest to posttest. From posttest to six-month follow-up, there was an increase in overall life effectiveness, with significant increases in all subscales except emotional control from posttest to six-month follow-up. From pretest to six-month follow-up, the increase in overall life effectiveness was still statistically significant for all subscales except intellectual flexibility, active initiative, and self confidence.

Third-Year Findings

- **Anger:** Overall anger scores decreased from pretest to posttest and again from posttest to six-month follow-up.
- **Protective Factors:** neighborhood resources increased significantly.

Fourth-Year Findings

- **Anger:** Boys showed a drop in overall anger, dropping from 47.4 at the beginning of their second year to 39.2 at the end of their last year.
- **Life Effectiveness:** Achievement motivation and task leadership scores increased for males.
- **Protective Factors:** Neighborhood resources and positive attitude toward the future increased for campers.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Students who attend partnering schools and programs are eligible for the Undergrad program.
- Partners include the Bridgeport (Connecticut) School District, Elmsford Union Free School District (New York), P.S. 73 in the Bronx; Stanley M. Isaacs Neighborhood Center (New York),

and United North Amityville Youth Organization (New York).

- Students may only enter the program if they are referred first by a teacher or social worker. The students must also “demonstrate effort at school” (this term is not specifically defined, but the Education and Coaching Coordinator for Project Morry explained, “Our kids are not the best of the best, nor the worst of the worst. They are generally recognized as kids who need a chance. That said, they are not chosen using any academic criteria, other than they must pass each grade level and avoid summer school in order to participate in the required summer camp component.”
- Students must fill out an application, must have parent/guardian support, and must commit to year-round involvement.
- Students applying for the Postgrad program must fill out a more rigorous application, including writing an essay on how they will “make a difference.” Students must have references and demonstrated past parental/guardian involvement.

Program Components

Undergrad Program Components

- The Undergrad summer program focuses on seven areas identified by the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) for academic reinforcement, which include: arts, economics, geography, math, reading, science, and writing.
- Summer camp activities are academically focused but “experiential” in practice; for example, a Senior Researcher at the American Camp Association (ACA) explained that the youth had a “50s Night” as a culmination of the research they had been doing on 1950s history.
- During the summer, youth also participate in 60–90-minute sessions that focus on particular subject areas like Civil Rights or US government, and they work in teams on project-based lessons and activities. There is also a library, and one hour per day is dedicated to staff storytelling. There are also recreational activities like canoeing, hiking, and camp fires.

- Monthly School Year Gatherings also happen throughout the year as part of the Undergrad program after school and on weekends during the school year. Students meet to write about and discuss the goals they set for themselves related to school, home, and camp.

Postgrad Program Components

- The Postgrad program focuses more on life skills, educational opportunities, and leadership.
- The summer program involves outdoor adventure and challenges, service-learning, and an academic component that includes literacy, college preparation, and post-high school opportunities.
- During the summer, students visit colleges, museums, and historic sites.
- School Year Gatherings continue monthly throughout the Postgrad program to assess student goals and progress.

Overview of Evaluation

The study was a nonexperimental, cohort study that followed one cohort of 5th-grade students throughout their four years in the Undergrad Program. The evaluation measured youth development outcomes, even though the program itself is largely academically focused. A Senior Researcher at the American Camp Association (ACA) stated that Project Morry's logic model emphasizes that in order for students to excel academically, they must learn social skills. Therefore, the program promotes youth development foci in all the academic activities, such as teaching leadership through doing math activities and teaching emotional control through group projects. Project Morry believes this logic model is essential to its success. There was not a control group used, but the Senior Research at ACA stated the program participants were indeed compared against "preset norms," matched on factors such as gender, race, and income status. Qualitative and quantitative data collection methods were used. The camp partnered with the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, to conduct the study.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- All of the youth in the program who agreed to fill out surveys within the four-year evaluation term were deemed the study's population.
- Population participants ranged greatly from year to year due to attrition and due to the fact that not all participants filled out evaluations consistently. In the first year, only 29 campers participated in the program, but this number increased each year. Year 1 was deemed a "pilot year," and the Year 2 participants were added to the cohort, totaling 54.
- Response rates varied from year to year, with the number of evaluations collected ranging from a low of 24 to a high of 54.
- The evaluation sample included 26 female and 28 male children from "urban at-risk communities in and around New York City."
- Approximately 24.1 percent of the sample were African American, 18.5 percent were Hispanic, 3.7 percent were Caucasian, and 53.7 percent were Other, Mixed, or Undeclared.

Evaluation Methodology

The study was longitudinal in design and utilized mixed methods of data collection. Pretest, posttest and six-month follow-up assessments were given to measure anger, life effectiveness, and protective factors.

Outcomes Evaluated

- Anger (frustration level, physical aggression, etc.)
- Life Effectiveness (time management, social competence, task leadership, self-confidence, etc.)
- Protective Factors (neighborhood resources, caring adults, models for conventional behavior, ability to work out conflicts, etc.)

Quantitative Instruments Used

- Children's Inventory of Anger, which measures anger on a scale of 1–4 with 39 questions (reliability: .93).

- Life Effectiveness Questionnaire, which has a scale of 1–8 with 29 questions (reliability: .82).
- Protective Factor Scale, which has a scale of 1–7 with 30 questions (reliability: .68).

Qualitative Instruments Used

- Parent interviews.
- Camper journals.
- Focus groups with campers.
- Photo elicitation.
- Open-ended evaluation surveys.

Elements of Success

- Education system alignment
- Experiential learning
- Safe environment
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

The program is mostly funded by individuals and foundations. The evaluation was completely funded through general operating costs.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Lance W. Ozier
 Education and Mentor Coordinator
 Project Morry, Inc.
 914-806-3617
 lance@projectmorry.org,
 www.projectmorry.org

Research Contact

M. Deborah Bialeschki
 Senior Researcher
 American Camp Association
 5000 State Road 67 North
 Martinsville, Indiana 46151-7902
 (Home Office: 2419 Spruce Ave
 Estes Park, CO 80517)
 765-342-8456 ext. 318
 dbialeschki@ACAcamps.org
 www.ACAcamps.org
 www.CampParents.org

Sources Used

Bialeschki, M.D., Lyons, K., & Thompson, A.K.
 (2006, January 13). Four Years at Morry's Camp:
 A Longitudinal Study of Youth Development Out-
 comes of the Morry's Camp Experience.

Other Resources

www.projectmorry.org
 www.ACAcamps.org
 www.CampParents.org

Project Venture

Target Population	Primarily serves students in Grades 5–8; has been adapted for older teens as well
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness
Findings	Participants showed less of an increase in alcohol and drug use than nonparticipants
Elements of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on needs and interests of American Indian Youth High-quality program implementation Program evaluation Safe environment Structured program Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

Project Venture (PV) is an outdoor, adventure-based, experiential youth development program designed for high-risk American Indian (AI) youth that was first implemented in 1990 by the National Indian Youth Leadership Project (NIYLP). The goals of PV are for AI youth to develop positive self concept, effective social and communication skills, a community-service ethic, self-efficacy, and increased decision-making and problem-solving skills to build generalized resilience which can then be transferred to resistance of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. The model is guided by traditional AI values such as a focus on family, learning from the natural world, spiritual awareness, service to others, and respect. PV has served more than 4,000 youth to date in New Mexico and has been adopted by more than 60 AI and other schools and communities nationwide. The program operates year-round, including summer.

Key Findings

Key findings focus on alcohol and drug use for the treatment and control groups. In general, program participants demonstrated less of an increase in alcohol and drug use than nonparticipants (statistically significant with 95 percent confidence). Composite substance use (cigarette, marijuana, alcohol, and other) was measured by how many days in the last month youth used substances of any kind. Alcohol use was

measured by how many days in the last month participants had an alcoholic drink.

- Baseline outcomes indicated 9 percent of participants in both the treatment and control groups used alcohol at least once in the past month.
- Alcohol use for both participant and control groups increased after the baseline survey, but the treatment group leveled off, whereas the control group continued to increase at a 95 percent significance level.
- At the six-month follow-up, 40 percent of the treatment group reported using alcohol on at least one occasion in the past month versus 63 percent for the control group.
- At the 18-month follow-up, 35 percent of the treatment group reported using alcohol on at least one occasion in the past month versus 72 percent of control group participants.
- The results show a statistically significant difference in linear trends at a 95 percent significance level.

Program Population/Eligibility

- PV primarily serves students in Grades 5-8, but the program has been adapted for older teens as well. The AI population is generally considered an at-risk population.

- The great majority of youth in Native American communities are of low socioeconomic status (SES) by many measures.
- According to evaluators, McKinley County, New Mexico, is one of the poorest counties in the nation, with 85 percent of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch programs.
- Data from the Kids Count 2001 report and the US Census 2001 poverty report reveal that “McKinley County, with its high American Indian population, is the third most poverty-stricken county out of the 3,141 counties in the nation in terms of percentage of children living in poverty. Of children ages 5–17, more than 37 percent are from families below the poverty line. Per capita annual income has averaged \$11,700. On the Navajo Reservation, unemployment can exceed 40 percent.”
- PV is a self-referral program, because its staff do not want the stigma of only serving at-risk youth. Staff do, however, act on informal referrals from teachers and other adults in the school. Therefore, there is a range of youth with risk factors represented in this program. These may be youth who are not already engaged in other organized activities, such as sports or clubs, and might benefit from a positive youth development activity after school.
- Youth are recruited from the in-school sessions to attend intensive weekly afterschool programs, monthly weekend sessions, and summer camp.

Program Components

- PV does not specifically provide direct drug and alcohol education, resistance skills, or antidrug norms components. Instead, the program model is based on “habilitation,” or developing positive, preventative, youth development approaches. The program consists of classroom-based and outdoor experiential learning, adventure camps, wilderness treks, and community-oriented service learning, as follows:
- In-school program incorporates weekly problem-solving games and initiatives, developmentally sequenced.
- Weekly afterschool, weekend, and summer skill-building experiential activities and monthly challenge activities like hiking and camping.

Specific program components were not described in detail in the evaluation but are included in the Project Venture Replication Guide (available from NIYLP). The PV evaluation coordinator for the NIYLP explained:

- The afterschool weekday component includes a minimum of 20 afterschool sessions per school year with each session usually lasting about two hours, depending on transportation availability, etc.
- The weekend/holiday component includes at least one day-long (or overnight or longer) event per month, which allows for more intensive activities. The in-school and afterschool activities provide youth training in outdoor and camping skills needed for the more technically intense weekend activities.
- Summer camp immersion program for 7–10 days. The program recommends at least seven days in a wilderness setting. If a camp is not available, an extended backpacking trip is recommended.
- Service learning projects are infused throughout all activities, rather than as stand-alone activities. For example, a weekend backpacking trip might include trail repairs for the US Forest Service.
- Older teens who serve as junior staff members are present throughout the weekend and holiday and camp activities. Many of these youth will be Project Venture middle school alumni.
- The school year program culminates in a multiday wilderness experiential outing and community service learning project for which youth have prepared throughout the school year. Summer activities continue the wilderness and service learning activities and include a 7-10 day leadership camp.

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation used an experimental design in which schools were assigned to treatment or control conditions. In 1996, the NIYLP was invited by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) to participate in the National Cross-Site Study of High Risk Youth Programs. Study measures included alcohol and other drug use. Evaluations have been conducted annually since program inception and an outcomes chronology is updated annually and available through the contact source listed below. The chronology includes risk and resilience measures.

Evaluation Population

- The study compared outcomes from 6th-grade students at two randomly assigned middle schools in McKinley County, New Mexico.
- According to the evaluation, the ethnic distribution of youth in the participant and control groups was 75 percent AI, 16 percent Hispanic, 5 percent White, and 3 percent other. Treatment and control groups were well-matched at baseline on demographic and substance use measures.

Study Methodology

- Two middle schools with similar demographics in Gallup, New Mexico (McKinley County), were randomly assigned to treatment and control group conditions. The treatment group received all program components, and the control group received none. The treatment group was enrolled in PV for one year.
- The CSAP National Youth Survey was administered to both groups at baseline, six months after exit, and 18 months after exit. The CSAP tool assesses “actual” substance use as well as related risk and protective factors.
- The sample included 397 6th-grade students, with 262 students in the treatment group and 135 in the control group.
- All 397 students completed baseline surveys in Fall 1996.
- A six-month follow-up was completed by 222 treatment youth and 124 control youth, approximately one year after baseline.
- An 18-month follow-up was completed by 162 treatment youth and 98 control youth, approximately two years after baseline.
- Of the original sample, 98 control youth and 162 treatment youth completed all three surveys, and only these matched surveys were used as the actual sample in the analysis.

Elements of Success

- Focus on needs and interests of American Indian Youth
- Safe environment
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

The study was funded by CSAP. Its contractors, EMT Associates and Macro International, also helped with funding and training for a research assistant to conduct the study.

NIYLP no longer receives funding from CSAP. The major current funder is the New Mexico Department of Health, Office of Substance Abuse Prevention. This is supplemented by foundation grants.

Contact Information

Susan Carter
 Evaluation Coordinator for the NIYLP
 National Indian Youth Leadership Project
 P.O. Box 2140
 Gallup, NM 87301-4711
 505-783-4340
 susancarter@hughes.net

Sources Used

- Carter, S. & Straits, K. (2007). “Project Venture: Evaluation of a Positive, Culture-Based Approach to Substance Abuse Prevention with American Indian Youth.” *Technical Report*. McClellan Hall, The National Indian Youth Leadership Project.
- Carter, S., Straits, J., & Hall, M. (2007). “Project Venture: Evaluation of a Positive, Culture-Based Approach to Substance Abuse Prevention with American Indian Youth.” *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(3), (397–400).

Other Resources

http://niyplp.org/programs/project_venture

Quantum Opportunities Program Demonstration: Final Impact Report

Target Population	Youth in Grade 9 with low grades entering public high schools with high dropout rates
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness
Findings	Positive effects on high school graduation rates and college enrollment were found for some students, however QOP did not achieve its primary or secondary goals
Elements of Success	Comprehensive services Fidelity to model Financial incentives Personal relationships with staff Structured program

Overview of Program

The Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP) offers intensive and comprehensive services to youth at risk of dropping out of high school in order to keep them in school or reenroll them in secondary education or training. QOP's comprehensive design includes case management, mentoring, supplemental afterschool education, developmental activities, community service activities, comprehensive supportive services, and financial incentives. Programming is offered beginning in 9th grade and continuing year-round until graduation or for five years, even if a youth drops out of school or becomes incarcerated after becoming involved in the program. The primary goals of the program are to increase high school graduation rates and enrollment in postsecondary education or training. The secondary goals are to improve high school grades and test scores and reduce risky behaviors such as substance abuse, crime, and teen parenting.

Key Findings

Overall, QOP did not achieve its primary or secondary goals; however, beneficial effects on high school graduation rates and college enrollment, for example, were found for some students, such as students who were ages 14 or younger when entering 9th grade ("on-time" students) and for youth at the Cleveland, Ohio, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Washington, DC, sites. Program implementation and outcomes varied across the seven sites. Outcomes were reported on high school graduation rates, enrollment in postsecondary education or training, high school grades, test scores, and risky behaviors, as well as the fidelity of program implementation. There were no impacts found for youth at the Memphis, Tennessee; Fort Worth, Texas; Houston, Texas; and Yakima, Washington sites.

The evaluation strongly notes that the program implementation varied widely across the seven sites. The majority of the programs did not implement the program model faithfully. The evaluation explains that Philadelphia was the only truly faithful site, as it was run by the community-based organization that helped created the QOP model.

Outcomes for Participation in QOP

- Youth ages 14 and younger at the start of program increased their likelihood of graduating with a high school diploma or GED by six points; and increased the likelihood of attending college, vocational/technical school, apprenticeship, or the military by 10 points.⁷³
- At the Cleveland site, the likelihood of earning a diploma/GED increased by 19 points;⁷⁴ attending college increased by 18 points;⁷⁵ and earning a bachelor's degree increased by 6 points.⁷⁶ The likelihood of receiving welfare was reduced by 19 points,⁷⁷ but the likelihood of committing crime increased by 13 points.⁷⁸
- At the Philadelphia site, the likelihood of attending college increased by 18 points,⁷⁹ and the likelihood of receiving welfare was reduced by 23 points.⁸⁰
- At the Washington, DC, site, the likelihood of attending postsecondary school/training increased by 15 points,⁸¹ and the likelihood of completing two years of college or military service increased by 19 points.⁸²
- At the Memphis site, there was a slight decrease in the number of participants reporting poor health (9 percent less),⁸³ but all other significant effects were detrimental.
- At the Houston and Yakima sites, all significant effects were detrimental, and Fort Worth showed no significant effects.
- Overall, participation did not increase the likelihood of graduating from high school with a diploma or GED.

⁷³ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁷⁴ Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

⁷⁵ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁷⁶ Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

⁷⁷ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁷⁸ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁷⁹ Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

⁸⁰ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁸¹ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁸² Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

⁸³ Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

- Participation did not increase the likelihood of engaging in postsecondary education or training.
- Participation did not increase the likelihood of becoming employed.
- Participation did not increase the likelihood of improving grades or test scores.
- Participation did not generally decrease the likelihood of risk behaviors in the long-term (early- to mid-20s), although it seems to have reduced illegal drug use by 6 percent.⁸⁴ However, the likelihood of participants committing a crime in the last three months increased by 3 percentage points,⁸⁵ and being arrested or charged with a crime in the last two years increased by 6 percentage points.⁸⁶

Program Population/Eligibility

Youth in Grade 9 with low grades (under the 67th percentile on 8th-grade standardized tests) entering public high schools with high dropout rates (40 percent or higher).

Program Components

- Primarily an afterschool program providing case management and mentoring, supplemental education, developmental activities, community service activities, supportive services, and financial incentives.
- Supportive services include snacks, transportation assistance, and other services as needed, including child care, health and mental health services, and substance abuse treatment.
- Designed to be comprehensive and address all barriers to success, with services provided year-round for up to five years.
- The program model prescribed that each case manager work with 15 to 25 enrollees; specified enrollees participate for 750 hours annually. Information on frequency of participation was not provided in the evaluation.

⁸⁴ Findings are statistically significant with a 95 percent CI.

⁸⁵ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

⁸⁶ Findings are statistically significant with a 90 percent CI.

- QOP provides youth with three types of financial incentives to attend program activities:
 - A stipend of approx \$1.25 for every hour devoted to educational activities, developmental activities that were not purely recreational, and community service.
 - A matching amount either set aside or deposited in an accrual account that was promised to the enrollee when he or she earned a high school diploma or GED certificate and enrolled in college, a certified apprenticeship program, an accredited vocational/technical training program, or the armed forces.
 - A bonus for completing major program activities for enrollees in some sites.

Overview of Evaluation

The random assignment evaluation, conducted by Mathematica, and funded by the US Department of Labor (DOL) and the Ford Foundation, was conducted in seven cities between 1995 and 2001: Memphis, Tennessee; Cleveland, Ohio; Washington, DC; Fort Worth, Texas; Houston, Texas; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Yakima, Washington. Data from four surveys were used to determine the impact of program participation on: high school graduation rates, enrollment in postsecondary education or training (evaluation's primary goals); high school grades, high school standardized test scores and risky behaviors (evaluation's secondary goals); and the fidelity of program implementation. About 1,100 eligible youth were randomly assigned to the statistically identical treatment or control group and were followed for five years (1995-2000).

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- The demonstration targeted youth (9th-grade students) with low grades (under the 67th percentile on 8th-grade test scores) entering high schools with high dropout rates (40 percent or higher).
- Most schools served primarily Black or Hispanic populations.
- Randomly selected eligible youth were enrolled in QOP and were served even if they transferred schools, dropped out, became incarcerated, or became inactive in QOP for a long time.

- About 1,100 youth were followed as a cohort for five years (1995-2000).

Study Methodology

- Eligible students from the chosen schools were randomly assigned either to participate (treatment group) or not participate (control group) in the QOP programs.
- Treatment and control groups were statistically identical.

Data Collection

- Baseline data were collected from five sources:
 - Database used to determine QOP eligibility (8th-grade GPA and the name of the school attended at the beginning of 9th grade, date of birth, and for some schools, sex, race, or ethnicity).
 - Telephone survey administered during the fall and winter of the fifth year after sample members entered the 9th grade.
 - High school transcripts.
 - QOP case managers.
- The first of three telephone surveys was conducted during the fifth year of the demonstration and the second telephone survey was conducted two years after the end of the demonstration, more than two years before the third telephone survey.
- The third evaluation survey began a little more than three years after sample members were scheduled to graduate from high school; two years after scheduled graduation in the Washington, DC, site, where the demonstration was implemented one year later than the other sites.
- The fourth and final telephone survey was administered nearly six years after most sample participants were scheduled to graduate from high school. (Program operations began one year late in Washington, DC, so the telephone survey was administered nearly five years after most sample members in DC, were scheduled to graduate from high school.)
- Standardized achievement test scores in reading and mathematics were collected.

Elements of Success

- Comprehensive services
- Fidelity to model
- Financial incentives
- Personal relationships with staff
- Structured program

Funding

- Five of the sites were funded by DOL, and the other two were funded by the Ford Foundation. DOL funded the evaluation of the demonstration.
- The total cost of QOP per enrollee over the full five-year demonstration period was \$18,000 to \$22,000 for DOL-funded sites; \$23,000 for the Yakima site; and \$49,000 for the Philadelphia site. These figures do not include the cost of the technical assistance that was provided to sites.
- The total QOP expenditure per enrollee averaged \$25,000 for the full five years of the demonstration.

Contact Information

Program Contact

C. Benjamin Lattimore
Director, Office of National Literacy Programs
Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc.
1415 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122
215-236-4500
CBEL2@aol.com

Evaluation Contact

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
600 Maryland Ave., SW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
202-484-9220

Sources Used

Schirm, A., Stuart, E., McKie, A. (2006, July). The Quantum Opportunity Program Demonstration: Final Impacts. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Other Resources

See MPR's website for many more QOP reports:
<http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/education/qop.asp>.

Seeds to Success

Target Population	Students ages 14–18 with an IEP
Evaluation	Program to Watch; nonexperimental evaluation conducted internally without a control group
Findings	Improvements in money management and banking skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, developing workforce readiness skills, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology
Elements of Success	Active programming Community support Education system alignment Experiential learning Structured program Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

Seeds to Success is a youth farm stand project that began in 2003. Its mission is to provide workforce preparation to teens; create retail outlets that bring affordable, nutritious foods to consumers and improve food security; teach teens life skills; offer service learning for youth and economic development opportunities for local farmers and communities; and offer career training internships to college youth, who act as supervisors for the high school students. Seeds to Success combines basic financial management, nutrition and food safety education, food systems education, and workforce readiness training with employment opportunities, internships, economic development projects, community service, and food security initiatives. It is located in Gloucester County, New Jersey. In 2007, Seeds to Success became the first youth farm stand in New Jersey to qualify as an authorized food stamp vendor, allowing customers to purchase produce with food stamps. Programming is delivered during both the school year and summer. Seeds to Success is comprised of two in-school components, FUNdamental Finance (a financial basics course and assessment) and Jersey Fit (a healthy lifestyles and fitness course and assessment), as well as an eight-week summer farm stand work readiness component.

Key Findings

The key findings for the evaluation reflect participant improvements in money management and banking skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, developing workforce readiness skills, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology.

- *Knowledge of financial basics:* The FUNdamental Finance for Farm Stands Assessment was used to determine if students developed money management and banking skills, including how to complete a bank check, deposit slip, and check register. Of the 102 students in four schools taking the pretests and posttests, the pretest mean score (on a scale of 1–5) was 2.66 and the posttest mean was 3.61 (26 percent improvement). (See below.)

Through the four-week series FUNdamental Finance for Farm Stands, special needs teens in four high schools learned personal financial skills, cash register operations, and basic banking procedures. This series reached 666 youth in a five-year period. Pretests and posttests were used to measure the increase in ability to correctly complete a bank check, prepare a deposit slip, and record a check register. The following shows

Year	Number of Students		Pretest Score	Posttest Score	Pretest-Posttest Score Difference
	Pretest	Posttest			
2008*	160	149	30.2%	66.5%	36.3
2007*	118	102	41.3%	61.4%	20.1
2006	133	118	51.0%	72.6%	21.6
2005	93	91	47.3%	71.2%	23.9
2004	68	42	38.5%	66.5%	28.0

* Includes additional data on completion of a check register.

overall annual (pretest and posttest) results and follow-up data for special needs students since 2004 (see table above).

- **Healthy lifestyle practices:** Through Jersey Fit, 140 student completed pretests and posttests. Students identified healthier foods: 61 percent at pretest, 74 percent at posttest; fruits that did not grow locally: 21 percent to 68 percent; and fruits and vegetables grown locally: 54 percent to 74 percent (fruits) and 42 percent to 78 percent (vegetables). Students also improved their understanding of USDA recommendations through farm stand work and their ability to handle food safely.⁸⁷
- **Workforce readiness:** Twenty-six youth completed pretests and posttests that assessed how to fill out a check correctly, with the mean score from pretest to posttest increasing from 4.25 to 4.9 (number of questions answered correctly out of 12). Students also participated in a Skill-A-Thon at both the beginning and end of the summer, using the SCANS Skills and Competencies Checklist. The youth were tested on: produce identification, use of scale and knowledge of weights, knowledge of produce measurement terms, ability to make change and process government vouchers, bagging produce, and use of a cash register. Youth are scored by supervisors who watch them so that paper and pencil tests are not needed. There was a statistically significant increase in scores for all six indicators together, but only one (bagging produce) reached significance on its own.⁸⁸ On

skills that were measured such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, and fairness, 15 of 18 indicators had statistically significant positive outcomes from pretest to posttest.⁸⁹

- The youth retention rate was 89 percent in 2004 and 100 percent in 2007 and 2008.
- Secondary outcomes regarding economic and community development, community service, and food security were also assessed. Outcomes, measured qualitatively, are positive. Qualitative outcomes regarding how the communities perceive the farm stands were also positive.

