DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 360		UD 021 843

AUTHOR	Murray, Charles A.; And Others
TITLE	The National Evluation of the Cities in Schools Program. Report No. 4: Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	AIR-68201-2-81-FR-4
PUB DATE	81
CONTRACT	400-77-0107
NOTE	214p.; Some pages may be marginally legible due to reproduction quality of original document.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cost Effectiveness; *Delivery Systems; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Community Relationship; Social Services; *Student Development; *Urban Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Cities in Schools

ABSTRACT

This is the final report of an evaluation of the Cities in Schools (CIS) program which was designed to ensure the delivery of educational and social services to inner city students; CIS uses the school as a base of operations. CIS contends that the current delivery systems are insufficient to meet the needs of youth due to lack of coordination, personalism, accountability and morale, according to this report. CIS's solution to this problem was reviewed in the light of the following assertions: (1) CIS will provide a superior structure and process for service delivery to disadvantaged youth; (2) the higher quality of service leads to significant, positive impact on youth; and (3) these positive benefits can be achieved without excessive increase to costs of the present delivery systems. Also discussed are problem reduction strategies versus solution building strategies in the evaluation of CIS, and CIS elements as part of the solution. A commentary by CIS on the issues that affected the program evaluation is appended. A discussion of the design of the study, which includes samples of caseworker and student interview forms, service delivery questionnaires, project histories, and other archival data from the evaluation are included in the appendices. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210360

AIR 68201-2/81-FR(4)

The National Evaluation of the Cities in Schools Program

Report No. 4: Final Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

Prepared for the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC

Contract No. 400-77-0107

1981

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH/1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Washington DC 20007

021843

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

AIR 68201-2/81-FR(4)

The National Evaluation of the Cities in Schools Program

Report No. 4: Final Report

Charles A. Murray
Blair B. Bourque
Susan J. Mileff

Prepared for the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Contract No. 400-77-0107

1981

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH/1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Washington DC 20007

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments. 1
FOREWORD 3

I. THE CITIES IN SCHOOLS PROGRAM: A PRIMER. . . 5

CIS's Perception of the Problem 5
The CIS Solution 6
The Implemented Program. 10

II. THE EVOLUTION OF CIS 25

Getting Started. 25
Getting Federal Support. 28
Enter the Evaluation 33
Implementing the Federal Demonstration . . . 35

III. THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CIS 41

Assertion #1: "CIS will provide a superior structure and process for integrated service delivery to disadvantaged youngsters" 42

Assertion #2: "The higher quality of service leads to significant, positive impact on the youth". 66

Assertion #3: "These positive benefits can be achieved without excessive increase to costs of the present delivery systems". . . 81

IV. THE POTENTIAL OF CIS 87

"Problem-Reduction" Vs. "Solution-Building" in the Evaluation of CIS. 88
CIS Elements as Part of the Solution. . . . 90

V. CONCLUSIONS 111

APPENDICES

A. CIS Commentary
B. Design of the Study

LISTS OF TABLES AND EXHIBITS

Page

EXHIBITS

1.1 CIS Description of Family Staff Roles. 8

TABLES

1.1 1978-79 and 1979-80 Enrollment and Staffing in CIS 11
1.2 CIS Student Characteristics, 1979-80 at Smith, Arsenal Tech, Julia Richman. . . . 14
3.1 Percentages of Students Rated as Having "Severe" Nonacademic Problems. 45
3.2 Number of Staff Assigned from Agencies at Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman in 1979-80 49
3.3 Source of CIS Staff Salaries at All Schools, 1979-80. 50
3.4 Students Reporting Participation in "At Least One" Programmatic Activity 58
3.5 1978-79 Direction of Results in Achieving Outcomes. 71
3.6 Attrition in 1978-79 Cis Poputlation 72
3.7 Attrition in the 10th Grade: CIS Compared with Non-CIS Students 74
3.8 Effects of Attrition: The Case of Attendance 77
3.9 Absences: CIS Compared with Non-CIS STudents 78

FIGURE

3.1 Rationale for Impact Indicators. 68

EXHIBITS IN APPENDICES

A.1 Caseworker Interview Form, Post-Test/Schedule A and Post-Test/Schedule B
A.2 Institutionalization Questionnaire--Schedule A, Project Directors, CIS
A.3 Student Interview From, Post-Test/Schedule A; Student Post-Interview Rating Sheet; and Post-Test, Attitude
A.4 Teacher Interview Form
A.5 Institutionalization Questionnaire--Schedule B, Directors, Deputies of Social Service agencies and Community-Based Organizations
A.6 Service Delivery Questionnaire--Social Service Staff
A.7 Interview Form--Project History
A.8 Archival Data Forms
A.9 Observer Report Form

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A project that lasts for three and a half years and covers three cities accumulates many debts, more than we can acknowledge individually. But these people do stand out:

The staff of CIS itself was our main source of help. Being evaluated is never entirely pleasant, but CIS was remarkably ready to treat the evaluation as a potential help rather than as a threat. In this, the lead person was Elizabeth Baltz, first the director of the Indianapolis program, then CIS's liaison person for the evaluation. Among the dozens of other CIS staff who helped, we must single out Harv Oostdyk, Jimmy Hardy, William Smith, Neil Shorthouse, Mary Jane McConahay, Audrey Smith, Wayne Palmer, Tony Hernandez, Carolyn Wilson, Joyce McWilliams, Wib Walling, and Charles Tisdale. The dialogue was often argumentative, but the good faith that CIS brought to the evaluation made the process work.

Others in the public school systems and in the private sector who made our lives easier included Helen Branch, Ray Reed, Andy Paine, Stan Stern, and George Kennelley. Our thanks also to our on-site data collectors, especially Diane Foley, Juanita Harris, and Toni Simons.

At the outset, NIE set up a Technical Review Panel for the evaluation. Working with it turned out to be an unexpected pleasure. Its members -- Ward Edwards, Malcolm Klein, Robert Perloff, Robert Stake, and Eugene Webb were the most active ones -- consistently provided helpful, if varied, advice.

At AIR, the contributions of Pamela Belluomini, Joan Botts, Tony Cox, Joan Flood, Wilfred Hamm, Ron Harnar, Rigney Hill, Shirley Hines, Cindy Israel, Eileen Kelly, Karol Kerns, Helen MacKenzie, Mary Martin, Saundra Murray, Dian Overbey, Denise Peck, Thomas Raymond, Janice Redish, Victor Rouse, Jane Schubert, and Ellen Stotsky are gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks go to Robert

Krug, without whom AIR would not have been given the chance to do the CIS evalution, and to Paul Schwarz, who has been the project's Senior Reviewer throughout.

Finally, there is Norman Gold. Progenitor of the original Request for Proposals and Technical Monitor fo NIE, he has been a major contributor to both the intellectual and administrative sides of the evaluation, and a good friend as well.

5

FOREWORD

In mid-1977, the Federal government began funding a program called "Cities in Schools," a demonstration program to integrate human services in the inner-city. It would use the school as the focal point -- "put the city in the school" -- whence the name. In September, 1977, the American Institutes for Research was awarded a contract by the National Institute of Education to conduct an evaluation of the Cities in Schools Program. This is the final report of that evaluation.

It is the last of a long sequence of evaluation reports, briefings, presentations at conferences, memoranda of interim findings, and seminars. It comes at the end of a participatory process that involved a Technical Review Panel to monitor our work, half a dozen "stakeholder" panels to help develop our marching orders, and continual interchange, formal and informal, with the CIS staff. The evaluation itself is now being evaluated (by the Huron Institute) to determine what has been learned about conducting this type of interactive evaluation.

Throughout, our reports have catered to the needs of the people who were already involved in CIS. This time, in the final report, we address also the larger audience of people who want to know what has been learned about how to deal with the problems of urban schools, how to integrate human services, and how to take a program from demonstration to an established component of the system. For this audience, we treat CIS as a case in point.

But which "case in point" that CIS represents shall we describe? We have choices.

We may describe the CIS that the supporters of CIS see: a small group of dedicated street workers with one of the few original approaches available.

We may describe the CIS that attracted a short flurry of national publicity because of President and Mrs. Carter's support.

We may describe the CIS of the social worker and youth counselor, who point to the intrinsic value of the services that CIS provides.

We may describe the CIS that was portrayed by officials of the existing social service and school systems, of amateurs who are long on rhetoric and short on performance.

We may describe the CIS that the CIS staff sees: an underfunded, hand-to-mouth effort that is trying to tackle some of the most intractable of our urban problems while fighting off bureaucratic interference and rivalries.

Each of these versions can be sustained by the facts. CIS did some things very well and some things very badly. Depending on how one values the different things, CIS can be seen as an extravagance or a necessity.

Rather than write a report of the "On the one hand-...on the other hand..." genre, we begin with an overview of CIS (Chapter I), then proceed in the subsequent three chapters to give full play to each of three different approaches.

The first of these is a *contextual* evaluation. CIS developed out of a particular set of circumstances and evolved over time. Chapter II describes this process, with emphasis on the practical and political factors that affected the program's implementation.

The second of these is a traditional *program* evaluation: a statement of the program's accomplishments relative to the objectives that had been stated at the outset. Chapter III presents these results, drawing on data from previous reports as well as from the 1979-80 experience.

The third of the evaluation approaches is *diagnostic*. It explores what worked for whom in the CIS approach, and attempts to estimate the potential of CIS's various elements. The focus in Chapter IV is on "What has been learned from CIS?" rather than "What did CIS accomplish?"

Chapter V draws together the conclusions.

Chapter I.

The Cities in Schools Program: A Primer

As the chapter's title suggests, this is an introduction to Cities in Schools (CIS) for readers who are unfamiliar with the program. Others may proceed directly to Chapter II without loss.

CIS' PERCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM

CIS is a program to integrate the delivery of educational and social services to inner-city students, using the school as a base of operations. The problem that motivated it is a familiar one. As we put it in the Evaluation Design:

> Despite all the programs, all the money, and all the people that have been aimed at the problems of inner-city youth, a very large proportion of those youth apparently remain stuck in a cycle of failure, with "failure" defined in the elementary terms of an adulthood of stunted personal development, or destructive social behavior, or chronic unemployment, perhaps addiction or jail.

CIS holds that current resource allocations would be sufficient to meet the needs of youth, if the delivery system were not fragmented and uncoordinated. CIS contends that the system's ineffectiveness is a function of four defects:

- lack of coordination: comprehensive needs cannot be met in one place; services are fragmented;
- lack of personalism: since each "client" deals with many "providers," no personal relationships are developed;

- lack of accountability: providers are rarely held responsible for failure or rewarded for success; and

- lack of morale: both client and provider are apathetic about a system in which neither believes.

As CIS sees it, this situation has many negative consequences. The system duplicates some services and neglects others, treating the client as a bundle of discrete problems to be addressed in isolation, rather than as a whole person. Access to the people who need the services is limited because the initiative rests to an unreasonable degree with the recipient. He or she must recognize the problem, learn about the service, find out where it can be obtained, travel to an unfamiliar place to seek help from strangers, and, too often, deal with an indifferent bureaucrat. For many people, these barriers are sufficient to prevent them from seeking help. The existing services that could aid the family's attempt to succeed are not tapped, and the cycle of failure continues.

THE CIS SOLUTION

CIS proposed an approach to correct these system defects. The central feature of CIS is the assignment of Caseworkers to groups of problem students at an inner-city school. The school provides centralized access to the youth, an entry point for access to the family, and a place to put the CIS staff. Because one of the major problems of service delivery for youth is finding them, CIS argues that services should be provided through the one place where they are legally required to be -- building onto the public school, the institution that already is charged with playing a central role in the youth's development.

The school provides the place. The caseload provides the essential programmatic element. Each student in the program has one person on the CIS staff who is directly and comprehensively accountable for monitoring the student's well-being. If the student is absent, the Caseworker is supposed to track him down. If winter comes and he has no coat, the Caseworker is to see that he gets one. If the student cannot stay in school because he has to help take care of younger siblings, the Caseworker is responsible for helping the family make other child-care arrangements. In short, CIS takes the stance that the Caseworker can never say of a problem, "It's not my job." The caseload is to be small enough (10 to 15 students) to make this degree of responsibility reasonable.

There is a great deal of variation within this general model. The CIS schools include elementary schools, middle schools, senior highs, and street academies. Caseloads are static in some schools, selected during the summer and maintained throoughout the year. In others, caseload assignments are flexible; students are assigned to caseloads as problems crop up and are mainstreamed when the problems are resolved. Finally, the specific criteria for student selection vary from component to component.* In some components, low attendance or low academic achievement alone warrant inclusion in CIS; in others, a combination of these criteria, along with disruptive behavior, poverty, and other problems, are applied. One alternative school component in Indianapolis is specifically designed for delinquent youth.

But CIS has one distinctive structural approach that was the basis of its proposal for federal funding (IDC, 1977) and still dominates its promotional literature. Internally, CIS distinguishes this approach from the variants by calling it the "pure form" We will also adopt that usage. The pure form of CIS consists of the two basic elements of the CIS structure -- the school setting and the caseload -- and a third element -- unique to the pure form -- the Family.**

A Family consists of 40 students and four full-time staff. Each staff member has a caseload of 10 students, plus a specialist role. The four specialist roles are Youth Worker (also known as a Facilitator), who has overall management responsibility for the Family; Educator; Social Service Specialist; and Programmatic Specialist. Exhibit 1.1 shows CIS's complete description of each role and the kind of people who are intended to fill it.

---

*"Component" refers to the program in a given school.
**Throughout this report "Family" denotes the CIS Family and "family" denotes the students' kinship family.

EXHIBIT 1.1 CIS Description of Family Staff Roles*

FAMILY STAFF

The Family Staff's functions may be described in general terms as follows:

CATEGORY	PRIMARY FUNCTIONS	NOTE
Educator	To serve as the educational resource within a grouping (family) of 40 students and 4 staff; required to provide diagnostic testing of students' academic needs, advise other staff members on individual problem areas, facilitate remediation where appropriate, and assist classroom teachers in supportive role, able to provide guidance, friendship and availability to the youth and develop personal relationships with 10 of the 40 students.	An **Educator** would serve as a licensed teacher, reading lab instructor, or professional tutor; could be loaned from community agencies specializing in educational fields.
Youth Worker	To serve as the manager of a grouping (family) of 40 students and 4 staff; able to supervise operation of the team, maintain attendance and grade point records on the 40 students, provide leadership of planning sessions involving the team staff, must display high degree of charismatic skill in relating to youth in order to share personal relationship with all 40 students; make visits to students' homes and facilitate close contact and involvement with parents.	A **Youth Worker** could be a Boy's Club Supervisor, Police Athletic League Instructor, Girl Scout Representative or staff from a multiservice center; could be loaned from community agencies which generalize in the delivery of youth services.
Social Service Specialist	To serve as the social service resource with a grouping (family) of 40 students and 4 staff; able to provide in-depth counseling of adolescent youth, diagnose the need for psychological testing of appropriate students, assist youth and their parents with social service needs, and prepare necessary records on students in caseload; able to offer guidance, friendship and availability to the youth and develop personal relationships with 10 of the 40 students.	A **Social Service Specialist** could be juvenile probation officer, public housing advisor, welfare caseworker, psychologist or other professional counselor; could be loaned from community agencies apecializing in social service areas.
Programmatic Specialis	To serve as the programm resource within a grouping (family) of 40 and 4 staff, organize athletic, cultura creational activities for the student/staff team, identify facilities in the community to be utilized for these activities, participate in team planning to encourage recreational events of an educational nature and include activities encouraging involvement of students' parents and other family members; able to provide guidance, friendship and availability to the youth and develop personal relationships with 10 of the 40 students.	A **Programmatic Specialist** could be a playground supervisor from the Department Parks and Recreation, YMCA athletic director, physical education coach or Junior Achievement instructor; could be loaned from community agencies specializing in recreational and/or cultural fields.

---

* Taken from *Proposal for an Integrated System of Human Service Delivery*, 30 March 1977.

The Family is the structural key to integration of services. The theory is that integration of services requires a specific person who is accountable to the student and his family and who cares enough about the student to identify his needs. This precondition of service integration is met through the caseload. By bringing together a multidisciplinary team of experienced professionals, CIS intended that Caseworkers would share their skills, knowledge, and experience. Students would no longer be assessed in terms of discrete problems, nor treated in a compartmentalized fashion. The end result would be that the student would receive help for the underlying causes of his behavior rather than simply for the symptoms.

To ensure that this cross-fertilization of ideas took place, the pure form calls for weekly Caseworker meetings by content area (education, social services, programmatics and youth work) and by Family (across content areas). In practice, some components scheduled Family work periods during school as well. Content meetings were used to track staff efforts and to bolster their skills in each content area. In essence, the Caseworker wears two hats: he is directly responsible for the 10 students in his caseload, but he is also responsible for any of the 40 Family students who have needs falling within his content area. In practice, most of the responsibility was excercised within with the individual caseloads.

Another structural feature of some pure form components intended to foster interdisciplinary help for students and to strengthen the Family unit is the "orientation class setting." This refers to a class consisting of the 40 students in a Family and the four Caseworkers. It provides the students and Caseworkers with an opportunity to interact with Family members outside of their caseloads and to conduct Family business, such as scheduling programmatic activities. The low ratios of students to staff are intended also to increase the amount of individual attention provided to each student. Subject matter taught in orientation classes varies, but it typically includes material on careers, values classification, and decisionmaking.

Given the context of the CIS framework, we now turn to the CIS program as it was implemented in Atlanta, Indianapolis, and New York in the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years.

THE IMPLEMENTED PROGRAM

During 1978-79, the second full school year of federal funding, CIS served about 2,500 students in 18 schools in Atlanta, Indianapolis, and New York, and employed 279 caseload staff. Six of the schools were high schools, three were junior highs, five were alternative schools, and four were elementary schools. (See Table 1.1 for enrollment and staffing levels for each CIS component in 1978-79 and 1979-80.)

In 1979-80, both New York and Indianapolis closed some of the smaller components -- Arlington High School, Crispus Attucks High School, and School #101 in Indianapolis; P.S. 180 and P.S. 120 in New York -- to maintain the pure form components at the same level. Atlanta maintained all of its components and increased the number of caseload students. Although total staffing and caseload levels shrank slightly in 1979-80 in the three original cities, the overall size of CIS was augmented by the addition of three components, one each in Houston, Oakland, and Washington, D.C.

These components include three distinct types of programs -- pure form, also known as "Plan A", a less intensive variant known as "Plan B", and street academies. We will describe each of these in turn, focusing on the pure form components that are the subject of this study.*

Plan A

CIS generated Plan A (the name for the implemented pure form) at four high schools in 1978-79 and 1979-80 -- Smith and Carver in Atlanta, Arsenal Tech in Indianapolis, and Julia Richman in New York. These were the original evaluation data collection sites; Carver was subsequently dropped from the evaluation when the implemented program turned out to be quite different from

---

*Detailed profiles of the projects in Atlanta, Indianapolis, and New York are contained in two documents of the evaluation: Report No. 1: Program Descriptions (hereafter called Report No. 1), and Report No. 2: The Program and the Process (hereafter called Report No. 2). They are available from the National Institute of Education. The new projects in Houston, Oakland, and Washington, D.C., were not part of the evalution.

TABLE 1.1

1978–79 and 1979–80 Enrollment and Staffing in CIS

CIS Components	No. of Caseload Students[a]		No. of Caseworkers[b]	
	1978–79	1979–80	1978–79	1979–80
ATLANTA				
Smith High School	98	101	11	14
Carver High School	125	105	12	13
Academy A	110	96	11	8
Academy B	96	133	10	9
Academy T	100	163	10	8
St. Luke's Academy	90	88	9	8
Craddock Elementary	120	128	10	6
Total	**739**	**814**	**73**	**66**
INDIANAPOLIS				
Arsenal Tech High School (Plan A)	643	634	65	53
Arsenal Tech High School (Plan B)	310	144	39	14[c]
Arlington High School	60	––	6	––
Crispus Attucks High School	71	––	8	––
Indy Prep	29	36	5	6
School No. 101 (Jr. High School)	124	––	13	––
School No. 26 (Junior High School)	74	40	8	4
School No 45 (Elementary)	74	71	12	7
Total	**1,385**	**925**	**156**	**84**
NEW YORK				
Julia Richman High School	162	199	19	29
IS-22 (Junior High School)	120	134	22	19
PS-125 (Elementary)	80	––	6	––
PS-180 (Elementary)	60	––	3	––
PS-53 (Elementary)	––	70	––	––[d]
Total	**422**	**403**	**50**	**48**
HOUSTON				
M. C. Williams Junior High School	––	77	––	7
OAKLAND				
Hamilton Junior High School	––	78	––	15
WASHINGTON, D.C.				
Terrell Jr. High School	––	157	––	9

[a] The exact number of caseload students fluctuated from month to month, these figures represent approximate levels during the first semester

[b] These figures do not include project directors, and secretarial staff in 1979-80. Service staff who do not maintain caseloads are included only for the elementary and junior high programs.

[c] Represents those Plan B staff with specific caseloads only

[d] Missing data.

CIS's expectations.* The discussion centers on the Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman projects.

The Settings

CIS works with youth from inner-city neighborhoods in the "worst" schools -- those likely to have high concentrations of the multiproblem students for which CIS was designed. The Plan A components in Atlanta and Indianapolis are located in areas that fit the inner-city stereotype. Both schools are in declining residential areas that had once been white middle class and had undergone a racial and socioeconomic transformation in the 1960s. The neighborhoods have high crime rates, deteriorating housing and high unemployment rates. In the Smith neighborhood, for example, 45 percent of the heads of households were jobless in 1975-76, less than 10 percent of the families owned their homes, and the mean family income was $9,675.

The site of the Julia Richman high school project is anomalous. The school is located in the fashionable East 60s of Manhattan and was once a girls' school with a student body drawn from the middle and upper classes of New York. Julia Richman now draws almost all of its students from Harlem, predominantly from East Harlem, with a few students who come all the way from the Bronx.

All three of the high schools are large. Arsenal Tech is the largest, with approximately 4,500 students housed on a 74-acre campus. Julia Richman serves about 3,300 students. Smith is the smallest of the three schools with an enrollment of 1,100.

The typical indicators of a school's rankings -- mobility indexes, drop-out rates, attendance rates, and standardized tests -- leave little doubt that Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman represent the "worst" schools. In 1977-78, Smith ranked next-to-last in percentage of student attendance among the 22 high schools in the Atlanta Public School System (APS). It had a drop-out rate of 11.8 percent, the highest in the APS (the mean was only 4.9 percent). Smith ranked last also among the 22 schools in all three subtest scores in the 11th grade Tests of Academic Progress, given in the fall of 1978. The school's means on the subtest scores were all at or below a seventh grade equivalent, although the national norm is 11.1 and the Georgia norms ranged from 9.4 to 10.1. Smith's "mobility index," based on student transfers, used as a measure of school stability, was .41, the third worst in the Atlanta system

---

*Among other things, the Principal changed the program's scope and functions to fit with other initiatives he was taking. These changes may have been good or bad, but the result was not a "pure form" project.

At Julia Richman, two-thirds of the student body read at least two years below grade level, compared to 44 percent in the New York school system as a whole. More than a third (35 percent) of the student body left Julia Richman each year. Average daily attendance ran at roughly 68 percent. A third of the students were financially eligible for free lunches.*

Students and Staff

Students are selected for the program on the basis of poor attendance, disruptive school behavior, and low academic achievement in the preceding year. In 1978-79, the primary selection criteria were poor attendance and low reading scores, and to a lesser extent, disciplinary problems. In Indianapolis, where Title XX funds were used, poverty was also used as a selection criterion. Students whose Caseworkers were paid with Title XX monies had to be "Title XX eligible," i.e., from families with incomes at or below the poverty level. CIS enrolled 101 students at Smith, 634 at Arsenal Tech, and 199 at Julia Richman in 1979-80.**

Table 1.2 displays the CIS students' age, sex, and race in 1979-80. The CIS populations at Smith and Julia Richman were almost entirely constituted of minority groups: black at Smith, and black with an admixture of Hispanic at Julia Richman. At Arsenal Tech, slightly more than three-quarters of the CIS students were black. Of the whites, most came from Appalachian backgrounds.

---

*The Indianapolis public school system does not release comparative statistics on its schools. The judgment of teachers and administrators at Tech, plus our own observations, indicate that Tech is one of two high schools with the most disadvantaged student populations in Indianapolis.

**These represent numbers of students who at least registered at the beginning of the school year.

TABLE 1.2

CIS Student Characteristics, 1979–80 at Smith, Arsenal Tech, Julia Richman

	Smith	Arsenal Tech	Julia Richman
TOTAL STUDENTS ENROLLED	**99**	**634**	**199**
Race			
Black	100%	63%	71%
White	0%	36%	0%
Hispanic	0%	0%	29%
Sex			
Male	55%	49%	47%
Female	45%	51%	53%
Age			
14	3%	18%	2% *
15	36%	31%	21%
16	30%	33%	35%
17	23%	14%	28%
18+	8%	4%	14%
Grade			
9	42%	43%	92%*
10	34%	36%	8%
11	20%	21%	
12	4%		

* Age and grade breakdowns at Julia Richman are estimates.

Females predominated in all of the sites except Smith. Most of the CIS high school students in 1979-80 were 15-16 years old. The Julia Richman project served 9th and 10th graders; Smith and Arsenal Tech included 11th graders as well (Smith even had a few seniors).

Staff at the three projects were assigned to the four role specialities discussed earlier: programmatic specialist, educator, social service specialist, and youth worker. Within each Family, the Tech and Julia Richman projects tried to maintain equal distributions of males and females, blacks and whites (plus some Hispanics at Julia Richman).

The size of the Caseworker staffs increased during the last two years of the evaluation at Julia Richman and Smith. Julia Richman had a basic staff of 19 Caseworkers in 1978-79 and 29 in 1979-80; the comparable numbers for Smith were 11 and 14. In contrast, Tech had 65 Caseworkers in 1978-79 and then, because of a funding delay, had only 53 Caseworkers (at most) in 1979-80 -- while the number of students in the program remained constant.

Routine Activities

The bulk of CIS's daily activities in the pure form programs can be grouped under four headings: counseling, human services, academic support, and special activities, as described below.*

Counseling. Much of what CIS staff do during a day falls into "counseling," defined broadly. Students talk to their Caseworkers nearly every day. They meet informally in the halls, in class, during lunch, or after school. Attendance and school work are the most common issues discussed, and students and Caseworkers indicate that discipline problems are also a frequent source of discussion. Personal and family problems are brought up less frequently. In addition to the individual contact, students in grade 9 meet with the others in their Family during orientation class and with their caseload once a week in a group counseling situation.

Arsenal Tech has a regular counseling center staffed on a rotating basis by social service Caseworkers. Students with particularly serious problems are referred by Caseworkers and teachers for individual or group counseling. Some students drop in on their own. In addition, the counseling center staff are responsible for students on probation. They serve as the liaison between the school and the court, regularly submitting attendance, grade, and progress reports to the probation officers.

---

*The actual levels of these activities are discussed in Chapter III.

Human Services. The projects vary in the number and type of social services provided to the students (see Chapter III) but all of them engage in some routine service delivery activities. All three projects provide some preliminary health and dental screenings (i.e., pulse, temperature, blood pressure, eye checks, T.B. skin tests, sickle cell anemia, etc.) either through CIS nurses or referral to local health centers. Relief services such as book fees, bus tickets, and clothing are arranged when possible; and Smith has set up second-hand clothing shops. Other social service efforts include a preventive health project at Arsenal Tech that attempts to increase students' understanding of sexuality, contraception, disease and hygiene, and to provide drug and alcohol counseling on a small scale.

Academic Support. In Plan A programs, CIS students are block scheduled with other CIS students for at least one class, with one exception. In Smith, CIS students were not grouped together for any classes in 1979-80, although they had been block scheduled for English, math, science, and social studies in the previous year. In the Plan A program at Arsenal Tech, students are together for math, English, reading, social studies, and orientation class. At Julia Richman, CIS students are grouped together for English, civics, orientation, and -- in the case of the ninth graders with the lowest reading scores -- Learning Center. Most of these classes are taught by CIS teachers. In the classes taught in an orientation setting, an entire Family is grouped together with the social service specialist, programmatics specialist, and youth worker assisting the CIS educator.

In some cases, as with the reading lab and math courses at Smith, CIS grouping provides smaller class size and more individual attention than was otherwise available, but the majority of the blocked classes are of average size. In some instances, CIS also has put a Caseworker in the classroom as a type of teachers aid. More generally, CIS sees "freeing teachers to teach" as one of it's major educational support functions.

Special reading programs. Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman have special reading labs, staffed by CIS reading specialists and featuring individual instruction and class sizes of 3 to 15 students. In some cases, students are assigned to the Learning Center for an entire semester. In others, students with reading problems or those lagging behind in a subject are generally referred to the reading labs (called Learning Centers) by classroom teachers for a specified time period -- a few days to several weeks. Using both individualized reading materials and the assigned classroom work, the reading specialist works with the student until he or she is ready to return to class. Reading labs are seen as an adjunct to, rather than a replacement of, regular classes.

Orientation. The CIS programs in Julia Richman and Plan A at Arsenal have "orientation" classes in which all four caseloads and Caseworkers from a Family are grouped together.* The Family educator plays the lead role in the class, but other Family staff teach when the subject matter is appropriate to their backgrounds. The content of the orientation class varies according to the site and the grade level. Orientation classes at Julia Richman and those for freshmen at Smith and Arsenal deal with careers, goal setting, decisionmaking, and values in an effort to increase students' awareness of themselves and the working world and to improve their decision-making capabilities. Arsenal Tech also has orientation classes for sophomores and juniors. The sophomore class receives one semester of health and one semester of drug education; the junior class consists of U.S. History I and II -- courses that are required for graduation.

Career education is an important element of orientation classes. For example, a drug education class focused on criminal justice careers related to the criminal use of drugs. Representatives of the police narcotics squad, attorneys, court stenographers, and probation officers were invited to discuss their work. The class culminated in a trial with students role-playing. Another example is "Project Business," a nationwide program sponsored by Junior Achievement that was utilized in six orientation classes at Arsenal Tech. Twelve persons from the business community met with students weekly for a semester, presenting a practical approach to economics, money and banking, the market system, financial statements, career choices, and consumerism.

---

*Regular credit is received for this course. In Indianapolis, the city school system has adapted the Orientation course for city-wide use for ninth graders.

Teaching approaches vary from traditional, structured lecture classes to participatory, learn-by-doing classes where the students are actively involved in lesson planning and implementation. An example of the latter is the "Pottersville" concept at Arsenal Tech. Students have researched various service jobs and have attempted to construct a human services delivery system. The programmatics program at a CIS elementary school was actually run by Tech CIS students who were participating in Pottersville.

Tutoring. Caseworkers conduct tutoring sessions at all three pure form projects. Their efforts are supplemented by volunteer and peer tutors in some cases. Since tutoring is conducted on an as-needed basis, there is wide variance in the frequency and length of sessions. Some students have regularly scheduled individual sessions several times a week, while others just drop in after school for a little help on a particular assignment.

Home visits. Family involvement is an important part of the rationale of the CIS program, and the Plan A projects all require that the Caseworkers make periodic home visits (once a month has often been the norm). As discussed in Chapter III, the actual frequency of home visits has been highly variable. These visits typically involve telling parents about the program, getting permission forms signed, or discussing specific problems at school The home visits serve also to set the stage for providing services to the family.

Programmatic activities. CIS provides an extensive array of programmatic activities both in and out of school for students during the year. These activities range from flag football after school or a pizza with the Caseworker to trips and visits to museums and sports events. Some of the activities include the entire CIS student body, others the Family, the caseload, or simply one student. Caseload activities are scheduled at least twice a month, and a major Family or program activity occurs about once every three months. The activities that CIS has provided are discussed in Chapter III.

Plan B Programs

"Plan B" refers to variants of the CIS approach as applied in the public school setting. In 1979-80, Plan B programs were in operation in three elementary schools, three junior high schools, and three senior high schools. Although the severity of the problems CIS is dealing with at the three school levels differs -- incipient academic and behavior problems at the lower grade levels and full--blown attendance and academic problems at the upper grade levels -- the approaches are generically similar.

Plan B can best be described in contrast to Plan A or pure form. First, it is less structured; students are not grouped into Families.* Second, Plan B Caseworkers are assigned to schools as support staff for the entire student body or for a few grade levels, rather than for a specific caseload of students as in pure form. They perform the same functions as Plan A Caseworkers -- counseling troubled youth, tutoring low achievers, arranging for social services, and providing programmatic activities -- but they are not restricted to specific service recipients. In most Plan B programs, however, Caseworkers develop priority caseloads of students with particularly severe problems and work with them intensively on a short-term basis or, in some schools, throughout the year. Plan B Caseworkers do not have a regularly scheduled period to work with their students as do the pure form Caseworkers. Frequently, teachers release students from a class for tutoring sessions or counseling about in-class behavior problems, and Caseworkers catch students whenever they can to provide other types of help.

In addition to providing help to individual students, Plan B Caseworkers perform support services for the entire school such as monitoring the halls and cafeteria, staffing in-house supervision rooms, nursing offices, and study halls. In one school, several of the Deans are CIS staff. Other foci of Plan B programs are neighborhood services and parent involvement. Staff are included in community organizing, liaison with members of the Parent Teacher Organization, and solicitation of community and parent support for student activities.

