P3 IMPACT EVALUATION
BROWARD COUNTY BEST OPPORTUNITIES TO SHINE (BOSS) PROGRAM

This report informs the collaborative effort to improve the employment, education, personal developmental and well-being of youth at risk of being disconnected from opportunities to succeed after graduating from high school.

Children's Services Council of Broward County
Our Focus is Our Children.

PR/Award #: V420A150015

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Introduction

A. Introduction and Study Overview

(1) Overview. This study involves youth at risk of disconnecting from school (i.e. at-promise youth) who are restricted from participating in all available supports due to conflicting program rules. These students attend schools in Broward County that offer supplemental education programs through the 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC), or workforce development programs through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA). Based on eligibility requirements and enrollment limitations, at-promise youth are forced to choose between these programs. To overcome this service barrier, Broward's Best Opportunities to Shine and Succeed (BOSS) program provides at-promise youth with the beneficial interventions of both programs, which, when combined, have the potential to improve school engagement, academic performance, graduation rates, post-secondary success, enhanced family involvement, and employment opportunities. To support these goals, the BOSS program utilizes a waiver for program eligibility requirements through the Performance Partnership Pilots (P3) grant program that removes the funding barriers between 21st CCLC and WIOA, and braids their funding with Library Services Technology Act (LSTA) funds to create a hybrid program that employs tiered case management services. The following waivers were approved by Federal Lead Agency and the Federal Consulting Agencies: 1) WIOA Sec. 129(a)(4)(A) waved WIOA's 25% funding requirement for "in school youth" allowing underutilized "out of school youth" dollars to fund the BOSS program; 2) WIOA's Sec. 129 (a) (1) (c) was waived reducing the reporting requirements for the BOSS program allowing schoolwide eligibility for youth attending the six schools who are citizens or legally documented non-citizens eligible for employment; 3) WIOA Sec. 116 (B)(2)(A)(ii)(I – III) was waived allowing the State of Florida to approve alternative Performance Accountability Measures for the BOSS youth that are similar to the existing 21st CCLC performance measures; 4) Secs. 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was waived allowing the provision of services during the school day for the BOSS participants; and 5) 34 CFR §75.708 (a) was waived allowing the Children's Services Council of Broward County (CSC) to subgrant 21st CCLC funds to our BOSS service providers (i.e. YMCA and Hispanic Unity). An independent evaluation conducted by the South Florida Education Research Alliance (SFERA) assessed the impact of the BOSS program on at-promise youth.

(2) Need for the Project. A collaborative partnership of Broward County organizations performed a needs assessment in 2015 that identified schools with high population- and community-risk factors for the BOSS program. These high risk factors focused on characteristics known to be associated with the post-secondary success of at-promise youth (Table 1). The selected schools include those serving students who reside in eleven zip codes (ACS 09-13a, b, c), and attend schools in the most disadvantaged areas of the following cities: Deerfield Beach (Deerfield Beach H.S.), Hollywood (McArthur H.S.), Lauderhill and Lauderdale Lakes (Boyd Anderson H.S.), Miramar (Miramar H.S.), Plantation (Plantation H.S.), and Sunrise and Lauderdale Lakes (Piper H.S.). These communities include many recent immigrants with limited English proficiency/ESOL (see Table 1) creating cultural assimilation challenges that impact post- secondary success (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). The percentage of residents without a high school Diploma/GED (see Table 1) is higher than the county average (ACS 09-13b), which affects the ability of families to help make their children aware of the academic skills required for post-secondary success (Conley, 2007). The high poverty rate (see Table 1) for children living in these communities (ACS 09-13c) explain why the Free and Reduced Lunch rate for the targeted schools are higher than the School District

Table 1: Population and Community Risk Factors at BOSS Schools

School	ESOL[a]	Diploma/GED[a]	Poverty[a] (FRL) [c]	Communities	Violent Crime[b]	Juvenile Arrests [b]
Deerfield Beach	44%	23.3%	28.9% (74.6%)	Deerfield Beach	13th	9th
McArthur	45%	17.7%	19.6% (77.8%)	Hollywood	11th	7th
Boyd Anderson	30%	26.9%	36.7% (88.9%)	Lauderhill	8th	10th
				Lauderdale Lakes	1st	15th
Miramar	41%	15.8%	18.1% (77.6%)	Miramar	14th	3rd
Plantation	31%	19.8%	21.4% (72.7%)	Plantation	15th	12th
Piper	34%	11.2%	17.4% (71.2%)	Lauderdale Lakes	1st	15th
				Sunrise	18th	6th
District Average	*17.8%*	*17.3%*	*18.9% (60.3%)*	Range for community variables - 1st worst to 30th best		

[a] Data by zip codes data, [b] Data by city, [b] FRL = Free / Reduced Price Lunch

average (Broward County Public Schools [BCPS], 2014a) and impact the resources required for a successful post-secondary transition (Frazier, Capella, & Atkins, 2007). In 2013, six of the seven cities' violent crime rates ranked amongst the worst in Broward's 30 cities (Florida Department of Law Enforcement [FDLE], 2014a), a trend that is evident in juvenile arrests (FDLE, 2014b), and greater involvement in the juvenile justice system decreases the chance of achieving post-secondary success (Ameen & Lee, 2012).

The better a student is academically prepared, the more likely they will succeed in the post-secondary environment (Conley, 2007). More youth at the focal schools performed below grade level on Florida's standardized student assessment in reading (61.4% vs 48%), math (46.4 % vs 36%) and End of Course Exams (EOCs) in Algebra (53 % vs 34%) than students at other traditional public high schools (FDOE, 2014). On average, traditional public high schools had 22.4 disruptive school incidents per 100 students in the 2013/14 school year, compared to an average of 27.7 disruptive incidents at the six focal high schools (Broward Schools, 2014c). The average Federal Graduation Rate (84.5%) for the BOSS schools is lower than the district average graduation rate for traditional public high schools (87.5%) (FDOE, 2014), and less than half (49.4%) of ninth graders at the BOSS schools are likely to graduate on time compared to six out of ten (59.8%) at all high schools in Broward County (FDOE, 2015). The average 2014 district four-year-at-risk graduation rate is higher at Boyd Anderson, Deerfield Beach, Miramar and Piper high schools, (FDOE, 2015), and one in three (28.9% in 2015) of the seniors identified by the school district as being at high risk for not graduating attend the BOSS schools, which are only (20%) of the traditional high schools in Broward.

Early positive connections to the workplace increase the chance for successful future employment, particularly for at-promise youth (Schwartz, York, & Ramos-Hernandez, 2015). The estimated unemployment rate in 2011-13 for 16-24-year-olds in Broward County is 24.8%, the rate increases to 37% for youth aged 16-19 years old (ACS 09-13e). The employment rate varies by race - 22% White, 26% Hispanic, and 57% Black (ACS 11-13 e, f, g.), illustrating the importance of reaching out to youth of color who comprise 83.8% of the focal schools' combined population (BCPS, 2014a). To address youth unemployment, CareerSource Broward hosted Industry Forums for employers to rate workforce skill deficits and highlighted the need for "soft job skills training," a need that employers rated highest for young people (CareerSource, 2014). In January 2015, CSC administered a Post-Secondary Student Needs Assessment survey of job skills to over 900 at-promise youth attending 21st

CCLC programs at the targeted schools and found "soft job skills" knowledge was extremely low: 71% failed the assessment, and a third were unable to identify what should NOT appear on a resume.

The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) sheds light on the long-term effect of the community and school performance risk factors on the at-promise youth attending the focal schools. FETPIP tracks post-secondary choices for high school graduates, and, in 2010-13 (FETPIP, 2014), youth graduating from the focal schools were less likely (49%) than students attending other Broward high schools (62%) to enroll in post-secondary education opportunities. If they did continue their education, they were more likely (13% vs. 6%) to enroll in expensive private colleges rather than affordable state universities. The at-promise youth attending the six target schools were more likely to be employed (45% vs. 41%) than youth attending other schools, but they found work in low paying jobs that required them to qualify for TANF and/or Food Stamps (18% vs. 11%).

The BOSS program utilized the P3 waivers to remove the barriers of the competing 21st CCLC and WIOA programs that have similar yet different required performance measures. This was done to blend and braid funding supports in order to create a more efficient evidence-informed service delivery model based upon tiered case management. The case managers then worked to connect the at-promise youth (who are legally documented, a WIOA requirement) with appropriate evidence-based and evidence-informed educational, employment, and personal development services. Tiered case management is a holistic continuum of care coordination approach designed to promote the socio-cognitive, developmental, interpersonal relationship skills, and internal self-efficacy (Scarborough, Lewis, & Kulkarni, 2010) required for all youth to graduate high school on time and successfully transition to post-secondary opportunities.

The BOSS evaluation used a randomized controlled trial (RCT) to compare the impact of tiered case management services on at-promise youth. The evaluation examined the effect of the case managers on helping treatment youth earn a diploma, and transition to post-secondary education and employment opportunities (the three primary outcomes)

B. Primary Research Questions

The BOSS evaluation was designed to test the impact of tiered case management services on the following primary research questions: graduating high school on time, transitioning to post-secondary educational opportunities, and or employment. The three primary research questions:

RQ1A: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager (i.e., treatment youth) more likely to earn a high school diploma than at-promise youth with access to the same out-of-school-time programs but not assigned a case manager (i.e., control group youth)?

RQ1B: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to transition to post-secondary educational opportunities after graduation than control group youth?

RQ1C: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to transition to employment after graduation than control group youth?

A third-party evaluator, the South Florida Education Research Alliance (SFERA), evaluated the three primary research questions and four additional primary outcomes (earning a Career Technical Diploma Certificate, number of unexcused absences, number of suspensions, and employability skills test score) at the end of each program year, which is June 2017 for year 1 and June 2018 for year 2. SFERA also compared the differences in outcomes between years to determine if the length of time of the intervention impacted the effect size of the case management intervention.

C. Secondary Research Questions

The secondary research questions examined if the at-promise youth assigned BOSS case managers demonstrated significantly better academic, behavioral, employment, and family engagement outcomes than at-promise youth not assigned case managers. The secondary research questions:

RQ2A: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to participate in the 21st CCLC and or LEAP High out-of-school time program than control group youth?

RQ2B: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to demonstrate better reading grades than control group youth?

RQ2C: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to demonstrate better online course completion rates than control group youth?

RQ2D: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to demonstrate better completion rates for CSC's Summer Youth Employment Program than control group youth?

RQ2E: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to demonstrate better completion rates for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid than control group youth?

RQ2F: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to maintain a stable housing environment than control group youth?

RQ2G: Are at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager less likely to be involved with the juvenile justice system than control group youth?

RQ2H: Are caregivers of at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to participate in their child's education than control group caregivers?

RQ2I: Are caregivers of at-promise youth assigned a BOSS case manager more likely to be referred to adult education opportunities than control group caregivers?

SFERA evaluated the nine secondary research questions at the end of each program year, which is June 2017 for year 1 and June 2018 for year 2. SFERA also compared the differences in outcomes between years to determine if the length of time of the intervention impacted the effect size of the case management intervention.

Program and Comparison Programming

A. Description of Program

The BOSS program was an intervention designed to improve the outcomes of at-promise youth. The BOSS program combined the beneficial services of the 21st CCLC and WIOA programs by creating an intensive, comprehensive, and sustained holistic service pathway built upon a tiered case management framework that provides services to help at-promise youth progress seamlessly from high school to post-secondary opportunities. The BOSS program enhances the existing federally funded 21st CCLC program and CSC's fully sustained 21st CCLC program—Leadership, Enrichment, and Academic Pursuits (LEAP High)—at the six high schools by adding case management services offered by the WIOA program. Youth attending CSC's 21st CCLC/LEAP High program were randomly assigned to the BOSS program (intervention group) and provided individual tiered case management services by the BOSS case managers who worked with them during the school day, after school, and over summer. The BOSS case managers were employed by CSC's 21st CCLC/LEAP High service providers. Case managers were bachelor-level staff who received extensive training on: school policies, graduation requirements, career pathway planning, the state university system's enrollment requirements, college affordability, fundamentals in case management practices, implicit bias training, positive youth development training, and the provision of human services in Broward.

Table 2. Broward County P3 Logic Model for the Best Opportunities to Shine and Succeed (BOSS) Program

All of the program components listed in the interim indicators and long-term outcomes are evaluated by SFERA.

