

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

21st Century Community Learning Centers
Pathways to Progress Project, Saint Paul Public Schools

FALL 2001

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

Kyla Wahlstrom, Principal investigator
Tim Sheldon, Roger Anderson & Holly Zorka

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

21st Century Community Learning Centers *Pathways to Progress Project, Saint Paul Public Schools*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the executive summary of the annual evaluation report for the *Pathways to Progress* program. The annual evaluation report for the *Pathways to Progress*, 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant is intended to assist the ongoing efforts of *Pathways* staff to modify and improve the project content and processes by examining program planning, development, and implementation at the eight school sites.



PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Pathways to Progress is a three year, federally funded grant that establishes community learning centers at each of the eight Saint Paul Public School sites. These community learning centers are designed to provide coordinated expanded day and year community learning activities for students, families and community members in Saint Paul. The grant period extends from June 2000 through May 2003.

Pathways offers multiple activities and programming in eight school sites, five elementary and three middle/junior high schools, divided into three clusters¹ spread throughout the Saint Paul Public School System. These sites were selected to provide additional support to youth who experience low academic achievement and who face risk factors in their environment (e.g. violence, poverty, drug use). The grant's three specific goals are to increase student academic achievement, to reduce drug use and violence among youth and to increase parental capacity to support a child's education. Programming is focused in ten core activity areas.

Key staffing positions include Dr. Terilyn Turner, area superintendent who serves as project director and provides oversight for the grant, a project coordinator, a part-time clerical assistant, two cluster coordinators (individuals responsible for multiple sites), three site coordinators (individuals responsible for one site), and numerous part-time instructors/activity leaders comprised of community members (including high school and college youth), non-profit agency staff, university staff, and Saint Paul Public Schools teachers and support staff. In addition, volunteers supplement the work of paid staff.

¹ Cluster is a geographical grouping (Pathway) of elementary and secondary schools. Cluster 1 includes: Jackson, Galtier and Wilson, Cluster 2 includes: Phalen Lake and Cleveland, and Cluster 3 includes: Roosevelt, Cherokee Heights and Humboldt Junior High.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

CAUTIONARY REMINDER

This report includes many “findings,” but because we are using incomplete data, we should consider these findings preliminary and suggestive. Procedures are in place to make sure that the dataset for the 2001-2002 school year will be more reliable by the time we prepare our next annual report in October 2002.

In *Pathways*' first year:

YOUTH AND ADULTS

- 1,200 Saint Paul students – one in three – participated in the eight school sites. The demographics of students involved in *Pathways* parallel the demographics of students in general.
- *Pathways* reached a blend of students that parallels the ethnic composition of the district. The program fell a little short in its attempts to involve children who receive special education services, ELL or qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch. The program could also provide more high interest offerings for parents and senior citizens.
- Regular *Pathways* participants maintained a high attendance rate in school (98 percent).
- Only one percent of regular attendees had more disciplinary referrals after entering the *Pathways* program. Only six percent of the limited attendees had more referrals after joining *Pathways*.
- Program offerings provided multiple opportunities for students to work and play across grade levels while engaging in traditional school activities (such as academics, sports, and the arts) in less formal settings.
- *Pathways* involved over 1,000 parents and other adults in the community in its first year.

PROGRAM OFFERINGS

- Program offerings provided additional academic support and homework. Many of these programs provided homework in combination with recreational and other high interest activities.
- Programming in drug use prevention and violence prevention was offered to students.
- School sites were open an additional 14 hours every week because of *Pathways* programming. These additional hours came close to meeting the objective of expanded services.
- *Pathways* worked extensively with a wide range of community agencies and organizations.

STAFF COMMITMENT

The staff appears to demonstrate a genuine commitment to the goals and activities of the grant project. The research team witnessed the project coordinator working long hours – overseeing that work was performed to the highest standards. The clerical assistant similarly provided important support with follow-up calls, data entry (over and above assigned responsibilities), and maintaining a problem-solving demeanor throughout the course of a challenging first year.

- Cluster and site coordinators also demonstrated a commitment to the goals of *Pathways* but even more importantly, commitment to the spirit of creating school-based Community Learning Centers.

Through interviews, site coordinators have demonstrated:

- A child centered focus on the programming as well as a commitment to both academic and social goals of the program
- The ability to tailor the site activities to the unique characteristics of the school

STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

Staff serving as cluster coordinators faced difficulties trying to manage and oversee the programming in more than one site. These challenges were amplified by the complexity of multiple programming. The resignation of one cluster coordinator early in implementation resulted in heightened stress and greater hardship for staff involved in that cluster.

DISCUSSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR REPLICATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

LIMITED PARTICIPATION AMONG HARDEST TO REACH POPULATIONS

A major program objective is to reach at-risk students. While *Pathways* is reaching a composition that nearly parallels the district composition, it has not attained the higher concentrations of children who receive special education services or children who qualify for free and reduced lunch. It is also necessary to place greater emphasis on providing high interest offerings that parents and other adults consider useful and to provide classes for senior citizens.

TRANSPORTATION WAS AN OBSTACLE TO PARTICIPATION IN THE FIRST YEAR

The absence of consistent transportation will be a *major* obstacle to the success of this program.