---

*One of the programs classified as Plan B, School #26, did have a Family structure during its last year of operation.

The elementary school programs focus on academic and behavior problems. In some components, students are referred to CIS-operated learning centers for help; in others, Caseworkers provide special in-class help or after-school tutoring. In both cases, Caseworkers are available to provide supportive assistance to teachers. They might lead small group discussions, tutor students who are lagging behind, counsel students about behavior problems, or simply help the teacher "keep peace." In components where staff are assigned to specific classrooms, Caseworkers meet regularly with the teachers to discuss their progress with individual students and to develop strategies.

The social service and programmatic activities provided at elementary schools varied according to the predominant needs of each school. CIS arranged for medical and dental screenings, operated clothing banks, and helped process applications for book and travel fees or income assistance. Informal counseling was, of course, an integral part of all the programs, and sometimes students were also referred for professional counseling.

The junior and senior high Plan B programs resemble those in the elementary schools. Caseworkers provide tutoring, counseling, and programmatic enrichment activities for priority caseload students, and to a lesser extent for the entire student body. Most components operate Learning Centers for tutoring during school and in-house suspension programs. Arsenal Tech also runs a program to encourage freshmen students to stay in high school. Staff encourage parental participation through tours, link students with alumni mentors, and train teachers in ways to encourage students to complete high school.

Caseload students are selected on the basis of poor attendance, low achievement, and behavior problems. The specifics (and the specificity) of the selection criteria varied by school and over time.

Street Academies

During 1978-79 and 1979-80, the CIS program operated in four street academies in Atlanta and in Indy Prep, an alternative high school program in Indianapolis.

The Atlanta street academies are alternatives to the standard high school and were established to meet the educational and social service needs of urban youth unable to cope within a traditional school setting. The first Atlanta academies were founded over eight years ago. Four were in operation during this study: Academy A, Academy B, Academy T, and St. Luke's Area III Learning Center. Indy Prep was established in 1976-77.

Although street academies are located in physically separate facilities, each maintains an affiliation with a high school in the public school system, preferably the one geographically closest. The high school gives diplomas to students who successfully complete a prescribed course of study. The academy serves as a place where the high school may refer students who experience difficulty adjusting to a standard school. Credits for some extracurricular activities such as the drill team may also be granted by the public schools. Students are sometimes assigned to an academy by the juvenile court as a condition of probation.

Staff members of the Atlanta academies represent both the educational and social service sectors. Total staff in each alternative program generally number 10 or 11 people (usually 4 or 5 teachers, 2 to 3 social service specialists, a streetworker, a project secretary, and a project director). In addition, Atlanta has a Social Service Coordinator and an Education Coordinator who work with all four academies. Teachers and social service specialists counsel students, provide transportation to school or extracurricular activities (sports events, field trips, theater), and generally try to provide support and guidance. The teachers teach the academic classes and frequently all or part of the elective courses. Social service workers address a variety of student needs -- such as court-related problems and referrals to social service agencies. They typically do not work with the teachers in daily classes as in the pure form programs.

Because the total population of each academy is only about 100, the 40-person Family concept is considered inappropriate. Academies are small and selfcontained, and staff and students tend to come in frequent daily contact with one another.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Students come to the Atlanta street academies from many sources: streetworkers searching for dropouts, public school officials referring "problem" students, parents seeking help for their children, staff of the other academies, social service agencies referring students, and court officials seeking placement for delinquents. Students also learn about the academies from their friends who like the flexibility of the program. Each academy serves approximately 70 to 115 students. Ages range from 15 to 23, but there is no upper limit. Almost all of the students are black and live in poor neighborhoods.

Indy Prep is an intensive program primarily for students who are on probation. It parallels the street academies in Atlanta with one major exception: The street academies are self-contained units that attempt to graduate students, whereas Indy Prep is an interim arrangement. Students are transferred into regular classes at the IPS Day Adult School after spending an adjustment phase at Indy Prep. Accordingly, students must be at least 16 years old, the minimum age for participation in the IPS Day Adult School program. Since the requirements in the Day Adult School program are not as stringent as those in the high schools, Indy Prep has broad flexibility in course offerings and hours.

Indy Prep has five staff members: two are Facilitators, one a Programmatics person, one an Educator, and one the Project Director. In addition to the CIS staff, five teachers on loan from IPS Day Adult teach Indy Prep students on a part-time basis. Each staff member has a caseload of approximately six students, but the numbers vary as students enter and leave the program. Indy Prep is structured around the Family concept, but the project is so small that in practice it is a highly individualized counseling-tutoring program.

There is no formal selection process for Indy Prep. The program accepts any student who is unable to function in a regular school setting but willing to agree to follow the program rules. Twenty of the students in 1978-79 were referred by the court and nine volunteered for the program after having been expelled or suspended from other high schools.

Academic Program. Students in the Atlanta street academies attend basic classes -- English, math, reading, science, and social studies -- from approximately 9:00 am to 1:00 pm. Academies match their course descriptions and credits to those of the regular high school. At Indy Prep, students attend classes from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm to earn a normal seven credits per semester. The students are segregated from the other Day Adult classes but the content of the courses is similar. Courses offered by the IPS Day Adult School during the spring semester include math, English, reading, gym, music, science, and U.S. history and government. In addition, CIS staff teach orientation class and social studies. In all five academies, a great deal of time is spent in informal counseling and tutoring sessions.

The alternative programs offer the same type of social services and extracurricular activities as the other CIS components. The small caseloads are intended to foster close Caseworker-student relationships, and a great deal of time is spent in informal counseling. Caseworkers visit students' homes periodically, and refer the students to service agencies as needs crop up. They also plan group and individual recreation and cultural activities with their caseloads.

Chapter II.

The Evolution of CIS

CIS was a "demonstration program" -- a term that calls to mind a tidy process whereby a program package is designed to meet certain objectives, provided with enough support to give it a fair trial, and then evaluated. Like most demonstration programs, CIS had very little in common with this model. The program's accomplishments and failures occurred largely because of contextual factors that had nothing to do with the program's intrinsic merits or defects. This chapter describes the main elements in an eventful history.

GETTING STARTED

The program now called CIS grew out of the experiences of a small band of activists -- mostly white, male Christian streetworkers -- who went to Harlem in the early 1960s. They spent the rest of the decade working with the kinds of youths who later would be sought as clients of CIS.*

Their work in Harlem eventually produced a set of "street academies," largely sponsored by corporate donors. They were alternative schools, dealing with the dropouts who could not succeed in the public school setting. Along with education, the staff of the street academies tried to make good on what was to be known in

---

*Most of the historical material is drawn from interviews. For Atlanta, primary sources were: David Lewis, Neil Shorthouse, Sandra Swans, C.T. Martin, and Helen Branch. For Indianapolis: Harv Oostdyk, Stanley Stern, Betsy Baltz, Karl Kalp, Ray Reed, and Richard Lugar. For New York: Harv Oostdyk, Carolyn Smith, Bruce Spraggins, Tony Hernandez, Paula Lipsitz, and Jewel Bickford. For the pre-CIS background: Harv Oostdyk, Willoughby (Wib) Walling, William Milliken, and Neil Shorthouse.

CIS as "personalism" -- the all-embracing responsibility of the Caseworker to know the student and get hold of whatever help was necessary.

In the 1970s, the work shifted to Atlanta, where another set of street academies was set up, funded (improbably) by the U.S. Postal Service as one of seven such programs around the country. But as their experience with street academies accumulated, the founders of CIS increasingly saw the standard school setting as the next step in reaching inner-city youth. Bit by bit, the notion of introducing Caseworkers into the school took hold, and by the mid-1970s the idea had led to embryonic programs in Atlanta (where the program was called "Project Propinquity") and Indianapolis (where it was called "Tech 300"). By this time, an institutional umbrella had also been created: the Institutional Development Corporation (IDC), which would later be renamed CIS Inc.

The details of how the footholds were carved out are described in Report No. 2 (pp. 16-50). Here, a brief description of the people who were in charge will help in understanding later developments.

Above all, it must be understood that the founders of CIS were committed to helping kids in trouble, and that this commitment dominated their stance toward the program, toward getting support for it, and toward their administration of it.* They were streetworkers. In this sense, the mission -- to help kids -- antedated the solution. The founders were not social engineers with a solution who set out to find a problem to which it could be applied. Rather, they became convinced out of their own experience that the key to dealing with the dropouts and the delinquents and the losers was intensive one-on-one contact. Youth services had somehow to be put in a personalized context.

The specifics about how this might be done were secondary to the essence of the logic: "Hire people who feel as strongly about kids as we do, and put them in a structure where they will have access to them and access to service resources." As time went on, the specifics took shape -- the notion of the 40-student "Family," of four staff from four human services specialities, and the rest. But these were details, not essentials.

---

*The statement applies to a shifting group of half a dozen persons who formed the nucleus of the program in its early years. In the discussion of priorities and style, "founders" refers primarily to William (Bill) Milliken and Harv Oostdyk, who have been the leading actors in developing the ideas and obtaining support.

The foregoing hints at another defining characteristic of the founders: They were pragmatic and enterprising. They managed to carry on their work for almost a decade with only a smattering of Federal money. Throughout the period of the evaluation, the core organization (first called the Institutional Development Corporation, later changed to Cities in Schools) still operated entirely on donations -- the Federal money went to the school systems, not to the CIS organization itself.

Maintaining solvency in that way, for that long, required continual fundraising. CIS cast a broad net, ranging from foundations to large corporations to socially prominent private philanthropists on the New York/Washington axis.

As the founders developed their financial sources of support, they also developed their political entree. It was always from the top. The Indianapolis program depended on the patronage of Mayor (now Senator) Richard Lugar. The Atlanta program got off the ground with the help of Postmaster General Blount, and was solidified through the active support of some of the city's most prominent financial and business leaders. In New York City, the program got started through a combination of old connections from the 1960s program, but this uncharacteristically within-the-system approach was soon buttressed by a direct link with the Mayor's Office and a prestigious "Policy Board" headed by Howard Samuels, a prominent figure in New York politics.

The program's penchant for working at the top political levels reflected a pragmatic judgment. The founders were challenging the existing human services structure. The challenge was not likely to be sponsored by the existing bureaucracy. Only directives from the top would force access, they reasoned. But the strategy also contained the seeds of later problems. For, if only pressure from the top could get the program started, only support by the existing bureaucracy -- or at least a

In this endeavor, the general goals of the System were to be:

> (a) to coordinate the delivery of services for the greatest benefit of the underprivileged; (b) to organize the delivery of services comprehensively around the needs of the whole person, the family unit and the community; (c) to allocate resources with benefit of information and advice drawn from local people who are familiar with the needs of their neighborhoods and communities; and (d) to proceed initially within the boundaries of existing programs. (Proposal, p. 13)

The operational goals were stated as:

1. Eliminating program duplication and consolidating common activities and programs.

2. Creating an educational environment that develops the skills necessary for employment in our free enterprise system.

3. Providing a forum where the needs of an entire neighborhood can be expressed to the community power structure and through which new patterns of meeting these needs can be more fully developed.

These were followed by a statement of "Specific Developmental Objectives," as follows:

> As the System takes root it should bring about:
>
> 1. An extension of the scope of service beyond the individual to the family and to the neighborhood;
>
> 2. Greater intergovernmental cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies and growing involvement and support of private organizations and individual volunteers;

3. Better planning for use of existing resources at the local level so that the system draws upon the large base of established organizations and resources and uses only a negligible amount of new Federal funding;

4. A demonstrably workable prototype of a more effectively integrated neighborhood based service delivery system, capable of surviving local political changes; and,

5. A plan for limited replication of prototypes and for systematic testing and evaluating of those replications. (Proposal, p. 18)

Such was the rhetoric on which the funding of CIS was based. It is unclear how much of it should be read as the "real" intentions of the program. The confusion has arisen in part because the lead staff of CIS have never marched in lockstep on the specifics of its ideology. There is no such thing as doctrine. In that sense, any statement about the order of priorities is bound to be wrong.* But this is our best reconstruction of the consensus:

In the most general sense -- an aspiration to break away from compartmentalized services and move toward a holistic relationship between service-provider and service-recipient -- service integration was always an authentic objective.

The objectives relating to neighborhood-wide forums and outlooks never had much life outside the confines of the Proposal. They were general goals held by some of the leading figures in CIS, especially Oostdyk (who was one of the authors of the Proposal), but they never figured in the operations of CIS.

The objectives relating to integration of services for the whole family, not just the CIS students, were very real at the beginning. Certainly they figure prominently in the Proposal:

---

*See Report No. 2, pp. 11-15, for a detailed discussion of goals and objectives as perceived by the senior CIS staff.

> Prototype development will emphasize the importance of the family and seek to strengthen the family structure. The ultimate target of services should be coordinated around families. (*Proposal*, p. 20. Emphasis in the original.)

But, given the many difficulties associated with integrating services for even the student, plus the difficulties of gaining entree to the family, CIS staff backed away from this objective in practice, consigning it to a category of "next steps" once some other barriers had been surmounted.

The objectives that dominated the day-to-day operations of the program were ones that the *Proposal* mentioned only indirectly: reducing absences, improving academic skills (especially reading), acclimating the students to the world of work (and the world in general), counseling, and providing *ad hoc* social service assistance as needed.

This was the central disparity between the program described in the *Proposal* and the program that the evaluators came upon when we first started observing CIS in the fall of 1977: The means to an end -- service integration -- held center stage in the *Proposal*, while the end itself -- to help kids in trouble -- held center stage in the program that actually existed.

When questioned on this point, the principals in the development of CIS respond with varying viewpoints. Some argue that there was no dissonance. The lesson learned from the 1960s was that the existing structure for delivering human services was ineffective, but parallel structures (such as the New York street academies) could not be a replacement. The notion of service integration was the driving force behind CIS, and continues to be. Others who were authors of the proposal have said that the function of the *Proposal* was to get funding, and service integration was a saleable theme. For them, service integration was an important but not primary motivation. They genuinely believed that their approach could provide improved services without increasing the number of social services employees. They genuinely believed that the isolation and piecemeal delivery of services impeded their effectiveness. But the incentives of economy and a more rational structure were not the mainsprings of their enthusiasm. If they had been told to put Caseworkers in the school, and to forget about restructuring the social service delivery system, their motivation would have been essentially undiminished. The key notion, to reiterate, was to build a program that would enable intensive, daily interaction between Caseworkers and kids.

Whatever the order of "real" priorities, the written proposal before the White House and the funding agencies was unambiguously a proposal to begin the process of building a new configuration of human service delivery. It would use an operational component called "Cities in Schools" (its prospective organizational basis was left unclear) and a nonprofit consulting organization called the Institutional Development Corporation to begin this prototype work. It sought $2,674,000 in new Federal funds to round out a total projected budget of $5,915,000 for the first year as a national program (Proposal, p. 75).

The Proposal was dated 30 March 1977 and the President (who had been kept abreast of its development) approved it on the same day, via a letter to the department heads who were prospective funders of the program. It read in part that "On March 30, 1977, I approved the proposal...as an experimental effort aimed at developing an integrated system of human service delivery." A period of negotiations ensued. Finally, it became necessary for the President to send a letter to the cabinet heads of the seven departments that were to contribute support, explicitly asking them to support the effort.*

In the end, the seven agencies formed a sort of consortium in sponsorship of the program. The Community Services Agency (CSA) was designated as the agency responsible for monitoring the implementation of the program, while the National Institute of Education took responsibility for the evaluation.

---

*The White House connection was instrumental in obtaining the initial funding. It did not have much effect on the subsequent implementation of the project. The Carters' support was the subject of media attention, especially when Chip Carter briefly joined the staff of CIS. But aside from Mrs. Carter's continuing interest in the progress of CIS (she visited all of the original sites), neither the administration nor the scope of the program was affected.

ENTER THE EVALUATION

The competitive procurement process for selecting an evaluator was completed in September, 1977. AIR was awarded a contract for a three year evaluation. The work was to begin with a six-month design phase. Then, the evaluation would collect data for three school years: 1977-78, 1978-79, and 1979-80. In mid-course, the evaluation would submit a full-scale interim report on the CIS process and its impact on the youths in the program. The technical aspects of the evaluation would be monitored by a "Technical Review Panel" chosen by the Evaluation Research Society. And, from the outset, the evaluation would be planned and administered in accordance with the needs and interests of the "stakeholders" in the evaluation process.* Stakeholders -- people who had a stake in whether CIS worked -- would consist of decision-makers who were to decide on the fate of the program, the clients (parents and students), and the CIS staff members.

In October 1977, AIR's evaluation team made its first round of visits to the three sites, beginning the six month design period. We talked to the stakeholders, assessed the state of the available data, and recorded the state of implementation. The product was a detailed evaluation design that expanded on the design presented in the proposal, and adapted it to the program that had evolved.

In May 1978, we began systematic data collection in the three field sites, collecting end-of-year archival and interview data about the effects of the program on students during the 1977-78 school year.

The spring data collection was intended primarily as a pretest of the data collection instruments. But as we examined the results with an eye to improvements in the way we obtained data, it quickly became obvious that the findings had important implications for the program as well. Judging from what we had been told by the Caseworkers themselves, students in some sites had relatively few "problems" in the sense that CIS used the word, except that they were doing poorly in school. The incidence of CIS's "service delivery" other than general counseling was very low. Few Caseworkers had developed much knowledge about the family situation. Often, the Caseworker had not even visited the family.

---

*"Stakeholder" is a term first coined by Edwards, Guttentag, and Snapper (1975).

More generally, the program that we were evaluating was not the one described in the Proposal, but a collection of disparate activities in inner-city high schools, grade schools, middle schools, and street academies. Some of these activities were undoubtedly useful. Some bore a resemblance to the activities planned for the program. But in no sense was the evaluation going to be able to assess the validity of the CIS concept. The concept was not being tested.

AIR communicated these results to CIS staff. Part of their response was that the evaluators had not asked the right questions, or that the Caseworkers and students had not responded accurately. But another part of the response was to try to make the program work better the next year. A number of steps were taken to specify guidelines for Caseworker responsibilities and to arrive at explicit statements of what CIS was supposed to be.

In particular, all three sites sought to tighten the criteria used to select the program's participants. Indianapolis tried to apply some hard-and-fast criteria: the student had to have shown at least a 10% absence rate or to have tested at least three years below grade level in reading, or to have exhibited documented behavioral problems. Atlanta did not apply formal criteria, but did end up with a set of youngsters who had severe academic and other problems. New York, which during 1977-78 had deliberately chosen an "easy" population of students (because the program was so understaffed) went to the other extreme and recruited the "worst-of-the-worst."

The extent of the modifications was limited, however. The CIS sites were accustomed to substantial autonomy and had always looked askance at standardization. Further, senior CIS staff themselves were not unanimous about strategy, nor were they temperamentally attracted to the notion of coercing uniformity in a program that had to work under such widely varying conditions. Thus, the program did not try to establish a

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

common format for the various schools, nor even a common nomenclature. No attempt was made to standardize a core set of activities or a core "curriculum" for the orientation classes and tutorial programs.

The next major checkpoint during the evaluation was the circulation of the draft of Report No. 2, an assessment of administrative and process characteristics of the program, in April of 1979. The findings expanded on the types of information that had been uncovered during the preliminary look during the summer of 1978, pointing to a variety of discrepancies between the program's image of itself and the reality. Again, the CIS response was ambivalent, with energetic efforts to change some aspects of the CIS operation in response to the findings reported in the draft, but also an intense -- and tense, on occasion -- dialogue with the evaluators about the justice of the findings. The final version of Report No. 2 contained a 20-page commentary on the report, prepared by several members of the staff and approved by Milliken (then President of CIS Inc.) as a statement of policy.

The period between Report No. 2 and the analysis of program impact (Report No. 3) released in February 1980 was punctuated by a series of formal and informal interactions between AIR and the program staff, stakeholder groups, and the national CIS Board. Report No. 3 triggered another round of these meetings. Throughout this period, however, CIS was operating in a context that had, it sometimes seemed, been designed to prevent success. The evaluation of what CIS had done was increasingly irrelevant to the evaluation of what CIS could do. We turn now to the reasons for this state of affairs.

IMPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION

From the beginning, CIS operated under a peculiar, probably unique organizational and funding scheme. CIS itself (meaning IDC) was initially supported entirely by private funds. The projects in the many schools where CIS worked were under the administrative aegis of the local school system. The money for running the projects came from an array of federal and private sources -- as many as seven federal agencies were contributing funds at one time or another. And, depending on the city, the CIS program might have personnel whose institutional homes were scattered among a dozen municipal agencies, community-based organizations, and national organizations such as the Boy Scouts.

The funding sources were not coordinated. The various agencies did not contribute to a common pot out of which a CIS program was paid for. Rather, each contributed under the guidelines of its own grant programs, requiring CIS to comply with its particular objectives, reporting procedures, and payment schedules. Nor was funding automatic. CIS had to apply for each grant separately, and face the likelihood that the requested funding would be reduced, that it would not be awarded on schedule, and might not be awarded at all.

Of the many results of this gerry-built foundation, four stand out.

First, because the government agencies were slow in reaching funding decisions and in paying invoices, CIS was in a perpetual state of financial crisis. It was common for paychecks to be delayed. In New York, in 1977, the delay once stretched over two months. Staff quit, or could not be hired under such uncertain circumstances. In some cases, staff continued to work on a volunteer basis even when funding had run out altogether. Apart from the many short-lived crises, the funding problem in 1979-80 kept the Indianapolis program short of staff, while the number of caseload participants remained the same.

Second, CIS was constrained to hire marginal or inadequate Caseworkers. To some extent, good prospects were put off by the shaky, short-term prospects that CIS could offer. To some extent, the program was at the mercy of the choices of staff made by agency officials who were to assign someone to work at CIS. To some extent, the small salaries made the program noncompetitive with other job prospects. In Indianapolis, these factors were exacerbated by a peculiarity of its funding situation: about a third of its Caseworkers were funded out of CETA lines. And the people who were eligible for CETA jobs did not constitute a rich pool of qualified youth workers, remedial teachers, or social service specialists.

Third, CIS was always in an ambiguous position with regard to the school system -- neither a part of it, nor independent of it. In some schools, the relationship of CIS and the Principal remained excellent nonetheless. In some schools, the program had to leave, either at the Principal's request or because CIS felt that the program had been compromised. But in all three school systems, CIS attracted suspicion -- in some cases, open hostility -- by senior officials. Much of this could be ascribed to their genuine skepticism about the program. A substantial portion of the resistance, however, seemed a natural reaction of a bureaucracy (or any organization) toward a program that was operating on its turf, but not wholly under its control.

Finally, the financial and organizational setup was a continual drain on the attention and energy of CIS managers. CIS was not an administratively top-heavy program. A few managers, with modest clerical support, were trying to keep the many grant applications flowing, the finances in balance, and still attend to the day-to-day administrative tasks of running a complicated program. One of the major complaints of outsiders who worked with CIS was its sloppy management. This impression remains one of the strongest sources of opposition to the program. But seen dispassionately, CIS's failings (and there were some) were multiplied by the tangle of administrative requirements created for them by the funding structure.

It is within this context that the progress of the program must be viewed. The details of the history are recounted in Report No. 2 (pp. 16-71). The highlights that should be remembered in interpreting the subsequent chapters are as follows.

The New York program was volatile throughout the 1977-80 period. Two elementary schools were dropped from the program -- one because the promised staffing never materialized, the other because of persistent conflicts with the Principal. The overall management of the New York program shifted frequently. At Julia Richman alone, the program went through four directors during the three years. Julia Richman also underwent periodic shifts in its programmatic emphases. Some of these changes were constrained by events -- lack of personnel being a primary factor. Others were a function of the exuberance of the program's leadership: new and better additions to the CIS procedures and services were conceived, perhaps tried out, then dropped or replaced with yet another new idea. Structurally, the New York program made major gains in its efforts to obtain staff from the established social service agencies -- but again found itself hamstrung when the promised personnel did not show up when promised.

Of all the changes in the Julia Richman program, perhaps the most dramatic was in the nature of the students in the program. In its first, pre-federal year (1976-77), the program had taken on the students with the most difficult problems, with only a skeleton staff to deal with them. Most of the students dropped out; or, more accurately, most of them never were attending school enough for the program to start to deal with them. In reaction, the program deliberately chose students with relatively good records when it began the 1977-78 school year, only to be told by the evaluators that the students appeared to have so few problems that it was difficult to determine why they were in the program. In subsequent years (1978-80), with a larger staff (or promises of a larger staff), the Julia Richman program again took on the toughest cases. As we will discuss in subsequent sections, the magnitude of the problems of these students was sometimes so great that they raise the question of whether any one program could deal with them, no matter how well implemented.

The Atlanta program added a new school, Carver High School, during the 1977-78 school year. Otherwise the Atlanta program remained structurally much the same over the three years, continuing programs in four street academies, an elementary school, and Smith High School. The major events were internal, involving the relationship of the separate projects to the administrative umbrella (EXODUS, Inc.), and the administration of the projects themselves. The project at Smith High School underwent an administrative overhaul over the course of the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years.

Indianapolis was by far the largest of the three programs. In Tech High School alone, 600 students were carried on caseloads in Plan A (or "pure form." See page 7 ff). As in New York, the Indianapolis program had a tendency to change focus -- new twists (e.g., Green Carpet, Plan B) were added, then revised. But during the 1978-79 school year in particular, Indianapolis made a major effort to implement the basics of the "pure form" according to all the specifications of the rhetoric. It was during that year that the Tech program also produced the best evidence of positive impact on the students, and hopes were high that these accomplishments could be validated and improved in the 1979-80 school year. Then a teachers' strike immobilized the school system for the first two months of the 1979-80 school year. And key federal funding efforts were delayed, leaving the program at a fraction of its planned staff for the rest of the year.

Nationally, CIS started the period of federal support with the attitude that the iron was hot. Throughout 1977 and 1978, national staff were busy traveling to prospective replication sites. All three cities were hosts to numerous "tours" by outsiders, ranging from local school officials from other jurisdictions to the head of the federal Office of Education. New programs were established in Oakland, Houston, and Washington. Plans were underway for several others. In 1979, these efforts were deliberately cut back. The problems in orchestrating the programs in place were already keeping the staff fully occupied.

At the same time, CIS made a concerted effort to respond to criticisms of national management. An executive vice-president (formerly the director of the Oakland program) was hired to direct administration of the national program. Technical assistance on administration and planning was obtained. A comprehensive "five-year plan" was developed. Staffing and budgeting priorities were identified. Staff training and development activities were stepped up.

The learning process was visible. CIS at the end of the 1979-80 school year was identifying problems and responding to them in ways that were not part of its pre-1977 repertoire. The programs in the expansion sites were reported to have sidestepped many of the problems that were encountered in Atlanta, Indianapolis, and New York. In short, CIS could argue in 1980 that it was ready to be evaluated.

But the evaluation was not starting in 1980; it was ending. And as this history should have indicated, the evaluation was dealing with a program that was only partly implemented. Each of the critical elements was present in some of the sites, at some times; but not all of the elements were present in any one site over the period of the evaluation.

This history raises a fundamental question. The reason that CIS was funded as a federal demonstration program was the belief of its advocates that it represented an innovative, potentially important tool. All agreed that this belief deserved to be tested. But the test was conducted in a way that seemed calculated to undermine its value. The barriers were not the "natural" ones that established programs must cope with as well, but barriers that are characteristic of demonstration programs.

None of this is new to CIS. Readers of evaluations will find the refrain a familiar one: "We are unable to assess the potential of the original concept because of implementation difficulties." Insofar as CIS is not an isolated example, but the latest in repetitive history of similar histories, the account presented above may be more pertinent to the way the federal government supports demonstration programs than to the specifics of CIS.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Chapter III.

The Accomplishments of CIS

In this chapter, we apply the traditional criteria of program evaluation. We ask: Did CIS accomplish what it proposed to accomplish? We summarize the findings that bear on this question. In Chapter IV, we shall go on to the question of the program's potential. We shall probe the limits of what might be accomplished with the CIS approach. Here, we confine our remarks to that which actually was.

* * * * *

When a demonstration program such as CIS seeks federal support, it necessarily makes three assertions: that the program will implement activities of a certain type and quality; that, as a result of those activities, it will produce some important benefits; and that it is affordable. By demonstrating the validity of these assertions, the demonstration lays the groundwork for institutionalizing the program once the federal pilot funding ends. In the evaluation design, we converted these general assertions into the following for CIS:

- CIS will provide a superior structure and process for integrated service delivery to disadvantaged youngsters.
- This higher quality of service will lead to significant, positive impact on the youths in the program.
- These positive benefits can be achieved without excessive increase to costs of present alternative delivery systems (which produce less benefit). (Evaluation Design, 1978, pp. 1-2)

We used these assertions as the basis for deciding on the specific outcomes to be examined in the evaluation. These have been our findings:

ASSERTION NO. 1

"CIS will provide a superior structure and process for integrated service delivery to disadvantaged youngsters."

In its proposals for funding, its presentations to potential donors, and in its brochures and other public documents, CIS has used a commonly understood definition of "integrated service delivery." The statement in CIS's current promotional brochure is clear and representative of CIS's current thinking:

> Last year America poured over 300 billion dollars into programs for unemployment, education, hunger, health care, drug and alcohol abuse -- a patchwork of uncoordinated social services.
>
> Cities in Schools has figured out a way to coordinate these resources and put them into the lives of people who need them most.
>
> It operates in one central location: the city public school.
>
> So if you're a young girl with a drug problem or a city mother worried about her son's first arrest, getting help can be as easy as going to school....
>
> It works like this: The students selected for a Cities in Schools program attend classes with the other kids. Outside of class, they report to special counselors.
>
> These counselors monitor their student's schoolwork. They provide remedial education and lots of encouragement. They plan sports activities and field trips. If one of their students skips class, they find out why and try to do something about it.

> The Cities in Schools counselors are all kinds of people. They are licensed reading instructors, job counselors, or Scout leaders. They are lent by the city or selected from other agencies.
>
> Instead of working all over the city, they work full time in the schools. They free the teachers to teach, and they give the kids support that may get them through school and out of the welfare-unemployment-drug cycle.
>
> Cities in Schools is more than an educational program. It reaches outside the school, to the community.
>
> Each counselor is responsible for a group of students of his very own. He knows them, he knows their families.
>
> He speaks their language and understands their way of life. He puts them in touch with job possibilities, financial and legal aid, health care and housing, and if necessary, drug rehabilitation.
>
> Cities in Schools counselors are not miracle workers. They are advisors, referees, role models and friends. Most important, they're always there.
>
> What they have to give are the resources of existing federal, state, and local social service programs -- delivered in a personal way. (CIS, 1979, unpaginated)

The statement operationalizes the program's service--delivery functions. According to CIS, Assertion #1 will be made valid in the following ways:

- CIS will deal with students who have serious, probably multiple problems.

- CIS will provide Caseworkers trained in a variety of skills.

- The Caseworkers will develop close personal relationships with the students.
- The Caseworkers will monitor attendance and school performance, and provide remedial help as needed.
- The Caseworkers will provide enriching extra activities such as sports and field trips.
- The Caseworkers will orchestrate the delivery of social services as needed.

How well did the program mirror this image?*

CIS will deal with students who have serious, probably multiple problems.

> "So if you're a young girl with a drug problem or a city mother worried about her son's first arrest...."

Since the outset of the 1978-79 school year, this expectation has been met substantially at all three sites, and almost universally at Julia Richman and Smith. In all three cities, a reading of the complete file on each student almost invariably indicated severe academic deficits. More important, the students also showed very high incidence of nonacademic problems.

To estimate the incidence of nonacademic problems, a rating procedure was employed. Three members of the evaluation staff reviewed the complete file of each member of the interview samples (Caseworker and student structured interviews, intensive interviews, documentation from the CIS files, and school records), rating each of the problem categories on a three-point scale of "severe," "moderate," and "no evidence of a problem." Questionable cases were discussed among the raters. As a rule of thumb, a "severe" rating required either direct evidence that the problem was affecting the student's behavior (e.g., a student becomes very withdrawn after death of the father) or a reasonable expectation that the problem would have a major impact (e.g., only living parent is a chronic alcoholic). The results are shown in Table 3.1 below.

---

*The evaluation's data on this subject consists of: (1) CIS's data on service delivery from its own management information system, (2) AIR's reconstruction of service delivery from the case records of students in the sample, (3) structured interviews with students, (4) structured interviews with Caseworkers, (5) narrative descriptions by students, Caseworkers, and parents for the "intensive" sample. The "intensive" sample was a subsample of students whose CIS experience was investigated through supplementary interviews. See Appendix A.

TABLE 3.1
Percentages of Students Rated as Having "Severe" Nonacademic Problems

PROBLEMS	Smith (n = 44)	Arsenal Tech (n = 134)	Julia Richman (n = 54)
Emotionally Withdrawn	9%	15%	13%
Emotionally Aggressive	34%	32%	50%
Economic	36%	26%	56%
Family	50%	26%	50%
Other	39%	27%	33%
No "Severe"	7%	45%	15%

* Percentages sum to more than 100 because of multiple "severe" problems among some students.

