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# Executive Summary

The Massachusetts state legislature funded the Academic Support grants annually to enhance academic support services to assist all eligible students in meeting the Commonwealth’s Competency Determination,[[1]](#footnote-1) a requirement for high school graduation. Academic Support services were informed by evidence-based practices, as defined by ESE, and data collected by individual sites. The Academic Support grants funded four types of school year and summer grant programs: (1) Allocation grant program; (2) Work and Learning program; (3) Partnerships for Pathways to Success program; and (4) Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success (CPSS) program. The Allocation grant program was based on a formula that includes the number of high school students who scored at the “failing” level on their most recently available high school MCAS exam in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science and technology/engineering (STE). The other three grants were awarded through a competitive application process.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) engaged the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (UMDI) as a third party independent research organization to evaluate the programs funded by the Academic Support grants, with the objective of helping the state legislature and ESE to better understand program implementation, costs, benefits, and outcomes.

This report describes findings from all research activities conducted for the project, from January 2016 through June 2017.

**Key Findings**

A total of 25,047 students participated in Academic Support programs from SY13 to SY14.

Quantitative analyses revealed a complex picture regarding the outcomes associated with participation in Academic Support programs. Findings suggest that participating students were 1.4 times more likely to gain their Competency Determination than similar non-participating students. Additionally, results indicated that participants were 0.5 times less likely to drop out one year after participation than similar non-participants. Participating students also saw slight increases in their rate of attendance (by 1–2 school days) the year after participation. Contrary to these positive findings, however, results suggested that participants were 0.8 times less likely than similar non-participants to graduate one year after participation.

After outcomes were assessed, we estimated the economic cost/benefit of the program to the Commonwealth resulting from fewer students dropping out of high school after participating in the Academic Support programs. Conservative estimates suggest a total lifetime savings of $40.9 million as a result of student participation in the Academic Support programs in SY13 and SY14 after accounting for the cost of programming. Non-conservative estimates suggest a total savings of $131.3 million for SY13 and SY14 after accounting for the cost of programming.

Nearly all Academic Support program administrators reported—through survey and/or interview—that their program(s) met the goal of improving student performance on MCAS, which supported findings from the quantitative analysis. Most respondents also agreed that the program(s) had additional positive outcomes like increased connectedness to adults, increased confidence in academic ability, increased connections with school, increased college and career readiness skills, and earning course credits. Administrators reported that students were attracted to Academic Support programs because they provided small group or targeted instruction, the programs were free and convenient, and the program staff were engaging and supportive.

Demographic analyses indicate that Academic Support programs served High Needs students —including English language learners, students with disabilities, and those eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch— at a higher rate when compared to statewide percentages of the same groups.

Nearly all sites said that budget cuts were a significant challenge. Budget cuts resulted in reductions in the number of students being served, elimination of summer programming, and termination of program incentives. Other challenges included attendance issues, student retention, scheduling, student motivation, recruiting and maintaining contact with overaged students, and engaging parents/guardians. Although the majority of respondents highlighted the importance of their Academic Support program(s) for increasing students' likelihood of gaining their Competency Determination, only 4 percent of respondents indicated that they would likely continue all of their current Academic Support activities without continued funding. More than half of respondents said their programs would cease entirely without continued support.

**Summary of Findings**

**Quantitative Outcomes**

Results varied by model, but several analyses suggested the positive impacts of the Academic Support programs on students in terms of gaining their Competency Determination, decreasing the likelihood of their dropping out, and increasing their rate of attendance. Results also suggest that Academic Support programs are less effective at increasing students` likelihood of graduating one year after participation, especially amongst grade 12 students.[[2]](#footnote-2) These results are outlined in more detail below.

**MCAS**:

* Participating students were 1.4 times more likely to gain their Competency Determination than similar non-participating peers.
* Significant positive results were evident amongst the CPSS and Allocation programs.
* Larger positive effects were seen for grade 9 students. Positive effects were also seen in grades 10 and 11 but diminished in size. There was no effect for grade 12 students.
* Participating students from schools with low Accountability and Assistance levels were more likely than non-participating students to gain their Competency Determination, and participating students from high level schools were less likely than non-participating students to gain their Competency Determination.

**Graduation Status**:

* Participating students were 0.8 times less likely to graduate one year after participation than similar non-participating peers.
* Grade 12 students were significantly less likely to graduate than similar non-participating peers, though there was no significant difference in the likelihood of graduating one year after participation for grade 11 students.
* Counter to overall graduation findings, participation in science-focused programs, specifically science-focused Allocation programs, increased the likelihood that a student would graduate by one year after participation.

**Dropout Status**:

* Participating students were 0.5 times less likely to drop out one year after participation than similar non-participating peers.
* Participation reduced the likelihood of dropping out for white, African American/Black, and Hispanic/Latino students by about half.
* The strongest effect for reducing likelihood of dropping out was seen for grade 11 students. Participation also decreased that likelihood for grade 10 and grade 12 students, but to a lesser degree.

**Attendance**:

* Students who participated in Academic Support programs were slightly more likely to see an increase in school attendance the year after participation.
* In general, effect sizes were small, indicating that participating students attended approximately 1–2 days more than non-participating students. This effect held across subgroups, including gender, race, special populations, and by school Accountability and Assistance level.

**Economic Impact Outcomes**

Results of the economic impact analyses project a significant amount of money will be saved by the Commonwealth as a result of the Academic Support programs. Using model results to estimate the number of students who may have been expected to drop out had they not participated in an Academic Support program, we estimated a potential savings to the Commonwealth of between $41 and $131 million over the lifetime of SY13 and SY14 participants alone.

**Reported Successes of Academic Support Programs**

Survey and interview respondents described multiple positive outcomes that suggest Academic Support programs’ usefulness as a strategy for increasing students' ability to meet MCAS Competency Determination requirements. Administrators reported the following successes:

* MCAS scores increased after participation in a program, and students were more likely to receive their Competency Determination after participating in a program.
* Students developed connections to adults as well as to their school.
* Students had increased academic engagement.
* Entering freshmen felt more prepared for high school.
* Students increased their college and career readiness skills.
* Students earned course credits.
* Students felt more confident in their academic ability.

**Effective Support Strategies**

Survey and interview respondents described key strategies for increasing the likelihood of student success in their Academic Support programs. Program administrators highlighted the importance of:

* Small class size
* Targeted instruction
* Engaged, supportive, and high quality program staff
* Program being free and convenient to students
* When and where a program took place

***Strategies by Subject***

Program administrators also offered subject specific strategies for improving student performance. Suggestions included the following:

**ELA**

* Practice writing through composition as well as alternative types of writing like press releases
* Read through passages as a group
* Identify books that are of high interest to students

**Math**

* Utilize content-driven support
* Practice test-taking strategies using different question types (i.e., multiple choice versus open response)
* Underscore real-world applications

**Science, Technology, and Engineering (STE)**

* Practice vocabulary and memorization
* Use hands-on activities

**Advice Offered by Interviewees**

Interviewees were asked to provide advice for others regarding the challenges they faced with their Academic Support programs. Most interviewees advised others to keep class sizes small, build relationships with students, and recruit high-quality teachers. Sites offered conflicting advice regarding the optimal timing and structure of academic support programs. Some strongly advised that programs focus on serving students during regular school hours, while others believed that supports were most effective when offered outside of the regularly scheduled school day.

**Demographic Characteristics of Participants**

A total of 25,047 students participated in Academic Support programs from SY13 to SY14. The pool of eligible non-participants from SY13 and SY14 included 163,762 students. Grade levels of students served varied widely between Academic Support programs based on the priorities of individual grant programs. For example, Allocation and CPSS programs served more students who were at risk of failing or had recently failed one or more grade 10 MCAS subject assessments. Participants in these programs were more likely to be grade 9, 10, or 11 students, reflecting the aim of the Allocation and CPSS programs. Work and Learning, Pathways for Partnerships to Success, and Higher Education Institutions and Partners programs were more likely to serve older students who had already failed one or more MCAS subject assessments. These programs emphasized pathways to higher education and employment as an incentive for students to gain their Competency Determination. These programs were more likely to serve grade 12 students or overaged students. While only a small number of overaged students participated, programming targeting these students filled a critical need in the Commonwealth by serving students who failed to graduate high school (in part) because they had not obtained their Competency Determination. Work and Learning, Higher Education Institutions and Partners, and Pathways for Partnerships to Success programs were also more likely to serve high risk students. Allocation and CPSS programs served a greater proportion of low-risk students.

There were several notable differences in the demographic composition of the pools of students who were participants, eligible non-participants, and all grade 8–12 students statewide. In particular, high need students—including English language learners, students with disabilities, and students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch—were overrepresented in the sample of students served by Academic Support programs compared to the statewide percentages of these same groups. In SY13 and SY14, the portion of Academic Support participants that were students with disabilities was 37 percent, compared to 30 percent of eligible non-participants and 18 percent of all students statewide. The portion of participating students that were English language learners was 17 percent, in comparison to 7 percent of eligible non-participants and 5 percent of all students statewide. Likewise, 57 percent of participating students received free or reduced-price lunch, as opposed to 36 percent of all students in grades 8–12 statewide.

Work and Learning, Pathways for Partnerships to Success, and Higher Education Institutions and Partners grant programs served a noticeably higher percentage of African-American/Black students. The percentage of Hispanic/Latino students served was higher for all grant types, as compared to the percentage of Hispanic/Latino students served by Allocation grants. White students made up over half of students served by Allocation grants, but this proportion was much smaller for all other grant types, particularly Higher Education Institutions and Partners grants (18 percent).

Strategic Considerations

A summary of strategic considerations described in the report is provided below:

* ESE may wish to offer sites guidance and/or technical assistance. Survey and interview findings suggest the following activities may be appropriate:
  + Offering technical assistance regarding programmatic timing and structure to help sites optimize the impact of their Academic Support program(s).
  + Providing sites with strategies for maximizing grant impacts to support sustainability efforts.
  + Encouraging sites to consider accommodations for students, especially overaged students, who are required to retest to help them feel more confident—and ultimately be more successful—when retesting.
* ESE may wish to consider strategies for improving competitive grantees’ access to information regarding student performance on MCAS in order to help these programs better serve their students.

Data Collection

UMDI completed the following data collection activities during the first eight months of the project:

* **Survey of Program Administrators.** In April 2016, UMDI distributed the Academic Support Services Program Administrator Survey to the primary program administrator(s) of ESE-funded Academic Support programs operating during the 2015–16 school year. The survey instrument contains items that ask respondents to characterize the academic support services provided by their site through their award, to identify factors contributing to successful student outcomes, to characterize their program’s prospects for sustainability, to describe program successes, and to specify additional supports that might be useful. The survey was distributed to a total 199 administrators across the Allocation grant program, Work and Learning program, Partnerships for Pathways to Success program, and CPSS program, with a response rate of 72 percent (N=144).
* **Administrator Interviews.** UMDI conducted interviews with 30 program administrators from March 2016 to August 2016. ESE provided UMDI with a list of awardees to interview. The interview instrument contains items centered on program description and demographics of students served, effective strategies for increasing competency determination (generally, by subgroup, and by subject), and grade 8 to grade 9 transition assistance. Five additional questions were asked if time permitted, including questions regarding challenges, advice, additional successes and positive ripple effects, and closing comments. Interviews were conducted with 21 Allocation awardees, 3 Work and Learning grantees, 3 Partnerships for Pathways to Success grantees, and 3 CPSS grantees.

# Introduction

The Massachusetts state legislature funded the Academic Support grants annually to enhance academic support services to assist all eligible students in meeting the Commonwealth’s Competency Determination,[[3]](#footnote-3) a requirement for high school graduation. Academic Support services were informed by evidence-based practices, as defined by ESE, and data collected by individual sites. The Academic Support grants funded four types of school year and summer grant programs: (1) Academic Support Services Allocation grant program; (2) Academic Support Work and Learning program; (3) Partnerships for Pathways to Success program; and (4) Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success (CPSS) program. The Allocation grant program was based on a formula that includes the number of high school students who scored at the “failing” level on their most recently available high school MCAS exam in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science and technology/engineering (STE). The other three grants were awarded through a competitive application process. Students from the class of 2003 to the class of 2020 were eligible to participate in Academic Support programs during the 2015–16 school year.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Over the last two years, funding to Academic Support awardees has been reduced dramatically. During FY14, nearly $8.9 million in Academic Support grants was awarded. Funding cuts reduced the awards to $4.1 million in FY15 and $4.3 million in FY16. Academic Support grants were not funded for FY17.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) engaged the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (UMDI) to evaluate the programs funded by the Academic Support grants in FY16, with the objective of helping the state legislature and ESE to better understand program implementation, costs, benefits, and outcomes.

This final report describes research activities and findings from the duration of the project, from January 2016 through June 2017.

# Grant Descriptions

The Academic Support grants funded four types of school year and summer grant programs during SY16: (1) Academic Support Services Allocation grant program; (2) Academic Support Work and Learning program; (3) Partnerships for Pathways to Success program; and (4) Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success program. A fifth grant program, Higher Education Institutions and Partners, is included in data analyses from SY13 and SY14, but did not exist at the time of the interviews and survey distribution in SY16. Academic Support programs were designed to help students pass the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) in order to complete the state-required Competency Determination for high school graduation. Student grade and subject matter eligibility varied by program but could include grades 8–12 and post-grade-12 students. Allocation grants were awarded to all recipients who met the criteria specified in the Requests for Proposals (RFP) issued by ESE. The other grants were competitively awarded to only the applicants who best met the criteria specified in the RFPs. A brief description of each grant program follows:

**Allocation Grants.** The purpose of this program was to provide academic support services in ELA, mathematics, and/or STE needed to meet the Competency Determination for eligible students in grades 8–12 and post grade 12 (classes of 2003–2020). Programs provided intensive and engaging small-group or one-to-one instruction that addressed gaps in participants’ knowledge and basic skills.

**Work and Learning Programs.** The purpose of this program was to provide quality innovative and intensive instruction in ELA and mathematics through work and learning programs for students in grades 9–12 and post grade 12 (classes of 2003–2019) who had not yet earned their Competency Determination. Work and learning models typically combined academic instruction at the workplace with structured internships for participating students. Academic content was taught through the lens of a "real world" context to help engage students in their learning and raise achievement levels, while simultaneously giving them academic, technical/technological, and job skills necessary for success.

**Partnerships for Pathways to Success Programs.** The purpose of this program was to leverage well-designed partnerships between public institutions of higher education and One-Stop Career Centers to provide targeted students with pathways to success. The intended participants of this initiative included post-grade-12 students from the classes of 2003–2015 who needed further assistance to pass the MCAS in order to complete the state required Competency Determination for high school graduation.

**Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success (CPSS).** The purpose of this program was to develop collaborative partnerships between school(s)/district(s) and community partners with student/family involvement that supplement existing school district resources. These programs were intended to: (1) assist students with the transition into early high school years and serve as part of an early intervention process aimed at increasing the likelihood of exceeding the Competency Determination standards on students' initial taking of the grade 10 MCAS testing; (2) increase awareness of the connection between high school and future opportunities; (3) increase school district and community partners' ability to provide school year and summer academic support in English language arts, mathematics, and/or STE; and (4) create a service-learning curriculum and/or develop a college and career readiness curriculum and product to be integrated into programming.

**Higher Education Institutions and Partnerships.** The purpose of this grant program was to provide academic instruction in ELA, mathematics, and science and technology/engineering as well as support services that enable students in grades 10–12 and post grade 12 (classes of 2003–2015) to continue to pursue their Competency Determination while providing pathways to further education (with priority given to post-grade-12 students).

For more information about Academic Support grants, please visit: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/>

# Methods

**Quantitative Analysis.** UMDI completed 155 regression analyses to assess the effect of participation in Academic Support programs on four outcomes: MCAS Competency Determination, graduation status, dropout status, and rate of attendance the year after participation. We used rigorous, quasi-experimental matched comparison group designs to draw strong conclusions about the effectiveness of the programs (Cook and Campbell 1979). Treatment and comparison groups were matched on gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, English language learner status, disability status, grade level, rate of school attendance, and pre-intervention MCAS performance. Technical descriptions of the statistical methods are presented in Appendix A.

Analyses included all students (N=20,510) grades 8–12 who participated during SY13 and SY14. The comparison group included all students (N=119,231) at the same sites who were eligible to participate but did not. Effects were assessed one year after participation in an Academic Support program. Different groups of students were included in different analyses depending on the outcome indicator of a given model. For example, a student participating in grade 10 would not be expected to have graduated one year after the intervention and can therefore not be included in the graduation model. The following describes the grade breakdown of students included in given models:

* MCAS Models: Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12.
* Graduation Models: Grades 11 and 12.
* Dropout Models: Grades 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.
* Attendance Models: Grades 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Students were not randomly assigned to Academic Support programs. Program eligibility requirements varied by Academic Support program but generally required that a student be in danger of failing, or have recently failed, one or more MCAS test.[[5]](#footnote-5) To minimize any differences that may have existed between the treatment and comparison groups prior to the intervention, rigorous propensity score weighting procedures were used to weight each of the comparison students according to their similarity to students in the treatment group (Rubin 2001).

Tables provide odds ratios for models measuring whether a student gained their Competency Determination, graduated, or dropped out, and indicating the degree of impact of the intervention. An odds ratio greater than one indicates that the outcome was more likely for participants than non-participants, while an odds ratio less than one indicates that the outcome was less likely for participants than non-participants. For example, an odds ratio of 1.3 for Competency Determination means that participants were 1.3 times as likely as non-participants to gain their Competency Determination. An odds ratio of 0.7 for dropout status means that participants were 0.7 times as likely to drop out as similar non-participants.

For attendance models, the tables provide the beta (*β*) statistic to indicate the average expected difference in the rate of attendance between treatment and comparison students. For example, a beta of 1.2 for attendance means that participants averaged 1.2 percentage points greater attendance than non-participants.

The tables also provide a 95 percent confidence interval (CI), recognizing that the sample of students in the study might be somewhat different from the full population from which they were drawn. The confidence interval provides a range that has a 95 percent chance of including the true value of the odds ratio or beta statistic for that population.

**Economic Impacts.** UMDI assessed the potential economic impact of the Academic Support programs—resulting from programming offered during SY13 and SY14—to the Commonwealth. UMDI estimated this impact based on the cost of the Academic Support programs, the estimated expense to the Commonwealth for each high school dropout (over time), and the estimated number of students that would have been expected to have dropped out had they not participated in Academic Support programs.

In order to estimate the number of students who would have dropped out without the support of Academic Support programs, we first identified the number of actual dropouts that had been participants in the Academic Support programs—287 participant dropouts in SY13 and 411 in SY14. Next, we used the odds ratio calculated for the full dropout model (0.538) to estimate the number of students who would have been expected to have dropped out had no students participated in an Academic Support program. Finally, we subtracted the actual number of dropouts from the estimate of the number of students who would have dropped out without having participated in the programs in order to capture the number of potential students prevented from dropping out by the programs, or the number of students that may have been expected to have dropped out was it not for Academic Support program participation.

To estimate the expected cost to the Commonwealth, we multiplied the estimated number of potential students prevented from dropping out by the programs by the average national cost of dropping out as determined in previous literature. A literature review was conducted to identify potential cost estimates. Cost estimates considered included monies lost due to lower tax revenue, increased costs of social welfare programs, and increased costs incurred by the criminal justice system. Because studies fluctuated in their estimates, we present findings based on two studies in order to show the potential range in the cost of dropping out for the Commonwealth; one of these studies uses a nationally-representative sample to estimate the average cost of dropping out per student, while the second uses a high-risk sample of youth. The actual cost of the Academic Support programs was subtracted from the final figure in order to estimate the total savings to the Commonwealth due to these students being prevented from dropping out due to participation in a program.

**Qualitative Analyses**. The following data collection and analysis activities took place during the first eight months of the project:

**Survey of Program Administrators.** In April 2016, UMDI distributed the Academic Support Services Program Administrator Survey to the primary program administrator(s) of ESE-funded Academic Support programs operating during the 2015–16 school year. The survey was then distributed in July 2016 to the primary program administrator(s) of ESE-funded Academic Support programs operating during the 2016 summer. The survey instrument contains items that ask respondents to characterize the academic support services provided by their site through their award, to identify factors contributing to successful student outcomes, to characterize their programs’ prospects for sustainability, to describe program successes, and to specify additional supports that might be useful. The survey was field tested with a select group of respondents (N=8) and was revised in collaboration with ESE based on the responses to that survey. The final survey was distributed to a total of 199 administrators across the Allocation grant program, Work and Learning program, and Partnerships for Pathways to Success program, with a response rate of 72 percent (N=144). The survey protocol can be found in Appendix E.

**Administrator Interviews.** UMDI conducted interviews with primary program administrator(s) of the ESE-funded Academic Support programs operating during the 2015–16 school year and summer from March 2016 to August 2016. School year programs included those funded by the Academic Support Allocation grant program, Work and Learning program, and Partnerships for Pathways to Success program. CPSS programs ran during the summer. ESE requested that 21 sites receiving Allocation grants be interviewed, as Allocation grants comprise the majority of the Academic Support funding. Interviews were also conducted with three Work and Learning grantees, three Partnerships for Pathways to Success grantees, and three CPSS grantees.

Interviewees were not selected by UMDI. ESE provided UMDI with a list of awardees to interview based on contacts that had an extended history of receiving Academic Support grants. [[6]](#footnote-6) Of those sites originally selected for interviews, two Allocation grant sites could not be reached. Two alternate Allocation grant sites receiving similar grant amounts were suggested by UMDI, approved by ESE, and contacted for interviews. Grants ranged from $5,000 to $328,000 among all interviewees.

All sites receiving Academic Support grants completed an application for grant funding that asked for information about program dimension and scope. These documents were shared by ESE with UMDI prior to interviews and helped to inform the interview protocol.

All interviews were conducted by phone and lasted 20–30 minutes. Interviewees were asked the same questions regardless of grant type. Of the ten questions on the protocol, five were “required.” These questions centered on program description and demographics of students served, effective strategies for increasing Competency Determination (generally, by subgroup, and by subject), and grade 8 to grade 9 transition assistance. Five additional questions were asked if time remained, including questions regarding challenges, advice, additional successes and positive ripple effects, and closing comments. All interviewees answered the five required questions as well as the optional question regarding challenges. Sixty-three percent of interviewees provided feedback to at least one of the three advice questions,[[7]](#footnote-7) while only 56 percent identified additional successes and positive ripple effects. Forty-seven percent of interviewees provided closing comments. The interview protocol was field tested with three interviewees and revised in conjuncture with ESE based on the responses to that instrument. The full interview protocol can be found in Appendix F.

Qualitative data from the interviews were analyzed to document emergent or recurring themes related to sites’ Academic Support programs. These data were analyzed using a standard qualitative technique that involves multiple reviews and readings of the data. The qualitative analysis software package NVivo was used to organize and analyze the implementation interview data. The qualitative analysis highlighted trends and variations in program implementation, with an emphasis on identifying actionable items that could support future technical assistance, program improvement, and evaluation.

**Data Review and Preparation.** UMDI compiled demographic information for all Academic Support participants, eligible non-participants, and non-eligible non-participants across the state for SY13 and SY14. Summaries of participation were generated for each program and for participation in any program (i.e., combined across programs). Demographic characteristics including students’ Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) risk level, disability status, English language learner status, free or reduced-price lunch status, gender, race/ethnicity, and grade level were included in these analyses. Participation was also summarized according to the accountability level of the district in which participants were enrolled during their final year of participation.

# Quantitative Analysis

Detailed quantitative methods and findings regarding the outcomes of the Academic Support programs are provided below. The findings presented compare the MCAS performance, graduation and dropout rates, and attendance of students who participated in Academic Support programs with students who were eligible to participate but did not. We used rigorous, quasi-experimental matched comparison group designs to draw strong conclusions about the effectiveness of the programs (Cook and Campbell 1979). Treatment and comparison groups were matched on gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, English language learner status, disability status, grade level, rate of school attendance, and pre-intervention MCAS performance. Technical descriptions of the statistical methods are presented in Appendix A.

Analyses included all students (N=20,510) grades 8–12 who participated during SY13 and SY14. The comparison group included all students (N=119,231) at the same sites who did not participate. Effects were assessed one year after participation in an Academic Support program. Different groups of students were included in different analyses depending on the outcome indicator of a given model. For example, a student participating in grade 10 would not be expected to have graduated one year after the intervention and can therefore not be included in the graduation model. The following describes the grade breakdown of students included in given models:

* MCAS Models: Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12.
* Graduation Models: Grades 11 and 12.
* Dropout Models: Grades 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.
* Attendance Models: Grades 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Students were not randomly assigned to Academic Support programs. Program eligibility requirements varied by Academic Support program but generally required that a student be in danger of failing, or have recently failed, one or more MCAS tests.[[8]](#footnote-8) To minimize any differences that may have existed between the treatment and comparison groups prior to the intervention, rigorous propensity score weighting procedures were used to weight each of the comparison students according to their similarity to students in the treatment group (Rubin 1997).

**Program Outcomes:**

A complex picture emerged regarding the impact of participating in Academic Support programs. While participating students were more likely than non-participating students to gain their Competency Determination and less likely than non-participating students to drop out one year after participation, participating students were also generally less likely than non-participating students to graduate one year after participation.

Program impacts that were statistically significant are summarized in the following tables. Impacts for all models, regardless of statistical significance, are provided in Appendix C. Each table notes three levels of significance, or “p-values.” Lower p-values correspond to a higher degree of confidence that a result represents a true difference between groups rather than random variation in the data.

The tables provide odds ratios for models measuring whether a student gained their Competency Determination, graduated, or dropped out and indicating the degree of impact of the intervention. An odds ratio greater than one indicates that the outcome was more likely for participants than non-participants, while an odds ratio less than one indicates that the outcome was less likely for participants than non-participants. For example, an odds ratio of 1.3 for Competency Determination means that participants were 1.3 times as likely as non-participants to gain their Competency Determination. An odds ratio of 0.7 for dropout status means that participants were 0.7 times as likely to drop out as similar non-participants.

For attendance models, the tables provide the beta (*β*) statistic to indicate the average expected difference in the rate of attendance between treatment and comparison students. For example, a beta of 1.2 for attendance means that participants averaged 1.2 percentage points greater attendance than non-participants.

The tables also provide a 95 percent confidence interval (CI), recognizing that the sample of students in the study might be somewhat different from the full population from which they were drawn. The confidence interval provides a range that has a 95 percent chance of including the true value of the odds ratio or beta statistic for that population.

**MCAS Determination.** Students who participated in Academic Support programs were 1.44 times as likely as non-participants to gain their Competency Determination one year after participation. Results varied by subgroup, but, in general, Academic Support program participants were more likely than similar peers to gain their Competency Determination after participation.

Students participating in CPSS and Allocation programs were consistently more likely to gain their Competency Determination than similar non-participating peers. This finding held across all instructional subjects. Grade 9 students were 1.84 times more likely to gain their Competency Determination, grade 10 students were 1.73 times more likely, and grade 11 students were 1.37 times more likely. Grade 12 students, however, were no more or less likely than non-participants to gain their Competency Determination. This finding may suggest that early intervention increases the likelihood of success for these programs.

Students in schools with a low Accountability and Assistance level were 1.48 times more likely to gain their Competency Determination than non-participants, while participants from schools with a high Accountability and Assistance level were 0.84 times less likely to gain their Competency Determination. This is the only subgroup in which participants were less likely than non-participants to gain their Competency Determination.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Gaining Competency Determination** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | All | 1.44\*\*\* | [1.28, 1.60] |
| Male | 1.44\*\*\* | [1.28, 1.62] |
| Female | 1.42\*\*\* | [1.25, 1.61] |
| White | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.33, 1.76] |
| African Amer./Black | 1.52\*\*\* | [1.22, 1.89] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1.26\*\* | [1.07, 1.47] |
| FRL | 1.31\*\*\* | [1.17, 1.47] |
| ELL | 1.27\*\* | [1.07, 1.50] |
| SWD | 1.47\*\*\* | [1.31, 1.64] |
| Low Accountability | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.30, 1.69] |
| High Accountability | 0.84\* | [0.73, 0.97] |
| Grade 9 | 1.84\*\*\* | [1.30, 2.59] |
| Grade 10 | 1.73\*\*\* | [1.44, 2.08] |
| Grade 11 | 1.37\*\*\* | [1.14, 1.65] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.33, 1.77] |
| Math | 1.42\*\*\* | [1.24, 1.63] |
| SCI | 1.57\*\*\* | [1.38, 1.78] |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success** | All | 1.74\*\*\* | [1.25, 2.43] |
| ELA | 1.85\*\*\* | [1.43, 2.41] |
| Math | 1.55\*\* | [1.15, 2.10] |
| SCI | 1.80\* | [1.13, 2.86] |
| **Work and Learning Programs** | Math | 1.40\* | [1.03, 1.91] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.32, 1.66] |
| ELA | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.31, 1.79] |
| Math | 1.45\*\*\* | [1.26, 1.67] |
| SCI | 1.63\*\*\* | [1.42, 1.87] |
| + p < 0.1, \*p < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001 | | | |

**Grad Status.** Students who participated in Academic Support programs were overall less likely than non-participating students to graduate one year after participation. In general, fewer models had significant results, indicating that for many programs and subgroups there was no statistical difference between program participants and non-participants in regards to their likelihood to graduate one year after participation. Overwhelmingly,

however, results suggest that, across subgroups, Academic Support program participants were less likely than similar peers to graduate by one year after participation. Grade 12 participants were 0.58 times as likely as non-participants to graduate one year after participation. There were no significant differences between grade 11 participants and non-participants, indicating that the programs neither increased nor decreased their odds of graduating one year after participation. This may suggest that grade level at time of intervention is an important consideration when measuring the effect of participation on graduation status.

