

What Works Clearinghouse



Service and Conservation Corps

Program Description¹

Service and Conservation Corps engages young adults in full-time community service, job training, and educational activities. The program serves youth who are typically between the ages of 17 and 26 and who have dropped out of school, been involved with the criminal justice system, or face other barriers to success. Participants are organized into small crews that carry out environmental and energy conservation, urban infrastructure improvement, and other service projects intended to benefit

local communities. These crews are guided by adult leaders who serve as mentors and role models. All participants receive educational training, in addition to a variety of job training and support services. Youth who have dropped out of school receive classroom training to secure a GED or high school diploma. Participants receive a living allowance while in the program. Those who complete the program are usually eligible for post-program educational stipends or small cash awards.

Research²

One study of *Service and Conservation Corps* that falls within the scope of the Dropout Prevention review protocol meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards with reservations. This study included 626 at-risk youths primarily between ages 17–26 who participated in community service projects in California, Florida, New York, and Washington state.³

Based on this study, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Service and Conservation Corps* for at-risk youth to be small for the completing school domain. The study that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations does not examine the effectiveness of *Service and Conservation Corps* in the staying in school or progressing in school domains for at-risk youth.

Effectiveness

Service and Conservation Corps was found to have no discernible effects on completing school for at-risk youth.

	Staying in school	Progressing in school	Completing school
Rating of effectiveness	na	na	No discernible effects
Improvement index	na	na	-2 percentile points

na = not applicable

1. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program’s website (<http://www.corpsnetwork.org/>, downloaded April 2010). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review. The literature search reflects documents publicly available by May 2010.
2. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
3. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.

Additional program information

Developer and contact

The *Service and Conservation Corps* is developed and distributed by the Corps Network. Address: 1100 G Street, NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20005. Email: info@corpsnetwork.org. Website: <http://www.corpsnetwork.org>. Telephone: (202) 737-6272.

Scope of use

According to the developer, the nation's 143 *Service and Conservation Corps* operate in multiple communities across 44 states and the District of Columbia. Annually, *Service and Conservation Corps* enrolls more than 29,000 young people who provide their communities with nearly 21.3 million hours of service in year-round and summer programs.

Description of intervention

Service and Conservation Corps offers economically or educationally disadvantaged young adults the opportunity to participate in full-time community service, job training, and educational activities. The program aims to provide participants with the education and job skills they need to succeed, while completing projects that improve their communities.

Youth typically participate in *Service and Conservation Corps* full time and can remain in the program for 6 to 12 months. While participating, about 80% of their time is devoted to community

service projects, and the remainder to educational and other training and development activities. Participants are organized into crews of 8 to 15 youth that carry out projects designed to better their communities. Examples of projects include planting trees in urban areas, retrofitting low-income homes for energy efficiency, and restoring parkland. All participants receive educational training in addition to a variety of job training and support services. Youth who have dropped out of school receive classroom training to obtain a GED or high school diploma. This training is often offered through partnerships with local charter schools or community colleges. The topics covered are typically relevant to *Service and Conservation Corps* community service projects. Participants also receive an allowance, which is generally equivalent to or less than the minimum wage. Additionally, participants who complete the program are eligible for post-program educational stipends.

Funding for *Service and Conservation Corps* activities comes from a variety of sources, including federal, state, and local governments and fee-for-service projects in which sponsors pay some or all of the project costs.

Cost

Based on estimates from Jastrzab (1997), the average program costs are about \$13,000 per participant.⁴

Research

Twenty-three studies reviewed by the WWC Dropout Prevention Topic Area investigated the effects of *Service and Conservation Corps*. One study (Jastrzab, 1997) is a randomized controlled trial that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. The remaining 22 studies do not meet either WWC evidence standards or eligibility screens.

Jastrzab (1997) used a randomized controlled trial design to examine the effect of *Service and Conservation Corps* on

youth primarily between the ages of 17 and 26 across four sites located in California, Florida, New York, and Washington state. Under this design, program applicants were randomly assigned to either a treatment group that was allowed to enroll in the program or to a control group that was not. Although the combination of overall and differential rates of student attrition exceeds WWC standards for this topic area, the study statistically controls for (any small) differences between the

4. The WWC converted costs to 2009 dollars using the consumer price index.

Research (continued)

analytic groups in gender, race/ethnicity, and several measures of degree of disadvantage and school performance.⁵ The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons of 626 youths: 383 of whom had participated in *Service and Conservation Corps*, and 243 control group youths who had not. The study measured outcomes 15 months after the youths had applied to the program.

Extent of evidence

The WWC categorizes the extent of evidence in each domain as small or medium to large (see the WWC Procedures and Standards

Handbook, Appendix G). The extent of evidence takes into account the number of studies and the total sample size across the studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations.⁶

The WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Service and Conservation Corps* to be small for the completing school domain for at-risk youth. The study that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations does not examine the effectiveness of *Service and Conservation Corps* in the staying in school or progressing in school domains for at-risk youth.