RECORD KEEPING AND DATA COLLECTION A MAJOR CHALLENGE IN THE FIRST YEAR

A key focus of years two and three will be to promote and provide support for better record keeping methods. An obstacle in the first year of the program was the dominant district culture. It has traditionally not placed a high emphasis on keeping attendance records for after school activities and maintaining a centralized, comprehensive student database. Some changes have occurred but more will continue to be done in years two and three.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

21st Century Community Learning Centers *Pathways to Progress Project, Saint Paul Public Schools*



REPORT OVERVIEW

This document is the annual evaluation report for the *Pathways to Progress*, 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant. Its goal is to assist the ongoing efforts of *Pathways* staff to modify and improve the project content and processes by examining program planning, development, and implementation at the eight school sites.

This report is laid out in three main sections which provide a brief overview of the program and its structure and an assessment of the degree to which the program has met its objectives in its initial year of programming. The third section presents key findings and concluding remarks.



SECTION I

PROGRAM OVERVIEW



SECTION II

PROGRAM OUTCOMES: OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS



SECTION III

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The fourth section provides supporting information on additional data tables, the evaluation plan, background information on the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) and the project evaluation team.



SECTION IV

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION


SECTION I
PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Pathways to Progress is a three year, federally funded grant that establishes community learning centers at each of the eight Saint Paul Public School sites. These community learning centers are designed to provide coordinated expanded day and year community learning activities for students, families and community members in Saint Paul. The grant period extends from June 2000 through May 2003.

Pathways offers multiple activities and programming in eight school sites, five elementary and three middle/junior high schools, divided into three clusters² spread throughout the Saint Paul Public School System. These sites were selected to provide additional support to youth who experience low academic achievement and who face risk factors in their environment (e.g. violence, poverty, drug use). The grant's three specific goals are to increase student academic achievement, to reduce drug use and violence among youth and to increase parental capacity to support a child's education. Programming is focused in ten core activity areas.

In its first year, the 2000-2001 academic year, *Pathways* served over 1,200 students (roughly one third of the student population at the eight school sites) in dozens of classes and activities and 1,300 adults³. Parents and adult community members were also served in periodic program offerings. The total number of participants is expected to grow in subsequent years as the programming is expanded, visibility is increased, and transportation becomes more widely available.

Key staffing positions include Dr. Terilyn Turner, area superintendent who serves as project director and provides oversight for the grant, a project coordinator, a part-time clerical assistant, two cluster coordinators (individuals responsible for multiple sites), three site coordinators (individuals responsible for one site), and numerous part-time instructors/activity leaders comprised of community members (including high school and college youth), non-profit agency staff, university staff, and Saint Paul Public Schools teachers and support staff. In addition, volunteers supplement the work of paid staff.

² Cluster is a geographical grouping (Pathway) of elementary and secondary schools. Cluster 1 includes: Jackson, Galtier and Wilson, Cluster 2 includes: Phalen Lake and Cleveland, and Cluster 3 includes: Roosevelt, Cherokee Heights and Humboldt Junior High.

³ Adult participants include both parents and other community members. The adult participation rates are estimates that include head counts of participants at one-time events and adult who participate in regular classes. Only about one tenth of the adult participants attended regular classes.


SECTION II
**PROGRAM OUTCOMES: OBJECTIVES AND
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**
A CAUTION WHEN INTERPRETING THE RESULTS

Generally speaking the more complete the data, the more confidence we have in the conclusions we derive. For example, in this report we frequently mention three groups of students, those who are frequent participants in *Pathways* classes (regular attendees), those who attended *Pathways* classes occasionally (limited attendees), and those who did not participate in a *Pathways* class (non-attendees). Ideally for each student we would have good attendance data that allowed us to clearly identify students in each group, and we would also have a complete set of other kinds of data (first and second semester grades, number of discipline referrals, test scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test, 7th Edition (MAT/7), and *Pathways* survey data from students and teachers). For a variety of reasons, some inevitable during a startup year, the dataset is incomplete. A look in the following tables at the varying sizes of the groups being compared will illustrate the problem.

This report includes many “findings,” but because we are using incomplete data, we should consider these findings preliminary and suggestive. Procedures are in place to make sure that the dataset for the 2001-2002 school year will be more reliable by the time we prepare our next annual report in October 2002.

**PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM WILL DEMONSTRATE EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL
BENEFITS AND EXHIBIT POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES**
PART 1 - INDICATORS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Students regularly participating will show continuous improvement in achievement.

QUESTION 1.1 - CHANGES IN TEST SCORES

Do children who attend Pathways have levels of achievement comparable to children in the same schools who do not attend Pathways classes?

METHOD

Evaluators compared the reading and math gain scores of students in three groups.⁴

⁴ Three groups are repeatedly referred to and compared throughout this report. They are: regular *Pathways* attendees, limited *Pathways* attendees and non-attendees. All students from the eight school sites fall into one, and only one, of these three groups. Regular *Pathways* attendees are students who attended at least 30 days of programming or would have attended 30 days if attendance for the whole year had been available, limited attendees did not reach this threshold, non-attendees never participated in the *Pathways* program.

TABLE 1.1 - TEST SCORES BY GROUP

Group	READING				MATH			
	<i>Average National Percentile (Conversion of NCE)</i>							
Group	N	2000	2001	Gain	N	2000	2001	Gain
Regular attendees	285	27	30	+3	285	39	43	+4
Limited attendees	436	25	29	+4	436	34	39	+5
Non Attendees	1775	29	32	+3	1775	39	43	+4

Source. Saint Paul Public Schools

FINDINGS

Table 1.1 shows the Metropolitan Achievement Test, 7th Edition (MAT/7) results for those students who took the test in the spring of 2000 and 2001. The table shows that:

- Students in all groups were below average on both tests
- Students in all groups scored somewhat higher on the math test than the reading test
- The gains for all three groups were approximately equal

The impact of specific factors is bulleted below. Additional detailed information is in SECTION FOUR.