Program Population and Eligibility

- Participants range in age from 14–18 and attend Woodbury, Paulsboro, and Glassboro high schools, as well as Bankbridge Regional School, an alternative school for special needs youth. Up to one-third of the students in the summer program come from the Bankbridge Regional School.
- Youth served must have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and most youth are from low-income families.
- The communities of Woodbury and Paulsboro were targeted, because they are lower-income communities where at least 20 percent of the population lives in households with incomes below the poverty level.

⁸⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁸⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

⁸⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome is not due to chance ($p < .05$).

Totals listed by Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Caucasian/White	12	13	11	9	10	6
African American/Black	11	13	20	20	12	14
Hispanic/Latino	—	2	3	2	4	4
Asian	—	—	1	1	—	—
Total	26	28	34	32	26	24

Diversity Information: As outlined in the 2000 Gloucester County Demographic Survey, 46 percent of households in Paulsboro and 38 percent of households in both Woodbury and Glassboro fall at or below the federal poverty level. The farm stands bring economic development in at-risk communities in the following ways: employment benefits to local special needs youth, expanded markets for local farmers, and availability of fresh nutritious produce to residents. The farm stands accept Food Stamps, WIC and Senior Farm Market coupons, so limited resource persons have a convenient way to redeem their vouchers and access healthy fresh produce for themselves and their families. In the five years of operation from 2003—2007, the youth employment demographics include the following (see table above).

All employed youth have qualified for the project because each one possesses an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The IEP promotes supported transition from school to the workplace. The plan is based on individual needs and current abilities. The retention rate of these youth is exemplary with an average of 95 percent completing their work experience each year. Due to the limitations of the program each employee is able to work only for four years. In the fifth year, 12 of the 26 youth were first-year employees, two worked for four years, four for three years, and eight returned for a second year. In the limited resource communities in which these young people live, these retention rates for long term work are noteworthy. The widening population growth and increased diversity within Gloucester County is reflected in the broad racial and cultural representation, as detailed above.

- Between 100–125 students are served through FUNDamental Finance annually, and about 200–250 are served annually through Jersey Fit.

- Schools help the program coordinators identify youth who are eligible (i.e. appropriate motor skills) and who they believe would thrive in the program. Students in Grades 9 and 10 are especially recruited because they are less likely to have already had work experience.
- Interested teens complete a job application and are interviewed.

Program Components

Students receive the finance and nutrition programs in their regular classes (mostly health, physical education, math, and science classes). In two schools, the guidance counselors are the administrators; in one school, a teacher is the administrator; at Bankbridge, the school-to-work coordinator administers the finance and nutrition programs. Seeds to Success has developed its own series on money and banking entitled “FUNDamental Finance for Farm Stands.”

- *Financial basics:* The FUNDamental Finance program is offered in school. The four-week course assesses correctly completing a bank check, deposit slip, and check register.
- *Healthy lifestyle practices:* The Jersey Fit program is offered in school. Youth participate in an eight-week food safety and nutrition intervention, which includes hands-on, skill-building activities and games, encourages youth to consume more fruits and vegetables, and teaches youth how to read Nutrition Facts Labels.
- *Workforce readiness through farm stand work:* Students who are selected complete training prior to starting work and continue to receive regularly scheduled training sessions during the summer and

throughout the school year to operate their farm stands. Students are assessed as they work at the farm stand during the summer on using a scale, writing checks, using the price list, and writing a resume. They are also assessed on trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, decision-making, and citizenship. Minimum wage is paid to the students when they work at the farm stand.

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation was nonexperimental and conducted internally without a control group. Outcomes reflected participant improvements in money management and banking skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, developing workforce readiness skills, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology (scales, calculator, and cash register).

Evaluation Population

Various numbers of students completed the pretests and posttests depending on how many youth were participating in each component of the program.

Methodology

- Pretests and posttests were used to measure financial basics, healthy lifestyle practices and workforce readiness through farmstand work, and scales were mostly used to assess changes from pretest to posttest.
- There was no control group.
- College interns served as supervisors and rated students with checklists and observations to assess competence in the Skill-A-Thon skills and in the SCANS Skills and Competencies Checklist (this method is used because many of the youth have difficulty writing).
- The SCANS Skills and Competencies Checklists assessed whether participation in the youth farm stand increased youth workplace competencies in the areas of utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology. Farm stand supervisors used the checklist to rate students as Needs Improvement, Shows Improvement, Satisfactory, Outstanding, or Not Applicable.

- Students also took written tests for in-school components to assess their knowledge on nutrition, filling out a check, etc.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Community support
- Education system alignment
- Experiential learning
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding/Costs

Funding is provided by the Children, Youth, and Families-at-Risk: New Communities Project, US Department of Agriculture, CSREES, 2003-2008, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, Jersey Fresh Matched Funds, Grant, 2004-2008 Valero Refinery Benefit for Children Golf Classic, 2005-2008, Borough of Glassboro (New Jersey), Neighborhood Preservation Funding, Program, 2005-2008 Glassboro (New Jersey) School District, 2005. (Taken from <http://www.national4-hheadquarters.gov/about/pod-leadership/seeds2success.pdf>)

Contact Information

Program and Evaluation Contact

Linda Strieter
 County 4-H Agent Rutgers Cooperative Extension of Gloucester County
 Offices of Government Services
 1200 N. Delsea Drive
 Clayton, NJ 08312
 856-307-6450, extension #2
 strieter@aesop.rutgers.edu

Luanne J. Hughes, MS, RD: Family & Community Health
Cooperative Extension of Gloucester County
Rutgers New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station
County Government Services Building
1200 N. Delsea Drive
Clayton, NJ 08312-1095
856-307-6450, extension #2
hughes@aesop.rutgers.edu

Sources Used

Hughes, L., Strieter, L., (2007). Seeds to Success Final Outcomes Report (Internal Report). Rutgers, New Jersey: The State University of New Jersey.

Other Resources

<http://cyfar.rutgers.edu/seeds.asp>

Study of Promising After-School Programs Final Report

Target Population	Middle school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; two-year study compared participants at three different levels of program participation
Findings	Gains in standardized test scores and work habits as well as reductions in behavior problems among disadvantaged students; Positive academic and behavior outcomes were found for Program Plus and Program Only participants
Elements of Success	Active programming Collaboration with schools Community partnerships High-quality and devoted staff Peer support network Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

More than 200 programs were reviewed by the study's research team in the process of identifying 35 high-quality afterschool programs to be included in the Study of Promising After-School Programs. The 35 programs selected for inclusion in the study offered services four or five days per week and were free of charge to students. In all programs, students were found to be engaged with one another and with program activities, and the group leaders typically structured activities to maximize learning and positive relationships. Disruptive behavior was rarely seen, and the adult leaders were found to manage any student disruptions calmly and constructively. The programs offered a mix of age-appropriate enrichment and recreational activities, as well as tutoring and games designed to improve math and reading skills, community service, and arts opportunities.

Key Findings

Overall, a link was found between regular participation in high-quality afterschool programs and significant gains in standardized test scores and work habits, as well as reductions in behavior problems among disadvantaged students, offsetting the negative impact of a lack of supervision after school.

Positive academic and behavior outcomes were found for Program Plus and Program Only participants.

Findings in the evaluation were reported separately for academic outcomes and behavior outcomes and for elementary and middle school students based on level of program participation.

All findings reported are statistically significant with an effect size of .20 or $-.20$ or larger.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ An effect size measures the strength of the relationship between the variables being measured (program participation and academic and behavior indicators). In general, an effect size up to .20 is considered small, .20 to .40 is considered moderate and .40 and above is considered large

Middle School Student Outcomes Outcomes from Achievement Test Scores

- Statistically significant improvements from baseline to Year 2 were seen in math scores for program-plus and program-only participants versus low-supervision participants;⁹¹ no statistically significant improvements were found for reading.

Outcomes from the Student Report

- Statistically significant improvements from baseline to Year 2 were seen in work habits for program-plus and program-only participants versus low-supervision participants.⁹²
- Statistically significant decreases were found for misconduct⁹³ and substance use⁹⁴ for Program Plus and Program Only participants versus Low Supervision participants.

Outcomes from the Teacher Report

- No statistically significant outcomes were reported for middle school students from the Teacher Report.

Program Population and Eligibility

- Of the 35 programs, 16 served middle school students.
- Programs were based either in schools or in community centers that coordinated with nearby schools.
- The programs were located in Bridgeport, Connecticut; Denver, Colorado; Los Angeles, Oakland, San Diego, and San Ysidro, California; Missoula, Montana; New York, New York; Central Falls and Pawtucket, Rhode Island; and Salem, Oregon.

⁹¹ Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of .57 for Program Plus and .55 for Program Only.

⁹² Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of .33 for Program Plus and .20 for Program Only.

⁹³ Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of -.64 for Program Plus and -.55 for Program Only.

⁹⁴ Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of -.67 for Program Plus and -.47 for Program Only.

- All programs served low-income, ethnically diverse youth in high-poverty communities.

Program Components

- The programs offered services four or five days per week at no cost to participants.
- Regular participation was expected throughout the year.
- The programs served at least 30 students in elementary school (Grades 3-4), middle school (Grades 6-7), or a combination of the two.
- Evaluation emphasized that strong partnerships with neighborhoods, schools, and community organizations were a strong component of all the programs.
- Programs were observed to nurture positive interpersonal relationships among students and to actively engage them.
- Programs had a mix of recreations, arts, and enrichment activities.
- Programs offered age-appropriate learning opportunities, including tutoring and games designed to improve math and reading skills, plus recreational activities, community-based service and other experiences, and arts opportunities.
- The staff was well-trained and all programs maintained low youth-to-staff ratios and strong connections with partner schools and with parents.
- Typically, students were highly engaged with one another and with the activities, and group leaders structured activities to maximize learning and positive relationships.
- The adults facilitated activities without imposing controls that limited student learning opportunities.
- Disruptive behavior was rarely observed, and when behavioral problems arose, the leaders managed them calmly and constructively.

Overview of Evaluation

The two-year study followed approximately 3,000 low-income, ethnically diverse elementary and middle school students from eight states in six metropolitan centers and six smaller urban and rural locations. The evaluation was designed to study relations between high-quality afterschool programs and academic and behavior outcomes for low-income students. Programs were rated “high-quality” if they consistently demonstrated evidence of supportive relationships between staff and child participants and between participants themselves, as well as rich and varied- academic support, recreation, arts, and other enrichment opportunities. The Study of Promising Afterschool Programs was grounded in a paradigm that all young people have the capacity to make healthy, positive choices if given the opportunity. The intermediate and longer-term outcomes measured were improved social skills and interpersonal behavior, improved grades and work habits, improved test scores, and reduced misconduct and risky behavior. This particular summary will provide information on the outcomes measured and findings for the middle school participants.

Evaluation Population

Approximately 3,000 low-income, ethnically diverse elementary and middle school students from eight states in six metropolitan centers and six smaller urban and rural locations were included.

- Approximately 50 percent of the students attended high-quality afterschool programs at their schools or in their communities.
- A total of 2,914 students (1,796 elementary school and 1,118 middle school) were studied; a lead researcher on the study explained that the youth chosen for the study were already enrolled in the schools that were affiliated with the programs selected for inclusion in the study. The number of students was narrowed based on parental permission to include the youth in the study.
- A lead researcher explained that included programs were required to be ethnically diverse and mainly serve economically disadvantaged youth.
- Average annual family incomes were less than \$20,000.

- Of the middle school students, 47 percent were male and 63 percent received free or reduced-price school lunch; 69 percent were students of color (49 percent Hispanic, 13 percent Black, and 7 percent Asian).
- The characteristics of the study participants mirrored the characteristics of the schools they attended.
- Of the middle school participants, 76 percent remained in the program, so data was collected on them at the end of the year.
- Of the middle school sample, 49 percent participated in one of the high-quality programs.

Methodology

- Teachers and youth completed surveys to measure the social (social skills with peers, prosocial conduct with peers), academic (grades, task persistence, work habits), and problematic (misconduct, substance use, aggression) actions of study participants.
- Standardized test scores in math and reading were collected on each child at three points over the two-year period; baseline, end of Year 1, and end of Year 2.
- Missing data due to attrition and failure to complete all assessments was taken into account.⁹⁵
- Youth were categorized into three groups based on their level of participation in afterschool programs. About two-thirds of program participants did not participate in other afterschool activities and were categorized Program Only; one-third attended the programs for two to three days per week and also participated in other organized afterschool activities and were categorized Program Plus; about 15 percent of the students spent one

⁹⁵ Missing data are replaced by a sample of observations drawn randomly from a multivariate distribution fit to the variable and covariates. Therefore, all observations are included in the analysis, and missing observations are treated as unknown only to the degree that they cannot be reliably inferred from other variables. The bias for missing data is reduced and standard errors for the model parameter estimates are computed correctly.

to three days per week unsupervised by adults and dropped in sporadically on organized activities and were categorized as Low Supervision.

- In order to determine if selected afterschool programs were protective for children and youth at risk for social and academic problems, researchers compared outcomes for participants in the Program Plus versus Low Supervision groups and Program Only versus Low Supervision groups from baseline to Year 2.
- Researchers controlled for gender, ethnicity, and family background (family income, family structure, maternal education, and maternal work).
- Analyses were conducted separately for elementary and middle school samples.
- The research team reviewed more than 200 programs, including published materials, recommendations from afterschool experts, evidence from evaluations, telephone interviews, document reviews, and site visits to determine the quality of 35 select programs that were included in the research study; 16 of the 35 programs served middle school students.
- The researchers used a rating system to assess programs for quality based on evidence of supportive relationships between staff and child participants and participants themselves, and rich and varied academic support, recreation, arts opportunities, and other enrichment activities.

Data Sources

- Achievement test scores provided data on academic achievement outcomes.
- A student self-report provided data on work habits, misconduct, and substance use.
- A teacher self-report provided data on academic performance, work habits, task persistence, social skills with peers, prosocial behavior with peers, and aggressive behavior with peers.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Collaboration with schools
- Community partnerships
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Peer support network
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding/Costs

Program and Research Contact

Elizabeth R. Reisner

Principal

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

1718 Connecticut Ave NW Suite 400

Washington, DC 20009

202-939-5323

202-939-5732 fax

ereisner@policystudies.com

www.policystudies.com

Sources Used

Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E. R., & Pierce, K. M. (2007, October). *Outcomes Linked to High Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Findings from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs*. Report to the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Summer Career Exploration Program

Target Population	High school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; youth were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group
Findings	Positive outcomes for short-term outcomes to provide teenagers with jobs, the means to earn money and be productively engaged during their summertime school break, provide teens with supportive adult contact
Elements of Success	Active programming Experiential learning Financial incentives Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

The Summer Career Exploration Program (SCEP) was created by the William Penn Foundation and has operated in the Philadelphia region since 1983. SCEP is a summer jobs program for low-income teens. In 2003 it became part of the City's newly-established youth workforce development system, WorkReady Philadelphia, and the administration of SCEP was taken on by the Philadelphia Youth Network. Each summer, 20-28 participating agencies provide youth with paid, real-work experience coupled with academic and career-related adult support through agency staff and monitors who provide twice-weekly mentoring sessions. Starting in 2005, some participating youth have been eligible for school credit for their participation.

Key Findings

Positive outcomes were reported for short-term indicators of success (provide teenagers with jobs, the means to earn money and be productively engaged during their summertime school break, and supportive adult contact). The intermediate outcomes (exhibit stronger orientation toward college, increase employment rates of participants after leaving the program, and foster better attitude toward work or work readiness) were not met.

Immediate (Short-term) Outcomes

- 92 percent of SCEP teens had jobs versus 62 percent of youth in the control group.
- Allowed teen participants to earn money and be productively engaged during their summertime school break.
- Provided teens with supportive adult contact. Almost two-thirds of first-time SCEP participants saw their college monitors at least twice per week; another 37 percent saw them about once per week.

Intermediate Outcomes (One Year after Applying to SCEP Program; Findings Are Not Significant)

- Teens who participated were not more likely to plan to attend college; 78 percent of SCEP youth versus 81 percent of control youth "plan to attend college."
- SCEP did not increase employment rates of participants after leaving the program; 60 percent of SCEP youth versus 61 percent of control youth worked during the school year.
- SCEP did not foster a better attitude toward work or work readiness; the mean score for "attitude toward work" on a scale of 1-4, with 1 being lowest, was 3.36 for SCEP youth and 3.43 for control youth.

Other

- Authors also note that SCEP participants did not seem to increase their orientation toward doing better in school. They note that this may be because the program did not make a meaningful connection between school success and working.
- In a typical year, one-third of SCEP participants return from the previous year.
- It is important to note that this was only a six-week summer program, so it may not be reasonable to expect significant effects. The evaluation researchers emphasize two main reasons why SCEP may not have had an impact, including the short duration of program and the type of students that are recruited to the program. Specifically, the majority of recruited students are already highly-motivated youth (who want to go to college, etc.), and their baseline scores often leave little room for improvement.
- Authors also conclude that since the SCEP-specific components of the program (namely, linking school success with work success, the mentorships, etc.) had no effect on the youth, many of the job skills youth learned through SCEP could have been learned if participation in other programs targeted different youth, provided better connections (to mentors and between work and school), and was longer in duration.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Teens in Philadelphia and Delaware counties in Pennsylvania and in Camden, New Jersey are eligible. Teens are recruited in schools, through year-round program activities, local organizations, and word of mouth.
- Students must come from families with income levels at no more than 235 percent of the federal poverty level. Students must be enrolled in school and must have completed the 10th grade or have graduated in the previous school year.
- Students may participate for up to three summers.
- Application requirements vary by site, but most include formal written applications including

income information, copies of school transcripts, and in-person interviews.

- The program does not necessarily encourage the most high-risk students to apply. The Camden website says youth are not eligible unless they have a C average or higher and a “sincere desire to learn.”
- In recent years SCEP has placed about 900 youth per year at about 400 work sites. To date, more than 23,000 youth have participated in SCEP.

Program Components

- Summer participants work for six weeks in the private sector.
- An effort is made to match jobs with teens’ interests.
- Students earn minimum wage (which was \$5.15 per hour during the P/PV study but is now \$7.15) and work 25 hours per week for the duration of the summer. A stipend from the Funders’ Collaborative, a network of more than 16 foundations, corporations, and trusts that financially support SCEP, pays for all the operating costs and the teens’ first 20 hours of wages per week; employers pay for the additional five hours. Participating agencies recruit the employers and the youth. Since 2005, participating agencies have been chosen through an application and request for proposal process.
- Workplace readiness is addressed in pre-employment trainings offered by the agencies on reoccurring Fridays, called Friday Seminars.
- At the time of evaluation, college student “monitors” were used as role models and encouraged students to do well in school and learn about the college admissions process, which addressed the program component to place value on education; however, no formal education-related components were offered. The recruitment of college students for the student monitor position is done through referrals from other students, notices in local newspapers, college placement offices, work-study programs, and agency newsletters.

- Currently, monitors are not required to be college students. After two years of operation, PYN determined that the proximity in age of college students (especially freshmen and sophomores) meant some key functions of the monitors were not carried out as effectively as they could be by more experienced professionals. Current requirements state that the monitors must: 1) possess the experience and skills to appropriately monitor worksites, 2) function as a liaison between the employers and youth, and 3) possess the ability to effectively teach work readiness skills to youth.
- Personal support is provided to the participants through the monitors as well as the work site supervisors who provide mentoring.
- The program has formal ties to College Access Centers and Student Success Centers, free access centers with resources on colleges, careers, and financial aid.

Overview of Evaluation

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) evaluated both the immediate and intermediate outcomes of participation in the SCEP program. From March 1999 through July 1999, 1,708 first-year applicants were randomly chosen for either the treatment or control group, all of whom completed a baseline questionnaire. Overall, 1,157 youth were chosen for the treatment group, and 551 were chosen for the control group. This study assessed stronger orientation toward work, increased work readiness, and improved educational planning. The study also examined the components of program implementation. Long-term impacts, such as getting and holding onto jobs in the future, were not assessed.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- The P/PV report indicates that 72 percent of participants were African American, 12 percent Hispanic, 17 percent Asian, 5 percent White, and 60 percent female. Race statistics from the Penn Foundation report show a slightly higher number of African Americans, 78 percent, than the P/PV report, with fewer Hispanics, 11 percent, and slightly fewer women, 55 percent.
- Of youth evaluated, 56 percent had just finished 10th grade, and 33 percent had never worked for pay before.

- The population served ranged from ages 12–22, with almost 80 percent being ages 16–18.
- The P/PV report notes that SCEP did not attempt to recruit youth who were at high risk for academic or employment failure. However, only low-income students were eligible. The program income guidelines as defined by the Philadelphia Youth Network indicate the maximum household income is 235 percent of the federal poverty line.
- At the time of the evaluation, SCEP was placing about 1,700 youth in jobs each summer.

Study Methodology

- From March through July 1999, 1,708 first-year SCEP applicants were randomly assigned to the treatment or control group.
- 551 youth were assigned to the control group and 1,157 youth were assigned to the treatment group.
- Youth in the control group were permitted to find summer employment on their own.
- A baseline survey was completed by 100 percent of the sample; a three-month follow-up phone interview was completed by 93 percent of the original sample; a one-year follow-up phone interview was completed by 89 percent of the original sample.
- Students and their families were notified that participation in the baseline survey was required in order to participate in the SCEP program.
- The follow-up phone interviews focused on summer employment history and experiences with SCEP.
- Omitted from the analysis were 17 youth assigned to the control group who were placed in a SCEP summer job.
- Of SCEP treatment youth, 78 percent found employment through the program and 22 percent did not or were unwilling to take a SCEP job. Regardless of employment, all treatment youth were included in the analysis.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Experiential learning
- Financial incentives
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

- SCEP is supported by a collaborative of foundations, corporations, and trusts. The William Penn Foundation is one major supporter of the program and supported the evaluation.
- According to a rough analysis of program expenditures in 1998, SCEP costs about \$950 per youth. Approximately two-thirds of that expense went to participants in wages, and the remaining money went to administrative costs, including work-site development, training and payment for the college monitors, and training and recruitment for participants.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Kelly Woodland
Program Officer
William Penn Foundation
Two Logan Square, 11th Floor
100 North 18th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-988-1830
215-988-1823 fax
KWoodland@williampennfoundation.org

Research Contact

Wendy McClanahan
Vice President for Research
2000 Market Street
Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-557-4400
215-557-4411 publications information line
wmclanahan@ppv.org

Sources Used

McClanahan, W. S., Sipe, C. L., & Smith, T. J. (2004, August). *Enriching Summer Work: An Evaluation of the Summer Career Exploration Program*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Other Resources

<http://www.workreadyphila.com>

Summer Search

Target Population	High school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; accepted and rejected students were surveyed
Findings	Continuing youth perceived an increase in the amount of support in their lives and increased positive school-related behaviors
Elements of Success	Experiential learning Personal relationships with staff Focus on needs and interests of youth

Overview of Program

Summer Search is an experiential learning social and academic support program for high school students from low-income families. It began in 1990 in the San Francisco Bay Area and has served 2,000 youth to date. Summer Search now has offices in seven cities around the country and supports more than 700 youth per year. The mission of the program is “to develop character and leadership by providing year-round mentoring, life-changing summer experiences, college advising, and a lasting support network” to at-risk adolescents. The program is steadily growing and plans to serve 2,000 youth per year by about 2012.

Key Findings

Overall, findings indicate that Summer Search did select students with higher academic and behavior outcomes; however, a significantly higher number of accepted students had more family hardships (parental divorce, loss of job, or illness). Additionally, continuing youth perceived an increase in the amount of support in their lives and increased positive school-related behaviors (making good grades, taking college preparation classes, studying, participating in sports, and participating in school clubs and activities). Information on statistical significance was not provided.

Outcomes Measured from the Baseline Survey

- Does Summer Search select the highest achieving and motivated students during the selection process?
- How do students who dropped out of the program differ from those who continued the program?

Outcomes Measured from the Midprogram Survey

- Did youth who dropped out of the program before the first summer trip differ in important ways from youth who dropped out after the first summer trip?
- What happened to youth as a result of participating in the program?

Outcomes from the Baseline Survey

- Summer Search did select highest achieving and motivated students in terms of academic performance and behavior, but not in terms of family hardship and demographic characteristics.
 - The average GPA of accepted students was 3.1 compared to rejected students’ average GPA of 2.8.
 - Accepted students are significantly more likely than rejected students to exercise and engage in positive behaviors (helping others or attending church) and significantly less likely to engage in risky behaviors (fighting, cutting school, or using drugs).

- ❑ Significantly more accepted applicants came from single-parent families compared to rejected applicants (55 percent compared to 41 percent).
- ❑ Accepted students experienced significantly more family hardships (parental divorce, loss of job, or illness).
- ❑ No significant demographic differences between accepted and rejected youth were found.
- Youth continuing in Summer Search were significantly more likely than dropped or rejected youth to perceive an increase in the amount of support in their lives.
- Youth continuing in Summer Search were significantly more likely than dropped or rejected youth to increase positive school-related behaviors (making good grades, taking college preparatory classes, studying, participating in sports, and participating in school clubs and activities).
- Rejected students exercised slightly less than continuing and dropped students.

Outcomes from the Midprogram Survey

- The evaluation states that time of dropping out does not matter, specifically, students who dropped out after the first summer trip were indistinguishable from the students who dropped out before the first summer trip in terms of baseline measures.
- However, students who dropped out after the first summer trip had lower GPAs than students who dropped out before the first summer trip (2.7 compared to 3.0, respectively).
- An average of 14 percent of students who dropped out did so before the first summer trip. The outcomes revealed that Silicon Valley participants had significantly more late droppers (39 percent). This outcome will be observed carefully to determine whether there is a lack of uniformity in programming across the sites.
- Youth participating in Summer Search were significantly more likely to perceive an increase in the amount of support in their lives; 61 percent of continuing students perceived an increase in support compared to 51 percent of accepted/dropped students and 46 percent of rejected students.

- Summer Search continuing participants were significantly more likely to increase positive school-related behaviors (making good grades, taking college preparatory classes, studying, participating in sports, and participating in school clubs and activities).
- Rejected students exercised less and continuing and accepted students exercised slightly more.

The final postprogram survey was administered in Spring 2008 and further analysis of the data will continue the effort to quantify the size of differences for participating, dropped, and rejected youth.