		Resources	Activities	Outputs	Interim Indicators	Long-Term Outcomes
Need Indicators of at-promise Youths' Communities and Schools	Employment	• WIOA funding • CSC funding for SYEP • 21st CCLC funding • CTE teachers • NFTE staff	• Employability skills training • Summer work experience • Naviance activities • Afterschool CTE enrichment programming • NFTE training	• 150 youth to complete 6 or more weeks of SYEP • 420 youth to complete NAVIANCE activity • 36 youth earn CTE designation on diploma	• Employability Skills Assessment **(Q2 & Q4)** • SYEP **(Y1Y2)**	• Seniors transition to employment **(Y1Y2)** • Seniors earn CTE credential **(Y1Y2)**
Communities Rank 1st-18th out of 30 in Violent Crime Rank 3rd -15th out of 30 in Juvenile Arrests Averages Schools FRL 87% Diploma 17% ESOL 18%	Education	• 21st CCLC funding • CSC funding	• Tutoring & Homework assistance • Project-Based Learning • Credit Recovery • End of Course Exam support • College Bound Training	• 420 youth participate 30 + days OST programming • 420 youth pass EOCs • 60 youth recover classes • 105 youth submit college applications	• Attendance **(Q)** • Reading grade **(Q)** • Pass online course **(Q)** • FAFSA **(Y1Y2)**	• Seniors graduate from high school **(Y1Y2)** • Seniors transition to post-secondary opportuntity **(Y1Y2)**
	Parental Services	• YMCA and Hispanic Unity provider staff • CSC funding	• Parent engagement	• 30 parents take GED and/or ESOL classes.	• Parent Referrals **(Q)** • Parents involvement **(Q)**	• Parents request Educational Referral **(Q)** • Parents participate in child's education **(Q)**
	Personal Well Being	• P3 funds case managers • TOP® Facilitators • 21st CCLC provider staff • USDA funding	• Case Management services • Character Education • TOP® • Physical fitness & nutrition educ. • Healthy meals at each site • Youth in Government	• 420 youth set Individualized Service Strategy Goals • 72 youth participate in Teen Outreach Program • 420 youth receive healthy meals each day	• Stable Housing **(Q)** • Suspensions and unexcused absences **(Q)** • No new Juvenile Justice involvement **(E, Q)**	• Stable housing **(Q)** • School behavior **(Q)** • No new Juvenile Justice Involvement **(E, Q)**

Theory of Change: Tiered case management services help at-promise youth graduate, and successfully transition to the post-secondary education and or employment opportunities that allow them to achieve their career goal. The case managers will provide one-on-one supports to motivate the at-promise youth to set academic and career goals based upon their response to a detailed needs assessment. To achieve their goals, the at-promise youth will be referred to the out-of-school-time support services (i.e., 21st CCLC and LEAP High) to improve their school engagement, while providing them with the academic supports to graduate. The case managers will also work with the at-promise youth to improve their employability skills knowledge and help them practice what they learn by enrolling them in the Summer Youth Employment Program. The case managers will attempt to build relationships with the caregivers of the at-promise youth, so the caregivers will become more engaged in their child's education. The case manager also works with seniors and their caregivers to complete post-secondary applications, the Federal Free Application for Student Aid, and scholarship applications. This way the at-promise youth who do graduate, will have an improved financial capacity to enroll in and complete the post-secondary opportunities they need to achieve their career goal.

Key: E = at program enrollment; Q = quarterly; Q2 = Quarter 2; Q4 = Quarter 4; Y1Y2 = end of year one and end of year two; WIOA = Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; CSC = Children's Services Council of Broward County; 21st CCLC = 21st Century Community Learning Center; CTE = Career Technical Education; NFTE = Network for Teaching Entrepreneurship; SYEP = Summer Youth Employment Program; OST = out-of-school time; P3 = Performance Pilot Partnership; ESOL = English Speakers of Other Languages; EOC = End of Course Exam in Algebra; TOP® = Wyman's Teen Outreach Program.

County. The Case Managers meet four hours each month with school district staff that helped them track the graduation requirement and post-secondary transition planning process of their seniors. The typical Case Manager received 12 days of training each year plus the monthly four hour meetings

After student assignment, the BOSS case managers were given two weeks to meet with the treatment youth and complete a Youth Needs Assessment, which was used to develop Individual Service Plans (ISP). The ISP included academic and post-secondary career goals and strategies to achieve those goals. The BOSS case managers helped the assigned treatment youth identify the particular services offered by the 21st CCLC/LEAP High program that would assist them in achieving their ISP goals, facilitated their enrollment and participation in the 21st CCLC/LEAP High program, and worked with the at-promise youth's family to address the family's educational and resource needs. The fundamental difference between the BOSS program and CSC's existing 21st CCLC/LEAP High program is the provision of tiered case management services to the treatment group. All treatment and control youth are offered the same 21st CCLC/LEAP High services (please see Appendix A for a list of services).

There are two limitations to note. First, even though all of the case managers met minimum academic and experience requirements, there was variability in the case managers' ability to deliver services caused by two factors: individual difference and school utilization in year one. Individually, not all of the case managers were bilingual, and although they had all worked with youth, only some of them had experience with at-promise youth. In year one, two of the schools did not have personalization periods during the school day for classroom pullouts, limiting interaction with the treatment youth to afterschool only. Second, contamination occurred from the interactions between the case managers, school faculty, and at-promise youth while recruiting participants for the BOSS program. Contamination also occurred while gathering data from the control group. While collecting data, 21st CCLC/LEAP High staff actively encouraged some control youth to complete the employability skills assessments, resulting in several control group participants requesting BOSS services that were not available to the control group participants. The potential effects of variability in the fidelity of implementation caused by these limitations was examined as part of the overall sensitivity analysis.

Comparison Group Services

The comparison at-promise participants were offered the same 21st CCLC/LEAP High out-of-school-time services as the treatment group. However, they did not have a BOSS case manager nor did they create an ISP to help guide their selection and participation in 21st CCLC/LEAP High program (please see Appendix A for the 21st CCLC/LEAP High services).

Table 3: Treatment and Control Youth Participating in 21st CCLC/LEAP High Services

Out-of-School Time Service Activity	Year 1		Year 2	
	Treatment *n = 390*	Control *n = 392*	Treatment *n = 269*	Control *n = 280*
Teacher Guided Homework Help	98	88	46	27
Academic Project Based Learning	230	219	100	54
Credit Recovery and/or Online Course	98	91	24	11
College and/or Career Readiness Activity	274	173	188	10
Service Learning, Wyman TOP®, or YMCA Youth In Government	44	37	139	81
Fitness Activity	101	101	26	18

Evaluation Design

A. Study Design

The BOSS program was evaluated using an individual-level **randomized controlled trial (RCT).** Eligible participants were randomly assigned to the treatment or control conditions maintaining a 50:50 assignment ratio within each of the six BOSS schools. The study groups were designed so that only "eligible" at-promise youth could participate in the BOSS program. The requirements to be eligible were: 1) signed *parental consent* and signed *student assent* to participate; 2) documentation of U.S. citizenship or legal residency in the U.S.; and 3) participation in the existing CSC 21st CCLC/LEAP High program operating at each high school. Consent was received prior to random assignment. For a complete timeline of study activities, see Appendix B.

B. Sample Recruitment

Recruitment of at-promise youth for the BOSS program occurred during the Summer of 2016 (IRB approval was given July 2, 2016) when CSC's 21st CCLC/LEAP High providers began discussing the program with the participants in their existing out-of-school-time programs at the six schools. The IRB approved consent forms were distributed at the six BOSS schools starting July 2, 2016 and eligible at-promise youth were recruited up until January 30, 2017. After collecting the signed consent forms and eligibility documentation, the case managers submitted all documentation to CSC's BOSS Program Manager and BOSS Project Director. When the required signatures were obtained and CSC staff verified the eligibility documentation, CSC's Project Director assigned a unique P3 Identification Number (P3ID) to each participant that was sent to SFERA—the independent evaluator—for random assignment. SFERA then used a random number generator to assign youth to the conditions. The BOSS Project Director notified the Providers of the assignment for youth at their BOSS schools. Members of the treatment group were appointed a case manager by the providers, while those from the control group were not. The BOSS program and evaluation planned to have 2 case managers at each of the six schools with 35 treatment participants each. This would result in 70 treatment and 70 control participants being assigned per school for a study population of 840 at-promise youth (420 treatment and 420 control) attending the six high schools.

The BOSS case managers recruited 782 eligible at-promise youth (390 BOSS and 392 control). This represented 93.1 % of the planned number of enrolled youth whose eligibility was confirmed by CSC's BOSS Program Manager and Project Director (see Table 4 for eligibility requirements). Only these participants were assigned a P3ID that was sent to SFERA for random assignment. The required consent and assent signatures, and citizenship/legal residency documentation were verified for almost all of the eligibility forms given to CSC by the providers. In the rare case that eligibility could not be verified by CSC, the eligibility form was sent back to the case managers to be corrected and resubmitted to CSC for verification.

Table 4. Eligibility Criteria for Participation in BOSS program

Attend one of six high schools (Boyd Anderson, Deerfield Beach, McArthur, Miramar, Piper, & Plantation)
Citizenship/legal residency as indicated by I-9 Eligibility documentation
Parental consent and youth assent for participation
Participation in 21st CCLC / LEAP program

C. Data Collection

Data were collected from the initiation of random assignment on July 2, 2016 to the end of the program which was June 30, 2018. CSC collected data from many different sources including: 1) CSC's internal SAMIS database (online course completion, program participation, parent participation and educational referrals, transition to post-secondary, and employment); 2) CSC's Integrated Data System (IDS) with the School District (reading grades, unexcused absences, suspensions, homelessness, ESE status, ESOL status, 8th Grade GPA, and Free/Reduced Lunch status); 3) the School District's Guidance Department (Free Application to Federal Student Aid); 4) school principals (Diploma and Career Technical Education designation on diploma); 5) CareerSource Broward (Summer Youth Employment Program); and the Department of Juvenile Justice (referrals). The time of the data collection was based upon the quarterly Performance Measure reports (i.e., ED. Form 524) and school year milestones (quarterly grades and end of school year). To ensure the accuracy and timeliness of data entered into SAMIS by the CSC Providers, CSC agreed to provide additional funding to the YMCA in December of 2016 to hire a full time staff member to collect and enter the control group data (see table 5).

Table 5. Data collection schedule

Source	Same for Treatment & Comparison	Timing	Data Collected	MOU
SAMIS	Yes	Rolling Basis	July 2016 —June 2018	N/A
IDS with School District	Yes	Quarterly	July 2016 —June 2018	Yes
District Guidance Department	Yes	Annually	June 2017 & June 2018	Yes
Department of Juvenile Justice	Yes	Rolling Basis	July 2016 —June 2018	Yes
CareerSource Broward	Yes	Annually	June 2017 & June 2018	NA
School Principals	Yes	Annually	June 2017 & June 2018	Yes

D. Outcomes for Analyses

The Primary Research questions focused on seven outcomes for at-promise youth: 1) diploma; 2) transition to college/military/vocational training (*post-secondary*); 3) transition to employment (*employment*); 4) unexcused absences in school years (*unexcused 17* and *unexcused 18*); 5) suspensions in school years (*suspensions 17* and *suspensions 18*); 6) highest employability skills test score (*employability skills test*); and 7) Career Technical designation on diploma (*CTE Designation*).

The Secondary Research questions concentrated on fourteen outcomes for at-promise youth: 21st CCLC/LEAP program participation in year 1 and year 2 (*OST Participation Year 1* and *OST Participation Year 2*); number of reading courses passed in year 1 and year 2 (*Reading Courses Passed Year 1* and *Reading Courses Passed Year 2*); completion of state online course requirement (*completion online*); completion of Free Application for Federal Student Aid (*completion FAFSA*); housing stability in year 1 and year 2 (*Maintain Stable Housing Year 1* and *Maintain Stable Housing Year 2*); juvenile justice involvement; parent participation in child's education in year 1 and year 2 (*Family Participation Year 1* and *Family Participation Year 2*); and parent referral to adult education in year 1 and year 2 (*Referred Adult Edu. Year 1* and *Referred Adult Education Year 2*).

Table 6.a. Outcomes Used for Primary Research Questions

P3 Outcome	Description of Measure	Timing of Measure
Diploma	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth earned a diploma. The measure is provided by the school principal.	July 30th
Post-secondary	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not seniors who graduated enrolled in college, military and or technical training. The measure is provided by the service provider staff who also provide the name of the post-secondary institution. The provider's response was verified by School District data.	July 30th
Employment	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not a senior who graduated transitioned directly to employment. The measure is provided by service provider staff and was verified by School District data.	July 30th
Unexcused 17	The variable is the number of unexcused absences in the 2017 school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data. Each year a student may have 0 (no unexcused absences) to 180 (unexcused every day of school year).	Quarterly
Unexcused 18	The variable is the number of unexcused absences in the 2018 school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data. Each year a student may have 0 (no unexcused absences) to 180 (unexcused every day of school year).	Quarterly
Suspensions 17	The variable is the number of suspensions (i.e., combination of external suspensions, internal suspensions and alternatives to suspensions) in the 2017 school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	Quarterly
Suspensions 18	The variable is the number suspensions (i.e., combination of external suspensions, internal suspensions and alternatives to suspensions) in the 2018 school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	Quarterly
CTE Designation	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth earned a Career Technical Education endorsement on their diploma. The measure is provided by the school principal.	After graduation
Employability Skills Test	The variable is the actual score on the CSC Developed Employability Skills Assessment which is a 40 question online survey that ask employability skills questions about six different domains. The score ranges from 0 (all wrong) to 40 (all correct).	2nd and 4th quarter
Primary Research Questions Control Variables		
Free Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	2nd and 4th quarter
Free Reduced Lunch Status dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was free and reduced lunch data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	2nd and 4th quarter
Rate of School Attendance 2016	The variable is the student's actual number of unexcused absences in the calendar year before the program. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Gender - Male	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether the youth is male. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Gender Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was gender data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Race - Black	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether the youth is black. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Race Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was race data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Age – Year 2	The variable is a measure of the youth's age Year 2. The measure is taken from School District administrative data	End of Year 1
Age Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there were age data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1