As the table indicates, the student populations in the Julia Richman and Smith programs had high incidence on all categories. Perhaps the most telling statistic is that 93% of the Smith sample and 85% of the Julia Richman sample were rated as having at least one "severe" nonacademic problem. "Severe" tended to mean very severe indeed. At Tech, only 55% of the sample were rated as having at least one severe nonacademic problem. This reflects partly the constraints of funding: Much of Tech's support was provided through Title XX, which provides funds for families that meet a financial "poverty" criterion. Thus, CIS at Tech found itself with a large number of students who were poor and had academic problems -- but who otherwise came from stable homes with supportive parents, and who had no abnormal behavioral difficulties. In part, the lesser incidence of students with severe problems at Tech may also reflect the nature of the context: inner-city Indianapolis does not have the same level of urban problems as inner-city Atlanta or New York.

The estimates in Table 3.1 are probably lower bounds. Many of the "no evidence of a problem" ratings could represent lack of positive information rather than persuasive evidence that no problem existed.*

CIS will provide Caseworkers trained in a variety of skills.

> "The Cities in Schools counselors are all kinds of people. They are licensed reading instructors, job counselors, or Scout leaders. They are lent by the city or selected from other agencies."

---

*Did the CIS students represent the bulk of the students in those schools who had such severe problems? We can only guess about this as about so many other aspects of the evaluation that would ordinarily have called for comparative data. In this instance, the ordinary barriers -- the regulations calling for parental permission, and the very low return rates on parental permissions in these schools -- were only one factor. An equally important barrier was that the personal problems in question were not ordinarily known by teachers or by other school personnel, nor could we expect them to emerge from a one-time interview with the student. Dossiers from the welfare agencies were not open to us. In short: on this topic, no data collection strategy for comparison data was both affordable and legal.

At the basic, structural level over which CIS had direct control, the Caseworker structural model was implemented as planned. Caseworkers were hired, assigned caseloads of 10-20 students, and were given a broad charter to deal with the problems of that student, whatever they might be. These staff persons were generally grouped into four-person teams, as the plan intended. Although there was variation across and within sites, these teams generally conducted regular staffings of the caseloads and otherwise attempted to take advantage of the multiple-staff setup.

Expectations for the training and expertises of the Caseworkers were not met in any of the three sites. Each site had a few trained personnel, but these were outnumbered by a large majority of Caseworkers who came to the job with very few special qualifications. These findings were discussed in detail in Report No. 2 (pp. 74-82, Tables 4.1-4.3). Some of the leading characteristics were as follows:

- More than a quarter of the Caseworkers had not completed college.
- Among the specialist categories in the Family staffing, only the educators were typically trained for that job (69%). Only about one in three of the social service specialists, one in four of the youth workers, and one in five of the programmatic specialists had appropriate specialized training.
- The availability of persons with training and experience in the critical areas of remedial education (as opposed to general teaching training) and psychological counseling (as opposed to informal counseling experience) was very low.

As noted elsewhere, CIS's latitude in this area was narrow: both the salaries and the job security that CIS could offer were unattractive to trained, experienced people. This situation did not change after the analysis in Report No. 2. Of the new Caseworkers hired since then, only 25 percent have specialized training in the major skill categories (social work, counseling, remedial education, remedial reading, recreation, nursing, juvenile delinquency services).* Many of the others had some experience -- acting as a counselor at summer camps, running recreation programs for the parks department. But even when this experience is taken into account, almost half (48%) of the new hires showed no qualifications for the job, either in training or job experience.

The program did make substantial progress in enlisting the participation of social service agencies. As shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3, Atlanta and New York were especially successful in obtaining outstationed staff. The large majority of these positions were accompanied by some sort of financial subsidy for the agency. Not surprisingly, the agency officials who were interviewed consistently reported that their budgets were tightly constrained, and that they could not afford to outstation staff to CIS if the subsidy ended.**

The Caseworkers will develop close personal relationships with the students.

> "Each counselor is responsible for a group of students of his very own. He knows them, he knows their families. He speaks their language and understands their way of life.... Cities in Schools counselors are not miracle workers. They are advisors, referees, role models and friends. Most important, they're always there."

On this dimension, the accomplishments of CIS run to extremes. For a minority of students, extremely close personal relationships developed between Caseworker and students. For another set of students with few problems or need to interact, there was relatively little contact, but this is not necessarily a problem -- Caseworkers might appropriately be concentrating their efforts on the

---

*The definition of "specialized training" is loose: a BS with a major in social work was counted, for example, as were partly completed graduate programs.

**For more on relationships between CIS and the existing social service agencies, see Report No. 2, pp. 127-138.

TABLE 3.2

Number of Staff Assigned from Agencies at Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman in 1979–80*

Agency	PLAN A Caseworker Staff	PLAN B Other Caseworker Staff	
ATLANTA - Smith High School			
Fulton Co. Department of Family and Children's Services	1	0	
Department of Human Resources	1	0	
Atlanta Public Schools	4	0	
City of Atlanta Police Department	2	0	
Mennonite Central Committee	1	0	
Total Agency Assignments	**9**	**0**	**9**
Percent of Total Caseworker Staff (13)			**69%**
INDIANAPOLIS - Arsenal Tech High School			
Near East Side Multi-Service Center	8	0	
Community Action Against Poverty	0	3	
Chamber of Commerce	0	1	
Indianapolis Public Schools [1]	5	0	
Total Agency Assignments	**13**	**4**	**17**
Percent of Total Caseworker (Plan A & B) Staff (95)			**18%**
NEW YORK - Julia Richman High School			
New York City Youth Board	4	1	
New York City Human Resources Administration	5	1	
New York City Board of Education	5	1	
New York City Police Department	5	0	
Inwood House	0	1	
Interfaith Neighbors	0	2	
Total Agency Assignments	**19**	**6**	**25**
Percent of Total Caseworker Staff (29)			**86%**

[1] Indianapolis Public Schools contributed 5 teachers to CIS who maintained small (1–3) caseloads due to the understaffing.

* Numbers in this table include staff from agencies regardless of the source of their salary.

students with the greatest needs. For a third set of students, Caseworkers failed to develop the expected personal relationship, despite the need to do so. The problem from an evaluation standpoint is that it is impossible to distinguish with confidence between students in the second and third groups. In short, we

TABLE 3.3

Source of CIS Staff Salaries at All Schools, 1979–80

	NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STAFF (OR EQUIVALENTS)			
	Administrative and Supervisory Staff	Caseworker * Staff	Other Caseload Staff **	TOTAL
ATLANTA - Smith Carver, 4 Academies, Craddock, Right to Read Academy, Youth Conservation Community Improvement Project, Administrative Office				
Office of Education	22[1]	23 2/3[2]	0	45 2/3
HUD/DOL	4	0	3	7
VISTA	0	0	4	4
Fulton Cty Dep't. of Family and Children's Services	0	2[3]	0	2
Title XX-Department of Human Resources	9	16	0	25
Atlanta Public Schools	0	16	0	16
United Way/Boys Club	1[4]	1/2	0	1 1/2
Atlanta Housing Authority	0	1/2	0	1/2
Boy Scouts of America	0	1	0	1
CETA	0	2	0	2
City of Atlanta Police Department	0	2	0	2
Discovery Learning, Inc	0	1/3	0	1/3
	36	**64**	**7**	**107**

* Includes only staff with specific caseloads

** Includes staff of the Youth Conservation Community Improvement Project and VISTA Community Organizers.

[1] Includes half the salary of two people.

[2] Includes 1/3 the salary of 3 people, 2/3 the salary of one person, and 1/2 the salary of 2 people.

[3] Includes 2/3 the salary of 3 people.

[4] Includes 1/2 the salary of 2 people

INDIANAPOLIS - Arsenal Tech Plan A and Plan B, Indy Prep, School No. 26, School No. 45.				
Title XX	3[1]	19	12	34
CETA	3	19	13	35
Office of Education	10[1]	15	0	25
OE - Community Action Against Poverty	0	0	3	3
Title XX - Near East Side Multi-Service Center	0	8	0	8
Title XX - Indianapolis Public Schools	3	6	0	9
	19	**67**	**28**	**114**

* Includes only staff with specific caseloads in Plan A-Arsenal.

** Includes Plan B-Arsenal Tech Staff, Plan B staff do maintain caseloads, but they serve many non-caseload service functions as well

[1] Includes 1/2 the salary of 2 people.

NEW YORK CITY - Julia Richman				
Office of Education	3	2	1	6
New York City Youth Board	0	4	1	5
New York City Human Resources Admin.	1	5	0	6
New York City Board of Education	1	5	0	6
New York City Police Department	0	5	0	5
Inwood House	0	0	1	1
Interfaith Neighbors	0	0	2	2
VISTA	0	0	3	3
TOTAL	**5**	**21**	**8**	**34**

* Includes only staff with specific caseloads.

** Includes VISTA volunteers working in students' neighborhoods, a teacher in the Learning Center, a Social Worker Coodinator, a School and Grade Coordinator, a part-time Social Worker for a pregnancy prevention group, two Counselors and one school-wide Services Coordinator.

can describe the level of contact between Caseworker and student, but statements about the quality of the relationships over the entire sample are problematic.

We start with the reports of students whom we interviewed. Their responses suggest that most of the relationships between Caseworkers and students remained confined to the school setting and to school topics. When we asked whether the respondent had ever discussed family problems, money problems, or other personal problems with the Caseworker, these were the results:*

- Atlanta had the best record. In 1978-79, 42% of the respondents said they had discussed any of these topics with the Caseworker. This figure rose to 62% in 1979-80.
- In Indianapolis, the comparable figures were 21% in 1978-79 and 3% in 1979-80.
- In New York, the comparable figures were 23% in 1978-79 and 9% in 1979-80.

The responses to a parallel question about four school topics (school work, attendance, teacher problems, dropping out) resulted in large majorities that reported discussing at least one, and often more of those topics. The percentages reporting at least one were:

- In Atlanta, 71% in 1978-79 and 81% in 1979-80.
- In Indianapolis, 73% in 1978-79 and 63% in 1979-80.
- In New York, 82% in 1978-79 and 64% in 1979-80

---

*The Smith and Julia Richman sample sizes for the spring interview data in 1979-80 are extremely small (fewer than 20 in both the Caseworker and student samples) because of attrition (see Chapter III and Appendix A), and the percentages should be interpreted with that in mind. But the information from students, Caseworkers, and the archives (for which sample sizes were adequate) was consistent on virtually all topics. This convergence across data sources gives some confidence that the sample size for any one source does not. In any event, interpretations are based on orders of magnitude rather than specific estimates of percentages.

These figures are probably understatements. Reasons that a student might fail to respond "yes" to the items include bad memory, impatience to finish the interview, or lack of understanding of the question. But the basic finding that the level of interaction on these subjects was lower than the program intended is supported by the Caseworkers -- whose answers should logically tend to be overstatements (to make themselves look good) if not on the mark. The Caseworkers did not portray a situation that was out of line with the one given by the students. For example, the percentages of cases in which Caseworkers reported that they had discussed at least one of the out-of-school topics were 42% in Atlanta, 35% in Indianapolis, and 60% in New York for the 1979-80 spring survey.* Even when restricted to school topics, the answer of "none" occurred for 11% of the cases in Atlanta, 35% in Indianapolis, and 20% in New York.

The same pattern prevails when we focus on the extent to which Caseworkers reported that they were familiar with problems and needs of the students. We examine two indicators: home visits by the Caseworkers, and the Caseworkers' self-reports about knowledge of the students.

Number of home visits is one indirect indicator of the extent to which Caseworkers explored the student's personal situation. The results vary both by year and by site. The Smith program particularly emphasized home visits, and they remained frequent throughout both years (the mean per student was 15.5 in 1978-79, when a strict policy of at least one home visit per month was in force, and 5.6 in 1979-80). Visits diminished markedly in both Indianapolis (from a mean of 4.6 to 1.9) and New York (from 3.4 to .8) from the 1978-79 to the 1979-80 school years.

The more informative indicator is the number of times that Caseworkers answered "I don't know" when we asked about a student's problems and characteristics. Two issues are involved: How quickly did the Caseworkers get on top of their caseloads? How well did they get to know the members of their Caseloads?

---

*The question was asked in a different form (about the "last week") in 1978-79, and comparable data are not available for that year. The results from the alternative form are presented in Report No. 2, p. 87.

For the first of these issues, we turn to the interviews conducted in the fall of 1978, four to eight weeks after the students had been assigned to caseloads.

The first set of questions involved the behavior of the student at school:

> "Does this student need help with any school subjects?"
>
> "At what level is this student reading right now?"
>
> "How well does this student interact with other kids?"

...and similar items asking the Caseworker to discuss the student's motivation, self-confidence, and other characteristics. For these questions, the "don't know" responses were extremely small (zero to less than 5% of the total). We cannot be sure that the Caseworkers' responses were accurate, but at least they expressed an assessment.

The next set of knowledge items involved the student's situation outside the school. The Caseworker was asked,

> "How about problems that are not school-related. Do you know about any?"

...and was shown a list of categories: "not known," "no other problems," "drug use," "alcohol use," "emotional problems," "family problems," "delinquency," "financial," and "other." The percentages of students for whom the Caseworker responded "not known" in the fall interviews were 68% in Atlanta, 58% in Indianapolis, and 61% in New York. These self-reported percentages are high, given the emphasis that the program placed on determining the students' needs quickly.

A third type of knowledge question asked about the student's family:

> "From what you know about the family so far, are there any needs that remain unmet?"

The categories were: "Don't know," "no," "medical or dental care," "child care," "alcoholism," "drug addiction," "emotional problem," "housing," "income assistance," "employment," and "other." Again, the "don't know" responses were very high during the fall interviews: 81% in Atlanta, 68% in Indianapolis, and 75% in New York. Overall, the Caseworkers were slow in establishing detailed knowledge about the student's situation away from the school.

Now we turn to the question of whether the Caseworkers later developed a detailed level of information about the students, using the interview material obtained at the end of the school year. By that time, when the Caseworker had typically known the student for about seven months, the "don't know" responses had diminished. But they were still substantial, given the premium that CIS put on the "personalism" of the Caseworker/student relationship. The "don't know" responses for the item about the students' out-of-school problems during the spring administration of the interview constituted 18% of the responses in Atlanta, 29% in Indianapolis, and 23% in New York. The "don't knows" for the item about the needs of the student's family were zero in Atlanta -- possibly a function of its strenuous home visit policy -- 27% in Indianapolis, and 17% in New York.

We have been using isolated indicators. When we read the entire case file, including the narrative interviews with Caseworkers, the numbers appear to be generally representative. Sometimes students had been arrested and appeared in court without the Caseworker knowing about it. Sometimes the student would tell of specific family problems (e.g., an invalid mother) of which the Caseworker was unaware. We cannot quantify these into a confident measure of "Caseworker knowledge of the student." But the simplest indicator -- Caseworkers stating explicitly that they did not know about certain important items -- gives a rough sense of the magnitude of the problem. The proportions of "don't knows" about out-of-school needs (running around 20% in most instances) are not out of line with the other indications about Caseworker performance.*

We should emphasize two points before leaving this topic. First, we have been assessing CIS against its own standards. When the Caseworkers' level of knowledge about the student is compared to the teachers' level of knowledge, the contrast is dramatic. The teachers we interviewed as part of the "intensive" case histories typically knew nothing about the student's out-of-school situation. Often, they were ignorant even of the student's school performance apart from their own classes. Second, the discussion has emphasized the proportions of Caseworkers who apparently maintained relatively superficial relationships with their students. We have not discussed the sizable proportion Caseworker/student relationships that were extremely close, and in which the Caseworker had a highly detailed, perceptive understanding of the student's personal and family situation. These are part of the analysis of CIS's potential, in Chapter IV.

---

*See Report No. 2, Chapter 4.

The Caseworkers will monitor attendance and school performance, and provide remedial help as needed.

> "These counselors monitor their students' schoolwork. They provide remedial education and lots of encouragement....If one of their students skips class, they find out why and try to do something about it."

This expectation has been met with regard to monitoring of schoolwork and followup on absences. Accomplishments in remedial education have varied widely across sites and across years, from intensive efforts to fragmentary ones.

The level of effort was extensive, and this was most true of efforts to keep the students in school. Although there was variance across and within sites, Caseworkers generally took an active role in monitoring attendance and school performance, and in trying to get the student to school when absences occurred. CIS instituted close checks on these aspects of Caseworker performance, and they appear to have had an effect.

Caseworkers were actively involved also as advocates and mediators for the students who encountered disciplinary problems and the Caseworker knew about it. According to the students, Caseworkers were seldom involved in minor disciplinary encounters. They were much more likely to be involved for major problems involving suspension. Of the suspensions that the students admitted to, the Caseworker was involved in some fashion in 70% of the cases (aggregating over both of the school years). Atlanta showed by far the most consistent and active record: The Caseworker was present at the hearing in 11 of the 17 instances that were reported by Atlanta students, and had at least discussed the issue with the student in 3 of the remaining 6.*

The level of effort in tutoring and other directly educational functions was inconsistent. All of the sites had some form of "orientation" class for all of the CIS participants, emphasizing life-coping skills (e.g., how to apply for a job, how to manage a budget, how to plan for a career). The details of the curriculum, the number of years that it continued, and the attention given to the curriculum varied widely among sites.** Reading labs are available at all of the sites; again, the degree of CIS control over materials and staffing varied. And all of the sites offered tutoring services.

In addition, some of the CIS students attended classes taught by teachers specifically chosen for CIS. This varied by school, and by year. The importance of being a "CIS teacher" also varied. In some sites, in some years, the CIS teachers consisted of volunteers who were, by the consensus of observers, highly motivated to work with disadvantaged or "problem" students. In some sites, in some years, teachers were assigned to CIS with very little choice; and neither CIS nor any other sources of evidence argued that these teachers were generally better than the average in the school.

Individual tutoring occurred on a case-by-case basis, decided by a combination of the student's need, the student's willingness to participate, and the Caseworker's determination. Group tutoring also occurred, at regularly scheduled times and places.

According to the interview data, tutoring involved roughly half of the students during 1978-79, then diminished markedly during 1979-80. In 1978-79, the more active year, Caseworkers indicated that fewer than half (48%) of the CIS participants received any regular tutoring at all. Only 17% of the students were receiving tutoring as often as three days a week. In the 1979-80 responses, Caseworkers indicated that only 23% of the students received regular tutoring, and only 9% received tutoring as often as three times a week. The differences among the three sites were minor -- the same trends prevailed in all of them.

---

*Note that the number of suspensions reported by students understated the real incidence, estimated from school records.

**See Report No. 2, pp. 57-60, for a more detailed description.

The Caseworkers will provide enrichment activities for the students.

> "[The Caseworkers] plan sports activities and field trips."

This expectation (which encompassed much more than sports and field trips) was generously met in all of the sites during the first two years of observation. In 1979-80, the levels of student participation fell moderately in Indianapolis. In New York, participation in such activities fell to very low levels, at least for the students who remained in the program for a second year.

One of the major activities of CIS was an attempt to expose the students to experiences they would not ordinarily have (e.g., taking CIS students to a play, or on a camping trip) and to engage them in out-of-school group activities as a general mechanism for enriching their experiences. The activities also acted as incentives to stay in the program.

The variety was wide, as a sampling of the activities indicates -- visits to art galleries, tickets to the Ice Capades, a camping trip to North Carolina (from Atlanta), preparing a collection of the students' art, photography, and poetry, organized sports teams, attending a touring Broadway show, a group trip to New York, tours of City Hall, tours of local industrial plants, watching a local production of *Carmen*, skating and bowling parties, a visit to the Dance Theatre of Harlem, a tennis clinic by Arthur Ashe.

For summary purposes, we may group these into four categories: particpant events (sports teams, reacreational events), general entertainment (movies, sports events, amusement parks), "enrichment" entertainment (plays, concerts, museums, visits to other cities), and social events (dinners or other social gatherings with CIS staff). Table 3.4 shows the percentages of students who engaged in at least one such activity during 1978-79 and 1979-80.

TABLE 3.4
Students Reporting Participation in "At Least One" Programmatic Activity

	Smith		Arsenal Tech		Julia Richman	
Activity	**1978-79 (n = 24)**	**1979-80 (n = 16)**	**1978-79 (n = 102)**	**1979-80 (n = 35)**	**1978-79 (n = 34)**	**1979-80 (n = 11)**
Participatory	0%	81%	27%	46%	0%	9%
Entertainment	8%	81%	24%	34%	21%	18%
Enrichment	25%	94%	47%	26%	35%	0%
Social	21%	38%	48%	34%	3%	9%

* Percentages sum to more than 100 because of multiple activities among some students.

The proportions of students who participated during 1978-79 were high at all three sites. Atlanta increased the level of participation in 1979-80. In Indianapolis, the shortened school year and loss of staff again were reflected in lowered activity levels. At Julia Richman, there appears to have been a generally lower level of activity, but the second-year students (who constituted our sample in 1979-80) were especially inactive.

We are unable to attach specific outcomes to this participation, except the positive reactions of the students that they enjoyed them. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that these activities, like a close relationship with a Caseworker, were goods in themselves. For an adolescent from Harlem who had never left the city to go for a camping trip in the mountains; for a youngster from inner-city Atlanta to see a professional dance company: these kinds of experiences can hardly have been negative, and they were probably landmark events in some instances.

The Caseworkers will orchestrate the delivery of social services as needed.

> "[The Caseworker] puts them in touch with job possibilities, financial and legal aid, health care and housing, and if necessary, drug rehabilitation....What [the Caseworkers] have to give are the resources of existing federal, state, and local social service programs -- delivered in a personal way."

This topic has been a source of continuing controversy between the program and the evaluation. Therefore, we incorporate CIS's reading of the situation in Appendix B.

From one perspective, the counseling function represented a major social service in itself. We have already discussed the topics of the interactions between Caseworkers and the students. Insofar as those interactions usually involved some sort of discussion, advice, or other counseling content, and insofar as they spanned a variety of concerns -- school performance, family problems, emotional problems, etc. -- "integration" of that service was taking place.

The program was also especially active in helping students to find and keep jobs.* Student self-reports in the spring interviews for 1979 and 1980 revealed that, by May,

---

*One of the most successful of these programs (in Atlanta) occurred after the observation period for the evaluation had officially ended. Using a combination of CETA slots and corporate support, a high proportion of interested students were placed and successfully maintained in summer jobs.

- At Smith, 16 of the 23 respondents had applied (or been accepted) for summer jobs; of those, 11 had been helped by CIS.
- At Tech, the comparable figures were: 82 out of 99 were applying, of whom 71 acknowledged CIS help.
- At Julia Richman, 31 out of 34 were applying, and 30 acknowledged CIS help.

CIS also conducted active screening programs: medical examinations for CIS students and surveys to determine eligibility for Title XX assistance were the two most common types. Other efforts were made to establish whether families were obtaining all the benefits to which they were entitled from programs such as AFDC and Food Stamps.

When the subject is limited to actual delivery of social services of the type mentioned in the CIS brochure, the level of accomplishment appears to be low. Based on all of the evidence that we have been able to assemble from interviews and from the archival materials, our finding is that delivery of social services as traditonally defined (e.g., housing, welfare assistance, professional counseling, legal advice, medical assistance) was a small part of the CIS operation. We will summarize the basis for this finding in terms of three types of evidence: the structured interviews with Caseworkers, the archival logs maintained by CIS Caseworkers, and the results of the intensive, open-ended interviews.

Interviews with Caseworkers. The data in Report No. 2 indicated that the incidence of noneducational service delivery was extremely low (pp. 107-110). The data from the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years were consistent with those results, despite the efforts of CIS to upgrade the identification of needs and the delivery of services.

For student needs, the relevant item in the interview asked whether the student had problems that were not academically-related. The response categories were: drug use, alcohol use, emotional problems, family problems, delinquency, financial problems, or "other." We then asked the Caseworker to describe how these problems were handled.

The results from both years and across cities were consistent. On three categories -- emotional problems, family relations, and financial problems -- the percentages of students who received help were substantial (Emotional problems: 17% in 1978-79, 21% in 1979-80. Family relations: 28% and 27%. Financial problems: 30% and 26%). The percentages of students who received help on the other categories (delinquency, drugs, alcohol) ranged from 2% to 8% in both years.

The meaning of "receiving help" admits of considerable ambiguity. The percentages of students who were referred to service delivery resources was very small when computed over the whole sample of students (from 1% for alcohol problems, in 1978-79, to a high of 8% for family relations problems, also in 1978-79). In the rest of the cases, "receiving help" consisted of counseling by the Caseworker.

At another point in the interview, we asked whether the Caseworker had "been involved in trying to arrange assistance" with regard to medical or dental care, child care, mental health (including probems of alcoholism or drug addiction), housing, income assistance, employment, or any other family need. The wording was deliberately inclusive, so that we would capture the full range of CIS efforts, minor or major, successful or unsuccessful, in this domain. Despite the inclusiveness of the question, the "yes" responses were few. In 1978-79, Caseworkers reported that they had been "involved" in 13% of the students' families. In 1979-80, the proportion rose slightly to 17%. When we examined the details of what being "involved" meant, the numbers dwindled further. For example, the percentages just given include instances such as, "Talked to the store manager where [the student] had been laid off. Haven't heard anything since" -- apparently an instance of an unsuccessful attempt to help. They include instances such as "Encouraged mother to apply for Food Stamps -- don't know if she ever did," where both the extent of the Caseworker's effort and its outcome are in doubt. The more concrete examples, such as "Took student to see the doctor" accounted for fewer than half of the instances when the Caseworker said that he had been involved in arranging help.

These data can be interpreted in several ways, depending on one's estimates of the ability of the Caseworkers, whether the data reflect ignorance of problems or real incidence, and the proportions of students that constitute a "large" or "small" number. But we may avoid these ambiguities by staying for the moment with the most basic issue: For whatever reason, CIS Caseworkers did not report large-scale orchestration of service delivery to meet family-specific needs. On the contrary, their responses taken at face value suggest that such services were provided (or were needed) only sporadically.

The Archives. In 1977-78 and 1978-79, we examined the program's case files, attempting to reconstruct the inventory of services and interactions. These efforts proved to be of no analytic use, except to point to problems in record-keeping. A few of the Caseworkers kept excellent records; most did not. In the summer of 1980, however, the Director of the Smith program asked that we reexamine our coding from the 1978-79 school year and add data from the 1979-80 school year. The Smith program had made a major effort to maintain accurate, complete logs, and he felt (and we agreed) that these data should be reflected in the evaluation. Therefore, we reconstructed the archival record for 39 students: 18 who were nominated by the Smith staff as their best examples of success, and another 21 randomly selected from among the remaining members of our original 1978-79 interview sample.*

For certain types of CIS services, we cannot expect that the logs reflected the complete record. Caseworkers were routinely supposed to check on the eligibility of families for Title XX and for other types of entitlements. We assume that some of these checks were not entered in the log, especially when no further action was indicated. In addition, the program provided free physical examinations for all students. Sometimes Caseworkers took their own caseloads to the examination, and that was noted in the log. In instances when a Caseworker took several students at one time, or students from another caseload, we assume that not all of the physical examinations were noted in all of the appropriate case files.

---

*The number of cases in this effort was determined by the amount of time we had available at that late point in the evaluation (the data collection was supposed to have ended).

With those qualifications, the instances of attempts (successful and unsuccessful) to respond to specific service needs were as follows:

Help in applying for a job	19
Medical (other than physical exam)	10
Housing advice or assistance	4
Emergency supplies (e.g., food)	4
General transportation help	3
Advocacy with the juvenile court	3
Other legal assistance	1
Help in applying for welfare benefits	1
TOTAL	45

Note that the total of 45 represents number of citations either in the log or in associated documentation, not numbers of students. In 15 of the 39 cases -- 38% -- "social services" as that word is traditionally defined were not provided. Further, many of the items in the list involved marginal services -- "general transportation assistance" meant that the Caseworker drove the student someplace. "Advocacy with the juvenile court" was counted even if the log reported only that the Caseworker attended a court hearing.

The most impressive aspect of service delivery was employment assistance, consistent with the experience at the other two sites.

The Qualitative Record. The set of "intensive" cases, in which the Caseworker, student, and parents were interviewed using open-ended items, reveal a story that is consistent with those of the structured items and the archives: There were indeed isolated instances in which Caseworkers were instrumental in obtaining assistance in housing, emergency food allotments, or other services. But we continue to deal with very small numbers. More to the point, the instances in which the Caseworker did arrange for help are outnumbered by accounts of problems that the Caseworker had identified, but did nothing (or was powerless to do anything).

The patterns follow those observed earlier in CIS's history (see Report No. 2, pp. 110-122). Rather than add to that record here, we will incorporate material about the characteristics of effective and ineffective Caseworker behavior in the analysis in Chapter IV.

Summary. The picture we have given of CIS's accomplishments in providing services is not consistent with the information that CIS collects on the same subject. We are most conspicuously at odds on the issue of social service delivery. CIS's Management Information System (MIS) reports student contacts, family contacts, student services, and family services for 22 categories of services.* Strict definitions of "contact" and "service" are used, requiring that the event involve concrete needs and actions. We have no evidence that the numbers in the MIS are deliberately inflated. On the contrary, we have observed repeated efforts by CIS to upgrade the accuracy of the system.

Why is there a discrepancy? The answer seems to lie in some wide differences between AIR evaluations and CIS Caseworkers about what constitutes evidence of a service. This is best illustrated by the results when AIR and CIS used the identical data base (in Atlanta) to count services.

When the Director of the Smith program requested that we reexamine the case files, he did so because, from his perspective, those files contained evidence of intensive and extensive service delivery. The files were indeed fat, sometimes running to more than a hundred entries. Yet, when we had finished with them, we emerged with the skimpy list shown earlier. The rest of the material fell into the categories of educational services, general counseling, and enrichment activities.

After these results were given to CIS in October, staff at Smith took 12 of the 39 names and duplicated our search. The results they found for the same categories were vastly different from AIR's. Where we had found 10 instances of medical assistance for all 39 cases, they found 17 for just the subsample of 12. Where we had found 19 instances of help in applying for a job, they found 29 instances (again, for just the subsample of 12) in the category of "career development and job placement efforts." And so on, through all the categories.

---

*The categories are: employment, dental, medical, glasses, drug/alcohol counseling or treatment, AFDC, food stamps, Title XX, Medicaid, other public assistance, counseling for family problems, peer problems, school problems, and personal problems, staff counseling for the family, professional counseling, housing, clothing, legal/criminal justice, day care, transportation, and "other."

There was no time for the obvious next step: to compare notes on those 12.* We do know that AIR's numbers were obtained through an extremely detailed examination of the files. Instructions were explicit that every possible instance be noted. The data collectors independently reviewed identical files on a spot-check basis. Two data collectors always worked together, so that marginal items could be discussed. Direct quotations were taken from the files for later review when there was ambiguity. In short: we believe our numbers to be accurate. Further, they were inclusive.

In compiling the list of 45 items, a loose definition of "service" was used. For example, we did count an entry that read,

> "Told John that there is a job opening at MacDonalds and encouraged him to take it,"

even though it is not at all clear that a real service had been provided. But we did not count entries such as

> "Asked John whether he had submitted the job application. He said no."
>
> "John told me that he had decided not to apply for the job."
>
> "Talked with John about summer jobs, and told him I would be glad to help him with applications if he wanted me to."

One plausible explanation for the discrepancy between our figures and those of the MIS is that analogs of the last three examples are showing up as "services provided."

---

*The results about the 12 were received five days before the final report was due.

For that matter, should we have counted them too? Our judgment is "no." CIS is described appropriately as providing for extensive interaction between students and Caseworkers. A legitimate distinction may be drawn between general interactions, whether about jobs or school or personal problems, and specific services. The story from the Caseworker interviews, from the student interviews, from the open-ended "intensive" cases, and from the logbooks all consistently indicate that the incidence of the latter type of service delivery was low.

ASSERTION NO. 2

"The higher quality of service leads to significant, positive impact on the youth."

It is obvious that the purpose of CIS is to help the students who participate. It is less obvious precisely how that help should manifest itself in short-term, observable results. There are some candidate measures that quickly come to mind -- higher attendance, better grades, better behavior in school. But these do not get at the ultimate purposes of the program. CIS was not developed because inner-city high schools have attendance and achievement and discipline problems. It was started because of the longer-range debilities. Given everything known about the type of school population with which CIS works, it must be expected that most of the students who have the worst academic and behavioral problems while CIS works with them will become adults with worse problems yet -- perhaps unemployed, on drugs, in jail, and, whatever the specific outcome, wasted. As its ultimate objective, CIS seeks to forestall this future for at least some of its students.

To do so, CIS does not have the option of a single, dramatic "treatment" that makes the problems go away. Rather, it can only set in motion a sequence of events whereby the program engages the student's interest and cooperation, induces internal changes in attitude and motivation, and finally (it is hoped) observes the fruits of those internal changes in the form of changes in behavior. We stress the notion of a sequence of outcomes. It has two implications for the impact analysis.

First, the sequential nature of the outcomes shapes the interpretation of cause and effect in assessing CIS's

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

role. Failure to achieve the early outcomes casts doubts on CIS's role if changes in the later outcomes are observed. Conversely, failure to achieve the later outcomes does not necessarily mean that the program is a failure. We discuss this issue at greater length in Chapter IV, but the main point is a simple one: CIS is not intended to be a panacea, but a contributing factor to improvement. Certain outcomes are almost entirely within its control, and CIS can be held accountable for them. Others depend on a variety of other circumstances. Failure to achieve them may have more important implications for other aspects of the "surround" -- the rest of the factors -- than for CIS.