Program Population/Eligibility

According to Summer Search staff, the program purposefully attracts highly-motivated at-risk high school youth, as described below (2006 data):

- 69 percent qualify for free or reduced-price federal lunch
- 40 percent live below the poverty line
- 92 percent are minority students
- 93 percent are first-generation college students
- Average GPA: 3.1

Eligibility

- Summer Search students must be nominated by a referral partner in their sophomore year of high school. (Referral partners are partnering high schools.)
- Summer Search selects students from disadvantaged families with a recognizable need. Applicants must reside near the local Summer Search community.
- Applicants must demonstrate resiliency, altruism, and performance, referred to as the *RAP Characteristics*.
- Students are served in Boston, Massachusetts; New York, New York; San Francisco, North San Francisco Bay, and Silicon Valley, California; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Seattle, Washington.

Program Components

Summer Search starts each cohort in January of every school year and offers the following components:

- Weekly mentoring sessions with highly-trained staff mentors, from sophomore year to high school graduation. These sessions happen year-round during out-of-school time. Students are required to participate in the mentoring sessions.
- Two summer experiential education programs after the sophomore and junior years. The sophomore program is most often a wilderness program for three to five weeks; the junior program ranges substantially, from academic/college preparation programs to international trips to art programs. All programs fall under the experiential education category, and they usually run from eight to 12 weeks.
 - Summer Search partners with about 45 summer programs in the country, such as Outward Bound. Summer Search handles the youths' application process and matches the youth with the programs for the summer. Weekly mentoring stops only during the duration of the summer program if the program is in the wilderness or abroad. Summer Search splits the cost of the summer projects with the partnering agencies evenly.
- College advisory services such as finding a college, applying to it, and applying for financial aid, are offered throughout the high school years. Advisory sessions occur after school and on weekends. Students are required to participate.
- Alumni support throughout college and beyond. About 70 percent of Summer Search graduates who are college students use one or more of the alumni services. These include:
 - Peer support, including an online alumni directory and a yearly Alumni Summit that Summer Search organizes.
 - Professional development opportunities, including the Career Advisory Network (CAN), which matches community volunteers with Summer Search alumni to learn about their job or organization; workshops on professionalism; and paid summer internships, which are taken advantage of by about 150 alumni per year during their college summers.

- Emergency scholarship assistance is offered but is a very small part of the program.

Overview of Evaluation

The 2008 Summer Search Longitudinal Evaluation Report reviewed the six evaluation studies that have been conducted by See Change and provided updates on two studies still underway. The goal of the longitudinal evaluation was to document how the 6 studies aligned with one another, as well as with Summer Search's mission "to develop information and knowledge, grounded in empirical data generated by its ongoing work, to inform the field of youth development and, as a long term hope, to improve its practices." The research design and methodology varied for each study; overall the evaluation sought to determine if Summer Search was working with youth who would "make it" anyway; what happens to Summer Search participants; how Summer Search participants differ from those who drop out; differences between accepted youth who drop out of the program early versus late; how supports and risks in youth's lives affect participation; and if the score card used for interview purposes predicts if accepted youth will drop out of the program.

This summary focuses on Study 4, which examined whether Summer Search selected the highest achieving and motivated students during the student selection process; how students who drop out of Summer Search differed from those who continued in the program; if the time of dropout mattered, and what happened to youth as a result of participating in Summer Search. Study 4 included a baseline and midprogram survey that was administered to a sample of 832 accepted and rejected applicants. The midprogram survey examined how accepted/continuing students one year into the program differed from students who dropped out or were rejected. Results from the 2006-2007 program year were included in the evaluation, and results from the 2008-2009 program year will be reported in a future evaluation.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

- The baseline survey (Fall 2006) was completed by 832 sophomores who applied to the program at all Summer Search sites in 2006, representing 87 percent of the total applicants.
- Of the 832 youth who applied, 584 were accepted, and 578 were rejected.

- The midprogram survey (Fall 2007) was completed by a total of 499 students, 51 percent of whom were accepted/continuing students, 19 percent accepted/dropped students, and 29 percent rejected students.

Demographics of the 832 students indicate that students were:

- 28 percent Latino/a; 22 percent African/Diaspora; 18 percent East Asian (term used in evaluation); 10 percent Caucasian, and 12 percent other or unknown.
- 66 percent female and 34 percent male.
- 49 percent lived in a single-parent family.
- 25 percent were immigrants.
- 68 percent had a mother who was an immigrant.
- 72 percent had a father who was an immigrant.
- 15 percent participated in San Francisco, California; 21 percent in Boston, Massachusetts; 9 percent in New York, New York; 8 percent in Silicon Valley, California; 6 percent in Napa/Sonoma Valley, California; 40 percent in Seattle, Washington; and 11 percent in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Study Methodology

- The quasi-experimental study gave baseline surveys to all 832 sophomores who applied to Summer Search in Fall 2006.
- According to a researcher on the study, every student who completed a baseline survey was asked to complete a midprogram survey.
- Students enrolled in Summer Search were given the midprogram survey by their program mentors to remain in good standing in the program.

- Students who had been rejected and/or dropped out of the program were sent up to three email messages inviting them to participate and offering them a Starbucks gift card (\$5) as a thank you.
- The baseline research questions asked if Summer Search selected the highest achieving and motivated students during the selection process and how students who dropped out of the program differed from those who continued the program.
- The midprogram survey research questions asked if the time of drop from the program mattered. In other words, did youth who dropped out of the program before the first summer trip differ in important ways from youth who dropped out after the first summer trip? The midprogram survey also asked what happened to Summer Search students as a result of participating in the program.

Elements of Success

- Experiential learning
- Personal relationships with staff
- Focus on needs and interests of youth

Funding

Summer Search's funding comes completely from private philanthropy sources: 60 percent from major individual gifts and 40 percent from foundations and corporations. This study was initially funded by the Koret Foundation, but has been funded in part over the years by Koret, Blue Ridge Foundation, Orfelea Foundation, and Summer Search's operating budget.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Jay Jacobs
CEO
Summer Search
620 Davis Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-362-5225
415-362-5274 fax
jay@summersearch.org
www.summersearch.org

Research Contact

Melanie Moore Kubo, PhD
See Change
2140 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 502
Berkeley, CA 94704
510-666-8896
510-666-9202 fax
melanie@seechangeevaluation.com
www.seechangeevaluation.com

Sources Used

Kubo, M. M. (2007, February). *Second Year Report —Summer Search Evaluation*. See Change: Evaluation Through a New Lens.

Summer Search: Quantitative Outcome Measurement: Presentation to Board Members (2007, February 16). PPT presentation, Boston Consulting Group.

Saphir, M., et al. (2008, October 3). *Summer Search Longitudinal Evaluation Report, Years 3 & 4: 2008 Review and Synthesis with Theory of Change*. San Francisco: Summer Search National.

Other Resources

www.summersearch.org

The After School Corporation Evaluations (series by Policy Studies Associates)

This summary focuses mainly on two reports: *Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary Report of the TASC Evaluation*, November 2004, and *After-School Programs and High School Success: Analysis of Post-Program Educational Patterns of Former Middle Grades TASC Participants*, October 2007. The reports are referred to by their year below.

Target Population	Students Grades K–12 are served; the evaluation studied middle and high school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; four-year study compared TASC participants to nonparticipants at TASC schools and non-TASC schools
Findings	Positive outcomes in high school attendance and credit accumulation for former participants
Elements of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with schools Community partnerships High-quality and devoted staff Provides choices for participants Structured program Student-centered programming Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

The After-School Corporation (TASC) was founded in 1998 and works with public and private partners across New York City and the State of New York to develop and implement high-quality afterschool services for public elementary and secondary students. TASC's two main goals are to increase the availability of out-of-school time (OST) programs and enhance program quality. The central mission of TASC is to promote the belief that high-quality afterschool programming is an appropriate public responsibility. The usual TASC model involves a host school working with a community-based organization (CBO) partner, but all programs operate at school-based sites. The program model intends to demonstrate quality by recruiting students who are likely to benefit from OST learning experiences and promoting high levels of OST enrollment and attendance. As an intermediary organization, TASC serves as a leader in employing well-qualified staff, building strong relationships with host schools and parents, delivering activities that promote learning growth and exposing students

to positive new experiences, providing training and technical assistance to staff, and encouraging fiscal independence. TASC strongly supports the use of program evaluation and reflection and has used evaluation findings to determine whether the program's afterschool services are offering programming that benefits participants in measurable, significant ways. Programs run from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday and are free of charge.

Key Findings

Please note that “active” PK–8th grade students are defined as those who attended a TASC project at least 60 days during the school year (of the 160 operation days) and also attended at least 60 percent of the days that it was possible for the student to attend (an average of three days per week). For 9–12th grade students, “active” participants were those who participated more than 20 days during a school year and 20 percent of the days that it was possible for the student to attend (an average of once per week).

Overall, the 2004 study determined that TASC recruited a high number of students from schools with high enrollment of students at risk of education failure, retained the students, and encouraged high levels of attendance. Data from Year 4 indicated that the majority of site coordinators had a bachelor’s degree, the majority of projects had strong relationships with host schools, and the majority of principals reported alignment with curriculum and TASC programming.

Overall, the 2007 study found positive outcomes in high school attendance and credit accumulation for former middle school TASC participants, compared to both matched comparison groups.

2004 Programmatic Outcomes

- TASC recruited high numbers of students (50,000 in 2003–2004) from schools that enrolled high percentages of students at risk of education failure due to poverty, low achievement, etc.
- TASC projects retained students (63 percent) and encouraged high levels of attendance (average was 85 percent for Grades K–8).
- In Year 4 of the evaluation, 86 percent of site coordinators had bachelor’s degrees and 40 percent had master’s degrees.
- In Year 4, 97 percent of projects had strong relationships with host schools.
- In Year 4, 86 percent principals reported alignment with curriculum, an increase from Years 2

and 3, due, according to principals, largely to an increase in incorporating school themes and needs into the work of the TASC project.

2004: Youth Outcomes

- Grades PK–8:
 - For Grades 3–8:
 - Math test scores were significantly higher for participants, but even higher for regular participants (those who participated the most days, for the longest amount of time).⁹⁶
 - Those who participated for a whole year showed high gains on math test scores; even higher gains were found for those participating for two or more years;⁹⁷ for “active” one- and two-plus-year participants, the effects were even larger.⁹⁸
 - For Grades 3–8:
 - No gains were found for reading or ELA.
 - Overall, school attendance was significantly better for participants than nonparticipants.⁹⁹ After two years of participation, the school attendance rates for all TASC participants increased attendance by one-half day of school per year compared to nonparticipants;¹⁰⁰ “active” participants who attended for two years increased attendance by three-fourths day of school per year compared to nonparticipants.¹⁰¹ The attendance gap widened the longer a student remained in TASC (compared with nonparticipants).
 - For Grades 5–8, the difference in attendance rates between participants and nonparticipants was positive and statistically significant.¹⁰²

⁹⁶ In this study, an effect size of 0.10 or higher is considered meaningful. Effect sizes below this threshold, even if statistically significant, are deemed not to represent meaningful effects.

⁹⁷ Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of .42 for students of two or more years.

⁹⁸ Findings are statistically significant with an effect size of .79 for 2+ year students.

⁹⁹ After Year 1, active participants attended 94.22 percent of the time, all participants attended 93.41 percent of the time, and nonparticipants attended 91.84 percent of the time. All results are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p=.05).

¹⁰⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p=.05) with an effect size of .04.

¹⁰¹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p=.05) with an effect size of .06.

¹⁰² Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence (p=.05) with an effect size >.10.

- 71 percent met the criteria for “active” participants.
- *High school:* Please note participants had fewer risk factors than nonparticipants, and there were only six high schools in the sample. The evaluation did not provide information on statistical significance for the high school outcomes.
 - Overall, high school TASC participants passed more Regents exams and earned more credits toward high school graduation than did nonparticipants in the same schools.
 - Specifically, at the four sites that had complete Regents data available, participants passed more exams earlier in their high school career than did nonparticipants; “active” participants were likely to pass five exams by the end of 12th grade in two of the four schools. Participants earned more credits at the end of 9th grade than nonparticipants. Both participants and nonparticipants entered 9th grade at the same 8th-grade proficiency level.
 - School attendance was higher for participants. Attendance for all students in all grades decreased from year to year; however, TASC students’ attendance rates decreased less.
 - 47 percent met the criteria for “active” participants.

2007: Youth Outcomes

- 9th-grade TASC participants attended school significantly more than nonparticipants, equaling an extra seven days of attendance.¹⁰³ When TASC 9th-grade students were compared with students at non-TASC schools, they attended about four days more of school.¹⁰⁴
- 10th-grade TASC participants attended school significantly more than nonparticipants. The average daily attendance rate for TASC participants

¹⁰³ The 9th-grade average daily attendance rate of former TASC participants was 90.8 percent, compared to 87.1 percent for matched nonparticipants from TASC middle schools. This difference was statistically significant with 100 percent confidence (p=0.00), with an effect size of 0.26.

¹⁰⁴ The 9th-grade average daily attendance rate of former TASC participants was 90.8 percent, compared to 88.6 percent for matched students who attended non-TASC middle schools. This difference was statistically significant with 100 percent confidence (p=0.00), with an effect size of 0.16.

was 89.1 percent, compared to 85.8 percent for nonparticipants.¹⁰⁵ This effect diminished in 10th grade and beyond.

- Significantly more participants remained enrolled in a New York City high school for at least two years after 9th grade than did matched nonparticipants from TASC middle schools, although the size of the effect was relatively small.¹⁰⁶ There were no meaningful differences in suspension rates.
- TASC participants in the 9th grade earned significantly more credits than nonparticipants attending TASC schools;¹⁰⁷ this effect diminished in later grades.
- There were no significant differences in number of Regents exams passed by participants versus nonparticipants in any grade.
- Former middle-grades TASC participants were significantly more likely to be promoted on schedule from the 9th to 10th grade than were matched nonparticipants from TASC middle schools; 73 percent of former middle-grades TASC participants were more likely to be promoted on schedule from the 9th to 10th grade versus 69 percent of matched nonparticipants, which is statistically significant, but the effect size is small.¹⁰⁸
- Former TASC participants earned more credits by the end of their 11th-grade year compared to matched students who attended similar schools that did not host a TASC program.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ This difference was statistically significant (p=0.00), with an effect size of 0.18.

¹⁰⁶ 89 percent of participants compared to 86 percent of nonparticipants, enrolled in high school for at least two years after 9th grade; effect size=0.08.

¹⁰⁷ Former TASC participants earned an average of 10.2 credits by the end of their 9th-grade year, while matched nonparticipants from TASC middle schools earned 9.7 credits. This difference was statistically significant (p=0.02), with an effect size of 0.12.

¹⁰⁸ P values were not given, however in order to be deemed statistically significant, the evaluators noted the P value had to be greater than or equal to .05.

¹⁰⁹ Former TASC participants earned an average of 38.2 credits by the end of their 11th-grade year, while matched students who attended similar schools that did not host a TASC program earned 37.1 credits. This difference was not statistically significant (p=0.03), with an effect size of .18.

- No statistically significant effects on graduation rates were found.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Currently, TASC serves 22,000 youth through 125 programs.
- TASC serves students in Grades K–12.
- TASC programs exist across the State of New York, but the majority of programs are located in New York City.
- All public school students who attend schools that host TASC programs are eligible. Most of these schools have high percentages of at-risk students.

Program Components

TASC programs share the following program components, which the evaluators associated with positive youth outcomes:

- High frequency and duration of activities focusing on academics and cognitive development.
- Employment of a site coordinator who is licensed to teach.
- High frequency and duration of activities focusing on fitness, sports, and recreation.
- Requirement that OST staff must submit activity plans for advance review by site coordinator.
- Project staff of which at least one in four has a four-year college degree.

Additional Program Components

- Programming includes academic enrichment, homework assistance, the arts, and recreation.
- Programs are run by a full-time site director and run until 6 p.m.
- The main objectives taken on by TASC programs are to help students build academic skills and to expose students to positive new experiences.

- Common program delivery methods include culminating performances, such as an artistic play, speech, oral report, or final written products, such as a newspaper or story. In Year 2, 82 percent of projects completed a final written product, and in Year 4, 97 percent of projects completed a culminating performance.
- To increase student engagement, projects often incorporated a theme across the school and TASC project.
- In Year 4, 35 percent of TASC themes were coordinated with the host school.
- 36 percent of TASC site coordinators utilized a curriculum developed outside of school, such as the Putomayo “World Playground” program, the Bronx Zoo curriculum, or the Foundations, Inc. literacy curriculum.

Overview of Evaluation

The 2004 four-year quasi experimental evaluation sought to determine if TASC services were meeting high expectations for quality, if students were benefiting from participation in TASC, and the practices associated with the greatest benefits for students. Data was collected through surveys, site visits, and a review of administrative records. Data collection focused on TASC projects conducted in New York City from 1998–1999 and 1999–2000, Years 1 and 2 of TASC program operations, during which 50 projects were funded. Additionally, grades and Regents test scores were used for high school data. Interviews, focus groups, observations, and site visits were conducted at 10 to 15 sites.

The 2007 report was funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and examined long-term effects of program participation on high school performance. The evaluation sought to determine whether participation in a TASC program in the middle grades promoted the development of protective factors that resulted in higher levels of school engagement and academic progress and in lower levels of delinquent behavior than are characteristic of similar students who did not participate in TASC programs. Data utilized for the evaluation included program participation numbers contained in the TASC evaluation database as well as demographic and educational performance data maintained in the New York City Department of Education (DOE)

central databases for the 1998-1999 through 2004-2005 school years. The study examined how middle school TASC participants compared to both matched students who attended a middle school that hosted a TASC program but did not participate in TASC programming and matched students who attended similar New York City middle schools that did not have TASC programs.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

TASC programs exist throughout New York State, but only New York City programs were assessed.

2004 Report

Data were collected from 96 TASC afterschool projects and their host schools in New York City.

- The student sample included approximately 52,000 TASC participants and 91,000 students attending TASC schools but not enrolled or participating in the programs.
- Of the student sample, 3,920 were high school students.

2007 Report

- The participant group consisted of 2,390 former middle-grades participants from 28 TASC programs throughout New York City.
- The two control groups consisted of 1,933 matched nonparticipants from TASC schools and 2,208 matched nonparticipants from non-TASC schools.

Study Methodology

In this study, an effect size of 0.10 or higher is considered meaningful. Outcomes were measured and reported separately for middle and high school participants and nonparticipants.

2004 Report

- The report collected data over four years on programmatic outcomes, such as participant recruitment and retention as well as youth academic outcomes.

- Attendance records and teacher, student, and site coordinator surveys were used for both middle and high school data.
- Additionally, grades and Regents test scores were used for high school data.
- Interviews, focus groups, observations, and site visits were conducted at 10 to 15 sites.
- PSA developed an online tracking system that produced data on patterns of enrollment and attendance, which was cross-referenced with New York City's Department of Education student data. Students in TASC programs were compared with students at TASC schools not enrolled in TASC.
- Participants were statistically similar to nonparticipants in terms of family income, gender, receipt of special education, English language learner (ELL) and recent immigration status, and prior educational performance. Race was also similar, but with slightly more Black participants in the group (37 percent versus 28 percent).
- Evaluation statistically controlled for differences in student demographic characteristics, grade level, and initial test scores across the two groups.

2007 Report

- For the 2007 report, two control groups were used: youth attending TASC schools but not in TASC program, and youth attending non-TASC schools. The treatment group consisted of TASC participants. Two control groups were used to address the selection bias by the use of comparison students who had the opportunity to enroll in a TASC program in their schools but did not. Efforts were made to ensure that all three groups of students were similar in terms of demographics, ELL status, and gender (and free or reduced-price lunch status between schools). However, attendance and grades were not controlled for. A slightly higher attendance rate was noted for TASC participants versus nonparticipants at the baseline, but reading and math test scores did not differ significantly from group to group. All of this means that the effects that were shown on attendance rates cannot be seen as causal, at this time; only correlation can be proven.

- Indicators used to assess for engagement in school included school attendance rates, persistence in school, and rates of suspension. For educational performance, indicators included credits earned in each year of high school, the number of Regents tests passed, progress towards on-time grade promotion, and diploma status.

Elements of Success

- Collaboration with schools
- Community partnerships
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Provides choices for participants
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

The budget for the first year TASC was operating was \$14 million; Year 2: \$36 million; Year 3: \$61 million; Year 4: \$76.8 million; Year 5: \$87.9 million; Year 6: \$97.5 million. Funding sources include the following:

- Funding provided to 75 programs from New York State under the Advantage After-School Program.
- Funding provided to 60 programs from 21st CCLC money from the New York Department of Education.
- Funding provided to 5 programs with 21st CCLC money directly from the federal government.
- Funding provided to 39 programs through federal AmeriCorps funding.
- Funding provided to 28 programs with support from TASC's partnership with New York City Department of Youth and Community Development Beacon program.

- Several others get grants from New York State's Extended Day Violence Prevention Program and the City's Workforce Investment Act program.

Four foundations are supporting a multiyear Policy Studies Associates study to assess TASC's effectiveness: Charles Stewart Mott, Carnegie Corporation of New York, William T. Grant, and Atlantic Philanthropies.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Lucy N. Friedman
President
The After-School Corporation
925 Ninth Avenue
New York, NY 10025
212-547-6992
212-547-6983 fax
lfriedman@tascorp.org
www.tasc.org

Research Contact

Elizabeth R. Reisner
Principal
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
1718 Connecticut Ave NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20009
202-939-5323
202-939-5732 fax
ereisner@policystudies.com
www.policystudies.com

Sources Used

- Birmingham, J., & Pechman, E., et al. (2005, November). *Shared Features of High-Performing After-School Programs: A Follow-Up to the TASC Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Birmingham, J. & White, R. (2005, January 27). *Promoting Positive Youth Development for High School Students After School: Services and Outcomes for High School Youth in TASC Programs*. Policy Studies Associates.
- Reisner, L., & White, R., et al. (2004, November 3). *Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary Report of the TASC Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Russell, C., & Reisner, L., et al. (2005, June). *Supporting Social and Cognitive Growth Among Disadvantaged Middle-Grades Students in TASC After-School Projects*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Russell, C., Mielke, M., Miller, T., & Johnson, J. (2007, October). *After-School Programs and High School Success: Analysis of Post-Program Educational Patterns of Former Middle Grades TASC Participants*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Other Resources

See the PSA website for even more reports (many may be found here: <http://www.policystudies.com/studies/youth/Evaluation%20TASC%20Programs.html>). TASC: www.tascorp.org

The Children's Aid Society Community Schools: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Target Population	Middle school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; three-year longitudinal, comparison evaluation
Findings	Increase in academic achievement and positive youth development outcomes
Elements of Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration Community support Offers a range of activities Personal relationships with staff Structured program

Overview of Program

The Children's Aid Society (CAS) provides health, mental health, afterschool, parent, Head Start, Early Head Start, weekend and summer programs in 21 New York City community schools. Community schools provide added services to students and families through partnerships between CAS and the school. According to the CAS "Theory of Change," a good afterschool program is one important strategy to reach CAS's long term goals of academic achievement and positive youth development. Each site is a 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) and has a different specific focus, such as "leadership" or "self-expression." The CAS programs offer academic enrichment and youth development activities.

Key Findings

Overall, the findings for the three-year longitudinal study indicated an increase in academic achievement and positive youth development for CAS participants over nonparticipants. Students enrolled in CAS programs had higher school attendance than nonparticipants.

The authors do note that outcomes cannot be attributed in a causal way to the program; only association is possible due to the research method used. However, plausible arguments for causality are strengthened because the outcomes hypothesized in the Theory of Change are those found. For Year 3, the significance cutoff was

.05, indicating 95 percent confidence that the outcome did not occur by chance.

- Students who participated in the afterschool programs at all from 2004–2007 attained steadily higher *scale scores* on the math test compared to nonparticipants.
- Students who participated in the afterschool programs at all from 2004–2007 attained steadily higher reading *scale scores* significantly more often than nonparticipants.

Of the students who were in CAS afterschool programs from 2004–2007, 44.7 percent demonstrated a statistically significant increase in their performance levels in math compared to 37 percent of those students who did not attend CAS afterschool programs.

- There were no statistically significant differences in reading performance levels between CAS afterschool participants and nonparticipants for 2004–2007.
- Of CAS afterschool program participants, 20.9 percent increased their performance levels in reading, and 29.4 percent increased their performance levels in math for Year 3 (2006–2007).

- Of CAS participants who spent 60 percent of their time or more in CAS during 2006–2007, 42.1 percent performed at Level 3 on the math test for Year 3 (2006–2007).
- Participants had higher levels of school attendance from 2004–2007 than students who never participated in programs during that time, and greater afterschool participation was related to better school attendance.
- Significant increases were observed in self-esteem and career aspirations, along with decreased reports in problems with communication, from Year 1 to Year 3.
- In Year 3, students who had higher (60 percent or more) program participation were significantly more engaged in their communities than other students.
- From 2004–2007, school engagement showed a statistically significant decrease, which could be attributed to major structural changes in the schools.

In 2004–2005, CAS afterschool participants were significantly less likely to spend two or more hours per week watching television or playing video games and more likely to spend more than two hours reading. In 2005–2006, participants reported more often that they learned new things or acquired new skills. From 2006–2007 a significantly higher percentage of CAS participants engaged in sports, games and activities where they could get help with school or research projects.

Program Population/Eligibility

- Program enrollment includes students in 5th or 6th through 8th grades, but staff emphasized that program enrollment is actually heavily 5th- and 6th-grade students.
- Each program serves 250 to 400 youth (roughly one-quarter of the school’s population).
- From 2006–2007, 75.9 percent of participants were Hispanic, 21.3 percent were African American, 1.4 percent were Asian, .6 percent were White, and .5 percent were Native American.