Two findings stood out as counter to these overall findings in that they *increased* the odds of graduating after participation. Participation in science-focused programs, and specifically in science-focused Allocation programs, increased the likelihood of graduating one year after participation. In general, participating science students were 1.24 times as likely as non-participating students to graduate, and Allocation program science students were 1.48 times as likely as non-participating students to graduate.

Given these results, it is important to note that sample sizes across all graduation models were markedly lower than sample sizes across models specifically assessing dropout status. Unlike the other models, graduation status models only included grade 11 and grade 12 students— thus reducing the possible sample N—as these are the only students who would have been expected to have graduated within one year of participation. Additionally, it is possible that there may be unaddressed differences between grade 11 and grade 12 students that the models were unable to capture. For example, students who have not passed the MCAS by senior year may be at higher risk to not graduate than those who have not passed by junior year since senior participation indicates multiple MCAS failures. It may be that students who have experienced multiple failures do not put in as much effort as those who have only experienced one failure, or perhaps they are already so far behind in other areas that passing the MCAS does not complete the requirements for high school graduation. Although outside the purview of this study, additional analyses examining the effect of program participation on graduation two or three years after participation could illuminate more on this subject, as they would include more students from more grade levels.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Graduation Status One Year After Participation** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **All** | All | 0.82\* | [0.70, 0.96] |
| **Subgroup** | Male | 0.84\* | [0.73, 0.97] |
| Female | 0.79\* | [0.64, 0.97] |
| White | 0.82\* | [0.67, 0.99] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.70\* | [0.52, 0.93] |
| Grade 12 | 0.58\*\*\* | [0.47, 0.70] |
| **Subject** | SCI | 1.24\* | [1.01, 1.60] |
| **Work and Learning Programs** | All | 0.54\* | [0.31, 0.94] |
| ELA | 0.39\*\* | [0.22, 0.71] |
| SCI | 0.50\*\* | [0.31. 0.81] |
| **Allocation Grants** | SCI | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.18, 1.85] |
| **One-Stop Career Centers** | All | 0.44\* | [0.19, 0.98] |
| + p < 0.1, \*p < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001 | | | |

**Dropout Status.** Students who participated in Academic Support programs were 0.54 times less likely to drop out than similar non-participating peers. Overwhelmingly, across subgroups, grade, and subject, participating students were far less likely to drop out than non-participating students.

Results suggest that participation reduces the likelihood of dropping out for White, African American/Black, and Hispanic/Latino students by about half. Results were similar across academic subject concentrations. There were no significant results for competitive grant programs, but, across all subjects, Allocation grant participants were about half as likely to drop out as similar non-participating peers.

When looking at this outcome by grade level, participation was not significant for either grade 8 or grade 9 participants. Grade 10 students, however, were 0.47 times less likely to drop out. The effect size increases for grade 11 students, suggesting that these students are the least likely group to drop out (0.37 times as likely). The effect size decreases slightly for grade 12 students, showing that grade 12 students are 0.71 times as likely to drop out as non-participants.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Dropout Status One Year After Participation** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **All** | All | 0.54\*\*\* | [0.46, 0.62] |
| **Subgroup** | Male | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.62] |
| Female | 0.57\*\*\* | [0.49, 0.68] |
| White | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.64] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.58\*\*\* | [0.44, 0.75] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.61\*\*\* | [0.48, 0.77] |
| FRL | 0.59\*\*\* | [0.50, 0.71] |
| SWD | 0.56\*\*\* | [0.46, 0.68] |
| Low Accountability | 0.49\*\*\* | [0.41, 0.58] |
| High Accountability | 0.64\*\* | [0.48, 0.87] |
| Grade 9 | 0.74+ | [0.55, 1.00] |
| Grade 10 | 0.47\*\*\* | [0.33, 0.65] |
| Grade 11 | 0.37\*\*\* | [0.28, 0.47] |
| Grade 12 | .71\* | [0.55, 0.93] |
| **Subjects** | ELA | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.64] |
| Math | 0.54\*\*\* | [0.45, 0.63] |
| SCI | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.63] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.44, 0.61] |
| ELA | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.41, 0.64] |
| Math | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.61] |
| SCI | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.63] |
| + p < 0.1, \*p < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001 | | | |

**Attendance.** Students who participated in Academic Support programs were slightly more likely to see an increase in school attendance the year after participation. In general, effect sizes were small, indicating that participating students attended approximately 1–2 days more than non-participating students. This effect held across subgroups, including by gender, by race, by special population, and by school Accountability and Assistance level.

The largest significant effect size was seen for English language learner (ELL) students. ELL students on average attended about 3 percent more school days the year after participation (about 5 days). The smallest significant effect size was for White students. On average, White students attended 0.3 percent more school days (about half a day more).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Rate of Attendance the Year After Participation** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **All** | All | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| **Subgroup** | Male | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.01] |
| Female | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| White | 0.003\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.02\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| FRL | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| ELL | 0.03\*\* | [0.01, 0.05] |
| SWD | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| Low Accountability | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| High Accountability | 0.02\*\* | [0.01, 0.04] |
| Grade 10 | 0.01\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Grade 11 | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 0.01\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Math | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| SCI | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grants** | All | 0.01+ | [0.00, 0.02] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| ELA | 0.01\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Math | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| SCI | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| + p < 0.1, \*p < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001 | | | |

**Overaged Student Models.** Academic Support programs sought to reengage out-of-school youth in order to help them achieve their Competency Determination, a chief barrier for many students in gaining a high school diploma. Overaged students are those students who previously dropped out of high school and were likely not registered to a high school during the year of study. In total, Academic Support programs were able to reengage 1,004 students in SY13 and SY14. Of those students, 293 received their Competency Determination and 48 graduated—a distinct success for the programs.

Additional analyses were conducted to assess the effect of participation in Academic Support programs for overaged students; these are presented in Appendix D. Models measured the effect of participation on Competency Determination, graduation status, and dropout status. Attendance models were not conducted for this group.

These models are limited in several ways. First, unlike the previous models, overaged students could not be nested within school, as the majority of students had not been registered to a school during their year of participation. This means that models could not properly account for variation in school or program context. Second, access to an adequate comparison group was limited. Because there are no “similar” non-participating students whose information was accessible, participants were matched to eligible non-participating grade 12 students. These groups are inherently different in context, which therefore limits the ability to make conclusions about the effect of programming specifically for overaged students. Lastly, overaged students overwhelmingly tended to be missing information, especially in regard to their previous MCAS scores. This may be because some eligible overaged students never took a science MCAS, as it was not yet a requirement, or because they dropped out of high school prior to taking the MCAS. In order to preserve the largest sample possible, MCAS was not used as part of the weighting equation. Weighting factors were ultimately limited to demographics, including gender, race, low income status, ELL status, and students with disabilities (SWD) status. For more information about the quantitative methods used in the overaged student models, please see Appendix B.

In lieu of the limitations outlined above, results cannot be described as conclusive and require a contextual interpretation.

**Future Directions.** Quantitative analyses were limited to measuring outcomes the year after participation. Additional studies would benefit from observing outcomes two and three years after participation. In particular, we expect that there may be more positive effects seen in graduation models in light of many of the very positive outcomes being seen in other models at the grade 9 and 10 levels. Findings above suggest that early intervention may have a better ability to keep students on track, and this may hold true as well for graduation outcomes. Because we observed outcomes one year later, we were not able to see the effects of participation on graduation for grade 9 or 10 students. Expanding this analysis may further illuminate this subject.

# Economic Cost Analysis

Academic Support programs are intended to support students in earning their Competency Determination, which is a requirement for earning a high school diploma in the Commonwealth. One of the primary intentions of these programs was to prevent students from dropping out of school. Using the number of dropouts as a guide, we estimate the potential cost of dropping out of high school to the Commonwealth by using well established estimates provided in past literature. These estimates include common costs associated with dropping out, such as lost tax payments, increased public expenditures in the health, criminal justice, and welfare systems, as well as other reduced subsidies (Belfield et al., 2012; Sum et al., 2009). Using the estimates from this literature and the results from the dropout model outlined above, we estimate the number of potential students prevented from dropping out by participation in the Academic Support programs, and we calculate how those figures would translate into dollars lost by the Commonwealth over time if those students had not participated.

While most existing literature estimates the cost of dropping out using similar factors (such as the lost tax payments, incarceration costs, and health costs mentioned previously), due to variations in sample selection, year, and added costs measured, actual estimates of dropout costs vary within the research. In order to address this variation, we present the potential cost of dropping out to the Commonwealth in two ways, by calculating a conservative and non-conservative estimate. Estimates reflect the nationwide average cost of dropping out and are adjusted to account for inflation. Figures are presented in 2014 dollars.

**Number of Dropouts.** The table below shows the number of participating students who dropped out within one year after their final year of participating in an Academic Support program (SY13 or SY14). Using the coefficient obtained from the full dropout model (0.538), we estimated the number of additional students that would have been expected to have dropped out if they had not received the intervention. The number of potential students prevented from dropping out was then used to estimate the total lifetime savings to the Commonwealth as a result of not dropping out of high school (see below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Year** | **Actual Number of Dropouts** | **Estimated Number of Prevented Dropouts** |
| **2013** | 287 | 246 |
| **2014** | 411 | 353 |

**Cost of Programs.** The table below shows the total cost of Academic Support programs during SY13 and SY14. This information was taken from the grant pages on the ESE website under “Funds Allocated.”[[9]](#footnote-9) These figures are accounted for when calculating the net benefit to the Commonwealth.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **FY13** | **FY14** |
| Funding Code: 632 and 625 | $6,378,100 | $6,000,700 |
| Funding Code: 596 | $548,533 | $510,276 |
| Funding Code: 596a | $7,890 | $7,450 |
| Funding Code: 597 | $617,181 | $632,213 |
| Funding Code: 619 | $234,633 | $313,690 |
| Funding Code: 592 | $531,911 | $536,718 |
| Funding Code: 598 | $302,000 | $296,000 |
| Funding Code: 593 | $115,000 | $104,000 |
| Funding Code: 627 | $594,306 | $544,263 |
| Funding Code: 626 | $112,489 | $115,737 |
| **Total Cost** | $9,442,043 | $8,420,329 |

**Lifetime Benefit to the Commonwealth.** The total net lifetime cost to the Commonwealth was calculated using figures generated from two nationally-representative studies. The first estimate is based on Carroll and Erkut (2009), a RAND Corporation publication aimed at assessing the benefits to taxpayers from increases in students’ educational attainment. The study compiled multiple national-level databases to compute the total net benefit of having a student not drop out of high school in 2002 dollars (2002 represented the most recent year for which all data were available at the time the study was completed). This study accounted for increases in the public budget, including tax payments, reduced spending on social programs, and reduced spending on incarceration, as well as the total cost of providing additional education. In 2002 dollars, the study estimates the total savings to be $74,000 per student not dropping out. This figure accounts for the cost of an additional year of schooling. We adjust for inflation using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator. Inflating that figure to 2014 dollars results in a total savings of $98,039.92. Among studies using nationally-representative data to estimate the costs of dropping out, this figure is among the smallest and is therefore considered our “conservative” estimate of the total savings. To calculate the total savings to the state, we multiplied this amount by the estimated number of students prevented from dropping out as a result of participating in the Academic Support programs.

Had these students actually dropped out, the potential cost to the Commonwealth in FY13 would be estimated at $14,720,605.98. In FY14, the estimated cost would have been $26,181,931.39. This results in a total savings to the Commonwealth of $40,902,537.37, far more than the cost of all of the Academic Support programs over these years. This figure is conservative and, in fact, could be underestimating the actual savings.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lifetime Savings** | **Total Cost of Program** | **Total Savings (Benefit minus Cost)** |
| **2013** | $24,162,648.98 | $9,442,043 | $14,720,605.98 |
| **2014** | $34,602,260.39 | $8,420,329 | 26,181,931.39 |
| **Total** | $58,764,909.37 | $17,862,372 | $40,902,537.37 |

Conducting a similar assessment at the national level, Belfield et al. (2012) looks at the fiscal burden caused by opportunity youth. While definitions of opportunity youth vary, this term typically refers to teens/young adults who are chronically “neither accumulating human capital in school or college nor accumulating labor market skills by working” (Belfield et al. 2012, 5). Opportunity youth have a higher likelihood of being involved in the criminal justice system and have a higher likelihood of needing social services such as public housing or welfare, further increasing their potential fiscal burden.

Belfield et al. (2012) estimate that opportunity youth create a total taxpayer burden of $235,680 (in 2011 dollars) over the life-course. We account for inflation using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation calculator. Inflating that figure to 2014 dollars equals $248,857.79. Among studies using nationally-representative data to estimate the costs of dropping out, this figure is among the highest, as it draws on a sample of the most at-risk youth. It is therefore considered our “non-conservative” estimate of the total savings. After calculating these savings, we multiply them by the estimated number of students prevented from dropping out as a result of participating in Academic Support programs.

Had these students actually dropped out, the potential cost to the Commonwealth in FY13 would be estimated at $51,890,763.33. In FY14, the estimated cost would have been $79,411,668.92. This results in a total savings to the Commonwealth of $131,302,432.25. While this figure provided is a non-conservative estimate, it shows the high end of potential savings to the Commonwealth over the course of these two years.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Lifetime Savings** | **Total Cost of Program** | **Total Savings (Benefit Minus Cost)** |
| **2013** | $61,332,806.33 | $9,442,043 | $51,890,763.33 |
| **2014** | $87,831,997.92 | $8,420,329 | $79,411,668.92 |
| **Total** | $149,164,804.25 | $17,862,372 | $131,302,432.25 |

# Administrator Survey Results

Survey Response Rates

In April 2016, UMDI distributed the Academic Support Services Program Administrator Survey (Appendix E) to the primary program administrator(s) of ESE-funded Academic Support programs operating during the 2015–16 school year. As such, surveys were distributed to those programs funded by the Academic Support Allocation grant program, Work and Learning program, and Partnerships for Pathways to Success program in April 2016. CPSS grantees were surveyed during summer 2016 because that was the period of peak program activity. One of the Allocation awardees was not included in the survey distribution due to recent changes in program administrator staffing. This exclusion was requested by the site and approved by ESE. As depicted in the table below, the survey was distributed to a total 199 administrators across the three grant types, with a response rate of 72 percent (N=144).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Survey Response Rates By Grant Type, SY16 | | | |
| **Grant Type** | **Number of Surveys Distributed** | **Number of Surveys Completed** | **Response Rates (%)** |
| Allocation Awardees | 167 | 118 | 71 |
| Work and Learning Grantees | 6 | 6 | 100 |
| Partnerships for Pathways to Success Grantees | 11 | 8 | 73 |
| Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grantees | 15 | 12 | 80 |
| **All Awardees** | 199 | 144 | 72 |

Findings

Survey respondents were asked to identify all key components of their current Academic Support grant-funded programs. As shown in the table below, survey respondents overwhelmingly reported providing academic remediation instruction as a key program component. Ninety-two percent of all survey respondents identified ‘academic remediation instruction’ as a key component of their program.

There are a few differences of note by grant type. Allocation awardees identified fewer program components in describing their Academic Support program compared to the competitive grantees. Allocation awardees selected, on average, two and a half key program components, whereas competitive grantees selected an average of 6 program components. In large part, this difference is attributable to the varied purposes of each program. Allocation grants were intended to support academic remediation activities. In fact, nearly two-fifths (38 percent) of Allocation awardees selected ‘academic remediation instruction’ as the sole component of their Academic Support program compared with only one competitive grantee (4 percent). Competitive grants had additional intended purposes beyond academic remediation. For example, one of the intentions of the Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grants was to emphasize the importance of service learning. This is reflected in the survey results, with the majority (75 percent) of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees reporting service-learning projects as a key component of their Academic Support programs compared to only 2 percent of Allocation awardees.

| Key Components of Academic Support Programs by Grant Type, SY16 | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Support Program Components** | **All Awardees**  **(N=144)**  **(%)** | **Allocation**  **(N=118)**  **(%)** | **Work & Learning**  **(N=6)**  **(%)** | **Partnerships for Pathways**  **(N=8)**  **(%)** | **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success**  **(N=12)**  **(%)** |
| Academic remediation instruction | 92 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 42 |
| Credit recovery | 21 | 19 | 50 | 13 | 33 |
| Curriculum development | 13 | 10 | 33 | 0 | 42 |
| Project/inquiry based learning | 15 | 9 | 50 | 0 | 58 |
| College and career readiness activities | 22 | 14 | 100 | 88 | 25 |
| Individual learning plans (ILP) | 17 | 17 | 33 | 25 | 8 |
| Service-learning projects | 9 | 2 | 17 | 13 | 75 |
| Work-based learning opportunities/internships | 9 | 0 | 100 | 75 | 11 |
| Work-based learning plan (WBLP) | 6 | 0 | 100 | 38 | 0 |
| Web-based/software tutorials | 13 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 8 |
| Mentoring | 13 | 8 | 50 | 63 | 17 |
| Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support | 19 | 12 | 67 | 63 | 33 |
| Informing parents/guardians about remediation options | 26 | 25 | 67 | 38 | 8 |
| High school transition support services | 22 | 13 | 83 | 63 | 58 |
| Other | 10 | 9 | 17 | 13 | 8 |
| *Note*: ‘Other’ responses included MCAS preparation and tutoring (N=9) and one response each for: assistance with college application process, English language learner services, Student Success Action Plan, resolving barriers and providing community services/referrals, and math, engineering, and design. | | | | | |

Allocation awardees most frequently identified the following as key program components:

* Academic remediation instruction (97 percent),
* Informing parent(s)/guardian(s) about remediation options (25 percent),
* Credit recovery (19 percent), and
* Use of individual learning plans (17 percent).

Competitive grantees most frequently identified the following as key program components:

* Academic remediation instruction (73 percent),
* High school transitional support services (65 percent),
* College and career readiness activities (62 percent),
* Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support (50 percent),
* Work-based learning opportunities/internships (50 percent), and
* Service-learning projects (42 percent).

Survey respondents were asked to estimate the typical ratio of participating students to program-dedicated staff (e.g., teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors) in their Academic Support programs. While information gathered during interviews with a sample of program administrators indicates that group size can vary from day to day across sites, it is clear that Academic Support programs typically provide smaller student to teacher ratios than found in an average school classroom. As shown in the table below, approximately 55 percent of survey respondents reported a typical ratio of 5 to 10 students per teacher and approximately two-fifths (38 percent) reported a ratio of 2 to 4 students per teacher. Very few programs reported either 1:1 or larger than 11:1 student to teacher ratios. It is important to note that one of the requirements for receiving Academic Support grant funding is to keep the ratio of students to teachers to no more than 10:1. Survey results reveal that 4 percent of respondents estimated a typical student to teacher ratio of 11:1 or more. Given these findings, ESE may want to revisit grant requirements as part of their future technical assistance services, particularly student to teacher ratios.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Typical Ratio of Participating Students to Program Dedicated Staff by Grant Type, SY16 | | | | | |
| **Grant Type** | **N** | **1:1**  **(%)** | **2:1 – 4:1**  **(%)** | **5:1 – 10:1**  **(%)** | **11:1 or more**  **(%)** |
| Allocation Awardees | 118 | 4 | 43 | 49 | 3 |
| Work and Learning Grantees | 6 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 17 |
| Partnerships for Pathways to Success Grantees | 7 | 0 | 29 | 57 | 14 |
| Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grantees | 12 | 0 | 8 | 92 | 0 |
| **All Awardees** | 143 | 4 | 38 | 55 | 4 |

Respondents were provided with a list of ESE recommended best practices and asked to identify the frequency with which each was implemented at their site. As shown in the table below, more than 80 percent of all respondents reported ‘often’ or ‘always’ implementing the following best practices:

* + Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students (93 percent);
  + Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning (91 percent);
  + The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction (88 percent);
  + Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum (87 percent); and
  + Educators are given time to plan, revise, and evaluate program services (82 percent).

Even the least frequently cited practices were practiced by approximately half of all respondents ‘often’ or ‘always’.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,**  **School Year 2015─2016** | | | | | | |
| **All Awardee Responses** | | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 137 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 37 | 25 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 141 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 28 | 59 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 131 | 23 | 13 | 14 | 27 | 24 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 140 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 30 | 58 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 139 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 29 | 62 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 141 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 65 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 139 | 2 | 14 | 31 | 29 | 25 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 134 | 2 | 18 | 28 | 26 | 25 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 140 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 39 | 43 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 128 | 16 | 14 | 20 | 36 | 13 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know.” The percentage of respondents who selected this choice is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 5%, Qb. 2%, Qc. 9%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 4%, Qf. 2%, Qg. 4%, Qh. 7%, Qi. 3%, and Qj. 11%. | | | | | | |

Though these findings are generally consistent across all grant types, there is one key difference of note. While student engagement in college and career readiness activities was not commonly implemented across Allocation awardees, 100 percent of Work and Learning and Partnerships for Pathways to Success grantees reported ‘often’ or ‘always’ engaging students in planning for their future as part of their program. This is due to the fact that both of these competitive grants were designed to increase college and career readiness, with the intention of helping students prepare for their futures outside of school. See Appendix E for further detail.

Students who struggle to earn their Competency Determination often face other barriers to graduation like poor grades, low motivation, and lack of connection to school, among others. Awardees were provided with a list of strategies and asked to indicate to what extent their organizations/districts were utilizing these strategies within or in collaboration with their Academic Support–funded programs to address other barriers to graduation. As shown in the table below, at least 60 percent of respondents indicated that they implemented the following strategies ‘to a great extent’:

* Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support, (67 percent) and
* Alternative pathways to meet a range of needs (61 percent).

Moreover, more than half of respondents indicated that they implement all the strategies ‘somewhat’ or ‘to a great extent.’

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Addressing Barriers to Graduation, School Year 2015─2016** | | | | | |
| **All Awardee Responses** | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. | 124 | 6 | 2 | 32 | 61 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 109 | 24 | 13 | 26 | 28 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 127 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 67 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 115 | 14 | 16 | 35 | 36 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 123 | 14 | 8 | 30 | 48 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 120 | 13 | 8 | 33 | 46 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 113 | 17 | 17 | 46 | 20 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 4%, Qb. 6%, Qc. 1%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 2%, Qf. 3%, and Qg. 4%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 17%, Qc. 9%, Qd. 15%, Qe. 11%, Qf. 13%, and Qg. 16%. | | | | | |

Some competitive grantees reported implementing the above strategies more frequently than Allocation awardees. The greatest differences in responses between competitive grantees and Allocation awardees were on utilizing the following strategies:

* Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches (100 percent of Work and Learning and Partnership for Pathways to Success grantees utilize ‘to a great extent,’ compared with 30 percent of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees and 19 percent of Allocation awardees),
* Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs (61 percent of competitive grantees utilize ‘to a great extent,’ compared with 39 percent of Allocation awardees), and
* Service learning and/or work-based learning models (61 percent of competitive grantees utilize ‘to a great extent,’ compared with 27 percent of Allocation awardees).

In large part, these differences are attributable to the varied purposes of each grant. Allocation grants focused mainly on providing academic remediation services in a traditional school setting. Most competitive grant programs were run outside of the normal school day and were located in alternative settings. In addition, interview data suggest that while Allocation grants may have at one time utilized more of the aforementioned strategies, many sites reduced the scope of services they offered when faced with budget reductions.

See Appendix E for further detail.

Factors for Success and Student Outcomes

Awardees were asked to identify the primary reasons that students were enrolling in their Academic Support programs. Respondents could choose a maximum of three of the listed responses. As shown in the table below, the most frequently cited reasons for program enrollment include:

* Small-group / individual instruction is offered (55 percent),
* The program is free and convenient (42 percent), and
* Program staff are engaging and supportive (41 percent).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary Reasons Students Enroll in Academic Support Programs by Grant Type, SY16 | | | | | |
| **Reasons for Enrollment** | **All Awardees**  **(N=144)**  **(%)** | **Allocation**  **(N=116)**  **(%)** | **Work & Learning**  **(N=6)**  **(%)** | **Partnerships for Pathways**  **(N=8)**  **(%)** | **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success**  **(N=12)**  **(%)** |
| 1. Enrollment is automatic. Supports are integrated into regular school/program activities. | 22 | 27 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Students enroll in program for support with earning their Competency Determination. | 34 | 38 | 33 | 25 | 8 |
| 1. The program is free and convenient. | 42 | 42 | 33 | 63 | 42 |
| 1. Program outreach to eligible participants is effective. | 24 | 21 | 33 | 13 | 58 |
| 1. Parent(s)/guardian(s) require their children to participate. | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 1. Program staff are engaging and supportive. | 41 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 33 |
| 1. High-quality academic remediation services are offered. | 29 | 31 | 33 | 13 | 25 |
| 1. Small-group / individual instruction is offered. | 55 | 61 | 17 | 38 | 33 |
| 1. Enhancement activities (e.g., college & career readiness, internships) are offered. | 8 | 2 | 33 | 25 | 42 |
| 1. Counseling and/or other behavioral/ social-emotional support services are offered. | 7 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 8 |
| 1. Program staff partner with local community organizations, businesses, and/or colleges. | 6 | 2 | 33 | 25 | 25 |
| 1. Other | 3 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 17 |
| *Note*: Respondents could select a maximum of three responses. ‘Other’ responses included “It’s a class with pass/fail grade” and “Our program requires more than 3 responses.” | | | | | |

While the above cited reasons for enrollment are consistently noted across grant type, a few key differences between Allocation and competitive grantees are noted below:

* 61 percent of Allocation awardees selected ‘small-group / individual instruction’ as a primary reason for enrollment compared with 31 percent of competitive grantees.
* 27 percent of Allocation awardees selected ‘Enrollment is automatic. Supports are integrated into regular school/program activities’ as a primary reason for enrollment compared with 4 percent of competitive grantees.
* 29 percent of competitive grantees selected ‘Enhancement activities are offered as part of the program’ as a primary reason for enrollment compared with 3 percent of Allocation awardees.
* 29 percent of competitive grantees selected ‘Program staff partner with local community organizations, businesses, and/or colleges’ as a primary reason for enrollment compared with 3 percent of Allocation awardees.

Next, awardees were asked to identify the key factors facilitating participant success this year in their Academic Support programs. Awardees could choose a maximum of three of the listed responses. As displayed in the table below, the most frequently selected factors for participant success include:

* Small-group / individual instruction is provided (55 percent), and
* Program staff are engaged and supportive (57 percent).

These findings are consistent across grant types with one key difference. In addition, to the factors cited above, competitive grantees also commonly identified the importance of providing enhancement activities as a key factor for participant success. Nearly half (46 percent) of competitive grantees selected ‘Enhancement activities are provided’ as a key factor for participant success this year, compared with 4 percent of Allocation awardees. In addition, Allocation awardees (43 percent) were more likely to select ‘Program staff are highly qualified' as a key factor for success than competitive grantees’ (27 percent). Sixty-seven percent of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees reported that 'Participants are engaged and motivated' compared to less than 25 percent of all other awardees.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key Factors Facilitating Participant Success in Academic Support Programs,  By Grant Type, SY16 | | | | | |
| **Factors of Participant Success** | **All Awardees**  **(N=144)**  **(%)** | **Allocation**  **(N=118)**  **(%)** | **Work & Learning**  **(N=6)**  **(%)** | **Partnerships for Pathways**  **(N=8)**  **(%)** | **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success**  **(N=12)**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants consistently attend the program(s). | 35 | 38 | 0 | 13 | 42 |
| 1. Participants are engaged and motivated. | 27 | 24 | 17 | 25 | 67 |
| 1. Participants’ parent(s)/guardian(s) are engaged and supportive. | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 1. Program staff are engaged and supportive. | 57 | 59 | 67 | 50 | 50 |
| 1. Program staff are highly qualified. | 39 | 43 | 0 | 38 | 33 |
| 1. High-quality academic remediation services are provided. | 31 | 34 | 50 | 25 | 8 |
| 1. Small-group / individual instruction is provided. | 55 | 60 | 50 | 63 | 17 |
| 1. Enhancement activities (e.g., college & career readiness) are provided. | 11 | 4 | 83 | 38 | 33 |
| 1. Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support services are provided. | 5 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| 1. Program staff partner with local community organizations, businesses and/or colleges. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 8 |
| 1. Program staff collaborate with other school departments (e.g., guidance, special education, English language learner). | 13 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 8 |
| 1. Program enrollment alone is having a positive effect. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 1. Other | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Note: Respondents could select a maximum of three responses. ‘Other’ responses included “We give a grade and credit” and “Our program requires more than 3 responses.” | | | | | |

Awardees were asked to what extent they agree that involvement in Academic Support funded programs and activities are affecting a list of twelve participant outcomes. As highlighted in the table below, at least half of respondents ‘agree’ that participation in Academic Support activities affects the following outcomes:

* Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s) (85 percent),
* Participants are developing connections with adults (71 percent),
* Participants are increasing their academic engagement (66 percent),
* Participants are increasing their connection to school (59 percent),
* Participants are increasing their readiness for high school (59 percent),
* Participants are increasing their college and career readiness skills (53 percent), and
* Participants are earning course credit(s) (50 percent).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs, SY16 | | | | | | |
| **Participant Outcomes** | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 139 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 85 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 84 | 23 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 50 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 131 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 71 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 129 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 31 | 59 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 139 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 66 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 103 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 59 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 118 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 44 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 122 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 26 | 53 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of postsecondary options. | 100 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 34 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 98 | 11 | 5 | 22 | 33 | 29 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 81 | 21 | 9 | 24 | 21 | 26 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 95 | 17 | 2 | 24 | 30 | 27 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 1%, Qc. 4%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 1%, Qg. 6%, Qh. 3%, Qi. 4%, Qj. 4%, Qk. 3%, and Ql. 1%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 1%, Qb. 38%, Qc. 3%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 25%, Qg. 9%, Qh. 9%, Qi. 24%, Qj. 25%, Qk. 39%, and Ql. 30%. | | | | | | |

Competitive grantees generally were more likely to agree that participation in Academic Support-funded activities positively affected a wide variety of participant outcomes. Again, it is important to note the small number of competitive grantees (N=25 or fewer depending on the question) compared to Allocation awardees (N=118 or fewer depending on the question) responding to the survey.

