State of the Field: Education

What’s Working in Education in National Service and the Social Innovation Fund

AmeriCorps State and National Symposium 2016
Intro

• Learning objectives
• Session agenda
  – Federal policy context
  – Synthesis methodology
  – Discussion of intervention elements and program contexts
  – Activity: brainstorm challenges, opportunities, and questions with small group, large group
Education Policy & Evidence

• Education Policy Context
• Evidence in the Every Student Succeeds Act
• Learning from Existing Research
Sources

- The Role of National Service in Closing the Graduation Gap (a report by America’s Promise Alliance)
- Knowledge Management Education State of the Practice Report (CNCS product)
- 2016 AmeriCorps Grant Application Review Process database (CNCS product)
Criteria for Selection

- Reports looking at programs with relevant outcomes and met SIF level of evidence (LOE) of Strong or Moderate
- Reports that met ASN 2016 NOFO definition of Strong or Moderate with high quality rating
- Reviewed positively by other federal evidence clearinghouse such as What Works Clearinghouse
- Strengths and limitations of review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Evidence</th>
<th>ASN</th>
<th>SIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Preliminary</td>
<td>Organization shows relevant data collection experience</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>Up to two relevant outcomes studies with promising results</td>
<td>Research showing promising results for program or similar model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Up to two QED or RCT studies on program demonstrating effectiveness; limited generalizability</td>
<td>Directly relevant evidence from previous studies that can support positive causal conclusions; limited generalizability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Well-designed and well-implemented QED(s) or RCT(s) with (consistently) positive results at state, regional, or national level</td>
<td>Directly relevant evidence from previous studies that can support positive causal conclusions at state, regional, or national level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synthesis Process

• Categorize research and evaluation reports by outcome area
• Identify core components of intervention
• Identify key contextual factors
• Overlay components, contextual factors within outcome areas
• Cross check with Knowledge Management Synthesis products
## Programs by Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PreK – School Readiness</th>
<th>K-12 – Improvements in Reading and Math Achievement</th>
<th>K-12 – Improvements in Attendance and Behavior</th>
<th>Post-Secondary – Increased Access to College and Careers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Jumpstart</td>
<td>• Minnesota Reading Corps K-3 Program</td>
<td>• AARP Experience Corps</td>
<td>• College Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIPPYCorps</td>
<td>• Reading Partners</td>
<td>• City Year Whole Child Whole School</td>
<td>• The National College Advising Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minnesota Reading Corps PreK Program</td>
<td>• AARP Experience Corps</td>
<td>• Communities in Schools Integrated Student Supports</td>
<td>• Blue Engine NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detroit Parent Network Pathways to Literacy</td>
<td>• United Way of Dane County Schools of Hope</td>
<td>• Playworks</td>
<td>• Kentucky College Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City Year Whole Child Whole School</td>
<td>• Citizen Schools</td>
<td>• Citizen Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach for America</td>
<td>• WINGS for Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizen Schools</td>
<td>• Latin American Youth Center Promotor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communities in Schools Integrated Student Supports</td>
<td>Pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Programs by CNCS Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNCS Funding</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, SIF</td>
<td>AARP Experience Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps, SIF</td>
<td>HIPPYCorps, Reading Partners, WINGS for Kids, College Possible, NCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps, Senior Corps</td>
<td>Jumpstart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps</td>
<td>MRC PreK, MRC K-3, United Way of Dane County Schools of Hope, City Year WCWS, TFA, Citizen Schools, CIS Integrated Student Supports, Playworks, Blue Engine NY, Kentucky College Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIF</td>
<td>Detroit Parent Network Pathways to Literacy, Latin American Youth Center Promotor Pathways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PreK – School Readiness

Outcomes focused on emotional/behavioral readiness and reading ability

Programs Reviewed

• Jumpstart
• HIPPYCorps
• Minnesota Reading Corps PreK Program
• Detroit Parent Network Pathways to Literacy
Common components and context

- **Curriculum** to guide service delivery
- Mix of one-on-one and small group sessions
- Standardized **training** for those delivering services
- Half of programs trained national service **members in service delivery**, other half used national service members to **train volunteers** in service delivery; both were shown to be effective.
- Majority used “**franchise**” model, meaning national parent organization for support and assessment.
- Implemented in locations **convenient to those served**, including in schools, at daycares, and in homes
K-12 – Reading and Math