Effectiveness Findings

The WWC review of interventions for Dropout Prevention addresses student outcomes in three domains: staying in school, progressing in school, and completing school. The study included in this report covers one domain: completing school. The findings below present the authors' estimates and WWC-calculated estimates of the size and the statistical significance of the effects of *Service and Conservation Corps* on at-risk youth.⁷

Completing school. The study found no statistically significant differences between *Service and Conservation Corps* and control group youth in their self-reported rates of having ever earned a high school diploma or GED 15 months after program application. According to the WWC calculations, the effect size was not large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria (i.e., effect size of at least 0.25).

Thus, for the completing school domain, one study showed indeterminate effects.

Rating of effectiveness

The WWC rates the effects of an intervention in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative. The rating of effectiveness takes into account four factors: the quality of the research design, the statistical significance of the findings, the size of the difference between participants in the intervention and the comparison conditions, and the consistency in findings across studies (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E).

5. See WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III for a discussion of establishing equivalence in randomized controlled trials with high attrition.
6. The extent of evidence categorization was developed to tell readers how much evidence was used to determine the intervention rating, focusing on the number and size of studies. Additional factors associated with a related concept (external validity, such as the youths' demographics and the types of settings in which studies took place) are not taken into account for the categorization. Information about how the extent of evidence rating was determined for *Service and Conservation Corps* is in Appendix A4.
7. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, when necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. For the *Service and Conservation Corps* study summarized here, no corrections for clustering or multiple comparisons were needed.

The WWC found *Service and Conservation Corps* to have no discernible effects on completing school for at-risk youth

Improvement index

The WWC computes an improvement index for each individual finding. In addition, within each outcome domain, the WWC computes an average improvement index for each study and an average improvement index across studies (see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix F). The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and the percentile rank of the average student in the comparison condition. Unlike the rating of effectiveness, the improvement index is entirely based on the size of the effect, regardless of the statistical significance of the effect, the study design, or the analysis. The improvement index can take on values between -50 and

+50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group.

The improvement index for completing school is -2 percentile points for a single finding from one study.

Summary

The WWC Dropout Prevention Topic Area reviewed 23 studies on *Service and Conservation Corps*. One study meets WWC evidence standards with reservations; the remaining 22 studies do not meet either WWC evidence standards or eligibility screens. Based on the one study, the WWC found no discernible effects on completing school for at-risk youth. The conclusions presented in this report may change as new research emerges.

References

Meets WWC evidence standards with reservations

Jastrzab, J. (1997). *Youth Corps: Promising strategies for young people and their communities*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Additional source:

Jastrzab, J., Masker, J., Blomquist, J., & Orr, L. (1996). *Impacts of service: Final report on the evaluation of American Conservation and Youth Service Corps*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Studies that fall outside the Dropout Prevention review protocol or do not meet WWC evidence standards

Albornoz, J. (1996). The New Jersey Youth Corps at Jersey City State College: A case study of urban young adult dropouts in a successful second-chance program. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(11A), 275-4621. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Causey, K. A. (2002). Getting to work: Factors influencing sustained work performance by high-risk youth. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(05A), 216-2010. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Edelman, P., Holzer, H., & Offner, P. (2006). *Reconnecting disadvantaged young men*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Harris, L., & Bass, R. (1989). *An in-depth study of Michigan Youth Corps participants, subcontractors, and honor roll employers*. New York: Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Ivry, R., & Doolittle, F. (2003). *Improving the economic and life outcomes of at-risk youth* (MDRC Concept Paper). New York: MDRC. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Lacy, G., & Yang, A. (1990). *Building Youth Corps*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearinghouse. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Lewis, A. (2003). *Shaping the future of American youth: Youth policy in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. The study is ineligible for review because it is

References (continued)