All or nearly all competitive grantees responding to this outcomes question ‘agreed’ that participant involvement in Academic Support programs affects the following:

* + Increasing academic engagement (100 percent), and
* Developing connections with adults (96 percent).

Furthermore, more than two-thirds of competitive grantees responding to this question ‘agreed’ that involvement in Academic Support programs affects the following:

* Improving their college and career readiness skills (84 percent),
* Increasing connection to school (83 percent),
* Improving their personal/social skills (80 percent),
* Increasing their work-based learning skills (71 percent), and
* Making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s) (71 percent).

A few key differences exist between competitive grantees. All or nearly all Partnerships for Pathways to Success grantees and Work and Learning grantees reported that "participants are increasing their awareness of postsecondary options,” compared to only 30 percent of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees. Additionally, 100 percent of Partnerships for Pathways to Success and Work and Learning grantees reported that "participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options,” compared to only 33 percent of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees. Finally, 100 percent of Partnerships for Pathways to Success and Work and Learning grantees reported that "participants are increasing their career exploration skills,” compared to 29 percent of Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees.

See Appendix E for further detail.

Awardees were asked to describe a key success of their Academic Support program—whether at the organizational or student level—to showcase and share with ESE and other districts. More than half (N=80; 55 percent) of respondents provided an answer to this question.[[10]](#footnote-10) Given the open-ended nature of this question, responses about success stories varied widely. Awardees described successes like improved participant outcomes, specifically increases in MCAS scores and increases in the likelihood of gaining Competency Determination. High quality staffing lent itself to improved student-teacher relationships and helped smooth some students’ transition from grade 8 to grade 9. Effective practices, like targeted instruction and building on student confidence, were highlighted as helping students succeed within the program. The location and timing of the program, as well as the addition of supplemental college and career readiness activities, were cited as causes for increased student motivation.

Descriptions of success story themes are included below along with individual quotes for additional illustration.

* Improved Participant Outcomes. More than half of those who replied to this question (N=44; 55 percent) cited specific participant outcomes resulting from involvement in their Academic Support programs. Awardees most commonly noted that participation led to increases in students passing the MCAS and gaining their Competency Determination. As one awardee noted, “We can demonstrate significant differences in the growth on MCAS scores of students who participate in our program compared to students who are recommended but do not participate.” In addition, many awardees specified a variety of other participant outcomes including, but not limited to, decreasing the dropout rate, increasing self-confidence, increasing connection to school, improved grades and/or schoolwork, improved relationships, increased connection to the community, and/or improved social/emotional health needs.

“Students are reporting doing better in their daily classwork as well as in MCAS proficiency.”

“We have already seen many successes. One of the successes I am seeing are the students are taking risks both academically and socially. Some of the students we asked to participate were either in danger of failing, or had low MCAS scores. These students also happen to struggle socially. During the after-school program, I saw these “quiet, not usually social students” talking to peers they normally wouldn’t. These same students also started to participate in class more. Teachers were commenting that behaviors improved from these students. My hope is that they gained a stronger connection to school and feel more invested.”

“Student retention has dramatically increased since our Transition Program has been instituted. Even though the program is voluntary, we have approximately 95 percent enrollment based on the positive feedback from students and parents regarding the program. This program has had an enormous impact on our school achievement and school climate.”

* Staffing.Approximately one-third of those who responded to this question (N=24; 30 percent) indicated program success was due in large part to the high-quality of interactions facilitated by the individual staff/instructors working directly with students. Respondents described staff as being “highly qualified” and “experienced,” and noted the importance of “supportive relationships” developed with students. In addition, awardees described the importance of instructors collaborating with classroom teachers and other school departments. Additionally, one transition program highlighted the importance of building relationships with high school teachers prior to moving on to grade 9.

“Our success comes from having highly qualified staff who are also SPED certified and previously TBE certified. Many of them work closely with participants in classes so they are well aware of the students’ strengths and weaknesses. We also work closely with their classroom teachers to enhance their learning.”

“A key success of the school year Academic Support Service program is the expertise and dedication of the staff. Many of the same teachers work in the academic support programs year after year so they are well versed in the curriculum the students need and how to work individually with students to reach their goal.”

“Keys to the success of our Academic Support Service program are hiring staff that can quickly build rapport with each student in the program, thus maximizing engagement during each lesson that encourages strong attendance.”

* Effective Instructional Practices. The following effective practices (N=28; 35 percent) were commonly cited as keys to program success: small group instruction, individualized and targeted learning, data-driven instruction, and service-learning. In addition, respondents noted using hands-on, engaging activities that provide students with concrete examples as well as providing test-taking strategies and offering immediate feedback.

“With a philosophy of ‘success first’ we have found that students become more likely to delve further into topic content. Starting easy and building from ‘success’ is a uniquely different experience than many of them have had in prior coursework, and builds some momentum into trying to learn and challenge themselves with more complex material. Making tiered and UDL driven units we have allowed for students to find a pathway that works for them, and then try to inspire them to challenge themselves into other content or a different device to learn further. It has led to a great deal of success for us.”

“Student participation in Saturday MCAS preparation program was never higher than it was this year. Teachers developed a protocol that allowed for students to get immediate feedback on their writing.”

“As we work towards each student having the tools to find success in completing the requirements to pass the MCAS we offer engaging, hands-on, knowledge-based programming. We also offer test taking strategies which prepare students for success. We consistently share positive thoughts, give incentives and boost self-esteem.”

*"The Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success service-learning programs are the most engaging and successful programs that the school has held.[We]believe the success of the program is that it is service-learning and entails academic integrity, student's ownership, and community partnerships that solve local problems."*

* Program Design.Many awardees (N=24; 30 percent) pointed to the importance of their program design—where/when program took place—as key factor to program success. Interestingly, school-day, after-school, weekend, summer, and boot-camp program designs were each described by different awardees as key to their program’s success. Awardees also noted benefits of being based at the students’ school, on a college campus, or at a neutral community organization. It is clear that many sites tailored their programs to the unique needs of the students they served.

“Having our Academic Support working and learning program be a part of the school schedule has been impactful for students. What they like about that is that they don’t feel they have one more extra class or thing to do after school. They want the support, and having it fit into their everyday schedule makes it manageable for them. The internship component is also a great opportunity that they view as an incentive which encourages their participation in the program.”

“The after-school program runs twice a week for the five weeks prior to taking the MCAS in ELA, math, and science. Students enjoy the quick review and in 5 weeks it’s complete. The material, strategies, and content are fresh in their minds. This is particularly popular with our high school students because they are in sports and work after school. The program runs for one hour after school, a total of 10 hours.”

“One of the successes has been having students access the college even prior to enrollment. Classes take place at the college which is located in downtown Lowell.”

*"We use this grant to provide a four week long transition program for rising ninth graders. This free summer program is designed to orient students to the high school, engage them in learning and the high school community, make lasting connections to peers and faculty, and receive academic enrichment in science, math, and ELA."*

* Integrating College and Career Readiness Activities. Four grantees—each of the Work and Learning grantees that responded to this question—discussed the significance of integrating college and career readiness skills and opportunities into their Academic Support program.

“The integration of workplace and academic learning engages and motivates students in the program. As a result the pass rate of students in the programs is typically around 80 percent which is fantastic.”

“The students in our program struggle in school, in large classrooms, and in special ed programs, and are not connected. Program staff are dedicated and caring, making students feel that they are important and can succeed. Students attended MCAS tutoring in math, ELA, and science after school and several weeks of job readiness training, including guest speakers like the Bristol County DA, Financial Literacy and Dress for Success Workshops, etc. Students became engaged and felt a sense of belonging to something. […] Students’ level of confidence was dramatically improved over the course of the program. Currently they are all involved in paid work experiences with the WBLP. Supervisors have raved about their performance and students are quite pleased with their progress.”

Other success story themes cited include consistent attendance (N=5), effectively reaching or serving key sub-populations (N=6) (e.g., English language learners, special education students, transient populations, parenting teens, people with disabilities), family outreach and communication (N=3), and combining funding streams (N=2).

See Appendix F for a complete listing of responses by district/organization.

Finally, awardees were asked whether the activities and services currently supported by their Academic Support grant(s) would continue in the absence of such funds. As depicted in the table below, only 4 percent of respondents reported that all of their current programming would continue in the absence of Academic Support grant funds and 8 percent 'don't know' what would happen. More than half of all respondents reported that activities and services currently supported through this grant would cease in the absence of these funds, while only one-third of awardees reported that some, but not all, of their activities would continue in the absence of these funds (34 percent). These findings are generally consistent across grant type.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Sustainability in the Absence of Academic Support Funding,  By Grant Type, SY16 | | | | | |
| **Program Sustainability** | **All Awardees**  **(N=137)**  **(%)** | **Allocation**  **(N=112)**  **(%)** | **Work & Learning**  **(N=6)**  **(%)** | **Partnerships for Pathways**  **(N=7)**  **(%)** | **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success**  **(N=12)**  **(%)** |
| **NO:** Our site/school/district would not be able to continue current academic support activities and services beyond the funding period. | 54 | 55 | 67 | 71 | 33 |
| **PARTIAL:** Our site/school/district would likely continue some but not all of our current academic support activities services beyond the funding period. | 34 | 33 | 17 | 14 | 67 |
| **YES:** Our site/school/district would likely continue all of our current academic support activities and services beyond the funding period. | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **DON’T KNOW:** I don’t know. | 8 | 8 | 17 | 14 | 0 |

As a follow-up, awardees were asked to identify other support and/or technical assistance, aside from funding, that ESE could offer to help districts/organizations sustain their current Academic Support programs and activities. Approximately one-third (N=50) of survey respondents provided suggestions of and recommendations for support.[[11]](#footnote-11) Suggestions varied by site, but had common themes. Although sites were asked for suggestions aside from additional funding, many respondents persisted in highlighting the budget as their chief concern. In addition to budgeting requests, respondents highlighted the importance of sharing information across sites to promote effective practice. Respondents also emphasized a need for professional development around best practices. Finally, sites described a desire for addition support surrounding use of technology in programming, as well as more support integrating college and career readiness activities into existing programming.

More detail regarding these suggestions is provided below:

* Continued Funding. While the question asked for suggestions aside from funding, nearly half (N=21; 42 percent) of those who responded cited the critical importance of funds for sustainability.

“We have developed a program of very effective supports. Unfortunately, the staffing end of this requires funding. Without this grant the programs would probably not continue. Our school system is stretched to the maxim um and additional funding is not available.”

“Funding is the best form of help as it allows us to structure the support as best fits our school.”

* Sharing Information on Successful Programs and Effective Practices. Respondents often cited a desire to learn more about model programs and best practices (N=13; 26 percent) across awardees. This information could be shared through a variety of means, including reports, webinars, meetings, and conferences.

“A meeting or webinar that focuses on promising practices and/or programs that work!”

“A publication of model programs around the state so that we could have ideas about ways to improve our program.”

*"One support that could be beneficial is training on how to strengthen the transition program and/or opportunities to network with other districts to discuss how they utilize this grant."*

* Professional Development. Respondents (N=13; 26 percent) also suggested the need for additional professional development offerings for program staff related to better understanding the MCAS exam itself, improving program outreach and participation, and assisting students in reaching their competency determination.

“Seminars and workshops on the new version of the MCAS exam for the instructors that provide the remediation support.”

“Any professional development opportunities for our staff on building literacy and mathematical fluency would be greatly appreciated, particularly in this time of crunched budgets.”

*"Continue to offer service-learning training and support."*

* Technology. Five respondents (10 percent) recommended additional access to technology, such as Chromebooks, and information on effective computer-based programs to assist in student engagement.

“Technology for the students to use, such as Chromebooks, laptops with charging stations, and headsets as well for students who need noise buffers or to work independently.”

“One of the biggest needs is simply finding evolving tools that catch students’ interest. Kahoot, a web-based live-action program is an example that our students ask for. They “ask” to be tested, and we are talking about students who end up with us due to chronic academic failure. It is the program’s design there that makes it so good—it is like a game show on TV, and it is competitive and fun. Finding more tools like this helps us keep students in seats daily. Without that, they fall into their old habits of being streaky attenders who miss large portions of material, and end up with no [cohesive] whole of understanding about anything; just rote parts of it all, and usually short-termed memorized at that.”

* College and Career Readiness Services. A few respondents (N=3; 6 percent) noted a desire for additional support services around incorporating college and career readiness skills.

“Offer professional development for MCAS tutors, especially around college and career readiness. “

“Our program primarily focuses on helping the students pass MCAS. Maybe the state could offer some other services/programs to help the students with career exploration or job skills.”

Other recommendations included providing family outreach assistance and participant support services related to transportation, food, and field trips. For your convenience, the entire set of responses is included in Appendix I.

# Interview Results

The following is a presentation of findings from the interview portion of this study. This section is structured thematically based on individual questions asked during interviews. Findings are presented regarding program models and dimensions, effective strategies for increasing competency determination (general, by subgroup, and by subject), grade 8 to grade 9 transition, successes, challenges, advice, and strategic considerations.

Program Models and Dimensions

The program supports four types of school year and summer grant programs: (1) district and approved private special education schools and collaboratives; (2) One-Stop Career Centers and higher education institutions; (3) Work and Learning programs; and (4) Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success.

Nearly all interviewed sites provided MCAS test support services. Supports included MCAS test tutoring, test taking support, general academic instruction, college and career readiness activities, and internships, among others. A few sites engaged in service learning projects aimed at helping students transition to high school. Sites employed current teachers, experienced tutors, or qualified community members—primarily retired teachers—to staff their programs. More detailed information regarding types of supports provided by Academic Support sites can be found in the previous survey find ings section.

Within and across Academic Support grant types, sites structured their Academic Support programs differently, depending on their individual needs, preferences, contexts, and available resources. Some programs spanned the majority of the school year and provided tutoring throughout the year, while other programs set up in a “boot camp” model to provide intensive tutoring to a targeted group of students in the weeks leading up to an exam. Other sites integrated additional supports into regularly scheduled academic classes or study halls, while some held after-school or weekend classes. Additionally, a few sites ran summer transition programs. Many sites, often those receiving Allocation grants, reported trying different models during previous years of the grant and adjusted their programs accordingly until they were able to find one that worked for them.

Effective Strategies

District representatives were asked to identify effective strategies for increasing students’ Competency Determination achievement within their Academic Support programs. Sites uniformly agreed that the strategies they implemented have led in the past or would lead this year to student progress towards earning their Competency Determination. Reported strategies were fairly consistent across sites, and a summary of the strategies most frequently cited as effective is provided below.

**Small class sizes**. Sixty-six percent of respondents reported that the most effective strategy for improving a student’s ability to achieve their Competency Determination was small class sizes. The grants require sites to have no more than a 10:1 student-teacher ratio, with many sites reporting smaller ratios. Two sites reported having class sizes of up to 15 students per teacher, although one of these sites also offered one-on-one tutoring for students with the highest needs. Small class sizes allowed teachers to move at the pace of individual students, identify learning gaps, use differentiated instruction, and target individual needs throughout a session. As one interviewee stated, “The ability to personalize content is difficult in a class of 25 … and that [personalization] is very important here. The teachers’ whole task [in this program] is to identify gaps in learning, and then address those gaps. Classes are small, … almost like a workshop. That is hard to do in a regular classroom.”

Twenty-six percent of sites reported that small-group settings also allowed students to make connections to other students and teachers. One interviewee said, “[Small groups] make students feel more comfortable and it helps us get inside the students’ heads.” Several interviewees reported that in small-group settings, students were much more willing to open up with teachers about materials they did not understand than they would normally be in a larger, mixed-level classroom. In a small learning environment, students felt more comfortable and as a result were more likely to ask for help.

“Students often reflect, ‘We haven’t had a teacher who can explain like this.’ ‘We haven’t been able to ask questions in such a comfortable environment.’ The program allows kids to learn in ways they can’t in school.”

“[One of the most effective strategies is] allowing the students to learn in a small group environment. When [they] don’t know something in a larger, regular class environment, they won’t ask for help. In a small environment, they feel more comfortable.”

**Targeted instruction.** About half of sites highlighted the importance of targeting gaps in student knowledge with instruction, as opposed to more general MCAS test review. Sites emphasized the use of prior MCAS exams to prepare students for upcoming tests or retests. Using this preparation method, sites could identify gaps in students’ knowledge and tailor session content to areas of greatest need. Sites noted that they do not try to review the entire exam; rather, they try to identify sections of the exam where students are struggling most. While the content of the exam changes every year, basic concepts and topics remain similar. By focusing on these topics, sites reported that they were able to increase students’ passing rates.

“The focus of the program is to make sure we know where [the students] are weak and to give instruction in a very small group or individualized instruction. This is different from during the day where they are in big classes. They get a full hour of instruction on what they are weak in, targeted at their needs, rather than a class as a whole. The program is totally focused on where the student’s weaknesses are based on previous MCAS tests.”

**Building student-teacher relationships**. As a result of small class sizes and targeted learning, Academic Support instructors were able to build trusting relationships with their students. Sixty percent of sites noted these relationships were critical for fostering student success and perseverance. Sites highlighted the importance of getting students to understand that their teacher(s) really cared about them and that they were “not just another kid in the class.” Students responded positively and performed better when they knew teachers genuinely cared about their well-being, were present, and were willing to help students. After the program ended, some interviewees stated that students would seek Academic Support teachers to share their success stories.

**High-quality teachers**. A quarter of the interviewees indicated that having high-quality teachers was very important for the success of Academic Support programs. One interviewee said, “The teachers really make this program. The teachers have such great interactions and relationships with these students and make them want to be there. There is a high level of trust and nurturing.” Two sites reported that ability to motivate students was also an important quality of teachers in their program. Finally, low teacher turnover across years, teachers being licensed in particular content areas, and teachers who were flexible were mentioned by individual sites as factors contributing to high-quality programming for students.

One interviewee noted, “Teachers need to be flexible. They need to understand that some weeks ten students will show up and the next only one. They have to not be bitter about it and just keep the ball rolling.” They continued by stating that teachers should not treat tutoring like a normal academic course in which students could be penalized for inconsistent attendance. Instead they should keep an open mind and realize that any tutoring a student can receive will ultimately help him or her achieve more long-term success.

**Communication among staff.** A few awardees reported that constant communication between staff was a key to the success of their program. Communication was often discussed by awardees in three ways: (1) communication among Academic Support teachers and between Academic Support teachers and classroom teachers as a way to check on student performance and progress; (2) communication between Academic Support programs and other departments like guidance or special education to help identify proper supports for students; and (3) communication between competitive grantees and sending high schools to try to obtain student information, including information regarding past MCAS test performance and information regarding upcoming test dates.

“It’s important to have open staff meetings. We need to have a thorough understanding of where students are. Why are students doing well in one class but not in another? We need to have communication with staff.”

**Attendance and engagement supports.** Twenty percent of sites noted the importance of resources used to support student attendance and engagement as an additional factor for success. Providing food during after-school and Saturday programs was often described as critical to the success of the programs. Students were more likely to attend when offered food and had increased attention when they were not feeling hungry. Assisting students with transportation via a late bus or public transportation also helped programs increase attendance and retention. A very small number of programs also utilized “incentives” such as gift cards from local businesses to increase student engagement with the program. These incentives, however, were often among the first strategies abandoned when faced with budget cuts.

**Program physical location**. Five out of nine competitive grantees highlighted the location of their program as important for student success. All Pathways grantees noted that being on a college campus especially helped students visualize life after high school and exposed students to what being a college student was like. Students were able to attend open houses, tour campuses, attend college functions, participate in clubs and activities on campuses, and were often given assistance with applying for financial aid at the completion of the program. One Work and Learning program was located in the same building as that campus’ Office of Disabilities, which allowed students to access additional resources they may not have received otherwise.

Another Work and Learning grantee described their space in the following way:

*“It is a communal, shared space because the students are pulled from other high schools and it’s easy to get to through public transportation. Coming here gets students out of their normal setting. If kids have failed, sometimes it’s also a mental block. Sometimes changing the dynamic for them makes them feel different. Whatever baggage they had before at [their] old school is left at the door, and they can just learn here. They know teachers are here to support them.”*

While program location was not specifically mentioned as a factor facilitating success for Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success students, two grantees described the importance of working within the community and alternative use of the school building as a success of the program. One grantee explained that by having the program's service learning project center on the school building, in this instance remodeling a school courtyard, students took ownership in the building and felt a higher level of connectedness to the school.

Effective Practices by Subgroup

Program administrators were asked what practices were most effective for improving the performance of English language learners, students with disabilities, and overaged students.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Subgroups targeted for intervention varied based on program location and the demographic profile of the school district or site. Slightly less than half off all interviewees said that because of the individualized nature of their program, there were no practices that were directly linked to a given subgroup. Instead, every student had their needs met through targeted support that could not be generalized for a given subgroup. Other programs offered suggestions for best practices by subgroups, which are summarized below. Of the 30 sites, 14 provided suggestions for working with English language learners, 10 provided suggestions for working with students with disabilities, and 7 offered suggestions for working with overaged students.

**English language learners**. Schools serving English language learners typically utilized teachers or tutors that were certified ELL instructors and/or bilingual. Schools emphasized the importance of working on vocabulary with ELL students. One school stated, “ELL students have a harder time passing both science and ELA MCAS [tests]. They have mastered their social language, but they don’t have the necessary academic language. This is especially pronounced in science because there are so many new technical words.” Academic remediation for ELL students often focused on mastering academic vocabulary and getting students more comfortable with the layout and wording of the tests. One site also reported providing dictionaries to their ELL students.

One Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantee reported that their program was solely focused on ELL students. This program was supported by an ESL professor from a local college, the school's Office of ELL, and a site supervisor who was a certified ESL specialist. Following the ELL framework model, this site used many strategies to teach ESL, including: working on vocabulary, reading, and writing skills in similar-level language groups and utilizing mixed-level ELL groups for creating final projects such that more-advanced ELL students were grouped with less-advanced students. Additionally, projects centered on community issues which allowed students to interact with community members and helped improve language through increasing listening and speaking skills.

**Students with disabilities (SWD)**. Two sites serving students with disabilities reported having discussions with SWD departments to identify what services work best for the individual students. Two additional sites mentioned using student’s individualized education plans to determine appropriate accommodations for SWD students. For instance, if a student was allowed to use a calculator during the test, they would be given one during tutoring sessions so they could practice in a setting closely mirroring the actual test setting.

While specific accommodations varied, sites generally agreed that small-group instruction and individualized attention were particularly important for students with disabilities. Small class sizes reduced distractions and increased focus. One school described their SWD students as frustrated with school in general. They recommended trying to build on successes first to increase student confidence among this population.

**Overaged students**. Very few schools reported serving overaged students through their Allocation grant program, although many said overaged students were invited to participate. Schools reported difficulties in attempting to make contact with students who were beyond grade 12 and no longer registered at school due to the transient nature of the population. Addresses and phone numbers were often out of date, making it difficult to get in touch with many of these students.

Work and Learning and Partnerships for Pathways to Success grantees reported greater success in serving overaged students. One Pathways grantee noted having greater success serving this population because that program was not at the high school. Other grantees shared similar sentiments, expressing that overaged students often did not want to return to their original high schools because of the stigma associated with not graduating or feeling as though they had failed. Large age gaps between high school and overaged students may also cause additional stressors, making it more difficult for overaged students to succeed in a high school setting. Additionally, some overaged students were not required to pass a science and technology/engineering MCAS test when they were in high school. When overaged students do come back for testing, they may be surprised to learn that they have an additional test that needs to be passed in order to graduate.

These grantees highlighted the importance of making overaged students feel like they were no longer in high school. Four interviewees from programs located at community colleges emphasized the student’s new role as a college student. One interviewee remarked, “When a student walks onto campus, none of the other students know they didn’t graduate from high school. They are just another college kid.” In addition, these grantees stressed the importance of preparing students for the next stage in their life, including preparing students for the job market or for post-secondary education. Looking toward the future helped students set goals and increased motivation.

Effective Practices by Subject

Program administrators were asked if there were any strategies that were particularly effective at improving ELA, mathematics, or science MCAS test performance. Some sites only offered tutoring support in one or two of the MCAS test subjects and could therefore only comment on supports for those particular subjects. Other sites offered tutoring services ranging across multiple subjects within the same setting or program.

A little more than half of all interviewees stated that strategies remained similar across the different subjects, reporting that tutoring targeted individual student needs and occurred in small-group settings. Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees highlighted the importance of service learning and project-based inquiry, and explained that the MCAS test subject being targeted varied year-to-year based on the focus of the project that year. The other half of interviewees did identify one or more effective subject specific practice, and those are listed below.

ELA:

* Practice writing. Many sites described spending the majority of ELA tutoring time on developing student compositions, reviewing old compositions from previous MCAS exams, discussing writing strategies, and breaking down composition prompts so students could understand what the prompts were asking for. Two Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees also described the creation of presentations, Power Points, and webpages as ways to improve writing skills.
* Read through passages. Tutoring often included reading passages from previous MCAS tests, identifying main themes, and discussing reading comprehension strategies.
* Identify books that are of high interest to students. Students who do not pass the ELA MCAS test may be struggling with reading in general. Teachers stressed the importance of identifying the right material to get students engaged.

Mathematics:

* Utilize content-driven support. Because the topics on the mathematics MCAS test tend to be similar across years, sites reported focusing on topics that they knew the test would include and that students typically to struggle with. For instance, schools reported focusing on key concepts from algebra, geometry, and probability during sessions.
* Practice test taking strategies used for different question types. Many students struggled with understanding what questions were asking. Students especially struggled with open-response questions with multiple parts. Instructors explained how to break down these questions question so that students could better understand what was being asked. When students could not answer the whole question, teachers encouraged students to still answer the parts they could in order to get partial credit. Instructors also reviewed general test-taking strategies, like eliminating alternative answer choices provided for multiple choice questions that cannot be correct.
* Underscore real-world applications. Three programs reviewed key mathematics concepts using real-world applications. For example, at one site students were asked to use algebraic equations to calculate how much pizza they would need to have at a pizza party, and were asked to find the dimensions of classroom furniture to practice concepts from geometry. The service project at another site centered on designing, measuring, and building a community garden where student utilized MCAS math skills to build handicap-accessible garden benches and flower beds.

Science:

* Practice vocabulary and memorization. Teachers remarked that, unlike the ELA and mathematics MCAS exams, the science exams tend to include more subject-specific vocabulary that needs to be memorized. Instructors spent considerable time reviewing vocabulary, quizzing students on definitions, and, at times, teaching students useful Latin roots.
* Use hands-on activities. Some students were given the opportunity to do hands-on learning during “lab” components of tutoring sessions. One district described using part of their Allocation grant in a previous year on circuit models, which they continue to use to prepare students for the technology and engineering MCAS test. Another district encouraged students to sign up for academic classes with formal lab components.

Grade 8 to 9 Transition and Success

Transition assistance varied widely across schools receiving Academic Support grants. Most schools stated that transition assistance was not the focus of their grant, they did not serve grade 9 students, or transition assistance had to be cut in favor of academic remediation components of programs due to budget cuts. Only 5 sites out of 30 reported having transition support as a part of their current Academic Support programs. Three of these sites were Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees. These schools spoke of the importance of transition programs in general. The two non-Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees spoke about their use of funds outside of the Academic Support grant to support these programs.