Table 6.b. Outcomes Used for Secondary Research Questions

P3 Outcome	Description of Measure	Timing of Measure
OST Participation Year 1	Count of days youth participated in 21st CCLC/LEAP High program during year one. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (no participation) to 128 (participated 128 days).	Quarterly
OST Participation Year 2	Count of days youth participated in 21st CCLC/LEAP High program during year two. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (no participation) to 128 (participated 128 days).	Quarterly
Reading Courses Passed Year 1	Count of reading classes youth passed during year one. The measure is taken from School District administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (passed no class) to 4 (passed four classes in year).	Quarterly
Reading Courses Passed Year 2	Count of reading classes youth passed during year one. The measure is taken from School District administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (passed no class) to 4 (passed four classes in year).	Quarterly
Completion Online Course	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth passed their state mandated online course. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	Quarterly
Completion FAFSA	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not senior completed their FAFSA. The measure is taken from School District administrative data directly from FL Dept. of Education.	End of Year 1 & 2
Maintain Stable Housing Year 1	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth qualified for homeless student services during the school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	Quarterly
Maintain Stable Housing Year 2	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth qualified for homeless student services during the school year. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	Quarterly
Juvenile Justice Involvement	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth received a qualifying offense in the Juvenile Justice Information System. The measure is taken from the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice administrative data	At Enrollment & then Quarterly
Family Participation Year 1	Count of parent events participated during year one. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (no participation) to 4 (participated 4 days).	Quarterly
Family Participation Year 2	Count of parent events participated in during year two. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data. The variable ranges from 0 (no participation) to 4 (participated 4 days).	Quarterly
Referred Adult Edu. Year 1	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not parent requested an education referral during year one. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data.	Quarterly
Referred Adult Edu. Year 2	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not parent requested an education referral during year two. The measure is taken from SAMIS administrative data.	Quarterly
Secondary Research Questions Control Variables		
Free Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not youth qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	2nd and 4th quarter
Free Reduced Lunch Status dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was free and reduced lunch data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	2nd and 4th quarter
Rate of School Attendance 2016	The variable is the student's actual number of unexcused absences in the calendar year before the program. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Gender - Male	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether the youth is male. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Gender Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was gender data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Race - Black	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether the youth is black. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Race Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not there was race data available for the youth. The measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1
Age – Year 2	The variable is a measure of the youth's age Year 2. The measure is taken from School District administrative data	End of Year 1
Age Dummy	The variable is a yes/no measure of whether or not age data is available for the youth. Measure is taken from School District administrative data.	End of Year 1

E. Analytic Samples

CSC was able to verify the eligibility (i.e. WIOA's citizenship and or legal residency requirement) of 782 at-promise youth (93.1% of the 840 sample size proposed in the Approved P3 Application), and assigned all of these eligible at-promise youth a P3 Identification number that was sent to SFERA for random assignment (seven batches of P3 Identification numbers were sent to SFERA for assignment). Of the 782 youth whose eligibility was verified, 390 youth (49.9%) were randomly assigned to the treatment group and 392 youth (50.1%) to the control group. The random assignment was done by batch, not by school, so each at-promise youth had an equal chance of being assigned to the treatment and or control group across the full sample. The breakdown of youth assignment by school was: Boyd Anderson, 68 treatment and 70 control; Deerfield Beach, 64 treatment and 65 control; McArthur, 65 treatment and 59 control; Miramar, 62 treatment and 66 control; Piper, 70 treatment and 69 control; and Plantation, 61 treatment and 63 control (see table 7 for the number of youth for whom baseline data were available). The total number of at-promise youth randomly assigned (782) was divided into four analytical samples because the primary research questions addressed graduation and the post-secondary transition, and the secondary research questions examined the factors impacting academic performance, career readiness and family involvement. The four analytical samples were: (1) seniors at enrollment (123: 54 treatment and 69 control); (2) juniors at enrollment (229: 120 treatment and 109 control); (3) all participants (782: 390 treatment and 392 control); and (4) non-seniors at enrollment (549: 269 treatment and 280 control). Depending on the specific outcome, complete-case retention ranged from 49.6% to 96.1% for an average complete-case retention rate of 80.8 % for the primary research Questions, and 41.8% to 96.1% for an average retention rate of 85.8% for the secondary research questions (attrition rates by outcome are available in Appendix C).

F. Baseline Equivalence

Using regressions, comparisons were made between the treatment and control groups with the following demographic variables: gender, race, free/reduced price lunch, mean age in years, and rate of school attendance. Using these variables, baseline equivalence was tested for the four analytical samples: (1) seniors eligible to graduate in year one; (2) juniors eligible to graduate in year two; (3) all participants in year one; and (4) all participants in expected to be in school in year two. Analytic samples (1) and (2) were used to examine the primary research questions, the secondary research questions were examined by samples (3) and (4). All frequencies, means, standard deviations, difference scores, and missing data points for the baseline equivalence analysis of the four analytical samples are shown in Tables 7 – 10.

Findings: Baseline Equivalence

In terms of at-promise youth who were seniors in the course of the evaluation (Tables 7 and 8), there were no significant differences on any of the five demographic characteristics or control variables in the analytical samples examining the primary research questions. Focusing on the analytic sample for all at-promise youth in years one and two, there were no significant differences on any of the five demographic characteristics (Tables 9 and 10). However, in both years there were statistically significant differences for all youth who attend school E because a larger percentage of control participants were randomly assigned at this school. The results of the baseline equivalence analyses provide support for the strength of this randomized control trial (RCT) study and the efficacy of both the selection and random assignment process used to establish the treatment and control groups.

Table 7. Comparison of Baseline Equivalence: Seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; and, * p <.05	Mean (SD for continuous variables) Treatment (*n*=54)	Control (*n*=69)	Difference Score (Standard Error)	Missing N Treatment	Control
Gender - Male	.50	.42	.08(.09)	0	0
Race - Black	.72	.78	-.06(.08)	0	0
Age (second year of implementation.)	16.04 (1.06)	16.26(1.05)	-.22(.19)	0	0
Free/Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	.73	.69	.04(.08)	2	1
Rate of School Attendance 2016	1.43 (2.74)	2.09 (3.83)	-.66(.62)	0	0

Table 8. Comparison of Baseline Equivalence: Juniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; and, * p <.05	Mean (SD for continuous variables) Treatment (*n*=120)	Control *n*=109)	Difference Score (Standard Error)	Missing N Treatment	Control
Gender - Male	.46	.52	-.06(.07)	0	0
Race - Black	.85	.85	.00(.06)	0	0
Age (second year of implementation.)	15.44 (1.08)	15.49(1.29)	-.09(.17)	0	0
Free/Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	.85	.65	.20(.06)	0	0
Rate of School Attendance 2016	1.69 (2.88)	1.77 (4.90)	-.17(.58)	0	0

Table 9. Comparison of Baseline Equivalence: All Participants

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; and, * p <.05	Mean (SD for continuous variables) Treatment (*n*=390)	Control (*n*=392)	Difference Score (Standard Error)	Missing N Treatment	Control
Gender - Male	.49	.48	.01(.04)	1	0
Race - Black	.80	.81	-.01(.03)	0	0
Age (second year of implementation.)	15.00 (1.33)	15.07(1.37)	-.07(.10)	0	0
Free/Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	.79	.75	.04(.03)	2	2
Rate of School Attendance 2016	1.74 (3.51)	2.06 (5.42)	-.32(.33)	0	0

Table 10. Comparison of Baseline Equivalence: Non-seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; and, * p <.05	Mean (SD for continuous variables) Treatment (*n*=269)	Control (*n*=280)	Difference Score (Standard Error)	Missing N Treatment	Control
Gender – Male	.44	.49	-.05(.04)	0	0
Race - Black	.82	.81	.01(.03)	0	0
Age (second year of implementation.)	14.73 (1.18)	14.80(1.26)	-.07(.10)	0	0
Free/Reduced Lunch Status - Yes	.79	.72	.07(.03)	0	0
Rate of School Attendance 2016	1.74 (3.30)	1.90 (5.26)	-.16(.38)	0	0

Conclusions. There were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control groups in any of the demographic variables analyzed for each of the overall analytical samples. This finding provides evidence that random assignment was successful at creating equivalent treatment and control groups. Since there are no significant differences between groups at baseline, subsequent differences can, with greater assurance, be attributed to strategies/interventions implemented by the BOSS program. Further, since the sample could vary based on observed outcomes, baseline equivalence checks were performed for each outcome-specific analytic sample in Appendix D.

G. Methods

Group differences for all variables were examined using ordinary least squares regression. The regression equations are reported with the proportion of variance explained in the outcome by the considered predictors. Coefficient estimates representing group differences in proportions for

categorical variables, or means for continuous variables, were obtained while controlling for all covariates. The non-binary nominal data were turned into dummy variables that were coded so affirmative information was represented as one (1) and negative responses as zero (0) for each available response. This resulted in the analyses of binary data involving the comparison of mean proportions of affirmative responses between groups. Analyses for continuous data involved comparing mean raw responses between the treatment and control groups. In all analyses, a finding is considered statistically significant if it achieves the 5% threshold level.

Analyses for the primary and secondary research questions **involved two separate sets of regression analyses**. The first set of analyses, hereinafter the Complete Case analyses, examines group differences for those with complete outcome and baseline characteristics and utilizes covariates to determine if the group differences persist when controlling for the five demographic variables. The second set of analyses, referred to as the Full Sample analyses, examines group differences on each measured outcome with covariates to control for the five demographic variables and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates (see Appendices C & D).

For the primary research questions, the proportions of participants in the treatment and control groups were compared on the following outcomes: diploma status, post-secondary (transition to post-secondary education opportunity), employment (transition to employment), and earning a career technical certificate (CTE designation). Mean differences in proportions between groups were examined on the following variables: (1) Unexcused absences (frequencies of unexcused absences during the considered school year minus the number of unexcused absences the prior year). A negative score suggests less unexcused absences during the considered year of implementation when compared to the prior year. (2) Total suspensions (frequencies of all suspensions [external, internal, and alternative] during the considered school year minus the number of suspensions the prior year. A negative score suggests less suspensions during the considered year of implementation when compared to the prior year. (3) Highest score for the employability skills test (the maximum score that each participant obtained on the two administrations of this test).

For the secondary research questions, the proportions of participants in the treatment and control groups were compared on the following variables: completion of School District online course, completion of Summer Youth Employment, FAFSA completion, maintain stable housing, and Juvenile Just Involvement. The mean differences in the proportions between groups were compared on the following variables that were collected during both years of implementation: BOSS program participation (number days participated in 21st CCLC/LEAP program), number of reading courses passed, family member participation in participant's education, and family member referred to adult education services.

The following control covariates were included in the second sets of analyses for the primary and secondary research questions: Gender 1 for females and 0 for males); Free/reduced price lunch status (1 for yes and 0 for both no and missing data); Dummy variable for free/reduced price lunch status (zero for data present and 1 for data not present);Eighth-grade grade point average (0 for missing data); Dummy variable for eighth-grade grade point average (0 for data present and 1 for data not present); and five (5) school to school variation fixed dummy variables (the first school in alphabetic order is the reference school).

Study Findings

Primary Research Question – Seniors and Juniors at Enrollment

Seniors at Enrollment: The post-secondary outcome was statistically significant in both the Complete Case (.31) and Full Sample (.30) regression estimates. As can be seen in Table 11, the significant group differences for the post-secondary outcome suggests that treatment seniors who graduated were 30 percentage points more likely to transition to a post-secondary educational institution than graduating control group seniors. Using the actual data not reported in the table below, 87.9% (29/33) of the graduating treatment seniors transitioned to a post-secondary education opportunity in year one compared to 60.5% (23/38) of the graduating control group seniors.

Table 11. Primary Research Question Regressions: Seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	Diploma Year 1	.01 (.08)	.02	.818	.06	.01 (.08)	.02	.816	.07
2	Post-secondary Year 1	.31 (.11)**	.35**	.007	.14	.30 (.11)***	.34***	.008	.14
3	Employment Year 1	-.01 (.13)	-.01	.888	.09	.02 (.12)	.02	.880	.09
4	Unexcused 17	.86 (2.0)	.04	.668	.06	1.01 (1.9)	.04	.608	.06
5	Suspensions 17	-.51 (.42)	-.11	.229	.04	-.35 (.45)	-.07	.429	.13
6	Employability Skills Test Yr. 1	.75 (1.2)	.08	.080	.06	.58 (1.2)	.05	.646	.17

[1] Complete – Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Juniors at Enrollment: The models in Table 12 examine the impact of two full years of the BOSS program on those who were juniors when they enrolled in year one of the BOSS program. In both the Complete Case and Full Sample estimates, the post-secondary transition and employability skills test scores outcomes were statistically significant and positive. Treatment seniors who graduated in year two of the BOSS program were 36 percentage points more likely to transition to post-secondary educational opportunities than comparable seniors in the control group. Using the actual data not reported in the table below, 74.0% (74/100) of the graduating treatment seniors transitioned to a post-secondary education opportunity in year two compared to 36.5% (31/85) of

Table 12. Primary Research Question Regressions: Juniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	Diploma Year 2	-.00 (.05)	-.00	-.003	.05	-.04 (.05)	-.00	.931	.06
2	Post-secondary Year 2	.36 (.07)***	.36***	.000	.17	.36 (.07)***	.36***	.000	.17
3	Employment Year 2	-.01 (.06)	-.01	.831	.01	- 01 (.06)	-.0	.831	.01
4	Unexcused 17	-1.9 (1.38)	-.09	.162	.13	-1.9 (1.39)	-.09	.165	.13
5	Unexcused 18	5.4 (1.7)**	.199**	002	.13	5.3 (1.7)**	.196**	.003	.13
6	Suspensions 17	1.38 (.94)	.09	.143	.03	1.39 (.95)	.10	.142	.03
7	Suspensions 18	.342(.16)*	.143*	.035	.04	.345 (.16)*	.145*	.034	.04
8	Employability Skills Test Yr. 2	1.6 (.66)***	.16***	.003	.05	-1.6 (.66)*	.16*	.016	.06
9	CTE Designation Year 2	.10 (.09)	.10	.263	.17	.36 (.07)	.10	.263	.17

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

the graduating control group seniors. The treatment seniors in year two performed better on the employability skills test and scored on average 1.6 points higher (out of 40) than the control group.