- From 2006–2007, 51.9 percent were male and 47.8 percent were female.
- Students described as English as a Second Language (ESL) students comprised 23.7 percent of the population in 2004–2005, 24.8 percent in 2005–2006, and 12.8 percent in 2006–2007.
- Youth attending middle schools with CAS/21stCCLC programs in New York City are eligible for this particular program.
- Youth are recruited through flyers, notices, staff phone calls, mailings, visits to classrooms, tables at parent nights, and word of mouth at the beginning of the year. Programs also approach youth who have attended in previous years.

Program Components

- A typical CAS afterschool program begins with a 20-minute snack or supper, followed by homework help, academic enrichment, and youth development activities.
- Academic enrichment and youth development programs include sewing, cooking, media arts, Recycle a Bicycle, Operation SMART (science projects for girls), Fashion Club, Hip Hop poetry, performance arts, yoga, Youth Council, Peace Games, and HOPE Leadership Academy.
- All programs offer study hall or homework help, as well as sports and recreation activities. Some programs offer “open activities” such as movies or sports on Friday afternoons, where students can relax in a less formal environment.

Overview of Evaluation

The report summarized the full results of a three-year longitudinal, comparison evaluation of afterschool programs conducted by the Children’s Aid Society (CAS) Community Schools and prepared by ActKnowledge. The evaluation examined long-term outcomes of academic achievement, attendance, and youth development. The basic goal of the evaluation was to determine if youth who attended CAS afterschool programs did better academically, behaviorally, and/or attitudinally than youth who did not attend. Therefore, the evaluation measured academic and development outcomes for a cohort of youth

participants and a comparison group of nonparticipants, as well as preconditions tied to academic and development outcomes (such as active engagement in learning activities and strong psycho-social development) and program implementation. The students who were enrolled as 6th-grade students in 2004 were the cohort followed throughout the study. For the youth development measures, the evaluators selected four of the six schools to participate. The four schools were chosen to represent CAS middle schools geographically and by numbers of years as Community Schools. For both the academic and youth development outcomes, students in CAS afterschool programs were compared to similar students who did not participate in the programs. A variety of data collection methods were used. The results from this three-year evaluation are summarized below.

Evaluation Population

- All six afterschool programs studied were 21st CCLC operating within six CAS community middle schools.
- Students were in Grades 5-8.
- The population studied for the academic achievement and attendance outcomes included all youth in all six schools. A sample of youth were selected for youth and teacher surveys to measure youth development outcomes between participants and nonparticipants and over time.
- Students who participated in CAS afterschool programs were compared to students who did not participate.
- The 6th-grade classes at all six CAS schools in 2004 comprised the cohort that was studied throughout the longitudinal study.
- For the youth development component, a smaller sample of youth was drawn from four of the six middle schools to complete a pretest and posttest youth development survey. The youth were representative of program participants and nonparticipants at each school. Participants were enrolled in programs on a first-come, first-served basis, so the youth development survey was quasi-experimental.
- The entire sample for academic achievement/attendance measurements was 5,163, or all youth who attended the six middle schools. Of these, 1,766 were 8th-grade students (the cohort being studied) by Year 3 of the evaluation. During Spring 2007, a total of 246 students completed the youth development survey.
- The 246 youth who completed the survey in Spring 2007 were the final longitudinal cohort for the youth development survey. Because students moved in and out of programs, all of these students had participated in CAS afterschool programs for at least one year between Years 1 and 3. Therefore, the evaluation could not make comparisons on youth development between students who had ever participated and had never participated. Instead, comparisons were made by participation dosage, specifically 60 percent or more participation versus less than 60 percent.
- All students in Grades 5-8 in the six Community Schools could exercise choice as to which program they attended and many of the nonparticipant (comparison group) students did attend another afterschool program. The other programs were primarily Supplemental Education Services (SES).
- All of the schools met 21st CCLC eligibility requirements and Title 1 eligibility. The percentage of students receiving free lunch at all the schools was 82 percent to 98 percent. Additionally, some of the schools were in areas with high rates of linguistic isolation, and all were in neighborhoods with high rates of other risk indicators.

Study Methodology

- The evaluation was a quasi-experimental, longitudinal comparison study.
- Outcomes were measured in two ways: by comparing participants' change over time and by comparing participants to nonparticipants. In addition, comparisons were made based on degree of program attendance. For youth development outcomes, a sample was used, whereas for academic and attendance outcomes, the entire population was analyzed.

- Data collection methods used for academic achievement and attendance included standardized test score data, school attendance records, and teacher responses to the 21st Century Annual Performance Review (APR) teacher survey.
- Data collection methods for the youth development component included a youth survey and teacher surveys. In addition, focus groups; interviews with youth, staff, parents, family and community members; observations; and the New York State After-School Program Quality Self-Assessment tool were used to explore preconditions to academic achievement and program implementation.
- To identify youth in afterschool programs, The Community Schools Information System (CSIS) data was used.
- For the academic achievement/attendance component measures, baseline data collected in Year 1 included student demographics and standardized test scores.
- For the youth development measures, one baseline student survey was administered during the Fall 2004 and a posttest at the spring of each year, along with teacher and staff student ratings.
- For both the academic and youth development components of the evaluation, comparisons were made based on level of participation; “never participated” refers to students who did not participate, “ever participated” refers to students that participated for any amount of time, “participated in CAS 60 percent or more” or “high-level” attendees refers to participants that spent 60 percent of the time or more in the program. These categories were used to compare student outcomes on academic achievement and youth development.

Elements of Success

- Collaboration
- Community support
- Offers a range of activities

- Personal relationships with staff
- Structured program

Funding

Funding from the 21st CCLC primarily supported the programs. In Years 2 and 3, CAS afterschool programs received funding from New York City’s Department of Youth and Community Development’s Out of School Time (OST) Program. School funding also supported the programs.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Jane Quinn
 Assistant Executive Director for Community Schools
 The Children’s Aid Society
 105 East 22nd St.
 New York, NY 10010
 212-949-4800
janeq@childrensaidsociety.org

Evaluation Contact

Kira Krenichyn, PhD
 Hélène Clark, PhD
 Nicole Schaefer-McDaniel, PhD
 Lymari Benitez, PhD
 ActKnowledge
 Center for Human Environments
 365 Fifth Avenue, 6th Floor
 New York, NY 10016
 212-817-1906
hclark@actknowledge.org
kkrenichyn@actknowledge.org

Sources Used

- Krenichyn, K., Clark, H., Schaefer-McDaniel, N., & Benitez, L. (2006, January). “21st Century Community Learning Centers at Six New York City Middle Schools: Year One Report.” The Children’s Aid Society.
- Krenichyn, K., Clark, H., & Schaefer-McDaniel, N. (2007, June). “21st Century Community Learning Centers at Six New York City Middle Schools: Year Two Report.” Act Knowledge. The Children’s Aid Society.

Other Resources

<http://www.childrensaidsociety.org/>

The Children's Aid Society: Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program

Target Population	Students ages 12–18
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; three-year longitudinal study compared randomly assigned participants and nonparticipants
Findings	Decline in sexual activity and teenage pregnancy for participants; participants had higher odds of condom and birth control use and increased odds of receiving good primary health care
Elements of Success	Active programming Comprehensive prevention program Safe environment Structured program Student-centered programming

Overview of Program

The Children's Aid Society (CAS) Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program was started in 1984 with a mission to provide support to local and national agencies and institutions implementing programs to reduce teen pregnancy in their communities. The program is guided by the following principles: each young person is viewed as family and has high potential; multiple services are implemented to meet varying needs; contact with youth is consistent and continuous; parental and adult involvement is valued; and services are offered in the community under one roof in a nurturing environment. The principles support the program's five activity components and two service components, with activities ranging from a Job Club, individual tutoring, self-expression, sexuality education, and mental health and medical services. The intent of the program is for teens to learn about sexual responsibility while developing goals and aspirations for life. This approach centers on the belief that success in school, meaningful employment, access to quality medical and health services, and interactions with positive role models have a potent contraceptive effect on teens.

Key Findings

The findings recognized a statistically significant decline in sexual activity and teenage pregnancy for Carrera Program participants. The evaluation focused on the overall impact of the comprehensive Carrera Program, rather than the effectiveness of each individual component. The authors noted that further analysis is needed to determine what type of effect each of the activity and service components have on participants. At the conclusion of the three years, 48 percent of participants were actively involved in all program components, and 31 percent had contact with program staff after school hours. Findings from the three years include:

- Female program participants had significantly lower odds of being sexually active: 75 percent of female participants did not have sex when pressured compared to 36 percent of control group females;¹¹⁰ 54 percent of female participants had ever had sex compared to 66 percent of female control group participants,¹¹¹ and 10 percent of female participants had ever experienced a preg-

¹¹⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome was not due to chance ($p < .05$).

¹¹¹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome was not due to chance ($p < .05$).

nancy compared to 22 percent of control group females.¹¹² Of female participants, 36 percent used a condom and a hormonal method of birth control together, compared to 20 percent of control group females.¹¹³

- No significant impact on males' sexual and reproductive behavior outcomes was demonstrated. (Males were asked many of same questions, but also if they knew for sure whether they had caused a pregnancy or birth, if they did not know but thought they had, or if they did not know but thought they had not.)
- Both genders had elevated odds of having received good primary health care.¹¹⁴ The health assessment asked youth about five desirable health care outcomes: having received medical care in a setting other than an emergency room; having had a medical checkup in the last year; having been given a social assessment (e.g. answering questions about broader family and environmental factors) at that checkup; having had a Hepatitis B vaccination; and having had a dental checkup in the last year.
- Both genders scored higher on the sexual knowledge questionnaire at the close of the program showing a 22 percent increase in correct answers from baseline for the treatment group versus an 11 percent increase for the control group.¹¹⁵
- Of Carrera participants studied, 79 percent stayed in the program for three full years with 48 percent considered active. In contrast, only 36 percent of the control group was "regularly" participating after three years. Treatment youth participated for an average of 16 hours per month.

Program Population/Eligibility

- The average participant in the Carrera Program is a middle school student between 10–18 years of age.

¹¹² Findings are statistically significant with 9 percent confidence the outcome was not due to chance ($p < .01$).

¹¹³ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence the outcome was not due to chance ($p < .05$).

¹¹⁴ For example, 69 percent of youth received a four out of five on their health assessments versus 54 percent of the control group; statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence ($p < .001$).

¹¹⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 99.9 percent confidence the outcome was not due to chance ($p < .001$).

- Public, charter, and private school students are eligible from 10 years of age and may continue past high school. According to the Founder and Director of the Carrera Program, Dr. Carrera, the outcomes from the CAS random assignment evaluation led the program to change the start age to 10-11 in order to have a greater impact, especially on boys.
- Although not assessed in the evaluation, the program also involves the parents and/or guardians of those served.
- New York City is the birthplace of program but the Carrera Program website states: "Currently, we have 21 replications and 30 program variations in 20 states throughout the country."

Program Components

The program consists of seven program components (five activity components and two service components):

- Educational support, which includes individual assessment, tutoring, homework help, SAT preparation, and college admissions assistance (daily).
- Career awareness and Job Club, which includes stipends, help with bank accounts, graduated employment experiences, and career awareness (about two times per week). Youth reported receiving internship advice, and some youth were assigned internships at the facility site.
- Lifetime individual sports, which emphasizes individual sporting activities requiring impulse control for all ages, such as golf, squash, snowboarding, and swimming (weekly).
- Creative expression, which includes dance, writing, and drama workshops (weekly).
- Comprehensive no-cost medical and dental services, which includes checking for sexually transmitted diseases and making a wide range of contraceptive options available (yearly check-ups).
- Mental health services delivered by a licensed social worker, which includes counseling, crisis intervention, and weekly discussion groups as needed.

Additional program components include:

- Family life and sex education sessions, which emphasize age- and stage-appropriate sexual knowledge (weekly).
- Programs run Monday through Friday for three hours each day.
- Participants rotate among the five activities (one to two activities per day, with academic help daily).
- According to additional remarks by Dr. Carrera, youth participate in center programming a minimum of five times per week; most programs also have a Saturday session.
- Over the summer, “maintenance sessions” are held to reinforce sexual education lessons and academic gains from the school year. The program also offers assistance for finding internships and jobs, with an emphasis on entrepreneurial skills and career awareness.
- In 2006, the Carrera Program reformatted the program model into lesson plans that could be used during the school day. The program now operates two versions of the program model, the integrated school model (currently implemented at ten schools) and the traditional afterschool model. The integrated school model assigns senior staff from the program office to communicate directly with principals. The seven program components are delivered in classroom settings by Carrera Program staff (five New York City sites) and school staff trained in the fidelity of the model (five out-of-state sites).

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation of the Children’s Aid Society Carrera Program was a three-year, random assignment longitudinal study. The evaluation assessed the effects of participation in the Carrera teenage pregnancy prevention program on the odds of current sexual activity, use of a condom along with use of hormonal contraceptive, pregnancy, and access to good health care. Six CAS supported agencies each randomly assigned 100 disadvantaged 13–15-year-olds to their regular youth program or to the Carrera Pregnancy Prevention Program. Both program and control group youth were followed for three years. The pro-

gram evaluation of six New York City agencies was completed by Philliber Research Associates.

Evaluation Population

- The evaluation studied 484 disadvantaged teens in the CAS Carrera Program and control program.
- Youth were eligible to be studied if they were not currently in a structured out-of-school time program, were ages 13–15 on July 1, 1997, and were not currently pregnant or parenting.
- The control program was, in most cases, a regular youth program offered by New York City Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and most often included recreational activities, homework help, arts and crafts, or only drop-in privileges; none of the agencies had health care services on-site.
- Of the 42 programs in the City that applied for the study, six were chosen, because they were the most likely to faithfully implement the program as intended and had the infrastructure to do so.
- Each site recruited 100 youth, numbering 600 total, of which 484, or 81 percent, became the actual sample. All six programs served disadvantaged, inner-city populations.
- The youth population in the program was 60 percent Black, and most of the remainder were Hispanic; 21 percent lived in a household with no working adult and received benefits, and another 40 percent lived with an unemployed adult or received benefits; 52 percent lived in single-parent homes; 28 percent reported that their parents/another adult family member had ever participated in or experienced one of the following social risk factors: substance abuse, domestic violence, illness, incarceration, or unemployment; 19 percent reported having parents with two or more of these factors, and 26 percent reported having had sex before the program’s start.

Study Methodology

- 100 youth per agency were recruited, and 484, or 81 percent, became the sample.

- The agencies used a variety of youth recruitment strategies, including outreach in schools, distributing flyers, contacting families on their mailing lists, and recruiting adolescents who were already involved in recreational activities at a program.
- Recruited youth (the sample) were asked to draw envelopes to determine whether they would be assigned to the Carrera or the other afterschool program already offered by the Center. Parents and youth were notified about the study, and permission was sought by both in order for youth to participate in the Carrera or control program.
- Authors state that treatment and control groups did not differ significantly in terms of demographics, risk factors, and other characteristics.
- Baseline data were collected between February and April of 1997.
- Both program and control youth were followed for three years.
- Multivariate regression analyses assessed the effects of program participation on the odds of current sexual activity, use of a condom along with a hormonal contraceptive, pregnancy, and access to good health care.
- Age, ethnicity, baseline measures of the outcome variables, and social development barriers at intake, such as living in a household of low socioeconomic status or having a poor relationship with one's mother were controlled for with a logistic regression analyses. The logistic regression analysis was done to better assess whether the program indeed had the impacts on the youth versus outside factors.
- The evaluators developed a six-point scale to measure how many of the barriers to healthy social development each young person had.
- Data were collected through annual surveys of youths' characteristics and program outcomes, annual tests of knowledge of sexual topics were administered by the evaluation team at the same time as the surveys, and monthly attendance records were reviewed. Medical records were used to check the accuracy of pregnancy (and other health) information given by the youth.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Comprehensive prevention program
- Safe environment
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming

Funding

Program Funding

Program is funded by Children's Aid Society, Robin Hood Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, and Bernice & Milton Stern Foundation.

Evaluation Funding

Evaluation was funded by Robin Hood Foundation.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Dr. Michael A. Carrera
 The Children's Aid Society
 105 East 22nd St.
 New York, NY 10010
 212-949-4800
<http://www.stopteenpregnancy.com/contact/>

Evaluation Contact

Susan Philliber
 Jacqueline Williams Kaye
 Emily West
 Philliber Research Associates
 137-58 Thurston Street - Lower Level
 Springfield Gardens, New York 11413
 347-626-7233
info@philliberresearch.com

Sources Used

Philliber, S., Kaye, J., & West, E. (2002, October). *Preventing Pregnancy and Improving Health Care Access Among Teenagers: An Evaluation of the Children's Aid Society—Carrera Program*. Philliber Research Associates: Evaluation for the Children's Aid Society.

Other Resources

<http://www.stopteenpregnancy.com/>

The Urban Alliance High School Internship Program Two Evaluation Reports: 2005–2006, 2006–2007

Target Population	High school students
Evaluation	Program to Watch; all participants were assessed at four points during the year
Findings	Students increased basic, intermediate, and advanced “hard skills” and generally increased “soft skills”
Elements of Success	Active programming Clear, sequenced structure Community partnerships Experiential learning Financial incentives High-quality and devoted staff Relevant work experience Supportive adult relationships

Overview of Program

The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. (UA) was founded in 1996 and serves DC Public Schools (DCPS) high school students (mostly juniors and seniors) by providing them with internship opportunities throughout the entire year through the High School Internships Program. Students also receive a professional mentor, skill-building opportunities, college/career planning, and a 3:1 matched savings account through Capital Area Asset Building, a financial education Community based-organization (CBO). Additionally, UA provides job opportunities in the health field for high school graduates through their Health Alliance Program, and they provide a Graduate Services Program.

Key Findings

The findings indicate that students increased basic, intermediate, and advanced “hard skills” and generally increased “soft skills.”

High School Internship Program Outcomes 2005–2006

- Scores for basic skills (faxing, filing, copying, and attending meetings) increased from 2.7 in the fall to 3.7 in the summer.
- Scores for intermediate skills (answering phones, data entry, and email) increased from 2.5 to 3.5.
- Scores for advanced skills (researching, taking notes, and customer service) increased from about 2.0 to 3.5.
- Scores for professionalism (attendance, punctuality, attitude, and attire) increased from 3.2 to 3.7.
- Scores for communication (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) increased from 2.9 to 3.5.
- Scores for job competency (task completion, work accuracy, initiative, and time management) increased from 3.0 to 3.4.
- Scores for development (balancing responsibilities, accepting criticism, following directions, goal setting, and understanding consequences) increased from 2.9 to 3.5.
- The retention rate was 86 percent for high school

seniors and 69 percent for all enrolled students. Of the 71 students who were initially enrolled in the High School Internship Program, 49 successfully completed the full school year internship.

- Of the 41 high school seniors completing their school year internships in May 2006, 39 (95 percent) graduated on time and 38 (97 percent) enrolled and began college in Fall 2006.

High School Internship Program Outcomes 2006–2007

- Scores for basic skills increased from 3.53 in the fall (baseline) to 3.72 in August.
- Scores for intermediate skills increased scores from 3.27 to 3.59.
- Scores for advanced skills increased from 2.99 to 3.53.
- Scores for professionalism skills decreased from 3.79 to 3.67.
- Scores for communication skills increased from 3.41 to 3.59.
- Scores for job competency skills increased from 3.38 to 3.51.
- Scores for development skills increased from 3.33 to 3.48.
- The retention rate for the High School Internship Program was 79 percent.
- Of the 100 high school seniors completing their school year internships in May 2007, 98 (98 percent) graduated on time, 96 of these completed the summer program, and 82 (85 percent) enrolled and began college in Fall 2007.

Program Population/Eligibility

- The program concentrates efforts on the poorest areas of Washington, DC, specifically targeting 11 schools in Wards 5, 7, and 8, but it does accept students from all wards. Students receive priority ranking if they attend one of the 11 targeted schools.

- UA recruits students from classroom presentations about six months prior to the start of the program year.
- During the 2005-2006 year, 163 students were enrolled in all three programs (105 in the High School Internship Program, 29 in the Health Alliance Program, and 29 in the Graduate Services Program).
- For 2006-2007, there were 213 participants (154 in the High School Internship Program, 19 in the Health Alliance Program, and 40 in the Graduate Services Program).
- On average, students are ages 16–18.
- Enrolled students are 97 percent African American, and 72 percent are from Wards 5, 7, and 8 (considered at-risk areas).
- In 2005–2006, participants were 59 percent female and 41 percent male (with 97 percent females in the Health Alliance Program); in 2006–2007, participants were 81 percent female and 19 percent male (with 100 percent females in the Health Alliance Program).
- More girls are served in the Health Alliance program because in DC, more girls stay in high school whereas more boys drop out. UA tries to recruit more boys, but has had difficulty attracting them.

Program Components

The program starts in September with UA-led trainings, and the employment placement starts in November. The internship program ends in August.

- *High School Internship Program:* Starting each November, UA internship participants receive year-round paid internship opportunities. UA has 80 employment partners, and UA mandates that at least 75 percent of student internships be paid for by donations from these partners (partners pay UA and funds go to the student's salary, job training by UA, and overhead costs). Students also receive a professional mentor, skill building opportunities, college and career planning, and a 3:1 matched savings account through Capital Area Asset Building. Specific components include:

- ❑ Part-time (paid) work during the school year, Monday through Thursday, 2 to 5 p.m.
 - ❑ Life-skills and job readiness workshops on Fridays during the school year (after school). Topics include conflict resolution, interview skills, professional writing, and work etiquette.
 - ❑ College and career planning assistance provided by UA program coordinators.
 - ❑ Full-time (paid) work during the summer, Monday through Thursday.
 - ❑ Financial literacy workshops on Fridays during the summer.
 - ❑ Matched savings accounts, through which students can save up to \$1,000 matched at 3:1 ratio for a total of \$4,000.
- **Health Alliance Program:** The Health Alliance Program is a partnership between UA, Providence and Sibley Hospitals, The University of the District of Columbia, and Northern Virginia Community College. The program began in 2003. Participants must be high school graduates (ages 18-28). Participants receive free certified nursing assistant (CAN) training and employment at the partner hospitals, attend registered nursing classes, weekly counseling, weekly tutoring, and life skills workshops. UA is no longer enrolling students in the Health Alliance program, and enrollment numbers will remain static.
 - **Graduate Services Program:** This program formally began in October 2007 as a response to alumni coming back to UA to seek services after graduation from high school. The Graduate Services Program offers one-on-one college and career advice to students for as long as they want it. The matched savings account is also extended for these youth. Some youth are eligible for the internship component as well. There is also an interactive website, where students can find job postings and network with other graduates.

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted internally and did not use a control group; therefore, it is not possible to determine statistical significance. This summary reflects information and outcomes from the 2005–2006 and 2006–2007 evaluation reports. The evaluation utilized data from application forms, skill assessments, and in-house satisfaction surveys. The evaluation measured hard job skills (faxing, data entry, researching, and taking notes) and soft job skills

(more fluid abilities that make a person successful in the work place, including professionalism, communication, job competency, development of personal responsibility, and goal setting).

Evaluation Population

- All program participants from 2005 to 2007 made up the “sample” and were assessed at four points during the year.
- During 2005–2006 year, 163 students were enrolled in all three programs (105 in the High School Internship Program, 29 in the Health Alliance Program, and 29 in the Graduate Services Program).
- For 2006–2007, there were 213 participants (154 in the High School Internship Program, 19 in the Health Alliance Program, and 40 in the Graduate Services Program).
- In 2006–2007, 85 percent of students completing the program (102 of 121) were assessed at all four points during the year. (Data on survey completion is not provided for 2005–2006).

Study Methodology

- The evaluation was internal and did not use a control group.
- Various forms of data were collected, including data from student application forms, student skill assessments, and in-house satisfaction surveys.
- Students were rated on a 0–4 scale on a variety of skills by their employment supervisors. Supervisors filled out a form for each student to assess their hard and soft skills.
- Four data sets were taken, one baseline, and three follow-ups. The baseline assessment was not technically taken at the start of the employment program (November), because the supervisors were not ready to assess the skills of the youth at that time. The baseline scores were instead filled out by supervisors along with the first follow-up, in February, and supervisors rated what they thought the students’ skills were in November.

- The second follow-up was conducted in May and the final one in August.
- The evaluation did not control for counterfactual conditions, so analysis could not determine what conditions would have occurred over time to similar youth nonparticipants.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Clear, sequenced structure
- Community partnerships
- Experiential learning
- Financial incentives
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Relevant work experience
- Supportive adult relationships

Funding

This evaluation is supported by general operating funds. UA is funded by more than 30 organizations, including the Children’s Fund of Metropolitan Washington, DC, Children & Youth Investment Corporation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, and the Ruddle Memorial Youth Fund.

Contact Information

Program and Research Contact

Sean Segal
Director of Operations
Urban Alliance
202-266-7268
SSegal@urbanalliancefoundation.org
www.urbanalliancefoundation.org

Sources Used

- Moran, N. “The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2005—September 2006.”
- Moran, N. “The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2006—February 2007: Mid-Year Report.”
- Moran, N. “The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2006—August 2007.”

Other Resources

<http://www.urbanalliancefoundation.org>

Upward Bound Math-Science (UBMS)

Target Population	Students in Grades 9–12
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; Mathematica study compared a random sample of matched participants and nonparticipants; RTI International study examined a cohort of participants over a six-year period
Findings	Mathematica improved high school grades in math and science, increased the likelihood of taking chemistry and physics in high school, increased the likelihood of enrolling in more selective four-year institutions, increased the likelihood of majority in math and science, increased the likelihood of completing a four-year degree in math and science RTI found positive outcomes for participants in postsecondary enrollment
Elements of Success	Active programming Collaboration with a postsecondary institution Education system alignment Focus on minority achievement High-quality and devoted staff Small learning communities Structured program Student-centered programming

Overview of Program

The US Department of Education (USED) established a math and science initiative within Upward Bound (UB), a college access program funded under TRIO in 1990. Upward Bound Math-Science (UBMS) was designed to provide disadvantaged high school students with skills and experiences that prepare them for college success. Additionally, UBMS seeks to help students develop their potential to succeed in the field of math and science and pursue degrees in these fields. Grants are awarded to two- and four-year colleges and universities to operate UBMS projects, which are intensive hands-on science and math projects that include access to outside speakers and opportunities for field trips. A six-week summer program including lab science and precalculus is also offered.