Sites that provided transition programs highlighted the importance of students becoming comfortable in the school and allowing students time to adjust to becoming high school students. Transition programs oriented students to the school building, to teachers they would have in grade 9, to school services, and to school resources. One site explained, "The 8th grade is coming from a context where failure is more acceptable in lower grades. They haven’t learned that they have to pass credits in order to continue on to the next grade. Many don’t believe it until it happens, that if you fail you don’t move on… they don’t have full academic or social learning curriculum to be successful in the high school." Summer programming allowed students to acclimate to the new responsibilities they would have to take on once they were in grade 9, with the ultimate goal of increasing the success of students in high school.

One school district stated that although supporting students transitioning from grade 8 to grade 9 was not an explicit goal of their program, participating students were engaged by staff members in academic supports at the very beginning of grade 9. These staff members clarified expectations regarding what was necessary for students to achieve success in high school, which ultimately had a positive effect on student transition.

“[The transition from 8th to 9th grade was] not a focus of the program, but does occur in the sense that it begins to engage them with a person that will support them academically. The students have a place to talk about skills and organization needed to be successful in high school. Students who struggle to graduate typically have difficulty their freshman year. If you can get them to be successful and passing classes at freshman level they [have] a better chance at graduating.”

Successes

Many successes are embedded in the effective strategies section of this report. All interviewees agreed that the greatest success of the Academic Support program was that students were more likely to receive their Competency Determination after participating in their program. Throughout the interviews, sites mentioned various other successes briefly. The following represents successes that were offered by individual sites:

* Students performed better in other academic classes. One interviewee noted that students performed better in core academic classes when they felt their academic needs were being met and their struggles were being recognized through additional support services.
* Students had increased confidence in their academic ability. One interviewee said, “Getting the students to pass the exam is a confidence booster. When you can show them that they can really do it, it really helps with confidence. When they find out they passed, they are beaming.”
* The programs increased the likelihood that students would graduate on time. One interviewee noted that since 2007, every student who had gone through their program had received their diploma on time.
* The programs decreased student behavior problems. One interviewee noted that when students were doing well academically they had fewer behavioral issues in class. Students felt more engaged and supported and were less likely to act out.
* The programs increased student’s connectedness to an adult in the building. One program reported that having both a classroom instructor and an MCAS test prep teacher gave students additional adults within the school they could turn to. One interviewee said, “Students knew that two people were looking out for them in terms of mathematics.” All Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees reported that students were able to build emotional connections to teachers prior to entering high school and that these relationships persisted throughout the students' high school careers.
* The programs increased student's connectedness to the school and to the community. Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantees reported that students were engaged in community issues as a result of their service learning projects. One noted that because their service learning project involved the physical high school building, students developed a deeper pride and sense of ownership in the building.
* Students were eager to celebrate their success with instructors. One interviewee said, “Passing the retest is a real celebration. It means a lot to students to finally pass after struggling.” Two additional sites reported that students sought out instructors after attaining their Competency Determination to share their successes.
* The programs helped students visualize the rest of their life. Work and Learning and Partnerships for Pathways for Success grantees noted that the program provided opportunities for students to start a career or enter college. The program helped students visualize what life would be like after high school.

“Many [students] come to [the] program feeling incapable. This program provides [students with] a restart, [an opportunity] to choose to be successful and to build their self-confidence and academic confidence.”

“Some of what we find works really well is to focus on strength gains and exposure to community. Getting students beyond the classroom walls and [exposing] them to meaningful experiences.”

“The program feels good for students. These are students who would typically fall through the cracks, they are failing classes, not having success on MCAS, but because they weren’t in special ed, it was, ‘Oh well.’ Now, there is a legitimate support for them that makes them feel good that their needs are being addressed and being taken seriously. It positively impacts their families. It positively impacts their classes. When they are in there and are doing well, you have less behavior problems, they are participating in class. It is all positive.”

Additional successes are provided in the survey analysis section of this report.

Challenges

Interviewees were asked to identify key challenges they have faced with their Academic Support programs. Budget cuts were cited as the cause of many challenges, including:

* Numbers of students served. As budgets decrease in size, programs were forced to limit the number of students they could serve through their Academic Support program(s). Many sites reported not being able to serve as many students as they had in the past. Sites commented on the difficulty of having to choose which students needed the program the most, when other students would also benefit from the support.
* Summer programming and transition programming. A few sites mentioned that previous summer programming or transition programming was eliminated in favor of direct academic remediation when faced with budget cuts. Sites with the smallest grants, especially those under $10,000, reported spending all their money on supporting academic instruction hours.
* Additional resources or incentives. While many sites described providing resources like food as an effective strategy, some sites had to cut this from their budget. Other sites also had to make cuts in resources provided to students by eliminating academic software licenses, workbooks, and other materials they would normally provide students. Transportation assistance was also cut from some programs. Without transportation, many students were unable to access tutoring. This was especially problematic for schools in more rural areas where access to public transportation was limited. Finally, one Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success program discussed the inability to use grant funding on stipends for students and how this hindered their recruiting efforts given that many students were from low-income families and had to work during the summer.

Other challenges reported by sites included the following:

* Attendance issues and student retention. Forty percent of sites, mainly running after-school and Saturday programs, struggled with getting students to consistently attend sessions. Many interviewees discussed the timing of their program as critically important to the success of their program, which is discussed in more detail in the advice and strategic considerations section below.
* Scheduling for students or teachers. Programs run during the school day were occasionally forced to assign tutoring sessions during academic classes rather than study hall periods, placing additional burden on students to keep up with their studies. Additionally, one site reported having difficulty scheduling teachers due to teachers feeling overburdened.
* Student motivation. Many sites reported that long wait times between testing dates and MCAS test scoring made it difficult to get students motivated to join a tutoring program. Students did not want to participate in an MCAS test tutoring program prior to knowing whether they failed the test.
* Recruiting and maintaining contact with overaged students. Overaged students tended to be highly transient and difficult to contact.
* Parental engagement. Some sites reported that they had low parent buy-in, which affected student motivation and participation.

Advice

Interviewees were asked to provide advice to other districts in three ways: (1) To provide advice regarding challenges they had outlined for their program; (2) to provide advice for sites thinking about starting an Academic Support program; (3) to provide advice for sites who are currently implementing an Academic Support program. These questions were only asked if time permitted. Of the 27 interviewees, 17 provided an answer in regards to at least one of the advice questions.

**Advice for dealing with challenges**

The following section summarizes advice provided by sites related to addressing program challenges outlined in the previous section. Advice was given on the following challenges: dealing with decreased budget, challenges associated with scheduling students to tutoring services, student motivation issues, recruiting and maintaining contact with overaged students, and dealing with challenges associated with parental buy-in. The quotes provided below best describe advice that was common across interviews.

Dealing with decreased budget. Interviewees suggested working outside of the boundaries of the grant by finding additional sources of funding, including other grants and school- or district-provided monies.

*“Don’t just work within [the] boundaries of the grant. When it comes short financially, use data you’ve tracked to show the success of your program so you can get money from other sources. You need to pound the pavement!”*

Dealing with challenges associated with scheduling students. Interviewees advised program administrators to look for anything else that may affect the schedule of the program, like snow days. Additionally, interviewees advised accommodating programming by taking advantage of free periods/study halls, or scheduling students to a support program "class" rather than squeezing a program into an existing schedule (i.e. having the program during other classes).

Dealing with challenges associated with student attendance. Interviewees advised flexibility with student attendance and enrollment, suggesting that enrollment cutoffs and mandatory attendance could be detrimental to the long-term success of students in the program. Additionally, a Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grantee recommended engaging students with a hands-on, student-centered, project-based program, stating that "if the program feels like school every day, students aren't going to come".

*“Encourage students to come, but a little bit of prep is better than none.”*

*“We don’t have a cutoff date for enrollment. If you want to enroll late, I want you there. If you can get what you need to pass in 4 days, I’m for it. You have to be open especially when kids are working or working parents, you have to take that into consideration.”*

Dealing with student motivation issues. Interviewees advised various approaches to student motivation, including active engagement with students, developing student-teacher relationships, and offering extra incentives like food.

“Don’t be afraid to ask questions [of] the students. You want to show the students that you are invested because the students will become invested.”

“Meet kids where they are at, especially before the impact of failure has set in.”

Dealing with challenges associated with recruiting and maintaining contact with students. Interviewees advised programs to engage in recruitment activities throughout the year. They also suggested working with community partners to better support the needs of the student population being served and to further support student outreach.

“In terms of recruitment, people need to know [about the program]. You have to [recruit] continually. Even if it was a flyer or in newspaper, too much is going on every day. If it wasn’t relevant at the time, people forget, so you need to be constantly recruiting.”

Dealing with challenges associated with parental buy-in. Interviewees advised programs to be in contact with as many adults present in a child’s life as possible in order to increase general support, motivation, and attendance.

“Tap into all adults that are present in the kid’s life. Reach out to parents, teachers, guardians, etc.”

**Advice for sites starting or currently implementing Academic Support programs**

Although we asked sites to provide advice for those sites thinking about launching similar programs and those already doing the work separately, sites did not make a clear distinction between these two groups. In general, advice offered by sites tended to reflect promising practices outlined above, like keeping class sizes small, building relationships with students, and choosing high-quality teachers. Selected examples of these themes are provided below.

“Address individual needs as opposed to working in a group situation where everyone is doing the same thing. One of our greatest successes is looking at individual students and their weaknesses and helping them improve on their weaknesses as opposed to [trying to do the same thing with] large group classroom instruction. Figure out what each student needs to be successful.”

“There’s a trust factor involved when trying to recruit students to program. We have a tight communication loop to create a triage support system. It is important to put in as many supports as possible to help these kids succeed. An in-school ally, an advocate, a champion in the school, is very important [to the success of a student].”

“Finding the right people is key [to the success of the program]. We have had the same English and math people for years.”

Some sites offered advice that was unique to their program experience. One site recommended patience in creating an Academic Support program, stating that curriculum and best practices emerge over time, while also emphasizing a need to stick with the program. Another program administrator cautioned against overburdening students with supports, pointing out the need for balance and fun in students’ day-to-day lives. Additional pieces of advice centered on utilizing student workforce, defining program ownership, increasing planning time, and engaging key stakeholders in the program. Selected examples of these themes are provided below:

“Use students to assist with the program. … Use students who are very willing, and they earn credits and community service. We have a huge force of students who spend their afternoons here during the school year every single day. This has been a tremendous help to the teachers because they are able to give these kids the one-on-one time that they need to address specific issues that we can’t generally do in a larger setting.”

“It is helpful that we have someone who ‘owns’ the program. It’s not just her title. She is aware of all of the kids who need support. She develops relationships with classroom teachers and guidance, and knows the kids schedules.”

*"Start planning very early! If you are going to do service learning you need to plan early. You can't do that during the last weeks of the school year. You need time to get your partnerships together. Make sure you leave enough time for planning, have strong partnerships... Try to pull the teaching team together early."*

“You need to meet key stakeholders in the school or district, like principals, in order to gain support for the program.”

**Advice for Scheduling Academic Support Programs**

Sites offered contradictory opinions in regards to the timing of their Academic Support programs, and all advocated strongly for changing the timing of the program to address attendance issues and increase student success. Some sites came to their conclusions based on trial and error over the course of multiple years of programming, while other programs had strong opinions about what would work depending on the context of their programs. Seven sites reported the timing of their programs as one of their most effective practices, while an additional five sites offered pieces of advice regarding the timing of the program.

Of the sites for which timing of the program was one of their most effective strategies, six recommended a school day model. After-school models were found to be difficult because it was hard to get students to commit to the program, students had low buy-in when the program was seen as “optional,” and the after-school timing interfered with competing priorities like sports, family care, and work. School day programs were often thought of as more successful because students were a “captive audience.” Because students got pulled from classes or had tutoring built into their scheduling, students were able to get the support they needed and had fewer opportunities to “skip.”

The remainder of sites offering after-school programming cautioned against placing supports during school time because it interfered with other classes. Typically, school day programs described pulling students out from study hall, but some sites did not have this as an option and had to pull students from other non-core academic classes or electives. One site running a school day program described this as a challenge because they did not want to pull students from classes they were succeeding in. For example, if a student excelled at art, the school did not want to take the student out of a class that set the student up for success and acted as a morale booster.

One program offered the following suggestion for balancing these competing concerns:

“In our old model, we used to provide after-school tutoring, but we could never get kids to participate. Putting it in school, during their schedule, works so much better. At one point we also tried a ‘pull out’ method, where students were pulled from other classes, but that started interfering with other work. I have found that trying to get an attentive group of students requires having an actual class, during the school day, which is part of their schedule, where they get academic credit. It provides academic support for other classes in addition to filling holes found using the data from previous MCAS [tests]. By doing this, we find students being successful in their academic classes. If they are doing well in their normal ELA, and math classes, it has a direct correlation to doing well/improving on the MCAS. It also addresses direct concerns on the MCAS.”

# Demographic Characteristics of Participants

This section provides a brief overview of the demographic composition of various pools of participating and non-participating students that are of interest for this study.

The table on the following page summarizes the demographic composition of students who participated in the Academic Support programs, students who were eligible to participate but did not do so, and all students (grades 8–12) statewide. Data for participants and eligible non-participants were taken from SY13 and SY14.[[13]](#footnote-13) The unduplicated pool of participants from SY13 and SY14 included 25,047 students. The pool of eligible non-participants from SY13 and SY14 included 163,762 students. To facilitate comparisons, statewide averages from SY14 are also included in the table.

| **State-wide Student Participation in Academic Support Programs by Subgroup, SY13 and SY14** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Academic Support Participants**  **(N=25,047)**  **(%)** | **Eligible to Participate, but did not Participate**  **(N=163,762)**  **(%)** | **SY14 State Average for all 8th–12th Grade Students**  **(N=368,092)**  **(%)** |
| **Early Warning Indicator System Risk Level** | | | |
| High Risk | 22 | 24 | 14 |
| Moderate Risk | 22 | 27 | 13 |
| Low Risk | 56 | 49 | 73 |
| **Special Populations** | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 37 | 30 | 18 |
| English Language Learners | 17 | 7 | 5 |
| Free or Reduced-Price Lunch | 57 | 52 | 36 |
| **Gender** | | | |
| Male | 52 | 53 | 51 |
| Female | 48 | 47 | 49 |
| **Race/Ethnicity** | | | |
| African American/Black | 16 | 13 | 9 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 27 | 23 | 15 |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic or Latino | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 50 | 57 | 68 |
| **Grade Level** | | | |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 22 | 20 |
| Grade 9 | 14 | 25 | 21 |
| Grade 10 | 33 | 17 | 20 |
| Grade 11 | 31 | 17 | 19 |
| Grade 12 | 16 | 17 | 19 |
| Other | 4 | 0 | 1 |

A total of 188,809 students were eligible to participate in Academic Support programs between SY13 and SY14.[[14]](#footnote-14) Of those, 25,047 students actually participated in programming.

The demographic composition of participating students was notably different from eligible non-participants and students grades 8–12 statewide during these years. Students with disabilities, English language learners, and students receiving free or reduced price lunch were over represented in the sample of students served by Academic Support groups when compared to percentages of these same groups among eligible non-participants and students grades 8–12 statewide.

In SY13 and SY14, the portion of Academic Support participants that were students with disabilities (37 percent) was larger than the portion of eligible non-participants (30 percent) and all students statewide (18 percent) of the same group.

The percent of participating students that were English language learners (17 percent), was over three times as large as the percent of all students statewide that were identified as such (5 percent). Similarly, 57 percent of participating students received free or reduced-price lunch, as opposed to 36 percent of all students statewide.

The table also indicates that 44 percent of Academic Support participants and 43 percent of eligible non-participants were identified as being at “high” or “moderate” risk of not achieving important academic milestones, while only 27 percent of all students statewide were designated as such. The percentage of participants designated as “low risk” (56 percent) was higher than the percentage of eligible non-participants in that group (49 percent). This may be due to a number of factors, such as low-risk students being more motivated to participate in Academic Support programs, as they are (likely) passing more classes and/or closer to the MCAS proficiency cutoff than moderate or high-risk students.

The percentage of participants who were African-American/Black (16 percent) was higher than the percentage of eligible non-participants (13 percent) and all students statewide (9 percent) who were identified as such. Similarly, 27 percent of participants were Hispanic/Latino, while 23 percent of eligible non-participants and 15 percent of all students statewide were identified as such.

The table on the next page summarizes the demographic composition of Academic Support participants by grant type. The last grant type listed in the table, Higher Education Institutions and Partners, did not exist at the time of the interviews and survey dissemination (SY16), but was included in analysis of data from SY13 and SY14.

Allocation grant programs served more students (22,336) than all other grant combined from SY13 to SY14. Competitive Academic Support grants funded smaller groups of students. This is because Allocation grants were awarded to all schools that applied, whereas competitive Academic Support grants were awarded to a small number of schools or institutions through a competitive application process.

| **State-wide Student Participation in Academic Support Programs by Grant Type and Subgroup, SY13 and SY14** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Allocation Participants**  **(N=22,336)**  **(%)** | **Work & Learning Participants**  **(N=649)**  **(%)** | **Pathways for Partnerships to Success Participants**  **(N=834)**  **(%)** | **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Participants**  **(N=760)**  **(%)** | **Higher Education Institutions and Partners Participants**  **(N=512)**  **(%)** |
| **Early Warning Indicator System Risk Level** | | | | | |
| High Risk | 20 | 52 | 61 | 25 | 46 |
| Moderate Risk | 22 | 19 | 12 | 21 | 22 |
| Low Risk | 58 | 29 | 27 | 54 | 32 |
| **Special Populations** | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 37 | 42 | 46 | 32 | 37 |
| English Language Learners | 16 | 34 | 20 | 15 | 38 |
| Free or Reduced-Price Lunch | 55 | 84 | 66 | 66 | 74 |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
| Male | 52 | 48 | 48 | 58 | 39 |
| Female | 48 | 52 | 52 | 43 | 61 |
| **Race/Ethnicity** | | | | | |
| African American/Black | 15 | 26 | 30 | 16 | 37 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Asian | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 38 | 30 | 29 | 38 |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic or Latino | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 52 | 29 | 35 | 44 | 18 |
| **Grade Level** | | | | | |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Grade 9 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 23 | 1 |
| Grade 10 | 34 | 9 | 1 | 59 | 5 |
| Grade 11 | 33 | 27 | 4 | 12 | 22 |
| Grade 12 | 15 | 53 | 12 | 3 | 36 |
| Other | 1 | 8 | 82 | 0 | 36 |

Notable differences in demographic composition exist across grant type. Work and Learning grant programs, Higher Education Institutions and Partners grant programs, and Pathways for Partnerships to Success grant programs served a higher percentage of students who were designated as high-risk by EWIS when compared Allocation and Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grant programs.

For all grant types, over half of students served received free or reduced-price lunch. A larger percentage of female students were served by Higher Education Institutions and Partners grant programs than other grant types (61%), whereas a noticeably larger percentage of male students were served by Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success grant programs (58%).

Work and Learning, Pathways for Partnerships to Success, and Higher Education Institutions and Partners grant programs served a noticeably higher percentage of African-American students. The percentage of Hispanic students served was higher for competitive grant programs as compared to the percentage of Hispanic/Latino students served by Allocation grants. Allocation grant programs served more white students than all other grant types (by percent), particularly Higher Education Institutions and Partners.

Observed variations in students served by grade level were consistent with program design. Allocation and CPSS programs were targeted largely at students who were in danger of failing or had recently failed one or more grade 10 MCAS subject assessments. Participants in these programs were more likely to be grade 10 and 11 students, reflecting the aim of the Allocation and CPSS programs. Work and Learning, Pathways for Partnerships to Success, and Higher Education Institutions and Partners programs were targeted mainly at serving older students, emphasizing pathways to higher education and employment, and were more likely to serve grade 12 (or older) students.

Additional information regarding district level composition of students served by grant type is provided in Appendix I. Tables report the number of students participating in Academic Support programs, broken down by grant type, by district, and by eligibility to participate in Academic Support programs.

The table below shows the demographic composition of students who participated in Academic Support programs disaggregated by the accountability level of the school district in which they were enrolled during their final year of participation. Level 1 districts are the highest performing, and Level 5 districts are the lowest performing.

| **State-wide Student Participation in Academic Support Programs by Accountability Level and Subgroup, SY13 and SY14** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Level 1**  **(N=1,652)**  **(%)** | **Level 2**  **(N=8,337)**  **(%)** | | **Level 3**  **(N=8,455)**  **(%)** | | **Level 4**  **(N=5,181)**  **(%)** | **Level 5**  **(N=776)**  **(%)** | |
| **Early Warning Indicator System Risk Level** | | | | | | | | |
| High Risk | 5 | | 11 | 26 | 38 | | | 34 |
| Moderate Risk | 14 | | 18 | 26 | 24 | | | 26 |
| Low Risk | 82 | | 71 | 47 | 38 | | | 40 |
| **Special Populations** | | | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 52 | | 43 | 32 | 31 | | | 23 |
| English Language Learners | 3 | | 4 | 19 | 35 | | | 44 |
| Free or Reduced-Price Lunch | 35 | | 35 | 68 | 77 | | | 90 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 57 | | 52 | 53 | 50 | | | 51 |
| Female | 43 | | 48 | 47 | 50 | | | 49 |
| **Race/Ethnicity** | | | | | | | | |
| African American/Black | 4 | | 10 | 18 | 30 | | | 2 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Asian | 2 | | 3 | 6 | 4 | | | 0 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | | 10 | 31 | 40 | | | 93 |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic or Latino | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 0 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| White | 80 | | 75 | 42 | 24 | | | 4 |
| **Grade Level** | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 8 | 1 | | 4 | 3 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Grade 9 | 5 | | 13 | 16 | 15 | | | 9 |
| Grade 10 | 45 | | 37 | 32 | 27 | | | 27 |
| Grade 11 | 40 | | 35 | 29 | 27 | | | 24 |
| Grade 12 | 8 | | 10 | 18 | 22 | | | 36 |
| Other | 0 | | 1 | 1 | 9 | | | 4 |

The table represents a total of 24,401 Academic Support participants.[[15]](#footnote-15) The greatest numbers of participants were served by Level 2 and Level 3 districts and the smallest number were served by Level 5 districts.

The table above shows summarizes the demographic composition of Academic Support participants served by districts assigned to different levels of accountability. Districts assigned to accountability Level 1 or Level 2 were more likely to serve students designated by EWIS as low-risk than districts assigned to accountability Level 3, Level 4, or Level 5.

The percentage of participants who received free or reduced-price lunch decreased as accountability level decreased (from 90 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 5 districts to 35 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 1 districts). This could be due to the fact that the percentage of low-income students in districts with higher accountability levels is likely to be higher than in districts with lower accountability levels.

The percentage of participants who were English language learners decreased as accountability level decreased (from 44 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 5 districts to 3 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 1 districts). The percentage of participants with disabilities served increased as accountability level decreased (from 23 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 5 districts to 52 percent of participants served by districts assigned to accountability Level 1 districts).

The percentage of male students was higher than the percentage of female students at Level 1 schools, whereas the percentages of male and female students were more similar at higher district accountability levels. Most participants (93 percent) served at districts assigned to accountability Level 5 were Hispanic/Latino, while the majority of students served at districts assigned to accountability Level 1 were white.

# Strategic Considerations

The following recommendations for ESE may help enhance the impact of Academic Support programs and reduce key barriers to success.

ESE may wish to offer sites guidance and/or technical assistance. Survey and interview findings suggest the following activities may be appropriate:

* Offer technical assistance regarding programmatic timing and structure.Specific attention should be dedicated to the potential benefits and challenges associated with the timing of the program (in school versus after school) and the structure of the program (all year long versus shorter, more intensive sessions). Program timing and structure came up as elements programs struggled with the most. Many interviewees discussed adjusting the timing or structure of their programs over multiple years, with many trying new things every year with the hope of identifying a program configuration that worked well for their students and staff. While some sites were satisfied with the timing and structure of their programs, ESE may wish to provide guidance to sites regarding key considerations for designing and optimizing their programs.
* Provide sites with strategies for maximizing grant impacts. Some sites reported being able to combine their Academic Support grants with other funding streams, and as a result were able to serve greater numbers of students and provide additional services. Other sites were not able to procure additional funds and struggled to provide the same level of services they had in previous years. Some sites reported cuts to summer programming or a reduction in the number of students they were able to serve. Sites receiving smaller Allocation grants often reported spending all of their money on direct instructional support. With 76 percent of all schools receiving Allocation funding now receiving grants under $10,000, ESE may wish to provide guidance on maximizing grant impacts, bolstering funds through other grant opportunities, or raising funds through their respective sites in order to ensure the sustainability of the Academic Support programs.
* Identify strategies to enhance early intervention efforts. Early intervention can help reduce the number of students having to take a retest and in doing so avoid many of the negative ramifications that can come to the student after having experienced a failure. The current Allocation grant guidelines require that all students assigned an achievement level of “warning” or “failure” on their previous MCAS test must be served before students assigned an achievement level of “needs improvement” on their grade 8 MCAS test who may be in danger of failing their grade 10 MCAS test. Because of the size and scope of the current Allocation grant, many sites had to make difficult decisions regarding which students to serve—those who were likely to fail or those who have failed already because they did not have enough resources to serve all students in need of support. One site labeled this the “wait until failure model.” Although a few interviewees stated the importance of early intervention, few were able to serve 8th or 9th graders. ESE may wish to help districts identify strategies to enhance early intervention efforts.

“Because funds keep getting cut, there are often only enough funds to target kids who have already failed. I have enough data to identify kids who may be in danger of failing using, for instance, 8th-grade ELA MCAS scores and 9th-grade ELA grades to know that they should be getting services. It doesn’t sit well to wait until they fail. Everyone should have access to these services because they are really important. A lot of students that really need this don’t get included, which is a shame.”

* Encourage sites to consider accommodations for students required to retest. Overaged students face unique obstacles to achieving their Competency Determination. One site serving overaged students described them as wary of school, while a competitive grantee spoke of the trauma students feel when forced to enter a school that they left in the first place in order to take their MCAS test. Because there are no regional testing centers, students are assigned to their “sending” school for testing, which may cause feelings of failure to resurface. One site reported that being surrounded by younger students also alienated students and made it more difficult for them to do well upon retesting. ESE may wish to encourage sites to consider accommodations for students, especially overaged students, who are required to retest in order to help them feel more confident—and ultimately be more successful—when retesting.

“At the career panel we had student share reflections about failing the MCAS. We addressed socio-emotional components. Many of the students opened up and discussed the trauma of failing the MCAS and the stigma of being a failure—not only from other students but from family members who said they are not smart enough. They got emotional and pivoted to provide more of a therapeutic session—to get them feeling positive about taking the test. Many [were] feeling nervous and had high anxiety. After the test, students said they felt prepared and really tried.”

ESE may wish to consider strategies for improving competitive grantees’ access to information regarding student performance on MCAS in order to help these programs better serve their students.

* Streamline the process through which competitive grantees are able to access student information. Competitive grantees require a more streamlined approach to gathering information regarding the students in their programs. Specifically, competitive grantees face barriers in accessing past MCAS testing data for their students without the assistance from the student’s sending school. ESE may wish to offer additional support to competitive grantees in regards to building relationships with sending schools and navigating the process through which they are able to access information about their students.

# Conclusions

The final report describes conclusions drawn from all research activities and findings.

Findings indicate that Academic Support programs were very successful. Quantitative analyses consistently report that the Academic Support programs have a strong, positive impact on increasing the likelihood that participants gained their Competency Determination. This finding is echoed by the qualitative analyses. Nearly all Academic Support program administrators reported—through survey and/or interview—that their program(s) met the goal of improving student performance on MCAS.

Quantitative analyses also confirm that Academic Support programs have a significant effect on reducing the likelihood of dropping out and increasing rates of attendance in the year following participation. Outside of these, most respondents also agreed that the programs had additional positive outcomes, such as increased connectedness to adults, increased confidence in academic ability, increased connections with school, increased college and career readiness skills, and earning course credits. Administrators reported that students were attracted to Academic Support programs because they provided small group or targeted instruction, the programs were free and convenient, and the program staff were engaging and supportive.

Quantitative findings suggest a particularly strong impact among Allocation programs and, in particular, science-focused programs. The largest positive impacts were often found for grade 10 and grade 11 students, while more negative outcomes, such as a lower likelihood to graduate by one year after participation, were seen in grade 12 students, suggesting that programs may be more effective prior to grade 12. Even though there are fewer positive results for grade 12 students and overaged students, these programs are nonetheless important for targeting these at-risk youth in an effort to increase their likelihood of gaining their Competency Determination in order to graduate. Every student that these programs are able to prevent from dropping out of high school is a distinct success for the Commonwealth.

Academic Support programs were particularly successful at serving high needs students, including English language learners, students with disabilities, and those eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch. These groups of students were overrepresented in the sample of students served by Academic Support programs compared to the statewide percentages of these same groups.