- Ethnic Group – For Asian/Pacific Islanders, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with less progress in math; for Hispanics, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with more progress in math; for Caucasians, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with more growth in reading.
- Grade in school – For grade 5 only, participation in *Pathways* was associated with more growth in math and reading. For other grades there was no difference.
- ELL – No significant differences
- Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch – No significant differences
- Special Education status – For Special Education students, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with less growth in reading; for non-special education students, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with more growth in math.

QUESTION 1.2 – CHANGES IN ACHIEVEMENT DISTRIBUTION

Is Pathways participation associated with shifts in the distribution of achievement for students across the four quartiles?

METHOD

As before, evaluators used district data to determine how students were distributed across the quartiles for each of the three groups.

TABLE 1.2 – PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING AT EACH QUARTILE USING MAT/7 SCORES

READING				
	<i>FIRST QUARTILE (1-24th percentile)</i>	<i>SECOND QUARTILE (25-49th percentile)</i>	<i>THIRD QUARTILE (50-74th percentile)</i>	<i>FOURTH QUARTILE (75-99th percentile)</i>
Regular attendees	48	29	14	9
Limited attendees	52	27	13	9
Non-attendees	45	30	16	9
MATH				
Regular attendees	35	28	19	19
Limited attendees	41	23	19	17
Non-attendees	39	24	19	17

Source. Saint Paul Public Schools, 2001

FINDINGS

Table 1.2 presents the MAT/7 results in a different way. In this table, the percentage of students scoring in the four quartiles is shown. The patterns seen in Table 1.1 are also manifest in this table.

- About a quarter of the students scored above average on the reading portion (third and fourth quartile).
- About 35 percent scored above average on the math portion of the test (third and fourth quartile).
- There were no significant differences among the three groups of students.

QUESTION 1.3 – CHANGES IN GRADES

Do middle school students in the three groups differ in their achievement as measured by report card grades given in the first and second semesters of academic year 2001? (That is, do math and English grades increase, decrease, or remain unchanged?)⁵.

METHOD

District data was used to compare achievement changes between first and second semesters of the 2001 academic school year of the two groups.

⁵ Elementary school grades could not be compared since each school has different ways of measuring academic progress and record keeping (e.g. the inclusion/exclusion of pluses and minuses, word designations “Very Good, Satisfactory”).

TABLE 1.3 - AVERAGE REPORT CARD GRADES FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS IN PATHWAYS PROGRAMS

Group	ENGLISH		MATH	
	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 1	Semester 2
Regular Attendees	B+	B	B	B+
Limited Attendees	B-	B-	B-	B-

Source. Saint Paul Public Schools, 2001

FINDINGS

Grades for non-*Pathways* students were not available for this analysis, thus only the two *Pathways* groups are included in the analysis. When grades for the two groups are compared, there is essentially no difference between the two *Pathways* groups.

- Grades for regular attendees fell slightly in English and rose slightly in math.
- Grades for limited attendees remained unchanged
- Although the groups of students in this table were not the same as the group in Table 1.2, it seems reasonable to support that the grades they get from teachers are about average from a national perspective even though their academic skills are relatively weak (as measured by the MAT/7).

PART 2 - INDICATORS OF CHANGES IN STUDENT BEHAVIOR

Students participating in the program will show improvements on measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary referrals.

QUESTION 2.1 - CHANGES IN SCHOOL ATTENDANCE PATTERNS

Is student participation in Pathways associated with improved attendance in schools during the regular school day?

METHOD

Evaluators compared student attendance records among the three study groups. Do students who attend *Pathways* display different attendance patterns than students who do not attend *Pathways*?

TABLE 2.1 – PERCENT AVERAGE ATTENDANCE FOR STUDENTS WITH TWO YEARS OF ATTENDANCE DATA

Group	N	SCHOOL YEAR	
		2000	2001
Regular Attendees	294	97	98
Limited attendees	466	96	97
Non-attendees	1529	95	96

Source. Saint Paul Public Schools, 2001

FINDINGS

Table 2.1 shows that each group's attendance rate increased by one percentage point from 2000 to 2001. Regular *Pathways* attendees maintain a high (98 percent) attendance rate at school. Since regular attendees were, by definition, students who attended the program often, it is not surprising that their average attendance was higher than the other two groups.

QUESTION 2.2 - CHANGES IN CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

Do classroom teachers of Pathways students see improvements in student performance?

METHOD

At the end of the school year, some classroom teachers completed a survey to determine if the behavior of *Pathways* students had improved during the year. Table 2.2 shows the percent of students who improved in ten areas.

TABLE 2.2 - CHANGE IN CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR AS SEEN BY CLASSROOM TEACHER

	Regular Attendees (N=168)	Limited Pathways (N=85)
Student is improved in:	% Yes	% Yes
Turning in homework on time	57	66
Completing homework to my satisfaction	58	68
Participating in class	58	70
Volunteering (extra credit, more responsibilities)	58	68
Attending class regularly	51	69
Being attentive in class	51	69
Behaving well in class	54	71
Having satisfactory or better academic performance	54	81
Coming to school ready and prepared to learn	61	72
Getting along well with other students	58	70

Source. Pathways Teacher Survey, 2001

FINDINGS

A review of these results by school suggests that there was a lot of variation in how the teachers approached this survey. Some teachers seemed to respond as if they wanted to show that all was well; other teachers seemed to respond as if nothing good happened. The results in Table 2.2 are an average of these teachers, and should be interpreted cautiously.