Treatment group seniors in year two had 5.4 more unexcused absences than control group (Complete Case = 5.4 and Full Sample = 5.3), and demonstrated slightly worse behavior than the control seniors in year two (Complete Case = .342 more suspensions and Full Sample = .345 more suspensions).

Conclusions – Primary Research Questions on Seniors and Juniors at Enrollment:

Results from the analyses suggest that graduating at-promise seniors assigned to BOSS were better prepared to make a post-secondary transition, and scored higher on their employability skills test than comparable control group seniors. The statistical differences in outcomes between the treatment and control seniors is noteworthy because the federal Performance Pilot Partnership legislation was created to "test innovative, cost-effective and outcome-based strategies for improving results for disconnected youth" (www.youth.gov). Clearly, the findings from analyzing the seniors in CSC's BOSS program demonstrates improved outcomes for at-promise youth because those assigned to BOSS were more likely to transition to post-secondary opportunities and scored higher on their employability skills test than the control group.

Secondary Research Question - Seniors and Juniors at Enrollment

Seniors at Enrollment: In both the Complete Case and Full Sample analyses, completing the State's online course requirement and family participation in their child's education were statistically significant (see Table 13). Treatment seniors were 21 percentage points more likely to complete Florida's online course requirement than the control seniors in year one. Although the actual data are not reported in the table below, this equates to 64% 32/50) treatment seniors versus 44% (28/64) control seniors in year one. The significant difference for the number of times a family member attended a family literacy event suggests that family members whose seniors were in the treatment group participated in 1.09 more parent events during year one than the parents of control group seniors. This is important because parent involvement impacts the successful transition to post-secondary opportunities by at-promise youth (Frazier, Capella, & Atkins, 2007).

Table 13. Secondary Research Question Regressions: Seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
Model	Outcome	Complete Case				Full Sample			
		Unstandardized Coefficient	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	OST Participation Year 1	-2.34 (5.09)	-.04	.646	.06	-1.42 (5.14)	-.02	.780	.05
2	Reading Courses Passed Year 1	.14 (.09)	.16	.116	.15	.13 (.09)	.15	.137	.14
3	Completion Online Course	.20 (.09)*	.20*	.037	.09	.21 (.09)*	.21*	.025	.10
4	Summer Youth Employment	-1.27 (.58)	-1.27	.105	.73	-1.21 (.58)	-1.21	.105	.73
5	Completion FAFSA	-.07 (.04)	-.17	.093	.04	-.07 (.04)	-.17	.092	.04
6	Maintain Stable Housing	*Model not estimated because no seniors homeless in year 1.*							
7	Juvenile Justice Involvement	*Model not estimated because no seniors involved in JJS in year 1.*							
8	Family Participation Year 1	1.09 (.33)***	.30***	.002	.14	1.06 (.32)**	.30**	.001	.14
9	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 1	.02 (.03)	.075	.609	.10	.02 (.03)	.07	.609	.10

[1] Complete – Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Juniors at Enrollment: The completion of the state's online course requirement and family participation in their child's education outcomes in both years were statistically significant for juniors at enrollment (see Table 14). Both models showed that the treatment seniors were 21 percentage points more likely to complete the state's online course requirement during the two years of the BOSS program. Using the actual data not presented in the table below, 89.8% (106/118) of treatment juniors at enrollment completed the online course requirement meaning they were 1.34

times more likely to complete the online course requirement than the control group seniors (73/109 = 66.9%). In both years, the parents of the treatment group juniors at enrollment were more likely to participate in the family literacy events (1.03 more events in year one and .16 more events in year two). The parental involvement results are important because parent involvement impacts the success rate of post-secondary transitions, particularly for at-promise youth (Frazier, Capella, & Atkins, 2007).

Table 14. Secondary Research Question Regressions: Juniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
Model	Outcome	Complete Case				Full Sample			
		Unstandardized Coefficient	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	OST Participation Year 1	-1.30 (4.06)	.02	.362	.01	-1.2 (4.08)	-.30	.760	.01
2	OST Participation Year 2	2.73 (2.96)	.06	.356	.03	2.7 (2.92)	.06	.356	.03
3	Reading Courses Passed Year 1	.00 (.07)	.00	.986	.04	.03 (.07)	.04	.967	.04
4	Reading Courses Passed Year 2	-.00 (.08)	.00	.930	.01	.00 (.08)	.00	.930	.01
5	Completion Online Course Yr. 2	.21 (.05)***	.26***	.000	.13	.21 (.05)***	.25***	.000	.13
6	Summer Youth Employment Yr. 2	.07(.07)	.19	.339	.22	.07 (.07)	.19	.339	.22
7	Completion FAFSA Year 2	*Model not estimated because FAFSA is a constant.*							
8	Maintain Stable Housing Yr. 1	.01 (.01)	.07	.775	.01	.01 (.01)	.07	.338	.01
9	Maintain Stable Housing Yr. 2	.00 (.00)	.06	.345	.02	.00 (.00)	.06	.337	.02
10	Juvenile Justice Involvement Yr. 2	-.01 (.00)	-.10	.140	.04	-.01 (.00)	-.10	.141	.04
11	Family Participation Year 1	1.03 (.22)***	.30***	.000	.10	1.03 (.23)***	.31***	.000	.10
12	Family Participation Year 2	.16 (.08)*	.13*	.049	.04	.16 (.08)*	.13*	.045	.04
13	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 1	-00 (.02)	-.04	.719	.10	-.00 (02)	-.04	.719	.10
14	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 2	-.05 (.02)	-.15	.053	.03	-.05 (.02)	-.15	.053	.03

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Conclusion. Treatment group seniors and juniors at enrollment were both more likely than similar control group members to complete the state's online course requirement and have their parents participate in an educational parent event. The statistically-significant parental-involvement findings are encouraging because research shows that parental involvement impacts the educational outcomes of their children (Epstein, 1997). A meta-analysis of parental involvement among children of color found that the impact of parental involvement, as a whole, has a large positive impact on student achievement, including secondary student populations (Jeynes, 2012). This provides more evidence to understand how CSC's BOSS program (via the tiered case management services) can improve the outcomes of at-promise youth, which is by connecting youth and their families to the support services they require to successfully transition to post-secondary education opportunities.

Primary Research Question – All Participants and Non-seniors at Enrollment

All Participants: The Complete Case and Full Sample regressions presented in Table 15 below examine all 782 participants in the RCT. As can be seen in Table 15, significant group differences emerged on two out of the four variables: change in suspensions between the 2017 and 2016 school years, and higher employability skills test score. Treatment group participants scored 1.43 points higher on the employability skills test than the control group participants (33.49 average highest score for the treatment group compared to 32.06 average highest score for the control group, not shown in table). During year one of the BOSS program, treatment participants had 1.08 more suspensions (Complete Case = 1.08 and Full Sample= 1.10) in 2017 school year than the treatment group, suggesting the treatment group behaved better in the first year of the BOSS program than the control group. The findings for the employability skills test were consistent with the seniors-only analyses and provide more evidence of the beneficial impact of tiered case management services for improving the outcomes of at-promise youth

Table 15. Primary Research Question Regressions: All Participants

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	Unexcused 17	-.58 (.65)	-.03	.368	.04	-.52 (.65)	-.02	.421	.04
2	Suspensions 17	1.08 (.45)*	.08*	.017	.03	1.10 (.45)*	.08*	.014	.03
3	Employability Skills Test Year[1]	1.43(.43)***	.12***	.001	.02	1.43 (.44)***	.12***	.001	.03

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Non-seniors at enrollment: The regressions presented in Table 16 below analyze 9th through 11th graders at enrollment in year one and two, which reflects two years of the BOSS program intervention. The number of suspensions in school year 17, and highest score on the employability test were both statistically significant outcomes that favored the treatment participants. The findings for the highest employability skills test score demonstrate that treatment youth scored 1.5 points higher (Complete Case = 1.5 and Full Sample = 1.5) than the control group (the average highest score was 32.05 for the control participants, not shown in table). The number of suspensions in school year 17 reveal that treatment group participants had 1.32 more suspension than the control group (Complete Case = 1.32 and Full Sample = 1.38) in year two). The analyses presented in Table 16 found the same variables to be statistically significant as the year one analysis of all participants (suspensions in school year 17, and the highest employability skills test score) and the findings for the employability skills test were similar to the examination of juniors at enrollment (i.e. table12).

Table 16. Primary Research Question Regressions: Non-seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	Unexcused 17	-.79 (.69)	-.04	.249	.03	-.76 (.69)	-.04	.249	.03
2	Unexcused 18	.97 (.83)	.04	.242	.06	.94 (.83)	.04	.260	.06
3	Suspensions 17	1.32 (.52)*	.09*	.011	.03	1.38 (.52)**	.09**	.011	.03
4	Suspensions 18	.22 (.11)	.07	.053	.01	.22 (.11)	.07	.052	.01
5	Employability Skills Test Yr. 2	1.5 (.47)**	.13**	.001	.00	1.5 (.47)***	.13***	.002	.03

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Conclusions. The results from the analyses of all participants and non-seniors at enrollment across both years of the BOSS program provide more support that tiered case management services improve the outcomes of at-promise youth. The employability skills test results favored the treatment group providing additional evidence that the case managers are helping prepare the treatment participants for employment.

Secondary Research Question – All Participants

All Participants: The year one analyses of all participants revealed significant group differences for completing the state's online course requirement, and family participation in a parent educational events. The identical outcomes were significant in the regression of seniors in year one presented in table 13, providing evidence of the robustness for these results for the full sample. The treatment participants were 10 percentage points more likely to complete the state's online course requirement compared to the control group (only 50% of the control participants completed this test, not shown in table). Treatment group family members attended approximately one more (Complete Case = .76 and Full Sample = .76) family event in year one compared to the control group families.

Table 17. Secondary Research Question Regressions: All Participants

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	OST Participation Year 1	.81 (2.09)	.01	.698	.02	1.07 (2.09)	.01	.610	.02
2	Reading Classes Passed Year 1	- .02 (.04)	-.02	.552	.01	-.02 (.04)	-.02	.559	.01
3	Completion Online Course	.10 (.03)***	.10***	.006	.02	.10 (.03)***	.10***	.005	.02
4	Summer Youth Employment	.08 (.08)	.12	.302	.09	.08 (.01)	.12	.302	.09
5	Completion FAFSA	-.04 (.02)	-.12	.104	.02	-.04 (.02)	-.12	.103	.02
6	Maintain Stable Housing	.00 (.00)	.02	.879	.00	.00 (.00)	.02	.599	.00
7	Juvenile Justice Involvement	-.00 (.00)	-.02	.134	.08	-.00 (.00)	-.02	.136	.00
8	Family Participation Year 1	.76 (.12)***	.22***	.000	.03	.76 (.12)***	.22***	.000	.06
9	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 1	.00 (.01)	.02	.933	.00	.00 (.01)	.02	.593	.03

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

Non-seniors at enrollment: The models presented in Table 18 below analyze 9th through 11th graders at enrollment in year one and two, which reflects two years of the BOSS program intervention. Statistically significant results were found for the following outcomes: out-of-school time participation in year two, completing the state's online course requirement, parental involvement in a parent educational event in both program years, and referrals for adult education services in year two. Treatment participants attended the out-of-school time support services 4.67 days more than the control participants (control group participants attended 12.33 days of these services, not shown in table). Treatment at-promise youth were 7 percentage points more likely to complete the state's online course than the control group (51% of control participants completed this course, not shown in table). Treatment group family members attended almost one more (Complete Case .70 and Full Sample .71) family event in year one and slightly more family events (Complete Case .11 and Full Sample .11) in year two than the control group parents. An unexpected finding was that the control group parents where 3 percentage points more likely to be referred to adult education services in year two than the treatment parents. However, this result is most likely caused by the small number of parents from both groups who actually requested parent education (3 treatment parents and 11 control parents in year two, not shown in table). The findings for the online course and parent

Table 18. Secondary Research Question Regressions: Non-seniors at Enrollment

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, and * p <.05		Unique Estimates for Group (Standard Error) [1]							
		Complete Case				Full Sample			
Model	Outcome	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2	*Unstandardized Coefficient*	*Standardized Coefficient*	*p*	R^2
1	OST Participation Year 1	1.32 (2.3)	.02	.567	.02	1.38 (2.3)	.02	.564	.02
2	OST Participation Year 2	4.67 (1.8)**	.10**	.012	.03	4.67 (1.8)*	.10*	.012	.03
3	Reading Courses Passed Year 1	-.05 (.04)	-.05	.230	.00	-.05 (.04)	-.05	.238	.00
4	Reading Courses Passed Year 2	-.07 (.04)	-.07	.104	.01	-.07 (.04)	-.07	.104	.01
5	Completion Online Course	.07 (.03)*	.07	.044	.03	.07 (.03)*	.07*	.046	.02
6	Summer Youth Employment	-.04 (.05)	-.09	.453	.18	-.04 (.05)	-.09	.453	.08
7	Completion FAFSA	*Model not estimated because no variation across covariates*							
8	Maintain Stable Housing Yr. 1	.00 (.01)	.02	.593	.00	.00 (.03)	.02	.593	.00
9	Maintain Stable Housing Yr. 2	-.00 (.00)	-.01	.646	.00	-.00 (.00)	-.01	.652	.00
10	Juvenile Justice Involvement	-.00 (.00)	-.02	.582	.00	-.04 (.00)	-.02	.581	.00
11	Family Participation Year 1	.70 (.13)***	.21***	.000	.05	.71 (.13)***	.21***	.000	.05
12	Family Participation Year 2	.11 (.04)*	.09*	.017	.03	.11 (.04)*	.09*	.016	.02
13	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 1	.00 (.01)	.00	.898	.04	.00 (.01)	.00	.898	.04
14	Referred to Adult Edu. Yr. 2	-.03 (.01)*	-.09*	.042	.01	-.03 (.01)*	-.09*	.042	.01

[1] Complete - Case covariates include male, black, age, qualify for Free and or Reduce Priced Lunch, and unexcused absences 2016, the Full Sample analyses use these same covariates and dummy variables to control for missing data across the covariates.

participation in their child's education outcomes were consistent across the analyses of all participants in year one (Table 18), and the juniors graduating in year two (Table 14), providing evidence for the findings' robustness.

