



Evidence-based practices

Community building

March 2011

**Prepared for the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood
Solution Action Groups by:**

Wilder Research
451 Lexington Parkway North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104
651-280-2700
www.wilderresearch.org

This packet lists “evidence-based practices” for consideration by Solution Action Groups as we develop recommendations for the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood. It also includes some local programs which have not yet been nationally identified as “evidence-based practices,” but which do have research to support their effectiveness and which appeared in Saint Paul’s Promise Neighborhood proposal.

What are evidence-based practices?

Evidence-based practices are programs which research has shown to be effective with children and young people. No program can ever be perfect, but evidence-based practices have research to show that they have the greatest chance of success with the largest number of children. (Other programs might be effective, but they don’t have research evidence.)

Why are evidence-based practices important for the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood?

Evidence-based practices are important for two reasons.

First, we want to make the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood as effective as possible for as many children as possible. The more that we can include evidence-based practices in our plans, the greater the chances that we can support all of the neighborhood’s children.

Second, the federal government and other funders favor the use of evidence-based practices. The more evidence-based practices that we include in our design of the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood, the better our chances of receiving the investments we need to succeed.

How should we include evidence-based practices in our planning?

Each Solution Action Group will identify solutions for a specific age range of children in the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood. These solutions will support children to succeed in school and in life. We want to pick solutions which will help children at their present age – and which will have positive effects on them for the rest of their lives.

In each of our groups, we should select solutions which we consider most likely to have positive impacts on children. Over the next 10 years or more, the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood will measure those impacts with “indicators.” That is, we will measure indicators such as the *percentage of five year olds who are ready to attend kindergarten*, or the *proportion of students who attend school regularly*, or the *proportion of children who graduate from high school*.

In our groups, we want to select solutions which will move the indicators in a positive direction. For example, this means:

- If the indicator we want to move in a positive direction is the *percentage of third graders who read at their grade level*, we need to ask: What solutions will increase reading achievement for 3rd graders from the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood?
- If the indicator we want to move in a positive direction is the *percentage of students with a caring adult in their home, school or community*, we need to ask: What solutions will increase the number of students from the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood who have a caring adult?

Will all of our solutions be evidence-based practices?

Not all, but hopefully, as many as possible. Solutions can include:

- Services or programs (new or improved) that will be available to children and their families (e.g., after school tutoring for students; parent education for pregnant women and their partners; health screening for preschool children; etc.)
- Reorganization of current efforts in the neighborhood – getting people to work in different ways (e.g., parents, teachers, police, librarians, etc.)
- Activities by neighborhood residents to support young people or to make the neighborhood better for all (volunteer mentoring of young people; block clubs; etc.).
- New locations for services (e.g., making services available in several schools, community centers, or other places)
- Resources (e.g., a new playground, a traffic light at a dangerous intersection, etc.)

Researchers have not developed evidence-based practices for everything we need to do. We should use evidence-based practices when they fit, but we must also do our best to develop other solutions suited to the unique situation of children in the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood – that is, solutions suited to the geography of the neighborhood, the diverse cultures who live here, and other factors. The plan for the Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood will include a mixture of evidence-based practices and other solutions, crafted to fit the neighborhood.

Format: Evidence-based practices, and the other local, research-based practices from our Promise Neighborhood proposal, appear in the following format:

Result: The outcome we are trying to achieve, e.g., “children enter kindergarten ready to learn,” or “children have access to 21st century learning tools.”

Indicator: The measure which tells us if we have achieved a result, e.g., “students who are physically active,” or “high school graduates get a post-secondary degree.” (Note: These are just some of the indicators which we have identified in the Solution Action Groups. The longer lists which we developed appear in a separate document.)

Program/practice: The name of the program, a brief description, and a local provider (if there is one).

Target group: The group for whom the program/practice is appropriate.

Impact: The results which research shows the program/practice can achieve.

At the end of the packet, we have identified research sources.

Result: STUDENTS ARE HEALTHY

Indicator: Children are physically active and regularly eat fruits and vegetables

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Center for Disease Control's key strategies for schools to prevent obesity - <i>Local provider: Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) implemented nutrition and physical activity policies/ procedures; City of St. Paul, SPPS, and YWCA offer extended day physical recreation/ nutrition opportunities</i>	School-age	Well-designed, well-implemented school programs can effectively promote physical activity and healthy eating.