The data seems to indicate that fewer regular attendees improved in these areas than limited attendees. We should wait for next year to see what full participation by teachers using standard directions will bring. At that time we can also look at the results for various subgroups.

QUESTION 2.3 - CHANGES IN STUDENT ATTITUDES

Do regular attendees' attitudes towards school change from early in the program to later in the program?

METHOD

Evaluators collected data from student surveys administered in October through April.⁶

TABLE 2.3 - CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TOWARDS SCHOOL BY STUDENTS FOR WHOM PRE- AND POST-SURVEYS WERE AVAILABLE

Percent of students responding "Yes"	Regular Attendees (N=102)		Limited Pathways (N=30)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Item from student survey				
Do you like to go to school?	77	80	76	89
Do you study hard for tests?	71	89	72	85
Do you feel safe in school?	91	92	93	97
Do your parents talk to you about schoolwork?	85	96	90	97
Do you like this program?		97*		97*
Are you comfortable talking to the staff?		89*		93*
Is there someone here to give you help?		95*		97*
Are you doing better in school now?		91*		90*
Do you feel safe in this program?		92*		93*

Source. Pathways Student Survey, January – May, 2001

* Post-test included five additional questions not included on pretest.

FINDINGS

The results from the student surveys are very suspect. One issue that arose was that only 30 limited *Pathways* students took both fall pre-surveys and spring post-surveys. In addition, some sites significantly delayed pre-survey administration because the program had a start date later than anticipated. Further complicating matters, some post-surveys were administered in late winter (rather than the spring) to accommodate the federal report due in April. As a result, the interval between the two surveys varied significantly from school to school both in time interval and comprehensiveness of administration.

If we take the results at face value (as an exercise in data interpretation), there was little difference between regular and limited attendees. Most students feel safe and generally are more positive in the spring than in the fall about the topics in the survey. Next year we will look at how these results vary by subgroup to see if the programs are having more impact with some students than others.

⁶ Over such a short period of time we would not expect to see much change. The sample size for students taking both pre- and post-tests was small, further limiting the usefulness of the data.

QUESTION 2.4 - CHANGES IN DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS TAKEN

Are regular attendees less likely to be referred for disciplinary reasons? What are the referral rates among regular attendees and non-regular attendees?

METHOD

Student discipline data collected and provided by the district was analyzed to determine if a correlation existed between *Pathways* attendance and change in student referral rates.

TABLE 2.4 - CHANGE IN THE NUMBER OF BEHAVIORAL REFERRALS FOR TWO GROUPS OF PATHWAYS STUDENTS FROM 2000 TO 2001

	Fewer referrals %	Same number %	More referrals %
Regular Attendees (N=481)	33	66	1
Limited Pathways (N= 776)	40	54	6
Non Pathways (N=4138)	33	39	28
TOTAL	34	43	23

Source. Saint Paul Public Schools, 2001

FINDINGS

- Across all *Pathways* schools about one in five students had more discipline referrals in 2001 than the year before (2000).
- Only one percent of regular attendees had more referrals after entering the *Pathways* program. Only six percent of the limited attendees had more referrals after joining *Pathways*.

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL OFFER A RANGE OF HIGH QUALITY EDUCATIONAL, DEVELOPMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES

PART 1 – PROGRAM OFFERINGS IN CORE ACADEMIC AREAS

All Pathways to Progress Community Learning Center sites will offer high quality services in core academic areas, such as, reading and literacy, mathematics and science.

QUESTION 3.1 – OFFERINGS IN CORE ACADEMIC AREAS

What is the extent of classes and activities being offered in the school sites?

METHOD

An inventory was made of the programs offered during the first year of operation at all *Pathways* sites.

FINDINGS

In the first year fewer classes and activities were offered than initially proposed. The reduction of class offerings was mostly as a result of start-up obstacles. The programs vary widely across sites to reflect the diversity of the schools and communities served. Still, each cluster offered many programs and provided significant support in the core academic areas. Proportionally, fewer math and science courses make up the total core academic courses being offered.

Many classes were offered which specifically targeted literacy, math and science. Literacy classes included:

- *Family Reading Nights*
- *Accelerated readers*
- *Balanced literacy*
- *Raising Readers/Success for All*
- *America READS!*
- *Junior Great Books*
- *Area Learning Center*
-

Math classes included:

- *Brain teasers*
- *Area Learning Center*

Science classes included:

- *Science Olympiad*
- *Classes led by Science Museum of Minnesota staff*
- *Magic Science (teaching science through magic)*

Additionally, many offerings supported academic areas through the provision of homework time, fieldtrips and adult support. These included:

- *Hoops and Homework (Tutoring, mentoring and games)*
- *African American Mentoring Program*
- *Evening tutoring classes*
- *ACES (Athletes Committed to Educating Students)*

PART 2 – PROGRAM OFFERINGS IN ENRICHMENT AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

All sites will offer enrichment and support activities programming in nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.

QUESTION 3.2 - ENRICHMENT AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

To what extent do sites offer programming in nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation?

METHOD

An inventory was made of the classes offered during the first year of operation at all *Pathways* sites.