Conclusion. Treatment at-promise youth were more likely than the control group to participate in the support services offered by the 21st CCLC/LEAP High out-of-school time programs in year two. Treatment participants were more likely to complete the state's online course requirement for graduation than control at-promise youth. The family members of treatment participants were more likely to attend a parental education event in both years of the BOSS program, but control group parents were more likely to request referrals for adult education support services in year two. Research indicates parental involvement improves educational outcomes for their children (Epstein, 1997), and the positive impact of this finding is greater for students of color, including those in high school (Jeynes, 2012). The identical year one results for all participants and non-seniors at enrollment, and the online course and family participation findings being replicated by the regression estimates for seniors and juniors at enrollment, provide more support for the robustness of the findings that tiered case management services improve outcomes for at-promise youth.

Discussion and Conclusion

Main Findings

Case managers who help at-promise youth develop academic and career focused goals based on an in-depth needs assessment can improve the outcomes for at-promise youth. The tiered case management intervention implemented by Broward's BOSS program improved the likelihood that at-promise youth will transition to post-secondary educational opportunities. These same at-promise youth demonstrated increased employability skills knowledge, higher completion rates for the state's mandated online course requirement, and were more willing to partake in the 21st CCLC/LEAP High out-of-school time support services. Also important, the case managers mobilized parental involvement into the high school education of their children. The impact of the tiered case management services on the treatment participants were consistent across the analytical samples and regression estimates of each sample (i.e. Complete Case and Full Sample), providing greater support for the robustness of the findings.

Community Structures Established by The BOSS Program

SFERA conducted a qualitative study to document the broader impact of P3 on the creation of community and systemic structures connecting governmental bodies, organizations, and individuals. The goal of developing these structures was to support the efforts of BOSS to address individual-level racial disparities at a higher level. Due to the federal Performance Partnership Pilot, Broward has developed four approaches to do this: 1) the development of an Integrated Data System; 2) the implementation of Community Participatory Action Research with youth; 3) the Broward Bridge 2 Life Committee; and 4) ongoing Racial Equity education and organizing.

The Integrated Data System. The P3 grant provided an opportunity to expand and enhance data systems and the use of data in Broward to improve results for at-promise youth. Broward has a tradition of collaboration, a plethora of individual data sharing memoranda of understanding (MOU), robust research partners and a common vision for data-driven decision making. A portion of the BOSS funding has built an Integrated Data System (IDS) that is more efficient, accurate, and secure. CSC's SAMIS database, the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, the local behavioral health

managing entity (Broward Behavioral Health Coalition – BBHC), and Broward County Public Schools TERMS data warehouse are being linked for the following three purposes: 1) individual case planning and decision-making; 2) law, policy and program development; and 3) performance measurement, program evaluation and research. Local youth-serving organizations will be strengthened by the creation of an IDS that reduces manual data collection, increases accuracy and manages secure access to data for administrative and case management purposes.

By leveraging the P3 funding, CSC was selected by the Florida Children and Youth Cabinet's Technology Workgroup as a local pilot to create technological and legal platforms to locally integrate data across state databases. CSC was also awarded a technical assistance grant from the University of Pennsylvania to participate in the 18-month Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy's (AISP) integrated data system learning community to draw on national experts and best practices for building integrated data systems. CSC now convenes a Florida Integrated Data Systems Partners call that includes the Agency for State Technology responsible for improving data quality in Florida and several county-level agencies who are building or improving their IDS. This resulted in CSC receiving funding to collaborate with Third Sector Capital Partners, Inc., to enhance the process for measuring outcomes and develop replicable, outcomes-oriented contracting process that leverages the IDS to improve program evaluation and impact.

Community Participatory Action Research. In November 2017, the Council approved funding the Public Science Project to build youth, staff and community capacity to use community participatory action research (CPAR) as an integral part of the Broward integrated data system operations. CPAR is a research approach that has been used in the public health arena for decades to reduce racial and ethnic health disparities (Pearson, et. al, 2015). CPAR is a method of research where youth, program staff, and academic researchers are partners in designing research or evaluation studies, collecting and analyzing data, and leveraging the findings to improve programs, policies, conditions, and outcomes.

Faculty from the Public Science Project trained youth and adults in the CPAR approach in March 2018. Thirteen youth from three youth organizations (AMIkids Greater Fort Lauderdale, PACE Center for Girls, and South Florida Wellness Network's Youth Move) joined adults from eight organizations (Broward County Human Services Department, Broward County Behavioral Health Coalition, Broward County Sheriff's Office Child Protection Investigation Services, Casey Foundation, ChildNet, CSC, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, and Nova Southeastern University).

CPAR projects included (1) evaluating group home services in Broward, (2) evaluating opportunities to improve the juvenile justice Failure to Appear protocols and (3) identifying marketing strategies for different populations to access mental health and substance abuse services. In addition to interviews, focus groups and document/data reviews, the trainers wove interactive components throughout the workshop to build relationships, knowledge and skills. The youth's stories and questions consistently transformed the development of the projects. Up to 100 youth and staff from system service providers participated in the data collection. The collected data was analyzed with the Public Science Project faculty in July 2018 with the co-researchers who participated in the March workshop.

Bridge 2 Life Committee. The P3 Project Director and the Broward County Public Schools Guidance Counselor Director co-created a new Broward Children's Strategic Plan committee to strengthen pathways for youth's post-secondary success. The committee was awarded a Florida College Access Grant for $20,000 to build the college access supports in Broward County by convening a Steering Committee of high level organizational staff and support youth to create peer lead initiatives. The

steering committee has met monthly for the last 4 months and created goals and plans to improve students' financial viability and the sustainability of the pathways. Over 45 community partners attend the regular committee meeting on an ongoing basis.

Racial equity education and work. CSC Broward has a commitment to racial equity and overcoming the racial disparities in every system of care (i.e., education, health, criminal justice, employment, etc.). As part of CSC's commitment, we have trained nearly 2,000 staff and community partners in the local history of race, racism and resistance in Broward County, FL, and in how implicit racial bias is present in decision making at all levels (i.e., self, interpersonal, institution and policy). The BOSS case managers received the 8-hour training and learned how many of the conditions that their students and families face are legacies of Jim Crow laws, discrimination and segregated systems and communities. Many at-promise youth also participated in a two-day training over the summer with adults to learn about racism and racial equity. The lessons learned will inform the CSC's upcoming high school programs procurement set to be released in 2018-2019.

References

Ameen, E. J. & Lee, D. L. (2012). Vocational training in juvenile detention: A call for action. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *60(*2), 98-108.

Broward County Public Schools. (2014a). *Benchmark day enrollment report, 2014-2015* [Data File]. Retrieved from: http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/dsa/counts/1415/benchmark/Appendix%20C%20Diversity%201415.pdf.

Broward County Public Schools. (2014b). *Summary of 2013- 2014 Algebra 1, Biology 1, Civics, Geometry, and US History End of Course (EOC) Examinations Results* [Data File]. Available from: http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/sar/releases/memos/SpringEOC2014Memo.pdf

Broward County Public Schools. (2014c). *Florida/s federal high school graduation rates by special category by school, 2012-13*. [Excel]. Broward County Public Schools, Florida Department of Education. Taken from: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/eiaspubs/pubstudent.asp.

Broward County Public Schools. (2014d). Broward County Public Schools 2013/14 14th Day Enrollment Report Appendix C: Diversity Characteristics by School, Center and Charter; Percentages used for BCPS District Total for High Schools excludes Charters and Centers. Available from: http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/dsa/counts/1314/14th/Appendix%20C%20Diversity%201314.pdf

Brown. D. E., & Thakur, M. B. (2006). Workforce development for older youth. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2006*(111), 91-104.

CareerSource Broward (2014) Summary letters of Industry Forum Results. Provided by CareerSource Broward, January 2015.

Conley, D. T. (2007). *Redefining college readiness*. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center.

Dion, R. (2013). A framework for advancing the well-being and self-sufficiency of at-risk youth. *Mathematica Policy Research.* Available from: http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/~/media/publications/PDFs/family_support/YDD_Framework_IB.pdf.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part B. Sec. 4203 (a) (8) (A) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part B. Sec. 4205 (a) (1-12) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Florida Department of Education. (2014). *Detailed information on high schools, high school grades all districts 2013-14 (winter release)* [Dataset]. Retrieved from http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org

Florida Department of Education. (2015). F*lorida's federal graduation rates by special category by school, 2013-2014* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/data-

sys/edu-info-accountability-services/pk-12-public-school-data-pubs-reports/students.stml.

Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program. (2014). Division of Accountability, Research and Measurement (ARM) Annual Outcomes Report Fall 2013 Data, December, 2014. Retrieved from: http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7592/urlt/1213FETPIPAnnualOutcomesReport.pdf.

Florida Department of Law Enforcement. (2014a). *County and Municipal Offense Data, 2013* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/Content/getdoc/2c79e16b-8846-4383-be92-c7c16e227813/CoMuOff2013annual.aspx

Florida Department of Law Enforcement. (2014b). *Totals and Index Arrests by Jurisdiction, 2013* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/Content/FSAC/Data---Statistics-(1)/UCR-Arrest-Data/UCR-Arrest-Data.aspx.

Frazier, S., Cappella, E., & Atkins, M.S. (2007). Linking mental health and after school systems for children in urban poverty: Preventing problems, promoting possibilities. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 34*(4), 389-399.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. & Christian, D. (2006.) *Educating English Language Learners.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, K. & Burd-Sharps, S. (2013). Halve the gap by 2030: Youth disconnection in America's cities. *Measure of America of the Social Science Research Council.* Retrieved January 13, 2105 from http://ssrc-static.s3.amazonaws.com/moa/MOA-Halve-the-Gap-ALL-10.25.13.pdf.

Opportunity Index. (2015). *Broward county opportunity index results* [Data File]. Retrieved January 13, 2015 from http://opportunityindex.org/#9.00/26.19/-80.366/Broward/Florida.

Orthner, D. K., Akos, P., Rose, R., Jones-Sanpei, H., Mercado, M., & Woolley, M. E. (2010). CareerStart: A middle school student engagement and academic achievement program. *Children & Schools*, *32*(4), 223-234.

Pearson, C. R., Duran, B., Oetzel, J., Margarati, M., Villegas, M., Lucero, J., & Wallerstein, N. (2015). *Research for improved health: Variability and impact of structural characteristics in federally funded community engaged research, 9*, 17-29.

Scarborough, M. K., Lewis, C. M., & Kulkarni, S. (2010). Enhancing adolescent brain development through goal setting activities. *Social Work, 55*(3), 276- 278.

Schwartz, I., York, P., & Ramos-Hernandez, A. (January 16, 2015). PAAYS Project: Data analytics progress report. Paper presented to ChildNet, Plantation, Broward County, FL.

Shernoff, D. J. (2013). *Optimal learning environments to promote student engagement.* New York: Springer – Verlag.

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014a). *Selected social characteristics in the United States, 2009 – 2013 American Community Survey 5-year estimates (DP02)* [Data File].

Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_5YR_DP02&prodType=table

ACS 09-13a: Limited English Proficiency Data Taken By Zip Code and State of Florida From The Following Tables:

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33023, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33024, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33025, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33064, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33309, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33311, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33313, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33319, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33323, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33351, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). State of Florida, ZCTA5 33441, DP02 Selected Social Characteristics in the United States [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014b). *Educational Attainment, 2009 – 2013 American Community Survey 5-year estimates (S1501)* [Data File]. Retrieved from

http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_5YR_S1501&prodType=table

ACS 09-13b: Educational Attainment Data Taken By Zip Code and Broward County From The Following Tables:

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33023, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33024, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33025, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33064, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33309, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33311, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33313, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33319, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33323, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33351, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCTA5 33441, S1501 Educational Attainment [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014c). *Poverty status in the past 12 months, 2013 American Community Survey 1-year estimates, (S1701)* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_1YR_S1701&prodType=table.