While administrators overwhelmingly reported positive impacts on students, programs were not without challenges. Nearly all sites said that budget cuts were a significant challenge. Budget cuts resulted in reductions in the number of students being served, elimination of summer programming, and termination of program incentives. Other challenges included attendance issues, student retention, scheduling, student motivation, recruiting and maintaining contact with overaged students, and engaging parents/guardians. Although the majority of respondents highlighted the importance of their Academic Support programs for increasing students' likelihood of gaining their Competency Determination, only 4 percent of respondents indicated that they would likely continue all of their current Academic Support activities without continued funding. More than half of respondents said that their programs would cease entirely without continued support.

Quantitative analyses and findings are limited only to those effects that can be measured one year after participation. More information should be gathered on the effects of participation two and three years after, especially in terms of graduation status.

# Appendices

Appendix A: Methods for Quantitative Analysis

For the Academic Support outcome analyses, differences between treatment and comparison group students were assessed using a quasi-experimental matched comparison group design. Multi-level mixed-effect logistic regression analyses were conducted to assess the impact of participation­ on Competency Determination, graduation, and dropout status. Similarly, a multi-level mixed-effect regression analysis was conducted to assess the impact of participation on participants’ post-intervention rate of attendance. Carefully selected covariates were included in each analysis to minimize the potential for bias. These covariates included gender, race/ethnicity, low-income status, English language learner status, disability status, grade level, rate of attendance, and pre-intervention MCAS performance. This design enabled strong inferences about the outcomes for students who participated in the intervention as compared to the expected level of student performance in the absence of the intervention.

Students were not randomly assigned to the intervention. In addition to specific requirements set forth by ESE, staff at each site applied their own criteria to assign students to treatment. Because funds at some sites were limited, not all students that were eligible to participate were chosen to participate. Therefore, it is likely that there were pre-intervention differences between participating students and non-participating students. These differences could have represented a significant threat (i.e., selection bias) to the validity of the study’s findings. To reduce these differences substantially, propensity score weighting procedures were used, thereby improving the validity of the estimates of program impacts.

In total, 155 models comparing Academic Support participants to non-participants were analyzed. Propensity score weighting results were within the parameters specified in the U.S. Department of Education’s What Works Clearinghouse “Procedures and Standards Handbook” (2014) for all of the models assessed in this study. Data collected were pooled across years, reflecting an assumption that the effects of participation in Academic Support programs were similar across years of the study.

Results for outcomes were assessed one year after participation. Separate sampling and modeling procedures were developed to assess different outcomes because outcomes were dependent on the grade level of the participating student. Analyses were conducted separately for grades 8–12 students and overaged students. The following sample selection description corresponds to analyses conducted for grades 8–12. Sampling procedure for overaged students will be reported separately in Appendix B.

**Sample selection.** Sites were not included in the final sample if they did not have both eligible participating and eligible non-participating students. In order to nest the data, all students had to have a valid school code. Students participating in Competitive Grantee programs located off campus (at colleges or career centers) were assigned to their original/sending schools. The resulting treatment samples included a total of 20,510 participants from 476 sites.[[16]](#footnote-16) The comparison sample included all 119,231 students who were enrolled at these sites in the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years but did not participate in Academic Support programs.

The treatment subsamples utilized for Competency Determination, graduation, dropout, and attendance models differed by outcome. Models that assessed Competency Determination included students in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Models that assessed dropout status included students in all grades from 8 to 12. Models assessing graduation status included only grades 11 and 12, as those would be the only grades expected to have graduated one year after participation. Models assessing attendance the year after participation included all participants, grades 8 to 11.

Comparison samples also varied by outcome. Members of the comparison group who were registered at a participating site for multiple years of the study were randomly assigned a “year of intervention,” and outcomes for those students were assessed from that point in time. For example, a comparison student who was registered in a participating site in school years 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 could have been randomly assigned to either school year as a year of intervention. Assigning this designation was required to carry out the outcome analyses.

A subset of analyses were conducted by instruction subject. These analyses were limited to participants for whom we could verify their participation in one or more subjects. Subject specific analyses were not conducted for One-Stop Career Center programs, as they did not report instruction subject.

**Modeling procedures.** For all students and for all subgroups of interest, mixed-effects logistic regression models were developed to assess the impact of the intervention on Competency Determination, graduation, and dropout status. Mixed-effects logistic regression contains both fixed effects and random effects. The equation below represents the general modeling procedure. Some covariates were not included in certain analyses. For example, when assessing impacts by gender, the gender covariate was removed from the model.

*Yij* *= β0 + β1*(*Participantij*) *+β2*(*Attendance Year Priorij*) *+β3*(*Whiteij*) *+β4*(*Afr. Amer./Blackij*) *+β5*(*Asianij*) *+β6*(*Hispanic/Latinoij*) *+β7*(*Maleij*) *+β8*(*FRLij*) *+β9*(*ELLij*) *+β10*(*SWDij*) *+ β11*(*Grade 09ij*)*+β11*(*Grade 10ij*) *+β12*(*Grade 11ij*) *+β13*(*Grade 12ij*) *+β14*(*ELA Scaled MCAS Scoreij*) *+β15*(*Mathematics Scaled MCAS Scoreij*) *+β16*(*Science Scaled MCAS Scoreij*) *+ u0j + eij*

For *i =* 1, … , *nj* students,and *j =* 1, … , nsites*.*

Random effects were included to account for site and individual student effects by adding a random error term for each site (*ui*) and for each individual observation (*eij*). *β0* represents the intercept. The coefficients *β1* through *β16* represent the fixed effects of a given covariate on the outcome (*Yij*).

For this study, the coefficient of greatest interest was *β1*,which represents the estimated impact of program participation on the outcome of interest. Outcomes of interest included Competency Determination, graduation status, dropout status, and percent in attendance one year after participation.

Appendix B: Methods for Overaged Student Models

For the Academic Support overaged student analyses, differences between treatment and comparison group students were assessed using a logistic regression model with a matched comparison group design. For this particular design, the treatment group represents all overaged students participating in Academic Support programs that had a minimum amount of complete background information. Because there is no “similar” comparison group (i.e., overaged, eligible non-participating students) for which there was information collected, the analyses used a sample of eligible non-participating grade 12 students as the comparison group.

All overaged students participating in an Academic Support program were dropout students who were reengaged by the program. A small portion of students were formally reengaged, however, and, as a result, only these students had official school records. Most other students participated in programming in alternative locations, like community colleges or one-stop career centers. As a result, overaged students were not able to be nested within schools. Because we cannot adequately nest students within a school, we are unable to control for inherent differences in educational context.

Logistic regression analyses were conducted to assess the impact of participation­ on Competency Determination, graduation, and dropout status. Some covariates were included in each analysis to minimize the potential for bias. These covariates included gender, race/ethnicity, low-income status, English language learner status, and disability status.

Unlike the all-student models, the overaged student models were unable to account for differences in previous MCAS performance, as many students were missing complete information for these fields. This may be because many of the students had dropped out prior to having to take the exam in grade 10 or because they dropped out prior to MCAS science becoming a requirement for graduation. Had we chosen to limit the sample to only those who had complete MCAS information, the majority of the sample would have been eliminated. As such, we chose to remove MCAS as a weighting factor in order to preserve as much of the sample as possible.

**Sample Selection**. All overaged students were included in the model provided they had complete information for all of the weighting factors outlined previously. The comparison sample included all eligible non-participating grade 12 students who also had complete information. These students are inherently dissimilar given their student status, which introduces bias into the models, but they nonetheless represent the best available option for a comparison group.

Students were not randomly assigned to the intervention. In addition to specific requirements set forth by ESE, staff at each site applied their own criteria to assign students to treatment. Because funds at some sites were limited, not all students that were eligible to participate were chosen to participate. Additionally, some funds were targeted specifically at younger students and were consequently not open to overaged students (like the CPSS grant). Therefore, it is likely that there were pre-intervention differences between participating students and non-participating students. These differences could have represented a significant threat (i.e., selection bias) to the validity of the study’s findings. To reduce these differences, propensity score weighting procedures were used, thereby improving the validity of the estimates of program impacts.

Propensity score weighting results were not within the parameters specified in the U.S. Department of Education’s What Works Clearinghouse “Procedures and Standards Handbook” (2014) for all of the models assessed in this study, indicating that the weighting procedure does not adequately account for the differences prior to treatment between the comparison and treatment groups. Data collected were pooled across years, reflecting an assumption that the effects of participation in Academic Support programs were similar across years of the study.

The resulting treatment samples included a total of 1,004 participants. The comparison sample included all 28,256 grade 12 students who were enrolled at these sites in the 2012–13 and 2013–14 school years and who were eligible for, but did not participate in, Academic Support programs.

**Modeling procedures.** For all students and for all subgroups of interest, logistic regression models were developed to assess the impact of the intervention on Competency Determination, graduation, and dropout status. The equation below represents the general modeling procedure. Some covariates were not included in certain analyses. For example, when assessing impacts by gender, the gender covariate was removed from the model.

*Yij* *= β0 + β1*(*Participantij*) *+β2*(*Whiteij*) *+β3*(*Afr. Amer./Blackij*) *+β4*(*Asianij*) *+β5*(*Hispanic/Latinoij*) *+β6*(*Maleij*) *+β7*(*FRLij*) *+β8*(*ELLij*) *+β9*(*SWDij*) *+ eij*

For *i =* 1, … , *nj* students,and *j =* 1, … , nsites*.*

*β0* represents the intercept. The coefficients *β1* through *β9* represent the effects of a given covariate on the outcome (*Yij*).

For this study, the coefficient of greatest interest was *β1*,which represents the estimated impact of program participation on the outcome of interest. Outcomes of interest included Competency Determination, graduation status, dropout status, and percent in attendance one year after participation.

Appendix C: Quantitative Results for All Models

| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Gaining Competency Determination** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | All | 1.44\*\*\* | [1.28, 1.60] |
| Male | 1.44\*\*\* | [1.28, 1.62] |
| Female | 1.42\*\*\* | [1.25, 1.61] |
| White | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.33, 1.76] |
| African Amer./Black | 1.52\*\*\* | [1.22, 1.89] |
| Asian | 1.36 | [0.99, 1.88] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1.26\*\* | [1.07, 1.47] |
| FRL | 1.31\*\*\* | [1.17, 1.47] |
| ELL | 1.27\*\* | [1.07, 1.50] |
| SWD | 1.47\*\*\* | [1.31, 1.64] |
| Low Accountability | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.30, 1.69] |
| High Accountability | 0.84\* | [0.73, 0.97] |
| Grade 9 | 1.84\*\*\* | [1.30, 2.59] |
| Grade 10 | 1.73\*\*\* | [1.44, 2.08] |
| Grade 11 | 1.37\*\*\* | [1.14, 1.65] |
| Grade 12 | 1.03 | [0.85, 1.24] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.33, 1.77] |
| Math | 1.42\*\*\* | [1.24, 1.63] |
| SCI | 1.57\*\*\* | [1.38, 1.78] |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grants** | All | 1.74\*\*\* | [1.25, 2.43] |
| ELA | 1.85\*\*\* | [1.43, 2.41] |
| Math | 1.55\*\* | [1.15, 2.10] |
| SCI | 1.80\* | [1.13, 2.86] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | 0.77 | [0.50, 1.18] |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | 0.83 | [0.53, 1.30] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Work & Learning Programs** | All | 1.20 | [0.88, 1.62] |
| ELA | 1.33 | [0.73, 2.41] |
| Math | 1.40\* | [1.03, 1.91] |
| SCI | 1.29 | [0.86, 1.94] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.32, 1.66] |
| ELA | 1.53\*\*\* | [1.31, 1.79] |
| Math | 1.45\*\*\* | [1.26, 1.67] |
| SCI | 1.63\*\*\* | [1.42, 1.87] |
| **One-Stop Career Centers** | All | 0.44 | [0.18, 1.06] |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |

| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Graduation Status** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | All | 0.82\* | [0.70, 0.96] |
| Male | 0.84\* | [0.73, 0.97] |
| Female | 0.79\* | [0.64, 0.97] |
| White | 0.82\* | [0.67, 0.99] |
| Asian | 0.79 | [0.55, 1.13] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.70\* | [0.52, 0.93] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1.01 | [0.82, 1.25] |
| FRL | 0.93 | [0.78, 1.11] |
| ELL | 0.89 | [0.71, 1.12] |
| SWD | 1.02 | [0.86, 1.22] |
| Low Accountability | 0.82 | [0.67, 1.01] |
| High Accountability | 0.85 | [0.64, 0.12] |
| Grade 11 | 1.10 | [0.90, 1.35] |
| Grade 12 | 0.58\*\*\* | [0.47, 0.70] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 0.89 | [0.74, 1.08] |
| Math | 0.91 | [0.76, 1.10] |
| SCI | 1.24\* | [1.01, 1.60] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grants** | All | 0.82 | [0.35, 1.95] |
| ELA | 3.69 | [0.65, 21.03] |
| Math | 1.09 | [0.49, 2.42] |
| SCI | 2.59 | [0.43, 15.46] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | 0.66 | [0.41, 1.08] |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | 0.62 | [0.35, 1.10] |
| SCI | 0.60 | [0.35, 1.03] |
| **Work & Learning Programs** | All | 0.54\* | [0.31, 0.94] |
| ELA | 0.39\*\* | [0.22, 0.71] |
| Math | 0.74 | [0.40, 1.37] |
| SCI | 0.50\*\* | [0.31, 0.81] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.87 | [0.73, 1.03] |
| ELA | 0.92 | [0.76, 1.12] |
| Math | 0.94 | [0.77, 1.15] |
| SCI | 1.48\*\*\* | [1.18, 1.85] |
| **One-Stop Career Centers** | All | 0.44\* | [0.19, 0.98] |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |

| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Dropout Status** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup**  **Subgroup** | All | 0.54\*\*\* | [0.46, 0.62] |
| Male | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.62] |
| Female | 0.57\*\*\* | [0.49, 0.68] |
| White | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.64] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.58\*\*\* | [0.44, 0.75] |
| Asian | n/a |  |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.61\*\*\* | [0.48, 0.77] |
| FRL | 0.59\*\*\* | [0.50, 0.71] |
| ELL | n/a |  |
| SWD | 0.56\*\*\* | [0.46, 0.68] |
| Low Accountability | 0.49\*\*\* | [0.41, 0.58] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | High Accountability | 0.64\*\* | [0.48, 0.87] |
| Grade 8 | 1.41 | [0.42, 4.67] |
| Grade 9 | 0.74+ | [0.55, 1.00] |
| Grade 10 | 0.47\*\*\* | [0.33, 0.65] |
| Grade 11 | 0.37\*\*\* | [0.28, 0.47] |
| Grade 12 | 0.71\* | [0.55, 0.93] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.64] |
| Math | 0.54\*\*\* | [0.45, 0.63] |
| SCI | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.63] |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grants** | All | 0.73 | [0.45, 1.17] |
| ELA | 0.69 | [0.42, 1.12] |
| Math | 0.84 | [0.53, 1.34] |
| SCI | 0.62 | [0.20, 1.88] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |
| **Work & Learning Programs** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.52\*\*\* | [0.44, 0.61] |
| ELA | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.41, 0.64] |
| Math | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.43, 0.61] |
| SCI | 0.51\*\*\* | [0.42, 0.63] |
| **One-Stop Career Center** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Gaining Competency Determination** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | All | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.60, 0.71] |
| Male | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.01] |
| Female | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| White | 0.003\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.02\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| Asian | 0.004 | [-0.01, 0.01] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| FRL | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| ELL | 0.03\*\* | [0.01, 0.05] |
| SWD | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.63, 0.80] |
| Low Accountability | 0.01\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| High Accountability | 0.02\*\* | [0.01, 0.04] |
| Grade 8 | 0.00 | [-0.01, 0.01] |
| Grade 9 | 0.01 | [-0.00, 0.02] |
| Grade 10 | 0.01\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Grade 11 | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| **Subject** | ELA | 0.01\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Math | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| SCI | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grants** | All | 0.01+ | [0.00, 0.02] |
| ELA | 0.00 | [-0.01, 0.02] |
| Math | 0.01 | [-0.01, 0.03] |
| SCI | 0.01 | [-0.01, 0.02] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |
| **Work & Learning Programs** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| ELA | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.02] |
| Math | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| SCI | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| **One-Stop Career Center** | All | n/a |  |
| ELA | n/a |  |
| Math | n/a |  |
| SCI | n/a |  |

Appendix D: Significant Results for Overaged Student Models

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Gaining Competency Determination, Overaged Students** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **All** | All | 0.04\*\*\* | [0.04, 0.05] |
| **Subgroup** | Male | 0.04\*\*\* | [0.03, 0.05] |
| Female | 0.05\*\*\* | [0.04, 0.06] |
| White | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.07\*\*\* | [0.05, 0.09] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.06\*\*\* | [0.05, 0.08] |
| FRL | 0.04\*\*\* | [0.03, 0.05] |
| ELL | 0.11\*\*\* | [0.08, 0.16] |
| SWD | 0.03\*\*\* | [0.03, 0.04] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.04\*\*\* | [0.03, 0.04] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | 0.04\*\*\* | [0.03, 0.06] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Graduation Status, Overaged Students** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **All** | All | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| **Subgroup** | Female | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| White | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| African Amer./Black | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.04] |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| FRL | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |
| ELL | 0.03 | [0.02, 0.05] |
| SWD | 0.01\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.02] |
| **Allocation Grants** | All | 0.00\*\*\* | [0.00, 0.01] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | 0.02\*\*\* | [0.01, 0.03] |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts of Participation in Academic Support Programs on Dropout Status, Overaged Students** | | | |
|  | **Student Group** | **Odds Ratio** | **95% CI** |
| **Subgroup** | Hispanic/Latino | 0.47\* | [0.24, 0.92] |
|  | ELL | 0.36\* | [0.13, 0.98] |
| **Academic Support Services College Transition Programs** | All | 0.12\* | [0.02, 0.69] |

Appendix E: Program Administrator Survey Protocol

The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute is collaborating with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) to explore the ways that districts provide academic support services to eligible students for meeting the state’s Competency Determination and to examine key factors to program effectiveness. **Please respond to all questions based on your district’s current school year (FY16) programming funded through your ESE Academic Support Grant.**

* **Academic Support Services Allocation Grant (FC632)**
* **Academic Support Work and Learning Grants (FC596 and 597)**
* **Academic Support Partnerships for Pathways to Success Grant (FC594)**
* **Academic Support Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grant (FC592)**

Information collected through these questions will be reported in summary form to interested parties such as ESE and other schools and districts. Your individual responses to these questions are confidential and will not be shared or attributed to you or your district without your permission.

**Academic Support Services in Your District**

1. Which of the following are key components of your Academic Support grant funded program(s) this year? Select all that apply.

* Academic remediation instruction
* Credit recovery
* Curriculum development
* Project/inquiry based learning
* College and career readiness activities
* Individual learning plans (ILP)
* Service-learning projects
* Work-based learning opportunities/internships
* Work-based learning plan (WBLP)
* Web-based/software tutorials
* Mentoring
* Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support
* Informing parents/guardians about remediation options
* High school transition support services
* Other(s): Please specify. 

1. What is the typical ratio of participating students to program-dedicated staff (e.g., teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors) in your district’s academic support program(s)?

* 1:1
* 2:1 to 4:1
* 5:1 to 10:1
* 11:1 or more

1. How often does your district implement the following practices in your Academic Support grant funded program(s) this year?

|  | **Never** | **Rarely** | **Sometimes** | **Often** | **Always** | **Don’t Know** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual student success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d) The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e) Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f) Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| g) Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/ guardians. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| h) Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| i) Educators are given time to plan, revise, and evaluate program services. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| j) Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Students who struggle to earn their Competency Determination often face other barriers to graduation. To what extent is your district utilizing the following strategies (within or in collaboration with your Academic Support grant program) to address barriers to graduation this year? (Grantees are not required to implement these strategies).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not At All** | **Very Little** | **Somewhat** | **To a Great Extent** | **Don’t Know** | **Not Applicable** |
| a) Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs (i.e., behavioral-health support). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d) Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e) Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f) Expansion of the school year/ structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| g) Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Factors for Success and Student Outcomes**

1. What do you think are the primary reasons students are enrolling in your Academic Support program(s) this year? Select up to 3 responses.

* Enrollment is automatic. Supports are integrated into regular school/program activities.
* Students enroll in program for support with earning their competency determination (CD).
* The program is free and convenient (e.g., location, time, transportation).
* Program outreach to eligible participants is effective.
* Parent(s)/guardian(s) require their children to participate.
* Program staff are engaging and supportive.
* High quality academic remediation services are offered.
* Small group/individual instruction is offered.
* Enhancement activities (e.g., college & career readiness, service-learning, internships) are offered as part of the program.
* Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support services are offered as part of the program.
* Program staff partner with local community organizations, businesses and/or colleges.
* Other(s): Please specify.

1. What do you think are the key factors that are facilitating participant success this year? Select up to 3 responses.

* Participants consistently attend the program(s).
* Participants are engaged and motivated.
* Participants’ parent(s)/guardian(s) are engaged and supportive.
* Program staff are engaged and supportive.
* Program staff are highly qualified. 
* High quality academic remediation services are provided.
* Small group/individual instruction is provided.
* Enhancement activities (e.g., college & career readiness, service-learning, internships) are provided.
* Counseling and/or other behavioral/social-emotional support services are provided.
* Program staff partner with local community organizations, businesses and/or colleges.
* Program staff collaborate with other school departments (e.g., Guidance, Special Education, ELL).
* Program enrollment alone is having a positive effect.
* Other(s): Please specify.

1. To what extent do you agree that involvement in Academic Support grant funded activities is impacting the following participant outcomes?

|  | **Disagree** | **Somewhat Disagree** | **Neither Agree or Disagree** | **Somewhat Agree** | **Agree** | **Don’t Know** | **Not Applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Participants are earning course credit(s). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Participants are developing connections with adults. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d) Participants are increasing their connection to school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e) Participants are increasing their academic engagement. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f) Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| g) Participants are improving their personal and social skills. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| h) Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| i) Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| j) Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| k) Participants are increasing career exploration skills (e.g., resume, interview, dress code). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| l) Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. ESE is particularly interested in learning about the successes of individual grantees. Please describe a key success of your Academic Support services program(s)—whether at the organizational or student level—that you would like to showcase and share with ESE and other districts.

*[Individual responses to this question will be shared with ESE and attributed to your individual district or organization].*

**Program Sustainability**

1. Do you believe that the activities and services currently supported by your Academic Support grant would continue in the absence of these funds?

* Our site/school/district would not be able to continue current academic support activities and services beyond the funding period.
* Our site/school/district would likely continue some but not all of our current academic support activities and services beyond the funding period.
* Our site/school/district would likely continue all of our academic support activities and services beyond the funding period.
* I don’t know.

1. Aside from funds, what other supports and/or technical assistance could ESE offer that would help you sustain your current academic support programs and activities?

**THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.**

**YOUR FEEDBACK IS GREATLY APPRECIATED!**

Appendix F: Interview Protocol

**General Information:**

1. Interviewee Date/Phone
2. School District
3. Position

**Type of Award:**

* **Allocation Grant Program (Fund Code 632)**
* **Work and Learning Program (Fund Codes 596 and 597)**
* **Partnerships for Pathways to Success Program (Fund Code 594)**
* **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Program (Fund Code 592)**

**Introduction [2 minutes]**

* Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.
* The purpose of the interview is to develop an understanding of what's happening in schools and districts that receive academic support grants, strategies used to support students and teaching, some of the key successes and challenges you have encountered, as well anything you think would be useful for us to know as the evaluators.
* Information collected through this interview will be reported in summary form to interested parties such as the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and other schools and districts. Your individual responses to these questions are confidential and will not be shared without your permission.
* Ask for permission to record the interview.

**Background information:**

[insert program specific information here]

**Implementation/ Outcomes** [15 min]**:**

1. The following is a brief summary of my understanding of the types of support strategies or services your school(s)/district is providing through your [insert grant type] funding this year. [*Briefly mention each of the support strategies, based on district proposal to ESE*]

**Follow up:**

* Is this accurate? Are there any [insert grant type] funded support strategies or services you would like to add to this list? [*Give examples of alternative strategies not expressed in district proposal]*

1. The following is a brief summary of my understanding of the demographics/characteristics of the students that your school(s)/district is serving though your [insert grant type] funding this year. [*Briefly describe student population(s) being served, based on district proposal to ESE*]

**Follow up:**

* Is this accurate? Would you like to add to or clarify this description?

1. Do you believe any of these support strategies or services will effectively increase the number of students who earn their Competency Determination?

**Follow up:**

* + Which support strategies or services have been most effective this year?
  + Why do you believe the program or the program's support strategies or services have [or have not] been effective?
  + For whom have the support strategies or services been most effective? Have they been effective for English language learners? For over-aged students? For students with disabilities?

1. Among the strategies or services previously mentioned, are there any that are particularly effective at improving ELA, Math, or STE MCAS performance [Identify if program provides subject specific supports prior to interview]?
2. [If applicable] For programs that serve at-risk 8th graders and 9th graders, how does the program(s) facilitate their transition to high school? How does the program(s) facilitate success in high school?

**If time allows:**

1. What have been the biggest challenges in implementing the programs funded through your [award/grant type inserted here]? What strategies have you or your colleagues used in attempting to overcome those challenges? What advice would you give to other districts facing similar issues?
2. Is there any other advice you would like to share that would be useful for districts implementing these types of programs? Any advice for districts who are thinking about starting a program?

**Probe:**

* Promising practices? Lessons learned?

1. [If interviewee mentions successes above] Are there any other factors not yet described that have facilitated the programs’ success?

OR

[If interviewee does not mention successes above] What factors have facilitated the programs' success?

1. Has the program resulted in any additional positive "ripple effects" for students, teachers, or administrators in your school/district?
2. Is there anything else you would like to add that we haven't covered?

Appendix G: Survey Tables

The body of the report presents survey results across all grant types. This appendix presents outcomes across all grant types and by grant type. Tables from across all grants include “Not Applicable” (NA) responses. Those that are grant specific exclude NA responses.