Result: STUDENTS LIVE IN STABLE COMMUNITIES

Indicator: Students live in the same place/experience a low mobility rate

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Housing support programs* - housing and services focused on the unique needs of people exiting homelessness <i>Local initiatives: Wilder's ROOF and QUEST; YWCA programs</i>	Homeless families	Significant increase in housing stability
Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention Program* - provided a variety of services to homeowners faced with foreclosure, including negotiations with lenders, budget and mortgage counseling, and referrals to social services <i>Local initiative: Program sites included Minneapolis and St. Paul.</i>	Homeowners faced with foreclosure	The program successfully prevented foreclosures for up to 42%-62% of homeowners in program (depends on individual program).

Result: STUDENTS FEEL SAFE AT SCHOOL AND IN THEIR COMMUNITY

Indicator: Students feel safe at school and while traveling to and from school

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Ramsey County Wakanheza Project - a community-wide effort that provides tools and strategies for creating welcoming environments for children, youth and families.	School-age children and their families	Findings show several elements that correlate with evidence-based practice methods found in the literature, indicating positive benefits to implementing the project.

* Evidence-based practice

Result: FAMILIES/COMMUNITY MEMBERS SUPPORT LEARNING

Indicator: Students have a caring adult in their home, school or community

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Families and Schools Together (FAST)* - parent involvement program designed to help at-risk youth build relationships and prevent juvenile delinquency	Ages 3-14	Improved social and academic performance.
Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities* - Parent training program using various intervention strategies aimed at raising children with a violence-free, healthy lifestyle. <i>Local provider: Wilder program</i>	High-risk families with children up to 18 years.	Increases parent involvement and parent's sense of competence.
Triple P (Positive Parenting Program)* - Parenting program targeting prevention of child maltreatment by enhancing competence and preventing or altering dysfunctional parenting practices.	Parents of children birth-8 years	Decreases in the number of substantiated reports of child maltreatment, child out-of-home placements, and child maltreatment injuries.

Result: STUDENTS ARE PROFICIENT IN CORE SUBJECTS

Indicator: Students perform at or above grade level according to state language arts and mathematics assessments

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Boys & Girls Club of Philadelphia, Inc.* - range of programs include homework assistance, technology centers, sports and art classes, leadership development <i>Local provider: In St. Paul</i>	Middle and high school students	Improved verbal and writing skills and school engagement
Fast Track Prevention Project* - comprehensive intervention including classroom curriculum, teacher training, tutoring, family group meetings, and home visits	1 st -10 th grade	Positive impacts on social, academic, and behavioral outcomes.

* Evidence-based practice

Result: STUDENTS GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL

Indicator: Students have a high rate of graduation from high school

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Job Corps* - Education and job training program, includes remedial education, GED preparation, vocational training, and job placement assistance <i>Local provider in St. Paul</i>	Economically disadvantaged youth	Potentially positive impacts on school completion.
JOBSTART* - education and training program, includes GED preparation, occupational skills training, job placement assistance, and training-related supports	Disadvantaged high school dropouts	Positive impacts on GED or high school diploma receipt.

Result: STUDENTS ARE HEALTHY

Indicator: Children are physically active and regularly eat fruits and vegetables

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
SHAPEDOWN* - fitness and diet program; regular meetings with a weigh-in, group interaction, and exercise	Middle school and high school students	Significant improvement on relative weight, weight-related behavior, and weight management knowledge

Result: FAMILIES/COMMUNITY MEMBERS SUPPORT LEARNING

Indicator: Students have a caring adult in their home, school or community

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS)* - intensive mentoring program pairing at-risk participants with community volunteers <i>Local provider: In St. Paul</i>	Ages 10-16	Improved relationships with parents and peers.

Result: STUDENTS SUCCEED

Indicator: High school graduates get a postsecondary degree, certification or credential

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
Youth Corps* - full-time, temporary paid work program accompanied by academic and life skills training, job search help, GED courses	Young adults out of school (18-25 years)	In some populations, greater number of associate's degrees earned; increased desire to graduate from college

* Evidence-based practice

Sources

Center for Disease Control's key strategies for schools to prevent obesity

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *Key strategies for schools to prevent obesity*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/childhoodobesity/>

Saint Paul Public Schools Nutrition Services: http://ns.spps.org/About_Us.html

Housing support programs

The National Center on Family Homelessness. (2009, March). *The Minnesota Supportive Housing and Managed Care Pilot: Evaluation Summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.hearthconnection.org/files/The%20Minnesota%20Supportive%20Housing%20and%20Managed%20Care%20Pilot%20-%20Evaluation%20Summary%20%28March%202009%29.pdf>

Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention Program

Chase, R.A. (1999, February). Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention Program site profiles: Final report. St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research.