Key Findings

Overall, the Mathematica impact analysis found that UBMS improved high school grades in math and science, increased the likelihood of taking chemistry and physics in high school, increased the likelihood of enrolling in more selective four-year institutions, increased the likelihood of majoring in math and science, and increased the likelihood of completing a four-year degree in math and science. The findings below for the Mathematica study are statistically significant unless stated otherwise.

Findings from the RTI 2008 program outcomes report indicate the most significant positive outcome for UBMS participants is postsecondary enrollment of participants. The report emphasizes that as length of participation in the program increased, college enrollment rates increased for UBMS participants.

Outcomes Measured for Mathematica Study

- Performance in high school, especially in math and science.
- Postsecondary attendance, persistence, and completion.
- Intention of completing a postsecondary degree in math or science field.

Outcomes Measured for RTI Study

- Program retention (persistence).
- Postsecondary enrollment rates.
- Postsecondary attendance patterns.

Findings for Mathematica Study

- Improved high school grades in math and science and overall. The average math GPA increased from 2.7 to 2.8, and the average science GPA increased from 2.7 to 2.9.¹¹⁶
- Increased the likelihood of taking chemistry and physics in high school. The percentage of students taking chemistry increased from 78 percent to 88 percent, and the percent in physics increased from 43 percent to 58 percent.¹¹⁷ UBMS did not affect participation in advanced math courses.
- Increased the percentage of students attending four-year institutions from 71 percent to 82 percent,¹¹⁸ and the percentage of students attending two-year schools decreased from 16 percent to 11 percent.¹¹⁹
- Increased the percentage majoring (or planning to major) in math and science from 23 percent to 33 percent and decreased the percentage majoring in

fields outside math and science from 51 percent to 42 percent.¹²⁰

- Increased the intention of completing a four-year degree in math and science from 6 percent to 12 percent¹²¹ and decreased the intention of degrees in other fields from 20 percent to 14 percent.¹²² Note that 47 percent of the students surveyed were still in college at the time of the survey, so these findings are preliminary only.
- UBMS has larger effects on grades and coursework for Hispanic students than for African American students. UBMS raised the average GPA in math courses from 2.4 to 2.5¹²³ for African American students and from 2.4 to 2.7¹²⁴ for Hispanic students. The likelihood of African American students taking chemistry and physics increased by 7 percent each,¹²⁵ and the likelihood of Hispanic students taking chemistry and physics increased by 17 percent and 27 percent,¹²⁶ respectively.
- College completion rates differ between men and women. The percentage of UBMS women earning a bachelor's degree increased from 32 percent to 40 percent.¹²⁷ However, for men the effect of UBMS was statistically insignificant. UBMS did increase the percentage of men completing an associate's degree from 4 percent to 8 percent.¹²⁸

¹¹⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$ for both statistics.

¹¹⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$ for both statistics.

¹¹⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$.

¹¹⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$.

¹²⁰ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$ for both statistics.

¹²¹ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$.

¹²² Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence at $P < .05$; UBMS also seems to be increasing the percentage of participants majoring in the social sciences.

¹²³ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence at $P < .10$.

¹²⁴ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence at $P < .05$.

¹²⁵ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$.

¹²⁶ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence at $P < .05$.

¹²⁷ Findings are statistically significant with 90 percent confidence at $P < .01$.

¹²⁸ Findings are statistically significant with 99 percent confidence at $P < .01$ for both statistics.

Findings for RTI Study

- Of UBMS participants expected to graduate in 2004–2005, 86.1 percent enrolled in postsecondary education.
- Overall, 55.3 percent of UBMS participants remained in the program until their expected high school graduation date.
- Approximately 64 percent of UBMS participants who entered as seniors remained in the program through their expected high school graduation.
- Just more than 50 percent (52.9) of participants who entered before or during the 9th grade remained in the program through their expected high school graduation.
- Of the 2,936 UBMS participants expected to graduate in 2004–2005, 86.1 percent enrolled in postsecondary education.
- Length of program participation varied; 36.3 percent of 2004–2005 expected graduates participated for one to 11 months, 26.7 percent participated for 12 to 23 months, 20.6 percent participated for 24 to 35 months, and 16.4 percent participated for 36 or more months.
- College enrollment rates increased as length of program participation increased. College enrollment for UBMS students who participated for 11 months or less was 80 percent; college enrollment was more than 87 percent for students who participated for one year or more; and college enrollment was 94.3 percent for students who participated for 36 months or more.
- College enrollment rates increased for students who received services until their expected high school graduation (94.9 percent enrollment rate) versus those who left the program before their expected high school graduation (80.9 percent enrollment rate).
- Specifically, 19.9 percent of UBMS participants enrolled in postsecondary education at their UBMS program institution.
- Higher college enrollment rates were found for participants who received services from four-year public institutions (87.1 percent) versus two-year public institutions (86.9 percent), four-year private (85.9 percent) institutions, and community organizations (69.8 percent).
- UBMS students who received services from private four-year institutions were less likely to attend a college that was in the same sector as the program institution (9.4 percent enrolled in the same institution) than participants who received services from public four-year institutions (21.4 percent) or two-year institutions (31.3 percent).
- UBMS participants from participating schools located in towns or rural locations were most likely to attend their program institution for postsecondary education (27.2 percent and 22.6 percent, respectively) while participants from suburban schools were least likely to attend their program institution for postsecondary education (13.4 percent); 17.4 percent of participants from cities enrolled in their program institution for postsecondary education.

Program Population/Eligibility

- At the time of the study, UBMS students were 42 percent Black, 27 percent White, 15 percent Hispanic, 8 percent Asian, and 5 percent American Indian.
- UBMS serves students in Grades 9–12 and tends to serve older students than the regular UB program does. For example, 35 percent of UBMS participants enter the program prior to 10th grade, compared to 50 percent for UB participants.
- Each program serves between 50 and 75 participants annually.
- Initially in 1990, USED funded 30 UBMS projects. By FY 2004, there were 127 UBMS projects serving 6,845 students nationwide.
- Despite coming from low-income families, the evidence suggests that on average, UBMS serves students who do well in high school and attend college at higher rates than the average low-income student. Data reported by UBMS proj-

ects suggest that prior to participating in UBMS, UBMS participants earned higher grades on average than regular UB participants. In addition, the national evaluation of UB has shown that regular UB participants would have attended college at much higher rates than the average low-income student even if they had not participated in UB. Therefore, the evidence strongly suggests that UBMS serves high school students who are much more likely to attend college than the average low-income student.

- At least two-thirds of each UBMS's program participants must belong to families classified as low-income (no greater than 150 percent above poverty line) or be a potential first-generation college student. Interest in math or science is considered.
- The 2008 RTI report indicates:
 - In 2004-2005 there were 127 UBMS funded projects, serving 7,959 participants during the year.
 - In 2005-2006 there were 127 UBMS funded projects, serving 8,188 participants during the year. In 2005-2006, 5,910 participants were served during in the UBMS summer component, the primary emphasis of UBMS.

Program Components

- The UBMS program has an academic and summer component; both offer hands-on classes and projects in math and science.
- The academic and summer components provide academic enrichment in math and science subjects. Courses are offered in advanced algebra, geometry, precalculus, biology, chemistry, physics and computer software; many offer English courses in addition to math and science. The courses provide academic enrichment instead of academic remediation.
- Three out of four projects provided instruction primarily through single-subject academic courses or the combination of these courses with interdisciplinary instruction.
- On average, UBMS projects have 24 staff members, including eight instructors, five resident

counselors, four mentors, three tutors, two administrators, one academic or guidance counselor, and one clerical staff member. The average student-staff ratio in summer 1998 was 2:1.

Academic Component

- The academic year program is less intensive than the summer program; most of the activities offered are enrichment activities that are not offered in class, such as lab experiments, trips to field sites, and seminars with university professors. Another 30 percent of activities parallel what students are taught in their classes. The academic program includes help with college and financial aid applications, and tutoring in laboratory science and mathematics through precalculus, as well as site visits to potential employers. The majority of the academic time in UBMS is spent away from large lecture halls and is instead in small group teacher-led instruction (32 percent), science labs (29 percent), computer labs (12 percent), and other settings (4 percent).

Summer Component

- The six-week summer program is the main emphasis of UBMS programming and is more intensive. Almost all students reside in college dorms for the summer program. On average, UBMS participants spend 29 hours per week on instruction and 11 hours per week on tutoring, with an average of 240 academic hours per summer. In accordance with program guidelines, UBMS projects offer instruction in a diverse array of academic subject areas. 75 percent or more of projects in 1994 offered instruction in the following subjects: writing and composition, Algebra II, geometry, precalculus, computer applications and software use, biology, chemistry, and physics. More than half of offerings are math or science specific.

Overview of Evaluation

- Since 1991, Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) has been conducting the national evaluation of Upward Bound for USED. In 1997, MPR started evaluating UBMS and in 2007 USED published *Upward Bound Math-Science: Program Description and Interim Impact Estimates*. This evaluation summarizes MPR's first UBMS report. The

report provides a descriptive analysis of the program as well as an impact analysis of program participation. In 1998, MPR selected a random sample of students who participated in UBMS between 1993 and 1995 at 74 (of 81 total) projects that were still operating at that time. This quasi-experimental report compares UBMS participants to regular UB participants and applicants. Therefore the researchers acknowledge a selection bias in terms of the motivation and higher achievement levels that UBMS students enter the program with versus regular UB students. The impact analysis measures performance in high school, especially in math and science, postsecondary attendance, persistence, and completion and intention of completing a postsecondary degree in math or science field.

- In addition to the Mathematica report, in 2008 RTI prepared a report for USED on UB and UBMS Upward Bound *Math-Science Program Outcomes for Participants Expected to Graduate High School in 2004–05, With Supporting Data From 2005–06*.
- The report presents data on postsecondary enrollment rates for participants who were expected to graduate high school during the 2004–2005 academic year and examined a full cohort of those UBMS participants. The report utilized data from the 1999–2000 through 2005–2006 academic years, and therefore also includes information on the academic progress of a full range of participants, including those who entered the program as 9th-, 10th-, 11th- or 12th-grade students. The longitudinal data was collected over a six-year period. The report measured program retention (persistence), postsecondary enrollment rates, and postsecondary attendance patterns.

Evaluation Population/Eligibility

Mathematica Study

- The sample consisted of 1,759 UBMS participants and 2,830 regular UB sample members from the regular UB evaluation, conducted separately by Mathematica.
- Completed interviews were obtained for 1,425 UBMS participants and 2,146 regular Upward

Bound sample members for response rates of 81 percent and 76 percent, respectively.

- The authors state that the general UBMS population is statistically similar to the sample.

RTI Study

- Analysis based on 2,936 UMBS participants expected to graduate high school in the 2004–2005 school year.
- Participants did not necessarily enroll in Fall 2005; enrollment ranged from the summer prior to the 1999–2000 school year to the summer prior to the 2004–2005 school year.

Study Methodology

- The Mathematica and RTI studies used the same baseline data. The baseline data was collected using high school transcripts and surveys and included demographic and family characteristics, participation in other precollege programs, and 9th-grade academic achievement in math, science, and overall.

Mathematica Study

- In 1998, MPR selected a random sample of the students who participated in UBMS between 1993 and 1995 at projects that were still operating at that time.
- To obtain the sample, in 1998, the evaluators contacted the 65 UBMS Centers that were operating and had been in operation between 1993 and 1995 to request lists of participants from the summers of 1993, 1994, and 1995; one of every four students from the lists was used for the analysis sample.
- A matched comparison group was used and included participants from the evaluation of regular Upward Bound who reported that they had not participated in an UBMS Center.
- Matching was conducted differently for UBMS participants who had previously participated in UB and for those who had not; UBMS participants who had previously participated in regular UB were matched to members of the treatment group

(therefore enrolled in UB) in the evaluation of regular Upward Bound; UMBS participants who had not previously participated in regular UB were matched to regular UB control group (applied to, but did not enroll in UB) participants.

- The matching process ensured that students in both groups had similar characteristics, including eligibility and motivation. This evaluation did not attempt to compare UBMS students against students who had never received any type of precollege training.
- Data was collected between 1998–1999 and again between 2001–2002 for students who participated in UBMS between 1993–1995.

RTI Study

- Postsecondary enrollment and federal financial aid information was collected for the 2,936 UBMS participants expected to graduate in the 2004–2005 academic year. Data was collected starting from the 1999–2000 school year through the 2005–2006 school year.

Data Sources

Mathematica Study

- For the impact analysis, a survey was conducted between April 2001 and December 2002; the survey measured secondary and postsecondary education outcomes five to seven years after scheduled high school graduation; a monetary incentive of \$10 was given to participants upon survey completion.
- High school transcripts were used for information about grades, GPA, and courses taken. Surveys were taken to measure family demographics, participation in other precollege programs, and 9th-grade academic achievement in math, science and generally.
- Note that this study’s findings likely suffer from selection bias due to participants not being randomly assigned to treatment and control groups.

RTI Study

- Postsecondary enrollment information derived from the 2000–2001 through 2005–2006 UBMS Annual Performance Report (APR) and federal financial aid database maintained by USED’s Office of Postsecondary Education for 2000–2001 through 2005–2006.
- Data on program funding was derived from the Federal TRIO Programs’ funding database and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Institution Characteristics, 2005–2006.
- Information on participating schools was obtained from the NCES Common Core of Data.

Elements of Success

- Active programming
- Collaboration with a postsecondary institution
- Education system alignment
- Focus on minority achievement
- High-quality and devoted staff
- Small learning communities
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming

Funding

- UBMS is funded by the US Department of Education.
- The Mathematica evaluation states that the annual cost per UBMS student is approximately \$4,800 per academic year and is comparable to other Upward Bound programs.
- The 2008 RTI report indicates that the average cost per participant served for the 2004–2005 year was \$4,123; for 2005–2006 the average cost per participant served was \$3,980.

Contact Information

Neil Seftor
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Washington, DC Office
nseftor@mathematica-mpr.com
609-275-2246
600 Maryland Ave., SW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
202-484-9220
202-863-1763 fax

Sources Used

- Olsen, R., & Seftor, N., et al. (2007, April). *Upward Bound Math-Science: Program Description and Interim Impact Estimates*, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Knapp, L. G., Heuer, R. E., & Mason, M. (2008). *Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math-Science Program Outcomes for Participants Expected to Graduate High School in 2004–06, With Supportive Data From 2005–06*. Washington, D.C.: RTI International.

Other Resources

- <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/education/up-bound.asp>
<http://www.ed.gov/programs/triomathsci/index.html>

Woodcraft Rangers Nvision After School Program

Target Population	Students in Grades K–8 are served; evaluation studied middle school students
Evaluation	Stronger evidence of effectiveness; comparison group determined at the end of the year; participants were compared to nonparticipants
Findings	Participants improved or maintained their school attendance, learning skills and attitudes, student engagement, academic performance, grade point average and prosocial interests and behavior
Elements of Success	Personal relationships with staff Provides choices for participants Structured program Student-centered programming

Overview of Program

Woodcraft Rangers has been providing afterschool programs for elementary and middle school students throughout the City of Los Angeles for more than 80 years. The goal of the program is to provide a safe and supportive environment beyond the school day and to help students improve social, behavioral, and learning skills that contribute to improved school achievement and healthy lifestyles. In the 1980s, Woodcraft Rangers restructured their afterschool programs through the use of youth and parental surveys, and Woodcraft Rangers Nvision was born. Woodcraft Rangers Nvision was made into an “interest-based clubs” program, where young people choose clubs based on their interests. Today, the Woodcraft Rangers Nvision Program provides afterschool programs to 67 elementary and middle schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Garvey School District, Hacienda/La Puente USD, and Montebello USD. Services are provided at the schools through subcontracts, through Beyond the Bell (BTB). BTB is a branch of the LAUSD that oversees all before and afterschool programs in the district.

Key Findings

Findings for the middle school programs focus on program participation and recruitment, academic-related program outcomes, and social-behavioral program outcomes and program satisfaction. In general, findings indicate that participants improved or maintained their school attendance, learning skills and attitudes, student engagement, academic performance, grade point average (GPA), and prosocial interests and behaviors between Spring 2004–2005 and Spring 2005–2006. Findings are from the 2005–2006 report unless otherwise noted. Results are reported statistically significant with 95 percent confidence ($p < .05$).

- More than three-fourths (77 percent) of students participated for at least three months during the year and 22 percent of middle school students participated for nine months or more.
- The 2002-2003 report states that this is the first afterschool activity that 70 percent of the participating middle school students have joined.
- Middle school students participate in an average of two clubs. Students who are involved in more clubs attend longer and have higher school attendance rates.

- A majority of 89 percent of parents indicated youth were safe when attending programs and were very satisfied with program. In addition, 64 percent of middle school parents said staff members were friendly and caring.
- 60 percent of middle school students improved or maintained their school attendance from Spring 2005 to Spring 2006. Students who participated for at least six months had significantly fewer absences than nonparticipants.
- 100 percent of “far below basic” middle school participants maintained or improved their California Standards Test (CST) math level, with 60 percent showing improvement; 81 percent of “below basic” students improved or maintained their CST level, with 28 percent improving; 68 percent of “basic” students maintained or improved their CST level, with 25 percent improving; 83 percent of proficient students maintained or improved their CST level, with 19 percent improving; 55 percent of advanced students maintained their CST level. The five proficiency levels are “far below basic,” “below basic,” “basic,” “proficient,” and “advanced.” Statistics were similar for English Language Arts test scores.
- More than half (53 percent) of middle school students maintained or improved their GPAs from Spring 2005 to Spring 2006. Regression analysis controlled for Spring 2005 GPA, demographics, and school attended, and indicated that attendance in Woodcraft Rangers significantly predicted GPA.¹²⁹ 73 percent of middle school students said Woodcraft helped them “a lot” or “somewhat” to stay out of trouble.
- Almost half of middle school students improved youth survey scores for student engagement (45 percent), leadership (50 percent), and future planning (43 percent). For two-year participants, the findings were even more acute (51 percent, 50 percent, and 49 percent, respectively).
- Students and parents cite homework completion as the primary program benefit.

¹²⁹ Findings are statistically significant with 95 percent confidence.

Program Population/Eligibility

- The Nvision Program currently serves more than 15,000 youth annually through 67 elementary and middle schools in four greater Los Angeles school districts.
- Currently, 65 schools in LAUSD, Garvey School District, Hacienda/La Puente USD, and Montebello USD are being served and are eligible.
- Any youth in the participating schools may enter the program at any point during the year.
- Most schools served are deemed schools in “need of improvement” according to the LAUSD.
- Priority is given to these schools, as well as to schools with at least 50 percent of students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.

Program Components

- The afterschool program begins with a homework clinic, snack time, and a fitness period. Students also participate in clubs, which run for eight weeks at a time and meet two to five days a week.
- Each club has a specific theme in categories of sports/fitness/recreation, visual arts, academics, and performing arts.
- Reading, writing, and math exercises are woven into the club activities. Students also have access to field trips.

Overview of Evaluation

The evaluation was quasi-experimental and nonexperimental and used a variety of research methods and data sources. The evaluation examined student participation levels in Woodcraft afterschool clubs and the relationship between academic outcomes and program involvement in general. The report sought to determine the key characteristics of the students who joined the program, key demographic factors related to program participation levels, types of participant attendance patterns by program club type, whether participation increased attendance, to what extent participants improve their learning skills and attitudes, whether participation is associated with higher levels of academic achievement,

whether the program helps keep students safe during afterschool hours, to what extent students who attended developed prosocial interests and behaviors and avoided at-risk behaviors, and to what extent parents and participating students were satisfied with the quality of the program. The evaluation utilized both statewide measures, such as standardized tests results and localized measures, such as parent focus groups to report outcomes. Reports were conducted separately for elementary and middle school students. The 2005–2006 report is the seventh annual report produced by Lodestar; the research is expected to continue into the future. The most recent evaluation assessed 20 elementary and 10 LAUSD middle schools. Elementary and middle schools were evaluated separately.

Evaluation Population

- The 2005–2006 report evaluated the 20 LAUSD elementary schools and 10 middle schools served by Nvision.
- Middle school participants were 89 percent Hispanic and 57 percent male.
- Of the 77 percent of middle school students who participated for at least three months, 89 percent were Hispanic, 8 percent were African American, 43 percent were female, and 57 percent were male.
- The average age was 13 years old and 39 percent of the participants were in Grade 8.
- The evaluation notes that this demographic profile is also consistent with that for middle school students in LAUSD as a whole.
- The sample was made up of the 377 middle school students who completed both a baseline and end-of-year survey.

Methodology

Reports were conducted separately for elementary and middle school students. For the purposes of this compendium, only the middle school outcomes will be summarized.

Middle School Afterschool Sites

- Surveys were given to all students, and 377 filled out both presurveys and postsurveys, so they were therefore considered the “sample.”
- The survey included items on learning attitudes and skills, sense of efficacy, future planning and leadership skills, risk-related activities, students’ prior participation in afterschool activities, and their decision to participate in the program.
- The survey questions were grouped into the four scales: student engagement, leadership, risky behavior, and future planning. The end-of-year survey includes information on program satisfaction.
- Researchers determined comparison groups at the end of the year in order to allow all students the choice of participating in the program.
- The comparison groups were used to compare the academic outcomes of participants versus non-participants.
- Report outcomes were grouped into four categories: program recruitment and individual-level factors, program retention and individual-level factors, club-level factors related to recruitment/retention, and site-level factors related to recruitment/retention.

Data Sources

- A participant tracking database was used by site staff to collect gender, ethnicity, grade level, and other demographic information.
- Parent focus groups were held at the end of the year to determine parents’ perceptions of the program benefits and sense of student safety. These focus groups were facilitated by Woodcraft staff using a guide developed by the research team; 91 parents from 14 elementary schools and 37 parents from eight middle schools participated in 2005-2006.
- Standardized test scores were used to assess academic performance, as were school academic records, specifically math and English grades and GPAs.

- Along with this information, data was collected on English proficiency level and participation in free or reduced-price lunch programs.
- Youth surveys were conducted as pretests and posttests after one academic year in the program. Surveys asked youth about attitudes and skills learned, their sense of efficacy, future planning and leadership, risk-related activities, and satisfaction items. This evaluation only included surveys for youth who participated for at least three months and filled out both presurveys and postsurveys.
- The Supervisors (Woodcraft Club Leaders) filled out one-page assessments at the end of each eight-week club cycle and generalized the outcomes for the youth they served. Outcomes assessed include academics, prosocial behavior, leadership, and risky behavior. Note that some academic outcomes are self-reported, such as grades.

Elements of Success

- Personal relationships with staff
- Provides choices for participants
- Structured program
- Student-centered programming

Funding

The program uses funding from California's Department of Education's After School Education & Safety (ASES) program, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Los Angeles City, and private foundations. The evaluation was funded by United Way and other foundation grants.

Contact Information

Program Contact

Cathie Mostovoy
CEO
Woodcraft Rangers
Main Office
1625 West Olympic Blvd., Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90015
213-249-9293

Research Contact

Monica A. Kaiser
Vice President
Kaiser Group, Inc.,
237 South Street
Waukesha, WI 53186
262-544-4971
kaisermonica@mac.com

Sources Used

Woodcraft Rangers: Annual Evaluation Report for 2005–06 for the Elementary and Middle School After-School Programs. (June 2007). Lodestar Management/Research, Inc.

Other Resources

<http://www.woodcraftrangers.org/evaluation.html>.

PART III



Participant Outcomes
Policy Recommendations

Participant Outcomes -

A YPF found that expanded learning opportunities impact youth across a broad spectrum of outcomes. This range of program outcomes is not surprising given the wide diversity of ELO activities and programs. While many programs are designed to increase academic success or have a stated goal of improving academic performance, many other ELOs are designed to provide opportunities for youth to develop a range of skills and talents, expand their horizons, or prevent negative behaviors. The fact that ELOs can have a positive impact on such a variety of outcomes is important for policymakers and the public to know.

This research supports the finding that ELOs can positively impact academic outcomes, especially when ELOs are aligned to students' needs and the school curriculum. Expanded learning opportunities can also positively impact career preparation, social and emotional development, and health and wellness outcomes of youth participants. Interestingly, even when ELOs are not intentionally designed to improve academic outcomes, they can have positive impacts on academic indicators, supporting the concept of positive youth development that recognizes that youth need holistic, comprehensive, and supportive environments to grow and flourish.

Expanded learning opportunities produce both short-term and long-term positive outcomes, and do so not by chance, but rather by consciously working within a structure that supports high-quality student-centered programming. There is a positive correlation between the frequency and duration of youth participation and successful outcomes, raising the question of just how much is "enough" in order to impact positive outcomes. While the review of the evaluations does not answer this question definitively in terms of ideal levels of participation, it does shed light on the importance of frequent and ongoing youth involvement.

Outcomes are measured in both quantitative ways, such as studying school attendance, high school graduation and dropout rates, course grades, grade point averages (GPAs), achievement test scores, teen pregnancy prevention rates, and qualitative ways, such as measuring positive school-related behaviors and attitudes, perceived increase in sup-

portive adult relationships, and self-esteem. The outcomes measured generally align, in large part, to the mission and goals of the youth program itself. A program designed to strengthen bonds within the family and community may measure qualitative factors such as family closeness and parental involvement in school, just as the FAST (National) program did in its evaluation of the middle school program. On the other hand, a program designed to prepare high school students for college, such as the College Now program, measures quantitative factors such as GPAs earned in the first semester of college and persistence to a third semester of college.

The most common outcomes measured in the evaluations, Academic, Career Preparation, Social and Emotional Development, and Health and Wellness, are discussed in greater detail below and provide further evidence of the value that ELOs play in preparing youth for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement, and how these need to be a key ingredient in a comprehensive system of learning in every community.