Q3 – How often does your district implement the following practices in your Academic Support Services grant funded program(s) this year?

| Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,  All Awardees, SY16 | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 137 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 37 | 25 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 141 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 28 | 59 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 131 | 23 | 13 | 14 | 27 | 24 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 140 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 30 | 58 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 139 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 29 | 62 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 141 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 65 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 139 | 2 | 14 | 31 | 29 | 25 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 134 | 2 | 18 | 28 | 26 | 25 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 140 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 39 | 43 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 128 | 16 | 14 | 20 | 36 | 13 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know”. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 3%, Qb. 1%, Qc. 6%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 1%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 1%, Qh. 3%, Qi. 1%, and Qj. 8%. | | | | | | |

| **Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,**  **Allocation Awardees**, **SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 112 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 42 | 25 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 115 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 30 | 55 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 105 | 28 | 15 | 14 | 25 | 18 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 114 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 30 | 58 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 113 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 30 | 60 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 115 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 28 | 64 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 113 | 3 | 12 | 31 | 27 | 27 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 108 | 3 | 20 | 31 | 27 | 19 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 115 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 42 | 44 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 103 | 18 | 13 | 20 | 36 | 13 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know”. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 3%, Qb. 1%, Qc. 7%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 1%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 2%, Qh. 4%, Qi. 0%, and Qj. 9%. | | | | | | |

| **Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,**  **Work and Learning Awardees**, **SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 67 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 50 | 33 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 67 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 6 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 33 | 33 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 33 | 50 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 60 | 20 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know”. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, and Qj. 17%. | | | | | | |

| **Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,**  **Partnerships for Pathways to Success Grantees**, **SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 8 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 13 | 13 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 63 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 25 | 63 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 63 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 63 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 8 | 0 | 25 | 38 | 38 | 0 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 8 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 38 | 13 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 8 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 13 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know”. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, and Qj. 0%. | | | | | | |

| **Practices Implemented in Academic Support Programs,**  **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success to Success Grantees**, **SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Never**  **(%)** | **Rarely**  **(%)** | **Sometimes**  **(%)** | **Often**  **(%)** | **Always**  **(%)** |
| 1. Educators use students’ Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) and/or individual success plans to identify individual knowledge gaps and target instruction. | 11 | 27 | 0 | 36 | 9 | 27 |
| 1. Educators are involved in planning engaging, hands-on, relevant curriculum. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 92 |
| 1. Students are engaged in planning for their future as part of a more comprehensive college and career readiness program. | 12 | 8 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 25 |
| 1. The program supports and provides continuity with classroom instruction. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 67 |
| 1. Students are given opportunities to demonstrate their learning. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 75 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to students. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 58 |
| 1. Educators are given opportunities to provide feedback to parents/guardians. | 12 | 0 | 17 | 33 | 33 | 17 |
| 1. Parents/guardians are given opportunities to provide feedback to educators. | 12 | 0 | 25 | 17 | 42 | 17 |
| 1. Educators are given time to plan, revise and evaluate program services. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 75 |
| 1. Educators are given time to update EPPs based on student progress. | 11 | 27 | 0 | 55 | 9 | 9 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know”. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 8%, and Qj. 0%. | | | | | | |

Q4 – Students who struggle to earn their Competency Determination often face other barriers to graduation. To what extent is your district utilizing the following strategies (within or in collaboration with your Academic Support Services grant) to address barriers to graduation this year? (Grantees are not required to implement these strategies.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Addressing Barriers to Graduation, School Year 2015─2016** | | | | | |
| **All Awardee Responses** | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. | 124 | 6 | 2 | 32 | 61 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 109 | 24 | 13 | 26 | 28 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 127 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 67 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 115 | 14 | 16 | 35 | 36 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 123 | 14 | 8 | 30 | 48 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 120 | 13 | 8 | 33 | 46 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 113 | 17 | 17 | 46 | 20 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 4%, Qb. 6%, Qc. 1%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 2%, Qf. 3%, and Qg. 4%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 17%, Qc. 9%, Qd. 15%, Qe. 11%, Qf. 13%, and Qg. 16%. | | | | | |

| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Allocation Awardees, SY16** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs | 102 | 7 | 2 | 33 | 58 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 89 | 26 | 15 | 40 | 19 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 105 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 70 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 93 | 16 | 19 | 38 | 27 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 104 | 14 | 7 | 30 | 49 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 99 | 13 | 10 | 37 | 39 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 94 | 18 | 19 | 43 | 20 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 4%, Qb. 6%, Qc. 1%, Qd. 4%, Qe. 3%, Qf. 3%, and Qg. 4%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 7%, Qb. 17%, Qc. 8%, Qd. 15%, Qe. 8%, Qf. 11%, and Qg. 15%. | | | | | |

| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Work and Learning Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 5 | 20 | 0 | 40 | 40 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 17%, Qb. 17%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, and Qg. 17%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 17%, Qf. 0%, and Qg. 0%. | | | | | |

| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Pathways to Partnerships for Success Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 5 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 60 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 4 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 3 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 4 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, and Qg. 0%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 25%, Qb. 38%, Qc. 50%, Qd. 38%, Qe. 50%, Qf. 63%, and Qg. 50%. | | | | | |

| **Strategies Utilized Within or in Collaboration with Academic Support Programs,**  **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Not At All**  **(%)** | **Very Little**  **(%)** | **Somewhat**  **(%)** | **To a Great Extent**  **(%)** |
| 1. Alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs. | 11 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 |
| 1. Adult advocates, including graduation coaches and/or reengagement coaches. | 10 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 30 |
| 1. Positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support programs. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| 1. Service-learning and/or work-based learning models. | 11 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 |
| 1. Credit recovery and/or credit acceleration opportunities. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 |
| 1. Expansion of the school year/structured learning time and/or summer transition programs. | 12 | 8 | 0 | 25 | 67 |
| 1. Programs and systems specifically designed to serve transient students. | 11 | 9 | 0 | 82 | 9 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, and Qg. 8%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 17%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 8%, Qe. 17%, Qf. 0%, and Qg. 8%. | | | | | |

Q7: To what extent do you agree that involvement in your Academic Support Services grant funded activities are impacting the following participant outcomes?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs,**  **School Year 2015─2016** | | | | | | |
| **All Awardee Responses** | | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 139 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 85 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 84 | 23 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 50 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 131 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 71 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 129 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 31 | 59 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 139 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 66 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 103 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 59 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 118 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 44 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 122 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 26 | 53 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. | 100 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 34 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 98 | 11 | 5 | 22 | 33 | 29 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 81 | 21 | 9 | 24 | 21 | 26 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 95 | 17 | 2 | 24 | 30 | 27 |

Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 1%, Qc. 4%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 1%, Qg. 6%, Qh. 3%, Qi. 4%, Qj. 4%, Qk. 3%, and Ql. 1%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 1%, Qb. 38%, Qc. 3%, Qd. 3%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 25%, Qg. 9%, Qh. 9%, Qi. 24%, Qj. 25%, Qk. 39%, and Ql. 30%.

| **Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs,**  **Allocation Awardees, SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 88 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 70 | 24 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 47 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 106 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 27 | 65 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 105 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 35 | 53 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 114 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 33 | 59 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 84 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 30 | 55 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 93 | 1 | 2 | 29 | 33 | 34 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 97 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 30 | 44 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. | 77 | 8 | 9 | 29 | 31 | 23 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 73 | 15 | 7 | 27 | 36 | 15 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 61 | 28 | 10 | 31 | 21 | 10 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 74 | 22 | 3 | 30 | 31 | 15 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 1%, Qc. 4%, Qd. 4%, Qe. 1%, Qf. 1%, Qg. 7%, Qh. 4%, Qi. 4%, Qj. 4%, Qk. 3%, and Ql. 2%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 37%, Qc. 4%, Qd. 5%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 25%, Qg. 11%, Qh. 11%, Qi. 27%, Qj. 31%, Qk. 44%, and Ql. 34%. | | | | | | |

| **Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs,**  **Work and Learning Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 67 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 0%, and Ql. 0%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 33%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 17%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 0%, and Ql. 0%. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs,**  **Partnership for Pathways to Success Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 2 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 86 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 6 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 67 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 71 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 86 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 29 | 57 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 0%, and Ql. 0%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 0%, Qb. 71%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 14%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 71%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 0%, and Ql. 0%. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant Outcomes Based on Involvement in Academic Support Programs,**  **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grantees, SY16** | | | | | | |
|  | **N** | **Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Disagree**  **(%)** | **Neither Agree or Disagree**  **(%)** | **Somewhat Agree**  **(%)** | **Agree**  **(%)** |
| 1. Participants are making progress toward increasing their MCAS score(s). | 11 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 36 | 55 |
| 1. Participants are earning course credit(s). | 8 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 75 |
| 1. Participants are developing connections with adults. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their connection to school. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their academic engagement. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their readiness for high school. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 92 |
| 1. Participants are improving their personal and social skills. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 83 |
| 1. Participants are improving their college and career readiness skills. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 75 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness of post-secondary options. | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 30 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their awareness about different job and career options. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 50 | 33 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their career exploration skills. | 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 57 | 29 |
| 1. Participants are increasing their work-based learning skills. | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 63 |
| Note. Response options also included “Don’t Know” and “Not Applicable.” The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 0%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 0%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 8%, and Ql. 0%. The percentage of respondents who selected ‘Not Applicable’ is listed below, but these respondents were not used to calculate the percentages reported in the table. Qa. 8%, Qb. 33%, Qc. 0%, Qd. 0%, Qe. 0%, Qf. 0%, Qg. 0%, Qh. 0%, Qi. 17%, Qj. 0%, Qk. 33%, and Ql. 33%. | | | | | | |

Appendix H: Key Program Successes, Open-ended Survey Responses

This appendix includes site specific responses to survey item eight (as specified in the survey protocol).

Q8 – ESE is particularly interested in learning more about the successes of individual grantees. Please describe a key success of your Academic Support program(s)—whether at the organizational level or student level—that you would like to showcase and share with ESE and other districts.

| **Key Success of Academic Support Programs**  **By Grant Type, SY16** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Allocation Awardees** | |
| Acton-Boxborough | The small group setting that this grant afforded our district to provide, was a huge help to several students, but particularly one in the high school. She had taken the grade 10 Math MCAS a few times and had not been able to pass it. Via this grant, the after-school tutoring that was made available was a great setting for this student to grasp and retain key math concepts. She has since taken and passed the math MCAS exam! A big hurdle towards her high school graduation requirements has been removed! |
| Adams-Cheshire | The key to our high school tutoring program’s success is the ability to instruct students in small groups. We target the skill areas that are weak. This boosts the students’ ability and confidence level they need to pass the required MCAS retest. |
| Agawam | Small group instruction during the school day. |
| Amherst-Pelham | Students are receiving focused test prep in order to pass the MCAS. Unfortunately, the majority of the students have math and other disabilities including cognitive impairments of some sort, so the MCAS is a very poor measure of what these students can really do. They are being denied diplomas because they can’t pass the math MCAS, yet they have so many other talents and skills that we have cultivated that just aren’t reflected on the paper-pencil tests. The distress this test causes them after taking it so many times, is just sad to see as an educator. We’re using the Academic Support funds to help them pass the test by offering them this additional instruction after a long day of school. Many of these students are low income students who lose time from their part-time jobs to participate in this program so that they can pass the MCAS. |
| Arlington | The Learning Center at Arlington High School was created five years ago for students who are not supported by Special Education programs. Some students are assigned to this class several periods during the week for help with executive functions skills and meeting deadlines. Some walk in and ask for help writing essays, understanding math concepts, working on long-term projects or applying to college. Some of our students are in honors and AP classes, some are in remedial classes, and others are ELL students. We have a wide range of ability, but most of our students are very motivated and want to do well in school, but need extra help. The number of students in the room varies: sometimes we have 6 students and sometimes we have 20. The class is run by a retired math teacher and a retired English/history teacher. Both teachers have special education experience. It is a wonderful addition to Arlington High. |
| Ashburnham-Westminster | The in-school model of support through a learning center has been very successful. |
| Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical | Summer remediation has increased the success of students passing the MCAS. This is especially true for students taking the retest opportunities junior and/or senior year. |
| Attleboro | Positive, trusting relationships between staff and students have led to higher attendance, active engagement, and high-quality academic supports that promote positive academic outcomes. |
| Bedford | The most distinct characteristic of our program at Bedford High School is the MCAS Academies that our teachers create. After examination of the Edwin Analytics analyses and EPPs, teachers discuss actual MCAS tests. Program strengths include the quality of the staff, certified English, math, science teachers, special education teachers and skill center teachers who have experience in Academy Centers–type programs, administrative support to try new learning centers, the support given to the program by the skill center (prompt response to requests for student data), and the high level of participating students. We have learned from this type of program that   * Small groups are effective and are the key to the success of this type of program. * Concrete examples allow students to see and feel math concepts related to volume and probability. * A program of this type is one that resonates with the parents whose children participated and were pleased with their children’s progress. * Academy centers inspire teacher creativity, fostering the use of new approaches and materials in regular classrooms.   Math and ELA academy centers are created and focus on algebra, geometry, Pythagorean theorem, figurative language, inference reading comprehension, writing an exemplary long composition and the volume of various shapes. Students are immersed in academies every six days. The MCAS Academies were very successful in increasing students’ academic achievement as is evidenced by the MCAS scores of those students in the classes of 2014 and 2015 who participated in the program and took the November 2014 and March 2015 retests. The small group size, individual attention, and strategic approach helped these students. Science academy centers delivered instruction and strategy sessions in physics, chemistry, or biology. |
| Berkshire Hills | Several of our students who did not pass the MCAS ELA and/or math last Spring were able to benefit from small group instruction and remediation. They were successful on the next MCAS, and their ELA/math grades have improved. |
| Beverly | The tutoring provided has a direct, positive impact on the passing rate of our students retaking the MCAS exams. |
| Billerica | We can demonstrate significant differences in the growth on MCAS scores of students who participate in our program compared to students who are recommended but do not participate. |
| Boston | Our teachers and administrators partner with other school-day teachers to recruit, recommend, refer, and personally engage eligible students. Data review allows for the identification of these students, and teachers are surveyed to determine which of their students would benefit. We then collaborate to engage individual students, gathering them after school, sending reminder letters to stay after, communicating with parents that students will be staying and should not be coming home. These strategies have been very successful. We have found that if we can get students in the seats, they do quite well. |
| Bourne | A key success to our program is that it is offered during the regularly scheduled school day hours. Groups are small and student-centered and remediation focuses on individual needs and specific student data. |
| Brockton | Peer tutoring is a strategic part of our services provided. The grant allows us to staff the facility with responsible adults on a regular basis and to expand the services offered. Peer tutors assist the teachers in the operation of the center. This allows for more one-to-one assistance and the students respond well. There is training provided for the tutors and they are anxious to participate and help. |
| Burlington | The 632 Grant has allowed us to provide high-quality remediation support. This service has been extremely helpful for students as they work towards reaching competency on the MCAS. |
| Central Massachusetts SPED Collaborative | We have already seen many successes. One of the successes I am seeing are the students are taking risks both academically and socially. Some of the students we asked to participate were either in danger of failing, or had low MCAS scores. These students also happen to struggle socially. During the after-school program, I saw these “quiet, not usually social students” talking to peers they normally wouldn’t. These same students also started to participate in class more. Teachers were commenting that behaviors improved from these students. My hope is that they gained a stronger connection to school and feel more invested. |
| Chelsea | Continuity and familiarity with competent, experienced staff who are retired educators. |
| Chicopee | The Academic Support Services Program is providing an academic program previously not available to students who have not attain competency in the MCAS, specifically students with IEPs. |
| Dighton-Rehoboth | Student retention has dramatically increased since our Transition Program has been instituted. Even though the program is voluntary, we have approximately 95% enrollment based on the positive feedback from students and parents regarding the program. This program has had an enormous impact on our school achievement and school climate. |
| Douglas | The after-school program runs twice a week for the five weeks prior to taking the MCAS in ELA, math, and science. Students enjoy the quick review and in 5 weeks it’s complete. The material, strategies, and content are fresh in their minds. This is particularly popular with our high school students because they are in sports and work after school. The program runs for one hour after school, a total of 10 hours. |
| Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter) (District) | We communicate to students and families at the time they enroll (usually grade 9) that we expect every grade 10 student to participate in twice weekly MCAS preparation programming. By setting expectations early, families come to expect this as part of what it means to attend this school. They can plan for it along with their other after-school commitments. |
| Everett | Our program is meeting success for all students who regularly attend sessions. The staff has consistently provided outreach on a personal basis, both through the classroom and through guidance. The academic piece of the program is implemented both individually and through the group. Several outside contacts from both within and outside the district have consulted with the students to encourage goal setting. Our issue is in engaging a wider population of students to attend and to attend regularly. |
| Fall River | Student participation in the Saturday MCAS preparation program was never higher than it was this year. Teachers developed a protocol that allowed for students to get immediate feedback on their writing. |
| Framingham | With a philosophy of “success first” we have found that students become more likely to delve further into topic content. Starting easy and building from “success” is a uniquely different experience than many of them have had in prior coursework, and builds some momentum into trying to learn and challenge themselves with more complex material. Making tiered and UDL driven units we have allowed for students to find a pathway that works for them, and then try to inspire them to challenge themselves into other content or a different device to learn further. It has led to a great deal of success for us. |
| Franklin | A key success of our Academic Support Services program is the collaboration among and between the academic support faculty and guidance, special education, ELL/SEI, high school leadership, and central office leadership. |
| Gill-Montague | Because of the grant a student was able to work after school 1:1 with a math teacher and score proficient on the retest right before graduation. The prior test he failed by two points. |
| Hampshire | Students are provided individual or small group instruction that supports passing the MCAS. |
| Haverhill | In a district with high transient and ELL learning communities, we have been able to provide a positive and successful remediation program for a number of students. / Most recently, our Biology remediation program showed significant progress and passing biology MCAS scores in the February biology test for those students who regularly attended the program. Our outreach to postgraduate students, who received a COA at graduation, provided remediation and success on attaining a passing MCAS score and earning a full high school diploma for several students. |
| Hudson | We have small group instruction with very supportive staff who make connections with students. |
| Lawrence | This program ensured that we were able to provide a safety net for students who were in danger of not graduating. As a result, our dropout rate decreased and graduation rate increased. |
| Ludlow | All of our grant monies are for remedial small group MCAS instruction, for both juniors and seniors who are working toward their CD and for our sophomores who need additional ELA and math support before their spring MCAS testing. These classes are twice a week, with pass/fail grades and 1 credit, as well as mandatory classes for students that we identify as needing this remedial instruction. The most difficult part of our MCAS tutorial program has been the dramatic cut in funding from ESE in recent years. Ludlow used to receive over $20,000 in grant monies each year, and that figure has been slashed to $13,800 last school year and this year $9,700. Since our district does not add any monies to what the grant total is, this has meant that our MCAS classes are now very, very short in length, since we have less than half the monies that we used to have. |
| Lynn | We have employed retired teachers to work with students during the school day. |
| Malden | Our success comes from having highly qualified staff who are also SPED certified and previously TBE certified. Many of them work closely with participants in classes so they are well aware of the students’ strengths and weaknesses. We also work closely with their classroom teachers to enhance their learning. |
| Marshfield | Students attend individual and small group sessions during the school day in a supportive environment with immediate feedback and follow up. |
| Medford | One of the several programs supported by the grant is the transition to high school HS 101 program where students exiting grade 8 and entering grade 9 are given a jump start on the grade 9 curriculum while engaging in social endeavors that lead to a transition to high school. |
| Medway | We are able to bring in highly qualified individuals to work with students who have struggled to earn a CD. The work is done as part of the regular day which allows students and the teacher to work collaboratively with the classroom teacher to prepare for the MCAS. We have found success in having our students work with the grant-funded teacher immediately after the subject area is taught in order to reinforce what is being done in the classroom. |
| Methuen | Keys to the success of our Academic Support Service program are hiring staff that can quickly build rapport with each student in the program, thus maximizing engagement during each lesson which encourages strong attendance. |
| Millbury | We have had great success rate with students who have struggled to pass the MCAS pass after participating in the program. |
| Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical | The grant is used primarily in MCAS remediation classes and to bring in content area experts to serve as coaches for our staff so they are able to more effectively reach students at a range of ability levels. This has led to great success among students who are at risk for not achieving the competency determination. |
| New Bedford | The Parenting Teens Program is designed to provide adequate learning time for all students in all core subjects. For students not yet on track to proficiency in English language arts or mathematics, we provide additional time and support for individualized instruction through tiered instruction, a data-driven approach to prevention, early detection, and support for students who experience learning or behavioral challenges, including but not limited to students with disabilities and English language learners. Our program model provides a safe school environment and makes effective use of a system for addressing the social, emotional, and health needs of its students that reflects the behavioral health and public schools framework. |
| Newburyport | The students, parents, and teachers are invested in education. College is the primary goal for most students attending this high school, so passing the MCAS is very important. |
| Newton | We have been able to adapt services to meet the needs of individual students in terms of scheduling, format, and place where services are delivered. |
| Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical | The Academic Support program at the Northeast Metropolitan Vocational School District is braided with Title I funding, as well as funds from the IDEA 240 grant. The district is able to implement a transition program for grade 8 students entering from the 12 cities and towns that comprise the district. The district is able to implement an extended day RTI program for academically challenged students who meet the requirements for admission, yet require additional skills development. Thirdly the district is able to provide state assessment remediation for students who need to retest after grade 10. |
| Norwood | Students who have not been successful taking standardized, high-stakes tests frequently have anxiety when faced with retesting. Similarly, students who have failed a math class are not especially eager to take the class again. The singular message from the academic support tutor to these students is, “You are going to pass. Do not give up.” Having a tutor who understands the learning gaps and other weaknesses in each student’s background—and who can then show the student how to repair the deficits—helps the student get back on track and develop the confidence and competence needed to succeed. |
| Pittsfield | Our Academic Support program is an integral component of the support services our students are offered each year blended with 21st Century CCLC, WIOA and Mass Grad interventions. These supports are tracked through guidance, department heads, faculty and administrators so that students in need of multiple interventions/types of support receive on-time programming to meet their immediate needs to better support academic learning. |
| Plymouth | We are able to offer students targeted, high-quality MCAS math support through this program. |
| Shrewsbury | Many students who struggle passing the MCAS have successfully earned their CD because of the 632 grant. During the 2013–2014 school year, the school offered a summer transition program for students who were entering the high school. It was a very successful program, however the funding was cut and we could not offer the program the following year. |
| Somerset Berkley Regional School District | In our district, our spring math MCAS remediation program has over 30 participants. We have three certified teachers who develop lessons to help students prepare for the assessment, learn test taking skills, and develop relationships with the teachers and their peers. The program has run since 2001 and has been a huge success. The teachers provide direct instruction, small group and at times one-on-one instruction. Technology and activities are used to assist in student engagement and motivation. |
| South Hadley | Students participating in our tutoring programs gain extra knowledge in their subject area. This adds to their confidence and ability to obtain their CD in that subject. Teachers provide the motivation and one-on-one support needed. |
| Stoneham | The key success with our program is the small ratio of students to instructor. Students are able to get more individualized instruction based on their needs. |
| Tantasqua | Due to the allocation of the grant funding, we are able to offer small-group tutoring and curriculum intervention to many of our at-risk students. Students who attend the program regularly have a high rate of success on MCAS. |
| Tewksbury | The sole purpose of the use school year 632 grant funding is to supplement district and Title I money in providing one-on-one remediation support for those students who have previously failed a high school ELA, math, or biology MCAS exam. Each and every one of the students—that is one hundred percent—who receive this individualized instruction have gone on to pass their MCAS assessment. |
| The Education Cooperative (TEC) | Many students entered this year’s MCAS season feeling better prepared, confident, and willing to persevere through challenging test items. |
| Wachusett | Our district program has found greatest success in supporting 8th grade and high school students for demonstrating proficiency on MCAS assessments. This is particularly important for supporting high school students in meeting graduation requirements. |
| Walpole | The collaboration of staff members to support students is very important and reinforces to the students that they are important. Students believe that staff members care about them and their progress in high school. |
| Weymouth | We have been very successful with the students who come to us from our ESOL program. Many students have shared with us that our program has been a huge advantage to them with their high school success. This is an increasing population here in Weymouth and the needs are great. |
| Whitman-Hanson | As we work towards each student having the tools to find success in completing the requirements to pass the MCAS we offer engaging, hands-on, knowledge-based programming. We also offer test taking strategies which prepare students for success. We consistently share positive thoughts, give incentives and boost self-esteem. |
| Wilmington | Students are reporting doing better in their daily classwork as well as in MCAS proficiency. |
| Worcester | A key success of the school year WPS Academic Support Service program is the expertise and dedication of the staff. Many of the same teachers work in the academic support programs year after year so they are well versed in the curriculum the students need and how to work individually with students to reach their goal. |
| **Partnerships for Pathways to Success Grantees** | |
| Bristol Community College | A 2015 Durfee High School student with a language barrier enrolled in the spring 2015 biology program for assistance in passing the biology MCAS exam. With near perfect attendance in the program, this student successfully passed their MCAS exam and is currently in their second semester at Bristol Community College’s ESL program. This student also completed a one-credit CSS class that was offered through and paid through the program’s funding. |
| Middlesex Community College | One of the successes has been having students access the college even prior to enrollment. Classes take place at the college which is located in downtown Lowell. |
| Springfield Tech Community College | We have a young woman with personal issues who persisted for four years until she passed the MCAS portion of the MCAS. She will be attending STCC this fall |
| UMass Donahue CareerWorks | Students arrive for remediation tutoring at different levels of education and learning competencies, regardless of their age. It can take tutors a great amount of time to get each student up to speed and to the level of performance required for the MCAS. In fact, it has taken years with some of these students. However, those students who persevere with the program have successfully passed their exam(s). The tutors' experience and high quality academic remediation services have prepared them to work with the majority of students who arrive for these services regardless of their circumstances, skills, and sometimes even regardless of their disabilities. The ESE grant that allows the tutors and the Career Center to work collaboratively, more often than not, has proven to be successful for the population we serve. |
| **Work and Learning Grantees** | |
| Holyoke Community College | Key success for Holyoke Community College MCAS Academic Support Work and Learning program has been the small-group classroom setting and staff’s commitment to participants’ success. One particular student expressed at last year’s Moving Forward Celebration, after passing MCAS, stated that “she couldn’t have done it without the belief in her from the instructor. No one has ever believed that I was smart, until Ken.” Another student’s parent enrolled him in the program two years ago, and this past fall, he passed MCAS!!!! Again, he states that the staff’s belief in him and consistent checking-in help to make his dream come true. In addition, we strive to help students identify his or her life expectations, be accountable for ensuring they are being met, and be responsible when they are not met. We find that when students buy into their objectives/goal, they becomes more successful in their future endeavors. |
| Mt Wachusett Community College | Having our Academic Support working and learning program be a part of the school schedule has been impactful for students. What they like about that is that they don’t feel they have one more extra class or thing to do after school. They want the support, and having it fit into their everyday schedule makes it manageable for them. The internship component is also a great opportunity that they view as an incentive which encourages their participation in the program. |
| Taunton Area School to Career Partnership | The students in our program struggle in school, in large classrooms, and in special ed programs, and are not connected. Program staff are dedicated and caring, making students feel that they are important and can succeed. Students attended MCAS tutoring in math, ELA, and science after school and 15 weeks of job readiness training, including guest speakers like the Bristol County DA, Financial Literacy and Dress for Success Workshops, etc. Students became engaged and felt a sense of belonging to something. Attendance was strong throughout MCAS tutoring and job readiness training with strong level of participation. Sixty percent participated regularly—several students attended very regularly with two having perfect attendance. Three out of four students passed their MCAS math retest—no results for ELA or science yet. Students were engaged in their academics as tutors used interactive exercises, and small teacher-to-student ratio allowed special attention for each. Tutors reported students’ increases in engagement and social interaction with other students and with teachers. They have developed relationships with teachers and other students that they would not have had in such a big school and large classrooms. Teachers commented that this program keeps students in school, able to persevere through their academic struggles, and have plans for after high school. All students got along well, no behavior issues at all, being very respectful to all guest speakers and each other. Students’ level of confidence was dramatically improved over the course of the program. Currently they are all involved in paid work experiences with the WBLP. Supervisors have raved about their performance and students are quite pleased with their progress. |
| Worcester | The integration of workplace and academic learning engages and motivates students in the program. As a result the pass rate of students in the programs is typically around 80% which is fantastic. |
| **Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success Grantees** | |
| Attleboro | Attleboro's Transition to High School program requires parents to attend a parent/student meeting on the first day of the program and on the last day of the program. On the first day, we had 95% of the parents attend to hear about the anticipated outcomes of the program and to sign a parent/student contract. This has helped support parent involvement in the program. On the last day which is on August 4, parents will attend a meeting again, and watch a video of what their children did and will see and hear success stories. |
| Methuen | The students in our program are transitioning from 8th grade (Middle School) to 9th grade (HS) in September, so each student has been prepared (demonstrated 'high proficiency') for the following;  - developed strong relationships with their incoming teachers  - mastery in their school's environment (knowledge of academic departments, administration staff, non-academic programming, guidance and socio-emotional support staff, health and wellness staff and care, and student leadership)  - developed a strong "care" and "history" of their entire community/city by servicing the homeless community; the low-income community; the abusive community; the parks and recreation (DPW) community; the elderly community; and the diversity community.   - A deep understanding about their academic/graduation requirements (credits needed), while attaining credit to support the remediation of 8th grade competencies and the acceleration of credit attainment for 9th grade competencies.  - developed a high-level of proficiency with technology of the following; iMovie, iTunes, Google Apps, Keynote, MS Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint), iPad and the academic Apps used in classrooms - Notability, PhotoMath, SketchPad, CalcSci, etc. |
| North Adams | Focus on the themes of communication, interdependence and problem-solving. The themes are woven into academic lessons (e.g. climate change, civil rights), whole group activities (e.g. adventure orientation at beginning of session, daily whole group meetings), service-learning activities, and individual progress on skill development. |
| Northbridge | https://youtu.be/lftHQsKYimA - Link to the highlights of our summer program  We have a survey that we did with the students at the end of the program that cites what they got out of the programming and how it will affect their future success, but you do not have an option for attachments. |
| Quaboag | Students researched community problems and decided that more opportunities were needed to involve special needs individuals, community members, and seniors into the school community. They also researched health issues, gardening, and nutrition. They decided to take an overgrown, unused courtyard in the school and renovate it. They removed all the overgrown shrubs; designed, built and installed wheel-chair accessible garden beds; and created gardening spaces for seniors. The also learned the importance of fresh vegetables, how to shop for vegetables, and how to cook a meal for their families. Many of these students are in the alternative education program and will continue to work on these gardens throughout the following years. The CPSS service-learning programs are the most engaging and successful programs that the school has held. Quaboag believes the success of the program is that it is service-learning and entails academic integrity, student's ownership, and community partnerships that solve local problems. |
| Revere | The traditional school day does not work for every student. We are very proud to be able to offer students opportunities outside of the school day to receive credit. |
| Salem | The broad community partnerships and service learning curriculum |
| Somerville | In 2014, a team of ninth grade teachers and administrators used other ninth grade programs and national data to develop strategies to assist incoming ninth graders in adjusting to high school standards, expectations, and routines. This team created a program called the Ninth Grade Experience. This team identified three behaviors that limit success for ninth grade students: attendance, academic performance, and misbehavior. The team collects attendance and academic performance data to monitor the progress of all ninth graders in order to identify students in need of interventions. The Academic Support CPSS program is a critical competent of the NGE team's goals. We use this grant to provide a four week long transition program for rising ninth graders. This free summer program is designed to orient students to the high school, engage them in learning and the high school community, make lasting connections to peers and faculty, and receive academic enrichment in science, math, and ELA. The goal is to help students make a strong transition from the elementary schools to the high school, which dovetails with the NGE's goals to increase freshmen success rates and reduce overall drop outs. |
| Tewksbury | Based on previous data, 100% of those students who have been invited to participate because they are at risk to pass this test based on scores on previous assessments, have passed their high school MCAS tests in all three content areas. |
| Worcester | This project was modeled after a project we learned about at a state led conference back in the spring. It is not a community service project, but rather a community learning service project. The idea of this particular project is to empower youth to understand community perspectives then work to change those perspectives in positive ways. Part of the empowerment piece is for students to design their own questions and to learn if those questions were the right questions to ask. Students will build their communication, science and math skills throughout the process. They also were allowed to rethink and rewrite the questions along the way.  With support from their teachers and administrators, the students in MCAS English developed questions that stemmed from the themes in the novel, We Beat the Street by George W. Jenkins, Rameck Hunt, Sampson Davis, and Sharon Draper. The students in Biology developed a hypothesis based on the over-arching themes of the survey questions. The students in MCAS math added some qualitative questions regarding the demographics of those that would be surveyed.  The students in MCAS Biology reviewed the scientific process, the development of theories and how it applies to what we know/still wanting to know about the natural world. The teacher identified that this project was a social experiment and the students were able to make connections to perceptions on WPS and the media, public v. private schools, etc.  On July 12th and July 13th students from the MCAS summer program visited different locations throughout Worcester (City Hall, Elm Park, East Park, Stop and Shop Plaza, and Vernon Hill Pool/Playground) to survey the community regarding high school experiences, challenges students face in high school, the benefits of receiving a high school diploma, and their knowledge of the positive things going on at North High School.  After the data was collected each class analyzed the results and used the information in various ways.  The students in Biology transferred the process of the social experiment, the information they received from the survey participants, and the data collection into a lab report.  The students in the math classes compiled the data and made various pie charts, scatterplots, and bar graphs depicting the results using measures of central tendency and other statistics. This tied into the curriculum by showing real life examples of the skills and concepts students were learning in class. |

Appendix I: Additional Supports Needed, Open-ended Survey Responses

This appendix includes responses to survey item ten.