Ramsey County Wakanheza Project

Erickson, C.L., Lee, S. & Mattaini, M.A. (2009). A Community Prevention Approach to Peaceful Schools: Application of Wakanheza. *School Social Work Journal*, 34(1), 43-60.

Web site: <http://www.co.ramsey.mn.us/ph/cp/wakanheza.htm>

Families and Schools Together

McDonald, L. & Frey, H.E. (1999). Families and Schools Together: Building relationships. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin* (November). Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, US Department of Health and Human Services. (2008, December). *National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices intervention summary: Families and Schools Together (FAST)*. Retrieved from <http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=30>

Strengthening Multi-Ethnic Families and Communities

Kumpfer, K. L., & Alvarado, R. (1998). Effective Family Strengthening Interventions. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Family Strengthening Series. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED431055>

Triple P (Positive Parenting Program)

Prinz, R.J., Sanders, M.R., Shapiro, C.J., Whitaker, D.J., & Lutzker, J.R. (2009). Population-based prevention of child maltreatment: The U.S. Triple P System Population Trial. *Prevention Science*, 10(1): 1-12.

Triple P web site: <http://www.triplep-america.com/index.html>

Boys & Girls Clubs of Philadelphia, Inc.

Schinke, S.P., Cole, K.C., & Poulin, S.R. (2000). Enhancing the educational achievement of at-risk youth. *Prevention Science* 1(1), 51-60.

Fast Track Prevention Project

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1997). *Prevention of antisocial behavior: Initial findings from the Fast Track Project*. Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting, Washington, DC.

Greenberg, M. T. (1998). *Testing developmental theory of antisocial behavior with outcomes from the Fast Track Prevention Project*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Job Corps

Hair, E., Ling, T., & Cochran, S.W. (2003). Youth development programs serving educationally disadvantaged youth: A synthesis of experimental evaluations. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Jekielek, S., Cochran, S.W., & Hair, E. (2002). Employment programs and youth development: A synthesis. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Schochet, P., Brughardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2000). National Job Corps Study: The short-term impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Schochet, P., Brughardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2001). National Job Corps Study: The impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

U.S. Department of Labor's Job Corps web site: <http://www.jobcorps.gov/home.aspx>

JOBSTART

Cave, G., & Doolittle, F. (1991). *Assessing JOBSTART: Interim impacts of a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Cave, G., Bos, H., Doolittle, F., & Toussaint, C. (1993). *JOBSTART: Final report on a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Hair, E., Ling, T., & Cochran, S.W. (2003). Youth development programs serving educationally disadvantaged youth: A synthesis of experimental evaluations. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Jekielek, S., Cochran, S.W., & Hair, E. (2002). *Employment programs and youth development: A synthesis*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Manlove, J., Terry-Humen, E., Romano Papillo, A., Franzetta, K., Williams, S., & Ryan, S. (2001). *Background for community-level work on positive reproductive health in adolescence: Reviewing the literature on contributing factors*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Manlove, J., Terry-Humen, E., Romano Papillo, A., Franzetta, K., Williams, S., & Ryan, S. (2002). *Preventing teenage pregnancy, childbearing, and sexually transmitted diseases: What the research shows (Research brief)*. Washington, DC : Child Trends.

JOBSTART review from What Works Clearinghouse:

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/dropout/jobstart/>

SHAPEDOWN

Mellin, L.M., Slinkard, L.A., & Irwin, C.E. (1987). Adolescent obesity intervention: Validation of the SHAPEDOWN program. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 87(3), 333-338.

SHAPEDOWN program web site: <http://www.shapedown.com/index.htm>

Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS)

Grossman, J.B., & Rhodes, J.E. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 199-219.

Jekielek, S., Cochran, S.W., & Hair, E. (2002). *Mentoring programs and youth development: A synthesis*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Tierney, J.P., Grossman, J.B. & Resch, N.L. (1995). *Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Big Brothers Big Sisters web site:

<http://www.bbbs.org/site/c.9iILl3NGKhK6F/b.5962335/k.BE16/Home.htm>

Youth Corps (American Conservation and Youth Service Corps)

Child Trends. (2001). School readiness: Helping communities get children ready for school and schools ready for children (Research brief). Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Halle, T., Zaff, J., Calkins, J., & Margie, N.G. (2000). Background for community-level work on school readiness: A review of definitions, assessments, and investment strategies. Part II: Reviewing the literature on contributing factors to school readiness. Washington, DC: Child Trends, Inc.

Jastrzab, J., Masker, J., Bloomquist, J. and Orr, L. (1996). Impacts of service: Final report on the evaluation of American Conservation and Youth Corps. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Youth Corps web site: <http://www.youthcorps.net/>