- not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Martin, N., & Halperin, S. (2006). *Whatever it takes: How twelve communities are reconnecting out-of-school youth*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Michigan Youth Corps. (1988). *Michigan Youth Corps: Coming of age*. Lansing, MI: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- National Commission on National and Community Service. (1993). Youth corps: Reconnecting America's youth. In *What you can do for your country* (pp. 63–84). Washington, DC: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Partee, G. L. (2003). *Preparing youth for employment: Principles and characteristics of five leading United States youth development programs*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Partee, G. L., & Halperin, S. (2006). *Preparing youth for careers, lifelong learning, and civic participation: Principles and characteristics of six leading United States youth development programs*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Prouty, S. T. (2009). Achieving their potential. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 18(1), 37–40. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Prouty, S. T. (2009). Trails training opportunities: Corps provide training and career paths for young people. *American Trails Magazine*. Retrieved July 14, 2010 from <http://www.myvirtualpaper.com/doc/americantrails/Sum09ATM/2009072301/>. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Prouty, S. T., Sofer, E., & Karasik, J. (2009). *Civic Justice Corps: Transforming re-entry through service* (White paper). Retrieved May 12, 2010, from http://www.corpsnetwork.org/images/pdfs/publications/civic_justice_corps_transforming_reentry_through_service_comp.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Prouty, S. T., Sofer, E., & Karasik, J. (2009). *Service and Conservation Corps and America's public lands* (White paper). Retrieved May 12, 2010, from http://www.corpsnetwork.org/images/pdfs/publications/service_and_conservation_corps_and_americas_public_lands_comp.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Prouty, S. T., Sofer, E., Karasik, J., & Stankorb, S. (2009). *The Clean Energy Service Corps* (White paper). Retrieved May 12, 2010, from http://www.corpsnetwork.org/images/pdfs/publications/the_clean_energy_service_corps_comp.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Prouty, S. T., Sofer, E., Karasik, J., & Stankorb, S. (2010). *Corps: Jobs today, a lifetime of employment tomorrow* (White paper). Retrieved May 12, 2010, from http://www.corpsnetwork.org/images/pdfs/publications/corps_jobs_today_a_lifetime_of_service_tomorrow_comp.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Rappaport, C., Jastrzab, J. & Falzone, S. (2003). *Promising practices for helping low-income youth obtain and retain jobs: A guide for practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary

References *(continued)*

analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Reynolds, K. M. (1993). A case study of a public-private partnership: The Mobile Environmental Youth Corps prototype comprehensive boot camp for juvenile offenders. *Masters Abstracts International*, 32(03), 114–853. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Sagawa, S. (2007). *Serving America: A national service agenda for the next decade*. Washington, DC: Center for American

Progress. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Wald, M., & Martinez, T. (2000). *Connected by 25: Improving the life chances of the country's most vulnerable 14–24 year olds*. Menlo Park, CA: Hewlett Foundation, Children and Youth Program. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Appendix

Appendix A1 Study characteristics: Jastrzab, 1997

Characteristic	Description
Study citation	Jastrzab, J. (1997). <i>Youth Corps: Promising strategies for young people and their communities</i> . Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
Participants	<p>The study used a randomized controlled trial design to examine the effect of <i>Service and Conservation Corps</i> in four sites located in four states. The criteria for selecting sites included program size (70 or more participants), the absence of recruiting problems, at least one year in operation, and only one study site per state (to maximize geographic diversity). From August 1993 through May 1994, the four sites that met these criteria and agreed to participate in the study randomly assigned 1,642 program applicants to either a treatment group that was allowed to enroll in the program (1,378 youth) or to a control group that was not (264 youth). Although the combination of overall and differential rates of student attrition exceeds WWC standards for this topic area, the study statistically controls for differences between the analytic groups in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, and several measures of degree of disadvantage or school performance.</p> <p>The analysis sample consisted of 383 youths in the treatment group and 243 youths in the control group.¹ The combination of overall and differential rates of student attrition associated with this analysis sample exceeds WWC standards for this topic area.</p> <p>The average age of sampled youth was 20, with about two-thirds between 17 and 19 years of age. Slightly less than half of the study participants were African-American, about three-fifths were male, and half had not yet received a high school diploma or GED.</p>
Setting	The study was conducted in four sites: California Conservation Corps–Santa Clara District, City Volunteer Corps in New York City, Greater Miami Service Corps in Florida, and Washington State Service Corps.
Intervention	<i>Service and Conservation Corps</i> programs provide young people with a combination of work experience and education while participating in community service. Youth ages are typically 17 to 26. Most are disadvantaged economically or educationally. Corps members usually work in teams of 8 to 15 on service projects in their communities; many of the programs require participants to wear uniforms or at least t-shirts with the <i>Service and Conservation Corps</i> logo. Most programs are not residential. A few programs, including several sites of the California Conservation Corps, do provide participants with temporary lodging. Programs range in size from comparatively small corps serving 20 participants to programs with several hundred corps members. Participation is typically full time and intended to last between 6 and 12 months, although the average participant stays in the program for about 4 or 5 months. Participants generally spend 80% of their time in community service; the rest of the time is allocated to education and other personal or professional developmental activities. During their enrollment in <i>Service and Conservation Corps</i> , participants are paid a stipend, generally equivalent to or less than the minimum wage. Those who complete the programs often are eligible for post-program educational stipends or small cash awards. Through case management, participants are linked to a wide array of educational and supportive services, including counseling and education. The study reported youths' outcomes 15 months after program application.
Comparison	The control group did not receive <i>Service and Conservation Corps</i> services, but could receive other services available in the community. The program effects presented in this study are treatment on treated (TOT) impacts. In other words, the impacts adjust for “no-shows” and “crossovers” in the analysis sample and are based on enrolled treatment group members.
Primary outcomes and measurement	The relevant study outcome included in this review is whether youths reported ever having earned a high school diploma or GED. This outcome is based on student follow-up interviews conducted 15 months after program application. For a more detailed description of this outcome measure, see Appendix A2. The study also examined a number of other outcomes that are not within the scope of the Dropout Prevention review protocol, including employment, earnings, and measures of civic engagement.
Staff/teacher training	The program's educational component often is offered through partnerships with local charter schools or community colleges. No information is available about the training of the staff.

