



Evidence-based practices

High school

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.

High school

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
America's Choice* - promotes instructional improvement through curricular guides and teacher guidance, especially in language arts, but also mathematics. <i>Local provider: SPPS curriculum based on this model</i>	Customized for elementary, K-8, middle, and high schools.	Showed strong effects in literacy and mathematics, outpacing comparison schools.
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.
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports framework (PBIS) - A decision making framework guiding selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based academic and behavioral practices. Uses a three-tiered continuum in which students experience supports based on their behavioral responsiveness to intervention.	School-age	Improved academic and behavior outcomes for students.

** Evidence-based practice*

Result: STUDENTS SUCCESSFULLY TRANSITION FROM MIDDLE GRADES TO HIGH SCHOOL

Indicator: Students attend school regularly

Program/practice	Target group	Impact
ALAS* - intervention addressing various factors that affect dropping out. A counselor coordinates student-specific interventions. Students and parents receive training on relevant social and academic skills.	Middle and high school students	Positive impacts on staying in school
Career Academies* - Career-related curricula based on a career theme, academic coursework, and work experience through partnerships with local employers	High school students	Potentially positive effects on staying in and progressing in school
Career Beginnings* - 2-year school and workforce program involving mentoring, workforce training and placement, and competency-based curriculum	11 th and 12 th graders with average academic achievement and economically disadvantaged	Fewer unexcused absences from school and more likely to attend college.
Teen Outreach Program (TOP)* - structured, volunteer community service and classroom-based discussions of future life options	14-18 years old	Significantly less likely to have failed a course or to have been suspended from school
Twelve Together* - Weekly support and mentoring program; peer discussion, homework assistance, trips to college campuses, and annual retreat	Middle and high school students	Positive effects on staying in school
Check & Connect* - a dropout prevention strategy based on close monitoring of students' school performance, as well as elements of mentoring, case management and other supports. <i>Local initiative: Selected Minneapolis public schools and some Dakota County school districts</i>	Middle and high school students.	Positive effect on students staying in school; potentially positive effect on students' progressing in school.

* 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
<p>Talent Search* - provides services such as test taking and study skills assistance, academic advice and tutoring services, career development advice, college campus visits, and assistance with college financial aid applications. <i>Local provider: St. Paul College and St. Paul Public Schools</i></p>	Low-income, potentially first generation college students	Shows potentially positive effect on school completion rates.
<p>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></p>	Economically disadvantaged youth	Potentially positive impacts on school completion.
<p>JOBSTART* - education and training program, includes GED preparation, occupational skills training, job placement assistance, and training-related supports</p>	Disadvantaged high school dropouts	Positive impacts on GED or high school diploma receipt.
<p>Admission Possible - School-based program that monitors student progress in high school and college, providing social supports including tutoring, counseling, mentoring, and enrollment assistance. <i>Local initiative: Selected high schools in Minneapolis and Saint Paul.</i></p>	Low-income, potentially first generation college students	Positive impact on high school dropout rates, college attendance rates.
<p>Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) - places students in college preparatory track and supports them academically (e.g. tutoring, study skills, peer group support) <i>Local provider: Selected Saint Paul Public Schools</i></p>	Underserved, potentially first generation college students earning average grades	May increase enrollment in courses of higher rigor and high school graduation rates

*Evidence-based practice

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
The Stanford Adolescent Heart Health Program* - school-based curriculum emphasizing healthy behaviors	High school students	Increases in regular exercise and healthy food choices
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 provider: 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).

* Evidence-based practice

Result: STUDENTS FEEL SAFE AT SCHOOL AND IN THEIR COMMUNITY
Indicator: Students feel safe at school and while traveling to and from school

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.

Indicator: Students have family members who attend parent-teacher conferences

Result: STUDENTS HAVE ACCESS TO 21ST CENTURY LEARNING TOOLS
Indicator: Students have school and/or home access to a computer and broadband internet

** Evidence-based practice*

Sources

America's choice

Rowan, B., Correnti, R., Miller, R., & Camburn, E. (2009). *School improvement by design: Lessons from a study of comprehensive school reform programs*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/sii%20final%20report_web%20file.pdf
More information at: <http://www.americaschoice.org/index.cfm>

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.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS)

Sugai, George, Horner, Robert R. (2006) A Promising Approach for Expanding and Sustaining School-Wide Positive Behavior Support. *School Psychology Review*, 35(2), pp. 245–259.

Website: <http://www.pbis.org/research/default.aspx>

ALAS

Larson, K. A., & Rumberger, R. W. (1995). ALAS: Achievement for Latinos through Academic Success. In H. Thornton (Ed.), *Staying in school. A technical report of three dropout prevention projects for junior high school students with learning and emotional disabilities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

Gándara, P., Larson, K. A., Mehan, H., & Rumberger, R. W. (1998). *Capturing Latino Students in the Academic Pipeline*. Berkeley, CA: Chicano/Latino Policy Project.

Rumberger, R. W., & Larson, K. A. (1994). Keeping high-risk Chicano students in school: Lessons from a Los Angeles junior high school dropout prevention program. In R. J. Rossi (Ed.), *Educational Reforms for At-Risk Students* (pp. 141–162). New York: Teachers College Press.