ACS 09-13c: Child Poverty Rate Data Taken By Zip Code and Broward County From The Following Tables:

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33023, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33024, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33025, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33064, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33309, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33311, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33313, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33319, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33323, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33351, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009-2013). Broward County, ZCAT5 33441, S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months [Data]. *2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from* http://factfinder2.census.gov.

ACS 09-13e: Youth Unemployment by County Taken From The Following Table

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014d). *Sex by age by employment status for the population 16 years and older, 2009 – 2013 American Community Survey 5-year estimates (B23001)* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov.

ACS 11-13e: Youth Unemployment (Black Race) by County Taken From The Following Table:

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014e). *Sex by age by employment status for the population 16 years and older, 2011 – 2013 American Community Survey 3-year estimates (B23002b: Black Ethnicity)* [Data File].

ACS 11-13f: Youth Unemployment (White Race) by County Taken From The Following Table

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014f). *Sex by age by employment status for the population 16 years and older, 2011 – 2013 American Community Survey 3-year estimates (B23002a: White Ethnicity)* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov.

ACS 11-13g: Youth Unemployment (Hispanic Ethnicity) by County Taken From The Following Table:

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce. (2014g). *Sex by age by employment status for the population 16 years and older, 2011 – 2013 American Community Survey 3-year estimates (B23002c: Hispanic Ethnicity)* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov.

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014, Sec. 13. (a).

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014, Sec. 129. (a) (1) (B) (ii).

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act o f2014, Sec. 129. (c)(2) (A–M).

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014, Sec. 116. (b)(2)(A)(ii) (I-IV).

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014, Sec. 3 (24) (A-M).

Appendix A

Table A. 1 Out-of-School Time Services Available to all Students

21st CCLC	LEAP High
Academic	
Homework Assistance/EOC Tutoring	Homework Assistance/EOC Tutoring
Project Based Learning (1:13 ratio)	Project Based Learning (1:20 ratio)
Credit Recovery	Credit Recovery
Career and Technical Education (CTE)	Career and Technical Education (CTE)
College Bound Training Curriculum	College Bound Training Curriculum
Parent Engagement	
Parent Engagement Strategies	Parent Engagement Strategies
Parent Coordinator	
Personal Enrichment	
Youth in Government (YIG)	Teen Outreach Program (TOP ®) or YIG
Nutrition and Fitness Activities	Nutrition and Fitness Activities
Cultural Arts and Education	Cultural Arts and Education
Employability Skills Training	Employability Skills Training
Career Exploration	
Entrepreneurial Education	
Employability	
Opportunity for Summer Youth Employment	Opportunity for Summer Youth Employment

The primary goal of the case managers was to create an Individual Service Plan (ISP) and implement the ISP with fidelity. All at-promise youth received academic, college and career readiness, parent engagement and personal well-being services.

Academic services included homework assistance, EOC tutoring, project-based learning, credit recovery, career and technical education, and the College Bound Training Curriculum. In the three high schools with 21st CCLC funding, the teacher: youth ratio was 1:13 and in the three high schools with LEAP programs, the teacher: youth ratio was 1:20.

College and Career Readiness services included: Completing the school district's Naviance career exploration program, entrepreneurial education, and work experience. In addition to these services, the Broward Libraries' Educate and Motivate You College Club provided post-secondary transition services to high school seniors who are approaching graduation. The program included two-hour long biweekly club meetings for youth and biweekly counseling sessions for youth and/or parents. The program also connected youth to resources related to successful post-secondary transitions, including post-secondary personnel (i.e., college admissions officer) and morale-building activities.

Personal well-being services included the evidence-based Teen Outreach Program (TOP®) and Youth in Government (YIG) program as well as community service learning participation, nutritional and fitness activities, and cultural arts.

Appendix B

Table B.1. Timeline of evaluation activities

Activity	Start date	Stop date
Submit IRB Form to School District and Seek Authorization for RCT	June 2016	July 30, 2016
Recruit youth for the RCT	July 6, 2016	January 31, 2017
Obtain consent, screen, and enroll eligible youth into the RCT	August 1, 2016	August 30, 2016
If needed, recruit additional youth for RCT for fall 2016	August 1, 2016	October 15, 2016
Obtain consent, screen, and enroll additional eligible youth into the RCT	October 15, 2016	October 30, 2016
Provide P3/BOSS services to RCT youth	September 1, 2016	July 31, 2018
Data collection – baseline	January 31, 2017	July 30, 2017
Data collection – Year One	September 1, 2016	August 30, 2017
If needed, recruit additional youth for the RCT in Summer 2017	February 1, 2017	June 30, 2017
Obtain consent, screen, and enroll additional eligible youth into the RCT	February 1, 2017	June 30, 2017
Data collection – Year Two	September 15, 2017	August 30, 2018
Submit Year Two End of Year Report (RCT Analysis)	June 1, 2018	August 30, 2018
Submit Final RCT Evaluation	June 1, 2018	September 15, 2018

Note. All at-promise youth who registered for the 21st CCLC and LEAP High Programs were given the IRB BOSS Consent Form and upon verification of eligibility the assignment to the treatment and control groups occurred between August 2016 and January of 2017. No new at-promise youth were added to the random control trial and the assigned at-promise youth continued to receive services until they graduated, the program ended or they transferred out of the program. Data was continued to be collected for both groups until the end of the BOSS program on June 30, 2018, with follow up data collected through August 30, 2018.

Appendix C

The table below provides the number of youth assigned to four analytical samples that make up the four panels of at-pormise youth evaluated by the BOSS evaluation. The four analytical samples are: 1) Seniors who enrolled in the first year of the BOSS program, who are the only participants elgibile for a diploma and can transition to post-secondary opportunities and or employment in year one; 2) Juniors who enorlled in the first year of the BOSS porogram that are the only participants eligible for graduation and can transition to post-secondary opportunities and or employment in year two; 3) All youth who enorlled in the first year of the BOSS program that are examined on additional research questions after one full year of the program intervention; and 4) All youth in grades 9 – 11 in year one who are evaluated on additional research questions after two complete years of the intervention.

Assigned to condition means all at-promise youth in each panel randomly assigned to the condition (i.e. treatment or control group). The observed outcome is the number of at-promise youth that have data for the measured outcome. A complete case is the number of at-promise youth who have data for the measured outcome and have data for the five variables used to determine baseline equivlancy (i.e. male, black, free and reduced price lunch, age in year one, and unexcused absences in 2016).

Table C.1. BOSS Evaluation Sample Sizes and Retention Rates (number of youth at assignment, analysis and complete case)

Primary Research Question: Seniors at enrollment (Year 1 Outcomes)							
Diploma		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	123	54	69	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	114	49	65	92.68%	90.74%	94.20%
Post-Secondary		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	74	33	37	60.16%	61.11%	53.62%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	70	33	37	56.91%	61.11%	53.62%
Employment		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	66	29	37	53.66%	53.70%	53.62%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	61	26	35	49.59%	48.15%	50.72%
Unexcused Absences 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	122	53	69	99.19%	98.15%	100%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	113	48	69	91.87%	88.89%	94.20%
Suspensions 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	123	54	69	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	114	49	65	92.68%	90.74%	94.20%
Highest Score Employability Skills Test		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	66	41	25	53.66%	75.93%	36.23%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	61	37	24	49.59%	68.52%	34.78%

Primary Research Question: Juniors at Enrollment (Year 2 Outcomes)							
Diploma		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	229	120	109	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
Post-Secondary		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	210	111	99	91.70%	92.50%	90.83%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	202	108	94	88.21%	90.00%	86.24%
Employment		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	190	103	87	82.97%	85.83%	79.82%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	183	100	83	79.91%	83.33%	76.15%
Unexcused Absences 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	229	120	109	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
Suspensions 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
Unexcused Absences 18		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	228	119	109	99.56%	99.17%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	219	116	103	95.63%	96.67%	94.50%
Suspensions 18		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	228	119	109	99.56%	99.17%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	219	116	103	95.63%	96.67%	94.50%
Highest Score Employability Skills Test		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	174	95	79	75.98%	79.17%	72.48%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	168	93	75	73.36%	77.50%	68.81%
Career Technical Certificate		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	196	102	94	85.59%	85.00%	86.24%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	168	93	75	73.36%	77.50%	68.81%
Primary Research Question: All Participants (Year 1 Outcomes)							
Unexcused Absences 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	781	389	392	99.87%	99.74%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	740	365	375	94.75%	93.83%	95.66%

Suspensions 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	781	390	392	99.87%	99.74%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	741	366	375	94.88%	94.09%	95.66%
Highest Score Employability Skills Test		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	656	347	309	83.89%	88.97%	78.83%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	521	261	260	66.62%	66.92%	66.33%
Primary Research Question: Non-seniors at Enrollment							
Unexcused Absences 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	545	268	280	99.27%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	527	257	270	96.70%	95.54%	96.43%
Suspensions 17		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	527	257	270	95.99%	95.54%	96.43%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	524	256	268	99.43%	99.61%	99.26%
Unexcused Absences 18		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	546	268	278	99.45%	99.63%	99.29%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	524	256	268	95.97%	95.52%	96.40%
Suspensions 18		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	546	268	278	99.45%	99.63%	99.29%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	524	256	268	81.79%	95.52%	96.40%
Highest Score Employability Skills Test		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	546	268	278	99.45%	99.63%	99.29%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	449	223	226	81.79%	82.90%	80.71%
Secondary Research Question: Seniors at Enrollment							
Participation in the 21st / LEAP Program		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	123	54	69	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	114	49	65	92.68%	90.74%	94.20%
Number of Reading Courses Passed		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	92	40	52	74.80%	74.07%	75.36%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	85	36	49	69.11%	66.67%	71.01%
Completion of School District Online Course		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	114	50	64	92.68%	92.59%	92.75%

3. Complete Case	Year 1	106	46	60	86.18%	85.19%	86.96%
Completion of Summer Youth Employment		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	120	51	69	97.56%	94.44%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	111	46	69	90.24%	85.19%	100.00%
FAFSA Completion		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	123	54	69	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	114	49	65	92.68%	90.74%	94.20%
Main Stable House		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	107	48	59	86.99%	88.89%	85.51%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	100	44	56	81.30%	81.48%	81.16%
Juvenile Justice Involvement (New Violation)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	119	54	65	96.75%	100.00%	94.20%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	111	47	64	90.24%	87.04%	92.75%
Family Participation (# Events)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	112	49	63	91.06%	90.74%	91.30%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	104	45	59	84.55%	83.33%	85.51%
Family Referred to Adult Education		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	123	54	69			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	55	28	27	44.72%	51.85%	39.13%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	53	26	27	43.09%	48.15%	39.13%
Secondary Research Question: Juniors at enrollment							
Participation in the 21st / LEAP Program		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	205	105	100	89.52%	87.50%	91.74%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	197	103	94	86.03%	85.83%	86.24%
Number of Reading Courses Passed		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	184	98	86	80.35%	81.67%	78.90%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	178	97	81	77.73%	80.83%	74.31%
Completion of School District Online Course		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	227	118	109	99.13%	98.33%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	218	115	103	95.20%	95.83%	94.50%
Completion of Summer Youth Employment		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	216	108	108	94.32%	90.00%	99.08%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	208	105	103	90.83%	87.50%	94.50%

FAFSA Completion		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	172	90	82	75.11%	75.00%	75.23%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	194	87	77	84.72%	72.50%	70.64%
Main Stable House		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	228	119	109	99.56%	99.17%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	219	116	103	95.63%	96.67%	94.50%
Juvenile Justice Involvement (new violation)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	228	119	108	99.56%	99.17%	99.08%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
Family Participation (# events)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	228	119	109	99.56%	99.17%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	220	117	103	96.07%	97.50%	94.50%
Family Referred to Adult Education		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	229	120	109			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	171	93	78	74.67%	77.50%	71.56%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	169	93	76	73.80%	77.50%	69.72%
Secondary Research Question: All Participants							
Participation in the 21st / LEAP Program		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	782	390	392	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	741	375	366	94.76%	96.15%	93.37%
Number of Reading Courses Passed		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	623	307	316	79.67%	78.72%	80.61%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	592	287	305	75.70%	73.59%	77.81%
Completion of School District Online Course		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	760	376	384	97.19%	96.41%	97.96%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	723	355	368	92.46%	91.03%	93.88%
Main Stable House		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	684	336	348	87.47%	86.15%	88.78%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	653	318	335	83.50%	81.54%	85.46%
Juvenile Justice Involvement (new violation)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	778	388	390	99.49%	99.49%	99.49%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	738	364	374	94.37%	93.33%	95.41%
Family Participation (# events)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control

1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	715	356	359	91.43%	91.28%	91.58%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	678	335	343	86.70%	85.90%	87.50%
Family Referred to Adult Education		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	782	390	392			
2. Outcome observed	Year 1	340	191	141	43.48%	48.97%	35.97%
3. Complete Case	Year 1	327	188	139	41.82%	48.21%	35.46%
Secondary Research Question: 9th through 1th grade at enrollment (Year 2 Outcomes)							
Participation in the 21st / LEAP Program		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	547	269	278	99.64%	100.00%	99.29%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	525	257	268	95.63%	95.54%	95.86%
Number of Reading Courses Passed		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	511	253	258	93.08%	94.05%	92.14%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	492	243	249	89.62%	90.33%	88.93%
Completion of School District Online Course		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	549	269	280	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	527	257	270	95.99%	95.54%	96.43%
Main Stable House		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	546	268	278	99.45%	99.63%	99.29%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	524	256	268	95.45%	95.17%	95.71%
Juvenile Justice Involvement (new violation)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	549	269	280	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	527	257	270	95.99%	95.54%	96.43%
Family Participation (# events)		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	549	269	280	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	524	257	270	95.45%	95.54%	96.43%
Family Referred to Adult Education		Total	Treatment	Control	Total	Treatment	Control
1. Assigned to condition	Baseline	549	269	280			
2. Outcome observed	Year 2	468	228	2240	85.25%	84.76%	85.70%
3. Complete Case	Year 2	464	227	237	84.52%	84.39%	84.64%

Appendix D

The table below provides descriptive statics for the baseline characteristics used in the models studying each outcome. The statistical tests on mean differences use a Levene's Test for *equal variances not assumed*. The comparisons are made for each of the four analytical samples because the attrition rates for each outcome varied by sample.