FINDINGS

Many class offerings provided extensive support and enrichment activities in all areas of interest. On average, for every two hours of programming offered throughout the year, one hour was dedicated to support and enrichment programming. The abbreviated list below provides a general sense of the programs offered in the first year. Note that proportionally fewer art and technology courses were offered compared to sports and recreation courses.

In youth asset building classes:

- *Adventure Club*
- *Community Connection field trips*
- *Sisters (self esteem for girls in early adolescence)*
- *Get Ready, a college preparatory program*
- *Discovery Club (accredited school-age care)*
- *Friday Fieldtrips*
- *Girls Scouts of America*

In nutrition and health classes:

- *Clover Buds (4-H for kindergarten through third grade)*
- *Breakfast Club*
- *GEMS (University program for African American girls)*
- *Jump Into Fitness*
- *Snack Program*

In the arts classes:

- *After school band*
- *Theater Groups*
- *Eastside Arts Council*
- *Destination Imagination*

In sports and recreation classes:

- *Jump Into Fitness*
- *Volleyball, basketball, tennis*
- *Floor hockey*
- *Indoor baseball*
- *Swimming*
- *Cardio kickboxing*
- *Tae Kwon Do*

In technology

- *Computers*
- *Photography*

ALL PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN PARTNERSHIPS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY.

QUESTION 3.3 - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

To what extent have all Pathways to Progress sites established and maintained partnerships within the community? To what degree have these activities increased levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing and sustaining programs?

METHOD

An inventory was made of the programming offered in cooperation with community agencies.

FINDINGS

Community agencies played a major role in the classes and programs being offered in each of the *Pathways* sites. Also important to note is the diverse nature of community groups affiliated with *Pathways*.

Organizations include community organizations:

- *Hmong, African American and Latino Community groups*
- *Eastside Arts Council*
- *Saint Paul Parks and Recreation*

Statewide educational organizations:

- *Department of Children, Families, and Learning*
- *University of Minnesota*
- *College students from metropolitan colleges and universities*
- *Science Museum of MN*
- *Children's Museum of MN*

And local branches of national organizations such as:

- *USDA/4H*
- *Girl Scouts of America*
- *YMCA*
- *Boys and Girls Club*

While work must continue to strengthen organizational commitment to this programming, the type of involvement and the demonstrated commitment of these organizations appears strong.

In the broader community, support was evidenced by the ongoing commitment of the Planning/Management Team brought together by the project coordinator. The Planning/Management Team meets on a monthly basis and is made up of a broad set of community organizational leaders, Community Education advisory council members and school staff. Further, a strong relationship exists between *Pathways* and several youth serving collaboratives.

ALL OF THE PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL OFFER SERVICES TO PARENTS, SENIOR CITIZENS OR AND OTHER ADULT COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

QUESTION 3.4 – SERVICE TO PARENTS AND COMMUNITY

All of the Pathways to Progress sites will offer services to parents, senior citizens or other adult community members.

METHOD

An inventory was made of the programs offered during the first year of operation at all *Pathways* sites.

FINDINGS

Pathways offered many classes and activities for parents, families, and adults of the broader community.

Academic classes offered in the initial year included:

- *Computer classes*
- *ESL classes*
- *GED classes*
- *Adult literacy classes*
- *Technology nights*

Classes that provide parenting/cultural support included:

- *Positive Parenting Curriculum*
- *Hmong Parent Association meetings*
- *Latino Parent Association meetings*
- *Family classes*
- *Monday Night Live*
- *Family Fun days*
- *Saturday library hours*
- *Parent/child activities and fieldtrips*

Parents continue to express interest in other course offerings. Site coordinators have indicated a need to determine if the courses being offered are the most important to the community and if other methods for increasing adult participation are necessary. At this time there is no evidence that programming for senior adults is being offered, although many grandparents participate in family events.

ALL PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL OFFER SERVICES AT LEAST 15 HOURS A WEEK ON AVERAGE AND PROVIDE SERVICES WHEN SCHOOLS IS NOT IN SESSION, SUCH AS DURING SUMMERS AND HOLIDAYS.

QUESTION 3.5 – EXPANDED HOURS

How many additional hours do the school sites offer as a direct result of Pathways programming?

METHOD

An inventory was made of the activities offered during the first year of operation.

TABLE 3.5 – EXPANDED HOURS AT SITES

CLUSTER # - Site	Expanded hours
1 - Jackson	17
1 - Galtier	17
1 – Wilson Middle School	16
2 - Phalen Lake	19
2 – Cleveland Quality Middle School	4
3 - Roosevelt	10
3 - Cherokee Heights	12
3 - Humboldt Junior	13
AVERAGE EXPANDED HOURS	14

Source. Annual Performance Report, 2001

FINDINGS

Pathways schools expanded the average number of hours the school was open each week by fourteen hours each week.

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL SERVE CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS WITH THE GREATEST NEEDS FOR EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES.

QUESTION 3.6 – IN THE SERVICE OF GREATEST NEED

How do the schools where Pathways programming is offered compare socio-economic indicators to other schools in the district?

METHOD

Data from the Department of Children, Families & Learning were analyzed to compare *Pathways* schools to all other Saint Paul Schools.