Larson, K. A., & Rumberger, R. W. (1995). Doubling school success in highest-risk Latino youth: Results from a middle school intervention study. In R. F. Macías and R. G. García Ramos (Eds.), *Changing Schools for Changing Students*. Santa Barbara: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Larson, K. A. (1989). Task-related and interpersonal problem-solving training for increasing school success in high-risk young adolescents. *Remedial and Special Education*, 10(5), 32–42.

What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report, ALAS:

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

Career Academies

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

Kemple, J. (1997). *Career Academies: Communities of support for students and teachers: Further findings from a 10-site evaluation*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Kemple, J., Poglinco, S., & Snipes, J. (1999). *Career Academies: Building career awareness and work-based learning activities through employer partnerships*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Kemple, J. & Snipes, J. (2000). *Career Academies: Impacts on students' engagement and performance in high school*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Stern, D., Dayton, C., Raby, M. (2000). *Career Academies: Building Blocks for Reconstructing American High Schools*. Berkeley: Career Academy Support Network.

National Career Academy Coalition web site: <http://www.ncacinc.com/>

Career Academy Support Network: <http://casn.berkeley.edu/index.php>

Career Beginnings

Cave, G., & Quint, J. (1990). *Career Beginnings impact evaluation: Findings from a program for disadvantaged high school students*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

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

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

Redd, Z., Brooks, J., & McGarvey, A. (2001). *Background for community-level work on educational adjustment in adolescence: Reviewing the literature on contributing factors*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Redd, Z., Brooks, J., & McGarvey, A. (2002). *Educating America's youth: What makes a difference? (Research brief)*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Teen Outreach Program (TOP)*

Allen, J.P., Philliber, S., Herrling, S., & Kuperminc, G.P. (1997). Preventing teen pregnancy and academic failure: Experimental evaluation of a developmentally based approach. *Child Development*, 64(4), 729-742.

Philliber, S. & Allen, J.P. (1992). Life options and community service: Teen outreach program. In B. C. Miller, J. J. Card, L. Paikoff, & J. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Preventing adolescent pregnancy: Model programs and evaluation* (pp. 139-155). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Redd, Z., Brooks, J., & McGarvey, A. (2001). *Background for community-level work on educational adjustment in adolescence: Reviewing the literature on contributing factors*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Redd, Z., Brooks, J., & McGarvey, A. (2002). *Educating America's youth: What makes a difference? (Research brief)*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Twelve Together

Dynarski, M., Gleason, P., Rangarajan, A., & Wood, R. (1998). *Impacts of dropout prevention programs: Final report. A research report from the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program evaluation*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Dynarski, M., & Gleason, P. (1998). *How can we help? What we have learned from evaluations of federal dropout-prevention programs*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Hershey, A., Adelman, N., & Murray, S. (1995). *Helping kids succeed: Implementation of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Rosenberg, L., & Hershey, A. (1995). *The cost of dropout prevention programs*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report, Twelve Together:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/dropout/12_together/

Check & Connect

Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., Evelo, D. L., & Hurley, C. M. (1998). Dropout prevention for youth with disabilities: Efficacy of a sustained school engagement procedure. *Exceptional Children*, 65(1), 7.

What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report, Check & Connect:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/WWC_Check_Connect_092106.pdf

Talent Search

Constantine, Jill M., Seftor, Neil, Martin, Emily Sama, Silva, Tim, Myers, David. (2006). A Study of the Effect of the Talent Search Program on Secondary and Postsecondary Outcomes in Florida, Indiana and Texas: Final Report From Phase II of the National Evaluation, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service.

What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report, Talent Search:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/WWC_Talent_Search_122806.pdf

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/>

Admission Possible

Smart investments in Minnesota's students: A research-based investment proposal. (2008) Saint Paul, MN: Growth & Justice.

McLain, Laura. (2006). Admission Possible evaluation results: A program to increase college admission among low-income students. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Research. Retrieved 3/2/11. <http://www.wilder.org/download.0.html?report=1899&summary=1>
Web site: <http://www.admissionpossible.org/reports.html>

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)

Watt, K., Yanez, D., & Cossio, G. (2002). AVID: A comprehensive school reform model for Texas. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 19(3), 43-59.

Web site: http://www.avid.org/abo_whatisavid.html

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>

The Stanford Adolescent Heart Health Program

Killen, J.D., Robinson, T.N., Telch, M.J., Saylor, K.E., Maron, D.J., Rich, T., et al. (1989). The Stanford Adolescent Heart Health Program. *Health Education Quarterly*, 16(2), 263-283.

Hatcher, J. L. & Scarpa, J. (2001). *Background for community-level work on physical health and safety in adolescence: Reviewing the literature on contributing factors*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

--. (2002). *Encouraging teens to adopt a safe, healthy lifestyle: A foundation for improving future adult behaviors* (Research brief). Washington, DC: Child Trends.

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. Internal Wilder Research evaluation report.

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.9iILI3NGKhK6F/b.5962335/k.BE16/Home.htm>