Q10 – Aside from funds, what other supports and/or technical assistance could ESE offer that would help you sustain your current academic support programs and activities?

| **Additional Supports Needed by Academic Support Programs, SY16** |
| --- |
| I appreciate the efforts of the ESE, most especially in the redistribution of funds that can be applied to the 625 grant. [Our district] takes full advantage of this opportunity when available. |
| Funding is essential for a program such as ours to sustain since it is after school. Because of the cut last school year, we were unable to offer a summer program which had been proven to be extremely successful. Our student population does not have funds to pay for their own program. |
| Our activities from this grant are tiny. Much like the funding from this grant. It’s almost more trouble to complete the grant and results than it is actually worth in grant funds. |
| Nothing. We need MORE funds reinstated, not ALL funds being terminated. Are you hinting that MCAS 2.0 will become a totally non-funded ESE mandate in the future? Not cool. |
| A meeting or webinar that focuses on promising practices and/or programs that work! |
| We have developed a program of very effective supports. Unfortunately, the staffing end of this requires funding. Without this grant the programs would probably not continue. Our school system is stretched to the maximum and additional funding is not available. |
| Funding is critical given the current budgetary cuts we are facing. Models of successful programs would also be helpful. |
| Help with addressing individual student weaknesses on the MCAS. |
| The funding is everything for our small district. We have extreme budget constraints. |
| Best practices shared across districts to learn more about parent/student engagement, curriculum development, sustainability efforts, and community involvement. |
| The ESE could release MCAS items as they once did. |
| A publication of model programs around the state so that we could have ideas about ways to improve our program. |
| One of the biggest needs is simply finding evolving tools that catch students’ interest. Kahoot, a web-based live-action program is an example that our students ask for. They “ask” to be tested, and we are talking about students who end up with us due to chronic academic failure. It is the program’s design there that makes it so good—it is like a game show on TV, and it is competitive and fun. Finding more tools like this helps us keep students in seats daily. Without that, they fall into their old habits of being streaky attenders who miss large portions of material, and end up with no [cohesive] whole of understanding about anything; just rote parts of it all, and usually short-termed memorized at that. |
| The teachers who run this program are truly committed to helping their students to succeed. They have been known to assist students via email even on weekends and after the school day. Since increasing funding is not an option, what might help is money for 4 Chromebooks in the classroom. Often, all 10 computers are in use, and Chromebooks would be a great addition. |
| A showcase of best practices from other districts highlighting innovative practices. |
| I appreciate the resources that are offered on the ESE website. Our funding is not substantial, so we do not have a large program. |
| Evidence-based alternative activities or programs. |
| I would like to see more computer-based programs; I use New York’s regent prep website often, it is very user friendly. |
| Funding is the best form of help as it allows us to structure the support as best fits our school. |
| Professional development. |
| Funding provides the staffing. If funding was cut then staffing support would be needed from the ESE. |
| Technology for the students to use, such as Chromebooks, laptops with charging stations, and headsets as well for students who need noise buffers or to work independently. |
| More information on models used by other districts, an opportunity at statewide conferences to hear from highly effective programs. |
| Additional professional development, strategies for reaching a challenging subgroup of students, and sharing of resources with other districts. |
| Funding is the biggest support we can receive at this time. Thank you. |
| We need the funding from the state to run this program. Our program primarily focuses on helping the students pass MCAS. Maybe the state could offer some other services/programs to help the students with career exploration or job skills. |
| Specific strategies to help students who have taken the MCAS and have not attained competency offered in written form at a conference. |
| Aside from the funds, ESE could support individual like groups of districts to mentor and develop the program. This way ESE could see firsthand the difficulties in sustaining the programs long term. |
| Copies of most recent MCAS tests so that we can determine trends in the questioning and so we can use the itemized analysis more effectively. Offer professional development for MCAS tutors, especially around college and career readiness. Schedule the March retest later as we do not have sufficient time to work with these students. We also do not get the November results soon enough. |
| Available temporary educators to support math especially, although English is also needed. Support for encouraging student participation during the school day would also be helpful. |
| If ESE could accelerate grading on the Spring MCAS tests, scores would become available sooner. Having the scores earlier helps service providers in the individual districts plan how they might more effectively deliver remediation. |
| Seminars and workshops on the new version of the MCAS exam for the instructors who provide the remediation support. |
| Continued, varied teacher training on a variety of topics related to helping students reach competency / prepare for transitions. |
| As our district moves forward, with funding, our staff would be able to continue this high-quality opportunity for our struggling students. We continue to use innovative ideas to support our challenged learners to find success in passing the required testing. |
| Nothing else is needed. |
| Provide free training on ways to improve outreach programs. |
| Since the Parenting Teens Program is supported by grants, the funds are truly what sustain our program. Having said that, professional development, consultants, curriculum, Chromebooks, computers, field trips, bus passes, transportation services, interns, community service workers, volunteers. Thank you for your assistance, which helps support and sustain our program! |
| Data in a more timely fashion for results. |
| Not sure how to address this issue, but our biggest obstacle is getting students to stay after school... what could be done to address this issue besides funds? |
| Everyone has been great at ESE with support. Thank you. |
| They could do outreach to district families that highlight the success stories of students to inspire them to enroll their student in the program. |
| Any professional development opportunities for our staff on building literacy and mathematical fluency would be greatly appreciated, particularly in this time of crunched budgets. |
| Nothing further is needed. That said, more funding is needed and would be appreciated. The district provided an additional $10,000 in program support this year and that is not sustainable next year. |
| The support and technical assistance is very helpful, but without adequate funding, little can be done. |
| It would be helpful to learn best practices. What are successful strategies other programs are using for academic success? Also providing data that shows how successful and important these programs are to student success and dropout prevention. |
| Aside from funding, what would be [a helpful] additional support for our program and activities is increase in the number of retesting dates for MCAS, so students would be able to attend higher education or other training to become more employable. We lose a great number of enrollments of potential students when there is not a scheduled MCAS retest date. |
| Unfortunately when it comes down to it we have all the components to run a successful program, but without funding it is impossible to implement. |
| I am not sure. |
| We have tools provided by the state. We have systems in place and community partnerships. There is always room for improvement. However, the only thing we need at the moment in order to continue to provide this student population with the services they need to move forward in life is the funding. In general, we feel as though we can provide you with other key information for the purpose of this survey. We want to thank you in advance for taking the time to review our input and considering it.  Legislative Funding / Academic Support Grant Programs for those who have not passed their MCAS determination should continue to receive legislative funding for the following reasons:   1. No one else and no other agency is providing such services. The type of collaborative partnership between community colleges and career centers for the student population we serve. And while it is a great thing that the number of students failing the MCAS is decreasing, we are concerned for those who are in fact failing them, or not getting a chance to take them in any form, before leaving high school. Anecdotal data appear to indicate two distinct populations which identify themselves for MCAS / remediation services. [1] High school students affected by life events, over which adult and education support services were unsuccessful when a student first took the MCAS test, return for MCAS remediation at a point of increased independence. [2] High school students with disabilities, for numerous reasons, return for MCAS remediation at a point when college coursework and/or gainful employment are being sought. 2. The circumstances of life affecting high school students' educational attainment, include homelessness, divorce, domestic violence, hunger, teen pregnancy, inadequate support system and substance abuse. When participants return for MCAS remediation and career readiness services, these barriers may or may not be resolved. Since such circumstances of life can be beyond a participant’s immediate control, and given that MCAS determination is essential to obtaining their high school diploma in the state, the commonwealth has the obligation to provide MCAS remediation services in some form. (Please refer to program design comments below.) 3. Some input on the value that our summer tutoring program had at the time of its existence could be beneficial for the purpose of this survey. Tutors noticed it gave students time and flexibility that would be otherwise hard for many of them to find during regular semesters. Tutors reported a larger amount of students attending tutoring during the summer. A common understanding exists that enrollments for MCAS remediation continue to decrease annually. Given this reality, and the fact that career readiness services exist independent of ESE program grants, the following recommendations are offered for consideration:   Program Design   1. ESE may wish to consider future Academic Support grant funding that is offered to community colleges on a cost reimbursement basis. Community colleges would attest to having the infrastructure capable of providing MCAS remediation services and referrals to each college could be addressed, accordingly. One program design element would include referral to the local American Job Center. Another design element would be screening for MRC referrals. Outreach services, an integral component of successful program design, could become an element of a Workforce Investment Board. Traditionally, WIBs oversee WIOA youth services in the commonwealth. 2. There seems to be a level of confusion on the various options students with disabilities have in order to take the MCAS exams, specifically when it comes to the MCAS-Alt portfolios. As a result, students and parents alike seem to not be well informed about the options that are available for them. A conversation about MCAS Determination opportunities and those families whose high school students have IEPs would seem to be of value. A similar conversation between ESE staff and guidance counselors throughout the state serving those with special needs at the high school level would appear prudent. Involvement with MRC staff would be integral to the success of such conversations. Admittedly, such forums may already exist. Our experience with the Academic Support ESE grant is that once a person with special needs elects MCAS remediation through the tutoring, the outcome is seldom promising and time spent typically involves referrals to MRC which could have/should have taken place sooner. |
| One support that could be beneficial is training on how to strengthen the transition program and/or opportunities to network with other districts to discuss how they utilize this grant. |
| Continued literature (article or studies) on the supports needed for students transitioning to HS and to post-secondary levels. As well as socio-emotional support for students who are disengaged prior to leaving MS and/or who are coupled with non-supportive home-life situations. |
| Although we would like to take advantage of every professional development opportunity when it becomes available, for our system, the key to sustaining the current academic support programs and activities would be the funding. |
| Promising practices from other transition programs. |
| The networking/sharing sessions are helpful as is the TA with Tracy Harkins for service-learning planning. |
| Continue to offer service-learning training and support. |

Appendix J: District Participation in Academic Support Programs

This appendix summarizes district participation in each of the five programs offered during SY13 and SY14.

| **Table 1: Collaborative Partnerships for Student Success (592)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 756** | **N = 61,731** | **N = 70,055** |
| **Adams-Cheshire** | 3 | 272 | 279 |
| **Avon** | 1 | 83 | 212 |
| **Bellingham** | 1 | 281 | 580 |
| **Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public (District)** | 7 | 74 | 128 |
| **Billerica** | 1 | 889 | 1,388 |
| **Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 353 | 1,044 |
| **Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 413 | 559 |
| **Boston** | 4 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Bridgewater-Raynham** | 1 | 777 | 1,611 |
| **Brockton** | 1 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Central Berkshire** | 1 | 312 | 515 |
| **Chelsea** | 1 | 1,212 | 884 |
| **Chicopee** | 1 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **Douglas** | 1 | 252 | 387 |
| **Dracut** | 2 | 645 | 870 |
| **Everett** | 102 | 1,759 | 1,168 |
| **Fall River** | 31 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Falmouth** | 20 | 426 | 939 |
| **Fitchburg** | 24 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Framingham** | 23 | 1,187 | 2,049 |
| **Gardner** | 1 | 572 | 482 |
| **Grafton** | 1 | 326 | 899 |
| **Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical** | 69 | 1,466 | 1,009 |
| **Holbrook** | 1 | 190 | 233 |
| **Holyoke** | 31 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Leominster** | 2 | 1,279 | 1,554 |
| **Lowell** | 43 | 2,429 | 2,477 |
| **Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)** | 1 | 107 | 48 |
| **Malden** | 34 | 1,238 | 1,510 |
| **Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 383 | 394 |
| **Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 685 | 1,028 |
| **Newton** | 16 | 917 | 4,797 |
| **North Adams** | 16 | 202 | 273 |
| **Northbridge** | 5 | 471 | 574 |
| **Northern Berkshire Regional Vocational Technical** | 1 | 305 | 300 |
| **Norwood** | 1 | 606 | 987 |
| **Old Rochester** | 1 | 371 | 804 |
| **Paulo Freire Social Justice Charter School (District)** | 2 | 109 | 38 |
| **Peabody** | 1 | 1,219 | 1,515 |
| **Pittsfield** | 1 | 1,099 | 1,451 |
| **Plymouth** | 1 | 1,267 | 2,199 |
| **Quincy** | 36 | 1,749 | 2,423 |
| **Randolph** | 23 | 604 | 604 |
| **Revere** | 45 | 1,106 | 1,344 |
| **Salem** | 12 | 776 | 760 |
| **Saugus** | 1 | 489 | 613 |
| **Shawsheen Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 6 | 605 | 942 |
| **Somerville** | 24 | 908 | 873 |
| **South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 567 | 276 |
| **Tewksbury** | 62 | 544 | 965 |
| **Upper Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical** | 9 | 347 | 474 |
| **Wareham** | 20 | 604 | 502 |
| **Westport** | 31 | 216 | 383 |
| **Wilmington** | 1 | 393 | 1,081 |
| **Worcester** | 23 | 4,972 | 4,477 |

| **Table 2: Higher Education Institutions and Partners (593)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 277** | **N = 60,027** | **N = 51,553** |
| **Arlington** | 3 | 338 | 1,577 |
| **Boston** | 27 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 1 | 332 | 172 |
| **Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)** | 1 | 283 | 119 |
| **Brockton** | 64 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Chelsea** | 1 | 1,212 | 884 |
| **Chicopee** | 2 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **Easthampton** | 1 | 293 | 342 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 5 | 143 | 138 |
| **Everett** | 3 | 1,759 | 1,168 |
| **Fall River** | 6 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Fitchburg** | 11 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Gardner** | 10 | 572 | 482 |
| **Granby** | 1 | 197 | 281 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 4 | 662 | 968 |
| **Holbrook** | 1 | 190 | 233 |
| **Holyoke** | 7 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Leominster** | 24 | 1,279 | 1,554 |
| **Lowell** | 57 | 2,429 | 2,477 |
| **Ludlow** | 2 | 452 | 880 |
| **Lynn** | 5 | 3,149 | 2,466 |
| **Malden** | 2 | 1,238 | 1,510 |
| **New Bedford** | 3 | 2,796 | 1,322 |
| **North Central Charter Essential (District)** | 1 | 122 | 184 |
| **Pentucket** | 1 | 410 | 880 |
| **Phoenix Charter Academy (District)** | 1 | 142 | 125 |
| **Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public (District)** | 1 | 169 | 236 |
| **Quabbin** | 1 | 456 | 777 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 2 | 338 | 500 |
| **Salem** | 3 | 776 | 760 |
| **Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical** | 1 | 717 | 602 |
| **Springfield** | 14 | 7,693 | 3,065 |
| **Swampscott** | 1 | 299 | 817 |
| **Waltham** | 1 | 886 | 1,240 |
| **Westfield** | 4 | 1,392 | 1,447 |
| **Winchendon** | 2 | 319 | 219 |
| **Winthrop** | 2 | 337 | 498 |
| **Worcester** | 1 | 4,972 | 4,477 |

| **Table 3: Work and Learning (597)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 566** | **N = 51,555** | **N = 46,688** |
| **Athol-Royalston** | 13 | 276 | 252 |
| **Attleboro** | 13 | 919 | 1,621 |
| **Boston** | 146 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 1 | 332 | 172 |
| **Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)** | 1 | 283 | 119 |
| **Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 680 | 802 |
| **Brockton** | 19 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Chicopee** | 2 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **Easthampton** | 5 | 293 | 342 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 9 | 143 | 138 |
| **Fall River** | 75 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Fitchburg** | 82 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical** | 3 | 416 | 224 |
| **Gill-Montague** | 4 | 195 | 232 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 1 | 662 | 968 |
| **Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical** | 9 | 897 | 1,310 |
| **Holyoke** | 5 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Ludlow** | 2 | 452 | 880 |
| **Middleborough** | 1 | 545 | 678 |
| **New Bedford** | 12 | 2,796 | 1,322 |
| **Pittsfield** | 17 | 1,099 | 1,451 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 1 | 338 | 500 |
| **Randolph** | 2 | 604 | 604 |
| **Shrewsbury** | 1 | 399 | 2,176 |
| **Somerset Berkley Regional School District** | 1 | 324 | 854 |
| **Springfield** | 7 | 7,693 | 3,065 |
| **Taunton** | 25 | 1,388 | 1,462 |
| **Wachusett** | 1 | 782 | 2,439 |
| **Westfield** | 7 | 1,392 | 1,447 |
| **Worcester** | 99 | 4,972 | 4,477 |

| **Table 4: Allocation (625)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 22,058** | **N = 158,425** | **N = 252,120** |
| **Abington** | 156 | 194 | 481 |
| **Academy Of the Pacific Rim Charter Public (District)** | 1 | 108 | 206 |
| **Acton-Boxborough** | 24 | 429 | 2,565 |
| **Adams-Cheshire** | 23 | 272 | 279 |
| **Agawam** | 70 | 753 | 1,241 |
| **Amesbury** | 37 | 294 | 695 |
| **Amesbury Academy Charter Public (District)** | 2 | 48 | 23 |
| **Amherst-Pelham** | 48 | 360 | 1,182 |
| **Andover** | 67 | 476 | 2,412 |
| **Arlington** | 58 | 338 | 1,577 |
| **Ashburnham-Westminster** | 68 | 310 | 709 |
| **Ashland** | 56 | 201 | 862 |
| **Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 123 | 570 | 574 |
| **Athol-Royalston** | 79 | 276 | 252 |
| **Attleboro** | 133 | 919 | 1,621 |
| **Auburn** | 54 | 315 | 711 |
| **Avon** | 51 | 83 | 212 |
| **Ayer Shirley School District** | 11 | 276 | 297 |
| **Barnstable** | 77 | 906 | 1,442 |
| **Bedford** | 188 | 159 | 1,070 |
| **Belchertown** | 1 | 420 | 753 |
| **Bellingham** | 155 | 281 | 580 |
| **Belmont** | 40 | 265 | 1,559 |
| **Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public (District)** | 3 | 74 | 128 |
| **Berkshire Hills** | 2 | 303 | 519 |
| **Berlin-Boylston** | 11 | 112 | 324 |
| **Beverly** | 37 | 731 | 1,339 |
| **Billerica** | 39 | 889 | 1,388 |
| **Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 46 | 353 | 1,044 |
| **Blackstone-Millville** | 87 | 236 | 488 |
| **Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical** | 71 | 413 | 559 |
| **Boston** | 1,128 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Boston Collegiate Charter (District)** | 4 | 80 | 308 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 38 | 332 | 172 |
| **Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)** | 2 | 283 | 119 |
| **Bourne** | 66 | 275 | 524 |
| **Braintree** | 99 | 527 | 1,887 |
| **Bridgewater-Raynham** | 118 | 777 | 1,611 |
| **Bristol County Agricultural** | 21 | 160 | 378 |
| **Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational Technical** | 109 | 680 | 802 |
| **Brockton** | 635 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Brookline** | 77 | 466 | 2,343 |
| **Burlington** | 20 | 456 | 1,162 |
| **Cambridge** | 54 | 1,023 | 1,689 |
| **Canton** | 7 | 423 | 1,005 |
| **Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical** | 114 | 352 | 369 |
| **Carver** | 24 | 290 | 464 |
| **Central Berkshire** | 10 | 312 | 515 |
| **Chelmsford** | 117 | 506 | 1,846 |
| **Chelsea** | 216 | 1,212 | 884 |
| **Chicopee** | 159 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **City On A Hill Charter Public (District)** | 66 | 114 | 184 |
| **City on a Hill Charter Public School II (District)** | 31 | 51 | 24 |
| **Clinton** | 99 | 292 | 360 |
| **Codman Academy Charter Public (District)** | 94 | 4 | 83 |
| **Cohasset** | 20 | 98 | 528 |
| **Danvers** | 44 | 558 | 1,085 |
| **Dartmouth** | 54 | 520 | 1,196 |
| **Dedham** | 70 | 344 | 835 |
| **Dennis-Yarmouth** | 92 | 486 | 692 |
| **Dighton-Rehoboth** | 35 | 468 | 929 |
| **Douglas** | 59 | 252 | 387 |
| **Dover-Sherborn** | 69 | 104 | 881 |
| **Dracut** | 91 | 645 | 870 |
| **Dudley-Charlton Reg** | 62 | 606 | 1,147 |
| **Duxbury** | 50 | 278 | 1,326 |
| **East Bridgewater** | 73 | 252 | 655 |
| **East Longmeadow** | 146 | 419 | 833 |
| **Easthampton** | 55 | 293 | 342 |
| **Easton** | 70 | 458 | 1,326 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 76 | 143 | 138 |
| **Essex Agricultural Technical** | 16 | 175 | 400 |
| **Everett** | 51 | 1,759 | 1,168 |
| **Fairhaven** | 1 | 430 | 566 |
| **Fall River** | 389 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Falmouth** | 42 | 426 | 939 |
| **Fitchburg** | 111 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Four Rivers Charter Public (District)** | 1 | 74 | 142 |
| **Foxborough** | 38 | 363 | 921 |
| **Foxborough Regional Charter (District)** | 8 | 190 | 254 |
| **Framingham** | 64 | 1,187 | 2,049 |
| **Franklin** | 62 | 544 | 2,040 |
| **Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical** | 5 | 416 | 224 |
| **Freetown-Lakeville** | 39 | 426 | 880 |
| **Frontier** | 3 | 257 | 375 |
| **Gardner** | 6 | 572 | 482 |
| **Gateway** | 21 | 208 | 235 |
| **Georgetown** | 26 | 206 | 464 |
| **Gill-Montague** | 10 | 195 | 232 |
| **Global Learning Charter Public (District)** | 33 | 112 | 117 |
| **Gloucester** | 41 | 651 | 792 |
| **Grafton** | 4 | 326 | 899 |
| **Granby** | 31 | 197 | 281 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 107 | 662 | 968 |
| **Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical** | 625 | 577 | 458 |
| **Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical** | 78 | 1,466 | 1,009 |
| **Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical** | 473 | 897 | 1,310 |
| **Greenfield** | 19 | 347 | 279 |
| **Groton-Dunstable** | 14 | 247 | 1,121 |
| **Hampden-Wilbraham** | 55 | 555 | 1,277 |
| **Hampshire** | 26 | 262 | 496 |
| **Hanover** | 31 | 379 | 811 |
| **Harvard** | 41 | 74 | 554 |
| **Hatfield** | 21 | 62 | 114 |
| **Haverhill** | 200 | 1,394 | 1,483 |
| **Hingham** | 102 | 300 | 1,443 |
| **Holbrook** | 76 | 190 | 233 |
| **Holliston** | 24 | 241 | 1,031 |
| **Holyoke** | 183 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Hopedale** | 17 | 165 | 366 |
| **Hopkinton** | 33 | 241 | 1,445 |
| **Hudson** | 70 | 427 | 788 |
| **Hull** | 42 | 158 | 325 |
| **Ipswich** | 56 | 183 | 733 |
| **King Philip** | 67 | 603 | 1,498 |
| **KIPP Academy Lynn Charter (District)** | 3 | 208 | 191 |
| **Lawrence** | 518 | 3,558 | 1,788 |
| **Lee** | 90 | 85 | 234 |
| **Leicester** | 51 | 243 | 439 |
| **Lenox** | 60 | 69 | 258 |
| **Leominster** | 60 | 1,279 | 1,554 |
| **Lexington** | 61 | 315 | 2,870 |
| **Lincoln-Sudbury** | 57 | 263 | 1,808 |
| **Littleton** | 34 | 134 | 519 |
| **Longmeadow** | 14 | 338 | 1,147 |
| **Lowell** | 328 | 2,429 | 2,477 |
| **Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)** | 19 | 107 | 48 |
| **Ludlow** | 126 | 452 | 880 |
| **Lynn** | 695 | 3,149 | 2,466 |
| **Lynnfield** | 46 | 243 | 740 |
| **Malden** | 146 | 1,238 | 1,510 |
| **Manchester Essex Regional** | 14 | 140 | 575 |
| **Marblehead** | 36 | 281 | 1,288 |
| **Marlborough** | 46 | 745 | 1,046 |
| **Marshfield** | 103 | 575 | 1,423 |
| **Marthas Vineyard** | 12 | 25 | 52 |
| **Martha's Vineyard Charter (District)** | 1 | 216 | 674 |
| **Masconomet** | 18 | 401 | 1,707 |
| **Mashpee** | 37 | 334 | 350 |
| **Massachusetts Virtual Academy at Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School** | 3 | 99 | 56 |
| **MATCH Charter Public School (District)** | 1 | 149 | 228 |
| **Maynard** | 17 | 184 | 302 |
| **Medfield** | 28 | 231 | 1,130 |
| **Medford** | 99 | 881 | 1,169 |
| **Medway** | 65 | 220 | 963 |
| **Melrose** | 73 | 487 | 982 |
| **Mendon-Upton** | 17 | 291 | 805 |
| **Methuen** | 129 | 1,490 | 1,385 |
| **Middleborough** | 122 | 545 | 678 |
| **Milford** | 47 | 574 | 1,157 |
| **Millbury** | 24 | 276 | 442 |
| **Millis** | 70 | 162 | 395 |
| **Milton** | 72 | 365 | 1,185 |
| **Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical** | 57 | 383 | 394 |
| **Mohawk Trail** | 22 | 183 | 293 |
| **Monomoy Regional School District** | 4 | 296 | 447 |
| **Monson** | 1 | 244 | 329 |
| **Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical** | 61 | 685 | 1,028 |
| **Mount Greylock** | 49 | 113 | 412 |
| **Nantucket** | 50 | 233 | 405 |
| **Narragansett** | 52 | 261 | 347 |
| **Nashoba** | 11 | 324 | 1,280 |
| **Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 135 | 346 | 397 |
| **Natick** | 67 | 475 | 1,692 |
| **Nauset** | 70 | 307 | 1,073 |
| **Needham** | 43 | 359 | 2,060 |
| **New Bedford** | 213 | 2,796 | 1,322 |
| **New Leadership Charter (District)** | 3 | 34 | 27 |
| **Newburyport** | 42 | 230 | 888 |
| **Newton** | 80 | 917 | 4,797 |
| **Norfolk County Agricultural** | 19 | 173 | 403 |
| **North Adams** | 141 | 202 | 273 |
| **North Andover** | 67 | 641 | 1,517 |
| **North Attleborough** | 72 | 444 | 1,495 |
| **North Brookfield** | 29 | 77 | 115 |
| **North Central Charter Essential (District)** | 40 | 122 | 184 |
| **North Middlesex** | 13 | 556 | 1,014 |
| **North Reading** | 11 | 331 | 879 |
| **North Shore Regional Vocational Technical** | 51 | 247 | 285 |
| **Northampton** | 49 | 417 | 957 |
| **Northampton-Smith Vocational Agricultural** | 33 | 309 | 181 |
| **Northboro-Southboro** | 3 | 418 | 1,439 |
| **Northbridge** | 43 | 471 | 574 |
| **Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical** | 20 | 881 | 665 |
| **Northern Berkshire Regional Vocational Technical** | 8 | 305 | 300 |
| **Norton** | 29 | 353 | 798 |
| **Norwell** | 58 | 187 | 851 |
| **Norwood** | 58 | 606 | 987 |
| **Old Colony Regional Vocational Technical** | 47 | 276 | 394 |
| **Old Rochester** | 1 | 371 | 804 |
| **Oxford** | 40 | 332 | 438 |
| **Palmer** | 18 | 250 | 382 |
| **Pathfinder Regional Vocational Technical** | 24 | 440 | 324 |
| **Paulo Freire Social Justice Charter School (District)** | 3 | 109 | 38 |
| **Peabody** | 109 | 1,219 | 1,515 |
| **Pembroke** | 87 | 371 | 1,088 |
| **Pentucket** | 20 | 410 | 880 |
| **Phoenix Charter Academy (District)** | 6 | 142 | 125 |
| **Pioneer Charter School of Science II (PCSS-II) (District)** | 1 | 51 | 45 |
| **Pioneer Valley** | 44 | 192 | 301 |
| **Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public (District)** | 2 | 169 | 236 |
| **Pittsfield** | 170 | 1,099 | 1,451 |
| **Plymouth** | 220 | 1,267 | 2,199 |
| **Provincetown** | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| **Quabbin** | 42 | 456 | 777 |
| **Quaboag Regional** | 25 | 246 | 312 |
| **Quincy** | 106 | 1,749 | 2,423 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 51 | 338 | 500 |
| **Randolph** | 78 | 604 | 604 |
| **Reading** | 127 | 357 | 1,545 |
| **Revere** | 258 | 1,106 | 1,344 |
| **Rising Tide Charter Public (District)** | 3 | 88 | 176 |
| **Rockland** | 84 | 391 | 486 |
| **Salem** | 267 | 776 | 760 |
| **Sandwich** | 2 | 364 | 1,044 |
| **Saugus** | 73 | 489 | 613 |
| **Scituate** | 27 | 254 | 1,129 |
| **Seekonk** | 16 | 304 | 682 |
| **Sharon** | 44 | 281 | 1,457 |
| **Shawsheen Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 153 | 605 | 942 |
| **Shrewsbury** | 115 | 399 | 2,176 |
| **Silver Lake** | 72 | 556 | 1,245 |
| **Somerset Berkley Regional School District** | 66 | 324 | 854 |
| **Somerville** | 255 | 908 | 873 |
| **South Hadley** | 43 | 323 | 554 |
| **South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical** | 31 | 567 | 276 |
| **South Shore Charter Public (District)** | 9 | 88 | 153 |
| **South Shore Regional Vocational Technical** | 10 | 398 | 342 |
| **Southbridge** | 35 | 572 | 266 |
| **Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical** | 257 | 717 | 602 |
| **Southern Berkshire** | 20 | 102 | 213 |
| **Southern Worcester County Regional Vocational Technical** | 66 | 641 | 654 |
| **Southwick-Tolland-Granville Regional School District** | 29 | 316 | 524 |
| **Spencer-E Brookfield** | 35 | 368 | 358 |
| **Spirit of Knowledge Charter School (District)** | 20 | 92 | 43 |
| **Springfield** | 500 | 7,693 | 3,065 |
| **Stoneham** | 46 | 292 | 751 |
| **Stoughton** | 127 | 536 | 973 |
| **Sutton** | 27 | 201 | 452 |
| **Swampscott** | 35 | 299 | 817 |
| **Swansea** | 82 | 286 | 512 |
| **Tantasqua** | 39 | 715 | 1,114 |
| **Taunton** | 156 | 1,388 | 1,462 |
| **Tewksbury** | 50 | 544 | 965 |
| **Tri County Regional Vocational Technical** | 100 | 550 | 643 |
| **Triton** | 113 | 240 | 841 |
| **Tyngsborough** | 17 | 252 | 586 |
| **Upper Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical** | 6 | 347 | 474 |
| **Uxbridge** | 2 | 365 | 418 |
| **Wachusett** | 116 | 782 | 2,439 |
| **Wakefield** | 27 | 484 | 1,046 |
| **Walpole** | 87 | 434 | 1,295 |
| **Waltham** | 74 | 886 | 1,240 |
| **Ware** | 6 | 227 | 231 |
| **Wareham** | 69 | 604 | 502 |
| **Watertown** | 26 | 414 | 736 |
| **Webster** | 53 | 415 | 339 |
| **Wellesley** | 34 | 370 | 1,858 |
| **West Boylston** | 43 | 140 | 262 |
| **West Bridgewater** | 34 | 181 | 419 |
| **West Springfield** | 90 | 737 | 1,073 |
| **Westborough** | 12 | 301 | 1,344 |
| **Westfield** | 81 | 1,392 | 1,447 |
| **Westford** | 1 | 250 | 2,302 |
| **Weston** | 23 | 191 | 971 |
| **Westport** | 36 | 216 | 383 |
| **Weymouth** | 239 | 1,442 | 1,573 |
| **Whitman-Hanson** | 82 | 652 | 1,183 |
| **Whittier Regional Vocational Technical** | 281 | 470 | 821 |
| **Wilmington** | 67 | 393 | 1,081 |
| **Winchendon** | 29 | 319 | 219 |
| **Winchester** | 9 | 308 | 1,589 |
| **Winthrop** | 26 | 337 | 498 |
| **Woburn** | 34 | 890 | 1,186 |
| **Worcester** | 1,366 | 4,972 | 4,477 |

