

SUN Evaluation Workgroup

Meeting Summary

September 10, 2008

Attending: Dunya Minoo, Maxine Thompson, Peggy Samolinski, Diane Dorfman, Sik Chan, Mary Richardson, Lisa Pellegrino

The group reviewed and checked for agreement on which data we would ideally like for the superintendents to authorize MESD to analyze and release back to funders.

- School attendance percentage - still waiting for research on attendance bright line but expecting that school attendance needs to be at least 90% to correlate with positive outcomes we are looking for
- Agreement to drop attendance improvement measure that CHIF was using
- Agreement to drop behavior data tracking
- Agreement to track % that meets and exceeds math and reading benchmarks
- Agreement to track movement to a higher performance category for reading and math testing to assure that we see whether students are improving even if they are still not meeting benchmark
- Need to check with districts/MESD on feasibility of tracking course credit accrued in a given academic year and also question as to utility since AS programs generally do not address lack of credits – could maybe use as an indicator – CX25 will likely be wanting this information on the kids they've identified as being most at risk for dropout
- No MESD tracking and reporting back to us on demographics – funders to track on their own
- May want to ask MESD to disaggregate data on some of these variables by demographic categories that districts track

The group agreed that next step was to strategize about how to stage this discussion with all the relevant partners from the school district and MESD.

The group also discussed the upcoming SUN CC meeting and how we wanted to summarize our work. We agreed on the following:

- Describe our charge as data and evaluation; have started with trying to work on common data variables that partners could all use. See above for specifics.
- Group is also interested in data on other variables that none of us is currently tracking such as assessing the percentage of at risk children that SUN reaches in a given year, tracking what students who are participating in SUN some of the time are doing when they are not at SUN; getting data on a similar population that is not participating in SUN and comparing outcomes for the two groups.
- The group recognizes that in order to more deeply study the effect of SUN on students, the partners would need to undertake a more formal evaluation which would require dedicated funding.
- The group was also interested in how it might foster efforts to improve the quality of services delivered because all research shows that the higher the quality of the service, the better the outcome for the child. If there are not resources for an evaluation that focuses on child level outcomes, it might be worth investing in quality improvement as a means to assure positive outcomes.