TABLE 3.6 - COMPARISON OF PATHWAYS SCHOOLS TO ALL SAINT PAUL SCHOOLS ON FIVE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Demographic Variable	Pathways Schools (%)	All Saint Paul Schools (%)
1. Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch	79	64
2. ELL	45	36
3. Special Education	15	14
4. Ethnic Group		
▪ African American	20	26
▪ American Indian	2	2
▪ Asian	37	31
▪ Caucasian	24	31
▪ Hispanic	17	10

Source: Data Center, Department of Children, Families, & Learning, 2000

FINDINGS

All of the *Pathways to Progress* sites are located in high poverty communities. The program focuses on keeping students safe and smart in socially and economically challenged environments. Table 3.6 shows that students in grades 1-8 in the eight Pathways schools, compared to all students in grades 1-8 in the Saint Paul Schools were:

- More likely to be eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch and
- More likely to have ELL status

These two factors are associated with high risk for academic difficulties in school. The ethnic mix in these eight schools approximates the makeup across the district.

SECTION III

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND
CONCLUDING REMARKS

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM WILL DEMONSTRATE EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS AND EXHIBIT POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES

- In its initial year, *Pathways* reached one in three students in the school sites. The ethnic and socio-economic composition of students involved in *Pathways* is similar to the composition of students in the district in general.
- Regular *Pathways* attendees maintained a high attendance rate in school (98 percent).
- Program offerings provided multiple opportunities for students to work and play across grade levels while engaging in traditional school activities (such as academics, sports, and the arts) in less formal settings.
- Only one percent of regular attendees had more disciplinary referrals after entering the *Pathways* program. Only six percent of the limited attendees had more referrals after joining *Pathways*.
- In *Pathways* first year, some students had modest academic gains in mathematics.

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL OFFER A RANGE OF HIGH QUALITY EDUCATIONAL, DEVELOPMENTAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES

- Many courses were offered in core academic areas. The majority of these classes were in literacy with math and science offerings.
- Program offerings provided additional academic support and homework. Many of these programs provided homework in combination with recreational and other high interest activities.
- Youth asset building, sports and recreational classes made up the largest number of non-academic classes offered through *Pathways*.
- Programming in drug use prevention and violence prevention was offered to students.

ALL PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN PARTNERSHIPS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY.

- *Pathways* worked extensively with a wide range of community agencies and organizations.

ALL OF THE PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL OFFER SERVICES TO PARENTS, SENIOR CITIZENS OR OTHER ADULT COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

- *Pathways* involved over 1,000 parents and other adults in the community in its first year.
- *Pathways* offered several classes tailored specifically for the parents of students including:
 - Parents with diverse cultural backgrounds
 - Adults with parenting interests
 - Parents needing basic skills and English language classes
- Few classes were designed specifically for senior citizens.

ALL PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS SITES WILL OFFER SERVICES AT LEAST 15 HOURS A WEEK ON AVERAGE AND PROVIDE SERVICES WHEN SCHOOL IS NOT IN SESSION, SUCH AS DURING SUMMERS AND HOLIDAYS.

- In the first year, school sites were open an additional 14 hours every week because of *Pathways* programming. These additional hours came close to meeting the objective of expanded services.

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL SERVE CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS WITH THE GREATEST NEEDS FOR EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES.

- In its first year, *Pathways* reached a blend of students that parallels the ethnic composition of the district. The program fell a little short in its attempts to involve children who receive special education services, ELL, or qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch. The program could also provide more high interest offerings for parents and senior citizens.

IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORTS

Staff commitment – Staff appear to demonstrate a genuine commitment to the goals and activities of the grant project. Cluster and site coordinators also demonstrated a commitment to the goals of *Pathways* but even more importantly, commitment to the spirit of creating school-based Community Learning Centers.

Through interviews, site coordinators have demonstrated:

- A child centered focus on the programming as well as a commitment to both academic and social goals of the program
- The ability to tailor the site activities to the unique characteristics of the school

IMPLEMENTATION OBSTACLES

Simultaneous design and implementation – The team has done remarkably well implementing the goals and activities put forth in the original proposal even though many prerequisites were not in place (e.g., staff not selected, computers not available, assistants not available). The limitations have resulted in some confusion and delays in the implementation of various programs.

Response: The evaluators anticipate that much of this confusion will be reduced in year two simply through staff experience.

Transportation – Buses could not be contracted to provide transportation to all students each day. Consequently buses and programmed activities were limited to Tuesdays and Thursdays only (with few exceptions).

Response: For year two, Pathways is partnering with other after school programs to provide dependable, daily transportation. Additionally, more activities will be provided for walkers and students who can get their own transportation.

Staff responsibilities and multiple programming – Staff serving as cluster coordinators faced difficulties trying to manage and oversee the programming in more than one site. These challenges were amplified by the complexity of multiple programming. The resignation of one cluster coordinator early in implementation resulted in heightened stress and greater hardship for staff involved in that cluster.

Possible response: Consider hiring site coordinators for each school. Decreasing the total number of activities in any given school would reduce the amount of logistical work.

Interdependencies of key data – Analyses of large amounts of data depended on obtaining prompt, accurate data on the children in *Pathways*. Primary data (e.g. *Pathways* master lists) on children in *Pathways* were difficult to secure in a timely way and some data was unavailable or incomplete. As a result, secondary data (e.g., behavior referrals, school attendance) were similarly difficult to obtain or unavailable for a percentage of the students.