Academic

Of the 22 evaluations included in the compendium, 14 included measurements of academic success. The indicators used to measure academic success varied throughout the evaluations. For example, six of the 22 program evaluations specifically measured attendance rates, graduation rates, and/or dropout rates; 11 of the 22 measured course grades, GPA, credit accumulation, and/or achievement test scores; four evaluations measured college preparation outcomes, including taking college preparation courses, persisting to a third semester of college, and other postsecondary enrollment rates. Additionally, nine programs measured academic success-related behaviors and attitudes, such as increased engagement in school, taking college preparation classes, and studying more. More often than not, programs that increased participants' school-related behaviors and attitudes demonstrated an increase in other academic success outcomes, including increased attendance, GPA, and achievement test scores.

Positive Outcomes Measured

ELO Program	Academic Outcomes	Career Preparation Outcomes	Social & Emotional Development Outcomes	Health & Wellness Outcomes
21st CCLC at CAS Community Schools	✓		✓	
After School Matters	✓			
Bayview Safe Haven			✓	
Big Brother Big Sisters	✓		✓	✓
Boys & Girls Clubs: GPTTO/GITTO	✓		✓	
Children's Aid Society-Carrera Program				✓
Citizen Schools	✓	✓	✓	
College Now	✓			
Cool Girls, Inc.	✓		✓	✓
Girls Scouts PAVE the Way			✓	
Middle School FAST (National)	✓		✓	
Project Morry			✓	
Project Venture				✓
PSA Study of Promising After-School Programs	✓		✓	
Quantum Opportunities Program	✓			
Seeds to Success		✓		✓
Summer Career Explorations Program		✓	✓	
Summer Search	✓		✓	
The After School Corporation	✓			
Upward Bound Math-Science	✓			
Urban Alliance		✓	✓	
Woodcraft Rangers	✓			

School Attendance, Graduation, and Dropout Rates

Of the included program evaluations, six demonstrated positive outcomes in attendance, graduation, dropout rates, or a combination of the three outcomes. An increase in attendance, graduation, and/or graduation rates was always accompanied by other positive academic outcomes. For example, participants who participated in The After School Corpora-

tion (TASC) program exhibited positive outcomes in high school attendance as well as credit accumulation. Similarly, participants in Chicago's After School Matters program missed fewer days of school and failed fewer courses than similar classmates. Of the six included studies that demonstrated positive outcomes in attendance, dropout rates, or a combination of the three outcomes, three indicated that students who participated at the highest levels also had higher

rates of graduation and lower dropout rates. In order to measure school attendance rates, ELOs must collaborate with a school and/or school system in order for ELOs to receive access to attendance, graduation, and dropout rates. This strong collaboration between an ELO provider and a school occurred in five of the six programs that measured attendance, graduation, and dropout rates.

Course Grades, GPA, Credit Accumulation, and Achievement Test Scores

A total of 11 program evaluations demonstrated positive effects on course grades, GPA, credit accumulation, and/or achievement test scores. Programs that provided a structured tutoring component as one of several program components in a program session often reported an increase in such academic indicators. Overall, the tutoring sessions were offered daily and did not last longer than one hour, and students were provided with literacy and math enrichment more often than homework help. For example, Citizen Schools provides a structured extended day program from 3:00 to 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday that incorporates 60-90 minutes of daily homework and studying time led by adult community volunteers. Participants in the Woodcraft Rangers program begin each afternoon with a homework clinic and then move into more active programming, such as sports, visual arts, and performing arts. Both Citizen Schools and Woodcraft Rangers deliberately build targeted reading, writing, and math lessons and exercises into their programming. It is important to note that programs that did indicate positive academic outcomes, such as an increase in GPA scores or a decrease in courses failed, did not always explicitly provide programming with an academic component, such as tutoring or math enrichment. However, programs that collaborated with schools and/or postsecondary education institutions and provided active, student-centered programming, such as apprenticeships or experiential internships, often reported positive academic outcomes. For example, students who participated in After School Matters, a program that encourages high school students to explore their interests and provides hands-on internships in the arts, sports, technology, and communication, failed fewer courses than nonparticipants.

Academic Success-Related Behaviors and Attitudes

A total of nine program evaluations measured academic success-related behaviors and attitudes,

such as increased engagement in studying. Of the nine evaluations that measured academic success-related behaviors and attitudes, six also measured and showed an increase in other academic success outcomes, such as increased GPA or achievement test scores. Evaluated programs that measured levels of student engagement and other positive school-related behaviors and attitudes did so in accordance with a logic model that students who exhibit positive school-related behaviors and attitudes, such as student engagement, interest in learning, studying, and participation in school clubs, are better positioned for academic success. Students who participated in the Big Brothers Big Sisters program missed fewer days of school, felt more competent about school work, and also showed modest gains in GPA scores. Similarly, participants in the Boys & Girls Clubs Gang Prevention and Intervention program demonstrated positive school behaviors, accompanied by increased academic achievement.

College Preparation

A total of four evaluations measured college preparation outcomes, including taking college preparation courses, persisting to a third semester of college, and other postsecondary enrollment rates. Such programs demonstrated strong alignment with the participants' education system, collaboration with postsecondary institutions, and highly-trained staff. Both the College Now and Upward Bound Math-Science programs focused specifically on increasing minority academic achievement and college enrollment, and to do so, both programs collaborated with local colleges and universities to offer college preparation courses.

Career Preparation

A total of four program evaluations specifically measured indicators of preparation for career success. A range of indicators were used by the programs for career success preparation outcomes. The Seeds to Success program findings, for example, indicate participant improvements in basic financial skills, workforce readiness skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology, many of which could be characterized as 21st Century skills. Both the Summer Career Explorations Program and Urban Alliance provide students with internship opportunities and mentoring. The Summer Career Explorations Program successfully achieved the short-term outcomes of providing teenagers with jobs and the

means to earn money and be productively engaged during their summertime school break, however the intermediate outcomes of exhibiting stronger orientation toward college, increased employment rates of participants after leaving the program, and fostering a better attitude toward work or work readiness were not met. The Urban Alliance successfully increased basic, intermediate, and advanced “hard skills” (faxing, data entry, researching, and taking notes) and generally increased “soft skills” (more fluid abilities that make a person successful in the work place including professionalism, communication, job competency, development of personal responsibility, and goal setting).

Social and Emotional Development

Expanded learning opportunities provide students with exposure to environments that encourage youth to develop social and emotional skills that will benefit them into adulthood, including the development of personal responsibility and goal setting, increased perceived life chances and hope for the future, and the development of quality relationships with family and friends. A total of 13 programs improved social and emotional development of program participants, and three of the 13 programs improved the quality of their relationships with supportive adults, family, and friends, to some degree. Programs that demonstrated positive outcomes in supportive adult relationships more often than not directly involved or partnered with adults and/or parents in the programming. For example, the Middle School FAST program requires that participating families sign a consent form demonstrating their willingness to participate prior to youth participating. In addition, the core of the FAST program involves 10 weekly family meetings whose purpose is to strengthen bonds within the family and their community. Participants showed an increase in self-esteem, family-closeness, parental involvement in school, and reduction in social isolation. In addition, youth showed improvements in classroom behavior. Participants in Summer Search demonstrated a perceived increase in the amount of support in their lives. Summer Search participants were individually paired with highly-trained mentors for weekly mentoring sessions from sophomore year through high school graduation.

Health and Wellness

Participation in ELOs has been shown to increase the health and wellness of program participants. A total of five programs showed positive health and wellness

outcomes. The included outcomes vary and include increased awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention and increased knowledge about healthy lifestyle practices to preventative outcomes, such as teen pregnancy, drug, and gang prevention. Some of the included programs produced preventative outcomes, such as the Children’s Aid Society Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Program. The intent of the Carrera Program is for teens to learn about sexual responsibility while developing goals and aspirations for life; teens participate in a range of activities from a Job Club, individual tutoring, self-expression, sexuality education, and mental health and medical services. Program participants demonstrated a decline in sexual activity and teenage pregnancy and had higher odds of condom and birth control use, as well as increased odds of receiving good primary health care. Health, wellness, and nutrition comprise one of four programmatic areas that Cool Girls, Inc. seeks to impact positively. The evaluation of Cool Girls, Inc. indicated that program participation had positive effects on drug knowledge and physical activity.

Conclusion

The outcomes of the included evaluations demonstrate that youth who participate in ELOs benefit in a multitude of ways. The included evaluations contained a wide array of indicators used to demonstrate program success, from attendance rates and GPA scores, to workforce readiness skills and increased adult support. The array of evaluation outcomes were grouped into four overarching categories: academic; career preparation; social and emotional development; and health and wellness. Of the 22 evaluations included in the compendium, 14 demonstrated success in academic success indicators, three demonstrated success in career preparation indicators, 13 demonstrated success in social and emotional development indicators, and five showed positive health and wellness outcomes. More often than not, programs demonstrated success in more than one outcome category, which further supports the claim that participation in ELOs is one way to better ensure that all students are provided with the support they need to achieve academic and career success and develop into healthy, self-sufficient adults.

Policy Recommendations -

The underlying message drawn from this review of the 22 evaluations is that quality expanded learning opportunities work.

They improve youth outcomes in a variety of ways that include academic performance, career preparation, social and emotional development, and health and wellness. As such, ELOs should be viewed as a mainstream solution to help leverage scarce resources in the effort to ensure that youth are well-prepared for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement.

How ELOs fit into a strategy to serve all youth is still evolving, and policymakers can help move this discussion forward by creating a vision of a comprehensive learning system that places ELOs front and center in a new approach that recognizes that learning for older youth occurs 24/7 throughout the community. Policymakers can also advance this agenda by developing shared accountability systems; supporting partnerships and collaboration across systems; focusing on quality by building capacity; ensuring equity and access; improving data collection, evaluation, and research; and ensuring sustainability of ELOs. Many of these recommendations are relevant to both federal and state policy leaders.

Vision for a Comprehensive Learning System

- Promote a vision for a comprehensive learning system that draws upon all the resources available throughout the community.

Since learning and development continue when youth are out of the school building, policymakers and leaders need to fashion a vision of how multiple systems, programs, resources, and providers (e.g. K-12 education, social and family services, workforce development, health and mental health, etc.) can collaborate to prepare youth for postsecondary education, a family-wage career, and life as active and engaged citizens. Expanded learning opportunities are a critical component of this vision, but multiple systems need to be included in a comprehensive learning system. In this time of limited resources and high expectations for student success, policymakers

need to make the case that using all the resources of the community, including ELO programs, is essential in this task.

As policymakers work to create a vision of a comprehensive learning system, they need to develop policies that help align various programs and funding streams and encourage programs to collaborate and share resources and expertise. Efforts should be made to ensure that programs reach all youth, particularly those that need the most support. Strong leadership to encourage systems to work together is needed, and practitioners need concrete examples of communities that are doing this work and a clear understanding of the policies that enable such work.

Develop Shared Accountability

- Develop shared accountability by identifying outcomes and measures to which all programs and providers in the comprehensive learning system will be held accountable.

As part of the effort to create a comprehensive learning system of education and youth programs and providers, thought must be given to the development of a shared accountability process that recognizes the contributions of each system or program to the healthy development of youth. Currently, each program is held accountable for a specific outcome, and these outcomes vary a great deal. For instance, most schools are held accountable to test results and high school graduation rates, while other youth-serving programs are held accountable to measures such as reducing alcohol or drug use, improving school behaviors and attitudes, or increasing the incidence of healthy eating and/or exercise. All of these contribute to and are an important part of the healthy development of youth, but current measurement systems do not look holistically, across systems, at the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes youth need. The accountability systems operate in silos, just like many programs, and make it difficult for communities to consider how each program contributes to the overall success of young people.

Policymakers should support communities in their efforts to develop shared accountability by

providing flexibility in existing accountability measurements and by helping to design data collection systems that report on the health and well-being of youth in a holistic manner. For instance, a community whose problems include gang affiliation and dangerous adolescent behaviors may decide that its schools and youth providers need to focus on those issues, whereas another community faced with different challenges may wish to improve the college-going rates of immigrant youth. Education, social, and health supports would be critical players in both scenarios, but the services would be designed and provided very differently to meet these needs, and the programs would be measured on slightly different outcomes. There would still be the expectation that students are prepared for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement, but the first community might examine how each provider contributed most effectively to gang reduction and the other might examine how each provider helped immigrant youth improve postsecondary access and success.

A small number of communities across the country have created community-wide shared accountability systems, and policy should support increased experimentation in this arena and disseminate information on existing efforts.

Support Partnerships and Collaboration Across Systems

- Support partnerships and collaboration by breaking down barriers and provide support for intermediary organizations to manage the work.

One of the key elements of a comprehensive learning system that uses ELOs is to encourage and support collaboration among various education and youth providers, including K-12, postsecondary education, publicly-funded programs supporting youth (i.e. social and family services, health, and mental health), community-based organizations, and employers. As a condition of funding, policymakers could require that partnerships or collaborative groups be created that include certain stakeholders as partners. Policymakers could require that funding plans be approved in advance by other key partners or funding providers. Policymakers should review existing programs and determine where there are opportunities for programs to align, support, and complement one another, both in terms of how ELOs can be used to expand options for youth and how other programs can contribute to enhancing ELOs.

For example, policymakers could encourage programs like the federal TRIO or GEAR UP programs that help disadvantaged youth prepare for college to partner more systematically with ELOs that have a strong focus on college access and success.

Flexibility is essential in creating and sustaining partnerships between schools and ELO programs, as well as other providers of youth services. Policymakers can play a large role in ensuring that legislative and regulatory frameworks do not restrict collaboration and that active partnering and sharing is encouraged. Policies can permit cost-sharing or the transfer of funds from one program to another for a similar or common purpose; allow programs to use common reporting forms or limit certain reports when partnering; allow flexibility across eligibility requirements to better serve youth in certain targeted communities; permit programs to use common performance targets or outcomes; and pool funding to support innovative activities or structures.

Intermediary organizations that represent the common interests of youth and families or community stakeholders are an excellent mechanism for pulling together various parties, providing leadership and vision, enabling collaborative work, building capacity across programs and systems, and often, raising funding. But intermediary organizations are rarely acknowledged in legislation or funding streams and sometimes are not eligible for public monies, despite their being mission-driven and collaborative, cross-system managers. As collaborating and partnering become more common, policies should recognize and support the role of intermediaries in facilitating and sustaining quality services, and when appropriate, intermediaries should be allowed to compete for funds or be eligible recipients.

Focus on Quality by Building Capacity

- Focus on quality by building capacity across and within systems to ensure high-quality implementation of services.

Repeatedly, research has demonstrated that the quality of program implementation and the quality of the individual ELO have an impact on positive youth outcomes. Because data is so consistent in this area, policymakers should take active steps to ensure that quality becomes a key driver of ELOs and youth-serving programs.

Policymakers can ensure that ELOs are designed, implemented, and operated to high-quality standards

by providing sufficient resources for hiring strong, well-trained leaders and key staff, in supporting ongoing training and professional development for staff, building capacity of programs to meet the needs of youth based on research, and collecting and using data and evaluation for ongoing program improvement. One key area that policymakers could support is to encourage and fund cross-training of ELO, education, and other youth-serving providers so that services can be collaborative and there is greater understanding across school-based and non-school-based staff of youths' needs.

Policymakers should also ensure that individual ELO programs are based on research about effective existing ELOs. For example, various assessments to measure program quality elements such as youth engagement, peer interaction, and supportive and safe environments have recently been developed to help ELOs improve their practice and increase youth outcomes. Policymakers can encourage the use of such quality assessments and share information on how these assessments lead to improved programming. Research is also quite clear on how ELOs need to differentiate their programming based on the age of participants. Funders should require ELOs to design programs to meet the specific needs and interests of various ages based on research. While policymakers can provide specific guidelines about effective program practices, they should not become so prescriptive as to limit programs from trying innovative or untested approaches.

The quality of programs can have an impact on the frequency and duration of youth participation in ELOs, but student motivation also plays a role. A question for policymakers is whether it is possible to hold programs accountable for student participation or motivation, and if so, how. Policies that encourage incentives for programs and/or students to increase participation could be explored, but it is equally important to consider at what level (federal, state, or local) it makes sense to implement such policies, as well as the true impact of such incentives.

Ensure Equity and Access

- Ensure all youth have equal access to high-quality services from various providers.

All students should have access to high-quality ELOs, but that is not always the case, as many high-need communities lack a wide range of youth services. Policymakers need to ensure that resources

are distributed equitably throughout communities, based on need, and that youth in communities of need have access to high-quality ELO programs. In a period of declining resources, it will be important for policymakers to collect information on who is currently benefitting from ELO programs and ensure that public dollars are directed to the communities in greatest need or lacking adequate quality programs.

Policymakers should make special efforts to ensure that certain groups of youth, such as youth with disabilities, Native American youth, and foster youth, have access to quality ELOs and that such youth are actively encouraged to take advantage of ELO resources. Because these groups of students have special needs, policymakers should ensure that ELO providers that serve these populations are well-trained, understand their special circumstances, and know about the range of systems and programs with which they interact.

Improve Data Collection, Evaluation, and Research

- Improve data collection, evaluation, and research to track youth as they move across programs/systems and measure the impact of their participation in expanded learning opportunities.

Data should drive decision-making. If policymakers do not have adequate data, they may make poorly-informed decisions or policies. As noted throughout this publication (see additional suggestions about evaluation and research in Methodology and Research Notes, page 11), many ELO, youth, and education programs do not collect adequate data to inform program and policy considerations. Often the data is out-of-date, or lacks specificity, such as information on student demographics. Much of the data collected on student outcomes looks only at short-term outcomes and does not track students over a longer period of time to determine ultimate outcomes, or the data systems only track students in one system and not across systems. There is a strong need to improve data collection efforts and to help practitioners learn how to design systems that will provide feedback to help continuously improve programs and measure community-wide efforts.

Policymakers should also support the development of data systems that measure more than just academic skills. If there is a desire for youth to develop more than just academic skills, policymakers should indicate what other kinds of skills are

important to measure. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) focuses on measuring academic outcomes, with little attention paid to other types of skills and knowledge that youth need to be successful. While the information collected under NCLB has been useful in improving academic performance, it has had little impact on improving the development of other types of skills, as those skills have not been measured or valued. Policymakers need to affirm the value of measuring more than just academic skills and help to develop a more comprehensive assessment or accountability system to do so. Because assessment development is such a complex, expensive, and time-consuming undertaking, policymakers should take a greater role in the design and testing of assessments and provide support to states and communities in using comprehensive assessments.

Another aspect of data collection that needs policy guidance is a clarification of what data should be collected at what level and for what purpose, how various quantitative and qualitative skills and outcomes can best be measured, and who or what system (ELOs, schools, communities, or states, K-12, postsecondary) should collect the data.

To ensure adequate information about youth, data systems should be longitudinal and follow youth for a number of years, so that longer-term impacts can be measured. Creating data systems that span from K-12 to postsecondary education is challenging and can be expensive and time consuming, but this is being tackled by a number of states. These states should actively engage other systems, such as ELOs, as they begin the development of these longitudinal data systems from the start, rather than adding them at a later point in time. Policymakers can help provide funding for the design of longitudinal data systems or help design prototypes that can be widely shared.

Policymakers should provide support to states and communities interested in exploring new ways of determining the overall effectiveness of the community interventions and how each system or program contributed to the outcome. As more and more collaboration and cross-system partnerships occur, using a common or shared accountability measurement makes sense. Policymakers can support these efforts by providing seed funding to convene the appropriate researchers and data collection experts across systems and to allow some innovative approaches to be tested.

This publication has also noted the need for more and improved evaluations of not only ELO

programs, but education and youth service programs in general (see page 13). Most ELOs and youth programs do not have funds for evaluation, nor are their staff trained in conducting evaluations or scientific research. Policymakers can easily change this landscape by requiring publicly-funded programs to use a percentage of funding for evaluation. Funding and technical assistance should also be available to train key staff in how to design, conduct, and analyze program evaluations and use the data as a tool for improvement; this should be encouraged with the use of professional development funds.

Research is still needed to understand how to develop shared accountability measures and assessments, how to best encourage and support work across systems, what policies lead to effective expanded learning opportunities across systems, how to effectively develop comprehensive assessment systems, and the importance of duration and intensity of participation in positive outcomes.

Ensure Sustainability

- Ensure sustainability of efforts so programs continue in the absence of ongoing public funding.

Policymakers have a duty to consider how to sustain effective ELOs and to require grantees to plan for sustainability early in their grant funding cycles. While this is often stated, there are many programs that fall by the wayside as soon as public funding ends. While public funding should never be the only funding source used for ELOs, policymakers can provide assistance to programs to help prepare them for the end of a grant cycle.

Policy can also break down barriers to coordination and collaboration of various funding streams, so that various providers can share or access facilities, equipment, or personnel from other systems. Policy can also help program providers learn about effective strategies that lead to sustainability, including evaluating outcomes and demonstrating effectiveness, building broad-based community support, using funds strategically, and ensuring efficiencies through effective management.

Lastly, support from public sources, especially from the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (21st CCLC), has been a stabilizing factor in helping ELOs build a more sustainable funding base, as those dollars can be used to successfully leverage funds from other sources. Given the widespread public interest and support for afterschool

and expanded learning, increases in public funding and for the 21st CCLC program should be continued and expanded.

Closing

As noted earlier, expanded learning opportunities are an effective use of resources to prepare youth for the complexities that face them as adults. They improve academic, career, social and emotional, and health and wellness outcomes for youth. ELOs deserve ongoing and expanded support and to be viewed as a major contributor to the preparation of youth for postsecondary education, careers, and civic engagement.

PART IV



Matrix of Programs

Glossary of Terms

References

About the Authors

American Youth Policy Forum Publications

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
<p>21stCCLC Program at Children's Aid Society (CAS) Community Schools (Middle Schools; NYC)</p>	<p>Middle school students</p>	<p>21st CCLC afterschool program at CAS Community Schools provides 20 minute snack or supper, followed by homework help, academic enrichment, and youth development activities.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: The evaluation was a quasi-experimental, longitudinal comparison study. Outcomes were measured in two ways: by comparing participants' change over time and by comparing participants to nonparticipants. In addition, comparisons were made based on degree of program attendance. For youth development outcomes, a sample was used whereas for academic and attendance outcomes the entire population was analyzed.</p> <p>Data Sources: Data collection methods used for academic achievement and attendance included standardized test score data, school attendance records, and teacher responses to the 21st Century Annual Performance Review (APR) teacher survey.</p> <p>Data collection methods for the youth development component included a youth survey and teacher surveys. In addition, focus groups, interviews with youth, staff, parents, family and community members, observations and the New York State After-School Program Quality Self-Assessment tool were used to explore preconditions to academic achievement and program implementation.</p>	<p>The outcomes indicated a statistically significant increase in some academic achievement and positive youth development outcomes for CAS participants over nonparticipants. Students enrolled in CAS programs had higher school attendance than nonparticipants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Collaboration ■ Community Support ■ Offers a range of activities ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Structured program

<p>After School Matters (ASM)</p>	<p>High school students</p>	<p>ASM offers paid apprenticeships in the arts, sports, technology, and communications. Students are taught by skilled professionals and are paid stipends.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Quasi-experimental study used a treatment and comparison group to determine if participation in ASM was associated with greater school attachment and improved academic performance; Participants were compared against students who applied to the program and didn't participate (Applicants) and to students who never applied to ASM and never participated (Nonparticipants). An additional treatment group and comparison group was used to determine whether ASM participation increased graduation rates and lowered dropout rates. Data sources: Participation rates, attendance, course grades and test scores from participating schools.</p>	<p>Students who participated in ASM missed fewer days of school and failed fewer courses than similar classmates. Additionally, students who participated in ASM at the highest levels and students who were enrolled for 3 or more semesters had higher rates of graduation and lower dropout rates than similar students who did not participate in ASM.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Community support ■ Experiential learning ■ Financial incentives ■ Personal relationships with adults ■ Collaboration with schools
<p>Bayview Safe Haven</p>	<p>Youth in and out of school ages 10–21</p>	<p>Designed to help youth stay in school and out of the criminal justice system, while positioning them for responsible adulthood and improving the quality of life in their families and community. The program uses a strengths-based approach by focusing on youths' interests, hopes for the future, skills and hobbies and has academic, vocational, recreational and life skills/community service components.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Quasi-experimental and non-experimental study randomly matched comparison (control) group was used to compare program impacts on participants compared to nonparticipants; evaluation controlled for demographics (age, gender), juvenile crime record, and school performance. Data sources: Pre- and post-tests were done and data was collected at youth intake, at exit, and 6 months after exit.</p>	<p>Overall, program participation significantly decreased school suspensions, recidivism, the seriousness of delinquent behavior, and further involvement with the juvenile justice system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Community partnerships ■ Experiential learning ■ Safe environment ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBSA)	Youth ages 6–15	National mentoring program with over 500 local affiliates across the country. All affiliates must follow a certain BBBSA curriculum.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: The random assignment impact evaluation studied 8 local affiliates for 18 months; participants were compared against nonparticipants who were on waitlists. Data sources: Surveys (interviews) to parents/guardians and youth (at baseline and then 18 months after random assignment).	Littles were significantly less likely to initiate drug and alcohol use, hit less, missed fewer days of school, felt more competent about school work, skipped fewer classes, showed modest gains in GPAs, and improved the quality of their relationships with family and friends.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fidelity to model ■ Personal relationships with adults ■ Safe environment ■ Supportive adult relationships
Boys & Girls Clubs: GPTTO/GITTO	Youth in and out of school, ages 6–18, who are at risk of or already involved in gangs, are eligible	Both programs focus on activities that meet the interests of the youth involved. Activities are centered on character and leadership development; health and life skills; the arts; sports, fitness, and recreation; and education. Each youth is provided with a counselor who tracks his or her progress and provides case management.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: 1-year quasi-experimental study compared participants with similar students not in the programs. Comparison youth were youth attending alternative schools who had been suspended or expelled from mainstream schools. Data sources: Baseline and post-test surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observations.	Decreased levels of gang behaviors, decreased involvement with the juvenile justice system, increased academic achievement, and positive school behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Personal relationships with adults ■ Safe environment ■ Supportive adult relationships ■ Student-centered programming
Children's Aid Society–Carrera Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program	High school students ages 12–18	Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program includes five activity components and two service components, with activities ranging from a Job Club, individual tutoring, drama, sexuality education, and mental health and medical services. The intent of the program is for teens to learn about sexual responsibility while developing goals and aspirations for life.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: 3-year random assignment, longitudinal study; six Children's Aid Society supported agencies each randomly assigned 100 disadvantaged 13–15 year-olds to their regular youth program or to the Carrera pregnancy prevention program. Data sources: Annual surveys, tests, and attendance and medical records.	Statistically significant decline in sexual activity and teenage pregnancy for Carrera program participants. Participant had higher odds of condom and birth control use and increased odds of receiving good primary health care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Comprehensive prevention program ■ Safe environment ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming

<p>Citizen Schools (CS)</p>	<p>Students in grades 6–8</p>	<p>Structured extended day program from 3:00–6:00pm that incorporates academic support, apprenticeships with adult volunteers in a variety of fields, as well as community explorations. CS also has an alumni program to help students and their families transition successfully during the high school process.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Quasi-experimental study will include 6 phases; CS participants were compared to matched nonparticipants. The matched nonparticipants in the control group may have been enrolled in other out-of-school time programs. In Phase V, two comparison groups were used: the matched nonparticipants used in Phases I–IV and Boston Public School students as a whole.</p> <p>Data sources: Boston Public Schools files, including the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) data and Citizen Schools data: Test scores, grades, attendance rates, etc. were used as pre- and post-tests and were recorded when students started the program and then in an ongoing manner as they progressed through the program. Students who dropped out of the program at any time were not assessed after dropping out.</p>	<p>Increased levels of student engagement and achievement, more likely to be “on track” to graduation, higher attendance and course pass rate, lower suspension rates. CS had a positive impact on English and math course grades, MCAS ELA and math test scores, and the selection of a high-quality high school. CS has been successful in attracting and retaining educationally at-risk students and in putting these students on a path toward academic and social success. Participants felt a strong sense of connection to the program, experienced positive relationships with adults and peers and had opportunities to take on leadership roles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Collaboration with schools ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
College Now	High school students	Partners with high school and the City University of New York (CUNY) to offer courses specially designed to prepare high school students for college. Course offerings range from art to physics and are offered in the fall, spring and summer, after school hours. If eligible, students can earn free college credits and some courses are offered on campus.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Quasi-experimental study measured the effects of College Now participation on credits and Grade Point Average (GPA) earned in the 1st year at CUNY and persistence to a 3rd semester. Former College Now participants enrolled as 1st year CUNY freshmen were compared to similar 1st year CUNY freshmen who had never participated in College Now. Data sources: CUNY Collaborative Program's College Now database and CUNY's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provided student level records merged for both enrollment and performance data of 1st time freshmen at CUNY.	Positive effects were found on credits earned, GPA earned, and on the probability that former College Now participants persisted to a 3rd semester at CUNY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Collaboration with a postsecondary institution ■ Education system alignment ■ Focus on minority achievement ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Staff quality
Cool Girls, Inc. (CG)	Girls in grades 3-8	Afterschool program provides comprehensive programming in the form of mentoring relationships, field trips, health and life skills education, and academic tutoring.	Program to watch: The 2005-2006 evaluation was designed to measure participant patterns of change in comparison to a control group of nonparticipants in 4 of CG's programmatic areas: decision making skills, academic achievement, health, wellness and nutrition, and awareness of life opportunities. Data sources: Pre- and post-test surveys.	Overall, the evaluation indicated that program participation had positive effects on perceived life chances, hope for the future, drug knowledge, physical activity, and levels of school competence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Comprehensive youth development services ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Safe environment ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming

<p>Girls Scouts PAVE the Way</p>	<p>Girls ages 9–17</p>	<p>Anti-violence afterschool programs included programming on crime prevention, bullying prevention and intervention, internet safety, or gang prevention. Program format also varied across local councils.</p>	<p>Program to watch: Outcome evaluation assessed program characteristics and the impact of the intervention on program participants' personal growth and leadership development; studied programs at 26 councils, but focused on 5 successful models. Data sources: Program assessment rubric (PAR), surveys, and interviews.</p>	<p>Statistically significant improvements in awareness of crime prevention and bullying prevention were found for middle and high school girls.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Community partnerships ■ Peer support network ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Professional development for staff
<p>Middle School FAST (National)</p>	<p>Middle school students and their parents/guardians</p>	<p>Program consists of 10 weekly family meetings with goal of strengthening bonds within the family and their community. Youth attend meetings for 14 weeks; they start meeting 4 weeks before parents join. The meetings consist of 7 core elements including: 1) a meal shared as a family unit; 2) communication games; 3) time for couples or buddies; 4) a self-help parent group; 5) a youth support group; 6) one-on-one quality interaction; and 7) a fixed lottery in which each family wins once. Families graduate at the end of 10 weeks.</p>	<p>Program to watch: Nonexperimental methods used to evaluate 1,030 parents from 152 FAST cycles between 2002 and 2007 (nationwide) and 1,153 youth. Data sources: Pre- and post-tests aligned with the programs' goals were given to both parents and youth.</p>	<p>Statistically significant improvements in classroom behavior, home behavior, self-esteem, family-closeness, parental involvement in school, and reduction in social isolation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fidelity to model ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Professional development for staff ■ Program models allow flexibility to adapt to individual needs of the community ■ Student/family collaboration
<p>Project Morry</p>	<p>Middle school students</p>	<p>Year-round youth development organization that provides comprehensive services to each individual child, anchored by a residential camp experience.</p>	<p>Program to watch: Nonexperimental study followed cohort for 4 years. Data sources: Quantitative questionnaires; qualitative surveys and interviews.</p>	<p>Boys showed a statistically significant drop in overall anger, overall scores for anger dropped, and scores for life effectiveness and protective factors increased.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Education system alignment ■ Experiential learning ■ Safe environment ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
Project Venture	Students in grades 5-8	Outdoors experiential youth development program designed for high-risk American Indian (AI) youth includes both classroom-based and outdoor experiential learning, adventure camps, wilderness treks, and community-oriented service learning.	<p>Program to watch: Schools were randomly assigned; compares outcomes from 2 randomly chosen middle schools.</p> <p>Data sources: The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) National Youth Survey was administered to both groups at baseline, 6 months after exit, and 18 months after exit. The CSAP tool assesses “actual” substance use as well as related risk and protective factors.</p>	Participants demonstrated significantly less of an increase in alcohol and drug use than nonparticipants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Focus on needs and interests of American Indian youth ■ Safe environment ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships
Policy Studies Associates (PSA) Study of Promising Afterschool Programs	Students in grades 6-7	The programs offered a mix of age-appropriate enrichment and recreational activities, as well as tutoring and games designed to improve math and reading skills, community service, and arts opportunities.	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: The 2-year study followed approximately 3,000 low-income, ethnically diverse elementary and middle school students from 8 states in 6 metropolitan centers and 6 smaller urban and rural locations. The evaluation was designed to study relations between high-quality afterschool programs and academic and behavior outcomes for low-income students. In order to determine if selected afterschool programs were protective for children and youth at risk for social and academic problems, researchers compared outcomes for participants in the Program Plus vs. Low Supervision groups and Program Only vs. Low Supervision groups from baseline to Year 2.</p> <p>Data sources: Surveys, standardized test scores</p>	Overall, a link was found between regular participation in high-quality afterschool programs and significant gains in standardized test scores and work habits as well as reductions in behavior problems among disadvantaged students, offsetting the negative impact of a lack of supervision after school. Positive academic and behavior outcomes were found for program plus and program only participants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Collaboration with schools ■ Community partnerships ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Peer support network ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships

<p>Quantum Opportunities Program</p>	<p>Youth in grade 9 (under the 67th percentile on 8th grade standardized tests) entering public high schools with high dropout rates (40% or higher).</p>	<p>Primarily an afterschool program providing case management and mentoring, supplemental education, developmental activities, community service activities, supportive services, and financial incentives. Supportive services include snacks, transportation assistance, and other services as needed, including child care, health and mental health services, and substance abuse treatment.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Random assignment evaluation, conducted in 7 sites between 1995 and 2001. Data from 4 surveys was used to determine the impact of program participation on high school performance, graduation, postsecondary education or training, and risky behaviors as well as the fidelity of program implementation. About 1,100 eligible youth were randomly assigned to the statistically identical treatment or control group and followed for 5 years (1995–2000). Data sources: Surveys, and standardized test scores.</p>	<p>Overall, QOP did not achieve its primary or secondary goals, however beneficial effects on high school graduation rates and college enrollment, for example, were found for some students, such as students who were 14 or under when entering 9th grade (“on-time” students) and for youth at the Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. sites. Program implementation and outcomes varied across the 7 sites. Outcomes reported on include high school graduation rates, enrollment in postsecondary education or training, high school grades, test scores, and risky behaviors, as well as the fidelity of program implementation. There were no impacts found for youth at the Memphis, Tennessee; Fort Worth, Texas; Houston, Texas; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Yakima, Washington sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Comprehensive services ■ Fidelity to model ■ Financial incentives ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Structured program
---	---	--	---	--	--

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
Seeds to Success	Students ages 14–18; Participants must have an IEP and attend Woodbury, Paulsboro, and Glassboro High Schools as well as an alternative school for special needs youth, Bankbridge Regional School. One third of the students in the summer program come from the Bankbridge Regional School.	Programming is delivered in-school, afterschool and during the summer. Seeds to Success is comprised of two in-school components, FUNDamental Finance (a financial basics course and assessment) and Jersey Fit (a healthy lifestyles and fitness course and assessment) and an 8-week summer farm stand work readiness component.	Program to watch: The evaluation was non-experimental and conducted internally without a control group. Data sources: Pre- and post- tests.	The key findings for the evaluation reflect participant improvements in money management and banking skills, understanding of healthy lifestyle practices, developing workforce readiness skills, utilizing resources, working with others, using information, understanding systems, and working with technology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Community support ■ Education system alignment ■ Experiential learning ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships
Work Ready Summer Internships (Formally the Summer Career Explorations Program)	Teens in Philadelphia and Delaware counties in Pennsylvania and Camden, New Jersey are eligible.	Each summer, between 20–28 participating agencies provide youth with paid, real-work experience coupled with academic and career-related adult support through agency staff and college-age monitors who provide twice-weekly mentoring sessions.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Experimental and nonexperimental. Youth were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Data sources: Baseline survey, 3-month, and 1-year follow up interview with high response rates.	Positive outcomes were reported for short-term outcomes (provide teenagers with jobs, the means to earn money and be productively engaged during their summertime school break, provide teens with supportive adult contact). The intermediate outcomes (exhibit stronger orientation toward college, increase employment rates of participants after leaving the program, foster better attitude toward work or work readiness) were not met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Experiential learning ■ Financial incentives ■ Supportive adult relationships

<p>Summer Search</p>	<p>High school students</p>	<p>Weekly mentoring sessions with highly trained staff mentors, from sophomore year to high school graduation. Two summer experiential education programs after the sophomore and junior years. College advisory services such as finding a college, applying to it, and applying for financial aid, are offered throughout the high school years along with an alumni support network.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Study included a baseline and mid-program survey that was administered to a sample of 832 accepted and rejected applicants. The mid-program survey examined how accepted/continuing students one year into the program differed from students who dropped out or were rejected. Data sources: Baseline and mid-program survey.</p>	<p>Overall, findings indicate that Summer Search did select students with higher academic and behavior outcomes, however significantly more accepted students had more family hardships (parental divorce, loss of job, or illness). Additionally, continuing youth perceived an increase in the amount of support in their lives and increased positive school-related behaviors (making good grades, taking college prep classes, studying, participating in sports, and participating in school clubs and activities). Information on statistical significance was not provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Experiential learning ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Focus on needs and interests of youth
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
<p>The After School Corporation (TASC)</p>	<p>Students in grades K-12</p>	<p>Programming includes academic enrichment, homework assistance, the arts, and recreation. Programs are run by a full-time site director and run until 6pm. The main objectives taken on by TASC programs are to help students build academic skills and to expose students to positive new experiences.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: The 2004 4-year quasi-experimental evaluation sought to determine if TASC services were meeting high expectations for quality, if students were benefitting from participation in TASC, and the practices associated with the greatest benefits for students. Participants were compared to nonparticipants at TASC and non-TASC schools. Data sources: Surveys, site visits, and a review of administrative records. The 2007 report examined long-term effects of program participation on high school performance.</p>	<p>Overall, the 2004 study determined that TASC recruited a high number of students from schools with high enrollment of students at risk of education failure, retained the students and encouraged high levels of attendance for the students. Data from Year 4 indicated that the majority of site coordinators had a Bachelor's degree, the majority of projects had strong relationships with host schools, and the majority of principals reported alignment with curriculum and TASC programming.</p> <p>Overall, the 2007 study found positive outcomes in high school attendance and credit accumulation for former middle school TASC participants, compared to both matched and comparison groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Collaboration with schools ■ Community partnerships ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Provides choices for participants ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming ■ Supportive adult relationships

<p>Upward Bound Math-Science (UBMS)</p>	<p>Students in grades 9–12</p>	<p>Grants are awarded to 2- and 4-year colleges and universities to operate UBMS projects, which are intensive hands-on science and math projects that include access to outside speakers and opportunities for field trips. A 6-week summer program including lab science and pre-calculus is also offered.</p>	<p>Stronger evidence of effectiveness: The Mathematics quasi-experimental report selected a random sample of students who participated in UBMS between 1993 and 1995 at 74 (out of 81 total) projects and compared them to similar UB participants and applicants. The RTI report presented data on postsecondary enrollment rates for participants who were expected to graduate high school during the 2004-05 academic year and examined a full cohort of those UBMS participants over a 6-year period.</p> <p>Data sources: The Mathematics and RTI studies used the same baseline data. The baseline data was collected using high school transcripts and surveys and included demographic and family characteristics, participation in other precollege programs, and 9th grade academic achievement in math, science, and overall.</p> <p>Mathematics: Surveys and high school transcripts.</p> <p>RTI: Annual Performance Report (APR), financial aid database, TRIO and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) databases.</p>	<p>Mathematica: Improved high school grades in math and science, increased the likelihood of taking chemistry and physics in high school, increased the likelihood of enrolling in more selective 4-year institutions, increased the likelihood of majoring in math and science, and increased the likelihood of completing a 4-year degree in math and science.</p> <p>RTI: Significant positive outcomes for UBMS participants in postsecondary enrollment of participants. The report emphasizes that as length of participation in the program increased, college enrollment rates increased for UBMS participants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Collaboration with a postsecondary institution ■ Education system alignment ■ Focus on minority achievement ■ High quality and devoted staff ■ Small learning communities ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming
--	--------------------------------	--	---	---	---

Matrix of ELO Programs, Outcomes, and Elements of Success (cont.)

Program	Student Population	Description	Evaluation Strength and Description	Outcomes	Elements of Success
Urban Alliance (UA)	High school students	Provides internship opportunities throughout the entire year. Students also receive a professional mentor, skill building workshops, college/career planning, and a 3:1 matched savings account through Capital Area Asset Building, a financial education Community Based Organization (CBO). Additionally, UA provides job opportunities in the health field for high school graduates through their Health Alliance (HA) program, and they provide a Graduate Services program.	Program to watch: Nonexperimental; all program participants from 2005-07 made up the "sample" and were assessed at 4 points during the year on hard job skills (faxing, data entry, researching, taking notes) and soft job skills (more fluid abilities that make a person successful in the workplace including professionalism, communication, job competency and development of personal responsibility and goal setting). Data sources: Baseline and 3 follow-up skills assessments.	The findings indicate that students increased basic, intermediate, and advanced "hard skills" and generally increased "soft skills."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Active programming ■ Clear, sequenced structure ■ Community partnerships ■ Experiential learning ■ Financial incentives ■ Highly quality and devoted staff ■ Relevant work experience ■ Supportive adult relationships
Woodcraft Rangers	Students in grades K-8	The afterschool program begins with a homework clinic, snack time and a fitness period. Students also participate in Clubs, which run for 8 weeks at a time and meet 2 to 5 days a week. Each Club has a specific theme in categories of sports/fitness/recreation, visual and performing arts and academics. Reading, writing, and math exercises are woven into the Club activities. Students also have access to field trips.	Stronger evidence of effectiveness: Quasi experimental and nonexperimental; test scores and parent focus groups used (state-wide and localized measures). Surveys were given to all students, and 377 filled out both pre- and post-surveys, so they were considered the "sample." Comparison groups were determined at the end of the year in order to allow all students the choice of participating or not in the program. Data sources: Participant tracking database, focus groups, standardized tests, pre- and post-surveys, and supervisor reported assessments.	Findings indicate that participants significantly improved or maintained their school attendance, learning skills and attitudes, student engagement, academic performance, grade point average, and pro-social interests and behavior between Spring 2004-05 and Spring 2005-06.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Personal relationships with staff ■ Provides choices for participants ■ Structured program ■ Student-centered programming

Glossary of Terms -

21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC)

This program supports the creation and implementation of community learning centers that provide academic enrichment opportunities during hours outside of school for children, most significantly for students who attend low-income, low-performing schools. The 21st CCLCs assist students in meeting state as well as local standards in core academic subjects, as well as provide students with a wide array of enrichment activities and programs to supplement their academics during the school day. The 21st CCLCs also offer educational services (literacy classes, etc.) to the families of participating children.

21st Century Skills

21st Century skills represent the necessary student outcomes for the 21st Century, such as that students need to obtain Learning and Innovation Skills (creativity and innovation, critical thinking and problem solving), Information, Media and Technology Skills; Core Subjects; 21st Century Themes (global awareness, financial literacy, etc.); and Life and Career Skills (initiative and self-direction, among others).

Afterschool

The term “afterschool” has typically been used for well over a decade to describe activities that were offered to children and youth in the hours immediately following the school day, generally from 3 to 6 p.m. Many of these activities were designed to provide day care to young children of working parents and to keep them safe. Over the years, most afterschool programs have expanded to provide supplemental academic support.

After School Partnerships Improve Results in Education (ASPIRE) Act

The ASPIRE Act was introduced in the US Congress to establish and expand afterschool programs for middle and high school students in order to increase student engagement, improve school success and graduation rates, and provide opportunities to increase interest in high-demand career opportunities.

Expanded Learning Opportunities (ELOs)

Expanded learning opportunities, particularly for older youth, occur in a 24/7 environment; draw upon the resources of the community; blur the lines between schools and other valuable teachers, such as colleges, community organizations, museums, and employers; and incorporate virtual learning when appropriate. ELOs include traditional afterschool activities and an academic focus, but also incorporate activities such as internships, independent studies, classes on college campuses for high school students, and wraparound social supports.

Full Service Community Schools Act

The proposed Full Service Community Schools Act would encourage schools, out-of-school time providers, and other community-based organizations and public-private partners to coordinate educational, developmental, family, health, and other comprehensive services.

Investment in After-School Programs Act of 2008

This legislation was introduced in the U.S. Congress and calls for the creation of a pilot program to create or strengthen rural afterschool programs. The bill would provide grants of \$50,000 or more to programs to fund activities or projects such as transportation, training, planning, technology resources, or professional development tools to establish or improve afterschool programs in rural areas.

Out-of-School Time

Many organizations started using the term “out-of-school time” as a way to acknowledge that the large number of learning activities that occurred on weekends or during the summer particularly for older youth, not just in the afterschool hours of 3 to 6 p.m. This term incorporated both school-based activities that were offered after the regular day and programs and activities provided by community-based organizations.

SAFE Successful Afterschool Program Approaches (Sequential, Active, Focus, Explicit)

A 2007 review of successful afterschool programs identified four approaches that the successful programs had in common. Using the acronym SAFE to identify the four approaches, the review determined that effective programs: emphasized “Sequential” activities linked over several days, rather than offering unstructured drop-in opportunities; relied on “Active” involvement of youth, rather than passive reception of messages from adults; set aside time to “Focus” on personal or social skills; and were “Explicit” in identifying which skills they expected to develop (Durlak, J. A. & Weissberg, R. P. (2007).

Supplemental Education Services (SES)

Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Section 1116e), students from low-income families attending schools that do not make adequate yearly progress for three or more years are eligible to receive Supplemental Educational Services. Supplemental Educational Services are intended to increase students’ academic achievement, to provide information and options to families to help them ensure a quality education for their child, and to improve schools in need by providing incentives to various districts. These services must be provided outside the normal school day and are sometimes provided by community-based afterschool providers.

Time for Innovation Matters in Education (TIME) Act

The TIME Act was introduced in the US Congress and calls for an expanded learning time pilot project to lengthen the school day, week and/or year. The legislation specifies that time should be increased for academic and enrichment opportunities, such as music, arts, physical education, service-learning, and work-based learning opportunities that contribute to a well-rounded education. The legislation calls for collaboration between out-of-school time providers and schools and other educational and youth agencies and organizations to increase learning and development opportunities for students.

References -

- Afterschool Alliance. (2008, February). *21st Century Community Learning Centers Providing After-school Supports to Communities Nationwide*. Retrieved December 29, 2008, from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/Fact%20Sheet_21st%20century%20community%20learning%20centers%2008.pdf
- Afterschool Alliance. (2008, February). Facts and Research: *Afterschool Issue Overview*. Retrieved February 2008 from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/Fact%20Sheet_Afterschool%20Essential%20stats%2004_08%20FINAL.pdf
- Afterschool Alliance (2008, November). *Summary of Afterschool Findings: National Election Eve Election Night Poll*. Lake Research Partners.
- Afterschool Alliance. (2008, October). *Policy & Action Center: Policy News*. Retrieved November 2008 from <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/policyFedNewsArchive.cfm>
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2006, January). *Helping Youth Succeed Through Out-of-School Time Programs*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2007, November 2). "Using Assessment Tools to Evaluate Afterschool Programs: A Look at the Youth Program Quality Assessment" Forum with Charles Smith, Director, Youth Development Group High/Scope Educational Research Foundation; Nicole Yohalem, Program Director, Forum for Youth Investment; Judy Mills, Director, New York State Advantage After School Program; and Jeanne Leland, Director, North Branch Area Community Education.
- Anderson-Butcher, D., Newsome, W.S., & Ferrari, T.M. (2003). Participation in Boys & Girls Clubs and Relationships to Youth Outcomes. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(1), 39-55.
- Arbeton, A., & Bradshaw, M., et al. (2008, March). *More Time for Teens: Understanding Teen Participation—Frequency, Intensity, and Duration—In Boys & Girls Clubs*. Boys & Girls Clubs of America. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Arbreton, A., & Goldsmith, J. (2008, February). *Advancing Achievement: Findings from an Independent Evaluation of a Major After-School Initiative*. San Francisco, CA: James Irvine Foundation.
- Arbreton, A., Goldsmith, J., & Metz, R. (2008). *Putting It All Together: Guiding Principles for Quality After-School Programs Serving Preteens*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures. Commissioned by Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health.
- Arbreton, A., & McClanahan, W. (2002). *Targeted Outreach: Boys & Girls Clubs of America's Approach to Gang Prevention and Intervention*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Balfanz, Robert and Nettie Legters. (2007). *The Graduation Gap: Using Promoting Power to Examine the Number and Characteristics of High Schools with High and Low Graduation Rates in the Nation and Each State*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.
- Bernier, K. C. (2008, April). *Expanding Learning Time: How the Edwards Middle School in Boston Partnered with Citizen Schools to Transform the Learning Day*.
- Bialschki, M.D., Lyons, K., & Thompson, A.K. (2006, January 13). *Four Years at Morry's Camp: A Longitudinal Study of Youth Development Outcomes of the Morry's Camp Experience*.
- Birmingham, J., & Pechman, E., et al. (2005, November). *Shared Features of High-Performing After-School Programs: A Follow-Up to the TASC Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Birmingham, J. & White, R. (2005, January 27). *Promoting Positive Youth Development for High School Students After School: Services and Outcomes for High School Youth in TASC Programs*. Policy Studies Associates.
- Bridgeland, J. M., DiIulio, Jr, J., & Morison, K. B. (2006, March). *The Silent Epidemic: Perspectives of High School Dropouts*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises and Peter D. Hart Associates.
- Carter, S. & Straits, K. (2007). "Project Venture: Evaluation of a Positive, Culture-Based

- Approach to Substance Abuse Prevention with American Indian Youth." *Technical Report*. McClellan Hall, The National Indian Youth Leadership Project.
- Carter, S., Straits, J., & Hall, M. (2007). "Project Venture: Evaluation of a Positive, Culture-Based Approach to Substance Abuse Prevention with American Indian Youth." *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(3), (397-400).
- Communities In Schools (2008). "Communities in Schools. National Evaluation School-Level Report: Results from the National Evaluation's Quasi-Experimental Study, Natural Variation Study, and Typology Study". Fairfax, VA: ICF International.
- Durlak, J. A. & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The Effects of Social and Emotional Learning on the Behavior and Academic Performance of School Children*. CASEL, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Eichinger, M. K., et al., of the Improve Group. (2007, March). *PAVE the Way (Project Anti-Violence Education) Evaluation DRAFT Report for Girl Scouts of the USA*.
- Fabiano, L., & Pearson, L., et al. (2006, December). *Preparing Students in the Middle Grades to Succeed in High School: Findings from Phase IV of the Citizen Schools Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Goerge, R., Cusick, R., Wasserman, M., & Gladden R.M. (2007). "After-School Programs and Academic Impact: A Study of Chicago's After School Matters." *Chapin Hall Center for Children Issue Brief*, 112, 1-7.
- Grossman, J., Price, M., Fellerath, V., Juvocy, L., Kotloff, L., Raley, R., & Walker, K. (2002). *Multiple Choices After School: Findings from the Extended-Service Schools Initiative*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Grossman, J., Campbell, M., & Raley, R. (2007). *Quality Time After School: What Instructors Can Do to Enhance Learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Hall, G., Israel, L., & Shortt, J., (2004). *It's About Time: A Look at Out-of-School Time for Urban Teens*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Hughes, L., Strieter, L., (2007). *Seeds to Success Final Outcomes Report (Internal Report)*. Rutgers, New Jersey: The State University of New Jersey.
- Knapp, L. G., Heuer, R. E., & Mason, M. (2008). *Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math-Science Program Outcomes for Participants Expected to Graduate High School in 2004-06, With Supportive Data From 2005-06*. Washington, D.C.: RTI International.
- Krenichyn, K., Clark, H., Schaefer-McDaniel, N., & Benitez, L. (2006, January). "21st Century Community Learning Centers at Six New York City Middle Schools: Year One Report." The Children's Aid Society.
- Krenichyn, K., Clark, H., & Schaefer-McDaniel, N. (2007, June). "21st Century Community Learning Centers at Six New York City Middle Schools: Year Two Report." Act Knowledge. The Children's Aid Society.
- Kubo, M. M. (2007, February). *Second Year Report—Summer Search Evaluation*. See Change: Evaluation Through a New Lens.
- Kuperminc, G., & Emshoff, J., et al. (2006, August 8). "Program Evaluation of Cool Girls, Inc., Data From the 2005-06 Cool Girls Evaluation." Georgia State University Evaluation Team.
- McClanahan, W. S., Sipe, C. L., & Smith, T. J. (2004, August). *Enriching Summer Work: An Evaluation of the Summer Career Exploration Program*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- McDonald, L., & Price, K. (2007). "Evaluation Report for Middle School FAST," Aggregate Summary 2002-2007. FAST National Training & Evaluation Center.
- Michalowski, S. (2007). *Positive Effects Associated with College Now Participation*. The City University of New York: Collaborative Programs Research & Evaluation. Retrieved on October 8, 2008, from <http://web.cuny.edu/academics/CUNYPublicSchoolPrograms/databook/library.html>
- Moran, N. "The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2005—September 2006."
- Moran, N. "The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2006—February 2007: Mid-Year Report."
- Moran, N. "The Urban Alliance Foundation, Inc. Evaluation Report: October 2006—August 2007."
- National Center on Education and the Economy. (2007). *Tough Choices or Tough Times*. Washington, DC: The New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce.