1. The study included analysis of subgroups based on initial educational attainment, gender, and race. However, information on the baseline equivalence of the analysis groups in these subgroups is not provided. Therefore, these results were not included in the WWC review.

Appendix A2 Outcome measure for the completing school domain

Outcome measure	Description
Ever earned a high school diploma or GED	This outcome measures whether the student reported having ever earned a high school diploma or GED. These self-reported data were collected from follow-up surveys that occurred 15 months after program application (as cited in Jastrzab, 1997).

Appendix A3 Summary of study findings included in the rating for the completing school domain¹

Outcome measure	Study sample	Sample size (youths)	Author's findings from the study		WWC calculations			
			Mean outcome ²		Mean difference ³ (Corps-comparison)	Effect size ⁴	Statistical significance ⁵ (at $\alpha = 0.05$)	Improvement index ⁶
			Corps group	Comparison group				
Jastrzab, 1997⁷								
Ever earned a high school diploma or GED	Survey respondents	626	0.57	0.59	-0.02	-0.05	ns	-2
Domain average for completing school⁸						-0.05	ns	-2

ns = not statistically significant

1. This appendix reports findings considered for the effectiveness rating and the average improvement indices for the completing school domain.
2. The *Service and Conservation Corps* group and the control group mean outcome values from Jastrzab (1997) are proportions of youths who earned a high school diploma or GED during the follow-up period.
3. Positive differences and effect sizes favor the intervention group; negative differences and effect sizes favor the comparison group.
4. For an explanation of the effect size calculation, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix B. In the case of binary outcome variables, effect sizes are calculated using the Cox effect size index. The Cox index is based on logged odds ratios; therefore, standard deviations are not needed for the calculation of effect sizes for binary outcome measures, such as whether youth have earned a high school diploma or GED.
5. Statistical significance is the probability that the difference between groups is a result of chance rather than a real difference between the groups.
6. The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and that of the average student in the comparison condition. The improvement index can take on values between -50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group.
7. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, when necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. In the case of Jastrzab (1997), no corrections for clustering or multiple comparisons were needed.
8. This row provides the study average, which in this case is also the domain average. The WWC-computed domain average effect size is a simple average rounded to two decimal places. The domain improvement index is calculated from the average effect size.

Appendix A4 Service and Conservation Corps rating for the completing school domain

The WWC rates an intervention's effects in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative.¹ For the outcome domain of completing school, the WWC rated *Service and Conservation Corps* as having no discernible effects for at-risk youth.

Rating received

No discernible effects: No affirmative evidence of effects.

- Criterion 1: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either *positive* or *negative*.

Met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect. One study showed indeterminate effects.

Other ratings considered

Positive effects: Strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: Two or more studies showing statistically significant *positive* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant positive effect.

AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects.

Met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect.

Potentially positive effects: Evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and fewer or the same number of studies showing *indeterminate* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect. One study showed an indeterminate effect.

Mixed effects: Evidence of inconsistent effects as demonstrated through either of the following criteria.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect, but no more such studies than the number showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

1. For rating purposes, the WWC considers the statistical significance of individual outcomes and the domain-level effect. The WWC also considers the size of the domain-level effect for ratings of potentially positive or potentially negative effects. For a complete description, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E.

(continued)

OR

- Criterion 2: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, and more studies showing an *indeterminate* effect than showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect. One study showed an indeterminate effect.

Potentially negative effects: Evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: One study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and no studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

OR

- Criterion 2: Two or more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects, at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

Negative effects: Strong evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: Two or more studies showing statistically significant *negative* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

Not met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant negative effect.

AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

Met. No studies of *Service and Conservation Corps* showed a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect.

Appendix A5 Extent of evidence by domain

Outcome domain	Number of studies	Sites	Sample size		Extent of evidence ¹
			Youths		
Completing school	1	>2	626		Small
Staying in school	0	na	na		na
Progressing in school	0	na	na		na

na = not applicable

1. A rating of “medium to large” requires at least two studies and two schools across studies in one domain and a total sample size across studies of at least 350 students or 14 classrooms. Otherwise, the rating is “small.” For more details on the extent of evidence categorization, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix G.