Response: Evaluators in collaboration with Program staff have developed a “toolbox” for site coordinators that contains:

- *A chart of milestone dates when important data is to be collected*
- *A complete set of survey forms and when to administer them*
- *Copy of attendance spreadsheet (site coordinators also received a two-hour session on Excel in June from evaluation team).*
- *Contact information*
- *APR crib sheet*
- *Development of a tally sheet for counting attendance at large, one-time events.*

Student participation – Across all eight schools, one of every three children participated in *Pathways* programming, and one of every eight participants were regular attendees. Sites that had exclusive access to a coordinator (Cluster 1: Jackson, Galtier, and Wilson) had a higher percentage of regular attendees that sites that shared a coordinator with other sites (22 percent regular attendees versus nine percent regular attendees).

School demographics – Across all schools *Pathways* attracted children of all ethnicities and races equally, but had a more difficult time attracting children identified as special education students, limited English proficiency students, and free and reduced lunch students. This result may be a result of the limited transportation during the first year.

DISCUSSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR REPLICATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

CAUTIONARY REMINDER

This report includes many “findings,” but because we are using incomplete data, we should consider these findings preliminary and suggestive. Procedures are in place to make sure that the dataset for the 2001-2002 school year will be more reliable by the time we prepare our next annual report in October 2002.

Limited treatment result in limited results – The overall objectives are raising the bar for Saint Paul Public Schools and students alike. Given the complexity of the challenges, we would expect change to be slow with incremental improvements in student achievement and behavior.

Limited participation among hardest to reach populations – A major program objective has been to reach at-risk students. While *Pathways* is reaching a composition that nearly parallels the district composition, it has not attained the higher concentrations of children who receive special education services or children who qualify for free and reduced lunch. It is also necessary to provide high interest offerings that parents and other adults consider useful and to provide classes for senior citizens.

Transportation was an obstacle to participation in the first year – The absence of consistent transportation will be a *major* obstacle to the success of this program.

Record keeping and data collection a major challenge in the first year – A key focus of years two and three will be to promote and provide support for better record keeping methods. An obstacle in the first year of the program was the dominant district culture. It has traditionally not placed a high emphasis on keeping attendance records for after school activities and maintaining a centralized, comprehensive student database. Some changes have occurred but more will continue to be done in years two and three.



SECTION IV

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

DATA SOURCES

- Saint Paul Public Schools attendance data
- Saint Paul Public Schools discipline data
- Teacher survey developed for and administered by the project
- Student survey developed for and administered by the project
- Data collected from the program's Annual Progress Report (APR)⁷. (Data was self-reported by program staff including the project coordinator and the site/cluster coordinators)
- Data gathered from the Data Center, Department of Children, Families & Learning

TABLE S.1 - COMPARISON OF PATHWAYS AND NON-PATHWAYS STUDENTS IN GRADES 1 THROUGH 8

Demographic Variable	Pathways Students (%)	Non-Pathways Students (%)
1. Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch	64	82
2. ELL	37	47
3. Special Education	8	17
4. Ethnic Group		
▪ African American	21	18
▪ American Indian	1	2
▪ Asian	34	36
▪ Caucasian	17	26
▪ Hispanic	16	17

Table S.1 shows that students who take *Pathways* classes, compared to other students in the eight *Pathways* schools, are less likely to be eligible for Free or Reduced lunch, less likely to be ELL, and less likely to be in Special Education. The ethnic composition of the students taking *Pathways* classes roughly parallels the composition of the students who do not participate in *Pathways* classes.

⁷ Annual Progress Report (APR), the official report back to the U.S. Department of Education, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant funder.

TABLE S.2 - GAINS ON MAT/7 OF PATHWAYS STUDENTS RELATIVE TO NON-PATHWAYS STUDENTS

	Reading	Math
Asian/Pacific Islander	.	-
Hispanic	.	+
African American	.	.
Caucasian	+	.
American Indian	<i>Insufficient Data</i>	
ELL	.	.
Not ELL	.	.
FRL	.	.
Not FRL	.	.
Special Education	-	.
Not Special Education	.	+
Grade 2	.	.
Grade 3	.	.
Grade 4	.	.
Grade 5	+	+
Grade 6	.	.
Grade 7	.	.
Grade 8	.	.
. = No Difference + = Pathways student better - = Pathways students worse		

FINDINGS

The bulleted items below summarized the data that are displayed in Table S.2.

- Ethnic Group – For Asian/Pacific Islanders, attendance in Pathways was associated with less progress in math; for Hispanics, attendance in Pathways was associated with more progress in math; for Caucasians, attendance in Pathways was associated with more growth in reading.
- Grade in school – For grade 5 only, participation in *Pathways* was associated with more growth in math and reading. For other grades there was no difference.
- ELL – No significant differences
- Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch – No significant differences
- Special Education status – For Special Education students, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with less growth in reading; for non-special education students, attendance in *Pathways* was associated with more growth in math.

TABLE S.3 – STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR ALL SITES**Pathways Total**

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	900	24%	190	17%	710	26%
Black	724	20%	229	21%	495	18%
Asian	1362	37%	372	34%	990	36%
American Indian	76	2%	16	1%	60	2%
Hispanic	641	17%	176	16%	465	17%
Unknown	0	0%	53	5%	0	0%
Total	3702		1091		2719	
Sped Ed	554	15%	89	8%	465	17%
LEP	1669	45%	399	37%	1270	47%
FRL	2916	79%	693	64%	2223	82%
New to school	933	25%			933	34%

TABLE S.4 – STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BY SCHOOL SITE**Cherokee Heights (1)**