Second, developing an explicit view of the sequence enables us to put the achievements of the program in context. What does it mean, for example, that a student attends school more often because of CIS? This is not a good in itself; it is good because it facilitates certain other outcomes. Specifying the outcomes to which it contributes -- and specifying the earlier outcomes that must have fed into the student's decision to attend school more often -- provide a framework for interpretation.

To organize the indicators, we divided the sequence of outcomes into four stages: CIS services, preinvestment outcomes, investment behaviors, and achievement. Figure 3.1 on the following page depicts the overall map of outcomes that we have used. The map (or "program rationale," in AIR's terminology) moves from left to right, starting with the Caseworker's inputs and moving through the preinvestment outcomes, then the investment behaviors, to the achievement measures.

The definition of each stage, and the logic behind the specific outcomes listed under each, are described fully in Report No. 3. (pp. 17-26). Briefly, the argument is this:

- CIS tried to achieve its impact on the students through four mechanisms: by directly influencing behavior through the Caseworker's advice, example and authority; by affecting the student's values, norms, and motivations; by reducing the student's learning deficits; and by reducing the economic and social impediments to achievement.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

FIGURE 3.1
Rational for Impact Indicators

	Caseworker Functions —	**Mechanisms** →	**Pre-Investment Outcomes** →	**Investment Behaviors** →		**Achievement Outcomes**
CIS INTENDED EFFECTS	Monitor behavior Provide role model, authority figure Provide advice, counsel information Provide educational supports (tutoring, special classes) Provide social services	*Directly influence behavior* *Affect values, norms, motivations* *Reduce learning deficits* *Reduce economic and physical impediments to achievement*	Increased understanding of options and requirements Increased sense of control over the future Stricter standards of personal behavior	Increased resistance to negative peer pressures Increased effort to get to school (despite impediments) Increased voluntary learning (electives, extracurricular activities) Increased attention and effort in the classroom	Reduced real incidence of destructive behavior Reduced voluntary absences, cuts Increased success in interpersonal relations Increased success in learning situations Acquisition of basic reading skills	Reduced delinquency Reduced drug use Reduced school disciplinary actions Higher attendance Reduced dropouts Higher grades Higher test scores
COMPETITIVE EXTERNAL FACTORS			Lack of legitimate options Unrealistic requirements Negative peer standards of behavior	Peer sanctions against achievement Rewards for destructive behavior Lack of supplemental educational opportunities Economic costs of going to school	Poor teaching/ inappropriate curriculum Limited academic potential	Inappropriate testing instruments Negative expectations by teachers, disciplinary officials, police (e.g., labeling effects)

- If successful, these efforts by CIS will cause some early, internal outcomes. The student will have a better idea of what his options are, and what must be done to take advantage of them. He will have an increased sense of ability to control his future. And he will adopt stricter standards of personal behavior.

- To the extent that these internal changes have taken place, some behavioral changes should also occur. These are labeled "investment" behaviors to indicate that they represent attempts to achieve -- investments of time and energy -- rather than successful attempts to achieve. Examples of investment are increased resistance to negative peer pressure, increased effort to get to school, increased voluntary learning (in the form of electives, for example), and increased attention and effort in the classroom.

- If enough investment occurs, some evidence of success should eventually follow: reduced absences, increased classroom success, reduced destructive behavior,and increased success in interpersonal relations.

- Finally, these successes should be reflected in the official measures: reduced arrests, reduced dropouts, higher grades, higher test scores.

It is within this framework that we have examined the results of CIS. What have we found?

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Impact Results: 1978-79

After testing the performance of CIS in 1978-79 against these indicators, Report No. 3 found that, combining results across sites, CIS could not point to evidence of consistent success, even in achieving the earlier outcomes. For individual sites, however, some clear distinctions could be drawn. Smith and Julia Richman did not show a pattern of progress. The Tech program did. To summarize the results in Report No. 3, we developed a simple tally, duplicated in Table 3.5 below. In the Table, we display the direction of the results for each major cluster of indicators, using a three-point scale, assigning "+" when results were positive, "0" when they were mixed, and "-" when they were negative.

The difference between Tech and the other two sites was striking. To account for it, we noted differences in program continuity (the Tech staff had been stable at the senior levels for three years), the student populations (Tech had an "easier" population to work with), the external factors (Tech had an "easier" urban context to work within). But the most provocative difference between Tech and the other two cities, from an evaluation standpoint, was that Tech had much the better record in successfully operationalizing the structure and the rhetoric on which CIS was based. Our basic conclusion: The more closely CIS program operations and staff resemble the CIS model, the better the results. And we interpreted this as being a positive sign in evaluating CIS, the concept.

Impact During the 1979-80 School Year

We have very little new information to add to the 1978-79 analysis. Two events contaminated the analysis to such an extent that, to put it bluntly, the impact data from 1979-80 are uninterpretable.

First, the Tech program that produced the positive results abruptly ceased to exist during 1979-80. Because of the school strike in Indianapolis, school did not start until late October. Two out of the 9 months of the "treatment" were eliminated. Further, the "nontreatment period" was lengthened from three months to five months, with unknown but presumably definite consequences on stu-

TABLE 3.5
1978–79 Direction of Results in Achieving Outcomes

OUTCOME	Smith	Arsenal Tech (NA: Not Available)	Julia Richman
1. Increased understanding of options and requirements	–	+	NA
2. Increased sense of control over the future	NA	+	+
3. Stricter standards of personal behavior	–	+	–
4. Increased voluntary learning	0	0	+
5. Increased attention and effort in the classroom*	–	0	–
6. Reduced voluntary absences, cuts	–	0	–
7. Increased success in interpersonal relations	0	+	–
8. Increased success in learning situations	+	+	0
9. Acquisition of basic reading skills	+	+	NA
10. Reduced official delinquency	+	0	NA
11. Higher attendance	–	+	0
12. Higher grades	0	0	0

NOTE Sample sizes varied by indicator, as specified in Report No 3.

dent momentum, motivation, and attitude toward school in general. The reduction in the school year was compounded by a major shortage in Caseworker staff. Funding delays meant that the program was was around 20 to 30 percent short of its planned Caseworker staff throughout the year. But the number of students assigned to caseloads remained at the planned level. Caseload size was increased. Continuity in Caseworker/student pairings was low. Taken together, the strike and funding problems drastically altered the nature of the Tech program.

This leaves us with the two other sites, Smith and Julia Richman, which did not show demonstrable effects on the impact indicators shown in Figure 3.1 during the 1978-79 school year. Did they improve their performance in 1979-80? In trying to answer that question, we run up against the second contaminant: a very high attrition rate in the sample. The data are shown in Table 3.6 below.

TABLE 3.6
Attrition in the 1978-79 CIS Population

		Site	
	Smith	Arsenal Tech	Julia Richman
Original Sample Size*	**74**	**259**	**154**
Left school before graduation	22 (30%)	36 (14%)	39 (25%)
Transferred to another school or graduated	6 (8%)	13 (5%)	31 (20%)
No information	8 (11%)	61 (24%)	0 (–)
Still in school as of 5/80	38 (51%)	149 (58%)	84 (55%)

* For Smith and Julia Richman, the population of all students still on the roles as of 1 October 1978 was used For Arsenal Tech, a random sample was selected.

As the table indicates, only about half of the students who were in the program in September of 1978 were still in the program as of the end of the 1979-80 school year: 51% in Smith, 58% at Tech, and 55% at Julia Richman.

Most of these disappearing students left the school system before graduating. That is, they were dropouts, or left school for some other negative reason (e.g., incarceration). Of all those who left the sample for reasons that we could determine, 79% fit this category at

Smith and 73% at Tech. The rest of the disappearing students on whom we had information had transferred to another school, been mainstreamed into the regular school program, or had graduated.

This still leaves open the question of CIS's true dropout rate because, as Table 3.6 indicates, we could not obtain definite information on the whereabouts of some of the disappearing students. Among the "no information" students, the most plausible assumption is that most had left the school system; but we cannot determine the precise number.*

Attrition through dropout is a negative indicator in itself. One of the purposes of the program was to keep students in school, and in a large proportion of cases it failed to do so. Preventing dropout is, however, one of the tougher, longer range outcomes, and it depends on many factors beyond CIS's control. The dropout rate has a decisive effect on how well we can measure the program's effectiveness (as we will discuss shortly), but it is not decisive evidence that the program itself was a failure.

We have no satisfactory way of determining how many of these students would have dropped out if the program had not existed. CIS in all three sites dealt with subpopulations that were believed to be the most likely to fail. Further, the estimates of dropout rates from school data yield results far different from those that employ material from CIS as well. That is, the school records tend to show either "no information" or "transferred to another school system" when the real reason was dropout. Conversely, they sometimes show "dropout" when in fact the student had returned to school. Thus, (a) the official rates of dropout in all three schools are lower than from CIS, but (b) these figures are measured using incomparable data and an incomparable population.

We may, however, examine the records of groups in those schools who also had attendance problems, but were not in CIS. In Atlanta, the comparison group consists of non-CIS students who entered Smith as ninth-graders in fall 1978, and who missed at least 10 days of school during the 1978-79 school year.* In Indianapolis, we use a comparison group that originally was randomly chosen from among all students who met the program's entrance criteria.** In New York, the comparison group consists of non-CIS ninth graders who entered Julia Richman as ninth-graders in 1978-79 and were not assigned to any other special program (e.g., for gifted students). In all three cases, the comparison of dropout rates asks: Among students who stayed in school throughout the ninth grade, what percentage left the school's rolls during the tenth grade? The results are shown in Table 3.7.

---

*Even the category of "transferred to another school" is suspect, especially for the younger students who could not legally leave the school system.

TABLE 3.7
Attrition in the 10th Grade: CIS Compared with Non-CIS Students

	Non-CIS			CIS		
	Mean Days Absent 9th Grade	% Leaving School Rolls During 10th Grade	(n)	Mean Days Absent 9th Grade	% Leaving School Rolls During 10th Grade	(n)
Smith	41.7	29%	(42)	44.0	34%	59
Arsenal Tech	27.4	20%	(122)	27.7	34%	104
Julia Richman	47.6	33%	(102)	44.5	30%	106

CIS sample: all students who participated in CIS through the end of the 9th grade.

Non-CIS samples: **Smith:** students absent at least 10 days in 9th grade.
Arsenal Tech: comparison group (see Appendix A).
Julia Richman: all 9th graders not participating in another special program.

---

*Ten days was the lower limit that produced a subgroup with a mean absence rate closest to that of CIS ninth-graders.

**Despite subsequent contamination, the Tech comparison group is by far the best of the three in terms of its statistical comparability.

7,1

At all three sites, the ninth grade attendance patterns were similar for the CIS and non-CIS group.* The proportion of the ninth grade "survivors" who then dropped from the rolls during tenth grade was nearly the same for CIS and non-CIS alike at both Smith and Julia Richman. At Tech, the numbers favor the comparison group: only 20% of the comparison group left the rolls during the tenth grade, compared to 34% of the CIS group.

Explanations of the results from Tech must be speculative. Given the relative "comparability" of the Tech comparison group, the large, statistically significant difference cannot easily be ascribed to hypothesized "other differences" between the two groups. The explanation favorable to the program is that the successful CIS program in 1978-79 was keeping students in school who would otherwise have dropped out during that school year; the program lost them when it was truncated in 1979-80. The results from 1978-79 lend support to that explanation. Using a comparable measure, CIS lost only 6% of its ninth graders, while the comparison group lost 15% during that year. Given the admixture of school transfers and other innocent reasons for leaving the rolls, this should remain speculation.

Our reason for introducing the attrition problem at this point in the discussion is not because we think it is intrinsically the most important datum, but because it has a pervasive effect on the rest of the impact analysis for the 1979-80 school year. Attrition of this magnitude creates two insurmountable problems.

First, the attrition drove the interview sample sizes to very low levels by the end of the 1979-80 school year. Only in Indianapolis do we retain a large enough sample to use for more than anecdotal purposes -- and the Tech program in 1979-80 was truncated.*

---

*In addition to the similarity between means at each sites, the variation was comparable, with the exception of Julia Richman. Standard deviation pairs (non-CIS/CIS) were: Smith: 28.7/25.6. Tech: 29.3/23.7. Julia Richman: 35.0/43.6

But sample size is the lesser problem. Even if the sample sizes were usable (as in the archival data on grades and attendance), we cannot interpret the data, because of what we must assume to be a major selection artifact. That is, those who stayed in the program were different from those who left, and the bias works in favor of CIS. This is most simply illustrated in the case of attendance. When we report attendance data, we are in effect saying: "CIS took a population of students with poor attendance records. In assessing CIS's impact on attendance, we shall ignore the 50% whose subsequent attendance was worst, and present the figures for the other 50%."

The actual data reveal the problem vividly. First, consider the unadorned attendance data for the students in our remaining sample at the Smith High School CIS program. They tell us that, the year before joining CIS, these students had an average of 50.9 days of absences. During the first year in CIS the average absences dropped to 35.9 -- a reduction of 29%. During the second year of CIS, absences dropped again, to an average of 32.6 days -- an additional reduction of 9% and an overall reduction of 36% from the pre-CIS year. This appears to be a highly positive finding.

But: the only students in our sample are the ones who stayed in school through the two years. What about the students who left the program? When we compute the absences of the students who remained in the program for one year, but later left the school (and our sample), it turns out that the mean absences for this group during the first year in CIS was not 44.0 days, but instead

---

*The impact analysis examines change scores -- the difference from pretest to posttest on the same item. Statistically, change scores are much more sensitive to small sample size than estimates of the population mean at either time separately. Put roughly, interpreting a mean value requires only that the estimate be accurate within a certain range above or below the true value. When a change score is being intrepreted, the same level of inaccuracy in both estimates can lead to a misinterpretation not only of the size but even of the direction of the true change.

55.8. The pre-CIS absences for this group was 47.2 days. Thus, the net change in attendance among those who later disappeared from the sample was not a reduction of absences, but an increase of 18%.

Table 3.8 shows the figures for all three schools.

TABLE 3.8
Effects of Attrition: The Case of Attendance

	No. of Days Absent		
	8th grade	9th grade	10th grade
Smith			
Remained in sample	50.9	35.9	32.6
Left sample	47.2	55.8	—
Total	50.2	44.0	32.6
Total n	(29)	(59)	(30)
Arsenal Tech			
Remained in sample	35.7	19.9	26.9
Left sample	44.5	39.3	—
Total	39.2	27.7	26.9
Total n	(80)	(104)	(62)
Julia Richman			
Remained in sample	36.5	37.2	53.0
Left sample	54.9	55.0	—
Total	43.2	44.5	53.0
Total n	(77)	(100)	(52)

Original sample students who joined CIS as 9th graders in September 1978.

Tech has a somewhat more positive picture than Smith: absences decreased among those who later left the sample as well as among those who stayed. Julia Richman shows negative results for both groups: absences went up among those who survived the tenth grade as well as among those who left.

CIS has argued an alternative explanation: The students that are assigned to CIS are the ones that are expected to drop out. To keep such students in school is an achievement in itself; to reduce the absences of even a minority of them is noteworthy. Is this argument consistent with experience? Table 3.9 shows the results when the attendance records of the comparison groups are put against those of CIS.

TABLE 3.9
Absences: CIS Compared with Non-CIS Students

	Days Absent					
	Non-CIS			CIS		
	9th Grade	10th Grade	(n)	9th Grade	10th Grade	(n)
Smith						
Students who completed 10th grade	34.8	26.2	(31)	35.9	32.6	(39)
Students who left school rolls during 10th grade	61.1	–	(11)	55.8	–	(20)
Arsenal Tech						
Students who completed 10th grade	21.9	31.0	(90)	19.9	26.9	(68)
Students who left school rolls during 10th grade	48.9	–	(23)	39.3	–	(36)
Julia Richman						
Students who completed 10th grade	41.1	41.0	(68)	37.2	53.0	(69)
Students who left school rolls during 10th grade	60.7	–	(34)	55.0	–	(31)

CIS sample: all students who participated in CIS through the end of the 9th grade

Comparison samples: **Smith:** students absent at least 10 days in 9th grade
Arsenal Tech: comparison group (see Appendix A)
Julia Richman: All 9th graders not participating in another special program

At Smith and Tech, the comparison groups closely mimic the results of the CIS group from the ninth to the tenth grade. At Smith, the students who remained through tenth grade reduced their absences by 9%. The non-CIS students who had had attendance problems (at least 10 days absent in ninth grade) but had survived tenth grade also reduced their absences, by 25%. At Tech, the CIS students (who had shown a large reduction in absences between the eighth and ninth grades) increased their absences by 35% in the tenth grade. But the comparison group students also increased their absences, by 42%.

At Julia Richman, the comparison group did not resemble CIS. The comparison group students who survived the tenth grade held their absences steady at about 41 days. The CIS students who survived the tenth grade showed an increase of absences from 37.2 to 53.0, or an increase of 42%.

We stress the limits of these comparisons. The comparison groups show similar ninth grade attendance patterns, but in other respects the CIS youth were likely to have been a more problem-laden group, especially at Smith and Julia Richman. Thus, for example, we would dispute an interpretation of the Julia Richman data that CIS made things worse. But while the comparison data cannot be used to fine-tune our assessment of effects that did occur, they can be used to make a less ambitious statement: Students with attendance problems in the ninth grade behaved about the same in the tenth grade whether or not they were in CIS.*

The main point, however, does not have to do with attendance but with the magnitude of the distortions introduced into all of the impact measures by the large attrition rate. When attrition is relatively small, the analysis can compensate for the selection problem. When it reaches the proportions that characterized the CIS samples, it cannot. The numbers are not interpretable, and the same phenomenon applies throughout our measures. Whether the topic is attitudes, values, classroom behavior, peer relationships, or achievement, the students who left the program were predominantly "failures" on some or all of those dimensions. The analysis is perforce limited to those who were at least "partial successes" by the token of having remained in school.

---

*It should be noted that the reductions in absences found at the Tech program in 1978-79 could not be explained away in the same manner. See Report No. 3, pp. 68-72.

Even ignoring the selection problem, the numbers as they stand are not generally positive. Grades, for example, did not increase even among those who remained in school; in fact, they declined slightly over the students' first two years in the program. The items covered for 1978-79 in *Report No. 3* (e.g., on values, difficulty in school, locus of control, level of effort) did not reveal improvements among the students who remained in the program. In short, we are not faced with a body of results for 1979-80 that look good on the surface, but are probably spurious. The numbers as they stand do not make the case.

These statements about selection artifacts and about the observed results apply to *estimated changes across the CIS population*. It is appropriate to remember what we said about such estimates when we first wrote the evaluation design:

> *Large changes in individuals are of primary interest; not mean changes among groups.* Suppose, for example, that 100 CIS students showed a mean increase in attendance from 2.0 to 2.5 days per week. If that change consisted entirely of students who had formerly been skipping three days of schol per week and after CIS were missing only two-and-one-half, then the change would say very little about real impact on the youth, regardless of statistical significance. But if instead the change consisted of some students whose attendance changed dramatically -- from one or two days a week to full attendance except for legitimate absences -- then *for that subsample* of students the change in attendance is plausibly indicative of some fundamental change in approach to school and approach to the future. The same applies to most of the measures. (*Evaluation Design*, p. 12. Emphasis in the original.)

Given this situation, the appropriate next step is to examine the program's effects on a micro, case-by-case level, rather than to rely on statistical associations. This is the function of the discussion in Chapter IV. To conclude this aspect of the assessment, the summary statement is that the quantitative analysis of impact revealed no consistent pattern of progress in New York and Atlanta for either of the two years 1978-79 and 1979-80. The analysis did show a consistent pattern of positive indicators in Indianapolis for the 1978-79 school year. This pattern was not repeated in 1979-80. The parsimonious explanation is that the 1978-79 program was not repeated in the subsequent year, because of the teachers' strike and to understaffing.

ASSERTION NO. 3

"These positive benefits can be achieved without excessive increase to costs of present delivery systems."

The actual costs that CIS incurred were split among multiple sponsors. Some were dollar expenditures; other were in-kind. Some were associated with formal agreements; others were informal donations. Some had precise metrics (salaries); others did not (what is the opportunity cost associated with vacant office space in the school?). Some of the costs were ones that a continuing program would have to sustain; some were peculiar to CIS's status as a demonstration program.

The original assertion of CIS looked ahead to a full implementation of the concept, which would use the existing cadre of service-delivery personnel into the schools. The argument was that CIS could be implemented without a net increase in people, and hence without major incremental costs.

The possibility remains a live one. Agencies that use a caseload approach (e.g., probation departments, welfare agencies) could reconfigure the caseloads so that staff stationed at the school in combination with staff remaining at the central office cover the same total workload. For agencies that do not use a caseload approach, some fundamental changes in their way of doing business would be required.

Beyond this limited statement, however, the evaluation cannot speak to the issue. Although New York and Atlanta did employ a few outstationed regular employees of the existing system, nowhere did the program have the opportunity to test whether it is possible to use outstationed personnel to cover existing responsibilities.*

In the following discussion, we present a framework for assessing costs of CIS as a continuing, year-round program attached to the public school system. We assume a program the size of Smith's: three Families, each with four Caseworkers and initial caseloads of 15 students per Caseworker. We assume that attrition and replacement will leave each Caseworker with a net of "12 student-years" per caseload per year.

The purpose of the exercise is not to describe what CIS cost in the three sites (though our figures are generally consistent with experience) but to permit readers to project what a stable program would cost under varying local conditions. The cost elements are:

1. Caseworker salary and benefits
2. Director's salary and benefits
3. Clerical salary and benefits
4. Other personnel support (e.g., for time of school and service agency liaison, financial monitoring)
5. Teachers' salary and benefits
6. Programmatic activities not covered by donated services and materials
7. Transportation (home visits, transporting students to appointments, etc.)
8. Costs of teaching materials, testing
9. Overhead (office space, utilities, materials)

---

*If we cannot estimate the net costs of a fully implemented CIS, we can at least specify the gross dollar costs. The staff at one of the new sites, Houston, consists almost entirely of outstationed personnel. The experience there may permit some inferences about long-term feasibility of re-placing human services staff in the school.

The assumptions behind the numbers we attach to the cost elements are as follows:

Personnel Costs. These vary widely across the country. Our basic cost calculation assumes $18,000/year in salary and benefits for the Caseworkers, $12,000 for a secretary/assistant, and $24,000 for the Director. These salaries are considerably higher than the ones paid by CIS. They are used on the assumption that professional Caseworkers will be employed (with special training or directly relevant job experience).*

We assume that the program is under the administrative aegis of the school system, and that support of the program will require an aggregate of .5 person-years of various school administrators (Principals, personnel office, etc.) with average salary/benefits of $24,000.

The costs do not assume that the Caseworkers are outstationed from existing agencies. Personnel costs associated with regular staff from those agencies are therefore not projected.

We assume that teacher's of CIS classes will be drawn from the regular staff, will carry a teaching load equivalent to that of other teachers, and that the CIS program will not add to the total classhours that the school would otherwise support. No costs associated with teaching are included in this version.

Costs of Programmatic Activities. It is assumed that the program obtains donations for such items as tickets to events and short-term use of facilities (e.g., a camp, recreation hall). CIS has been successful in this at all sites. A residual out-of-pocket cost of $5 per student per month is added into the total.

Transportation. We have arbitrarily estimated $.22/mile and 100 miles per Caseworker per month.

Teaching materials, testing. It is assumed that CIS provides tutoring materials for the Caseworkers and conducts some special testing for self-evaluation purposes. The budget is calculated at $50 per student per year. This figure is higher than the program has experienced. It is used on the assumption that upgrading the tutoring and self-monitoring aspects of the program is a high priority of CIS, and that past expenditures would have to be augmented.

---

*In view of the evaluation's continuing theme that better Caseworkers are essential, the assumption attempts to set a realistic projected cost for a "CIS that works."

Overhead. The costs of office space and the associated expenses can vary widely. In many high schools with diminishing enrollments, extra space is available at little opportunity cost to the existing plant. At other sites, space might have to be rented from a nearby house (following the Smith model). We use a figure of $750/month in the calculation.

Plugging these assumptions into a budget, we reach the following estimate:

1.	Caseworkers (12)	$216,000
2.	Director	24,000
3.	Clerical	12,000
4.	School personnel	12,000
5.	Programmatic activities	8,640
6.	Transportation	3,168
7.	Teaching materials, testing	7,200
8.	Overhead	9,000
	TOTAL	$292,008

With a net of 12 student-years per caseload, the cost per student per year works out to $2,028.

These figures represent a baseline from which a variety of permutations may be figured. The costs presented above are especially sensitive to:

A continuing role for a national coordinator. If the experience in multiple sites is to be shared, then the costs of maintaining a CIS, Inc. or an analog organization must be factored into the total.

Implementation of special curriculum supplements. If a special educational program were to be installed that required more teachers than the school would ordinarily use, the teachers' salaries and support costs would add to the total.

S.1

Use of outstationed personnel on a large-scale. This option would require the budget to provide for liaison support from the regular social service agencies.

In any option, however, the dominant cost is for the Caseworkers. The price per student swings significantly up and down depending on relatively small changes in the estimated salary of the Caseworkers, or in the size of the Caseload.

Let us assume that the final figure for most configurations will fall between $1,800 and $2,200. Is this amount a large number or a small number?

We have no metric for measuring it. The results from the CIS-that-was do not give us a basis for projecting long-term dollar savings in the kinds of costs that CIS hoped to reduce -- the costs of incarceration, of welfare, and the others associated with dependency. And even under the best of circumstances, we could not calculate the value of the human support that students receive while they are in the program.

The point of the calculation is not to drive decisions about CIS, but to inform them. The calculations of costs versus benefits for CIS depend upon not upon the demonstration effort but upon a prudent projection of what may be expected if the effort is continued. Material for assisting in that assessment is contained in Chapter IV. The figures presented here provide a basis for projecting the likely magnitude of the investment.

Chapter IV.

The Potential of CIS

Let us step back for a minute and put Chapter III in the context of evaluations of other, analogous programs. Suppose that Chapter III were the concluding chapter, and that we were trying to draw lessons from the CIS experience. Without exaggeration, this is what the "lessons" would amount to:

> "We have learned that a program which is in a developmental phase, receives uncoordinated and irregular funding from multiple sources, is constrained to rely heavily on untrained Caseworkers, has limited access to the social service delivery system, and works with adolescents who have a history of severe problems -- such a program is unable to make major headway in solving those problems.
>
> We have also learned that, despite these constraints, the program can achieve a pattern of measurable benefits (Indianapolis, 1978-79). However, this success was not repeated when the staff was reduced and a strike cut two months from the school year."

These findings are not particularly useful. But they are characteristic of evaluations of social action programs. Whether the program has been intended to help disadvantaged students, or welfare recipients, or drug addicts, or juvenile delinquents, the evaluation report has consistently concluded that "it doesn't work." Sometimes the evaluator has gone further, and tried to speculate about the program's potential if it were administered under different circumstances (as we did in both Report No. 2 and Report No. 3). But even in the process of doing so, an element of apology intrudes. Evaluators have been trained that a "dispassionate" assessment consists in taking a program at face value and assessing it relative to its promises, as we have just finished doing in Chapter III.*

In this chapter we take another stance. It consists of two parts. The first part briefly resets the premises of CIS and of the evaluation. The second part examines the CIS experience in terms of the new premises.

"PROBLEM REDUCTION" vs "SOLUTION-BUILDING" IN THE EVALUATION OF CIS

We begin by drawing a distinction between what we shall call the "problem-reduction" and "solution-building" approaches to program development and evaluation.

"Problem-reduction" has been by far the most common of these approaches, and CIS started life as an embodiment of it. So did the evaluation. CIS as a single program was not expected to solve the problem of failing inner-city youth, but it was expected to reduce the problem a bit. It would save at least some of the students who came into its hands, and save enough of them to make the program cost-effective.

Program goals have chronically been established on the basis of this strategy, and the evaluators have followed suit. The "positive changes" that evaluators look for are reductions in the problem that motivated the program -- and reductions are what they fail to find.

The pervasive error has been the premise of sufficiency. CIS, like analogous programs, was funded on the assumption that this particular addition to the existing mix would be enough to produce significant improvements in the status quo. We have become so accustomed to this way of thinking that its unlikely logic has seldom been exposed. While CIS (or something like CIS) may be a necessary condition for progress, the sufficiency premise asserts that, for a significant number of its students, it is the only unmet necessary condition.

---

*Schwarz (1980) characterizes the standard approach as "program devaluation," and describes the dynamics of the evaluation process that make negative results the predictable finding. His article is also the source of the contrast between "problem-reduction" and "solution-building" evaluations. Because Schwarz (the President of AIR) has been AIR's Senior Reviewer for the CIS evaluation, and developed the article in part on the basis of CIS as a case in point, we borrow from his thinking in this chapter without further citation.

One of the senior staff of CIS put it succinctly, when faced with data showing that even the students whose attendance improved dramatically were still failing most of their courses: "We have learned that getting the kids to school doesn't mean that their grades will get better." Seeing it stated explicitly, the natural reaction is "Of course -- we all knew that." But in fact, neither program designers nor evaluators typically take advantage of that knowledge in setting goals and objectives.

To use an analogy: CIS saw itself as baking pies (having major effects on a student's life). The evaluation was seen as counting how many pies were baked. The more accurate view of the situation is that CIS was the flour. An evaluation that counts pies is never going to be in a position to answer the more pertinent questions: How good is the flour? What else is needed to produce the pie?

We propose an alternative to the problem-reduction strategy. We call it a "solution-building" strategy. It assumes that a given program -- CIS in this case -- is one component of the solution to the problem it addresses, and that there may be no visible change in the problem until all or most of the other components are present.

The change posed for the definition of "success" in CIS is substantial. It does not let CIS off the hook for achieving positive outcomes. But it drastically shifts the foci of our attention, and the nature of the proof we are looking for. Under a problem-reduction approach, CIS asserted that

> CIS will significantly raise achievement measures (e.g., attendance, grades, test scores) of a significantly large proportion of its clients.

Under a solution-building approach, the assertion is that

> CIS will significantly improve intermediate performance measures that represent its

> contribution to the eventual solution of the problem.

We have tried to implement the approach by use of the "rationale" as described in Chapter III. The appropriate performance measures are not necessarily the obvious ones such as test scores, but the intermediate outcomes (e.g., increased effort in the classroom) that track whether the program is making progress in terms of the intended sequence of events. Thus, when the Indianapolis program achieved a consistent pattern of improvements in these intermediate outcomes, we were prepared to interpret this as positive and important, regardless of the results on grades and test scores.

But this approach to outcomes does not resolve the diagnostic issue. We know that CIS did achieve a consistent pattern of results in one of its sites. It achieved those results when the program was implemented most fully. From a diagnostic standpoint, this is a generally positive sign that the CIS concept has some validity. But this is not much help to a decision-maker who is faced with a different kind of question. The most useful diagnostic information has nothing to do with CIS as a program, but with lessons that may have been learned about some of the elements of CIS. From this perspective, the question to be answered is:

> Disregarding CIS as a specific program, what elements of CIS might be valuable in dealing with the problems that motivated the program?

The rest of the chapter is devoted to extracting what lessons we can. Some are solidly grounded in the data; some are extrapolated from more isolated cases. We try to be explicit about which are which.

CIS ELEMENTS AS PART OF THE SOLUTION

CIS's truly distinctive theme was the use of small caseloads and intensive personal relationships between service-provider and client. Most high schools have counselors, but they serve large numbers of students and usually respond to specific events. Most social service bureaucracies have some sort of caseload arrangement, but either the caseloads are very large, or they are used only for special cases (e.g., chronic delinquents). CIS was unique in its application of the Caseworker as an all-purpose vehicle for problem-solving. In trying to derive lessons from the CIS experience, our attention shifts to these two sets of issues:

The uses of the personal relationship between Caseworker and student. Is the relationship feasible on a program-wide scale? If so, what kinds of Caseworkers are needed? And, most important, *for what* is the relationship useful? What kinds of *specific* functions can the relationship facilitate?

The appropriate CIS participant. No one proposes to use a CIS-like approach for every student -- it would be prohibitively expensive even if it were useful. Limiting criteria for participation are essential. Who can CIS help? Who can CIS not help? How can the two groups be distinguished?

Personalism and the CIS Structure

The personal, supportive relationship between a student and a specific Caseworker can operate as CIS said it would, and seems to be facilitated by the CIS structure. The figures in Chapter III were based on the total population of Caseworkers, and they disguised the merits of the personal, holistic approach to students among the better Caseworkers. A review of the case files of the students with whom Caseworkers did develop the intended relationship justifies three conclusions.

First, the assignment of the student to a specific person on the basis of *general* evidence of need rather than in reaction to a *specific* event has advantages. In the traditional school policy, a few "Deans" are assigned to take care of disciplinary problems, and they spend their time with the students who come to their attention for a specific event. The event (e.g., a fight) is dealt with. The student is then typically left to his own devices until a new crisis arises. The case histories of CIS students repeatedly show the ups and downs that occur between these episodes. They show also that Caseworkers who are assigned to keep track of the student even when he is not being a visible "problem" can identify dynamics in the student's life -- budding problems in some cases, an upswing in confidence or energy in others.