| **Table 5: One Stop (627)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 834** | **N = 65,990** | **N = 60,193** |
| **Amherst-Pelham** | 3 | 360 | 1,182 |
| **Ayer Shirley School District** | 2 | 276 | 297 |
| **Boston** | 245 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 7 | 332 | 172 |
| **Bridgewater-Raynham** | 1 | 777 | 1,611 |
| **Brockton** | 8 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Chelsea** | 1 | 1,212 | 884 |
| **Chicopee** | 4 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **Dartmouth** | 1 | 520 | 1,196 |
| **East Bridgewater** | 2 | 252 | 655 |
| **Easthampton** | 3 | 293 | 342 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 1 | 143 | 138 |
| **Everett** | 3 | 1,759 | 1,168 |
| **Fall River** | 343 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Fitchburg** | 12 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical** | 3 | 416 | 224 |
| **Frontier** | 1 | 257 | 375 |
| **Gardner** | 8 | 572 | 482 |
| **Gill-Montague** | 4 | 195 | 232 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 3 | 662 | 968 |
| **Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical** | 5 | 577 | 458 |
| **Greenfield** | 14 | 347 | 279 |
| **Hadley** | 1 | 86 | 186 |
| **Haverhill** | 2 | 1,394 | 1,483 |
| **Holyoke** | 2 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Hudson** | 2 | 427 | 788 |
| **Lawrence** | 30 | 3,558 | 1,788 |
| **Leominster** | 22 | 1,279 | 1,554 |
| **Lowell** | 1 | 2,429 | 2,477 |
| **Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)** | 1 | 107 | 48 |
| **Malden** | 16 | 1,238 | 1,510 |
| **MATCH Charter Public School (District)** | 2 | 149 | 228 |
| **Medford** | 3 | 881 | 1,169 |
| **Methuen** | 1 | 1,490 | 1,385 |
| **Mohawk Trail** | 3 | 183 | 293 |
| **Monson** | 1 | 244 | 329 |
| **Nashoba** | 1 | 324 | 1,280 |
| **Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 1 | 346 | 397 |
| **New Bedford** | 14 | 2,796 | 1,322 |
| **Northbridge** | 1 | 471 | 574 |
| **Pathfinder Regional Vocational Technical** | 5 | 440 | 324 |
| **Phoenix Charter Academy (District)** | 1 | 142 | 125 |
| **Pioneer Valley** | 3 | 192 | 301 |
| **Quabbin** | 1 | 456 | 777 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 1 | 338 | 500 |
| **Somerville** | 2 | 908 | 873 |
| **South Hadley** | 1 | 323 | 554 |
| **Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 717 | 602 |
| **Springfield** | 23 | 7,693 | 3,065 |
| **Stoneham** | 6 | 292 | 751 |
| **Stoughton** | 2 | 536 | 973 |
| **Taunton** | 1 | 1,388 | 1,462 |
| **Waltham** | 1 | 886 | 1,240 |
| **Ware** | 3 | 227 | 231 |
| **Westport** | 1 | 216 | 383 |
| **Winchendon** | 1 | 319 | 219 |
| **Woburn** | 2 | 890 | 1,186 |

| **Table 6: All Grant Programs** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 24,491** | **N = 158,511** | **N = 252,306** |
| **Abington** | 156 | 194 | 481 |
| **Academy Of the Pacific Rim Charter Public (District)** | 1 | 108 | 206 |
| **Acton-Boxborough** | 24 | 429 | 2,565 |
| **Adams-Cheshire** | 26 | 272 | 279 |
| **Agawam** | 70 | 753 | 1,241 |
| **Amesbury** | 37 | 294 | 695 |
| **Amesbury Academy Charter Public (District)** | 2 | 48 | 23 |
| **Amherst-Pelham** | 51 | 360 | 1,182 |
| **Andover** | 67 | 476 | 2,412 |
| **Arlington** | 61 | 338 | 1,577 |
| **Ashburnham-Westminster** | 68 | 310 | 709 |
| **Ashland** | 56 | 201 | 862 |
| **Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 123 | 570 | 574 |
| **Athol-Royalston** | 92 | 276 | 252 |
| **Attleboro** | 146 | 919 | 1,621 |
| **Auburn** | 54 | 315 | 711 |
| **Avon** | 52 | 83 | 212 |
| **Ayer Shirley School District** | 13 | 276 | 297 |
| **Barnstable** | 77 | 906 | 1,442 |
| **Bedford** | 188 | 159 | 1,070 |
| **Belchertown** | 1 | 420 | 753 |
| **Bellingham** | 156 | 281 | 580 |
| **Belmont** | 40 | 265 | 1,559 |
| **Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public (District)** | 10 | 74 | 128 |
| **Berkshire Hills** | 2 | 303 | 519 |
| **Berlin-Boylston** | 11 | 112 | 324 |
| **Beverly** | 37 | 731 | 1,339 |
| **Billerica** | 40 | 889 | 1,388 |
| **Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 48 | 353 | 1,044 |
| **Blackstone-Millville** | 87 | 236 | 488 |
| **Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical** | 73 | 413 | 559 |
| **Boston** | 1,550 | 13,354 | 10,878 |
| **Boston Collegiate Charter (District)** | 4 | 80 | 308 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 47 | 332 | 172 |
| **Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)** | 4 | 283 | 119 |
| **Bourne** | 66 | 275 | 524 |
| **Braintree** | 99 | 527 | 1,887 |
| **Bridgewater-Raynham** | 120 | 777 | 1,611 |
| **Bristol County Agricultural** | 21 | 160 | 378 |
| **Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational Technical** | 111 | 680 | 802 |
| **Brockton** | 727 | 3,552 | 3,091 |
| **Brookline** | 77 | 466 | 2,343 |
| **Burlington** | 20 | 456 | 1,162 |
| **Cambridge** | 54 | 1,023 | 1,689 |
| **Canton** | 7 | 423 | 1,005 |
| **Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical** | 114 | 352 | 369 |
| **Carver** | 24 | 290 | 464 |
| **Central Berkshire** | 11 | 312 | 515 |
| **Chelmsford** | 117 | 506 | 1,846 |
| **Chelsea** | 219 | 1,212 | 884 |
| **Chicopee** | 168 | 2,014 | 1,715 |
| **City On A Hill Charter Public (District)** | 66 | 114 | 184 |
| **City on a Hill Charter Public School II (District)** | 31 | 51 | 24 |
| **Clinton** | 99 | 292 | 360 |
| **Codman Academy Charter Public (District)** | 94 | 4 | 83 |
| **Cohasset** | 20 | 98 | 528 |
| **Danvers** | 44 | 558 | 1,085 |
| **Dartmouth** | 55 | 520 | 1,196 |
| **Dedham** | 70 | 344 | 835 |
| **Dennis-Yarmouth** | 92 | 486 | 692 |
| **Dighton-Rehoboth** | 35 | 468 | 929 |
| **Douglas** | 60 | 252 | 387 |
| **Dover-Sherborn** | 69 | 104 | 881 |
| **Dracut** | 93 | 645 | 870 |
| **Dudley-Charlton Reg** | 62 | 606 | 1,147 |
| **Duxbury** | 50 | 278 | 1,326 |
| **East Bridgewater** | 75 | 252 | 655 |
| **East Longmeadow** | 146 | 419 | 833 |
| **Easthampton** | 64 | 293 | 342 |
| **Easton** | 70 | 458 | 1,326 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 91 | 143 | 138 |
| **Essex Agricultural Technical** | 16 | 175 | 400 |
| **Everett** | 159 | 1,759 | 1,168 |
| **Fairhaven** | 1 | 430 | 566 |
| **Fall River** | 844 | 2,045 | 1,634 |
| **Falmouth** | 62 | 426 | 939 |
| **Fitchburg** | 240 | 1,130 | 812 |
| **Four Rivers Charter Public (District)** | 1 | 74 | 142 |
| **Foxborough** | 38 | 363 | 921 |
| **Foxborough Regional Charter (District)** | 8 | 190 | 254 |
| **Framingham** | 87 | 1,187 | 2,049 |
| **Franklin** | 62 | 544 | 2,040 |
| **Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical** | 11 | 416 | 224 |
| **Freetown-Lakeville** | 39 | 426 | 880 |
| **Frontier** | 4 | 257 | 375 |
| **Gardner** | 25 | 572 | 482 |
| **Gateway** | 21 | 208 | 235 |
| **Georgetown** | 26 | 206 | 464 |
| **Gill-Montague** | 18 | 195 | 232 |
| **Global Learning Charter Public (District)** | 33 | 112 | 117 |
| **Gloucester** | 41 | 651 | 792 |
| **Grafton** | 5 | 326 | 899 |
| **Granby** | 32 | 197 | 281 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 115 | 662 | 968 |
| **Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical** | 630 | 577 | 458 |
| **Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical** | 147 | 1,466 | 1,009 |
| **Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical** | 482 | 897 | 1,310 |
| **Greenfield** | 33 | 347 | 279 |
| **Groton-Dunstable** | 14 | 247 | 1,121 |
| **Hadley** | 1 | 86 | 186 |
| **Hampden-Wilbraham** | 55 | 555 | 1,277 |
| **Hampshire** | 26 | 262 | 496 |
| **Hanover** | 31 | 379 | 811 |
| **Harvard** | 41 | 74 | 554 |
| **Hatfield** | 21 | 62 | 114 |
| **Haverhill** | 202 | 1,394 | 1,483 |
| **Hingham** | 102 | 300 | 1,443 |
| **Holbrook** | 78 | 190 | 233 |
| **Holliston** | 24 | 241 | 1,031 |
| **Holyoke** | 228 | 1,580 | 1,023 |
| **Hopedale** | 17 | 165 | 366 |
| **Hopkinton** | 33 | 241 | 1,445 |
| **Hudson** | 72 | 427 | 788 |
| **Hull** | 42 | 158 | 325 |
| **Ipswich** | 56 | 183 | 733 |
| **King Philip** | 67 | 603 | 1,498 |
| **KIPP Academy Lynn Charter (District)** | 3 | 208 | 191 |
| **Lawrence** | 548 | 3,558 | 1,788 |
| **Lee** | 90 | 85 | 234 |
| **Leicester** | 51 | 243 | 439 |
| **Lenox** | 60 | 69 | 258 |
| **Leominster** | 108 | 1,279 | 1,554 |
| **Lexington** | 61 | 315 | 2,870 |
| **Lincoln-Sudbury** | 57 | 263 | 1,808 |
| **Littleton** | 34 | 134 | 519 |
| **Longmeadow** | 14 | 338 | 1,147 |
| **Lowell** | 429 | 2,429 | 2,477 |
| **Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)** | 21 | 107 | 48 |
| **Ludlow** | 130 | 452 | 880 |
| **Lynn** | 700 | 3,149 | 2,466 |
| **Lynnfield** | 46 | 243 | 740 |
| **Malden** | 198 | 1,238 | 1,510 |
| **Manchester Essex Regional** | 14 | 140 | 575 |
| **Marblehead** | 36 | 281 | 1,288 |
| **Marlborough** | 46 | 745 | 1,046 |
| **Marshfield** | 103 | 575 | 1,423 |
| **Martha's Vineyard Charter (District)** | 1 | 25 | 52 |
| **Marthas Vineyard** | 12 | 216 | 674 |
| **Masconomet** | 18 | 401 | 1,707 |
| **Mashpee** | 37 | 334 | 350 |
| **Massachusetts Virtual Academy at Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School** | 3 | 99 | 56 |
| **MATCH Charter Public School (District)** | 3 | 149 | 228 |
| **Maynard** | 17 | 184 | 302 |
| **Medfield** | 28 | 231 | 1,130 |
| **Medford** | 102 | 881 | 1,169 |
| **Medway** | 65 | 220 | 963 |
| **Melrose** | 73 | 487 | 982 |
| **Mendon-Upton** | 17 | 291 | 805 |
| **Methuen** | 130 | 1,490 | 1,385 |
| **Middleborough** | 123 | 545 | 678 |
| **Milford** | 47 | 574 | 1,157 |
| **Millbury** | 24 | 276 | 442 |
| **Millis** | 70 | 162 | 395 |
| **Milton** | 72 | 365 | 1,185 |
| **Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical** | 59 | 383 | 394 |
| **Mohawk Trail** | 25 | 183 | 293 |
| **Monomoy Regional School District** | 4 | 296 | 447 |
| **Monson** | 2 | 244 | 329 |
| **Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical** | 63 | 685 | 1,028 |
| **Mount Greylock** | 49 | 113 | 412 |
| **Nantucket** | 50 | 233 | 405 |
| **Narragansett** | 52 | 261 | 347 |
| **Nashoba** | 12 | 324 | 1,280 |
| **Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 136 | 346 | 397 |
| **Natick** | 67 | 475 | 1,692 |
| **Nauset** | 70 | 307 | 1,073 |
| **Needham** | 43 | 359 | 2,060 |
| **New Bedford** | 242 | 2,796 | 1,322 |
| **New Leadership Charter (District)** | 3 | 34 | 27 |
| **Newburyport** | 42 | 230 | 888 |
| **Newton** | 96 | 917 | 4,797 |
| **Norfolk County Agricultural** | 19 | 173 | 403 |
| **North Adams** | 157 | 202 | 273 |
| **North Andover** | 67 | 641 | 1,517 |
| **North Attleborough** | 72 | 444 | 1,495 |
| **North Brookfield** | 29 | 77 | 115 |
| **North Central Charter Essential (District)** | 41 | 122 | 184 |
| **North Middlesex** | 13 | 556 | 1,014 |
| **North Reading** | 11 | 331 | 879 |
| **North Shore Regional Vocational Technical** | 51 | 247 | 285 |
| **Northampton** | 49 | 417 | 957 |
| **Northampton-Smith Vocational Agricultural** | 33 | 309 | 181 |
| **Northboro-Southboro** | 3 | 418 | 1,439 |
| **Northbridge** | 49 | 471 | 574 |
| **Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical** | 20 | 881 | 665 |
| **Northern Berkshire Regional Vocational Technical** | 9 | 305 | 300 |
| **Norton** | 29 | 353 | 798 |
| **Norwell** | 58 | 187 | 851 |
| **Norwood** | 59 | 606 | 987 |
| **Old Colony Regional Vocational Technical** | 47 | 276 | 394 |
| **Old Rochester** | 2 | 371 | 804 |
| **Oxford** | 40 | 332 | 438 |
| **Palmer** | 18 | 250 | 382 |
| **Pathfinder Regional Vocational Technical** | 29 | 440 | 324 |
| **Paulo Freire Social Justice Charter School (District)** | 5 | 109 | 38 |
| **Peabody** | 110 | 1,219 | 1,515 |
| **Pembroke** | 87 | 371 | 1,088 |
| **Pentucket** | 21 | 410 | 880 |
| **Phoenix Charter Academy (District)** | 8 | 142 | 125 |
| **Pioneer Charter School of Science II (PCSS-II) (District)** | 1 | 51 | 45 |
| **Pioneer Valley** | 47 | 192 | 301 |
| **Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public (District)** | 3 | 169 | 236 |
| **Pittsfield** | 188 | 1,099 | 1,451 |
| **Plymouth** | 221 | 1,267 | 2,199 |
| **Provincetown** | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| **Quabbin** | 44 | 456 | 777 |
| **Quaboag Regional** | 25 | 246 | 312 |
| **Quincy** | 142 | 1,749 | 2,423 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 55 | 338 | 500 |
| **Randolph** | 103 | 604 | 604 |
| **Reading** | 127 | 357 | 1,545 |
| **Revere** | 303 | 1,106 | 1,344 |
| **Rising Tide Charter Public (District)** | 3 | 88 | 176 |
| **Rockland** | 84 | 391 | 486 |
| **Salem** | 282 | 776 | 760 |
| **Sandwich** | 2 | 364 | 1,044 |
| **Saugus** | 74 | 489 | 613 |
| **Scituate** | 27 | 254 | 1,129 |
| **Seekonk** | 16 | 304 | 682 |
| **Sharon** | 44 | 281 | 1,457 |
| **Shawsheen Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 159 | 605 | 942 |
| **Shrewsbury** | 116 | 399 | 2,176 |
| **Silver Lake** | 72 | 556 | 1,245 |
| **Somerset Berkley Regional School District** | 67 | 324 | 854 |
| **Somerville** | 281 | 908 | 873 |
| **South Hadley** | 44 | 323 | 554 |
| **South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical** | 33 | 567 | 276 |
| **South Shore Charter Public (District)** | 9 | 88 | 153 |
| **South Shore Regional Vocational Technical** | 10 | 398 | 342 |
| **Southbridge** | 35 | 572 | 266 |
| **Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical** | 260 | 717 | 602 |
| **Southern Berkshire** | 20 | 102 | 213 |
| **Southern Worcester County Regional Vocational Technical** | 66 | 641 | 654 |
| **Southwick-Tolland-Granville Regional School District** | 29 | 316 | 524 |
| **Spencer-E Brookfield** | 35 | 368 | 358 |
| **Spirit of Knowledge Charter School (District)** | 20 | 92 | 43 |
| **Springfield** | 544 | 7,693 | 3,065 |
| **Stoneham** | 52 | 292 | 751 |
| **Stoughton** | 129 | 536 | 973 |
| **Sutton** | 27 | 201 | 452 |
| **Swampscott** | 36 | 299 | 817 |
| **Swansea** | 82 | 286 | 512 |
| **Tantasqua** | 39 | 715 | 1,114 |
| **Taunton** | 182 | 1,388 | 1,462 |
| **Tewksbury** | 112 | 544 | 965 |
| **Tri County Regional Vocational Technical** | 100 | 550 | 643 |
| **Triton** | 113 | 240 | 841 |
| **Tyngsborough** | 17 | 252 | 586 |
| **Upper Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical** | 15 | 347 | 474 |
| **Uxbridge** | 2 | 365 | 418 |
| **Wachusett** | 117 | 782 | 2,439 |
| **Wakefield** | 27 | 484 | 1,046 |
| **Walpole** | 87 | 434 | 1,295 |
| **Waltham** | 76 | 886 | 1,240 |
| **Ware** | 9 | 227 | 231 |
| **Wareham** | 89 | 604 | 502 |
| **Watertown** | 26 | 414 | 736 |
| **Webster** | 53 | 415 | 339 |
| **Wellesley** | 34 | 370 | 1,858 |
| **West Boylston** | 43 | 140 | 262 |
| **West Bridgewater** | 34 | 181 | 419 |
| **West Springfield** | 90 | 737 | 1,073 |
| **Westborough** | 12 | 301 | 1,344 |
| **Westfield** | 92 | 1,392 | 1,447 |
| **Westford** | 1 | 250 | 2,302 |
| **Weston** | 23 | 191 | 971 |
| **Westport** | 68 | 216 | 383 |
| **Weymouth** | 239 | 1,442 | 1,573 |
| **Whitman-Hanson** | 82 | 652 | 1,183 |
| **Whittier Regional Vocational Technical** | 281 | 470 | 821 |
| **Wilmington** | 68 | 393 | 1,081 |
| **Winchendon** | 32 | 319 | 219 |
| **Winchester** | 9 | 308 | 1,589 |
| **Winthrop** | 28 | 337 | 498 |
| **Woburn** | 36 | 890 | 1,186 |
| **Worcester** | 1,489 | 4,972 | 4,477 |

| **Table 7: One Stop Participants vs. Non-Participating 12th Graders** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Students Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Eligible to Participate, but not Participating in Academic Support Program** | **Students Not Eligible to Participate in Academic Support Programs** |
| **N = 834** | **N = 12,618** | **N = 23,525** |
| **Amherst-Pelham** | 3 | 67 | 448 |
| **Ayer Shirley School District** | 2 | 31 | 109 |
| **Boston** | 245 | 2,810 | 4,130 |
| **Boston Day and Evening Academy Charter (District)** | 7 | 194 | 111 |
| **Bridgewater-Raynham** | 1 | 168 | 593 |
| **Brockton** | 8 | 687 | 1,208 |
| **Chelsea** | 1 | 227 | 289 |
| **Chicopee** | 4 | 410 | 726 |
| **Dartmouth** | 1 | 81 | 458 |
| **East Bridgewater** | 2 | 29 | 238 |
| **Easthampton** | 3 | 60 | 150 |
| **Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers (Horace Mann Charter School)** | 1 | 23 | 57 |
| **Everett** | 3 | 434 | 513 |
| **Fall River** | 343 | 383 | 607 |
| **Fitchburg** | 12 | 241 | 347 |
| **Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical** | 3 | 105 | 121 |
| **Frontier** | 1 | 24 | 170 |
| **Gardner** | 8 | 77 | 208 |
| **Gill-Montague** | 4 | 38 | 100 |
| **Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical** | 3 | 153 | 489 |
| **Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical** | 5 | 283 | 263 |
| **Greenfield** | 14 | 41 | 113 |
| **Hadley** | 1 | 8 | 78 |
| **Haverhill** | 2 | 236 | 515 |
| **Holyoke** | 2 | 283 | 412 |
| **Hudson** | 2 | 72 | 332 |
| **Lawrence** | 30 | 775 | 488 |
| **Leominster** | 22 | 186 | 686 |
| **Lowell** | 1 | 417 | 893 |
| **Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)** | 1 | 14 | 15 |
| **Malden** | 16 | 223 | 542 |
| **MATCH Charter Public School (District)** | 2 | 2 | 83 |
| **Medford** | 3 | 158 | 493 |
| **Methuen** | 1 | 273 | 522 |
| **Mohawk Trail** | 3 | 48 | 105 |
| **Monson** | 1 | 40 | 119 |
| **Nashoba** | 1 | 36 | 433 |
| **Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical** | 1 | 73 | 225 |
| **New Bedford** | 14 | 497 | 408 |
| **Northbridge** | 1 | 84 | 255 |
| **Pathfinder Regional Vocational Technical** | 5 | 111 | 193 |
| **Phoenix Charter Academy (District)** | 1 | 27 | 40 |
| **Pioneer Valley** | 3 | 28 | 131 |
| **Quabbin** | 1 | 68 | 324 |
| **Ralph C Mahar** | 1 | 45 | 212 |
| **Somerville** | 2 | 210 | 356 |
| **South Hadley** | 1 | 42 | 239 |
| **Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical** | 2 | 173 | 334 |
| **Springfield** | 23 | 1,029 | 1,099 |
| **Stoneham** | 6 | 66 | 295 |
| **Stoughton** | 2 | 96 | 371 |
| **Taunton** | 1 | 255 | 508 |
| **Waltham** | 1 | 177 | 518 |
| **Ware** | 3 | 36 | 90 |
| **Westport** | 1 | 35 | 172 |
| **Winchendon** | 1 | 60 | 120 |
| **Woburn** | 2 | 169 | 471 |
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1. Competency Determination is based on performance on the state’s high school MCAS tests in English language arts, mathematics, and science and technology/engineering. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Please see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/gradrates/dropoutvsgrad.html> for a description of ESE’s graduation and droput rate calcuations. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Competency Determination is based on performance on the state’s high school MCAS tests in English language arts, mathematics, and science and technology/engineering. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Additional student eligibility requirements by grant type can be found at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/grants/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For more information on eligibility requirements, see: http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For the purposes of this report, when referring to all recipients of Academic Support funds, we use the term “awardees” regardless of the funding source. When referring to competitive grantee recipients only, we use the term “grantees.” [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Advice questions included the following: (1) advice for districts in regards to challenges; (2) advice for programs starting Academic Support programs; and (3) advice for sites currently implementing Academic Support programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For more information on eligibility requirements, see: http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. For more information about funding allocation by grant type, please see: http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/ [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Two of the seventy responses cited current funding challenges rather than describing success stories of their programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. An additional five respondents answered this question either thanking ESE for current services provided or stating they did not know or did not have additional suggestions. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. ESE requested that questions be related to these three subgroups in particular. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. UMDI is assessing program impacts for participants from SY13 and SY14 because those are the two most recent years for which relevant outcome data are available. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Eligibility criteria varied by program and can be found here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/grants/> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. A small number of Academic Support participants were enrolled in a district that was not assigned an accountability level for SY13 or SY14 and are therefore not included in the table. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Complete SIMS and MCAS data could not be found for an additional 3,795 of these students, who were subsequently excluded from analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)