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Sweeping Education Reforms Launched in New Haven in 2009 and 2010

Goals
• Eliminate the achievement gap between NHPS and CT averages
• Improve the high school graduation rate and cut the dropout rate
• Make sure every student is academically prepared and financially able to go to college

Structure: Improvements are organized into three pillars
• School organization and learning environment
• Teaching and professional development
• Community engagement
Sweeping Education Reforms Launched in New Haven in 2009 and 2010

Goals

• Cultivate an aspiration for a college education in New Haven Public School students
• Build community and parent engagement
• Promote economic development in the City of New Haven

Structure: Scholars must meet eligibility requirements

• Provides up to $10,000 a year toward tuition for an in-state college
• Class of 2014 was first to be eligible for 100% of available funds
The New Haven Promise Board asked RAND to Examine *Progress to Date*

- Gathers *baseline* information
  - Where students and district are at this early stage
  - Can make comparisons later
  - Understand whether efforts are moving in right direction

- Too early to tell whether reforms have succeeded
  - Implementation is ongoing
    - School Change (2010 through 2015)
    - Promise (2010 through 2014)

- Difficult to pinpoint which effort is causing a specific improvement
  - By design, overlapping efforts work collectively

We are grateful for generous funding from the Peter and Carmen Lucia Buck Foundation
The RAND Study Serves as a Critical First Step in Documenting the Reforms’ Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and district climate</th>
<th>Reading and math test scores</th>
<th>High school drop out rates</th>
<th>Promise eligibility and college preparation</th>
<th>College enrollment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**School Change Goals**

**Promise Goals**
And Sets the Stage for Deeper Analysis at a Later Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and district climate</th>
<th>Reading and math test scores</th>
<th>High school drop out rates</th>
<th>Promise eligibility and college preparation</th>
<th>College enrollment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Trends through time**
- NHPS before vs. after the inception of reforms
- NHPS trends vs. a group of similar CT districts

**Any differences by a school’s...**
- Tier?
- TEVAL score?
- Student body characteristics?
- Teachers’ characteristics?
A Variety of Data Sources Provided a Balanced and Broad Portrait

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and district climate</th>
<th>Reading and math test scores</th>
<th>High school drop out rates</th>
<th>Promise eligibility and college preparation</th>
<th>College enrollment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Learning Environment survey (Spring 2010-2013)</td>
<td>CT and NHPS scores on CMT and CAPT</td>
<td>CT and NHPS drop out data</td>
<td>NHPS data on attendance, grades, and discipline record</td>
<td>National Student Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with 35 Promise Scholars and 21 parents of Scholars (Fall 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with 35 Promise Scholars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports of School Climate Were Positive

*On average, through time, scores on student and teacher SLE:*

- Remained relatively high (3.4 to 4.2 on a scale of 1 to 5)
- Were positively related to a school’s average TEVAL score
- Improved from 2010 to 2011, then did not change afterwards
- Tier I schools continued to have higher SLE scores than tier III schools

But District and School Engagement was Reportedly Lacking

- Parents would like a more active role in district decision-making and a deeper connection with schools
Student Achievement Scores Gained Slightly, Especially for Schools Deemed Most in Need (Tier III)

On average CAPT and CMT scores:
- Increased, similar to CT schools and districts with comparable sociodemographic and academic profiles as New Haven
- Significantly improved from 2010 to 2013 for students in tier III schools
  - Students in tier III schools had the largest gains

But Scores Remain Below State Averages
Drop Out Rates Improved, Especially for Schools Deemed Most in Need (Tier III)

On average:

- Students who started high school in 9\textsuperscript{th} grade and dropped out in 10\textsuperscript{th} grade improved from 9\% (2008-09) to 3\% (2011-12)

- Schools with the greatest improvements were more likely to be tier III and have larger percentages of lower-income students
Percentage of NHPS graduates Meeting Three Promise Eligibility Criteria is Higher After Implementation of Promise

Note: Does not include data on residency or hours of community service

Class of 2010: Prior to the Promise, only 28% would have met the 2012-13 eligibility criteria
But, in 2013, Only 36% of NHPS Graduates Met Three of Five Eligibility Requirements For a Promise Scholarship

**Note:**
Does not include data on residency or hours of community service
Promise Scholars Did Not Feel Adequately Prepared for Rigors of College

Especially in skills research links to academic performance in college:

- Content knowledge
- Time management
- Self discipline and study skills
College Enrollment Rates Slightly Increased, for Students Both Eligible and Ineligible for Promise

Figure 5.4 presents college enrollment rates by Promise eligibility status. We used the 2011–2012 eligibility requirements to determine Promise eligibility. The data indicate that college enrollment rates increased after the implementation of Promise and School Change for students who were eligible for Promise as well as for students who were not eligible for Promise. The difference-in-difference analysis indicates that there was no difference in post-Promise college enrollment changes by Promise eligibility status.

We tested the robustness of this finding by reestimating the difference-in-difference model using a subset of the sample whose GPAs ranged from 2.5 to 3.5. In restricting the range, we more closely tested the potential effect of Promise on those most affected by its implementation. In this supplementary analysis, available in Appendix C in the companion volume, we found that the difference in college enrollment rates between students who met three Promise eligibility requirements and students who did not within this narrower range of GPAs was consistent before and after Promise became available, corroborating the findings from the more-inclusive difference-in-difference analysis described here.

SOURCE: NHPS and National Student Clearinghouse.
Promise Funding Reportedly Expanded Post-secondary Options

Promise Scholars and parents of Scholars noted that the Promise supported decisions to:

- Attend a 4-year rather than 2-year institution
- Attend an in-state rather than out-of-state institution
- Live on campus rather than at home

And is helping to:
- Save money for graduate school
- Ensure families not incur debt
Promise Funding Reportedly Expanded Post-secondary Options

“the program enhances the feeling of community and gives hope to future generations for a college-going culture.”
- Promise Scholar

“Promise made my expectations for my child real because I did not have the financial resources... (nor the ability) to qualify for loans.”
- Parent of Promise Scholar

“Among minorities . . . there isn’t a college-going culture. . . . It was more of a motivational factor for me. . . . This is an opportunity that I can take. It was probably the final discriminating factor because I was deciding whether or not I was going to college or not.”
- Promise Scholar

“It was nice to see that an interest is being taken in the community. New Haven, in general, I feel like, there’s this change, like [from] this separate, isolationist ... that’s changing to a more community-building thing .... steps are being taken to change that, to have a more college-going culture.”
- Promise Scholar
This Preliminary Analysis Suggests that Critical Challenges Remain…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and district climate</th>
<th>Reading and math test scores</th>
<th>High school drop out rates</th>
<th>Promise eligibility and college preparation</th>
<th>College enrollment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents would like to be more engaged</td>
<td>Test scores still remain low and below state averages</td>
<td>Graduates of NHPS high schools struggle to meet requirements for a Promise scholarship</td>
<td>Promise Scholars do not feel adequately prepared for rigors of college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
…Yet Students are Making Progress on Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and district climate</th>
<th>Reading and math test scores</th>
<th>High school drop out rates</th>
<th>Promise eligibility and college preparation</th>
<th>College enrollment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive</td>
<td>Schools that were targeted for improvement by School Change have made steady and significant progress</td>
<td>College enrollment rates have increased</td>
<td>College-going attitudes are being prompted</td>
<td>Promise funding appears to be opening up opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>