Second, the small Caseload is a crucial enabling condition. Whether the proper number is 10 or 15 or 20 is unclear. It depends on the students. If a program like CIS restricted itself to only the most difficult cases, then ten is probably the proper size. Caseworkers who had ten such students (and the best Caseworkers tended to get that kind of Caseload) were usually fully occupied keeping abreast of them, including weekend and evening followup. If a program were to take many marginal cases -- students with academic or attendance problems, but not much else -- then the larger Caseload seems feasible. CIS Caseworkers in that situation tended to behave like their counterparts in probation offices and welfare agencies, spending a large majority of their time on a minority of the toughest cases. Whatever the specific number, the fact that Caseworkers were able to give several hours a week, over a long period of time, was said by the Caseworkers to be one of the major advantages of the CIS approach. Further, the students themselves talked about the availability of the Caseworker as one of the common reasons that the CIS people were "different" from other adults, and were accepted as trustworthy.

The "Family" concept (four Caseworkers grouped with their caseloads) has important facilitating virtues. As CIS intended, Caseworkers in the best-run projects did interact regularly in assessing the state of the students, providing each other with an important backstopping resource. We rarely observed the projected scenario -- the exchange of professional expertises -- because so few of the Families were staffed by four professionals with expertises to share. But the mix of sexes and races did permit other perspectives to be voiced. More importantly, the clustering of Caseworkers gave the student an alternative. Matching student with the right Caseworker could not be done with precision before the fact. The Family structure provided an easy way to make corrections as more was learned about the youth's specific personality and needs.

In sum, the structure seems to have been right for facilitating a Caseworker relationship with the student.

The Caseworker

When the relationship was formed as intended, it seems to have had the virtues that CIS ascribed to it. But, as we described in Chapter III, over the whole population of Caseworker/student relationships, a substantial proportion appears to have fallen short of expectations: contact between Caseworker and student consisted of talks about a few specific school performance problems; the Caseworker's knowledge about the student was spotty; when a problem was recognized, it was perceived superficially. Are there structural reasons for this? Is it embedded in the nature of casework? Or could another program based on the CIS model reasonably expect to do better?

In large part, the problems are susceptible to straightforward solutions. As we indicated in Chapters II and III, many of the problems associated with getting good Caseworkers can be explained by the sources of money and the amounts of money that were available. Nonetheless, the CIS experience highlights the importance of using Caseworkers with specialized training and experience. Out of necessity, CIS gave us an opportunity to ask whether amateur Caseworkers can be effective. Judging from the CIS experience, the answer is "No." Three types of problems were exacerbated by the use of Caseworkers with poor qualifications:

The Role Model Function. According to Caseworkers, teachers, and some of the students, a minority of Caseworkers were not positive role models. The complaint that Caseworkers "act like the students" -- as peers -- was frequent. The Caseworker was not someone that the student could treat as a source of guidance, but a friend who had many of the same problems as the student and who validated rather than challenged values that CIS was trying to change. The extreme cases -- open acceptance of drug use and toleration of illegal activity are examples -- were isolated. A more widespread set of examples related to a generally lackadaisical attitude toward the kinds of infractions -- getting in trouble with teachers, absenteeism, quitting a job because it was too much trouble -- that the Caseworker was supposed to discourage.

This was especially troublesome because of the Caseworker's advocacy role. The Caseworker was supposed to see that the student got a fair hearing, without approving of the student's misbehavior. In many instances, teachers complained, the advocacy role overshadowed the role-model function. In one instance, for example, a student who had struck a teacher was defended by the Caseworker against the teacher (in the student's presence) on grounds that sometimes the provocation would justify striking a teacher.

Parents also occasionally had complaints: "I had to ask [the Caseworker] to leave," one reported, "because he did not respect us." Parents and teachers alike commented on Caseworkers' dress and manners.

There is a matter of perspective in assessing these comments. It can be argued that the point of CIS is to establish close relationships with the students, not with other adults, and that the clothes and the talk and the values were exactly what was necessary to obtain that close relationship. But the data do not support the argument: being streetwise, or having that image, was not associated with unusually close relationships with students.

Educational Support. If Caseworkers are to provide educational support, they have to have a command of basic skills. Among Caseworkers with less than a college degree (and even among a few who did have a degree), many were not in a position to give their students much tutoring help, because their own skills were so poor. On occasion, the students themselves noted this fact: "I don't ask X for help in math. He doesn't know it any better than I do." Again, Caseworkers were a source of evidence. Many expressed dismay about some of their colleagues' basic skills (e.g., in writing, mathematics).

In still other instances, the Caseworker's mistake was not a matter of academic skills, but failure to do basic homework about the student and his academic history:

> Ted had a good attendance record but terrible grades. His first Caseworker provided him with intensive tutoring support. Ted finished his first CIS year with greatly improved reading scores and a C+ average. The next year, Ted had a new Caseworker. In interviews in both the fall

> and spring, the new Caseworker claimed that the student was motivated and had no problems with any of his subjects, and therefore was not receiving any tutoring help. In fact, Ted's gradepoint was a full point lower than the year before, and he was telling the interviewer that he was trying as hard, but the courses just seemed to be tougher.

Needs Assessment. The main problem with using amateur Caseworkers stemmed from the complexity of the students' needs. The CIS experience illustrates vividly that a program which tries to deal with the most difficult students ends up with cases that call for judgments about very sensitive issues. The case files reveal numerous examples of Caseworkers who had questionable judgment in such instances. Note that "questionable" is the operative word. We have no third-party, objective assessment against which to judge the Caseworker's behavior. The accounts we cited in Report No. 2 (pp. 114-122) provide some detailed examples. The subsequent data collection continued to show similar patterns. For example:

> Patricia tried to commit suicide and almost succeeded; she had to be hospitalized for two weeks. The Caseworker visited her often and tried to talk her out of her depression. Patricia continued to have behavior problems, and an attempt was made to arrange for psychological testing. The attempt failed, because the family did not qualify for public assistance. During the next school year, the school counselors again tried to set up psychological testing. But, the Caseworker said, "I told the counselors that Patricia doesn't need the testing. She has been consistent in improving her grades and attendance."

This is the kind of account that we label as "questionable judgment." In this particular instance, it is compounded by an inaccuracy: Patricia's grades and attendance did not go up during the second year; they went down.

Sometimes, the problem of judgment seemed to be more one of carelessness:

> Lucy's Caseworker took her to the bowling alley with some other students. She had been especially withdrawn, and had never participated in such activities, so the Caseworker had made a special effort to get her to attend. The Caseworker picked her up for the trip to the bowling alley, but at the end of the evening left her to find her own way home. Lucy finally had to walk. Her parents were furious, and refuse to let Lucy participate in any more CIS activities.

Such instances were not isolated. Many of the students in CIS had complex problems. How does one appropriately deal with an attempted suicide? Or with suspected sexual abuse at home? Or with extreme withdrawal? There are no prescriptions; the state of the art in counseling leaves much to be desired; but the choices and the possibilities are much greater than many of the Caseworkers appeared to recognize.

Often the symptoms were inconspicuous ones. The case histories frequently contained clues that are impossible to interpret at long distance, but which clearly need interpreting by the Caseworker on the scene. The case of Mark is illustrative:

> Mark lives with his mother and six sisters in a housing project. He is one of the better students in CIS. He attends school regularly and he never gets in trouble in class. He fails many courses, however, which is the problem that originally qualified him for CIS.
>
> Evidence started to accumulate that Mark lives in a fantasy world, believing that he attended a carpentry school during the summer, and talking about a close relationship with his father (who lives in another city). Mark also refused to eat lunch in the cafeteria, and told the Caseworker he was in CIS because he was crazy.

> All this was reported by the Caseworker. The Caseworker's response to the problem was to try to shower Mark with attention and "attempt to draw him out." After the second year in CIS, the Caseworker recommended that Mark did not need CIS the next year because CIS "had broadened his horizons" -- even though the fantasizing and the fear of the cafeteria continued.

Judging from the record as presented by the Caseworker, some professional psychological evaluation might have been appropriate.

This discussion does not argue that all Caseworkers should hold advanced degrees. There is clearly a role for training and staff development. The value of Caseworkers who have street wisdom is not disputed. Perhaps simply a stronger admixture of trained personnel would provide the needed technical buttressing for those with little training. But if there is a single area in which a CIS-like program should focus its energies, it is in a careful selection and training of the Caseworkers, and in expeditiously weeding out the mistakes.

The Uses and Limits of Personalism

CIS's strongest argument for its approach may well be the potential it offers for making good on other inputs. Some illustrative examples from the case files:

- The orientation class is having a section on different types of careers; the Caseworker uses this as a basis for discussions with the student about his interests, which leads into discussions about the training possibilities following high school.

- A special reading curriculum is available, but the student tries to avoid it. The Caseworker uses her friendship with the student to get him to take the class, and gives him supplementary tutoring help.

- The student has a medical problem, but keeps skipping the appointments with the physician. The Caseworker takes the student to the next appointment.

- A student gets a summer job through a CIS-sponsored program. The Caseworker briefs the employer ahead of time, visits the job site regularly, and keeps the student on the job.

In each instance, the Caseworker was not the provider of the service. The Caseworker was the supplementary resource who took advantage of the personal relationship with the youth. An examination of the case histories suggests that CIS was most successful when its Caseworkers were charged with this kind of specific, goal-oriented task. Rather than a diffuse charge to determine the student's needs and respond to them, the Caseworker had a concrete mandate: "The members of your caseload are enrolled in the remedial reading course. They will be pretested and posttested. We will be monitoring the progress of your caseload. Make sure that they get tutoring." In such instances, the Caseworker had something to *do*, on which it was reasonable to expect some closure. The same specificity applied to the mandate to track attendance and grades, and accounts for the generally intensive efforts that Caseworkers made to get the students to school.

The specificity of the task facilitated the student's response. To do the things necessary to improve a grade-point average, the student had to make a global change in his stance toward school. But to attend tutoring sessions or get a physical examination called for a more limited compliance with the Caseworker's request, and this much seemed to be possible.

The students' statements do not directly address the role of the personal relationship in facilitating the compliance. Only rarely did a student say things like, "I wouldn't do this for anybody but my Caseworker." But statements about the Caseworkers being "different" from the teachers were common. "They really care," and variants on that theme, were voiced by many. Others, when asked for an open-ended response to "What did you get out of the program," talked about the Caseworker's persistence in getting them to come to school. More directly, students who enjoyed close relationships with the Caseworker would state that "I can talk to X like I can't with other people." These types of responses, plus the behavioral evidence of close relationships (e.g., hanging around the offices to talk to the Caseworker) are indirect evidence of the proposition that CIS has always advanced: The personal relationship enables other things to occur.

The case histories are much less supportive of the proposition that the Caseworker can often have a generalized impact on the student, independent of specific services and specific objectives. We will touch on this issue at more length in the following paragraphs.

Who Should be in CIS?

During the course of the evaluation, the projects at Smith, Arsenal Tech, and Julia Richman gave us an opportunity to watch how CIS works for a varied population of students: poverty-stricken and middle-class, withdrawn and acting out; hyperactive and lethargic; from southern rural, Appalachian, and urban ghetto backgrounds; black, white, and Hispanic. The problems covered the range. Single-parent and no-parent homes were common, compounded by specific problems that included physical abuse, pregnancy, psychological disturbances, and incest. There was in addition a substantial minority that seemed to be slow learners, with no other discernible problem.

Given this mixture, what inferences can be drawn about which students profit most from the CIS approach?* We stress the inferential aspect: We do not have a large enough sample to test statistical relationships. And in the qualitative analysis, we must assume that our knowledge of the "real" home and personal situation is imperfect.

---

*Given enough variance in the outcome measures, a quantitative supplement to this analysis would have been included, using regression approaches to examine the roles of background variables in facilitating success. The actual distributions contained such a small proportion at the plus side of the range that such analyses were inappropriate. The noise from the "no change" and "negative change" subpopulations dominated the results.

The conclusion that seems most solidly grounded in the case histories is pessimistic: CIS did not demonstrate that its approach can permanently affect the subpopulation of youths with the most severe problems. Some examples of what we mean by "most severe problems":

- Student is in the middle of a bitter custody struggle. Is shifted from home to home. Has been a victim of prolonged neglect and physical abuse.
- Student is disfigured; may be one source of another problem, extreme emotional insecurity. Is on probation for selling drugs. Is suspected of theft and burglary.
- Student is the mother of two children. Lives with stepfather, who is unemployed and an alcoholic. May have been victim of sexual abuse by stepfather. Usually very withdrawn and sullen; sometimes suddenly aggressive. Functionally illiterate.
- Student has history of medical problems, is physically weak. History of violent behavior toward peers. Has run away from home. Once attempted suicide because of fear she was pregnant.

In assessing CIS's ability to deal with these severely disabled students, our pessimism does not derive from an inability of CIS Caseworkers to establish contact with these students. Some of CIS's most impressive successes were in the relationships that Caseworkers were able to develop with students who had been unreachable. The conclusion is based rather on a consistent pattern in the assessment of results by Caseworkers and students, and in objective indicators: no source of evidence indicates that CIS achieves more than temporary improvements. Take, for example, one of the hardest of the hard-core cases:

> Justin is a repeated runaway with a history of dealing drugs and violent behavior. He lives with his grandparents and siblings in an unsupervised environment. His long list

> of problems includes school suspensions (once for pulling a gun on another student), two stints on probation, and various altercations with a girl friend over a child he fathered. He seldom attended school and was failing all his courses when he came into CIS. His Caseworker worked intensively during the school year, giving Justin individual attention in class, setting up regular tutoring sessions with the reading teacher, and persuading Justin to join in the programmatic activities offered by the program. They would talk daily (when Justin came to school). The Caseworker was able to set up periodic sessions with a professional counselor.
>
> When Justin was interviewed at the end of his first year in CIS, he was emphatic about the respect and love -- his word -- that he felt for the Caseworker. He said he was trying to improve his attendance, and attributed his efforts directly to his desire to please the Caseworker. He also said he had enjoyed the activities and appreciated the tutoring -- "I feel like I have learned something for the first time."
>
> In terms of actual attendance and grades, no improvement was observed. In November of the next school year, Justin dropped out.

At the end of his first year in the program, Justin exemplified the "investment" stage of progress. Improvements were not apparent in terms of the hard indicators; the evidence did indicate, however, that the first elements of progress were being achieved. Similar, less dramatic stories were frequent, with progress being described in terms of improved motivation, increased commitment to change, or more peaceful relations with peers. A typical accomplishment might be described as,

> "For the first six months, Anthony wouldn't even talk to me. Finally he did, and at the end of the year he was starting to come over to the [CIS] office on his own."

Beyond this type of gain, Caseworkers very seldom claimed that significant gains had been made among the hard-core problem cases. Among that small set, it turned out that most had subsequently dropped out of school, or had regressed in the next year. The number of cases in which progress was claimed with no contradictory indications from other data sources was extremely small.*

It should be emphasized that these remarks focus on visible results. Embedded in those cases is a good-in-itself that has an unknown value: youths who were experiencing extraordinarily disabling circumstances had a friendship with the Caseworker that was acknowledged to be positive, caring, and supportive. We do not undervalue that accomplishment. Our conclusion is more limited: in these most difficult cases, visible, behavioral gains were typically short-term, and did not survive the evaluation's period of observation.

It is at this point, however, that CIS did give evidence that it could make good on its referral function when it had Caseworkers who were either directly seconded by the social service agencies, or when the Caseworker realized that the problem was beyond the capacity of the program to handle. In Atlanta, where a regular staff member of the Department of Children and Family Services was assigned to CIS, Caseworkers throughout the program called on her to help cut red tape, or for consultation about how to get help. From New York came this example of the referral role combined with CIS's standard counseling functions:

---

*Some explanation for this generalization is appropriate. In addition to the standard interview and archival material, we asked Caseworkers to nominate cases that they considered to be successes. Independently of those nominations, the evaluation staff rated each of the cases in the interview sample (see footnote on page 39). This produced a list of nominated successes. We then examined both the qualitative and archival material on these cases. The statements in this discussion refer to the cases rated as having a "severe" problem as described on page 39, and derive from (1) the very rare occasions when these files contained even unsubstantiated claims descriptions of progress, and (2) the additional attrition in our candidates when face-valid contradictory evidence (e.g., dropout, incarceration) emerged from the archival data.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

> Jacob lives with a "Grandfather" who is really his father and a "sister" who is really his mother, and who deals drugs. Jacob loves school, and could cope with it well enough to reach high school. But his behavior has always been strange enough to get him the reputation of "the crazy kid" around the neighborhood. CIS was a delight for Jacob. He hung around the office, and the Caseworker became his buddy. The Caseworker also tried to counsel Jacob, visited the home, and eventually obtained psychological counseling for him. When it became evident that Jacob would require institutional help, the Caseworker began the search for an available slot. That took time, however, and it was not until almost a year later that it was possible to place him. In the meantime, the Caseworker reported, other CIS students became protective of Jacob, shielding him from the "crazy kid" taunts that the rest of the school picked up.

CIS can persuasively argue that without CIS, Jacob would have slipped between the cracks of the social service bureaucracies. Certainly he had done so for many years before CIS took him. Perhaps as important, CIS provided for him an interim home that provided him with support and comfort.

With the severely disabled students, then, there seems to be room for the referral function. But it is not clear that the referrals resulted in long-term gains. And the evidence that CIS can work effectively *in tandem with* these supplementary services and have a synergistic effect is fragmentary.

We have been asking, "What can a CIS-like program contribute to the mix of inputs that will make inner-city schools work." In the case of these most drastically disadvantaged students, the CIS approach has the capacity to establish a supportive relationship. It is much harder to infer from the record what might be done -- added to the mix -- that will yield the desired gains for the CIS population.

A second group of students seemed impervious to help from another direction. These consisted of students who had poor grades and attendance, poor motivation, but were otherwise unexceptional. They had apparently normal family situations, were neither withdrawn nor behavioral problems. They were not in trouble with the law. They did not show signs of untapped abilities. They were, in short, slow learners. A member of this subgroup typically did not have an especially close relationship with the Caseworker, even when we limited the review to Caseworkers who were known to have been successful in establishing close relationships with other members of their caseloads. With this set of students, the conclusion is 180 degrees opposite that for the drastically disadvantaged. It is easy to infer that these students need some combination of remedial education inputs; it is less easy to argue that the CIS caseload approach is an essential part of the mix.*

The CIS success stories do not neatly fall into categories. Among those who were neither drastically disadvantaged nor simple "slow learners," there was a large random element: when the Caseworker was competent and tried hard, results were sometimes reported and sometimes not. Sometimes the Caseworker saw progress when the student did not. Sometimes the archives revealed improvements in attendance or grades, while the Caseworker did not claim they were the result of CIS. Sometimes the student reported that the program had been helpful in getting him through school, while neither the Caseworker nor the archival record indicated progress. Taken as a whole, however, three types of students may be especially susceptible to the kind of help that CIS offers. We discuss them with the understanding that we are extrapolating from relatively few cases.

The first category consists of students who have problems, but who also have supports from home. The problem with this set of cases is that one of two things might be happening. Perhaps CIS was working in tandem with the parents, accomplishing together what the parents could not do alone. The other possibility is that these cases represent instances in which the student was going to improve anyway, and CIS's presence was superfluous. This example conveys the nature of the ambiguity. When we start with the statement of the problem and the change, it looks like a clear CIS success story:

---

*If CIS were to exclude the students whose only visible problem was slow learning, it would have the side-benefit of diminishing CIS's reputation as being a "program for dumb kids," which was a problem at all three sites, especially at Tech. In the open-ended answers to the question, "What do your friends outside the program think about it?", the "It's for dumb kids" theme was recurrent.

> Ronald's reading jumped four grade levels during his first year in the program, from 2nd to 6th grade. His grades were excellent--5 As and 3 Bs in the last 6-week period--and much better than in any school he had attended previously. The parents and Caseworker alike observed that the student was very withdrawn at the beginning of the school year, whereas now he contributes regularly during classes and seems proud of it. An evaluation observer confirms his present behavior -- Ronald was the only one who was participating in a Junior Achiever class session. Ronald himself attributes his improved academic performance to the greater help he gets at Tech, from the CIS staff, and a more relaxed atmosphere.
>
> Further, these outcomes are occurring in the context of being the youngest of five children, in a family that has never graduated any of its members from high school.

When the description shifts to Ronald's home life, the role of CIS becomes less clear:

> The family is an unusually strong, supportive one. As Ronald told it, the father is a hard worker who tries to give his children everything they need. They built a fishing boat together last summer. Mom likes to do ceramics; he and she work on hobbies together. Together, the family has done a lot of work on their house -- paneling, carpeting, insulation, a complete renovation of the kitchen. Ronald feels he

> has learned a lot by this and is proud of his accomplishments. Being the youngest is an advantage--you can see what your brothers have done and learn from their experiences.
>
> So he does not participate in the programmatic activities at Tech; he would rather go home. He sees the Caseworker as a friend, and feels comfortable talking to her. But if he has a personal problem he talks to his parents about it. The Caseworker is fine, but she's not family.

Of the examples of this type, we have found it impossible to disentangle the relative contributions of the home supports and CIS. But it would be consistent with the experiences of parents and adolescents everywhere that adolescents do not always turn out right just because the parents are good parents. Additional supports are often needed to fill in the gaps.

CIS had the capacity to perform this supportive role in family settings that were much less secure than Ronald's. Successes were observed in family settings that were were single-parent, poor, or with other severe disadvantages. The key seemed to be whether there was at least one parent who was providing love, attention, and discipline, and was determined that the child succeed. Arthur, one of the most clear-cut success stories in the case files, is an example:

> Arthur's father is in prison. He lives with his stepmother and several of his own siblings and step-siblings. The apartment is located at the streetcorner that is the drug dealing center of the city.
>
> In the year befor[illegible]ining CIS, Arthur missed 55 days o[illegible]ol. When he did attend, he got in fights. He was on probation for vandalism, and extorted lunch money from the younger students on their way to school. As the Caseworker noted, Arthur was mean.
>
> The only visible asset in Arthur's environment was his stepmother. The Caseworker

> reported that she was a strong personality, who had managed to make a close family out of the assorted children in her care. She was deeply concerned about Arthur's behavior and school performance.
>
> The Caseworker provided intensive counseling and academic help. Arthur's stepmother and the Caseworker collaborated in checking on his homework, and in tracking whether he got to school after leaving from home. They surrounded him.
>
> During the second term in CIS, Arthur's attendance improved dramatically, to near-zero absences. He stopped fighting. He stopped stealing lunch money. He started passing his courses.
>
> The improvement continued throughout the second year in CIS. By the last interview, he was making plans to become a veterinarian. From the interviewers notes: "Arthur said he had learned more because while in the regular classroom the teacher will not take time to help you, CIS staff will.... 'It [CIS] is all about caring, one big family that is helping me push myself forward, showing me the right thing to do.'"

The combination of the supportive parent and the Caseworker seemed to be the key ingredient in these stories. Parents who were interviewed, especially single parents who had a fulltime job, consistently saw themselves in need of support -- they had the motivation, but not the time, to look after the problems that had put their child in CIS. Further, the comments of the parents often explicitly gave the credit for improvements to CIS. These are the remarks of Arthur's stepmother as noted by the interviewer:

> Arthur wouldn't have made it in the regular school. [CIS] has enabled Arthur to think about things that aren't offered in life for him, and about what he would like to do when he completes high school. He isn't as mean as he once was and is more respon-

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

> sible. The program has affected the whole family because the other children talk about how Arthur has progressed. It [CIS] has helped all members of the family to communicate with each other.

The second category of CIS successes involved students who already were showing signs of motivation, but who faced a discrete, concrete, fixable problem that CIS could solve -- or at least reduce. This type of student is very close to the one that was most often described in CIS's descriptions: the girl who is missing school because she has to take care of her little brother; or the one who has to work full-time because the family is not getting AFDC assistance; or the student who had a chronic undiagnosed medical problem.

Sometimes the problem was not only a physical or economic one; CIS also was able to deal with a sudden, crisis situation -- the death of a parent, or desertion by a parent. The common denominators in the cases we group under this category were that the problem was in some sense "delimited," and that the student had visible assets of motivation, and receptivity to help.

The nature of "success" in these cases was less often a dramatic turnaround (often the students were doing reasonably well already), but rather that the student maintained the status quo in an situation that could have been expected to be disabling:

> Alice was referred to CIS because of a sudden drop in attendance and grades, after a history of normal school performance. It turned out that she had become extremely upset by her father's death, and feared that her mother would die as well.
>
> The Caseworker focused her counseling on the grief and fear triggered by the father's death. After several months of intensive interaction, attendance and grades returned to normal and remained there during the second year of observation.

Perhaps the specificity of the problem is less important than the level of the student's motivation.

The following is an example of CIS apparently working with both a generalized and a specific problem:

> John had been living in a loosely supervised environment for several years. His mother was an alcoholic and spent most of her time with boyfriends. He took to CIS very quickly. He liked the programmatic activities and liked the Caseworker. John had no major behavioral problems other than skipping school. The Caseworker continued to track him down when he skipped, and John's attendance improved substantially.
>
> Shortly after these improvements had seemed to stabilize, John's mother left town abruptly. The Caseworker provided immediate temporary housing for John, then helped arrange for John's grandmother to take him in. As of the end of observation, John was continuing to attend school regularly.

CIS's accomplishments in this case followed the intention of the program very closely: The Caseworker was on hand at the time the problem arose, and could move quickly to avert a potentially crisis situation. In such cases, the merits of the ongoing relationship and the daily contact that the CIS approach provides are apparent -- there was no need to wait for John to think of approaching his grandmother, or for a social service caseworker to become aware that John was on the streets.

The third of these overlapping categories consists of students who probably "should not" be in the program in the first place. That is, their problems are said to be minor: the parents are not an active problem, but not very supportive either; grades and attendance are not good, but not failing; there are no overt behavioral problems. In some of these cases, CIS seems to have given the necessary nudge. The most common pattern was that CIS was instrumental in giving the student career aspirations:

- The tenth grader whose Caseworker got her interested in cosmetology, and who raised her grades to get into a cosmetology school.

- The student could barely cope with his academic courses, but could draw, and whose Caseworker then laid out a program that put the student into vocational training for draftsmen.

- The student who worked as a volunteer at a hospital through one of CIS's programs, and subsequently improved both attendance and grades in an effort to get into nursing school.

There is, of course, a problem in interpreting these examples. Wouldn't the student have stumbled onto some other aspiration and reacted the same way, because of some other event if CIS weren't there? But if the question is the potential of CIS, it seems fair to conclude that the traditional "mentor" function is one that CIS can play. Among the students that CIS takes, it also seems fair to say that very few other adults in the school have the time, or in some cases the interest, to perform this function.

Who belongs in CIS? If the question is put in terms of, "Who is most likely to benefit?" the answer that emerges from the examples of success seems to be: students who come to the program with at least some sort of asset. The asset can be a strong parent, or the student's existing motivation. It can be a combination of minor assets -- a little motivation, reasonable levels of academic achievement, and no major deficits. The student without any visible assets -- with problems at home, no signs of self-starting, behavioral problems, few basic academic skills -- may be retrievable, but not by CIS alone.

114

Chapter V.

Conclusions

The final step in any evaluation is to try to synthesize the evidence that was assembled, to make one or more summative statements about the program's value. In the case of CIS, this can be done at several levels. If the summative question is the simplest one,

> "Is the program as it exists a good investment of public funds?"

the answer from the three sites that we examined is "no." In one year, in one site (Indianapolis in 1978-79), the program could point to evidence of a pattern of positive results. Elsewhere, and in other years, the program did not demonstrably affect the behavior of large numbers of its participants. The best that can be argued from the record is that perhaps things would have been even worse without CIS. Lacking adequate comparison groups, that possibility remains open. The data that bear on the issue cast doubt on that proposition.

At the next level, the question becomes,

> "Can the factors that limited the program's effectiveness be corrected?"

Three types of impediments limited CIS's results: The way the program was funded and structured by its sponsors, the way the program was run by its administrators, and the responses of local agencies and school systems.

Of these three, the dominant factor was the funding arrangements. Even if the other problems had not existed, the program's ability to implement the planned CIS would have been crippled. The most important impediments were:

- The multiplicity of funding agencies. Each had its own agenda and its own requirements.

- The fragility of the funding. Caseworkers typically could be guaranteed only nine months work -- sometimes not that. Plans for allocation of resources could not be made more than a few months in advance. Even funds that were contractually obligated were chronically late, forcing a series of financial crises on the program.

- The requirements of the funding. Sometimes the money could be obtained only by doing things that were guaranteed to create problems. Title XX money could be used only if the student met certain economic criteria -- but meeting those criteria did not guarantee that the student was one who needed, or could benefit from, CIS. CETA lines used for hiring Caseworkers forced the program to choose from a poorly qualified pool of applicants.

- The level of the funding. The salaries that CIS paid for the Caseworkers it hired could not compete with those in the schools or other public service agencies.

The implied changes are not exotic. They are ones that would put a CIS-like program on the same financial and managerial footing as the typical established service agency. If they are made, it is reasonable to expect that they would enable the program to make major improvements in its staff, its long-range planning, and its monitoring.

The second factor was the internal administration of CIS. Early in the program's history, it was a major factor. At the time Report No. 2 was written (spring, 1979), the critics of the program's administration were numerous and vocal (see Report No. 2, Chapter 5). On this count, however, changes have occurred. We cannot know the effects of the extensive administrative renovations that have occurred -- most of them began well into the last year of observation. But, in any event, the question at issue is not whether CIS, Inc. has become an efficient, businesslike operation, but whether it is reasonable to expect that a CIS-like program could be designed to run that way. Nothing in the early criticisms of CIS suggests otherwise. The problems were managerial, with managerial solutions of the kind that CIS is now trying to implement. There was no inherent conflict between them and the CIS approach.

The third source of limitations to the program's effectiveness was the stance of other social service agencies and of the school systems. In CIS's calculations, these have loomed as large as the funding problems. Strategies for encouraging agency cooperation and developing workable relationships with the school systems have been complex and changing. CIS identifies many of its problems with the compromises that have been necessary to gain access to the demonstration sites. Earlier reports of the evaluation have focused on this aspect of CIS's experience. But our reading of the evidence is that many of these problems have been functions of the way CIS has been funded and managed. By and large, the complaints voiced by other elements in the social service system have been accurate ones, grounded in legitimate considerations. Given stable financing and management, the source of many of these doubts would be eliminated. If the question is, "Can the human services delivery system be reconfigured in the way that CIS originally envisioned?," then the jury is still out. But the limiting factors in the CIS experience that we evaluated were primarily grounded in the funding arrangements and CIS's own administrative choices.

In sum: Most of the major limiting factors that we observed seem to be fixable. The fixes do not depend on charismatic leadership, drastic modifications in the basic CIS approach, or complex systems. Specifically, we identify five basic conditions that could be met by a CIS-like program and that are fundamental. These conditions would ensure that a CIS-like program could:

- have an assured budget, and funds that arrive on time;
- offer year-round positions for a period of more than one year;

- hire its workers from the general pool of social service workers, remedial educators, and other types of youth workers;
- sustain the caseload contact over the summer; and
- choose its students solely on criteria of need.

Given a CIS that meets these conditions, we now ask,

> "If these changes are made, will the resulting program yield the desired benefits?"

The answer has two parts. One relates to the services that the program provides. The other relates to the behavioral impact of the program on its clients.

Effects on Services. Taking the record as a whole, the data support these positive statements about the CIS approach:

- At its best, the student's relationship with the Caseworker was a close, confidential, supportive one, often the only such relationship with an adult.
- CIS demonstrated its capacity to develop these relationships with students who are believed to be the most difficult to reach.
- Even when the relationships were more superficial, the small caseload and the Caseworker's location in the school facilitated knowledge of the student that very few teachers could match and an availability to help that centrally located service workers could not match.
- CIS demonstrated that the school location and daily presence can facilitate screenings for service needs (e.g., medical examinations, checks on basic welfare needs) that would not have occurred otherwise.

- Through its programmatic activities, CIS provided opportunities for social and cultural developmental experiences that would not have occurred otherwise.

On the negative side, there was really only one major finding:

- These positive things could have happened more often and more consistently.

The critical evidence cited in Chapters III and IV was almost exlusively about failures to do good, not about negative results. The criticism was that some Caseworkers failed to learn enough about the student's needs, not that anyone else knew more; that sometimes Caseworkers failed to provide services, not that anyone else would have provided them otherwise; that some Caseworkers were poorly qualified, not that a qualified alternative was standing by.

The only evidence of outcomes that were truly negative -- that the program made the students worse off than they would have been without CIS -- was skimpy. There were reports, mostly from one site, of negative labeling ("CIS is a program for dumb kids"), a handful of instances in which the Caseworker's actions were probably worse than doing nothing -- and that is about all.

Given this situation, CIS (or an analogue) is not in the position of having to alter the programmatic directions of its efforts. It has only to do more often what it already knows how to do. And the ways to do that -- get good Caseworkers and manage them effectively -- are the purpose of the fixes. It seems reasonable to predict that their effects would be to increase substantially the level of the "input" that has been CIS's most attractive feature.

We add two important cautions. First, the size of the program is likely to be an important factor. If a program is the size of the one at Smith -- about 120 students with about 12 Caseworkers -- the program should be able to recruit enough people with the qualities that are required in a Caseworker. It is much less clear that enough of the right people can be found to staff a program that tries to maintain several hundred students on caseloads.