- Olsen, R., & Seftor, N., et al. (2007, April). *Upward Bound Math-Science: Program Description and Interim Impact Estimates*, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2008). *21st Century Skills, Education & Competitiveness: A Resource and Policy Guide*. Tucson, AR: Partnership for 21st Century Skills.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2009). "Framework for 21st Century Learning." Retrieved January 7, 2009, from http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/documents/framework_flyer_updated_jan_09_final-1.pdf
- Pearson, L., Fabiano, L. (2006, December). *Preparing Students in the Middle Grades to Succeed in High School: Findings from Phase IV of the Citizen Schools Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Pearson, L., Vile, J. D., & Reisner, E. (2008, January). *Establishing a Foundation for Progress Toward High School Graduation: Findings from Phase V of the Citizen Schools Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Philadelphia Youth Network. "Final Grant Report to the William Penn Foundation from the Philadelphia Youth Network: Summer Career Exploration Program." Work Ready Philadelphia.
- Philliber, S., Kaye, J., & West, E. (2002, October). *Preventing Pregnancy and Improving Health Care Access Among Teenagers: An Evaluation of the Children's Aid Society—Carrera Program*. Philliber Research Associates: Evaluation for the Children's Aid Society.
- Politz, B. (1996). *Making the Case: Community Foundations and Youth Development*. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development, Center for Youth Development & Policy Research, Foundations for Change.
- "A Profile of the Evaluation of the Bayview Safe Haven Program." (2004). Harvard Family Research Project.
- Programme for International Student Assessment. *Problem Solving for Tomorrow's World: First Measures of Cross-Curricular Competencies from PISA 2003*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Reisner, L., & White, R., et al. (2004, November 3). *Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary Report of the TASC Evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Russell, C., & Reisner, L., et al. (2005, June). *Supporting Social and Cognitive Growth Among Disadvantaged Middle-Grades Students in TASC After-School Projects*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Russell, C., Mielke, M., Miller, T., & Johnson, J. (2007, October). *After-School Programs and High School Success: Analysis of Post-Program Educational Patterns of Former Middle Grades TASC Participants*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- "A Safe Place for Healthy Youth Development: A Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bayview Safe Haven." (2001, September). LaFrance Associates.
- Schirm, A., Stuart, E., McKie, A. (2006, July). *The Quantum Opportunity Program Demonstration: Final Impacts*. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Summer Search: Quantitative Outcome Measurement: Presentation to Board Members* (2007, February 16). PPT presentation, Boston Consulting Group.
- Saphir, M., et al. (2008, October 3). *Summer Search Longitudinal Evaluation Report, Years 3 & 4: 2008 Review and Synthesis with Theory of Change*. San Francisco: Summer Search National.
- Tierney, J., & Grossman, J. B. (2000, September). *Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Time, Learning, and Afterschool Task Force, Collaborative Communications Group. (2007, January). *A New Day for Learning*. Washington, DC: Time, Learning, and Afterschool Task Force.
- Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E. R., & Pierce, K. M. (2007, October). *Outcomes Linked to High Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Findings from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs*. Report to the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
- Weiss, H. B., Little, P. M. D., Bouffard, S. M., Deschenes, S. N., & Malone, H.J. (2008, November). *The Federal Role in Out-of-School Learning: After-School, Summer Learning, and Family Involvement as Critical Learning Supports*. Harvard Family Research Project.

- Weiss, H. B., & Little, P. M. D. (2008, May). *Strengthening Out-of-School Time Nonprofits: The Role of Foundations in Building Organizational Capacity*. Commissioned by The Wallace Foundation.
- Wilson-Ahlstrom, Yohalem, & Donner. (2008, November). *Speaking in one voice: Toward common measures for OST programs & systems*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment.
- Woodcraft Rangers: Annual Evaluation Report for 2005–06 for the Elementary and Middle School After-School Programs*. (June 2007). Lodestar Management/Research, Inc.
- Yohalem, et al. (2007, March). *Measuring Youth Program Quality: A Guide to Assessment Tools*. Washington, DC: The Forum for Youth Investment.

About the Authors -

Anne Bowles, Program Associate, joined the American Youth Policy Forum in 2008. Ms. Bowles identifies and researches issues, policies, and programs for AYPF's publications and learning events including Capitol Hill forums, site visits, and roundtable policy meetings with a special focus on afterschool and out-of-school time programs, community schools, and expanded learning opportunities.

From 2005 to 2008, Ms. Bowles taught Middle School Social Studies in Harlem, New York, through Teach For America (TFA). She also served as a Content Specialist and Adjunct Professor of best practices for middle school teachers through TFA and PACE University. Ms. Bowles earned her BA from the University of Michigan and her MA in Teaching from PACE University in New York City.

Prior to teaching, Ms. Bowles was an active member of the Prison Creative Arts Project (PCAP), a nonprofit committed to original work in the arts in Michigan correctional facilities, juvenile facilities, urban high schools, and communities across the state of Michigan. Ms. Bowles also served on the planning team of the Detroit Partnership, a student-run service learning organization at the University of Michigan dedicated to uniting Ann Arbor and Detroit by working with schools and community organizations; Ms. Bowles was responsible for coordinating service-learning opportunities. Previously, Ms. Bowles served as a service-learning intern with the Southeast YMCA, where she researched service learning programs to compile a service-learning manual for the YMCA of Southeast Michigan and was responsible for leading service-learning projects for middle school students in the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Betsy Brand, Executive Director of AYPF, is a leading expert in how to improve the lives of young people through education and labor policies, specifically career and technical education (CTE) and secondary education. She has spoken and written extensively on these issues and has testified multiple times before the US Congress.

As AYPF's Director, Ms. Brand identifies best policies and practices that lead to positive outcomes for the nation's young people. She oversees the creation of nearly 40 policy-oriented learning events annually—forums, briefings, and field trips—and the research and development of publications and policy briefs, all of which serve to inform the work of leading policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. Prior to her appointment in 2004, she served as the organization's Co-Director since 1998.

Ms. Brand has developed a deep understanding of education and workforce issues by crafting, implementing, and analyzing policy for the US Congress, the US Department of Education, and private clients. She was previously President of Workforce Futures, Inc., where she provided clients with public policy advocacy as well as analysis and development of legislation and regulations related to education reform and workforce preparation and development.

From November 1989 to January 1993, Ms. Brand served as Assistant Secretary of the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, US Department of Education, where she served as primary spokesperson for the Federal Government on issues relating to vocational-technical and adult education and workforce development; directed the White House Task Force on Literacy; increased programmatic collaboration with the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development; implemented the Perkins and Adult Education Acts, and oversaw the management of the Perkins and Adult Education Acts.

Prior to this, Ms. Brand spent 12 years working for the US Senate and the US House of Representatives, covering a wide range of legislation, including the Title I, Perkins, Adult Education, Individuals with Disabilities Education, and the Higher Education Acts.

Ms. Brand received her BA from Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

American Youth Policy Forum Publications -

Following is a sampling of American Youth Policy Forum publications. Prepaid orders only, please. Prices include shipping and handling in the contiguous United States only. Send orders to: American Youth Policy Forum, 1836 Jefferson Place, NW, Washington DC 20036. Call (202) 775-9731 for rates on bulk orders. Also see our website for additional and online publications: www.aypf.org

Helping Youth Succeed Through Out-of-School-Time Programs (2006)

The publication reviews current research on out-of-school time (OST) programs, especially with regard to their effectiveness; explores the range of OST activities as employed by various youth-serving sectors; considers the untapped possibilities of OST programs to meet the needs of young people, including academic enhancement, career and college preparation, leadership development, and civic engagement; and provides policy guidance on how to sustain high quality OST programs as part of a system of supports for older youth. **online and in print, \$5**

The College Ladder: Linking Secondary and Postsecondary Education for Success for All Students (2006)

This report profiles 22 schools, programs, and policies that allow high school students to take college classes during high school with the potential to earn college credit and ease the transition to postsecondary education. This compendium provides information to policymakers and practitioners regarding the type, structure, and outcomes for students who participate in programs that allow them the opportunity to earn college credit and demonstrates the value of such programs to students. **online and in print, \$15**

Whatever It Takes: How Twelve Communities Are Reconnecting Out-of-School Youth (2006)

This publication documents what committed educators, policymakers, and community leaders across the country are doing to reconnect out-of-school youth to the social and economic mainstream. It provides background on the serious high school dropout prob-

lem and describes in-depth what twelve communities are doing to reconnect dropouts to education and employment training. Descriptions of major national program models serving out-of-school youth are also included. **online and in print, \$8**

The Link between High School Reform and College Success for Low-Income and Minority Youth (2005)

An in-depth review of school reform research presenting evidence of college preparation for all students; examines the predictors of college-going behavior and how they have been addressed by the high school reform movement. The report then describes promising practices from existing reform initiatives and makes recommendations. **online and in print, \$8**

Youth Court: A Community Solution for Embracing At-Risk Youth—A National Update (2005)

Builds upon research by the Urban Institute and an extensive survey of youth court programs by the National Youth Court Center. Provides up-to-date data to give policymakers and the public an overview of youth court programs, their characteristics, and benefits. Findings cover program completion, cost, returns on investment, impact on youth offenders and volunteers, educational and civic opportunities, program sustainability, and recommendations to policymakers. **online and in print, \$5**

Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools (2005)

Co-published with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), this report questions the current focus on core academic subjects at the expense of an equally important role: preparing students to be engaged and effective citizens. The product of collaborative discussion among policymakers, education practitioners, community groups, parents, and youth, the report offers a seven-step action plan to help schools refocus on creating both academically proficient and civically engaged students. **online and in print, \$5**

Enhancing High School Reform: Lessons from Site Visits to Four Cities (2005)

Summarizes successful practices and policies of a number of innovative high schools visited by national policymakers on recent site visits. AYPF introduced these policymakers to the reform-minded leaders of transformed high schools to help them understand the challenges and possibilities of high school redesign. **online only**

Transforming the American High School: Lessons Learned and Struggles Ahead (2004)

From October 2000-April 2004, AYPF provided learning experiences for policymakers considering strategies to create more effective learning environments for youth, particularly disadvantaged youth, that lead to increased academic achievement and better preparation for further learning and careers. AYPF conducted organized speaker forums, field trips, discussion groups, and roundtables and produced publications for policymakers and practitioners. The report summarizes what was learned from these educational events. **online only**

Lessons Learned About Effective Policies and Practices for Out-of-School-Time Programming (2003)

Compiled from site visits by policymakers, discusses the challenges to out-of-school-time program implementation, including issues of going to scale, state and local roles and responsibilities, funding and sustainability, the role of intermediaries and advocates, and the relationship between OST programming and academic achievement. Offers tips on how communities can provide OST activities that are both effective and responsive to local needs. Illustrates numerous uses and public policy solutions to which OST programming has been applied, including leverage for school reform initiatives, opportunities for teacher professional development, expanded resources for schools and communities, sites for school-based services, reinforcement of mutual school and community interests, and outlets for individual/group expression, extended youth development, community culture, and community education. **online only**

Finance and Resource Issues in High School Reform (2003)

Summarizes discussions among education and youth development leaders regarding financial and resource issues in high school reform. These issues were iden-

tified as serious obstacles to meaningful reform in the 2000 American Youth Policy Forum report, *High Schools of the Millennium*. Addresses challenges in four distinct areas: 1) allocation and alignment of resources to support standards-based reform and higher expectations for all students, 2) generating resources for the interventions and specialized programs necessary to support the learning of students with special needs, 3) allocating resources to support learning in alternative education settings, and 4) developing funding strategies for dual enrollment programs. **online and in print, \$5**

Essentials of High School Reform (2003)

Speaks to a concern that much attention is being paid to greater academic achievement in core subjects, resulting in little focus on other outcomes that youth need to be successful: communication, teamwork, analytical and interpersonal skills. Contends that students also need to learn about potential careers, have a familiarity with the world of work beyond the classroom walls, and develop occupational competencies. Summarizes roundtable discussions that offered policy recommendations and practical advice on how to structure contextual teaching and learning and alternative assessments. **online and in print, \$8**

No More Islands: Family Involvement in 27 School and Youth Programs (2003)

When families are active in their children's learning at home, in school, and in youth programs, this connection yields higher grades and test scores, better attendance, attention to homework, fewer special education placements, better attitudes and behavior, higher graduation rates, and greater enrollment in postsecondary education. Family involvement is a requirement of both the No Child Left Behind and the Workforce Investment Acts. The report asserts that young people should not be treated as "islands" by school and youth programs, separate from the context of learning involving their families. **online and in print, \$8**

Building an Effective Citizenry: Lessons Learned From Initiatives in Youth Engagement (2003)

In 2002-2003, AYPF conducted a series of forums and field trips focused on the development of effective citizenry and youth engagement. Participants learned about the wide variety of work helping young people take action in their schools and communities and to become engaged and effective

citizens. Researchers presented findings about youth civic engagement, and leaders of youth organizations discussed their efforts to engage young people in education reform, service-learning, and community activism. **online and in print, \$5**

Finding Common Ground: Service-Learning and Education Reform (2002)

Highlights areas of compatibility between Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) programs and elements of service-learning. Most CSR programs (or models) provide opportunities for students to apply their knowledge and skills to real-life situations, address local community issues and interests, and develop civic skills and competencies. It remains to be seen whether these two educational movements collaborate to develop a unified approach to linking classroom academics to service in school and the community, providing a truly comprehensive education for America's children and youth. **online and in print, \$8**

Summary of the WIA Learning Exchange for Youth Systems (2003)

In April 2002, a General Accounting Office (GAO) report to Congress outlined challenges faced by state and local Workforce Investment Act (WIA) youth program implementers. To address these challenges a series of Peer Learning Exchanges focused on three areas of youth programming that needed improvement: 1) recruitment and retention of out-of-school youth; 2) strengthening the connection among WIA partners, particularly between the education and the workforce communities; and 3) documenting competencies and gains through appropriate assessments and credentials. Second, the Exchanges identified and promoted promising practices in local and state workforce investment areas about successful implementation of youth-related WIA provisions. Finally, the Exchanges aimed to develop a model for the delivery of system-wide technical assistance by incorporating visits to exemplary WIA sites, communicating practical experiences, and fostering learning networks. Summarizes key findings from the Learning Exchanges. **online only**

Finding Fortune in Thirteen Out-of-School-Time Programs (2003)

A compendium of evaluation summaries makes the case that participation in OST programs improves outcomes for youth in academic achievement improvement and higher developmental outcomes; contributes to the evidence needed to make reasoned

decisions regarding the future of after school and out-of-school-time OST programming. **online only**

Rigor and Relevance: A New Vision for Career and Technical Education (2003)

What should the role of the federal government be in Career and Technical Education (CTE)? AYPF organized a series of discussion groups with a diverse range of individuals to focus on this question. The paper provides a vision of reformed CTE, with career pathways, links to business, stronger connections from high school to postsecondary education, and more challenging academics. **online only**

Proceedings of 2001 Policy Forum: Education Reform Through Standards: What Does It Mean for Youth in Alternative Education Settings? (2002)

In 2001, the National Youth Employment Coalition organized a colloquium with AYPF to discuss issues surrounding reform through standards: education systems and employers raising expectations and standards and thereby creating a need for a parallel system of comprehensive supports, effective teaching practices, and higher expectations for literacy skills. The forum also examined the need for alternative education programs to link their curricula to state standards. **online only**

Raising Minority Academic Achievement (2001)

The culmination of a detailed, two-year effort to find, summarize, and analyze evaluations of school and youth programs that show gains for minority youth across a broad range of academic achievement indicators. The report provides an accessible resource for policymakers and practitioners interested in promoting the academic success of racial and ethnic minorities from early childhood through postsecondary study. **online only**

High Schools of the Millennium: Report of the Workgroup (2000)

High schools are out of date and need to be redesigned to meet the needs of today's youth. The report argues for a new vision of high school, one that uses all the resources of the community to create smaller learning environments, to engage youth in their striving for high academic achievement, to support them with adult mentors and role models, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their civic, social, and career skills. **online only**

Raising Academic Achievement: A Study of 20 Successful Programs (2000)

Twenty youth programs that are profiled in this report succeeded in raising test scores, retention rates, graduation rates, and other measures of academic performance. The report analyzes the strategies used and summarizes the program contents. online only

Looking Forward: School-to-Work Principles and Strategies for Sustainability (2000)

Organized around Ten Essential Principles to assist policymakers, practitioners, and the wider community in thinking about ways to sustain successful school-to-work approaches, the Principles represent a distillation of critical elements of the School to Work Opportunities Act: improving the school experience for young people, expanding and improving work-based learning opportunities, and building and sustaining public/private partnerships. Also identifies federal legislation and national programs that support these gains, as well as actions for leadership at the local, state, national, and federal levels. online only.

For a complete list of all AYPF publications, please visit www.aypf.org/publications.

PUBLICATIONS ORDER FORM

Federal ID # 31-157-6455

**Fill in your order and mail with payment to:
AYPF, 1836 Jefferson Place, NW; Dept. 301; Washington, DC 20036**

For rates on bulk or international orders, please contact Arika Norwood, (202) 775-9731 or anorwood@aypf.org

Name	
Organization	
Address	
Address	
City/State/Zip	
Phone	
Fax	
E-mail	

Title	Year	Price	Quantity	Total
Learning Around the Clock: Benefits of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Older Youth	2009	\$15.00		\$
Helping Youth Succeed Through Out-of-School Time Programs	2006	\$5.00		\$
The College Ladder: Linking Secondary and Postsecondary Education for Success for All Students	2006	\$15.00		\$
Youth Court: A Community Solution for Embracing At-Risk Youth— A National Update	2005	\$5.00		\$
Finance and Resource Issues in High School Reform	2003	\$5.00		\$
Essentials of High School Reform	2003	\$8.00		\$
Preparing Youth for Employment: Five Leading United States Youth Development Programs	2003	\$2.00		\$
No More Islands: Family Involvement in 27 School and Youth Programs	2003	\$8.00		\$
A Guide for the Powerless; A Political Process Primer	2003	\$3.00		\$
Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century	2003	\$8.00		\$
Finding Common Ground: Service-Learning and Education Reform	2002	\$8.00		\$
Lessons Learned: What the WAY Program Can Teach Us About Program Replication	2002	\$3.00		\$
Twenty-Five Years of Educating Children with Disabilities: The Good News and the Work Ahead	2001	\$4.00		\$
Higher Learning = Higher Earnings	2001	\$2.00		\$
Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works—and What Doesn't	1999	\$5.00		\$
Thinking About Tests and Testing: A Short Primer in "Assessment Literacy"	1999	\$5.00		\$
The Good News About American Education	1999	\$2.00		\$
Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices	1998	\$10.00		\$
MORE Things that DO Make a Difference for Youth (Compendium Volume 2)	1999	\$10.00		\$

Visit our online publications department at www.aypf.org/publications

Title	Year	Price	Quantity	Total
SPECIAL!! Double Volume Set of both Compendia: MORE Things That DO Make a Difference (Vol. 2) AND Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth (Vol. 1)	1999/ 1998	\$15.00		\$
Employers Talk About Building a School-to-Work System: Voices From the Field	1998	\$4.00		\$
What Business Organizations Say About School-to-Work: A Compendium of Organizational Materials	1998	\$4.00		\$
A Young Person's Guide to Earning and Learning: Preparing for College, Preparing for Careers	1998	\$2.00		\$
Youth Work, Youth Development and the Transition from Schooling to Employment in England: Impressions from a Study Mission	1996	\$2.00		\$
Opening Career Paths for Youth: What Can Be Done? Who Can Do It?	1994	\$2.00		\$
Prevention or Pork? A Hard-Headed Look at Youth-Oriented Anti-Crime Programs	1995	\$2.00		\$
The American School-to-Career Movement: A Background Paper for Policymakers	1994	\$2.00		\$
Dollars and Sense: Diverse Perspectives on Block Grants and the Personal Responsibility Act	1995	\$2.00		\$
Improving the Transition from School to Work in the United States	1993	\$2.00		\$
Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools	2005	online		
Preparing Youth for Careers, Lifelong Learning, and Civic Participation	2006	online		
Serving Older Youth Through a Comprehensive Out-of-School Time System: Lessons from the AYPF Philadelphia Field Trip, May 2006	2006	online		
Whatever It Takes: How Twelve Communities Are Reconnecting Out-of-School Youth	2006	online		
Less Cost, More Safety: Guiding Lights for Reform in Juvenile Justice	2000	online		
Building an Effective Citizenry: Lessons Learned From Initiatives in Youth Engagement	2003	online		
Enhancing High School Reform: Lessons Learned From Site Visits to Four Cities	2005	online		
The Link Between High School Reform and College Success for Low-Income and Minority Youth	2005	online		
Transforming the American High School: Lessons Learned and Struggles Ahead	2004	online		
No Child Left Behind: Improving Educational Outcomes for Students with Disabilities	2004	online		
In Service to Our Nation: A Guide to the Members of the National & Community Service Coalition	2004	online		
Lessons Learned About Effective Policies and Practices for Out-of-School-Time Programming	2003	online		
Summary of the WIA Learning Exchange for Youth Systems	2003	online		
Finding Fortune in Thirteen Out-of-School-Time Programs	2003	online		
Rigor and Relevance: A New Vision for Career and Technical Education	2003	online		
Proceedings of 2001 Policy Forum: Education Reform Through Standards: What Does It Mean for Youth in Alternative Education Settings?	2002	online		
Raising Minority Academic Achievement	2001	online		
High Schools of the Millennium: Report of the Workgroup	2000	online		
Raising Academic Achievement: A Study of 20 Successful Programs	2000	online		
Looking Forward: School-to-Work Principles and Strategies for Sustainability	2000	online		

Visit our online publications department at www.aypf.org/publications

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

ERIKA ARGERSINGER

Policy Director
Afterschool Alliance

KELLY BATHGATE

Foundations Relations Coordinator
Education Sector

SOUMYA BHAT

Program Assistant
The Finance Project

JENNIFER CAPECE

Program Manager
AACC Center for Workforce and Economic Development

BILL CHRISTESON

Research Director
Fight Crime: Invest in Kids

SARAH DESCHENES

Senior Project Manager
Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

JOSEPH A. DURLAK

Professor
Loyola University Chicago

FRITZ EDELSTEIN

Principal
Public Private Action

RON FAIRCHILD

Director, Center for Summer Learning
Johns Hopkins University

AYEOLA FORTUNE

Director, Extended Learning and Development Program
Council of Chief State School Officers

DAN FULLER

Vice President, Government Relations
Communities in Schools

PRISCILLA LITTLE

Associate Director and Project Manager
Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

LUCY FRIEDMAN

President
The After School Corporation (TASC)

LEIGH HOPKINS

National Network Director
National Center on Time & Learning

ANNE-MARIE HOXIE

Research Director
The After School Corporation (TASC)

MEGAN IVERSON

Policy and Research Associate
Afterschool Alliance

JOANN JASTRZAB

Principal Associate
Abt Associates, Inc.

GAIL MANZA

Executive Director
MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership

CAROL McELVAIN

Senior Program Associate
Afterschool Programming

TASHA PATUSKY

National Public Policy Manager
Citizen Schools

ERIC REID

National Urban Fellow
National League of Cities

TAJ REID

Director
Supplemental Educational Services

BONNIE POLITZ

Vice President and Director
Center for Youth Development and Policy Research

DANIEL PRINCIOTTA

Senior Policy Analyst, Education Division
National Governors Association

ELIZABETH REISNER

Principal
Policy Studies Associates

BILL RICHARDS

Director of Education Initiatives
Public Private Ventures

CHRISTINA RUSSELL

Senior Research Associate
Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

BELA SHAH

Senior Program Associate
Institute for Youth, Education and Families
National League of Cities

SUSANNE SPARKS

Senior Research Analyst
National Center for Summer Learning
Johns Hopkins University School of Education

MATTHEW STAGNER

Executive Director
Chapin Hall Center for Children

JENNIFER STEDRON

Program Manager, Education Programs
National Conference of State Legislatures

ROBERT STONEHILL

Chief Program Officer
Learning Point Associates

RHONDA TSOI-A-FATT

Senior Policy Analyst
Center for Law and Social Policy

NICOLE YOHALEM

Program Director
The Forum for Youth Investment

ISBN # 1-887031-97-9



AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM

1836 Jefferson Place, NW ■ Washington, DC 20036 ■ www.aypf.org