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	142	26%	36	24%	106	26%
Black	66	12%	31	21%	35	9%
Asian	120	22%	32	21%	88	22%
American Indian	16	3%	3	2%	13	3%
Hispanic	202	37%	42	28%	160	40%
Unknown			5	3%	0	0%
Total	546		149		402	
Sped Ed	75	14%	16	11%	59	13%
LEP	241	44%	59	40%	182	39%
FRL	335	61%	114	77%	221	48%
New to school	71	13%			0	
Total					462	

Cleveland (2)

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	72	15%	27	13%	45	10%
Black	126	26%	52	24%	74	26%
Asian	232	48%	106	49%	126	45%
American Indian	5	1%	3	1%	2	1%
Hispanic	48	10%	15	7%	33	12%
Unknown			12	6%	0	0%
Total	483		215		280	
Sped Ed	91	19%	23	11%	68	13%
LEP	280	58%	95	44%	185	35%
FRL	420	87%	144	67%	276	52%
New to school	164	34%			0	
Total					529	

TABLE S.4 – STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BY SCHOOL SITE (CONT.)**Galtier (3)**

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	59	19%	19	21%	40	18%
Black	166	53%	50	55%	116	52%
Asian	72	23%	12	13%	60	27%
American Indian	6	2%	0	0%	6	3%
Hispanic	9	3%	8	9%	1	1%
Unknown			2	2%	0	0%
Total	313		91		224	
Sped Ed	49	16%	8	9%	41	13%
LEP	86	27%	10	11%	76	25%
FRL	238	76%	48	53%	190	62%
New to school	75	24%			0	
Total					307	

Humboldt (4)

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	106	27%	11	13%	95	31%
Black	82	21%	17	19%	65	21%
Asian	86	22%	28	32%	58	19%
American Indian	16	4%	4	5%	12	4%
Hispanic	102	26%	22	25%	80	26%
Unknown			6	7%	0	
Total	392		88		310	
Sped Ed	85	22%	11	11%	74	13%
LEP	149	38%	31	32%	118	20%
FRL	335	85%	56	57%	279	48%
New to school	114	29%	0	0	114	19%
Total	683		98		585	

TABLE S.4 – STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BY SCHOOL SITE (CONT.)**Jackson (5)**

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	97	23%	44	23%	53	22%
Black	84	20%	51	26%	33	14%
Asian	215	51%	73	37%	142	60%
American Indian	4	1%	?		0	
Hispanic	21	5%	12	6%	9	4%
Unknown			10	5%	0	
Total	422		195		238	
Sped Ed	36	9%	12	6%	24	6%
LEP	204	48%	68	35%	136	33%
FRL	351	83%	126	65%	225	55%
New to school	25	6%			25	
Total	616		206		410	

Phalen Lake (6)

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	221	30%	31	23%	190	32%
Black	103	14%	13	9%	90	15%
Asian	361	49%	81	59%	280	47%
American Indian	15	2%	2	1%	13	2%
Hispanic	37	5%	10	7%	27	4%
Unknown			0	0%	0	0%
Total	737		137		600	
Sped Ed	101	14%	9	7%	92	8%
LEP	347	47%	67	49%	280	24%
FRL	635	86%	94	69%	541	46%
New to school	265	36%			265	22%
Total	1348		170		1178	

TABLE S.4 – STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION BY SCHOOL SITE (CONT.)**Roosevelt (7)**

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	80	15%	11	10%	69	16%
Black	64	12%	15	13%	49	12%
Asian	165	31%	25	22%	140	34%
American Indian	11	2%	4	3%	7	2%
Hispanic	213	40%	60	52%	153	37%
Unknown			0	0%	0	
Total	532		115		417	
Sped Ed	38	7%	6	5%	32	4%
LEP	262	49%	53	46%	209	29%
FRL	463	87%	72	63%	391	54%
New to school	90	17%			90	12%
Total	853		131		722	

Wilson (8)

Group	All students		Pathways Attendees		Non-attendees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	122	44%	11	11%	111	53%
Black	33	12%	50?		?	
Asian	111	40%	15	15%	96	45%
American Indian	3	1%	0	0%	3	1%
Hispanic	8	3%	7	7%	1	1%
Unknown			18	18%		
Total	277		101		211	
Sped Ed	79	29%	4	4%	75	19%
LEP	100	36%	16	16%	84	22%
FRL	139	50%	39	39%	100	26%
New to school	127	46%			127	33%
Total	445		59		386	

BACKGROUND ON THE EVALUATION TEAM

CENTER FOR APPLIED RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) is a collaborative organization that brings the resources of the College of Education and Human Development and the University of Minnesota to bear on educational issues in Minnesota and across the nation.

The work of CAREI focuses on:

- (1) Linking Minnesota school districts and the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota;
- (2) Conducting applied research and evaluation studies for local, state, and federal agencies; and
- (3) Providing technical assistance and serving as a clearinghouse of information on innovative programs across the United States.

Some 30 Minnesota school districts currently are members of CAREI, paying relatively modest annual dues to support targeted research efforts, grants for collaborative research projects involving schools and the college, topical seminars, and an annual symposium. In addition, CAREI publishes and disseminates to all school districts in Minnesota a newsletter, *ResearchPractice*, which shares the most recent information and research on a given educational issue. A policy board composed equally of public school superintendents (two from urban districts, two from rural districts and two "at large"), faculty/staff from each of the six departments within the College, the Dean of the College, and an *ex-officio* representative of the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning sets direction for these aspects of CAREI's work.

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

Kyla Wahlstrom, Principal investigator, Tim Sheldon, Roger Anderson, Holly Zorka