Second, the fixes that were listed above are to some extent at odds with one of CIS's major objectives: to staff itself with outstationed staff from other human service agencies. CIS reports that some of its best results are emerging from a program that has done just that (in Houston). We simply note here that the task of selecting the right Caseworkers is central to improving CIS's inputs, and that this is inherently more difficult to the extent that the selection of Caseworkers is taken out of the program's hands.

Nonetheless, the essence of our conclusions about CIS's inputs is that (1) CIS demonstrated that they were feasible, and (2) some straightforward changes in staffing and management could be expected to increase their consistency and intensity across all participating students.

Increasing the Program's Impact. Would these changes produce the kinds of effects that the program hoped to see -- improved attendance, improved academic performance, and, in the long run, an improved chance to make good as an adult?

Our data permit us to say very little. The pattern of improvements that was observed at Tech in 1978-79 occurred when the program was also being most fully, faithfully implemented. To this extent, it is reasonable to expect that results on the outcome measures will follow from better program content.

Other results are less encouraging. CIS when implemented as planned constituted an unusually intensive "treatment." Most remedial programs for the kinds of youths that CIS served last for weeks or months, not years, and the level of contact is usually measured in number of contacts per month, not number of contacts per day. CIS was correct in pointing to its unique characteristics, and this uniqueness did give some cause for hoping that, for once, dramatic results might be obtained.

It was this highly concentrated effort that prompted one observer to remark at the outset of the evaluation that the most provocative finding about CIS would not be if it was implemented as planned and found to work, but if it was implemented as planned -- and failed. In this context, one of the findings of the evaluation that cannot be ignored is that even when everything went right, there was very seldom a visible effect. The Caseworker would be capable, energetic, determined. The needed services would be found. A close personal relationship would be developed. The student would tell the interviewer that the Caseworker was the one person who understood him, that CIS was one of the best things that had happened to him, that he was learning more than ever before, seeing new possibilities for the future -- and then the records would show that he was becoming more truant, or more truculent, or more delinquent.

The data from the Indianapolis experience suggest that evidence of more progress will be forthcoming if the input side of CIS is improved. The data from the individual case histories suggest that the progress will probably be concentrated among the students who already have the most going for them. It is not at all clear that CIS is an answer for any appreciable number of the worst-of-the-worst among the nation's problem youth.

Perhaps the best way to close is with a true case that captures the ambivalence that has characterized this evaluation. It was drawn from the Indianapolis sample:

> Mary lives with her mother and two brothers. One of the brothers is a problem: he beats up on Mary and "tears up the house" (five times this year alone). Twice, he has pulled a gun on Mary. He has dragged the mother down the stairs. Mary wants someone to check the brother. The mother will not do anything about it; she is afraid of him. Mary tends to be sickly, and miss school. This is exacerbated because the mother keeps her home from school for any excuse. The family has a long tradition of not finishing high school (Mary would be the first in her family to do so), and the Caseworker can cite instances that suggest resentment at the idea of Mary breaking that tradition.
>
> When Mary joined CIS, she was absent most of the first term. The Caseworker kept working with her, however, and there was a dramatic turnaround in the second term. Absences went to zero, and Mary started

> making A's and B's. As far as the Caseworker can figure it out, Mary had always had the intelligence and the ambition, but she had been taught that she was not supposed to succeed, and CIS's contribution was to tell her that it was not only possible to succeed, but a good thing to do. The mother continued to be obstructive (e.g., by cancelling permission for Mary to go on an activity at the last second), but at the end of the 1978-79 school year, Mary had gone from a failure to an unequivocal success -- by her testimony, by the Caseworker's, and by the records.
>
> During the summer, there was no CIS program. Then the strike kept Mary away for another two months. When school returned to normal in late October, she had relapsed. Her mother continued to keep her home under any pretext. Mary's new Caseworker had no more luck than the preceding one in getting through to the mother. And Mary herself was seen by the Caseworker as listless and lacking motivation. The grades dropped back to D's and F's. Absences went back to the levels of her pre-CIS years.

Thus the choice in assessing the potential of CIS: The program achieved what could have been a decisive change in the trajectory of this girl's life. "She says she knows what she wants to do now," wrote the interviewer in the spring of 1979, "and regrets the time she has already wasted in achieving her goals." She was going to be the first in her family to graduate, the first to have a skilled job. She was proud of being on the honor roll, proud of getting an A in a class she had flunked the previous term. And it came to nothing.

The "what ifs" are many. What if, for example, a program did not drop the student for 3 months during the summer (5 months in this case, because of the strike)? What if the same Caseworker had been available in the second year? What if, once she came to school, she had been fed into a curriculum that excited her? What if the Caseworker, who made only two home visits (and was openly resented by the mother) had been trained to deal with a hostile situation, and had been able to get through to the mother?

Nobody can be sure that any of the "what ifs" would have retrieved the situation. But the "what ifs" are plausible. There is no sense of inevitability in the history of CIS.

The data for this evaluation support all three of these statements: CIS as a whole did not achieve its objectives. CIS under certain circumstances did achieve many of its objectives. CIS was implemented in ways that demonstrably diminished the impact that was possible.

Those capsule conclusions do not constitute a prescription for policy decisions. Our own view after three years of watching and evaluating CIS is that more is known now about how to make a CIS-like program work than was known before. That increased knowledge ought to be built upon. Some of the fixes suggested by the evaluation ought to be tried. And if that is done, it is probable that the process will have to go through yet another iteration, and perhaps a third, fourth, or eighth. Each time, it is reasonable to expect that more will be accomplished, more efficiently.

This is not, of course, the way things are done. It is more likely, given the history of other programs, that CIS will be tossed aside -- not just CIS, Inc., the organization and the specific program it developed, but the special ideas it contributed and the steps forward that it took. Soon, another solution will spring up. It will be given a shot, of sorts, found not to be The Solution after all, and discarded.

Let us pose this choice. On the one hand, it may be decided that inner-city schools are never going to work until fundamental changes take place in the communities that surround them. The problems are too great, the competing influences are too strong. The best we can do is take the few students who somehow have resisted the influences, and educate them.

Or, we may start by trying to visualize an inner-city school that does work, and trace our way backwards to what must be part of that success. A good curriculum will be a component -- a curriculum that can successfully be taught to this particular set of students. Good teachers will be a component, ones who have the training and are given the administrative support necessary to teach effectively, and to govern their classrooms. But in visualizing the inner-city school that works, it also seems inevitable that there will be some sort of additional component to provide one-on-one, continuing support to students who are facing special impediments. It will have to be something more than can be provided by counselors who have school-wide responsibilities. A caseload arrangement will probably be necessary. The counselors will have to have access to noneducational resources, because so many of the impediments will call for noneducational solutions. And probably it will be helpful if these counselors have an identity that sets them apart from the academic staff, to facilitate their mandate to look at the youngster as a whole person, not just as a student.

We do not reject the first choice out-of-hand. The data collected for this evaluation by no means promise that there are solutions. Maybe nothing will work by the time that adolescence is reached, and programs will have to focus on the earlier years. But if the choice is to keep trying, then the lesson of the CIS evaluation is not to toss CIS aside and hope for something better. The more reasonable assumption is that "an inner-city school that works" will include as part of its resources something very like CIS, and that the most economical way to reach that goal is to build on the start that CIS has made.

Appendix A.
Commentary by CIS

For the past three and a half years Cities in Schools has been evaluated by AIR. Much as a pediatrician would do an initial assessment on an infant, identify key variables to check regularly, and followup through childhood, so AIR set up its initial research/monitoring design and followed it for the three years of CIS' infancy. Also, much as the pediatrician would confer with the mother and both adjust their input so the child would grow healthy and strong, so have AIR and CIS staff progressed through CIS' infancy - AIR providing feedback at key checkpoints and CIS staff adjusting conditions where indicated to facilitate growth and development. It has been an "interactive" relationship between evaluators and evaluatees. AIR was the objective pediatric evaluator of growth and progress, CIS staff were the nurturing parents.

Sincere and deep appreciation is given to Charlie Murray and Cherry Bourque of AIR, who worked so closely with us in the evaluation. They made every effort to assist us in our internal program assessment, identifying areas of concern and areas of success. We didn't always agree and argued vigorously at times. On one key issue in particular, however, we did agree--that at the end of the three-year AIR evaluation the program was just at the beginning point of being ready to be thoroughly evaluated! The infant was now on its feet, ready for the first road race, and the race was over. There are three areas, in particular, in which CIS felt the evaluation did not give a true or complete picture of the program.

First, there were some very important variables on which AIR and CIS remained in disagreement after the 3-year evaluation. Second, there were some very important variables which were not covered in the evaluation at all because they entered the picture after the evaluation design was fixed, and so remained out of the design framework. And third, there were some program facets which were functioning throughout the evaluation period, but which were excluded from the design because of functional and budgetary constraints.

Because the evaluation was truly interactive, CIS has been afforded this opportunity to respond and provide additional information to AIR's report. We include:

A. Descriptive informative on:

1. Areas in which we remain in disagreement.
2. New programs and projects not evaluated by AIR.
3. Existing projects not evaluated by AIR.

B. Conclusions

* * * * * * * * * * * *

A. Descriptive Information

1. Areas of Disagreement

ATTRITION

AIR states that one of the reasons it was difficult to evaluate impact data was the high attrition rate. While attrition certainly hampered the evaluation, CIS felt that some additional statements should be offered to clarify the overall situation.

- Attrition is not analogous to "drop-out". CIS records attrition in 13 categories in its Management Information System (MIS). Seven categories are considered negative (Employment - a student should not have to stop school to work, lost interest, pregnancy, family problems, institutionalized, expelled, unknown - we should be able to find out), three are considered neutral (relocation-family moved, health problems-some traumatic conditions such as cancer, other-should be explained), and three are positive (GED/graduation, other school/training, armed services).

- Transferring to another school is not considered a negative termination. Many Students in CIS come from broken homes, one-parent families in unstable circumstances and sometimes these families move often. When we look at CIS students in comparison to other students in their schools, however, the CIS mobility rates are not--at least in Atlanta--significantly higher.

- In Atlanta, and Indianapolis, overall termination rates are decreasing. In Atlanta, first and second quarter data for 78-79 showed a 32% termination rate, and for the same period in 79-80 the rate was 23%; in the third quarter of 79-80 the rate was down to 18%. In Indianapolis, overall CIS terminations dropped from 554 in 1978-79 to 336 in 1979-80. In 78-79, 57% of those terminations were negative, and in 1979-80 the percent of negative terminations dropped to 34%.

- At least two adjustments in the Atlanta attrition data have been made since September, and CIS figures still do not agree with AIR's. In the fall of 1980 AIR reported that at the end of 2 years, 26 of their Atlanta sample of 74 CIS students remained participants and an additional 8 remained in school but not as participants: a total of 34. The rest had "dropped out" or their status was unknown and they were considered probable dropouts.

  CIS countered with data that showed that an additional 14 of the reported dropouts from the original sample were still attending school somewhere. Indeed, 3 of them were still enrolled in CIS, 7 were in the regular program at Smith, 3 were on the active roll at other high schools, and one was studying while a Job Corps participant.

- Students do not enter CIS on permanent status. For most, it is a one-year program. For those with severe needs, perhaps two. In some circumstances, a student might be mainstreamed back into regular school with only occassional follow-up monitoring by CIS staff. So, it would not be unusual for participant-status attrition to be quite high over a two-year or longer period. CIS recognizes that the length of time a participant should spend in the program to derive maximum benefit is a variable which needs to be studied.

- It should be reiterated that while still considerable, CIS attrition is not abnormal for an inner city school. It created an evaluation problem for

AIR, but should not reflect negatively on CIS' capabilities. As noted, when program-wide attrition or termination rates are studied, it is apparent that CIS has, in fact, been gradually lowering the termination rate for its students. Table 1 shows terminations as a percentage of total CIS caseload enrollment, by city, for 1978-79 and 1979-80. Atlanta's figures are high because four of the seven projects were Street Academies. Students in the Street Academies are youth who have already dropped out of school, and are generally older than in-school students. They have more severe behavioral and social problems, and tend to enroll and terminate and re-enroll. D.C.'s rates are high because the school is located in a very high mobility housing project neighborhood. When terminations are broken down by type, in Atlanta and Oakland only 17% of the terminations were for negative reasons, in New York only 7% and in D.C. only approximately 2%. Houston and Indianapolis figures had not been recorded.

Table 1

Terminations as a Percentage of Enrollment

	1978-79	1979-80
Atlanta	48%	41%
Indianapolis	43%	36%
New York	20%	20%
Houston	---**	15%
Oakland	11%*	17%
Washington, D.C.	40%*	40%

* These two cities were only operating for a part of the school year 1978-79. It would be expected that had they been open all year, the termination rate would have been higher. Both were Jr. High projects.

** Houston project did not begin until the summer of 1979. It was a single Jr. High project.

SOCIAL SERVICES (S.S.)

Counseling - In S.S., AIR evaluates CIS' ability in coordination of primarily "hard" social services. AIR has said, "... delivery of social services as traditionally defined (e.g. housing, welfare assistance, professional counseling, legal advice, medical assistance) was a small part of the CIS operation." We strongly disagree with the implication of that statement. The evaluation separates out most CIS counseling services as not professionally administered, i.e. - not provided by a licensed therapist/profesional counselor. We feel that most of the discrepancy AIR notes between their assessment of services delivered and our assessment of services delivered occurs because of this difference of opinion. CIS is not a traditional service system, and we don't define ourselves in traditional terms. We utilize staff from the traditional organizations and by coordinating their resources provide a better product. AIR does not compare us to existing resources to show whether our program services youth and families better than each cooperating singular organization does. And, they summarily dismiss the efficacy of general counseling by an eclectic staff as a notable service delivery.

- How many youth, in a normal situation, see and talk with a caseworker from any agency on a daily basis? How many youth in the existing social service structure receive counseling based on needs assessed by a group of caseworkers from various disciplines combining their expertise?

- Granted, CIS has had many staff who were not agency seconded and who did not have a great deal of experience. But, there were few, if any, CIS Family groups which did not have at least one or two experienced social service staff to provide informal guidance to the inexperienced Family caseworkers.

- As can be seen in Table 2, the levels of CIS non-professional counseling services provided were very, very high. They averaged about one per caseload student per week, as long as they remained in CIS. Not counted are the numerous counseling services provided to former participants to provide support when they return to the regular school program, or graduate, or even after they drop out. Maintaining a supportive relationship with a dropout sometimes results in CIS staff getting a student back in school.

Table 2

Counseling Services Provided

	N	1978-79	N	1979-80
Atlanta	1,206	27,900	1,160	38,144
Indianapolis	1,514	33,228	923	25,844 (1)
New York	395	14,400	215	4,134 (2)
Houston	- (3)		89	3,158
Oakland	115 (4)	2,448	159	2,710
Washington, D.C.	131 (5)	948	160	4,892

(1) Entire school system was closed until end of October for teachers' strike. Two CIS projects were closed.

(2) Only data for Julia Richman project were available.

(3) Project opened in 6/79.

(4) Project opened in 12/78.

(5) Project opened in 2/79.

A convincing argument we advance for including counseling as a social service is that even when services to youth have been provided to correct all the physical tangible problems, (i.e. housing, medical, legal, and welfare) if that youth's attitude, self concept, and values remain the same those tangible social services most likely won't result in measurable improvement.

- If the student does not recognize his/her hostility as a problem, he/she is not likely to work on changing that attitude to one of cooperation and trust.
- Personalism, Family group meetings, informal one-on-one raps, or whatever form in which counseling contact is established, it is the key to positive change in the students.

Defining Measurable Parameters of Social Services - included disagreement with AIR on the S.S. status of programmatics and educational services as well as general counseling. We think AIR's boundaries were much more narrowly defined that were CIS' in determining what, exactly constituted specific S.S. needs. There seemed to be agreement on written terminology, but when it was applied to categorizing caselog entries we differed sharply. On page 63 of the Report, AIR reports on a two-year analysis of 39 caseload student files; they identify 45 services delivered. In Table 3 CIS staff counted over one thousand services after going through only 12 of the same 39 files.

Table 3

Social Services
1978-79 and 1979-80 School Years
12 CIS Caselog Files

Type of Service Provided	Frequency of Provision
Transportation	96
Home Visits	131
Attendance Monitoring and Counseling	399
Academic Performance Monitoring & Counseling	93
Career Development and Job Placement Efforts	29
Probation Monitoring and Legal Advocacy	9
Counseling on Negative Behavior	62
Referrals for Psychotherapy	2
Counseling on Inter-Family Relationships	24
Counseling on Peer Relationships	12
Counseling on Motivation and Improvement in Self-Concept	70
Physical Assessments	6
Medical Treatment	17
Dental Treatment	10
Glasses	8
Family Planning	4
AFDC	4

Food Stamps	1
Title XX Eligibility	18
Other Public Assistance	3
Housing	1
Clothing	8
Food	2
Day Care	2
Parental Involvement	25
Group Cultural Activities	36
Group Educational Activities	46
TOTAL	1,118

The purposes of S.S. in CIS projects are:

1) to impact students' attendance and school performance;

2) to impact students' behavior at school, with peers, and with family;

3) to deliver health services, both preventive and treatment;

4) to provide enrichment experiences;

5) to assist in job placements and job readiness training;

6) to provide legal advocacy and probation monitoring;

7) to involve parents in their children's progress;

8) to meet emergency needs, i.e. housing, clothing, food;

9) to assist students and their families in obtaining public benefits which they may need;

10) to do all of the above in the context of a personal, trusting relationship with the student.

A relationship has to be established with the student that includes good communication. A student must have a reasonable attendance record to take advantage of the resources of the project. While school attendance is not an end in itself, for many students attending school regularly is a first step in taking responsibility for their lives. Attendance and academic monitoring, dealing with behavior problems, intervening in suspensions and preventing expulsions are basic functions that project staff must perform is the high-risk student is to remain in school.

The information on the past two pages are included for two reasons: First, to establish the fact that students in CIS require an intense level of service if they are to grow to self sufficiency. Table 3 shows that such intensity of effort is being provided by CIS. Second, the AIR report downplays the importance of much of this activity, and the levels at which they are reported. Many of the services fall into the categories of educational services, counseling, and enrichment activities. These are and must continue to be major service areas.

CIS believes it is this failure by AIR to acknowledge the importance we place on non-traditional Social Services which has resulted in our widely different interpretations of the data.

While AIR's interpretation does not validate our hypothesis, neither does it render it invalid. We agree that the results are inconclusive. CIS will not belie its claim for the efficacy of its model until or unless proof is shown.

ATTENDANCE

Attendance, as discussed in the Report, focuses on only those students followed longitudinally for two years. In fact, the "n's" reported in tables throughout the evaluation reflect just this group. We would like to clarify the fact that total enrollment in CIS was considerably higher, and that attendance for the overall groups showed positive trends. Table 4 shows the total enrollment in CIS projects during 1978-79 and 1979-80. Even in the three projects AIR studies, while attrition truncated their sample, the projects themselves maintained their enrollment at desired levels by entering new students when others left.

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

Table 4

CIS Enrollment - All Projects

	# of Sites	1978-79	# of Sites	1979-80
Atlanta	7	1,206	7	1,160
Indianapolis	7	1514	4	923
New York	3	395	3	388
Houston	-	-	1	89
Oakland	1	115	1	159
Washington, D.C.	1	131	1	160

Table 5 shows the percent of attendance, by city, for 1978-79 and 1979-80. As can be seen, unmatched, overall attendance increased in every city but Indianapolis. The drop in Indianapolis corresponded to a city-wide decrease in student attendance attributed to the eight-week teachers' strike.

Table 5

CIS Attendance - All Projects

	1978-79	1979-80
Atlanta	78.9	79.3
Indianapolis	85.2	78.6
New York	71.3	77.4
Houston	-	86.3
Oakland	67.0	78.2
Washington, D.C.	66.2	80.0

But, an additional view is more important --that is looking at and comparing data on a student by student rather than on a group average basis.

- In reviewing Atlanta attendance data for those students in the Smith project for the full two years evaluated by AIR, we discovered that one-half of this group's percent of attendance increased and one-half decreased from 1978-79 to 1979-80. The combined data for this group shows an increase from 79.9% to 81.2% attendance.
- Attendance data for the students in this group who were retained for the 1980-81 school year (third year in CIS) were also reviewed. For the first quarter of 1980-81, two-thirds of the group remaining improved their attendance over the prior year.
- There were 130 students in the Smith project during the 1979-80 school year. Fifty-six of them increased their percent of attendance compared to 1978-79.

The above data show that comparing data on a by-student basis provides a clearer picture of the project's impact in some cases than does averaging data for the group as a whole. We think we have shown that CIS has been successful in stabilizing or improving attendance with a significant number of students.

BASELINE BUDGET – RELATIVE PROGRAM COSTS

We would like to emphasize that at this time and in the future we would not start a project, or encourage anyone else to do so with "bought" staff. Caseload staff should be at a level determined by agency commitment and availability of their existing personnel to be outstationed as caseworkers (institutionalization), and as determined by the desired project size. The AIR projections on page 84 of the Report do not reflect what we would recommend in division of project costs: caseworkers would be paid for by their home-base agencies, and teachers would be paid for by the host school system; school personnel and most overhead would be in-kind contributions; only some administrative, activities, and materials costs would be direct financial responsibilities of CIS. This relieves a tremendous burden on the new projects in fundraising activities.

CIS is actually now at about a second of three stages in its development of financial costing. In the first stage, projects were formed in a city and most if not all staff and other costs were raised by CIS from Federal, state, and other sources. In the second stage, which is where most of the projects are now, CIS meets with city officials from agencies, the school system, and local government and business to determine level of potential support. The involved organizations "buy into" CIS, determining the extent of commitment and types of in-kind they can mobilize. The project starts with the number of staff which agencies and the schools provide to it. Some costs are picked up by CIS through Education Department funding or other sources. Technical assistance and coordination is provided by the national office, CIS, Inc. In the third stage, cities will take the initial steps in developing their CIS project. The national office will provide the standardized model and whatever technical assistance is necessary or requested. All funding will be arranged and coordinated by the city itself. A local policy group will bear the responsibility of running the project for their own city.

- When AIR sets a figure of perhaps $1800 to $2200 per year per student for CIS, they fail to address the most important and largely unanswered questions that are posed:
    - What would it cost to provide all the services CIS provides, particularly the daily contact, if each agency had to provide it at this level to a comparable number of youth, using their own staff and facilities?
    - What long-range impact may CIS be having on--
        - welfare costs (education = jobs)
        - birth defects (prenatal care = well babies)
        - crime rates (values & pride = good citizens)
        - unemployment (career development = jobs)?
    - Or asked another way; If CIS can provide prenatal care and nutrition information that saves one unborn child each year from developing permanent birth defects caused by his adolescent mother's use of drugs or poor diet, what would be the estimated long-range, lifetime savings to the existing social services?

- It is sometimes necessary to look at what the benefits to only one individual might be, to put an overall value on the model as a whole.

- The human value cannot be calculated. CIS reserves the right to operate humanistically, within an economically feasible model.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION

A lot has been said about institutionalization. In CIS, institutionalization is that process which results in caseload staff--caseworkers--being outstationed by their agencies at no cost to CIS, to work at a school-based CIS project site. AIR reports the concept faithfully--

- potential agency savings

- coordination of services

- personalism

- skill-sharing

They seem to conclude, however, that because of a number of reasons--

- bureaucratic paranoia

- inexperienced and/or unqualified staff assignments

- lack of job security and benefits

institutionalization should not be a priority concern or a part of the CIS standardization model. We strongly disagree with that conclusion. Coordination of services delivered by experienced staff could be bought if the funds were made available, but that:

- is becoming ever more difficult given the existing economic climate.

- totally defeats the concept of the cities being in the schools (CIS). When city governments and local agencies buy into Cities in Schools by agreeing to outstation existing staff, in effect restructuring their service delivery system, then they have internalized the program as a part of their city. We think that this is the only way the program can survive and fulfill its potential.

Just because it hasn't always worked in the projects at the level desired is not conclusive evidence that the idea should be abandoned. Rather, we think that in the past two years we have proven it does work, particularly as seen currently in the Houston and New York projects.

- In Houston, all but the five administrative staff are outstationed (25 experienced social service staff) from agencies such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boy Scouts, Harris County Child Welfare, Community Youth Service, Harris County Department of Education, Houston Department of Parks and Recreation, Hispanic International University, etc.

- In New York there are over 40 staff outstationed from such city agencies as the New York City Youth Board, Human Resources Administration, Department of Social Services, New York City Board of Education, Department of Parks and Recreation, and from such private agencies as United Families, Catholic Charities, Interfaith Neighbors, Inc., Columbia University Teachers College, etc.

- In Indianapolis a CIS Policy Group was created in May of 1979. CIS had gone to the Indianapolis Corporate Community Council to ask for support for the program. The Corporate Community Council responded by helping to develop a policy group for the program.

  The Policy Group has accepted responsibility for identifying and garnering resources, monitoring program results, and replication of the program. The members are from organizations which are influential in their areas and throughout the city/state. It is the vehicle by which Indianapolis CIS will move into the third stage of the institutionalization process--the city taking ownership of the program. Policy Group members include: Director, Near Eastside Multi-Service Center, Executive Director to the Governor, Special Assistant to U.S. Senator Richard Lugar, Vice Pres. of Indianapolis Power and Light, Board Chairman of Merchants National Bank, Vice Pres. of Indpls. Chamber of Commerce, Superintendent of Indianapolis Public Schools; President of American Fletcher National Bank; Board Chairman of Indianapolis Water Co.; Executive Director of Community Service Council - United Way; President of Indiana National Bank; President of Indiana Bell Telephone; Vice President of Midwest National Bank; Special Assistant to Senator Birch Bayh; and the Deputy Mayor of Indianapolis.

* * * * * * * *

AIR modified its research design during the course of the three year evaluation in several ways. Because of the large numbers of students and the vast amount of statistical data to be compiled and analyzed it was decided to follow for two years only those students who were enrolled in CIS at Arsenal Tech, Smith and Julia Richman High Schools in the fall of 1978. All other existing CIS sites, students, and new students entering the three projects studies were excluded from the analysis.

Even with the modifications, which were dictated primarily by financial constraints, the basic variables to be evaluated remained constant. Yet the program AIR evaluated at three sites was not really representative of CIS as it existed. Other than basic descriptive information, three CIS new projects which began after the AIR study started were not studied, and fourteen existing project sites in Atlanta, Indianapolis and New York were also excluded. The following two sections give some current information on the status of these "unknown soldiers."

2. New Programs or Projects not Evaluated by AIR

HOUSTON

1979-80

- one project at M.C. Williams Jr. High School
- 89 caseload students
  284 non-caseload students
  373 total youth served
- 55% were in families receiving public assistance.
- Average attendance for the project was 86.3%.
- Over 3,800 social services were provided.
- 15 public and private agencies had outstationed staff.
- More than 40 organizations and individuals provided financial support or other services and resources.

1980-81 (Sept. - Dec.)

- three project sites: M.C. Williams Jr. High, Wesley Elementary, Marshall Middle
- 193 caseload students are being served.
- Average Attendance for the three projects is 83.4%.
- Over 4,700 social services have been provided.
- More than 79 special recreational, cultural, and educational activities have been arranged for students.

OAKLAND

1979-80

- one project at Hamilton Jr. High School
- 81 caseload students
  389 non-caseload students
  470 total youth served
- 44% were in families receiving public assistance.
- Over 2,300 social services were provided.
- Nine public and private agencies had outstationed staff.
- More than 110 organizations and individuals provided financial support or other services and resources.

1980-81 (Sept. - Dec.)

- Three project sites: Melrose Elementary, Hamilton Jr. High, and Fremont High
- 166 caseload students are being served.
- Average attendance for the three projects is 86.3%.
- Over 2,200 social services have been provided.
- More than 277 special recreational, cultural, and educational activities have been arranged for students.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

1979-80

- one project at Terrell Jr. High School

- 160 caseload students
  1,198 non-caseload students
  1,358 total youth served

- 70% were in families receiving public assistance.

- Average attendance for the project was 80%.

- Over 6,900 social services were provided.

- One agency had outstationed eight staff.

- More than 50 organizations and individuals provided financial support or other services and resources.

1980-81 (Sept. - Dec.)

- one project site: Terrell Jr. High School

- 138 caseload students are being served.

- Average attendance is 81.5%

- Over 4,200 social services have been provided.

- More than 96 special recreational, cultural, and educational activities have been arranged for students.

3. Existing Projects not Evaluated by AIR

IN ATLANTA

Craddock Elementary School
Carver High School
Atlanta Street Academy "A"
Atlanta Street Academy "B"
Atlanta Street Academy "T"
* St. Luke's Area III Learning Center

---

* St. Luke's is a unique street academy sponsored jointly by St. Luke's Episcopal Church (building, maintenance, utilities and volunteer tutors), Atlanta Public Schools (teachers, educational

materials, and educational resources), and Cities in Schools (administrative staff).

- 14 public and private agencies had outstationed staff.
- In 1979-80, more than 400 special recreational and cultural activities were arranged for students.
- In 1978-79, 55 CIS students graduated form high school or received a G.E.D. In 1979-80, 74 students achieved this distinction.
- In 1978-80, more than 95 organizations and individuals provided financial support or other services and resources.

1980-81 (Sept. - Dec.)

- Six project sites: Carver High, Craddock Elementary, Academy "B", Academy "T", Smith, St. Luke's. Academy "A" closed because of funding cutbacks.
- 726 caseload students are being served.
- Average attendance for five of the projects is 84.1%. (Attendance has not been computed for the elementary project.)
- Over 7,600 social services have been provided.
- More than 178 special recreational and cultural activities have been arranged for students.
- More than 416 tutoring and special education activities have been arranged for students.

IN INDIANAPOLIS

1978-79 - Six other Project Sites:

Elementary School #45
Jr. High School #26
Jr. High School #101
Arlington Sr. High School
Attucks Sr. High School

Indy Prep
And approximately 800 other caseload students in
Plan A and Plan B at Arsenal Tech High School.

1979-80 * three other Project Sites:

Elementary School #45
Jr. High School #26
Indy Prep
And approximately 600 other students in Plan A and Plan B at Arsenal Tech High School.

* Three projects were closed because of funding constraints.

- Five public and private agencies had outstationed 24 staff.

- More than 75 organizations and individuals provided financial support or other services and resources.

- Reading scores for Tech Plan A freshmen students increased 2.1 grade levels.

IN NEW YORK

1978-79 - 3 sites in addition to Julia Richman

I.S. 22 - Jr. High School
P.S. 180 - Elementary School
P.S. 125 - Elementary School

- 13 public and private agencies had outstationed staff.

1979-80 - Two sites in addition to Julia Richman.

I.S. 22 - Jr. High School
P.S. 53 - Elementary School

- 193 caseload students
  374 non-caseload students
  467 total students served.

- 11 public and private agencies had outstationed staff.

- More than 3,600 social services were provided.

1980-81 (Sept. - Dec.)

- Five project sites: Julia Richman High, I.S. 22, P.S. 53, P.S. 101, I.S. 117. P.S. 101 and I.S. 117 are very new, have only one staff a piece.
- 461 caseload students are reported being served in three sites. P.S. 101 and I.S. 117 have not yet reported data.
- Average attendance for three of the projects is 76%.
- Over 6,700 social services have been provided.
- More than 113 special recreational and cultural activities have been arranged for students.
- More than 65 tutoring and special education activities have been arranged for students.
- 11 public and private agencies have outstationed staff.
- All but one staff person at Julia Richman is institutionalized.

B. Conclusions

Over the past three years, CIS has made significant improvements in staff development, development and use of the Management Information System (MIS) as a program assessment tool, data collection and internal evaluation, and standardization of the CIS model. We have also benefitted from the development of a strong and effective National Board of Directors.

And, not to belittle the concerns we have expressed, we found we agreed with AIR on several issues. The most notable are:

1. AIR says there have been problems with the quality of CIS caseworkers.

   a. CIS agrees that because of funding constraints and because of agency assignments, many of the caseworkers are not what AIR defines as professionals, and some do not have the skills which fit the tasks to be accomplished.

b. CIS responses to the need to strengthen the caseworker capabilities have included--

   (1) Extensive work to get existing service agencies to deploy experienced staff to the CIS projects. Where this has occurred, better results have been shown.

   (2) Obtaining grants for the national CIS office which will enable the provision of technical assistance, including staff development and training, to each CIS city.

   (3) Development of comprehensive one-year and five-year plans, which identify staffing and budgeting priorities.

   (4) Strategy meetings with human service agency directors in Houston, Atlanta, and Oakland, to plan future institutionalization of caseworker staff. Meetings in the other cities are planned in the very near future.

c. In the future, CIS plans to continue to work for--

   (1) Adequate funding to hire experienced and qualified staff.

   (2) Development of a set of appropriate criteria against which prospective staff could be measured.

   (3) Development of a comprehensive training and assessment program for existing staff.

   (4) Negotiating with agencies to--

       Assign experienced and resourceful staff to CIS; staff whose backgrounds meet our criteria.

       Institutionalize those staff, so that their funding is not in jeopardy each year. This would have a stabilizing effect on the overall program.

2. AIR states that unstable, fragmented funding has had a number of negative effects on CIS.

   a. CIS agrees that the funding problems have had negative effects such as--

(1) Not getting or keeping the quality of caseworkers needed.

(2) Inability to stabilize caseloads/program structure.