The following abbreviations are used: 1) N-T – sample size for the treatment group; 2) N-C - sample size for the control group; 3) Mean-T – mean for the treatment group; 4) SD-T – standard deviation for the treatment group; 5) Mean-C – mean for the control group; 6) SD-C- standard deviation for the control group; 7) Diff (T-C) – mean difference between treatment and control group; and 8) p-value – signficance value of the Levene's Test for equal variance not assumed.

Table D.1 Primary Research Question: Seniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 1	diploma	Male	52	68	0.5	0.5	0.43	0.498	-0.074	0.428
Year 1	diploma	Black	52	68	0.711	0.457	0.794	0.407	0.082	0.307
Year 1	diploma	Age	52	68	16.019	1.075	16.264	1.059	0.2454	0.215
Year 1	diploma	FRPL	50	67	0.72	0.453	0.686	0.467	-0.033	0.698
Year 1	diploma	School Attendance (2016)	52	68	1.42	2.796	2.01	3.811	0.592	0.329
Year 1	post-secondary	Male	33	38	0.48	0.508	0.34	0.481	-0.143	0.230
Year 1	post-secondary	Black	33	38	0.787	0.415	0.842	0.369	0.054	0.566
Year 1	post-secondary	Age	33	38	15.939	1.197	16.552	1.057	0.613	0.026
Year 1	post-secondary	FRPL	32	37	0.718	0.456	0.783	0.417	0.065	0.542
Year 1	post-secondary	School Attendance (2016)	33	38	1.21	2.781	1.87	3.967	0.656	0.418
Year 1	Employment	Male	28	36	0.46	0.508	0.36	0.487	-0.103	0.415
Year 1	Employment	Black	28	36	0.785	0.417	0.833	0.377	0.047	0.639
Year 1	Employment	Age	28	36	16.035	1.17	16.527	1.081	0.492	0.090
Year 1	Employment	FRPL	27	35	0.777	0.423	0.771	0.426	-0.006	0.954
Year 1	Employment	School Attendance (2016)	28	36	0.79	1.343	1.69	3.941	0.909	0.203
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Male	53	69	0.51	0.505	0.42	0.497	-0.089	0.333
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Black	53	69	0.717	0.454	0.797	0.405	0.08	0.314
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Age	53	69	16.018	1.065	16.26	1.052	0.242	0.214

Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	FRPL	51	68	0.725	0.45	0.691	0.465	-0.034	0.686
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	School Attendance (2016)	53	69	1.4	2.762	2.09	3.83	0.691	0.25
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Male	54	69	0.5	0.505	0.42	0.497	-0.08	0.383
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Black	54	69	0.722	0.452	0.797	0.405	0.074	0.342
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Age	54	69	16.037	1.063	16.26	1.052	0.223	0.247
Year 1	Suspensions 17	FRPL	51	68	0.722	0.450	0.691	0.465	-0.034	0.686
Year 1	Suspensions 17	School Attendance (2016)	53	69	1.40	2.76	2.09	3.83	0.691	0.250
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Male	41	30	0.49	0.506	0.6	0.498	0.112	0.355
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Black	41	30	0.731	0.448	0.833	0.379	0.101	0.306
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Age	41	30	16.024	1.083	16.133	1.074	0.108	0.676
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	FRPL	39	30	0.717	0.455	0.666	0.479	-0.051	0.654
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	School Attendance (2016)	41	30	1.56	3.099	0.93	1.76	-0.628	0.284

Table D.2. Primary Research Question: Juniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year2	diploma	Male	116	102	0.47	0.501	0.51	0.502	0.044	0.516
Year2	diploma	Black	116	102	0.784	0.412	0.852	0.355	0.068	0.19
Year2	diploma	Age	116	102	15.534	1.16	15.48	1.318	-0.054	0.75
Year2	diploma	FRPL	116	102	0.853	0.355	0.696	0.462	-0.157	0.006
Year2	diploma	School Attendance (2016)	116	102	1.72	3.978	2.22	6.657	0.5	0.509
Year2	post-secondary	Male	100	85	0.42	0.496	0.52	0.503	0.098	0.187
Year2	post-secondary	Black	100	85	0.79	0.409	0.823	0.383	0.033	0.566
Year2	post-secondary	Age	100	85	15.41	1.12	15.517	1.332	0.107	0.557
Year2	post-secondary	FRPL	100	85	0.84	0.368	0.682	0.468	-0.157	0.013
Year2	post-secondary	School Attendance (2016)	100	85	1.34	2.4	1.82	5.137	0.484	0.427
Year2	Employment	Male	102	86	0.43	0.49	0.52	0.502	0.092	0.211
Year2	Employment	Black	102	86	0.803	0.398	0.825	0.381	0.021	0.705
Year2	Employment	Age	102	86	15.431	1.13	15.523	1.32	0.091	0.613
Year2	Employment	FRPL	102	86	0.833	0.374	0.686	0.466	-0.147	0.02
Year2	Employment	School Attendance (2016)	102	86	1.42	2.535	2.37	7.208	0.951	0.247

Year2	Unexcused Absences 18	Male	119	109	0.47	0.501	0.52	0.502	0.052	0.432
Year2	Unexcused Absences 18	Black	119	109	0.789	0.409	0.853	0.355	0.063	0.216
Year2	Unexcused Absences 18	Age	119	109	15.54	1.155	15.513	1.29	-0.032	0.842
Year2	Unexcused Absences 18	FRPL	119	109	0.857	0.351	0.706	0.457	-0.152	0.006
Year2	Unexcused Absences 18	School Attendance (2016)	119	109	4.166	0.382	6.45	0.618	0.221	0.761
Year2	Suspensions 18	Male	119	109	0.47	0.501	0.52	0.502	0.052	0.432
Year2	Suspensions 18	Black	119	109	0.789	0.409	0.853	0.355	0.063	0.213
Year2	Suspensions 18	Age	119	109	15.54	1.155	15.51	1.295	-0.032	0.842
Year2	Suspensions 18	FRPL	119	109	0.857	0.351	0.706	0.457	-0.15	0.006
Year2	Suspensions 18	School Attendance (2016)	119	109	1.91	4.166	2.13	6.45	0.221	0.761
Year2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Male	112	96	0.46	0.501	0.49	0.503	0.025	0.717
Year2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Black	112	96	0.794	0.405	0.833	0.374	0.038	0.476
Year2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Age	112	96	15.517	1.13	15.51	1.297	-0.007	0.965
Year2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	FRPL	112	96	0.848	0.36	0.687	0.465	-0.16	0.007
Year2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	School Attendance (2016)	112	96	1.51	2.52	2.27	6.839	0.762	0.304

Table D.3. Primary Research Question: All Participants at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Male	388	391	0.49	0.501	0.49	0.5	-0.009	0.804
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Black	389	391	0.812	0.39	0.818	0.386	0.006	0.827
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	Age	388	391	14.997	1.33	15.066	1.366	0.069	0.475
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	FRPL	387	389	0.798	0.401	0.755	0.43	-0.042	0.154
Year 1	Unexcused Absences 17	School Attendance (2016)	389	391	1.73	3.51	2.06	5.42	0.326	0.319
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Male	389	392	0.49	0.501	0.48	0.5	-0.009	0.804
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Black	390	392	0.812	0.39	0.818	0.385	0.006	0.827
Year 1	Suspensions 17	Age	389	392	15.002	1.332	15.068	1.365	0.066	0.492
Year 1	Suspensions 17	FRPL	388	390	0.799	0.401	0.756	0.429	-0.042	0.154
Year 1	Suspensions 17	School Attendance (2016)	390	392	1.74	3.51	2.06	5.41	0.32	0.327
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Male	347	321	0.48	0.5	0.5	0.501	0.02	0.609
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Black	348	321	0.807	0.394	0.816	0.387	0.008	0.773
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	Age	347	321	14.896	1.258	14.891	1.312	-0.005	0.958
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	FRPL	346	321	0.803	0.397	0.753	0.431	-0.049	0.124
Year 1	High Score Employability Test Yr.1	School Attendance (2016)	348	321	1.66	3.103	1.94	5.55	0.28	0.427

Table D.4. Primary Research Question: Non-seniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 2	Unexcused Absences 18	Male	333	320	0.5	0.501	0.5	0.501	0.001	0.972
Year 2	Unexcused Absences 18	Black	334	320	0.826	0.379	0.825	0.380	-0.001	0.964
Year 2	Unexcused Absences 18	Age	333	320	14.825	1.293	14.8	1.283	-0.025	0.798
Year 2	Unexcused Absences 18	FRPL	334	319	0.808	0.394	0.768	0.422	-0.040	0.207
Year 2	Unexcused Absences 18	School Attendance (2016)	334	320	1.79	3.629	2.07	5.727	0.278	0.456
Year 2	Suspensions 18	Male	333	320	0.5	0.501	0.5	0.501	0.001	0.972
Year 2	Suspensions 18	Black	334	320	0.826	0.379	0.825	0.38	-0.001	0.964
Year 2	Suspensions 18	Age	333	320	14.825	1.293	14.8	1.283	-0.025	0.798
Year 2	Suspensions 18	FRPL	334	319	0.808	0.394	0.768	0.422	-0.04	0.207
Year 2	Suspensions 18	School Attendance (2016)	334	320	1.79	3.62	2.07	5.727	0.278	0.456
Year 2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Male	306	291	0.47	0.5	0.48	0.501	0.011	0.794
Year 2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Black	307	291	0.817	0.386	0.814	0.389	-0.003	0.921
Year 2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	Age	306	291	14.745	1.203	14.762	1.268	0.017	0.861
Year 2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	FRPL	307	291	0.814	0.389	0.762	0.426	-0.051	0.124
Year 2	High Score Employability Test Yr.2	School Attendance (2016)	307	291	1.67	3.108	2.04	5.794	0.37	0.334

Table D.5. Secondary Research Question: Seniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Male	54	69	0.5	0.505	0.42	0.497	-0.08	0.383
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Black	54	69	0.722	0.452	0.797	0.405	0.074	0.342
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Age	54	69	16.037	1.063	16.26	1.052	0.223	0.247
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	FRPL	52	68	0.73	0.447	0.691	0.465	-0.039	0.638
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	54	69	1.43	2.744	2.09	3.83	0.661	0.267
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Male	40	52	0.48	0.506	0.44	0.502	-0.033	0.758
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Black	40	52	0.7	0.464	0.769	0.425	0.069	0.464
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Age	40	52	16.05	1.036	16.288	1.072	0.238	0.284
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	FRPL	39	51	0.743	0.442	0.647	0.482	-0.096	0.327

Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	40	52	1.73	3.105	1.5	2.555	-0.225	0.711
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Male	50	64	0.5	0.505	0.44	0.5	-0.063	0.512
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Black	50	64	0.72	0.453	0.796	0.405	0.076	0.349
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Age	50	64	16.02	1.078	16.234	1.019	0.214	0.283
Year 1	Complete Online Course	FRPL	48	63	0.75	0.437	0.682	0.469	-0.067	0.437
Year 1	Complete Online Course	School Attendance (2016)	50	64	1.48	2.837	1.95	3.636	0.473	0.437
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Male	4	6	1	0	0.17	0.408	-0.833	0.004
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Black	4	6	All Yr. 1 Seniors completing SYEP were black.					
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Age	4	6	15	1.41	16.166	0.983	1.166	0.212
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	FRPL	4	6	0.25	0.5	1	0	0.75	0.058
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	School Attendance (2016)	4	6	4	7.348	1.67	1.751	-2.33	0.574
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Male	48	54	0.48	0.505	0.5	0.505	0.021	0.836
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Black	48	54	0.708	0.459	0.8148	0.392	0.106	0.214
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Age	48	54	16.062	1.079	16.296	1.109	0.233	0.284
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	FRPL	46	53	0.717	0.455	0.735	0.445	0.018	0.839
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	School Attendance (2016)	48	54	1.5	2.88	1.22	2.06	-0.278	0.582
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Male	48	59	0.48	0.505	0.42	0.498	-0.055	0.098
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Black	48	59	0.708	0.459	0.797	0.418	0.071	0.408
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Age	48	59	16.02	1.02	16.22	1.035	0.199	0.320
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	FRPL	47	58	0.723	0.452	0.655	0.479	-0.068	0.456
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	School Attendance (2016)	48	59	1.44	2.84	1.69	2.54	0.257	0.626
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Male	52	67	0.48	0.505	0.43	0.499	-0.048	0.607
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Black	52	67	0.71	0.457	0.791	0.409	0.079	0.327
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Age	52	67	16.038	1.083	16.268	1.052	0.23	0.247
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	FRPL	50	66	0.74	0.443	0.681	0.469	-0.058	0.496
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	School Attendance (2016)	52	67	1.37	2.71	1.76	2.89	0.396	0.445
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Male	49	63	0.51	0.505	0.44	0.501	-0.066	0.494
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Black	49	63	0.714	0.456	0.793	0.407	0.079	0.341
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Age	49	63	16.02	1.089	16.22	1.023	0.201	0.320

Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	FRPL	47	62	0.766	0.427	0.677	0.471	-0.088	0.308
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	49	63	1.51	2.85	1.95	3.66	0.442	0.475
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Male	28	27	0.5	0.509	0.44	0.506	-0.056	0.687
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Black	28	27	0.678	0.475	0.888	0.32	0.21	0.060
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Age	28	27	16.107	0.956	16.074	0.997	-0.033	0.901
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	FRPL	27	27	0.74	0.446	0.666	0.48	-0.074	0.560
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	28	27	1.5	2.58	1.67	2.236	0.167	0.799

Table D.6. Secondary Research Question: Juniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Male	105	99	0.44	0.499	0.51	0.503	0.067	0.341
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Black	105	99	0.781	0.415	0.838	0.369	0.057	0.298
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Age	105	99	15.409	1.089	15.525	1.304	0.115	0.494
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	FRPL	105	99	0.857	0.351	0.697	0.461	-0.16	0.006
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	105	99	1.67	2.837	1.74	4.791	0.071	0.899
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Male	98	86	0.45	0.5	0.51	0.503	0.063	0.399
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Black	98	86	0.795	0.405	0.814	0.391	0.018	0.759
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Age	98	86	15.408	1.119	15.511	1.343	0.103	0.574
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	FRPL	98	86	0.846	0.361	0.674	0.471	-0.172	0.007
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	98	86	1.37	2.21	1.86	5.11	0.493	0.409
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Male	118	109	0.46	0.5	0.52	0.502	0.065	0.328
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Black	118	109	0.796	0.404	0.853	0.355	0.056	0.263
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Age	118	109	15.508	1.107	15.513	1.295	0.005	0.974
Year 2	Complete Online Course	FRPL	118	109	0.855	0.352	0.706	0.457	-0.149	0.007
Year 2	Complete Online Course	School Attendance (2016)	118	109	1.93	4.177	2.13	6.451	0.196	0.788
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Male	18	11	0.33	0.485	0.45	0.522	0.121	0.54
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Black	18	11	0.833	0.383	0.818	0.404	-0.015	0.921

Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Age	18	11	15.666	1.084	14.909	1.578	-0.757	0.18
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	FRPL	18	11	0.833	0.383	0.636	0.504	-0.196	0.281
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	School Attendance (2016)	18	11	1	2.086	0.73	0.905	-0.273	0.632
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Male	36	34	0.39	0.494	0.47	0.507	0.082	0.497
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Black	36	34	0.805	0.401	0.41	0.07	-0.011	0.907
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Age	36	34	15.5	1.082	15.588	1.233	0.088	0.752
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	FRPL	36	34	0.861	0.35	0.705	0.462	-0.155	0.12
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	School Attendance (2016)	36	34	1.83	2.844	1.53	3.662	-0.304	0.701
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Male	119	109	0.47	0.501	0.52	0.502	0.052	0.432
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Black	119	109	0.789	0.406	0.852	0.355	0.063	0.213
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Age	119	109	15.546	1.155	15.513	1.295	-0.032	0.842
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	FRPL	119	109	0.857	0.351	0.706	0.457	-0.15	0.006
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	School Attendance (2016)	119	109	1.91	4.166	2.13	6.451	0.221	0.761
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Male	120	109	0.47	0.501	0.52	0.502	0.056	0.397
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Black	120	109	0.791	0.407	0.853	0.355	0.061	0.224
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Age	120	109	15.55	1.51	15.513	1.295	-0.036	0.824
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	FRPL	120	109	0.858	0.35	0.706	0.457	-0.151	0.006
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	School Attendance (2016)	120	109	1.9	4.14	2.13	6.45	0.228	0.753
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Male	119	109	0.47	0.501	0.52	0.502	0.052	0.432
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Black	119	109	0.789	0.409	0.853	0.355	0.063	0.213
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Age	119	109	15.546	1.155	15.513	1.295	-0.032	0.842
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	FRPL	119	109	0.857	0.351	0.706	0.457	-0.15	0.006
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	119	109	1.91	4.166	2.13	6.451	0.221	0.761
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Male	92	78	0.47	0.502	0.49	0.503	0.02	0.798
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Black	92	78	0.793	0.407	0.794	0.406	0.001	0.982
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Age	92	78	15.434	1.061	15.794	1.154	0.36	0.037
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	FRPL	92	78	0.858	0.35	0.756	0.432	-0.102	0.096
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	92	78	1.38	2.26	2.03	5.338	0.645	0.322

Table D.7. Secondary Research Question: All Participants

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Male	389	392	0.49	0.501	0.48	0.5	-0.009	0.804
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Black	390	392	0.812	0.39	0.818	0.385	0.006	0.827
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	Age	389	392	15.002	1.332	15.068	1.365	0.066	0.492
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	FRPL	388	390	0.799	0.401	0.756	0.429	-0.042	0.154
Year 1	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	390	392	1.74	3.51	2.06	5.417	0.32	0.327
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Male	306	316	0.47	0.5	0.48	0.5	0.007	0.858
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Black	307	316	0.82	0.384	0.813	0.39	-0.007	0.808
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	Age	306	316	14.895	1.265	15.031	1.33	0.136	0.191
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	FRPL	306	315	0.82	0.384	0.752	0.432	-0.067	0.039
Year 1	Reading Courses Passed Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	307	316	1.82	3.326	1.96	5.054	0.141	0.68
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Male	375	384	0.48	0.5	0.49	0.5	0.004	0.906
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Black	376	384	0.813	0.389	0.82	0.384	0.006	0.818
Year 1	Complete Online Course	Age	375	384	14.938	1.253	15.046	1.339	0.108	0.251
Year 1	Complete Online Course	FRPL	374	383	0.802	0.398	0.754	0.43	-0.047	0.115
Year 1	Complete Online Course	School Attendance (2016)	376	384	1.79	3.56	2.05	5.43	0.262	0.431
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Male	41	29	0.39	0.494	0.38	0.494	-0.011	0.928
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Black	41	29	0.829	0.38	0.827	0.384	-0.001	0.986
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Age	41	29	14.951	1.244	14.896	1.447	-0.054	0.87
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	FRPL	41	29	0.707	0.46	0.689	0.47	-0.017	0.877
Year 1	Complete Summer Youth Employment	School Attendance (2016)	41	29	1.56	3.017	1.17	1.774	-0.389	0.502
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Male	84	88	0.44	0.499	0.49	0.503	0.048	0.529
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Black	84	88	0.75	0.435	0.806	0.397	0.056	0.373
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	Age	84	88	15.821	1.11	16.022	1.203	0.201	0.255
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	FRPL	82	87	0.78	0.416	0.724	0.449	-0.056	0.399
Year 1	Complete FAFSA	School Attendance (2016)	84	88	1.64	2.857	1.34	2.775	-0.302	0.483

Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Male	335	348	0.47	0.5	0.49	0.501	0.011	0.774
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Black	336	348	0.818	0.386	0.816	0.387	-0.002	0.936
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	Age	335	348	14.961	1.26	15.031	1.326	0.07	0.477
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	FRPL	335	347	0.817	0.386	0.743	0.437	-0.074	0.019
Year 1	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 1	School Attendance (2016)	336	348	1.87	3.721	2.12	5.566	0.257	0.476
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Male	387	390	0.49	0.501	0.49	0.5	-0.004	0.916
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Black	388	390	0.811	0.391	0.817	0.386	0.006	0.827
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Age	387	390	14.997	1.334	15.064	1.365	0.066	0.491
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	FRPL	386	388	0.8	0.4	0.755	0.43	-0.045	0.129
Year 1	Juvenile Justice Involvement	School Attendance (2016)	388	390	1.73	3.511	2	5.325	0.271	0.403
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Male	355	359	0.48	0.5	0.49	0.501	0.003	0.937
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Black	356	359	0.817	0.386	0.821	0.383	0.004	0.881
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	Age	355	359	14.918	1.258	15.052	1.343	0.134	0.167
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	FRPL	354	358	0.813	0.39	0.745	0.436	-0.067	0.029
Year 1	Family Participation Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	356	359	1.84	3.646	2	5.021	0.16	0.626
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Male	198	141	0.5	0.501	0.48	0.501	-0.025	0.653
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Black	199	141	0.788	0.409	0.829	0.377	0.04	0.343
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	Age	198	141	14.828	1.31	14.943	1.302	0.114	0.425
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	FRPL	198	141	0.838	0.369	0.737	0.441	-0.1	0.028
Year 1	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr1	School Attendance (2016)	199	141	1.83	3.66	2.37	5.48	0.535	0.314

Table D.8. Secondary Research Question: Non-seniors at Enrollment

Time at measurement	Outcome	Baseline characteristic	N-T	N-C	Mean-T	SD-T	Mean-C	SD-C	Diff (T-C)	p-value
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Male	287	295	0.45	0.498	0.49	0.501	0.046	0.272
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Black	288	295	0.816	0.388	0.823	0.381	0.007	0.808
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	Age	287	295	14.686	1.167	14.783	1.272	0.096	0.34
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	FRPL	288	295	0.812	0.39	0.759	0.428	-0.053	0.118
Year 2	21st CCLC/LEAP High Program Participation Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	288	295	1.73	3.25	1.84	5.122	0.111	0.753

Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Male	277	270	0.47	0.5	0.49	0.501	0.012	0.775
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Black	277	270	0.83	0.376	0.818	0.386	-0.011	0.717
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	Age	277	270	14.689	1.202	14.744	1.272	0.054	0.604
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	FRPL	277	270	0.797	0.402	0.755	0.43	-0.042	0.236
Year 2	Reading Courses Passed Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	277	270	1.59	3.079	1.81	4.553	0.223	0.504
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Male	325	320	0.48	0.5	0.5	0.501	0.017	0.669
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Black	326	320	0.828	0.377	0.825	0.38	-0.003	0.914
Year 2	Complete Online Course	Age	325	320	14.772	1.195	14.809	1.268	0.037	0.703
Year 2	Complete Online Course	FRPL	326	320	0.809	0.393	0.768	0.422	-0.041	0.201
Year 2	Complete Online Course	School Attendance (2016)	326	320	1.83	3.661	2.07	5.727	0.234	0.537
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Male	37	23	0.32	0.475	0.43	0.507	0.11	0.405
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Black	37	23	0.81	0.397	0.782	0.421	-0.028	0.798
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	Age	37	23	14.945	1.24	14.565	1.37	-0.38	0.286
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	FRPL	37	23	0.756	0.434	0.608	0.499	-0.148	0.248
Year 2	Complete Summer Youth Employment	School Attendance (2016)	37	23	1.3	2.209	1.04	1.796	-0.254	0.629
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Male	36	34	0.39	0.494	0.47	0.507	0.082	0.497
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Black	36	34	0.805	0.401	0.794	0.41	-0.011	0.907
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	Age	36	34	15.5	1.082	15.588	1.233	0.088	0.752
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	FRPL	36	34	0.861	0.35	0.705	0.462	-0.155	0.12
Year 2	Complete FAFSA	School Attendance (2016)	36	34	1.83	2.844	1.53	3.662	-0.304	0.701
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Male	333	320	0.5	0.501	0.5	0.501	0.001	0.972
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Black	334	320	0.826	0.379	0.825	0.38	-0.001	0.964
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	Age	333	320	14.825	1.293	14.8	1.283	-0.025	0.798
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	FRPL	334	319	0.808	0.394	0.768	0.422	-0.04	0.208
Year 2	Maintain Stable Housing Yr 2	School Attendance (2016)	334	320	1.79	3.629	2.07	5.727	0.278	0.46
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Male	335	323	0.49	0.501	0.5	0.501	0.006	0.88
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Black	336	323	0.827	0.378	0.823	0.381	-0.003	0.897
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	Age	335	323	14.835	1.297	14.814	1.288	-0.021	0.831
Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	FRPL	336	322	0.809	0.393	0.77	0.421	-0.039	0.217

Year 2	Juvenile Justice Involvement	School Attendance (2016)	336	323	1.79	3.61	2.05	5.704	0.264	0.481
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Male	333	320	0.5	0.501	0.5	0.501	0.001	0.972
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Black	334	320	0.826	0.379	0.825	0.38	-0.001	0.964
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	Age	333	320	14.825	1.293	14.8	1.283	-0.025	0.798
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	FRPL	334	319	0.808	0.394	0.768	0.422	-0.04	0.208
Year 2	Family Participation Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	334	320	1.79	3.62	2.07	5.727	0.278	0.46
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Male	230	240	0.44	0.498	0.48	0.501	0.036	0.439
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Black	230	240	0.821	0.383	0.804	0.397	-0.017	0.626
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	Age	230	240	14.791	1.14	14.854	1.273	0.062	0.573
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	FRPL	230	240	0.821	0.383	0.787	0.409	-0.034	0.35
Year 2	Family Referred to Adult Education Yr2	School Attendance (2016)	230	240	1.55	3.04	2.01	5.575	0.456	0.269