Outcomes focused on improvements in reading and math scores

Programs Reviewed

• Minnesota Reading Corps K-3 Program
• Reading Partners
• AARP Experience Corps
• United Way of Dane County Schools of Hope
• City Year Whole Child Whole School
• Teach for America
• Citizen Schools
• Communities in Schools Integrated Student Supports
Common components and context

• **Curriculum** to guide service delivery

• Mix of **one-on-one and small group** sessions in service delivery; students were assessed for level of need to determine intensity

• Standardized **training** for those delivering services; most included training for sites hosting members and volunteers

• Effective whether using national service **members to deliver services** directly or **training volunteers** to deliver services

• Most included **on-site coordinator and/or curriculum coach**; typically staff but sometimes national service members

• Most used **data** and invested in data systems to assess student needs and monitor student progress throughout the program

• Many had “**franchise**” model, meaning national parent organization for support and assessment.

• Several included **whole class or whole school enrichment**, such as field trips or assemblies.
K-12 – Behavior and Attendance

Outcomes focused on improved attendance, diminished stress, increased attention, reduction in bullying, and decrease in risky behavior

Programs Reviewed

- AARP Experience Corps
- City Year Whole Child Whole School
- Communities in Schools Integrated Student Supports
- Playworks
- Citizen Schools
- WINGS for Kids
- Latin American Youth Center Promotor Pathways
Common components and context

- Mix of one-on-one and small group sessions in service delivery; students were assessed for level of need to determine intensity
- Standardized training for those delivering services; most included training for sites hosting members and volunteers
- Emphasis on one-on-one, long-term commitment to a student; program does even when service term limits ability of member
- Most used data and invested in data systems to assess student needs and monitor student progress throughout the program
- Many had “franchise” model, meaning national parent organization for support and assessment.
- Some included a curriculum and whole class or whole school enrichment, such as field trips or assemblies.
- Most programs were in largely low-income, urban communities.
Post-Secondary – College and Careers

Outcomes focused on graduation rates and post-secondary preparedness, whether college or job readiness

Programs Reviewed

• College Possible
• The National College Advising Corps
• Blue Engine NY
• Kentucky College Coaches
• Citizen Schools
Post-Secondary – College and Careers

Common components and context

• **One-on-one coaching model;** most used national service members in this role (and highlighted the importance of the near-peer element); some included community volunteers as mentors.

• Most used members as **secondary school counseling**, often having a set caseload and reporting to a school counselor.

• Most included mix of activities:
  – activities in support of graduation primarily consisted of one-on-one **academic tutoring**;
  – activities in support of post-secondary plans included **SAT/ACT prep, college application and financial aid form coaching, resume and interview prep, and out-of-school visits** to college campuses and potential employers

• Most directly **on school campuses**; varied whether in the classroom, during school hours but in another room, or after school
Study found program was implemented as designed with school leaders perceiving members as highly influencing success.
School Turnaround AmeriCorps – Successful Components

Programs ensure member quality and consistency by

• Improving member recruitment and retention;
• Providing specialized member training and preparation; and
• Providing on-site supervision and support.
School Turnaround AmeriCorps – Successful Components

Members **effectively deliver school-based services** by:

- Establishing **trusting relationships** with students;
- Maintaining a **consistent presence** to aid with classroom management;
- Collaborating with teachers to review student **data** and target supports to students’ needs; and
- Being **flexible** in meeting schools’ needs.
School Turnaround AmeriCorps – Successful Components

Programs’ focus on **communication and relationship building** with school stakeholders helps:

- Build program *buy-in*;
- Increase program *understanding*; and
- Ease *challenges* inherent in serving in low-performing schools, such as high turnover of school leaders and staff.
Common components across all?

- Intensive member training
- Supervision of direct service providers
- Set curriculum/service parameters
Activity: brainstorm opportunities, challenges, questions

• With a small group, discuss the following:
  – For your program or portfolio, where are there opportunities to learn from or apply the components presented in any of the outcome areas?
  – For your program or portfolio, what are some of the challenges in adopting or adapting any of the components discussed?
  – What are some questions you would like to explore further based on the components discussed?
• Large group discussion: what did your small group identify as opportunities, challenges, or questions?
Next Steps for Research and Evaluation

• What components are relevant to programs in other CNCS focus areas?
• What and how much contextual information needed for widespread adoption of effective practices?
• What is the role of CNCS HQ and/or state commissions in spreading these practices?