(3) Unwillingness of agencies to participate in CIS, much less institutionalize staff.

(4) Damaging CIS' credibility with schools, community, city, agencies, other funding sources.

(5) Lowering staff morale; i.e. "Where, and when, is my next paycheck coming?"

(6) Requiring extensive, duplicative paperwork, and overlapping reporting and evaluation requirements.

b. CIS responses to the need to stabilize funding have included--

(1) Development of an organizational five-year plan, which includes a priority for affecting policies and legislation on funding and funding patterns at federal, state, and local (county, city) levels.

(2) Much work, already accomplished in getting agencies to outstation their staff to CIS, with agency funding.

3. AIR has said that CIS needs to improve its management.

CIS has responded to this need by--

(1) Hiring, in Fall, 1979, an Executive Vice President charged with developing and implementing a comprehensive management system.

(2) Moving to standardize goals, objectives, and basic program structure.

(3) Refining and implementing a Management Information System (MIS) which is reported monthly, and used in program management and planning.

(4) Hiring a comptroller to standardize and consolidate all financial records and reporting, and to set fiscal policy and practices.

4. AIR has said Cities in Schools has too many agendas; the goals are overly ambitious.

CIS has moved to correct this weakness by--

(1) Standardizing the operating model, and the goals and objectives.

(2) Holding an education conference in November, 1980, with nationally recognized educational leaders and innovators as presenters, to explore CIS's role in the educational arena.

(3) Implementing regularly scheduled management meetings between city directors and national staff.

(4) Utilizing the services of the Support Center to assist in developing the five-year and one-year plans, for each city and for the national office.

(5) Obtaining grants to provide technical assistance to each local city and for the national office.

(6) Greatly decreasing the private debt incurred while originally developing and demonstrating the program.

(7) Elicitng greater involvement of the National Board of Directors (and local Policy Committees) in monitoring fiscal and programmatic controls, and assisting in fundraising.

* * * * * *

Finally, CIS staff would like to express thanks to the invaluable input received from Norman Gold, the NIE project officer for this evaluation.

Our infant, CIS, is on its feet--indeed has passed quickly through childhood. The real race CIS is in has no discernable finish ~~line~~, no cheering crowd at the end. Yet the outcome is critical for our nation--a workable model with which cities can prevent the loss of thousands of productive citizens to generations of poverty and dependency.

Appendix B.
Design of the Study

On October 19, 1977, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) began the evaluation of the Cities in Schools Program. Data collection for the evaluation ended in the summer of 1980. The final report was submitted in February 1981.

STAFF

The evaluation was conducted by AIR's Institute for Neighborhood Initiatives, directed by W. Victor Rouse. The evaluation's Project Director and Principal Investigator was Charles A. Murray. Associate Project Directors and other senior staff of the evaluation over the course of the three and one-half years were: Blair B. Bourque, D. Rigney Hill, Robert E. Krug, Saundra R. Murray, Dian Overbey, Janice Redish, and Jane Schubert. Support for data collection, data analysis, and report preparation was provided by Pamela Belluomini, Joan Botts, Louis Cox, Joan Flood, Wilfred Hamm, Ronald Harnar, Shirley Hines, Cindy Israel, Eileen Kelly, Karol Kerns, Helen McKenzie, Mary Martin, Denise Peck, Anita Bennett, and Ellen Stotsky. The principal on-site data collectors for the evaluation were Dian Foley (New York), Juanita Harris (Atlanta), and Toni Simons (Indianapolis).

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Three types of data were collected: interview, archival, and observational. We describe each in turn.

Interview Data

Interviews were conducted with (1) CIS staff (Case workers and administrative staff), (2) the students in CIS, (3) other students in the same schools, (4) school staff (teachers and administrative), (5) social service agency staff, and (6) local business and political leaders associated with the program. The interview data sometimes concerned individual students (as in the interviews conducted with CIS Caseworkers and students), and sometimes impressions and observations of the program as a whole (the interviews with teachers, CIS administrative staff, the social service agency staff, and business and political figures).

CIS Caseworkers. The basic sampling principle was to obtain triangulated information (CIS, student, archival) on a 30 percent sample of all CIS students. The 30 percent figure was governed primarily by the practical limits to the demands we could place on Caseworkers: Given a ten-student caseload, we interviewed each Caseworker concerning three students during the fall pretest and spring posttest. This represented about two hours of interviewing during each round. Topics in the interview focused on school achievement, school behavior, out-of-school behavioral or environmental problems, interactions with the Caseworker, participation in CIS activities, and overall student responses to the program. The instrument is shown in Exhibit B.1.

Discussions with CIS administrative staff were not limited to a single protocol. The form shown in Exhibit B.2 was used for purposes of data collection on outstationing. Other interactions varied from a few informal interviews on the program to regular extended discussions of a wide range of topics.

CIS students. The student interview protocol covered the topics addressed in the Caseworker form. The instrument is shown in Exhibit B.3.

Other students in the same schools. These interviews were conducted as part of data collection for a nonequivalent comparison group, to be used as a supplement to the analysis of CIS effects on the students. Because of severe self-selection problems (very few parents would return the mandatory parental permission forms), these data were of little use.

School staff. Interviews were conducted with 25 randomly selected teachers not assigned to CIS. The interview items called for open-ended responses to items about the program in general, as shown in Exhibit B.4. Additional interviews were conducted with the principals in the schools where CIS is active, most of the assistant principals, and senior members of the school system administration (see Exhibit B.5, described below).

Social service agency staff. We attempted to interview the head of each agency that maintained a relationship with CIS. The instrument shown in Exhibit B.5 was used for this purpose. In addition, CIS Caseworkers who had previous experience with another social service organization other than CIS were interviewed using the instrument shown in Exhibit B.6, to obtain comparisons between the working environment in CIS and in traditional service delivery formations.

Political and business leaders. The interviewees varied by city, depending on the contacts that the program had established. When the respondent represented an organization with a direct link to CIS, the instrument in Exhibit B.5 was used. In addition, open-ended narrative interviews were conducted in which the respondent was asked to recount the history of his interaction with the program, with follow-up questions as necessary about the respondent's assessment of the program, prognosis for the future, and suggestions for improvements.

CIS and school staff and political leaders. Several people who had played a major role in developing the program at each site were interviewed to obtain historical data. The interview guide is shown in Exhibit B.7.

The "Intensive" Sample

Midway through the evaluation, it was decided that additional data should be collected about a subsample of students, to permit a more detailed, triangulated case history approach. In addition to the standard data collection, members of this subsample were to be given additional narrative-response items in the fall and spring interviews. A third, entirely narrative, interview was conducted in the middle of the year. The sample procedure was followed for Caseworkers associated with these students. Parents were interviewed, as well as a teacher designated by the student. The subsample was called the "intensive" sample.

A total of 25 students were included in the intensive sample: 5 from Atlanta, 10 from Indianapolis, and 10 from New York City. Because the purpose of the intensive sample was to maximize our diagnostic information about CIS, a random sample was deemed inappropriate. Rather, we explicitly asked Caseworkers and administrators in CIS to nominate those students who (1) provided examples of CIS participants with high need for CIS, and (2) provided examples of an active CIS intervention.

Material from the intensive interviews was written in narrative form. For purposes of analysis, the main points were abstracted onto a face sheet. A page of guidelines was prepared for the interviewer, to be used for both the student and Caseworker interviews for the intensive sample. The guidelines had four sections.

Section 1 was an assessment of student and family needs. Subtopics were a description of the student, descriptions of the family members, description of the student's friends, description of the neighborhood, a review of the school record and the student's attitudes about school (attendance, grades, behavior, relationships with teachers, [illegible]), and the student's understanding of areas that needed improvement.

The second section concerned the students' interaction with CIS. Subtopics were a description of the activities CIS has provided, the students' attendance at those activities and their assessment of the value of the activities, a discussion of the relationship with the Caseworke and with CIS teachers, an assessment of what the program is good for, and their opinion of CIS classes.

The third section asked the student to identify the teacher that the student knew the best or liked the best. That teacher was subsequently interviewed as part of the intensive sample data collection.

The fourth section dealt with the interviewer's observations about the student: attitude, dress, demeanor, ability to communicate, and other characteristics that would not come across in the written record of the student's responses.

Archival Data

The archival data collection, like the interview schedules, broke roughly into halves: A general acquisition of program documentation, dealing with the history and administration of the program, and searches for the records dealing with specific students.

The three main sources of archival data on the students were the school files, the CIS program files, police records (in Indianapolis), and court records (in Atlanta). Data on police and court histories of CIS students could not be obtained from New York because of local statutes governing confidentiality. The forms used to record those data are shown in Exhibit B.8.

Observational Data

The three on-site data collectors (and Washington staff, during field work) had extensive opportunity to observe the program. These included observation of CIS classes, tutoring sessions, teacher conferences, counseling sessions, home visits, staffing sessions among Family personnel, policy meetings of CIS administrators, meetings of the CIS Policy Board, observation of programmatic activities, and, perhaps most importantly, day-to-day observation of the program at work. We did not attempt to structure the observations; the types of events that are most important to an assessment of the program are relatively rare and not amenable to observation during a specified time period. A form was provided for recording observational material (Exhibit B.9).

Comparison Groups

The evaluation did not have access to natural comparison groups. In all sites, the participants were selected in ways that made the CIS population unique to that school.

The closest approximation to a comparison group was obtained for the 1978-79 school year, at Arsenal Tech. Incoming ninth-graders were classified as "eligible" for CIS on the basis of explicit criteria based on eighth-grade attendance and reading scores. A member of the evaluation team (C. Murray) randomly assigned names to CIS and comparison populations. But a criterion for funding support for CIS was eligibility for Title XX funds, and the size of the CIS program at Tech meant that nearly all Title XX-eligible students had to be assigned to CIS. The result was substantial shifting of the randomly assigned populations, and the CIS population was not comparable to the comparison group on a presumptively important dimension: poverty.

At all sites, attempts to obtain comparison data were also frustrated by Federal regulations involving parental consent. Parents of CIS participants signed consent forms as part of the process of entering the program. But return rates of consent forms for non-CIS parents were extremely low (on the order of 20-30 percent), and follow-ups still left such a high non-return rate that the self-selection biases were great. In view of the acknowledged uniqueness of the CIS population, it was decided that greater expenditure of resources to obtain interview data would be unjustified.

Grade and attendance comparison data were nonetheless obtained for non-CIS students at all sites. Ex post facto procedures were employed to draw what inferences we could, focusing on the non-CIS students whose pre-ninth grade records were similar to those of the CIS students. In all cases, we tried to word the conclusions precisely, with emphasis on the limiting characteristics of the comparisons at each site.

Samples

Table B.1 on the following page summarizes the samples for data related to specific students (ignoring respondents who discussed the program in general).

TABLE B.1
Sample Sizes for Interviews and Archival Record Searches, 1978-79, 1979-80

	STRUCTURED STUDENT INTERVIEWS						STRUCTURED CASEWORKER INTERVIEWS						UNSTRUCTURED INTENSIVE INTERVIEWS 1978-79				UNSTRUCTURED INTENSIVE INTERVIEWS 1979-80			NORWICK-STRICKLAND INTERNAL EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL						ARCHIVAL RECORD SEARCHES	
	Fall 1978	Spring 1979	Matched Sets	Fall 1979	Spring 1980	Matched Sets	Fall 1978	Spring 1979	Matched Sets	Fall 1979	Spring 1980	Matched Sets	Student	Case Worker	Teacher	Parent	Student	Case Worker	Teacher	Fall 1978	Spring 1979	Matched Sets	Fall 1979	Spring 1980	Matched Sets	1978-79	1979-80
SMITH (Atlanta)																											
CIS	31	25	17	12c	16		31	22	15	11	19		5	5	–	3	10	10	8	–a	–	–	–	15	0	72	41 34 (No longer CIS)
Comparison b	–	18			–	–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–a	–	–	–			160	75
ARSENAL TECH (Indianapolis)																											
CIS	107	104	80	35	34		117	132	99	49	43		10	10	10	6	10	10	9	406	383	271	387	242	167	583	157 108 (No longer CIS)
Comparison b	–	25			15	–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	25	–	–			130	130
JULIA RICHMAN																											
CIS	44	34	31	22	11		28	35	20	24	15		10	10	10	NA	10	10	9	90	60	50	147	57	50	141	78 51 (No longer CIS)
Comparison b	–	–	–	–		–	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–	–	NA	–	–	–	–	–	–	–			102	160

[a] Atlanta CIS did not allow the administration of the Norwick Strickland scale in 1978-79

[b] The comparison group sample sizes represent those students whose parents returned a signed permission slip only

[c] Student interviews from the Fall 1979 at Smith were not included in the analysis due to questions about the interviewer

DATA ANALYSIS

The discussions of specific analyses are incorporated into the text of the various reports. General comments follow.

For quantitative analyses, standard procedures for data preparation and coding applied. At the end of data collection, and after the quantified data had been keypunched from the forms, all documents relating to a student were gathered in a single file. The set of case files that resulted were the primary tool for the qualitative analysis. It was found that, while any one source was often incomplete in its information, the multiple sources taken together provided an interpretable portrait.

A major shift in analytic perspective took place in early 1980, after the data were analyzed for Report No. 3. Originally, as described in the evaluation design, we had expected to use a regression-based approach to analyze the relative contributions of various components of the CIS "treatment." It was also intended to use regression-based analysis to explore the kind of student that profited most from CIS, under what circumstances. But an examination of the data from 1978-79 revealed that we would lack adequate variance in the outcome measures to permit a useful analysis. The very large numbers of "no effect" students would drown out the explanatory role of the variables that did promote a "successful" treatment.

Therefore, it was decided to focus on a qualitative, diagnostic analysis. To facilitate this, Caseworkers were asked to provide ratings of the sample students on a few simple dimensions of level of economic, personal, academic, family, or "other" problems; a rating of the level of intensiveness of the case worker effort; and a rating of the level of outcome. The AIR evaluation staff conducted similar ratings on the basis of materials in the case files. These ratings were used with quantitative indicators such as changes in attendance and grades to pull files that were candidate examples of success and failure. These files were then independently reviewed by the authors of the final report. The qualitative discussion in Chapter 5, and qualitative discussions of case worker performance in Chapter 3 represent consensus judgments based on these reviews.

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e) While you are not required to respond your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate and timely.

OMB Form No 51-R-1254
Expiration Date 30 August 1980

CITIES IN SCHOOLS EVALUATION

Caseworker Interview Form

POST-TEST / Schedule A

City ____________________ Component ____________________

Student ID No ____________________ Case Manager ID No. ____________________

Grade ________ Race ________ Sex ________

Interviewer Notes:

- *You are a member of an independent evaluation team visiting Atlanta, New York and Indianapolis.*
- *We will be asking about 2 or 3 students that have been randomly selected from your caseload.*
- *All answers are strictly CONFIDENTIAL. Students are assigned identification numbers; names are not recorded.*
- *We have interviewed you once about this student in the fall. During this interview we would like to focus upon two questions:*

  1. *What do you see as the needs of this student and his/her family?*
  2. *In what way has the program helped?*

● CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT

1. We have selected this student at random. How typical is this student?

Of all the students in my caseload, this student

☐ has had the fewest problems
☐ has had fewer problems than most
☐ is about average
☐ has had more problems than most
☐ has had the most problems

2. How close is your relationship with this student compared to others in your caseload?

☐ Closer than with almost any other student in my caseload
☐ Closer than the average
☐ About average
☐ Not as close as with most of the others
☐ You picked the student I am probably least close with
☐ Other (specify) ____________

3. In terms of school work, how motivated is this student compared to other students in his/her grade?

☐ Don't know
☐ Quite motivated
☐ Does only enough to get by
☐ Totally lacks motivation
☐ Other (specify) ____________
____

4. How self-confident is he/she for his/her age?

☐ Don't know
☐ Very self-confident
☐ About average
☐ Lacks self-confidence
☐ Other (specify) ____________
____

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

5. How intelligent do you think he/she is?

☐ Don't know
☐ Very intelligent
☐ About average
☐ Below average
☐ Other (specify) ____________

6. How well does this student interact with other kids?

☐ Don't know
☐ Is a loner. By him/herself almost all the time
☐ Has a few good friends
☐ Friendlier than average
☐ Needs to be around other people constantly
☐ Other (specify) ____________

● INTERACTION WITH CIS PROGRAM

7. During the LAST WEEK ONLY (last 5 school days), how often have you had an extended talk with this student. DON'T WORRY IF THE LAST WEEK WAS NOT TYPICAL; we are going to combine your answers with those of all the other case managers.

☐ Did not talk, except to say hello in passing
☐ Once
☐ Other (explain) ____________
☐ Twice
☐ More than twice

- Was last week typical ☐ Yes ☐ No

8. When do you usually see him/her to talk? (check all that apply)

☐ During regularly scheduled class
☐ During special activity period
☐ For individual appointment
☐ In the hall
☐ In the lunchroom
☐ After school
☐ Evening
☐ Weekend
☐ Other (specify) ____________

9. When was the LAST TIME you saw him/her to talk (more than saying hello)?

☐ During regularly scheduled class
☐ During special activity period
☐ For individual appointment
☐ In the hall
☐ In the lunchroom
☐ After school
☐ Evening
☐ Weekend
☐ Other (specify) ____________

- How did the meeting come about? ____________
- What was the topic? ____________
- What happened? ____________

10. Which topics have you discussed with this student this year? (check all that apply)

☐ School work
☐ Teacher problems
☐ Money problems
☐ School behavior problems
☐ Attendance at school
☐ Other (specify) ____________
☐ Problems at home
☐ Plans for activities
☐ Other personal problems
☐ Just talk

11. Of the ones you mentioned which ones have you talked MOST about? (give an example)
(place a star [★] beside that topic in item 10)

12. What program activities has this student participated in this year so far?

Activity	No. of times	Who participated?

13. Is there anything that makes it difficult for this student to participate in the program's after-school activities? (check all that apply)

☐ Not known
☐ No
☐ Has a job
☐ Health problem (specify)
☐ Other (specify)

☐ Child care responsibility for family
☐ Transportation
☐ Parents won't allow participation

Notes

● ACADEMIC

14. Did this student need help with any school subjects this year? (check all that apply)

☐ None
☐ Reading
☐ Math
☐ Grammar
☐ Other (specify)

☐ Social studies
☐ English as a second language
☐ Composition
☐ Science

15. What did CIS do for these academic problems? (check all that apply)

☐ Don't know
☐ Not needed
☐ Other (specify)

CIS provided	Sessions per week (circle)				
● Learning center	1	2	3	4	5
● Reading class	1	2	3	4	5
● Tutoring during school	1	2	3	4	5
● Tutoring after school	1	2	3	4	5
● Special in-class help	1	2	3	4	5

16. At what level is this student reading right now?

☐ Don't know
☐ Reads better than grade level
☐ Reads about at grade level

☐ Reads below grade level
☐ Non-reader

17. **Would you say that this student's grades are a reflection of his/her real ability?**

☐ Don't know
☐ Performing far below ability
☐ Somewhat below ability
☐ About at ability
☐ At the limits of his/her ability level

- If performing below ability, what is the reason? (check all that apply)

☐ Poor attendance
☐ Failure to do assigned work
☐ Speaks English only as second language
☐ Health problem (specify) ______________________________
☐ Other (specify) ______________________________
☐ Low motivation
☐ Family problems
☐ Poor teacher/student relationship

Notes ______________________________

● SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

As we noted before, a student's grades may not reflect his/her real potential. Sometimes the way a student behaves at school interferes with his/her academic performance.

18. **How often has this student acted this way at school during the past few months?**

	Never	Hardly Ever	About Once a Month	About Once a Week	Almost Every Day	Don't Know
Skip school						
Cut class						
Arrive late for school						
Get in trouble in class for fooling around						
Get into angry arguments with staff						
Get into angry arguments with other students						
Get high at school						
Get into fights at school						
Other (specify)						

19. **Of this list, which do you consider the student's most serious problem?**

- Why? ______________________________

20. **For each item that occurs "once a week" or more ask, What did you do the LAST TIME this happened?**

	1st Item	2nd Item	3rd Item
Counseled student individually at school			
Called student's house			
Visited student's house			
Went out of school to find student			
Talked to teacher			
Talked to Dean or other school official			
Other (specify)			

Notes ______________________________

____

● NON-SCHOOL PROBLEMS

21. How about problems that are not school-related? Do you know about any? (check all that apply)

☐ Not known
☐ No other problems
☐ Drug use
☐ Alcohol use
☐ Emotional problems
☐ Family problems
☐ Delinquency
☐ Other (specify) ____________

Notes ____________

22. How did you deal with these problems? (repeat for each item checked)

	1st Item	2nd Item	3rd Item
☐ No action			
☐ Counsel student individually at school			
☐ Home visit/counsel parent(s)			
☐ Talk with Dean or other school official			
☐ Referral to other social service agency			
☐ Other (specify)			

Notes: ____________

23. Has this student been in trouble with the police this year? (probe for event, when, outcome, and role of staff member in the situation)

____

24. Has this student gone to court this year? (probe for reason, outcome, role of any staff member)

____

25. Has this student been on probation this year? (probe for when, why, staff role with probation officer)

____

CONTACT WITH FAMILY

26. Have you visited this student's home this year? ☐ No ☐ Yes Number of times ______

27. What other contact have you had with the parent(s)?

☐ Telephoned parents ________
☐ Parents telephoned school ________
☐ Parents came to school for group meeting ________
☐ Parents came to school for private appointment ________
☐ Other (specify) ________ ________

28. Besides general conversation, what have your visits been about? (check all that apply)

☐ Told family about program
☐ Filled out forms for program permission
☐ Filled out forms for bus/lunch tickets
☐ Filled out forms for income eligibility
☐ Filled out other forms (specify) ________
☐ Discussed arrangements for non-school services for student
☐ Discussed arrangements for non-school services for another member of family
☐ Other (specify) ________
☐ Talked to parents about student's school work
☐ Find out if family needs other services program can help with

Notes. ________

29. How would you describe this student's relationship with his/her family?
(check all that apply, for each item checked, ask **"What makes you say this?"**)

	Reasons why you say this
☐ Don't know	
☐ Parents are unusually supportive	
☐ No unusual characteristics, about average	
☐ Parent and child are alienated	
☐ Parent unable to control child	
☐ Parent is negligent	
☐ Parent is exceptionally strict	
☐ Parent sometimes abuses child	
☐ Other (specify)	

30. From what you know of the family so far, what are the parents' attitude toward the program?
(check all that apply)

☐ Don't know
☐ The parent(s) does things that interfere with CIS's attempts to work with the student
☐ The parent(s) is not interested one way or the other
☐ The parent(s) approves of CIS, but does not often do much to help
☐ The parent(s) actively supports what CIS is trying to do with this student
☐ Other (describe) ________

31. From what you know about the family so far, are there any needs that remain unmet?

☐ Don't know
☐ No
☐ Medical or dental care
☐ Child care
☐ Mental health (i.e., alcoholism, drug addiction, other emotional problem)
☐ Other (specify) ________
☐ Housing
☐ Income assistance
☐ Employment

Have you been involved in trying to arrange assistance on these or any other services? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Yes, describe ________

Full Text Provided by ERIC

● BEHAVIOR CHANGES

32. Does this student act in the following ways more than last year (or the first few months of this year), less than last year or about the same?

(probe for examples, descriptions of each activity)

	More than last year	Less than last year	About the same as last year	Don't know
a. completes school assignments				
b. pays attention in class				
c. reads for pleasure				
d. participates in extracurricular activities (e.g., clubs, teams)				
e. gets high at school				
f. makes new friends				

● FINAL COMMENT

33. Overall, what is the highest priority task you had in working with this student?
(If question is not understood, ask "of all the problems that have been mentioned, which is the biggest one for this student?")

34. In what areas did this student make the greatest progress this year?

35. What role did CIS play in the student's achievements?
What else could have been done for him/her?

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

OMB Form No 51-R-1254
Expiration Date 30 August 1980

CITIES IN SCHOOLS EVALUATION

Case Manager Interview Form

POST-TEST / Schedule B

City ______________________ Component ______________________

Case Manager ______________________ Case Manager ID No. ______________________

Grade __________ Race __________ Sex __________

---

1. What do you think CIS has accomplished this year? What is your opinion of the program?

2. What are some of the problems the program has encountered? How would you attempt to solve them?

INSTITUTIONALIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE--SCHEDULE A

PROJECT DIRECTORS', C.I.S.

1. How were social service agency staff assigned to CIS? ______

______

2. How was the assignment of social service agency staff coordinated with agencies?

______

3. What kinds of problems have you encountered in coordinating this effort?

______

4. Are there any volunteers currently working with CIS? ______

Number of Volunteers and Affiliation	Activity	Hours per Week

5. Have you developed contacts with community churches, merchants, or community-based organizations? ______

Name of Contact	Organization	Nature of Contact	Frequency

ERIC

8/78)

OMB Form No. 51-R-1254 Expiration Date 30 August 1980

This report is authorized by law (20 USC 1221e). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

CITIES IN SCHOOLS EVALUATION

Student Interview Form

POST-TEST/Schedule A

City ______________ Component ______________

Student ID No. ______________ Birthdate ⎵⎵-⎵⎵-⎵⎵

Leader of your group of 10 ______________ Grade ____ Sex ____ Race ____

Introductory Remarks:

- *ON CONFIDENTIALITY: we will use ID numbers (no names) and will not discuss this conversation with anyone. Information will be assembled to report program activities and results, not to discuss specific individuals.*
- *You are not representing CIS, but are a member of an evaluation team that is visiting the program in the three cities where it operates. (Describe if necessary)*
- *We are talking to many students, staff members, and parents in each of the cities to find out what the participants do and do not like about the program.*
- *We are trying to learn about the program so other schools can start programs like this.*
- *Students are not required to answer any questions they do not want to. Ask if the student has any questions before you begin.*
- *We are interested in their experiences during this school year only. Some questions will refer only to the last few months.*

● SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

1. How do you feel about school in general?

☐ Boring ☐ Fun ☐ Worthwhile ☐ Okay
☐ Don't like it ☐ Other (specify) ______________

Why do you feel this way? ______________

2. Which classes do you enjoy? (list) ______________

How do you behave in them?

☐ Listen ☐ Participate in discussions ☐ Take notes
☐ Sleep ☐ Write letters ☐ Fool around
☐ Do nothing ☐ Talk to friends ☐ Do homework for other classes
☐ Read something other than class work
☐ Other (specify) ______________

Why? ______________

3. Which classes do you not enjoy? (list) ______________

How do you behave in them?

☐ Listen ☐ Participate in discussions ☐ Take notes
☐ Sleep ☐ Write letters ☐ Fool around
☐ Do nothing ☐ Talk to friends ☐ Do homework for other classes
☐ Read something other than class work
☐ Other (specify) ______________

Why? ______________

4. What courses are you taking this year that you didn't have to take? (list) ______________

165

st of special programs available at your school—

Are you in any of them? (list) ______________________________

Are there any you would LIKE to be in but aren't? (list) ______________________________

____

● ACADEMIC

6. Have you had difficulty with any of these subjects this year? ☐ No problems
(vary the order in which you read the studies.)

☐ Social studies ☐ Science ☐ E.S.L. ☐ Composition ☐ Reading
☐ Spelling ☐ Math ☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

7. Does someone in the program help you with any of these subjects? ☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Have you participated in any of the following?

Activity	Sessions per week (circle frequency)				
☐ Learning Center	1	2	3	4	5
☐ Reading class	1	2	3	4	5
☐ Individual tutoring after school	1	2	3	4	5
☐ Special in-class help	1	2	3	4	5
☐ Help with homework	1	2	3	4	5

9. In general, are you doing better or worse in your school work this year than last year?

☐ Better ☐ No Change ☐ Worse ☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

____

10. People mostly talk about three kinds of problems that students have in school—

1 *They do not go to classes—they cut classes, are late, or do not even come to school.*
2 *They make trouble for the teachers in classes.*
3 *They get in trouble in the halls and around the school—like getting into fights, or being high all the time.*

About how many times in the past few months have you . . .

	Never	Hardly ever	About once a month	About once a week	Almost every day
Skipped school					
Cut class					
Arrived late for class					

11. What do you do when you skip school, cut class, or are late?

☐ Sleep in ☐ Rap with friends on school grounds ☐ Rap with friends off school grounds
☐ Smoke a cigarette ☐ Get high ☐ Drink ☐ Go shopping
☐ Spend time with girlfriend/boyfriend ☐ Stay home to watch TV ☐ Stay home to babysit
☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

12. About how often in the past few months have you . . .

	Never	Hardly ever	About once a month	About once a week	Almost every day
Been in trouble in class for fooling around					
Had angry arguments with teachers					
Had angry arguments with other students					
Been high at school					
Had fights at school					

13. Have your parents been called in to a disciplinary hearing with the principal this year?
(explore reasons, outcomes, role of CIS staff, if applicable)

☐ Never ☐ Once or twice ☐ More than three times

14. Have you been suspended from school this year?
(explore reasons, outcome, role of CIS staff, if applicable)

☐ Never ☐ Once or twice ☐ More than three times

15. Did you drop out of school at any time this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No
(explore reasons for dropping out, motivation for return)

PARTICIPATION IN EXTRACURRICULAR AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

16. What do you usually do after school? Where do you usually go?

17. Would you RATHER be doing something else after school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what? ______

18. Here is a list of activities that students sometimes do after school or on weekends.
Which ones have you done in the last year?

	last year?	Who went? (family, friends, school, CIS)
Team sports (baseball, etc.)		
Attend a play		
Dinner parties		
Go to the movies		
Attend sports events		
Visit museums		
Attend special events (circus, etc.)		
Outdoor recreation activities		
Visit another city		
Visit amusement parks		
Church activities (choir, youth group)		
Neighborhood recreation center activities		
Volunteer activities		
Other (specify) ______		

19. Do you ever want to participate in some of these activities but can't? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, why can't you? ☐ Health problem ☐ Child care responsibilities ☐ Wasn't invited
☐ Employment ☐ Parental restrictions ☐ Not enough tickets
☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

● PEER GROUP

20. How many of the other students in your group of 10 are good friends? ______

How many are there in this group that you can't get along with at all? ______

21. How would you describe yourself in terms of the way you get along with other kids?

☐ Have only a few friends ☐ About average ☐ Friendlier than average ☐ Usually out going
☐ Want to be around people ☐ Other (describe) ______________________________

22. Has anybody you know well dropped out of school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, why did this person dropout?
____

What has made you stay in school? ______________________________

Was this person your brother, sister, good friend, acquaintance, other? ______________________________

● EMPLOYMENT

23. Have you had a part-time job this year? ☐ No ☐ Part-time ☐ Summer

If so, what did you do? ______________________________

How did you get it? ______________________________

Why did you quit? (if quit or fired, obtain reasons) ______________________________

24. Have you made arrangements for a summer job this year?

☐ Yes, have been hired
☐ In the process of applying
☐ No

If so, what will you be doing? ______________________________

What did you do to apply? ______________________________

Did CIS staff help with arrangements? How? ______________________________

25. If you have not yet made arrangements for a summer job, do you plan to get one? ☐ Yes ☐ No

26. Do you plan to finish high school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, why not and what do you plan to do?
____
____

27 If yes, what do you plan to do when you finish high school?

☐ Go to vocational school or training
☐ Go to junior college and study
☐ Go to college and study
☐ Haven't decided
☐ Find a job (what type)? ______________________________
☐ Other (specify) ______________________________

28. What can you do in high school that will help you reach this goal?

☐ Talk to program staff
☐ Take courses in the field
☐ Do volunteer work in the field
☐ Visit local business office
☐ Don't know
☐ Talk to guidance counselor
☐ Visit college or vocational school
☐ Write for information (catalogues, applications)
☐ Take entrance examination (i.e., SAT)
☐ Other (specify) ____________________

29. How did you decide on this future?

☐ Talked to career counselor
☐ Famous people in the news
☐ Other (specify) ____________________
☐ Heard about it in class
☐ Example among family or friends
☐ Read about it (where?) ____________________
☐ TV/radio/movies

30. Is there someone around your neighborhood you would like to be like? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, who? What does he/she do? Why do you want to be like that person?

● CRIMINAL JUSTICE CONTACTS

31. Have you been hassled by the police this year? ☐ Never ☐ Once or twice ☐ More than three times

(collect incident—what happened, who was involved, outcome)

32. Have you done anything against the law and not gotten caught this year (i.e., shoplifting, vandalism)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(describe offense)

33. Have you been sent to court this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(explore reason, outcome)

34. Have you been on probation this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, why?

● INTERACTION WITH CIS STAFF

35. With which program staff member do you spend the most time?

Why? ______

36. About how often each week do you see

☐ Daily ☐ 3-4 times ☐ 1-2 times ☐ Hardly ever

When? (check all that apply) ☐ During school hours ☐ After school ☐ Weekends

37. Have you talked to program staff about any of these topics since the school year began? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, indicate which topics:

☐ school work ☐ teacher problems ☐ personal problems
☐ attendance ☐ home problems ☐ dropping out of school
☐ just talk ☐ money problems ☐ other (explain)

______

______

Probe for details about one of the topics checked ______

______

______

38. Has anyone from the program visited your home this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Staff	Frequency	Nature of Visit

● BEHAVIOR CHANGES

39. Do you act in the following ways more than last year, less than last year or about the same?

	More than last year	Less than last year	About the same as last year
a. Complete school assignments			
b. Pay attention in class			
c. Read for pleasure			
d. Participate in extracurricular activities (e.g., clubs, teams)			
e. Get high at school			
f. Make new friends			

Probe for examples, descriptions of each activity ______

______

______

______

STUDENT CRITIQUE

40. What do your friends outside the program think about it?

41. What do you think the program is supposed to do?

42. What do you think you got out of it?

43. What do you think of the program?

44. Do you want to be in it next year? Why?

Respondent ID No. ____________

INTERVIEWER NOTES

a. Honesty of response:

Not honest at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very honest

b. Observed health/medical problems

c. Other observations (i.e., obvious recent drug or alcohol use, hostility, fatigue)

d. What came across to you during the interview that we might miss from reading the responses to the separate questions?

CITIES IN SCHOOLS

STUDENT POST-INTERVIEW RATING SHEET

(fill out one for each student after the interview)

_______________ Student ID No. __________ Interviewer __________

Tell me at what point these kinds of behavior become a problem for students your age.

ATTENDANCE: If a student is absent about . . .

☐ once every few weeks
☐ 1 day a week
☐ 2 days a week
☐ 3 days a week
☐ 4 or more days a week

VERBAL ABUSE OF TEACHER OR STAFF: If a student often (a few times a week) . . .

☐ talks back to a teacher using dirty language
☐ talks back to a teacher using dirty language, making threats, screaming, etc.
☐ something beyond screaming such as pushing or shoving the teacher

---

AGGRESSIVENESS TOWARD OTHER STUDENTS: A student often (a few times a week) . . .

☐ threatens other students (not in fun)
☐ pushes other students around
☐ starts minor fights (a few blows)
☐ starts real fights (fists, but someone usually gets hurt)
☐ starts fights and often brings a weapon (pipe, bottle, etc.)

DRUGS AND ALCOHOL: A student gets high at school . . .

☐ once every few weeks
☐ a few times a week
☐ almost every day for part of the day
☐ almost every morning and stays that way for the rest of the school day

---

DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR: A student . . .

☐ is committing minor offenses for which he/she could get arrested (petty shoplifting, vandalism, etc.)
☐ is not violent, but is committing offenses that would be felonies for an adult (burglary, shoplifting expensive goods, etc.)
☐ is committing violence-related offenses (battery, purse-snatching, robbery, etc.)

Cities in Schools Evaluation
STUDENT INTERVIEW FORM

POST-TEST

ATTITUDE

City ______________________ Component ______________________

Respondent ID No ______________

		RESPONSE (circle yes or no)	
1	Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?	Yes	No
2.	Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?	Yes	No
3.	Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway?	Yes	No
4	Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say?	Yes	No
5.	When you get punished, does it usually seem it's for no good reason at all?	Yes	No
6.	Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's mind?	Yes	No
7.	Do you feel that it's nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything?	Yes	No
8.	Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right?	Yes	No
9.	Do you believe that most kids are just born good at sports?	Yes	No
10.	Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?	Yes	No
11.	Do you feel that when a kid your own age decides to hit you, there's little you can do to stop him or her?	Yes	No
12.	Have you felt that when people were mean to you it was usually for no reason at all?	Yes	No
13.	Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?	Yes	No
14	Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?	Yes	No
15.	Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?	Yes	No
16.	Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?	Yes	No
17	Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?	Yes	No
18.	Do you feel that if someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?	Yes	No
19.	Do you usually feel that it's almost useless to try in school because most other children are just plain smarter than you are?	Yes	No
20.	Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?	Yes	No
21	Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?	Yes	No

4/79

Cities in Schools Evaluation
Teacher Interview Form

City ________ Component _____ Teacher I.D. No. ____________
Sex __________ Race __________ Age ____ Interviewer _________

o Introductory Remarks

- You are a member of an independent evaluation team doing an assessment of the Cities in Schools Program.
- You are interviewing teachers, selected randomly from the faculty, to discuss the impact of the program on the school and the students.
- All answers are strictly confidential.

1. Are you familiar with a program called Cities in Schools operating in this school? ___ No ___ Yes
Under what circumstances have you observed the program? ________

2. From what you have seen or heard, how would you describe the program?
____
(Probe for perceived objectives, description, activities, outcomes.)

3. What kind of students seem to be chosen for this program? ________
Have you ever recommended that a particular student be included in the program? ___ No ___ Yes If you have, what problems were they having? ________

4. Do you see the program making changes in these students? (I.e., academic improvement, differences in school behavior, self-esteem)
___ No ___ Yes Describe: ________
In your opinion, has the program had a positive effect upon the students? ___ No ___ Yes If yes, how? ________
Have there been any negative effects on the students? ___ No ___ Yes
If yes, what are they? ________

5. Are there any ways in which CIS has made your job easier? ___ No
___ Yes If yes, how? ________

6. Are there any ways in which CIS has made your job harder?
___ No ___ Yes If yes, how? ________

7. Any other side effects?

8. In your opinion, how important is this program to the students it serves?

9. If you had money, what kind of special program would you develop at this school? (Probe for objectives, activities, student population.)

10. In your opinion, how much communication is there between CIS staff and the teaching faculty?

What has been the nature of the communications?

11. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program?

12. Any other observations?

EXHIBIT B.5

INSTITUTIONALIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE--SCHEDULE B

DIRECTORS, DEPUTIES OF SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (STARRED ITEMS)

1.* What is the nature of your agency's relationship with CIS?

____ Staff have been assigned to work at a school, as part of CIS.
____ Plans to assign staff to a CIS project have been completed.
____ Plans to assign staff to a CIS project are being developed.
____ The agency is making inquiries about CIS.
____ None
____ Other (describe) ____

____

____

2. Briefly describe the procedure your agency uses in choosing which staff members are assigned to CIS.

____

____

____

3. How are staff who are assigned to CIS paid?

____ Federal funding only
____ Matching funds (describe) ________________________________

____

____

____ Agency funds only
____ Other (describe) ____

____

____

4. By what means does your agency maintain contact with staff assigned to CIS components?

____ Informally, as needed.
____ Through periodic memos or reports from assigned staff.
____ Other (describe) ____

____

____

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

5a. How would you characterize your agency's current position on the CIS project?

(1) ____ The agency is prepared in principle to assign personnel to the program on a permanent basis.
(2) ____ The agency approves of CIS as a program, but is unlikely to assign staff without continuing Federal subsidy.
(3) ____ The agency is taking a wait-and-see approach.
(4) ____ The agency is not favorably impressed by the CIS program.
(5) ____ No opinion.
(6) ____ Other (Describe) ____________________

____

____

____

5b. [If 6a is answered by "1" or "2", ask 5b.] Have you or staff designated by you publicly taken a position on the CIS project?

____ Visited the CIS site.
____ Spoke at a meeting or public gathering (Describe) ____________

____

____

____

____ Wrote letter(s) or article(s) on behalf of CIS.
____ Encouraged other agencies to obtain information on CIS.
____ Encouraged other agencies to assign staff to CIS.

7.* Could you comment on your own assessment of CIS? ____________

____

____

____

8.* What future would you predict for CIS? ____________

____

____

____

What is the basis of your prediction? ____________

____

____

9. Has CIS participation affected the way that your agency does its job?

____

____

____

____

EXHIBIT B.6

SERVICE DELIVERY QUESTIONNAIRE--SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF

1. In CIS, how many students are on your caseload? ____________

2. About how many of them do you talk to daily? ____________

3. About how often do you talk to any one student (besides saying hello)?

____ once a day ____ once a week ____ every few weeks

____ monthly ____ other ______________________________

4. Please take a look at this list of places where counseling may take place.

A. % of instances		B. Duration of Session
____	At a student's home	____
____	Away from school, but not at home	____
____	At appointments in the office	____
____	At appointments somehwere else at school (e.g., lunchroom)	____
____	Unplanned encounters during the school day	____
100%		

In Column A, place an estimate of the percentage of your counseling that occurs at each place. In Column B, indicate how much time you usually spend with a student.

5. About how often did you talk to client?

____ once a day ____ once a week ____ every few weeks

____ monthly ____ other ______________________________

6. Agency where previously assigned ____________

7. Location (e.g., central office, storefront, branch office, etc.

____

8. How large was your agency caseload? ____________

9. About how many of these clients did you talk to daily? ____________

10. Please read over the following items, and for each one indicate (by a check in the appropriate space) how your agency experience and CIS experience compare.

	Agency much better	Agency somewhat better	Agency and CIS same	CIS somewhat better	CIS much better
Access to client					
Time spent in direct contact with clients					
Career prospects					
Development of my professional skills					
Support services from the administration					
Knowledge of the client's real needs and resources					
Availability of help from other staff					
Positive impact of your work on the client					

11. One tenet of the CIS philosophy is that the program will be able to reach families through contact with the student at school. Have you found this to be true?

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

12. How would you compare your work at the agency and at CIS with regard to the problem of burning out?

13. What is the most important disadvantage of working out of the school rather than out of the office where you worked before?

14. What is the most important advantage of working out of the school rather than out of the office where you worked before?

15. Overall, where would you prefer to work if you had to choose between CIS and your agency's central office?

16. Do you still feel that you are part of your agency? ____________________

17. How do you deal with the two supervisors--the CIS program manager and the agency supervisor? ____________________

18. What changes would you make in the CIS program? ____________________

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

EXHIBIT B.7

CITIES IN SCHOOLS

Project History

Interview Form

Site ______________ Date __________

Interviewer ________________________

Interviewee ____
Name Title/agency Phone

Relationship to Cities in Schools ____________________________
(Role, length of service, dates)

Note to Interviewers.

- AIR will prepare the manuscript; your primary responsibility is to gather as much information as you can about the history of the project.
- Key data sources will be the project archives and personal interviews with key actors throughout the project development.
- References to people, events, decisions etc. should be well documented with information such as agency affiliations, dates, reasons for decisions, the decision makers and so forth.
- Request copies of any documents, reports, correspondence, archival materials of potential value in assembling the history.
- * Gather lots of examples of the interviewee's experience or observations related to the project. These can be situations which occurred with the students, staff members, sponsors, parents. We can learn a lot about the project through anecdotal accounts and they'll contribute to a more interesting narrative.
- Don't be bound by this outline. It is designed to cover the basics but is probably more exclusive than inclusive; let the interviewee talk about the program. We have a lot to learn.

The outline below briefly summarizes the contents on the following pages.

I. Introduction
II. Developing the Project
    A. The Original Program
    B. Early Support
III. Getting Started: The First Year
    A. Setting Up the Program
    B. Problems and Changes
    C. Evaluations and Reactions
IV. Project Continuation

---

* Items marked with an asterisk should provide opportunities for such examples. Collect both negative and positive situations.

ERIC

I. Introduction. Make a brief statement about the origins of the project. (Include antecedents of the project here and/or elsewhere)

II. Developing the Project.

A. The Original Program.

* 1. Why was the project started in this city?

2. To what extent was the idea for the project initiated here and/or elsewhere?

3. Who were the key actors required to establish the project here?

* 4. What local conditions stimulated this city's interest in Cities in Schools? (or whatever else called earlier)

5. Describe the design of the early project.

6. What were the long-range goals at the beginning of the project?

7. Were there any first year objectives stated at the outset of the project?

B. Early Support.

* 1. Describe the role, nature and extent of involvement, expectations of the following early supporters.

	Role	Nature and extent of involvement	Expectations
Mayor			
School superintendent			
Youth service agencies			
Business community			
Local community			
Other			

2. On funding. Try to obtain the following.

Sources sought	Why?	Degree of success in dollars	Continuation

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

III. Getting Started: The First Year

A. Setting Up the Program. (Description of the first implementation)

1. On school selection.

Name of school	Grade level	Why selected

2. On student selection.

Type of students	How selected	Approximate number

3. On staff selection.

Source (where come from)	How used	Selection criteria

4. Describe the administrators of the program e. g. who and why?

5. Agency participation.

Name of agency	Nature and extent of involvement	Why selected

6. List the fundings sources and the approximate amount supplied by each

7. Describe how the program was set up.

* 8. Describe some of the major activities during the first year. Note specific successes and failures.

B. Problems and Changes.

* 1. Describe any differences between the proposed project and the one which became operational.

* 2. Identify problems encountered in establishing the project.

* 3. What changes were made as the year progressed? Why?

C. Evaluations and Reactions.

1. If an evaluation was conducted, state what changes were made as a result. (Collect relevant documents)

* 2. Describe the response of the participants, parents, community members, stakeholders and others to the program.

IV. Project Continuation. Use one of these forms for each of the subsequent years to the present.

Year 2______ Year 3______ Year 4______ Year 5______ Year 6___

* A. Describe changes in the project between the previous year and the one checked above.

1. Expansion of the project.

2. Reduction of the project.

3. Organizational set up.

4. Personnel.

5. Agency participation.

6. Funding sources.

7. Student composition.

* B. Were there any new and/or different relationships among the principal actors, agencies, sponsors etc? If so, please describe.

* C. What obstacles arose during this year? Did any of the old ones disappear? How were these obstacles addressed?

D. Were there any changes in the focus of the project e. g. long and short term goals? What were they and why did they change?

* E. Describe some of the major activities during the year. Note specific successes and failures.

* F. Describe the response of nonschool participants and/or observers (community, parents, other stakeholders).

G. Were there any evaluations. If so, state who, when, how and why? What was done as a result of the conclusions?

Other comments offered by the interviewee.

Use this space for recording examples.

Cities in Schools Project Histories

1. Some suggestions to help in developing the histories:

Note: AIR will write up the histories so you can concentrate on getting the facts and figures down and not worry about putting the information into polished prose.

Basic sources of information will be:

1. project archives
2. talking to the people who were involved at the time.

Please include wherever possible

1. names, titles, agencies of all persons mentioned
2. dates for all events
3. for every step that required a decision:
    a. who made the decision
    b. for what reasons

At every interview, you should ask for copies of any documents, archival material, reports to sponsors, correspondence, etc. that you or the interviewee think might be useful to us.

Narrative and anecdotal accounts: Interviews often result in interesting and revealing information that does not seem to fit directly into any section of the outline. Please do include with the notes you give us incidents interviewees relate to you. (Readable interview notes will be fine.)

2. Brief outline

Introduction

I. Developing the Project
    A. The Original Program
    B. Early Support
II. Getting Started--The First Year
    A. Setting it Up
    B. Problems and Changes
    C. Evaluations/reactions
III. Second Year--Changes and Expansions
IV. Third Year--Changes and Expansions

3. Expanded outline with questions.

Introduction--a brief statement of when the project was started or how long it has been going and what it is all about.

I. Developing the project

  A. The Original Program

    1. Why was the project started here in this city?

    2. To what extent was the project developed here and to what extent was it an idea brought from elsewhere? What were the antecedents of the project in this city? in other cities?

    3. Who was involved in getting the project started in this city?

    4. Why do you think this city was receptive to the Cities in Schools idea? Were there specific local problems that were of major concern?

    5. What were the long-range goals at the beginning of the project?

    6. What were the first year objectives at the time the project was being formulated?

    7. What did the project look like when it was first proposed?

  B. Early Support

    1. Whose support was sought to get the project going?

      a. mayor's office

      b. school superintendent's office

      c. principal youth-service agencies

      d. any other important groups (e.g., business community)

    2. What was their reaction? What was the nature and extent of their involvement? What were their expectations of the project?

    3. What was the role/reaction/expectations of the local community? (neighborhood)

    4. Where was funding sought? Why? With what success? Where did first funding come from?

II. Getting Started--The First Year

A. Setting it Up--Describe the program as it was first implemented

1. School selection--which school(s), why was it (were they) selected

2. Student selection--how many students were involved, how were they selected

3. Staff selection--what was the staffing pattern, what were the selection criteria

4. Administration--who became administrators, why

5. Agency involvement--which agencies, exact nature of their commitment, why they were selected

6. Describe the actual set-up (e.g., students were divided into ____ families of ____ with ____ staff____)

7. Budget breakdown: amount of money from each funding source

8. Describe some major activities of the first year

B. Problems and Changes

1. How did the program as it was set up differ from the proposed program prior to implementation? Why?

2. What other problems were encountered in getting started?

3. What changes were made as the year progressed? Why?

C. Evaluations/Reactions

1. Was an evaluation done? If yes, attach report, memoranda, or other products. Was anything done as a result of the conclusions?

2. What was the response of participants, community, other stakeholders?

III. The Second Year

A. What happened to the project? Were there changes? Expansion? Components dropped?

B. Describe the program set-up for this year.

C. Name the new people and agencies involved this year.

D. Was there a new/different relationship among the principal actors, agencies, funding sponsors? Describe the new roles.

E. Were there changes in the focus of the project? In the long-range goals? In the objectives for this year? What were the changes? Why did they change?

F. Were old problems ameliorated? Did new ones arise?

G. Give figures for second year.

   1. Student/staff characteristics by component

   2. Budget breakdown by component and source

H. Describe some major activities/accomplishments during the year

I. Were there any evaluations? By whom, when, what was looked at, conclusions, what was done as a result of the conclusions?

J. Reaction of participants, community, other stakeholders

IV. The Third Year

For each subsequent year (if any) run through the questions in part III again. In that way we can get an historical picture of the project on a year-by-year basis.

EXHIBIT B.8

AIR CITIES IN SCHOOLS

City ______________
Component ______________
AIR Student ID No. ______________
Student Birthdate ____/____/______

I. IDENTIFICATION

A. City: (circle one)
1 = Atlanta
2 = Indianapolis
3 = New York City

B. Component (fill in school name) ______________________________

C. AIR Student ID No. |_|_|_|_|_|

D. School System ID No. |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

E. Grade in School, 1978 - 79 (write number 01 - 12) |_|_|

F. CIS Family (40) (write in name of family group leader):
____

G. CIS Family (10) (caseload: write in name of case manager): CM ID No. |_____|
____

H. Date joined CIS. ____ ____ ____
month year

I. Still in program at end of year: ______ yes ______ no

If no, date left CIS ____ ____ ____
month year

Reason for Withdrawing (circle one)

1 = Graduation
2 = GED
3 = Went back into regular school program at another school
4 = Moved away
5 = Incarcerated
6 = Unknown
7 = Employment
8 = Armed services
10 = Lost interest
11 = Pregnancy
12 = Family problems
13 = Health
14 = Expelled
15 = Other (specify). ______________________________

II. PERSONAL INFORMATION

Data Source

A. Race. 1 = Black 3 = Hispanic
2 = White 4 = Other

B. Home Language: 1 = English 3 = English/Spanish
2 = Spanish 4 = Other

C. Sex. 1 = Male 2 = Female

D. Evidence of Medical Problems (circle all that apply)

X = no information
0 = none (source specifies none)
1 = physical handicap
2 = chronic illness:
3 = malnutrition
4 = EMR/learning disability
5 = drug/alcohol use
6 = hearing/vision loss
7 = other (describe)

City ____________

Component ____________

AIR Student ID no. ____________

Student ID No ____ - ____ - ____

Data Source

II. PERSONAL INFORMATION (continued)

E. Evidence of Emotional Stresses
(circle all that apply)

X = no information
0 = none (source specifies none)
1 = violent, acting out
2 = frequent loss of temper
3 = uncooperative
4 = lacks friends
5 = other (describe) ____________

F. Student is an unwed parent?

X = no information
0 = No
1 = Yes

G. Student has special help (circle all that apply)

X = no information
1 = bus ticket
2 = lunch ticket
3 = school fees
4 = other (describe) ____________

H. Student has job?

X = no information
0 = no
1 = part-time during school year
2 = summer job
3 = both part-time during school and summer job

Coder remarks (describe any inconsistencies in data) ____________

III. SCHOOL INDEX

A. Time in school (circle one)

1 = Entered at beginning of year
2 = Entered later (fill in date) ____ / ____ / ____

Reason for late entry (circle one)

1 = seasonal employment
2 = illness
3 = lack of clothing
4 = lack of money
5 = incarcerated
6 = other (specify) ____________
7 = transferred from another school

1 = finished school year
2 = withdrew from school (fill in date) ____ / ____ / ____

B. Reason for withdrawing (circle one)

1 = graduation
2 = GED
3 = went back into regular school program at another school
4 = moved away
5 = incarcerated
6 = unknown
7 = employment
8 = armed services
10 = lost interest
11 = pregnancy
12 = family problems
13 = health
14 = expelled
15 = other (specify) ____________

City ____________

Component ____________

AIR Student ID No. ____________

Student Birthdate ____/____/____

IV. FAMILY INFORMATION

Data Source

A. Lives with
- X = no information
- 1 = both natural parents
- 2 = one natural parent and step parent
- 3 = single parent family
- 4 = lives alone or with siblings (not parent)
- 5 = lives with other adult relative
- 6 = lives with person other than relative
- 7 = other (describe): ____________

____

B. Size of family.

X = no information

Number of siblings ____________

Other people in home (list relationship)

____

____

____

Total number of people regularly living in home. ____________

C. Education level of father:
- X = no information
- 1 = grade school
- 2 = some high school
- 3 = graduated from high school
- 4 = some college/technical training
- 5 = finished post high school training course (not 4-year college)
- 6 = graduated 4-year college
- 7 = post graduate
- 8 = unknown

D. Education level of mother:
- X = no information
- 1 = grade school
- 2 = some high school
- 3 = graduated from high school
- 4 = some college/technical training
- 5 = finished post high school training course (not 4-year college)
- 6 = graduated 4-year college
- 7 = post graduate
- 8 = unknown

E. Occupation of head(s) of household:

____________ Father or male head
100

____________ Mother or female head
100

F. Employment status of head of household
- X = no information
- 1 = regularly employed
- 2 = temporarily unemployed
- 3 = chronically unemployed
- 4 = not seeking work but physically able to work
- 5 = disabled
- 6 = other (describe)

____

____

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

City ____________

Component ____________

AIR Student ID No. ____________

Student Birthdate ____ ____ ____

Data Source

IV. FAMILY INFORMATION (continued)

G. Income level of family

1 = less than $5,000 per year
2 = $5,000 – $10,000
3 = $10,000 – $15,000
4 = more than $15 000
5 = other (describe) ____________________

____

H. Type of financial assistance received by the family (circle all that apply):

X = no information
0 = none
1 = A(F)DC
2 = Social Security
3 = disability/workman's compensation
4 = child support
5 = unemployment compensation
6 = State Supplemental Income
7 = Food Stamps
8 = Medicaid
10 = Other (specify) ____________________

I. Family situation (circle all that apply)

X = no information
1 = parent physical illness/incapacitated
2 = parent emotionally unstable
3 = parent drug/ alcohol abuse
4 = sibling(s) drug/alcohol abuse
5 = parent involved in criminal activities
6 = sibling(s) involved in criminal activities
7 = unwed sibling(s) have children

Describe each problem circled: ____________________

____

____

____

J. Social Service needs of the family (circle all that apply):

0 = none (form states there are no service needs)
1 = employment
2 = income assistance
3 = medical/dental care
4 = food stamps
5 = housing
6 = childcare/daycare
7 = mental health/counseling
8 = drug/alcohol treatment
10 = clothing
11 = legal/criminal justice
12 = transportation
13 = child abuse
14 = pregnancy counseling
15 = other (specify)

Describe each need circled: ____________________

____

____

____

K. Is the student Title XX eligible? ______ yes ______ no

X. CIS RECORDKEEPING (circle one)

1. CIS File is missing most of the information needed to complete this form
2. CIS File is missing some of the information needed to complete this form
3. CIS File is missing only a few items needed to complete this form

Coder remarks (describe data inconsistencies) ____________________

____

____

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ______________________

Component ______________________

AIR Student ID No. ______________________

Student Birthday ____-____-____

Is there any record(s) on disciplinary actions for this student? ○ Yes ○ No

- If "Yes", complete Section V for each action:

V. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS AT SCHOOL (fill out one for each incident between 1975 and 1978).

A. Incidents: Date. ______

Data Source

- Problem Type.
  - x = no information
  - 1 = cutting class
  - 2 = truancy
  - 3 = disrupting class
  - 4 = fighting
  - 5 = drugs
  - 6 = verbal abuse of teachers
  - 7 = other (describe):

____

- Handled By
  - x = no information
  - 1 = dean
  - 2 = teacher
  - 3 = CIS staff member
  - 4 = principal
- Parental notification.
  - x = no information
  - 1 = parents came to school
  - 2 = parents called
  - 3 = parents sent note
  - 4 = no parental notification
  - 5 = other (describe):

____

- Action taken
  - x = no information
  - 0 = none
  - 1 = warning
  - 2 = detention
  - 3 = suspension
  - 4 = banned for semester
  - 5 = paddling
  - 6 = other (describe)

____

  - 7 = in-house suspension

- Number of days of disciplinary action ______

Coder remarks (describe data inconsistencies).

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

AIR CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ______________________

Component ______________________

AIR Student ID No. ______________________

Student Birthday ____-____-____

VI. ATTENDANCE

1. Fill in number of days absent using the smallest period of time recorded (semester, quarter, six times per year) however often the school records it.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Total	Data Source
1976-77								
1977-78								
1978-79								

2. Fill in number of classes cut (same time periods as in Item 1, above)

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Total	Data Source
1976-77								
1977-78								
1978-79								

Coder remarks (describe data inconsistencies).

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ____________________

Component ____________________

AIR Student ID No ____________________

Student Birthday ____-____-____

VII. GRADES

A. Fill in grade points or grades for each marking period in 1978-79 and the final grade point average.

		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Final
GPA								
Reading	01							
Spelling	02							
English/ Literature	03							
Social Studies	04							
Math	05							
Science	06							
Orientation	26							
Careers	27							
Drug Education/Health	32							
U.S. History I & II (Indianapolis only)								

B. List the courses taken in 1978-79

Data Source

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________
6. ____________________
7. ____________________
8. ____________________
9. ____________________
10. ____________________
11. ____________________
12. ____________________
13. ____________________
14. ____________________

City ______________________

Component ______________________

AIR Student ID No. ______________________

Student Birthday. ___-___-___

VII. GRADES (continued)

C. Fill in final grades for each subject listed for 1977-78 and 1976-77 and grade point average for those years.

		1977-78 Final Grade	1976-77 Final Grade	Data Source
GPA				
Reading	01			
Spelling	02			
English/ Literature	03			
Social Studies	04			
Math	05			
Science	06			
Orientation	26			
Careers	27			
Drug Education/ Health	32			
U.S. History (I & II) (Indianapolis only)				
Civics (New York only)				

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ________________

Component ________________

AIR Student ID No. ________________

Student Birthday ____-____-____

VIII. TEST SCORES—1976-79

Start with most recent score first and go back to last three sets (years) of test scores.
Record: name of test; date of test; subtest code*, and score.

* Subtest codes.
1 = Reading
2 = Language
3 = Math
4 = Comprehension
5 = Vocabulary
6 = Speed/accuracy
7 = Total battery

Set 1
Test Name ________________ Date. ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

Set 2
Test Name ________________ Date: ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

Set 3
Test Name ________________ Date: ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

Set 4
Test Name. ________________ Date ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

Set 5
Test Name: ________________ Date. ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

Set 6
Test Name: ________________ Date ________

Code*	GE	Percentile	Raw Score	Data Source

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ______________________
Component ______________________
AIR Student ID No. ______________________
Student Birthday ______________________

IX. SCHOOL BEHAVIOR / ATLANTA CONDUCT GRADES

	Fall	Winter	Spring	Average
Class 1				
Class 2				
Class 3				
Class 4				
Class 5				
Class 6				
Class 7				
Class 8				
Homeroom				

Data Source

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ______________________
Component ______________________
AIR Student ID No. ______________________
Student Birthday. ___-___-___

IX. SCHOOL BEHAVIOR / INDIANAPOLIS CONDUCT

A. Attitudinal Grades

	1977-78	1978-79
Cheerfulness		
Cooperation		
Courtesy		
Dependability		
Industry		
Leadership		
Punctuality		
School Interest		
Study Habits		

B. Teacher's Rating

	1977-78	1978-79
I = Superior		
II = Above Average		
III = Average		
IV = Below Average		
V = Poor		
VS = Special		

XI CIS SERVICE CONTACT SHEET

(Use only if necessary)

City ____________

Component ____________

AIR Student ID No. ____________

Student Birthdate ___/___/___

No	Date	Who	Type	Topic	Outcome
1.	___/___/___				
2	___/___/___				
3.	___/___/___				
4.	___/___/___				
5.	___/___/___				
6.	___/___/___				
7.	___/___/___				
8	___/___/___				
9.	___/___/___				
10	___/___/___				
11	___/___/___				
12	___/___/___				
13	___/___/___				
14	___/___/___				
15	___/___/___				

CITIES IN SCHOOLS
Archival Data/1978-79

City ______________________

Component ______________________

- **COMPONENT** (fill in one for each component in which AIR is collecting data)

1. Fill in total number of school days, using the smallest period of time recorded (semester, quarter, six times per year), however often the school records it.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Total
1976-77							
1977-78							
1978-79							

AIR ID No. ____________
City ____________
Police File No. ____________
Coder ____________

Crimes in Schools
POLICE CONTACT
SHEET

COLUMN DESCRIPTION:

1-6 DATE (enter month (2 col), day (2 col) and year (2 col)
7-8 OFFENSE (see list below)
9 INTIMIDATION (use of weapon by offender)
10-13 VICTIMS
  10 = Number of victims who received only minor injuries
  11 = Number of persons treated by medical personnel and discharged
  12 = Number of persons hospitalized
  13 = Number of victims killed
14-15 POLICE DISPOSITION
16-17 COURT DISPOSITION

Offense Codes:

ROBBERY AND THEFT
- 01 Unarmed robbery
- 02 Strong arm robbery
- 03 Armed robbery
- 04 Other robbery
- 05 Purse-snatching
- 06 Shoplifting
- 07 Auto theft
- 08 Larceny
- 09 Burglary
- 10 Other theft

VIOLENCE RELATED OFFENSES
- 11 Intimidation or extortion
- 12 Assault
- 13 Battery (or assault and battery)
- 14 Involuntary manslaughter
- 15 Attempted murder
- 16 Murder (specify under Remarks)
- 17 Rape
- 18 Deviate sexual assault
- 19 Deviate sexual conduct
- 20 Contributing to sexual delinquency of a minor
- 21 Other sex-related offenses
- 22 Battery with robbery or theft
- 23 Sexual assault
- 24 Other violent acts against persons

POSSESSION OFFENSES
- 31 Possession of heroin
- 32 Possession of marijuana
- 33 Possession of other controlled substance
- 34 Possession of stolen property or receiver of stolen property
- 35 Unlawful possession of a weapon
- 36 Other possession offense

CRIMINAL DAMAGE AND TRESPASS
- 41 Criminal damage to property or land
- 42 Criminal trespass to property or land
- 43 Criminal trespass to vehicle
- 44 Vandalism
- 45 Arson
- 46 Other damage offense
- 47 Other trespass offense

A MULTITUDE OF SINS
- 51 Disorderly conduct
- 52 Loitering
- 53 False fire alarm
- 54 Gambling
- 55 Riding in a stolen car (without knowledge)
- 56 Contributing to delinquency of a minor
- 57 Recruiting gang members
- 58 Resisting or obstructing peace officers
- 59 Unlawful use of a weapon
- 60 Violation of parole or probation
- 61 Writ or Juvenile Court warrant
- 62 [illegible]
- 63 Prostitution
- 64 Escapee

STATUS OFFENSE
- 71 Underage possession or use of alcohol
- 72 Incorrigible or ungovernable
- 73 Runaway
- 74 Truancy
- 75 Curfew violation
- 76 Driving underage
- 77 Other status offense

CATCH-ALL
- 91 Other offense not covered above (specify under Remarks)

Date of Offense			Offense	Intimidation	Victims				Police Disposition	Court Disposition
Month	Day	Year			Minor	Treat	Hosp	Killed		
1 2	3 4	5 6	7 8	9	10	11	12	13	14 15	16 17

Remarks:

EXHIBIT B.9

Observer Report Form

Observer:

Date:

Time:

Location:

Staff Present:

Students Present (if classroom observation, record the number of students in attendance and the number tardy):

Description:

Impression:

(CIS 1/8/79)

EXHIBIT B.10

This report is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

OMB Form No. 51-R-1254
Expiration Date 30 August 1980

CITIES IN SCHOOLS EVALUATION

Case Manager Interview Form

POST-TEST / Schedule B

City ____________________ Component ____________________

Case Manager ____________________ Case Manager ID No ____________________

Grade __________ Race __________ Sex __________

---

1. **What do you think CIS has accomplished this year? What is your opinion of the program?**

2. **What are some of the problems the program has encountered? How would you attempt to solve them?**

4/79

EXHIBIT B.11

CASEWORKER INTERVIEW FORM

POST-TEST 1980

City ____________________ Component ____________________

Caseworker ____________________ Caseworker ID No. ____________________

Grade ____________ Race __________ Sex __________

---

1. What do you think CIS has accomplished this year? What is your opinion of the program?

____

____

____

____

____

2. How would you rate the overall impact of the program on the students this year? Circle one.

Program had no impact	Program had a slight positive impact	Program had a moderate positive impact	Program had a major positive impact

Why did you circle that option? ______________________________

____

____

____

3. Were you a caseworker in 1978-79?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, how would you rate the effects of the CIS program on the students this year as opposed to last year?

___ Worse ___ No Change ___ Better

Why? ____

____

____

4. What are some of the problems the program has encountered. How would you attempt to solve them?

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

214

GPO 880-034